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NOTE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

This work differs from its companion volume in offering something more

like a continuous personal history than was necessary in the case of

such a man as Voltaire, the story of whose life may be found in more

than one English book of repute. Of Rousseau there is, I believe, no

full biographical account in our literature, and even France has nothing

more complete under this head than Musset-Pathay's \_Histoire de la Vie

et des Ouvrages de J.J. Rousseau\_ (1821). This, though a meritorious

piece of labour, is extremely crude and formless in composition and

arrangement, and the interpreting portions are devoid of interest.

The edition of Rousseau's works to which the references have been made

is that by M. Auguis, in twenty-seven volumes, published in 1825 by

Dalibon. In 1865 M. Streckeisen-Moultou published from the originals,

which had been deposited in the library of NeuchÃ¢tel by Du Peyrou, the

letters addressed to Rousseau by various correspondents. These two

interesting volumes, which are entitled \_Rousseau, ses Amis et ses

Ennemis\_, are mostly referred to under the name of their editor.

\_February\_, 1873.

\* \* \* \* \*

The second edition in 1878 was revised; some portions were considerably

shortened, and a few additional footnotes inserted. No further changes

have been made in the present edition.

\_January\_, 1886.
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HUGO.

ROUSSEAU.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY.

Christianity is the name for a great variety of changes which took place

during the first centuries of our era, in men's ways of thinking and

feeling about their spiritual relations to unseen powers, about their

moral relations to one another, about the basis and type of social

union. So the Revolution is now the accepted name for a set of changes

which began faintly to take a definite practical shape first in America,

and then in France, towards the end of the eighteenth century; they had

been directly prepared by a small number of energetic thinkers, whose

speculations represented, as always, the prolongation of some old lines

of thought in obedience to the impulse of new social and intellectual

conditions. While one movement supplied the energy and the principles

which extricated civilisation from the ruins of the Roman empire, the

other supplies the energy and the principles which already once, between

the Seven Years' War and the assembly of the States General, saved

human progress in face of the political fatuity of England and the

political nullity of France; and they are now, amid the distraction of

the various representatives of an obsolete ordering, the only forces to

be trusted at once for multiplying the achievements of human

intelligence stimulated by human sympathy, and for diffusing their

beneficent results with an ampler hand and more far-scattering arm.

Faith in a divine power, devout obedience to its supposed will, hope of

ecstatic, unspeakable reward, these were the springs of the old

movement. Undivided love of our fellows, steadfast faith in human

nature, steadfast search after justice, firm aspiration towards

improvement, and generous contentment in the hope that others may reap

whatever reward may be, these are the springs of the new.

There is no given set of practical maxims agreed to by all members of

the revolutionary schools for achieving the work of release from the

pressure of an antiquated social condition, any more than there is one

set of doctrines and one kind of discipline accepted by all Protestants.

Voltaire was a revolutionist in one sense, Diderot in another, and

Rousseau in a third, just as in the practical order, Lafayette, Danton,

Robespierre, represented three different aspirations and as many

methods. Rousseau was the most directly revolutionary of all the

speculative precursors, and he was the first to apply his mind boldly to

those of the social conditions which the revolution is concerned by one

solution or another to modify. How far his direct influence was

disastrous in consequence of a mischievous method, we shall have to

examine. It was so various that no single answer can comprehend an

exhaustive judgment. His writings produced that glow of enthusiastic

feeling in France, which led to the all-important assistance rendered by

that country to the American colonists in a struggle so momentous for

mankind. It was from his writings that the Americans took the ideas and

the phrases of their great charter, thus uniting the native principles

of their own direct Protestantism with principles that were strictly

derivative from the Protestantism of Geneva. Again, it was his work more

than that of any other one man, that France arose from the deadly decay

which had laid hold of her whole social and political system, and found

that irresistible energy which warded off dissolution within and

partition from without. We shall see, further, that besides being the

first immediately revolutionary thinker in politics, he was the most

stirring of reactionists in religion. His influence formed not only

Robespierre and Paine, but Chateaubriand, not only Jacobinism, but the

Catholicism of the Restoration. Thus he did more than any one else at

once to give direction to the first episodes of revolution, and force to

the first episode of reaction.

There are some teachers whose distinction is neither correct thought,

nor an eye for the exigencies of practical organisation, but simply

depth and fervour of the moral sentiment, bringing with it the

indefinable gift of touching many hearts with love of virtue and the

things of the spirit. The Christian organisations which saved western

society from dissolution owe all to St. Paul, Hildebrand, Luther,

Calvin; but the spiritual life of the west during all these generations

has burnt with the pure flame first lighted by the sublime mystic of the

Galilean hills. Aristotle acquired for men much knowledge and many

instruments for gaining more; but it is Plato, his master, who moves the

soul with love of truth and enthusiasm for excellence. There is peril in

all such leaders of souls, inasmuch as they incline men to substitute

warmth for light, and to be content with aspiration where they need

direction. Yet no movement goes far which does not count one of them in

the number of its chiefs. Rousseau took this place among those who

prepared the first act of that revolutionary drama, whose fifth act is

still dark to us.

At the heart of the Revolution, like a torrid stream flowing

undiscernible amid the waters of a tumbling sea, is a new way of

understanding life. The social changes desired by the various assailants

of the old order are only the expression of a deeper change in moral

idea, and the drift of the new moral idea is to make life simpler. This

in a sense is at the bottom of all great religious and moral movements,

and the Revolution emphatically belongs to the latter class. Like such

movements in the breast of the individual, those which stir an epoch

have their principle in the same craving for disentanglement of life.

This impulse to shake off intricacies is the mark of revolutionary

generations, and it was the starting-point of all Rousseau's mental

habits, and of the work in which they expressed themselves. His mind

moved outwards from this centre, and hence the fact that he dealt

principally with government and education, the two great agencies which,

in an old civilisation with a thousand roots and feelers, surround

external life and internal character with complexity. Simplification of

religion by clearing away the overgrowth of errors, simplification of

social relations by equality, of literature and art by constant return

to nature, of manners by industrious homeliness and thrift,--this is the

revolutionary process and ideal, and this is the secret of Rousseau's

hold over a generation that was lost amid the broken maze of

fallen systems.

\* \* \* \* \*

The personality of Rousseau has most equivocal and repulsive sides. It

has deservedly fared ill in the esteem of the saner and more rational of

those who have judged him, and there is none in the history of famous

men and our spiritual fathers that begat us, who make more constant

demands on the patience or pity of those who study his life. Yet in no

other instance is the common eagerness to condense all predication about

a character into a single unqualified proposition so fatally inadequate.

If it is indispensable that we should be for ever describing, naming,

classifying, at least it is well, in speaking of such a nature as his,

to enlarge the vocabulary beyond the pedantic formulas of unreal ethics,

and to be as sure as we know how to make ourselves, that each of the

sympathies and faculties which together compose our power of spiritual

observation, is in a condition of free and patient energy. Any less open

and liberal method, which limits our sentiments to absolute approval or

disapproval, and fixes the standard either at the balance of common

qualities which constitutes mediocrity, or at the balance of uncommon

qualities which is divinity as in a Shakespeare, must leave in a cloud

of blank incomprehensibleness those singular spirits who come from time

to time to quicken the germs of strange thought and shake the quietness

of the earth.

We may forget much in our story that is grievous or hateful, in

reflecting that if any man now deems a day basely passed in which he has

given no thought to the hard life of garret and hovel, to the forlorn

children and trampled women of wide squalid wildernesses in cities, it

was Rousseau who first in our modern time sounded a new trumpet note for

one more of the great battles of humanity. He makes the poor very proud,

it was truly said. Some of his contemporaries followed the same vein of

thought, as we shall see, and he was only continuing work which others

had prepared. But he alone had the gift of the golden mouth. It was in

Rousseau that polite Europe first hearkened to strange voices and faint

reverberation from out of the vague and cavernous shadow in which the

common people move. Science has to feel the way towards light and

solution, to prepare, to organise. But the race owes something to one

who helped to state the problem, writing up in letters of flame at the

brutal feast of kings and the rich that civilisation is as yet only a

mockery, and did furthermore inspire a generation of men and women with

the stern resolve that they would rather perish than live on in a world

where such things can be.

CHAPTER II.

YOUTH.

Jean Jacques Rousseau was born at Geneva, June 28, 1712. He was of old

French stock. His ancestors had removed from Paris to the famous city of

refuge as far back as 1529, a little while before Farel came thither to

establish the principles of the Reformation, and seven years before the

first visit of the more extraordinary man who made Geneva the mother

city of a new interpretation of Christianity, as Rome was the mother

city of the old. Three generations in a direct line separated Jean

Jacques from Didier Rousseau, the son of a Paris bookseller, and the

first emigrant.[1] Thus Protestant tradition in the Rousseau family

dates from the appearance of Protestantism in Europe, and seems to have

exerted the same kind of influence upon them as it did, in conjunction

with the rest of the surrounding circumstances, upon the other citizens

of the ideal state of the Reformation. It is computed by the historians

that out of three thousand families who composed the population of

Geneva towards the end of the seventeenth century, there were hardly

fifty who before the Reformation had acquired the position of

burgess-ship. The curious set of conditions which thus planted a colony

of foreigners in the midst of a free polity, with a new doctrine and

newer discipline, introduced into Europe a fresh type of character and

manners. People declared they could recognise in the men of Geneva

neither French vivacity, nor Italian subtlety and clearness, nor Swiss

gravity. They had a zeal for religion, a vigorous energy in government,

a passion for freedom, a devotion to ingenious industries, which marked

them with a stamp unlike that of any other community.[2] Towards the

close of the seventeenth century some of the old austerity and rudeness

was sensibly modified under the influence of the great neighbouring

monarchy. One striking illustration of this tendency was the rapid

decline of the Savoyard patois in popular use. The movement had not gone

far enough when Rousseau was born, to take away from the manners and

spirit of his country their special quality and individual note.

The mother of Jean Jacques, who seems to have been a simple, cheerful,

and tender woman, was the daughter of a Genevan minister; her maiden

name, Bernard. The birth of her son was fatal to her, and the most

touching and pathetic of all the many shapes of death was the fit

beginning of a life preappointed to nearly unlifting cloud. "I cost my

mother her life," he wrote, "and my birth was the first of my woes."[3]

Destiny thus touches us with magical finger, long before consciousness

awakens to the forces that have been set to work in our personality,

launching us into the universe with country, forefathers, and physical

predispositions, all fixed without choice of ours. Rousseau was born

dying, and though he survived this first crisis by the affectionate care

of one of his father's sisters, yet his constitution remained infirm and

disordered.

Inborn tendencies, as we perceive on every side, are far from having

unlimited irresistible mastery, if they meet early encounter from some

wise and patient external will. The father of Rousseau was unfortunately

cast in the same mould as his mother, and the child's own morbid

sensibility was stimulated and deepened by the excessive sensibility of

his first companion. Isaac Rousseau, in many of his traits, was a

reversion to an old French type. In all the Genevese there was an

underlying tendency of this kind. "Under a phlegmatic and cool air,"

wrote Rousseau, when warning his countrymen against the inflammatory

effects of the drama, "the Genevese hide an ardent and sensitive

character, that is more easily moved than controlled."[4] And some of

the episodes in their history during the eighteenth century might be

taken for scenes from the turbulent dramas of Paris. But Isaac

Rousseau's restlessness, his eager emotion, his quick and punctilious

sense of personal dignity, his heedlessness of ordered affairs, were not

common in Geneva, fortunately for the stability of her society and the

prosperity of her citizens. This disorder of spirit descended in

modified form to the son; it was inevitable that he should be indirectly

affected by it. Before he was seven years old he had learnt from his

father to indulge a passion for the reading of romances. The child and

the man passed whole nights in a fictitious world, reading to one

another in turn, absorbed by vivid interest in imaginary situations,

until the morning note of the birds recalled them to a sense of the

conditions of more actual life, and made the elder cry out in confusion

that he was the more childish of the two.

The effect of this was to raise passion to a premature exaltation in the

young brain. "I had no idea of real things," he said, "though all the

sentiments were already familiar to me. Nothing had come to me by

conception, everything by sensation. These confused emotions, striking

me one after another, did not warp a reason that I did not yet possess,

but they gradually shaped in me a reason of another cast and temper,

and gave me bizarre and romantic ideas of human life, of which neither

reflection nor experience has ever been able wholly to cure me."[5] Thus

these first lessons, which have such tremendous influence over all that

follow, had the direct and fatal effect in Rousseau's case of deadening

that sense of the actual relations of things to one another in the

objective world, which is the master-key and prime law of sanity.

In time the library of romances came to an end (1719), and Jean Jacques

and his father fell back on the more solid and moderated fiction of

history and biography. The romances had been the possession of the

mother; the more serious books were inherited from the old minister, her

father. Such books as Nani's History of Venice, and Le Sueur's History

of the Church and the Empire, made less impression on the young Rousseau

than the admirable Plutarch; and he used to read to his father during

the hours of work, and read over again to himself during all hours,

those stories of free and indomitable souls which are so proper to

kindle the glow of generous fire. Plutarch was dear to him to the end of

his life; he read him in the late days when he had almost ceased to

read, and he always declared Plutarch to be nearly the only author to

whom he had never gone without profit."[6] "I think I see my father now,"

he wrote when he had begun to make his mark in Paris, "living by the

work of his hands, and nourishing his soul on the sublimest truths. I

see Tacitus, Plutarch, and Grotius, lying before him along with the

tools of his craft. I see at his side a cherished son receiving

instruction from the best of fathers, alas, with but too little

fruit."[7] This did little to implant the needed impressions of the

actual world. Rousseau's first training continued to be in an excessive

degree the exact reverse of our common method; this stirs the

imagination too little, and shuts the young too narrowly within the

strait pen of present and visible reality. The reader of Plutarch at the

age of ten actually conceived himself a Greek or a Roman, and became the

personage whose strokes of constancy and intrepidity transported him

with sympathetic ecstasy, made his eyes sparkle, and raised his voice to

heroic pitch. Listeners were even alarmed one day as he told the tale of

Scaevola at table, to see him imitatively thrust forth his arm over a

hot chafing-dish.[8]

Rousseau had one brother, on whom the spirit of the father came down in

ample measure, just as the sensibility of the mother descended upon Jean

Jacques. He passed through a boyhood of revolt, and finally ran away

into Germany, where he was lost from sight and knowledge of his kinsmen

for ever. Jean Jacques was thus left virtually an only child,[9] and he

commemorates the homely tenderness and care with which his early years

were surrounded. Except in the hours which he passed in reading by the

side of his father, he was always with his aunt, in the self-satisfying

curiosity of childhood watching her at work with the needle and busy

about affairs of the house, or else listening to her with contented

interest, as she sang the simple airs of the common people. The

impression of this kind and cheerful figure was stamped on his memory to

the end; her tone of voice, her dress, the quaint fashion of her hair.

The constant recollection of her shows, among many other signs, how he

cherished that conception of the true unity of a man's life, which

places it in a closely-linked chain of active memories, and which most

of us lose in wasteful dispersion of sentiment and poor fragmentariness

of days. When the years came in which he might well say, I have no

pleasure in them, and after a manhood of distress and suspicion and

diseased sorrows had come to dim those blameless times, he could still

often surprise himself unconsciously humming the tune of one of his

aunt's old songs, with many tears in his eyes.[10]

This affectionate schooling came suddenly to an end. Isaac Rousseau in

the course of a quarrel in which he had involved himself, believed that

he saw unfairness in the operation of the law, for the offender had

kinsfolk in the Great Council. He resolved to leave his country rather

than give way, in circumstances which compromised his personal honour

and the free justice of the republic. So his house was broken up, and

his son was sent to school at the neighbouring village of Bossey (1722),

under the care of a minister, "there to learn along with Latin all the

medley of sorry stuff with which, under the name of education, they

accompany Latin."[11] Rousseau tells us nothing of the course of his

intellectual instruction here, but he marks his two years' sojourn under

the roof of M. Lambercier by two forward steps in that fateful

acquaintance with good and evil, which is so much more important than

literary knowledge. Upon one of these fruits of the tree of nascent

experience, men usually keep strict silence. Rousseau is the only person

that ever lived who proclaimed to the whole world as a part of his own

biography the ignoble circumstances of the birth of sensuality in

boyhood. Nobody else ever asked us to listen while he told of the

playmate with which unwarned youth takes its heedless pleasure, which

waxes and strengthens with years, until the man suddenly awakens to find

the playmate grown into a master, grotesque and foul, whose unclean grip

is not to be shaken off, and who poisons the air with the goatish fume

of the satyr. It is on this side that the unspoken plays so decisive a

part, that most of the spoken seems but as dust in the balance; it is

here that the flesh spreads gross clouds over the firmament of the

spirit. Thinking of it, we flee from talk about the high matters of will

and conscience, of purity of heart and the diviner mind, and hurry to

the physician. Manhood commonly saves itself by its own innate

healthiness, though the decent apron bequeathed to us in the old legend

of the fall, the thick veil of a more than legendary reserve, prevents

us from really measuring the actual waste of delicacy and the finer

forces. Rousseau, most unhappily for himself, lacked this innate

healthiness; he never shook off the demon which would be so ridiculous,

if it did not hide such terrible power. With a moral courage, that it

needs hardly less moral courage in the critic firmly to refrain from

calling cynical or shameless, he has told the whole story of this

lifelong depravation. In the present state of knowledge, which in the

region of the human character the false shamefacedness of science, aided

and abetted by the mutilating hand of religious asceticism, has kept

crude and imperfect, there is nothing very profitable to be said on all

this. When the great art of life has been more systematically conceived

in the long processes of time and endeavour, and when more bold,

ffective, and far-reaching advance has been made in defining those

pathological manifestations which deserve to be seriously studied, as

distinguished from those of a minor sort which are barely worth

registering, then we should know better how to speak, or how to be

silent, in the present most unwelcome instance. As it is, we perhaps do

best in chronicling the fact and passing on. The harmless young are

allowed to play without monition or watching among the deep open graves

of temperament; and Rousseau, telling the tale of his inmost experience,

unlike the physician and the moralist who love decorous surfaces of

things, did not spare himself nor others a glimpse of the ignominies to

which the body condemns its high tenant, the soul.[12]

The second piece of experience which he acquired at Bossey was the

knowledge of injustice and wrongful suffering as things actual and

existent. Circumstances brought him under suspicion of having broken the

teeth of a comb which did not belong to him. He was innocent, and not

even the most terrible punishment could wring from him an untrue

confession of guilt. The root of his constancy was not in an abhorrence

of falsehood, which is exceptional in youth, and for which he takes no

credit, but in a furious and invincible resentment against the violent

pressure that was unjustly put upon him. "Picture a character, timid and

docile in ordinary life, but ardent, impetuous, indomitable in its

passions; a child always governed by the voice of reason, always treated

with equity, gentleness, and consideration, who had not even the idea of

injustice, and who for the first time experiences an injustice so

terrible, from the very people whom he most cherishes and respects! What

a confusion of ideas, what disorder of sentiments, what revolution in

heart, in brain, in every part of his moral and intellectual being!" He

had not learnt, any more than other children, either to put himself in

the place of his elders, or to consider the strength of the apparent

case against him. All that he felt was the rigour of a frightful

chastisement for an offence of which he was innocent. And the

association of ideas was permanent. "This first sentiment of violence

and injustice has remained so deeply engraved in my soul, that all the

ideas relating to it bring my first emotion back to me; and this

sentiment, though only relative to myself in its origin, has taken such

consistency, and become so disengaged from all personal interest, that

my heart is inflamed at the sight or story of any wrongful action, just

as much as if its effect fell on my own person. When I read of the

cruelties of some ferocious tyrant, or the subtle atrocities of some

villain of a priest, I would fain start on the instant to poniard such

wretches, though I were to perish a hundred times for the deed.... This

movement may be natural to me, and I believe it is so; but the profound

recollection of the first injustice I suffered was too long and too fast

bound up with it, not to have strengthened it enormously."[13]

To men who belong to the silent and phlegmatic races like our own, all

this may possibly strike on the ear like a false or strained note. Yet a

tranquil appeal to the real history of one's own strongest impressions

may disclose their roots in facts of childish experience, which

remoteness of time has gradually emptied of the burning colour they once

had. This childish discovery of the existence in his own world of that

injustice which he had only seen through a glass very darkly in the

imaginary world of his reading, was for Rousseau the angry dismissal

from the primitive Eden, which in one shape and at one time or another

overtakes all men. "Here," he says, "was the term of the serenity of my

childish days. From this moment I ceased to enjoy a pure happiness, and

I feel even at this day that the reminiscence of the delights of my

infancy here comes to an end.... Even the country lost in our eyes that

charm of sweetness and simplicity which goes to the heart; it seemed

sombre and deserted, and was as if covered by a veil, hiding its

beauties from our sight. We no longer tended our little gardens, our

plants, our flowers. We went no more lightly to scratch the earth,

shouting for joy as we discovered the germ of the seed we had sown."

Whatever may be the degree of literal truth in the Confessions, the

whole course of Rousseau's life forbids us to pass this passionate

description by as overcharged or exaggerated. We are conscious in it of

a constitutional infirmity. We perceive an absence of healthy power of

reaction against moral shock. Such shocks are experienced in many

unavoidable forms by all save the dullest natures, when they first come

into contact with the sharp tooth of outer circumstance. Indeed, a man

must be either miraculously happy in his experiences, or exceptionally

obtuse in observing and feeling, or else be the creature of base and

cynical ideals, if life does not to the end continue to bring many a

repetition of that first day of incredulous bewilderment. But the urgent

demands for material activity quickly recall the mass of men to normal

relations with their fellows and the outer world. A vehement objective

temperament, like Voltaire's, is instantly roused by one of these

penetrative stimuli into angry and tenacious resistance. A proud and

collected soul, like Goethe's, loftily follows its own inner aims,

without taking any heed of the perturbations that arise from want of

self-collection in a world still spelling its rudiments. A sensitive and

depressed spirit, like Rousseau's or Cowper's, finds itself without any

of these reacting kinds of force, and the first stroke of cruelty or

oppression is the going out of a divine light.

Leaving Bossey, Rousseau returned to Geneva, and passed two or three

years with his uncle, losing his time for the most part, but learning

something of drawing and something of Euclid, for the former of which he

showed special inclination.[14] It was a question whether he was to be

made a watchmaker, a lawyer, or a minister. His own preference, as his

after-life might have led us to suppose, was in favour of the last of

the three; "for I thought it a fine thing," he says, "to preach." The

uncle was a man of pleasure, and as often happens in such

circumstances, his love of pleasure had the effect of turning his wife

into a pietist. Their son was Rousseau's constant comrade. "Our

friendship filled our hearts so amply, that if we were only together,

the simplest amusements were a delight." They made kites, cages, bows

and arrows, drums, houses; they spoiled the tools of their grandfather,

in trying to make watches like him. In the same cheerful imitative

spirit, which is the main feature in childhood when it is not disturbed

by excess of literary teaching, after Geneva had been visited by an

Italian showman with a troop of marionettes, they made puppets and

composed comedies for them; and when one day the uncle read aloud an

elegant sermon, they abandoned their comedies, and turned with blithe

energy to exhortation. They had glimpses of the rougher side of life in

the biting mockeries of some schoolboys of the neighbourhood. These

ended in appeal to the god of youthful war, who pronounced so plainly

for the bigger battalions, that the release of their enemies from school

was the signal for the quick retreat of our pair within doors. All this

is an old story in every biography written or unwritten. It seldom fails

to touch us, either in the way of sympathetic reminiscence, or if life

should have gone somewhat too hardly with a man, then in the way of

irony, which is not less real and poetic than the eironeia of a Greek

dramatist, for being concerned with more unheroic creatures.

And this rough play of the streets always seemed to Rousseau a manlier

schooling than the effeminate tendencies which he thought he noticed in

Genevese youth in after years. "In my time," he says admiringly,

"children were brought up in rustic fashion and had no complexion to

keep.... Timid and modest before the old, they were bold, haughty,

combative among themselves; they had no curled locks to be careful of;

they defied one another at wrestling, running, boxing. They returned

home sweating, out of breath, torn; they were true blackguards, if you

will, but they made men who have zeal in their heart to serve their

country and blood to shed for her. May we be able to say as much one day

of our fine little gentlemen, and may these men at fifteen not turn out

children at thirty."[15]

Two incidents of this period remain to us, described in Rousseau's own

words, and as they reveal a certain sweetness in which his life

unhappily did not afterwards greatly abound, it may help our equitable

balance of impressions about him to reproduce them. Every Sunday he used

to spend the day at PÃ¢quis at Mr. Fazy's, who had married one of his

aunts, and who carried on the production of printed calicoes. "One day I

was in the drying-room, watching the rollers of the hot press; their

brightness pleased my eye; I was tempted to lay my fingers on them, and

I was moving them up and down with much satisfaction along the smooth

cylinder, when young Fazy placed himself in the wheel and gave it a

half-quarter turn so adroitly, that I had just the ends of my two

longest fingers caught, but this was enough to crush the tips and tear

the nails. I raised a piercing cry; Fazy instantly turned back the

wheel, and the blood gushed from my fingers. In the extremity of

consternation he hastened to me, embraced me, and besought me to cease

my cries, or he would be undone. In the height of my own pain, I was

touched by his; I instantly fell silent, we ran to the pond, where he

helped me to wash my fingers and to staunch the blood with moss. He

entreated me with tears not to accuse him; I promised him that I would

not, and Ã kept my word so well that twenty years after no one knew the

origin of the scar. I was kept in bed for more than three weeks, and for

more than two months was unable to use my hand. But I persisted that a

large stone had fallen and crushed my fingers."[16]

The other story is of the same tenour, though there is a new touch of

sensibility in its concluding words. "I was playing at ball at Plain

Palais, with one of my comrades named Plince. We began to quarrel over

the game; we fought, and in the fight he dealt me on my bare head a

stroke so well directed, that with a stronger arm it would have dashed

my brains out. I fell to the ground, and there never was agitation like

that of this poor lad, as he saw the blood in my hair. He thought he had

killed me. He threw himself upon me, and clasped me eagerly in his arms,

while his tears poured down his cheeks, and he uttered shrill cries. I

returned his embrace with all my force, weeping like him, in a state of

confused emotion which was not without a kind of sweetness. Then he

tried to stop the blood which kept flowing, and seeing that our two

handkerchiefs were not enough, he dragged me off to his mother's; she

had a small garden hard by. The good woman nearly fell sick at sight of

me in this condition; she kept strength enough to dress my wound, and

after bathing it well, she applied flower-de-luce macerated in brandy,

an excellent remedy much used in our country. Her tears and those of her

son, went to my very heart, so that I looked upon them for a long while

as my mother and my brother."[17]

If it were enough that our early instincts should be thus amiable and

easy, then doubtless the dismal sloughs in which men and women lie

floundering would occupy a very much more insignificant space in the

field of human experience. The problem, as we know, lies in the

discipline of this primitive goodness. For character in a state of

society is not a tree that grows into uprightness by the law of its own

strength, though an adorable instance here and there of rectitude and

moral loveliness that seem intuitive may sometimes tempt us into a

moment's belief in a contrary doctrine. In Rousseau's case this serious

problem was never solved; there was no deliberate preparation of his

impulses, prepossessions, notions; no foresight on the part of elders,

and no gradual acclimatisation of a sensitive and ardent nature in the

fixed principles which are essential to right conduct in the frigid zone

of our relations with other people. It was one of the most elementary of

Rousseau's many perverse and mischievous contentions, that it is their

education by the older which ruins or wastes the abundant capacity for

virtue that subsists naturally in the young. His mind seems never to

have sought much more deeply for proof of this, than the fact that he

himself was innocent and happy so long as he was allowed to follow

without disturbance the easy simple proclivities of his own temperament.

Circumstances were not indulgent enough to leave the experiment to

complete itself within these very rudimentary conditions.

Rousseau had been surrounded, as he is always careful to protest, with a

religious atmosphere. His father, though a man of pleasure, was

possessed also not only of probity but of religion as well. His three

aunts were all in their degrees gracious and devout. M. Lambercier at

Bossey, "although Churchman and preacher," was still a sincere believer

and nearly as good in act as in word. His inculcation of religion was so

hearty, so discreet, so reasonable, that his pupils, far from being

wearied by the sermon, never came away without being touched inwardly

and stirred to make virtuous resolutions. With his Aunt Bernard devotion

was rather more tiresome, because she made a business of it.[18] It

would be a distinct error to suppose that all this counted for nothing,

for let us remember that we are now engaged with the youth of the one

great religious writer of France in the eighteenth century. When after

many years Rousseau's character hardened, the influences which had

surrounded his boyhood came out in their full force and the historian of

opinion soon notices in his spirit and work a something which had no

counterpart in the spirit and work of men who had been trained in Jesuit

colleges. At the first outset, however, every trace of religious

sentiment was obliterated from sight, and he was left unprotected

against the shocks of the world and the flesh.

At the age of eleven Jean Jacques was sent into a notary's office, but

that respectable calling struck him in the same repulsive and

insufferable way in which it has struck many other boys of genius in all

countries. Contrary to the usual rule, he did not rebel, but was

ignominiously dismissed by his master[19] for dulness and inaptitude;

his fellow-clerks pronounced him stupid and incompetent past hope. He

was next apprenticed to an engraver,[20] a rough and violent man, who

seems to have instantly plunged the boy into a demoralised stupefaction.

The reality of contact with this coarse nature benumbed as by touch of

torpedo the whole being of a youth who had hitherto lived on pure

sensations and among those ideas which are nearest to sensations. There

were no longer heroic Romans in Rousseau's universe. "The vilest

tastes, the meanest bits of rascality, succeeded to my simple

amusements, without even leaving the least idea behind. I must, in spite

of the worthiest education, have had a strong tendency to degenerate."

The truth was that he had never had any education in its veritable

sense, as the process, on its negative side, of counteracting the

inborn. There are two kinds, or perhaps we should more correctly say two

degrees, of the constitution in which the reflective part is weak. There

are the men who live on sensation, but who do so lustily, with a certain

fulness of blood and active energy of muscle. There are others who do so

passively, not searching for excitement, but acquiescing. The former by

their sheer force and plenitude of vitality may, even in a world where

reflection is a first condition, still go far. The latter succumb, and

as reflection does nothing for them, and as their sensations in such a

world bring them few blandishments, they are tolerably early surrounded

with a self-diffusing atmosphere of misery. Rousseau had none of this

energy which makes oppression bracing. For a time he sank.

It would be a mistake to let the story of the Confessions carry us into

exaggerations. The brutality of his master and the harshness of his life

led him to nothing very criminal, but only to wrong acts which are

despicable by their meanness, rather than in any sense atrocious. He

told lies as readily as the truth. He pilfered things to eat. He

cunningly found a means of opening his master's private cabinet, and of

using his master's best instruments by stealth. He wasted his time in

idle and capricious tasks. When the man, with all the ravity of an adult

moralist, describes these misdeeds of the boy, they assume a certain

ugliness of mien, and excites a strong disgust which, when the misdeeds

themselves are before us in actual life, we experience in a far more

considerate form. The effect of calm, retrospective avowal is to create

a kind of feeling which is essentially unlike our feeling at what is

actually avowed. Still it is clear that his unlucky career as apprentice

brought out in Rousseau slyness, greediness, slovenliness,

untruthfulness, and the whole ragged regiment of the squalider vices.

The evil of his temperament now and always was of the dull smouldering

kind, seldom breaking out into active flame. There is a certain

sordidness in the scene. You may complain that the details which

Rousseau gives of his youthful days are insipid. Yet such things are the

web and stuff of life, and these days of transition from childhood to

full manhood in every case mark a crisis. These insipidities test the

education of home and family, and they presage definitely what is to

come. The roots of character, good or bad, are shown for this short

space, and they remain unchanged, though most people learn from their

fellows the decent and useful art of covering them over with a little

dust, in the shape of accepted phrases and routine customs and a silence

which is not oblivion.

After a time the character of Jean Jacques was absolutely broken down.

He says little of the blows with which his offences were punished by his

master, but he says enough to enable us to discern that they were

terrible to him. This cowardice, if we choose to give the name to an

overmastering physical horror, at length brought his apprentice days to

an end. He was now in his sixteenth year. He was dragged by his comrades

into sports for which he had little inclination, though he admits that

once engaged in them he displayed an impetuosity that carried him beyond

the others. Such pastimes naturally led them beyond the city walls, and

on two occasions Rousseau found the gates closed on his return. His

master when he presented himself in the morning gave him such greeting

as we may imagine, and held out things beyond imagining as penalty for a

second sin in this kind. The occasion came, as, alas, it nearly always

does. "Half a league from the town," says Rousseau, "I hear the retreat

sounded, and redouble my pace; I hear the drum beat, and run at the top

of my speed: I arrive out of breath, bathed in sweat; my heart beats

violently, I see from a distance the soldiers at their post, and call

out with choking voice. It was too late. Twenty paces from the outpost

sentinel, I saw the first bridge rising. I shuddered, as I watched those

terrible horns, sinister and fatal augury of the inevitable lot which

that moment was opening for me."[21]

In manhood when we have the resource of our own will to fall back upon,

we underestimate the unsurpassed horror and anguish of such moments as

this in youth, when we know only the will of others, and that this will

is inexorable against us. Rousseau dared not expose himself to the

fulfilment of his master's menace, and he ran away (1728). But for this,

wrote the unhappy man long years after, "I should have passed, in the

bosom of my religion, of my native land, of my family, and my friends, a

mild and peaceful life, such as my character required, in the uniformity

of work which suited my taste, and of a society after my heart. I should

have been a good Christian, good citizen, good father of a family, good

friend, good craftsman, good man in all. I should have been happy in my

condition, perhaps I might have honoured it; and after living a life

obscure and simple, but even and gentle, I should have died peacefully

in the midst of my own people. Soon forgotten, I should at any rate have

been regretted as long as any memory of me was left."[22]

As a man knows nothing about the secrets of his own individual

organisation, this illusory mapping out of a supposed Possible need

seldom be suspected of the smallest insincerity. The poor madman who

declares that he is a king kept out of his rights only moves our pity,

and we perhaps owe pity no less to those in all the various stages of

aberration uncertificated by surgeons, down to the very edge of most

respectable sanity, who accuse the injustice of men of keeping them out

of this or that kingdom, of which in truth their own composition

finally disinherited them at the moment when they were conceived in a

mother's womb. The first of the famous Five Propositions of Jansen,

which were a stumbling-block to popes and to the philosophy of the

eighteenth-century foolishness, put this clear and permanent truth into

a mystic and perishable formula, to the effect that there are some

commandments of God which righteous and good men are absolutely unable

to obey, though ever so disposed to do them, and God does not give them

so much grace that they are able to observe them.

If Rousseau's sensations in the evening were those of terror, the day

and its prospect of boundless adventures soon turned them into entire

delight. The whole world was before him, and all the old conceptions of

romance were instantly revived by the supposed nearness of their

realisation. He roamed for two or three days among the villages in the

neighbourhood of Geneva, finding such hospitality as he needed in the

cottages of friendly peasants. Before long his wanderings brought him to

the end of the territory of the little republic. Here he found himself

in the domain of Savoy, where dukes and lords had for ages been the

traditional foes of the freedom and the faith of Geneva, Rousseau came

to the village of Confignon, and the name of the priest of Confignon

recalled one of the most embittered incidents of the old feud. This feud

had come to take new forms; instead of midnight expeditions to scale the

city walls, the descendants of the Savoyard marauders of the sixteenth

century were now intent with equivocal good will on rescuing the souls

of the descendants of their old enemies from deadly heresy. At this time

a systematic struggle was going on between the priests of Savoy and the

ministers of Geneva, the former using every effort to procure the

conversion of any Protestant on whom they could lay hands.[23] As it

happened, the priest of Confignon was one of the most active in this

good work.[24] He made the young Rousseau welcome, spoke to him of the

heresies of Geneva and of the authority of the holy Church, and gave him

some dinner. He could hardly have had a more easy convert, for the

nature with which he had to deal was now swept and garnished, ready for

the entrance of all devils or gods. The dinner went for much. "I was too

good a guest," writes Rousseau in one of his few passages of humour, "to

be a good theologian, and his Frangi wine, which struck me as excellent,

was such a triumphant argument on his side, that I should have blushed

to oppose so capital a host."[25] So it was agreed that he should be put

in a way to be further instructed of these matters. We may accept

Rousseau's assurance that he was not exactly a hypocrite in this rapid

complaisance. He admits that any one who should have seen the artifices

to which he resorted, might have thought him very false. But, he

argues, "flattery, or rather concession, is not always a vice; it is

oftener a virtue, especially in the young. The kindness with which a man

receives us, attaches us to him; it is not to make a fool of him that we

give way, but to avoid displeasing him, and not to return him evil for

good." He never really meant to change his religion; his fault was like

the coquetting of decent women, who sometimes, to gain their ends,

without permitting anything or promising anything, lead men to hope more

than they mean to hold good.[26] Thereupon follow some austere

reflections on the priest, who ought to have sent him back to his

friends; and there are strictures even upon the ministers of all

dogmatic religions, in which the essential thing is not to do but to

believe; their priests therefore, provided that they can convert a man

to their faith, are wholly indifferent alike as to his worth and his

worldly interests. All this is most just; the occasion for such a strain

of remark, though so apposite on one side, is hardly well chosen to

impress us. We wonder, as we watch the boy complacently hoodwinking his

entertainer, what has become of the Roman severity of a few months back.

This nervous eagerness to please, however, was the complementary element

of a character of vague ambition, and it was backed by a stealthy

consciousness of intellectual superiority, which perhaps did something,

though poorly enough, to make such ignominy less deeply degrading.

The die was cast. M. Pontverre despatched his brand plucked from the

burning to a certain Madame de Warens, a lady living at Annecy, and

counted zealous for the cause of the Church. In an interview whose

minutest circumstances remained for ever stamped in his mind (March 21,

1728), Rousseau exchanged his first words with this singular personage,

whose name and character he has covered with doubtful renown. He

expected to find some gray and wrinkled woman, saving a little remnant

of days in good works. Instead of this, there turned round upon him a

person not more than eight-and-twenty years old, with gentle caressing

air, a fascinating smile, a tender eye. Madame de Warens read the

letters he brought, and entertained their bearer cheerfully. It was

decided after consultation that the heretic should be sent to a

monastery at Turin, where he might be brought over in form to the true

Church. At the monastery not only would the spiritual question of faith

and the soul be dealt with, but at the same time the material problem of

shelter and subsistence for the body would be solved likewise. Elated

with vanity at the thought of seeing before any of his comrades the

great land of promise beyond the mountains, heedless of those whom he

had left, and heedless of the future before him and the object which he

was about, the young outcast made his journey over the Alps in all

possible lightness of heart. "Seeing country is an allurement which

hardly any Genevese can ever resist. Everything that met my eye seemed

the guarantee of my approaching happiness. In the houses I imagined

rustic festivals; in the fields, joyful sports; along the streams,

bathing and fishing; on the trees, delicious fruits; under their shade,

voluptuous interviews; on the mountains, pails of milk and cream, a

charming idleness, peace, simplicity, the delight of going forward

without knowing whither."[27] He might justly choose out this interval

as more perfectly free from care or anxiety than any other of his life.

It was the first of the too rare occasions when his usually passive

sensuousness was stung by novelty and hope into an active energy.

The seven or eight days of the journey came to an end, and the youth

found himself at Turin without money or clothes, an inmate of a dreary

monastery, among some of the very basest and foulest of mankind, who

pass their time in going from one monastery to another through Spain and

Italy, professing themselves Jews or Moors for the sake of being

supported while the process of their conversion was going slowly

forward. At the Hospice of the Catechumens the work of his conversion

was begun in such earnest as the insincerity of at least one of the

parties to it might allow. It is needless to enter into the

circumstances of Rousseau's conversion to Catholicism. The mischievous

zeal for theological proselytising has led to thousands of such hollow

and degrading performances, but it may safely be said that none of them

was ever hollower than this. Rousseau avows that he had been brought up

in the heartiest abhorrence of the older church, and that he never lost

this abhorrence. He fully explains that he accepted the arguments with

which he was not very energetically plied, simply because he could not

bear the idea of returning to Geneva, and he saw no other way out of his

present destitute condition. "I could not dissemble from myself that the

holy deed I was about to do, was at the bottom the action of a bandit."

"The sophism which destroyed me," he says in one of those eloquent

pieces of moralising, which bring ignoble action into a relief that

exaggerates our condemnation, "is that of most men, who complain of lack

of strength when it is already too late for them to use it. It is only

through our own fault that virtue costs us anything; if we could be

always sage, we should rarely feel the need of being virtuous. But

inclinations that might be easily overcome, drag us on without

resistance; we yield to light temptations of which we despise the

hazard. Insensibly we fall into perilous situations, against which we

could easily have shielded ourselves, but from which we can afterwards

only make a way out by heroic efforts that stupefy us, and so we sink

into the abyss, crying aloud to God, Why hast thou made me so weak? But

in spite of ourselves, God gives answer to our conscience, 'I made thee

too weak to come out from the pit, because I made thee strong enough to

avoid falling into it.'"[28] So the hopeful convert did fall in, not as

happens to the pious soul "too hot for certainties in this our life,"

to find rest in liberty of private judgment and an open Bible, but

simply as a means of getting food, clothing, and shelter.[29] The boy

was clever enough to make some show of resistance, and he turned to good

use for this purpose the knowledge of Church history and the great

Reformation controversy which he had picked up at M. Lambercier's. He

was careful not to carry things too far, and exactly nine days after his

admission into the Hospice, he "abjured the errors of the sect."[30] Two

days after that he was publicly received into the kindly bosom of the

true Church with all solemnity, to the high edification of the devout of

Turin, who marked their interest in the regenerate soul by contributions

to the extent of twenty francs in small money.

With that sum and formal good wishes the fathers of the Hospice of the

Catechumens thrust him out of their doors into the broad world. The

youth who had begun the day with dreams of palaces, found himself at

night sleeping in a den where he paid a halfpenny for the privilege of

resting in the same room with the rude woman who kept the house, her

husband, her five or six children, and various other lodgers. This rough

awakening produced no consciousness of hardship in a nature which,

beneath all fantastic dreams, always remained true to its first sympathy

with the homely lives of the poor. The woman of the house swore like a

carter, and was always dishevelled and disorderly: this did not prevent

Rousseau from recognising her kindness of heart and her staunch

readiness to befriend. He passed his days in wandering about the streets

of Turin, seeing the wonders of a capital, and expecting some adventure

that should raise him to unknown heights. He went regularly to mass,

watched the pomp of the court, and counted upon stirring a passion in

the breast of a princess. Ã more important circumstance was the effect

of the mass in awakening in his own breast his latent passion for music;

a passion so strong that the poorest instrument, if it were only in

tune, never failed to give him the liveliest pleasure. The king of

Sardinia was believed to have the best performers in Europe; less than

that was enough to quicken the musical susceptibility which is perhaps

an invariable element in the most completely sensuous natures.

When the end of the twenty francs began to seem a thing possible, he

tried to get work as an engraver. A young woman in a shop took pity on

him, gave him work and food, and perhaps permitted him to make dumb and

grovelling love to her, until her husband returned home and drove her

client away from the door with threats and the waving of a wand not

magical.[31] Rousseau's self-love sought an explanation in the natural

fury of an Italian husband's jealousy; but we need hardly ask for any

other cause than a shopkeeper's reasonable objection to vagabonds.

The next step of this youth, who was always dreaming of the love of

princesses, was to accept with just thankfulness the position of lackey

or footboy in the household of a widow. With Madame de Vercellis he

passed three months, and at the end of that time she died. His stay here

was marked by an incident that has filled many pages with stormful

discussion. When Madame de Vercellis died, a piece of old rose-coloured

ribbon was missing; Rousseau had stolen it, and it was found in his

possession. They asked him whence he had taken it. He replied that it

had been given to him by Marion, a young and comely maid in the house.

In her presence and before the whole household he repeated his false

story, and clung to it with a bitter effrontery that we may well call

diabolic, remembering how the nervous terror of punishment and exposure

sinks the angel in man. Our phrase, want of moral courage, really

denotes in the young an excruciating physical struggle, often so keen

that the victim clutches after liberation with the spontaneous tenacity

and cruelty of a creature wrecked in mastering waters. Undisciplined

sensations constitute egoism in the most ruthless of its shapes, and at

this epoch, owing either to the brutalities which surrounded his

apprentice life at Geneva, or to that rapid tendency towards

degeneration which he suspected in his own character, Rousseau was the

slave of sensations which stained his days with baseness. "Never," he

says, in his account of this hateful action, "was wickedness further

from me than at this cruel moment; and when I accused the poor girl, it

is contradictory and yet it is true that my affection for her was the

cause of what I did. She was present to my mind, and I threw the blame

from myself on to the first object that presented itself. When I saw her

appear my heart was torn, but the presence of so many people was too

strong for my remorse. I feared punishment very little; I only feared

disgrace, but I feared that more than death, more than crime, more than

anything in the world. I would fain have buried myself in the depths of

the earth; invincible shame prevailed over all, shame alone caused my

effrontery, and the more criminal I became, the more intrepid was I made

by the fright of confessing it. I could see nothing but the horror of

being recognised and declared publicly to my face a thief, liar, and

traducer."[32] When he says that he feared punishment little, his

analysis of his mind is most likely wrong, for nothing is clearer than

that a dread of punishment in any physical form was a peculiarly strong

feeling with him at this time. However that may have been, the same

over-excited imagination which put every sense on the alarm and led him

into so abominable a misdemeanour, brought its own penalties. It led him

to conceive a long train of ruin as having befallen Marion in

consequence of his calumny against her, and this dreadful thought

haunted him to the end of his life. In the long sleepless nights he

thought he saw the unhappy girl coming to reproach him with a crime that

seemed as fresh to him as if it had been perpetrated the day before.[33]

Thus the same brooding memory which brought back to him the sweet pain

of his gentle kinswoman's household melody, preserved the darker side of

his history with equal fidelity and no less perfect continuousness.

Rousseau expresses a hope and belief that this burning remorse would

serve as expiation for his fault; as if expiation for the destruction of

another soul could be anything but a fine name for self-absolution. We

may, however, charitably and reasonably think that the possible

consequences of his fault to the unfortunate Marion were not actual, but

were as much a hallucination as the midnight visits of her reproachful

spirit. Indeed, we are hardly condoning evil, in suggesting that the

whole story from its beginning is marked with exaggeration, and that we

who have our own lives to lead shall find little help in criticising at

further length the exact heinousness of the ignoble falsehood of a boy

who happened to grow up into a man of genius.[34]

After an interval of six weeks, which were passed in the garret or

cellar of his rough patroness with kind heart and ungentle tongue,

Rousseau again found himself a lackey in the house of a Piedmontese

person of quality. This new master, the Count of Gouvon, treated him

with a certain unusual considerateness, which may perhaps make us doubt

the narrative. His son condescended to teach the youth Latin, and

Rousseau presumed to entertain a passion for one of the daughters of the

house, to whom he paid silent homage in the odd shape of attending to

her wants at table with special solicitude. In this situation he had, or

at least he supposed that he had, an excellent chance of ultimate

advancement. But advancement here or elsewhere means a measure of

stability, and Rousseau's temperament in his youth was the archtype of

the mutable. An old comrade from Geneva visited him,[35] and as almost

any incident is stimulating enough to fire the restlessness of

imaginative youth, the gratitude which he professed to the Count of

Gouvon and his family, the prudence with which he marked his prospects,

the industry with which he profited by opportunity, all faded quickly

into mere dead and disembodied names of virtues. His imagination again

went over the journey across the mountains; the fields, the woods, the

streams, began to absorb his whole life. He recalled with delicious

satisfaction how charming the journey had seemed to him, and thought how

far more charming it would be in the society of a comrade of his own age

and taste, without duty, or constraint, or obligation to go or stay

other than as it might please them. "It would be madness to sacrifice

such a piece of good fortune to projects of ambition, which were slow,

difficult, doubtful of execution, and which, even if they should one day

be realised, were not with all their glory worth a quarter of an hour of

true pleasure and freedom in youth."[36]

On these high principles he neglected his duties so recklessly that he

was dismissed from his situation, and he and his comrade began their

homeward wanderings with more than apostolic heedlessness as to what

they should eat or wherewithal they should be clothed. They had a toy

fountain; they hoped that in return for the amusement to be conferred by

this wonder they should receive all that they might need. Their hopes

were not fulfilled. The exhibition of the toy fountain did not excuse

them from their reckoning. Before long it was accidentally broken, and

to their secret satisfaction, for it had lost its novelty. Their naked,

vagrancy was thus undisguised. They made their way by some means or

other across the mountains, and their enjoyment of vagabondage was

undisturbed by any thought of a future. "To understand my delirium at

this moment," Rousseau says, in words which shed much light on darker

parts of his history than fits of vagrancy, "it is necessary to know to

what a degree my heart is subject to get aflame with the smallest

things, and with what force it plunges into the imagination of the

object that attracts it, vain as that object may be. The most grotesque,

the most childish, the maddest schemes come to caress my favourite idea,

and to show me the reasonableness of surrendering myself to it."[37] It

was this deep internal vehemence which distinguished Rousseau all

through his life from the commonplace type of social revolter. A vagrant

sensuous temperament, strangely compounded with Genevese austerity; an

ardent and fantastic imagination, incongruously shot with threads of

firm reason; too little conscience and too much; a monstrous and

diseased love of self, intertwined with a sincere compassion and keen

interest for the great fellowship of his brothers; a wild dreaming of

dreams that were made to look like sanity by the close and specious

connection between conclusions and premisses, though the premisses

happened to have the fault of being profoundly unreal:--this was the

type of character that lay unfolded in the youth who, towards the autumn

of 1729, reached Annecy, penniless and ragged, throwing himself once

more on the charity of the patroness who had given him shelter eighteen

months before. Few figures in the world at that time were less likely to

conciliate the favour or excite the interest of an observer, who had not

studied the hidden convolutions of human character deeply enough to know

that a boy of eighteen may be sly, sensual, restless, dreamy, and yet

have it in him to say things one day which may help to plunge a world

into conflagration.
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CHAPTER III.

SAVOY.

The commonplace theory which the world takes for granted as to the

relations of the sexes, makes the woman ever crave the power and

guidance of her physically stronger mate. Even if this be a true account

of the normal state, there is at any rate a kind of temperament among

the many types of men, in which it seems as if the elements of character

remain mere futile and dispersive particles, until compelled into unity

and organisation by the creative shock of feminine influence. There are

men, famous or obscure, whose lives might be divided into a number of

epochs, each defined and presided over by the influence of a woman. For

the inconstant such a calendar contains many divisions, for the constant

it is brief and simple; for both alike it marks the great decisive

phases through which character has moved.

Rousseau's temperament was deeply marked by this special sort of

susceptibility in one of its least agreeable forms. His sentiment was

neither robustly and courageously animal, nor was it an intellectual

demand for the bright and vivacious sympathies in which women sometimes

excel. It had neither bold virility, nor that sociable energy which

makes close emotional companionship an essential condition of freedom of

faculty and completeness of work. There is a certain close and sickly

air round all his dealings with women and all his feeling for them. We

seem to move not in the star-like radiance of love, nor even in the

fiery flames of lust, but among the humid heats of some unknown abode of

things not wholesome or manly. "I know a sentiment," he writes, "which

is perhaps less impetuous than love, but a thousand times more

delicious, which sometimes is joined to love, and which is very often

apart from it. Nor is this sentiment friendship only; it is more

voluptuous, more tender; I do not believe that any one of the same sex

could be its object; at least I have been a friend, if ever man was, and

I never felt this about any of my friends."[38] He admits that he can

only describe this sentiment by its effects; but our lives are mostly

ruled by elements that defy definition, and in Rousseau's case the

sentiment which he could not describe was a paramount trait of his

mental constitution. It was as a voluptuous garment; in it his

imagination was cherished into activity, and protected against that

outer air of reality which braces ordinary men, but benumbs and

disintegrates the whole vital apparatus of such an organisation as

Rousseau's. If he had been devoid of this feeling about women, his

character might very possibly have remained sterile. That feeling was

the complementary contribution, without which could be no fecundity.

When he returned from his squalid Italian expedition in search of bread

and a new religion, his mind was clouded with the vague desire, the

sensual moodiness, which in such natures stains the threshold of

manhood. This unrest, with its mysterious torments and black delights,

was banished, or at least soothed into a happier humour, by the

influence of a person who is one of the most striking types to be found

in the gallery of fair women.

I.

A French writer in the eighteenth century, in a story which deals with a

rather repulsive theme of action in a tone that is graceful, simple, and

pathetic, painted the portrait of a creature for whom no moralist with a

reputation to lose can say a word; and we may, if we choose, fool

ourselves by supposing her to be without a counterpart in the

better-regulated world of real life, but, in spite of both these

objections, she is an interesting and not untouching figure to those who

like to know all the many-webbed stuff out of which their brothers and

sisters are made. The Manon Lescaut of the unfortunate AbbÃ© Prevost,

kindly, bright, playful, tender, but devoid of the very germ of the idea

of that virtue which is counted the sovereign recommendation of woman,

helps us to understand Madame de Warens. There are differences enough

between them, and we need not mistake them for one and the same type.

Manon Lescaut is a prettier figure, because romance has fewer

limitations than real life; but if we think of her in reading of

Rousseau's benefactress, the vision of the imaginary woman tends to

soften our judgment of the actual one, as well as to enlighten our

conception of a character that eludes the instruments of a commonplace

analysis.[39]

She was born at Vevai in 1700; she married early, and early disagreed

with her husband, from whom she eventually went away, abandoning family,

religion, country, and means of subsistence, with all gaiety of heart.

The King of Sardinia happened to be keeping his court at a small town on

the southern shores of the lake of Geneva, and the conversion of Madame

de Warens to Catholicism by the preaching of the Bishop of Annecy,[40]

gave a zest to the royal visit, as being a successful piece of sport in

that great spiritual hunt which Savoy loved to pursue at the expense of

the reformed church in Switzerland. The king, to mark his zeal for the

faith of his house, conferred on the new convert a small pension for

life; but as the tongues of the scandalous imputed a less pure motive

for such generosity in a parsimonious prince, Madame de Warens removed

from the court and settled at Annecy. Her conversion was hardly more

serious than Rousseau's own, because seriousness was no condition of her

intelligence on any of its sides or in any of its relations. She was

extremely charitable to the poor, full of pity for all in misfortune,

easily moved to forgiveness of wrong or ingratitude; careless, gay,

open-hearted; having, in a word, all the good qualities which spring in

certain generous soils from human impulse, and hardly any of those which

spring from reflection, or are implanted by the ordering of society. Her

reason had been warped in her youth by an instructor of the devil's

stamp;[41] finding her attached to her husband and to her duties, always

cold, argumentative, and impregnable on the side of the senses, he

attacked her by sophisms, and at last persuaded her that the union of

the sexes is in itself a matter of the most perfect indifference,

provided only that decorum of appearance be preserved, and the peace of

mind of persons concerned be not disturbed.[42] This execrable lesson,

which greater and more unselfish men held and propagated in grave books

before the end of the century, took root in her mind. If we accept

Rousseau's explanation, it did so the more easily as her temperament was

cold, and thus corroborated the idea of the indifference of what public

opinion and private passion usually concur in investing with such

enormous weightiness. "I will even dare to say," Rousseau declares,

"that she only knew one true pleasure in the world, and that was to give

pleasure to those whom she loved."[43] He is at great pains to protest

how compatible this coolness of temperament is with excessive

sensibility of character; and neither ethological theory nor practical

observation of men and women is at all hostile to what he is so anxious

to prove. The cardinal element of character is the speed at which its

energies move; its rapidity or its steadiness, concentration or

volatility; whether the thought and feeling travel as quickly as light

or as slowly as sound. A rapid and volatile constitution like that of

Madame de Warens is inconsistent with ardent and glowing warmth, which

belongs to the other sort, but it is essentially bound up with

sensibility, or readiness of sympathetic answer to every cry from

another soul. It is the slow, brooding, smouldering nature, like

Rousseau's own, in which we may expect to find the tropics.

To bring the heavy artillery of moral reprobation to bear upon a poor

soul like Madame de Warens is as if one should denounce flagrant want

of moral purpose in the busy movements of ephemera. Her activity was

incessant, but it ended in nothing better than debt, embarrassment, and

confusion. She inherited from her father a taste for alchemy, and spent

much time in search after secret elixirs and the like. "Quacks, taking

advantage of her weakness, made themselves her master, constantly

infested her, ruined her, and wasted, in the midst of furnaces and

chemicals, intelligence, talents, and charms which would have made her

the delight of the best societies."[44] Perhaps, however, the too

notorious vagrancy of her amours had at least as much to do with her

failure to delight the best societies as her indiscreet passion for

alchemy. Her person was attractive enough. "She had those points of

beauty," says Rousseau, "which are desirable, because they reside rather

in expression than in feature. She had a tender and caressing air, a

soft eye, a divine smile, light hair of uncommon beauty. You could not

see a finer head or bosom, finer arms or hands."[45] She was full of

tricks and whimsies. She could not endure the first smell of the soup

and meats at dinner; when they were placed on the table she nearly

swooned, and her disgust lasted some time, until at the end of half an

hour or so she took her first morsel.[46] On the whole, if we accept the

current standard of sanity, Madame de Warens must be pronounced ever so

little flighty; but a monotonous world can afford to be lenient to

people with a slight craziness, if it only has hearty benevolence and

cheerfulness in its company, and is free from egoism or

rapacious vanity.

This was the person within the sphere of whose attraction Rousseau was

decisively brought in the autumn of 1729, and he remained, with certain

breaks of vagabondage, linked by a close attachment to her until 1738.

It was in many respects the truly formative portion of his life. He

acquired during this time much of his knowledge of books, such as it

was, and his principles of judging them. He saw much of the lives of the

poor and of the world's ways with them. Above all his ideal was

revolutionised, and the recent dreams of Plutarchian heroism, of

grandeur, of palaces, princesses, and a glorious career full in the

world's eye, were replaced by a new conception of blessedness of life,

which never afterwards faded from his vision, and which has held a front

place in the imagination of literary Europe ever since. The notions or

aspirations which he had picked up from a few books gave way to notions

and aspirations which were shaped and fostered by the scenes of actual

life into which he was thrown, and which found his character soft for

their impression. In one way the new pictures of a future were as

dissociated from the conditions of reality as the old had been, and the

sensuous life of the happy valley in Savoy as little fitted a man to

compose ideals for our gnarled and knotted world as the mental life

among the heroics of sentimental fiction had done.

Rousseau's delight in the spot where Madame de Warens lived at Annecy

was the mark of the new ideal which circumstances were to engender in

him, and after him to spread in many hearts. His room looked over

gardens and a stream, and beyond them stretched a far landscape. "It was

the first time since leaving Bossey that I had green before my windows.

Always shut in by walls, I had nothing under my eye but house-tops and

the dull gray of the streets. How moving and delicious this novelty was

to me! It brightened all the tenderness of my disposition. I counted the

landscape among the kindnesses of my dear benefactress; it seemed as if

she had brought it there expressly for me. I placed myself there in all

peacefulness with her; she was present to me everywhere among the

flowers and the verdure; her charms and those of spring were all mingled

together in my eyes. My heart, which had hitherto been stifled, found

itself more free in this ample space, and my sighs had more liberal vent

among these orchard gardens."[47] Madame de Warens was the semi-divine

figure who made the scene live, and gave it perfect and harmonious

accent. He had neither transports nor desires by her side, but existed

in a state of ravishing calm, enjoying without knowing what. "I could

have passed my whole life and eternity itself in this way, without an

instant of weariness. She is the only person with whom I never felt that

dryness in conversation, which turns the duty of keeping it up into a

torment. Our intercourse was not so much conversation as an

inexhaustible stream of chatter, which never came to an end until it was

interrupted from without. I only felt all the force of my attachment for

her when she was out of my sight. So long as I could see her I was

merely happy and satisfied, but my disquiet in her absence went so far

as to be painful. I shall never forget how one holiday, while she was at

vespers, I went for a walk outside the town, my heart full of her image

and of an eager desire to pass all my days by her side. I had sense

enough to see that for the present this was impossible, and that the

bliss which I relished so keenly must be brief. This gave to my musing a

sadness which was free from everything sombre, and which was moderated

by pleasing hope. The sound of the bells, which has always moved me to a

singular degree, the singing of the birds, the glory of the weather, the

sweetness of the landscape, the scattered rustic dwellings in which my

imagination placed our common home;--all this so struck me with a vivid,

tender, sad, and touching impression that I saw myself as in an ecstasy

transported into the happy time and the happy place where my heart,

possessed of all the felicity that could bring it delight, without even

dreaming of the pleasures of sense, should share joys

inexpressible."[48]

There was still, however, a space to be bridged between the doubtful now

and this delicious future. The harshness of circumstance is ever

interposing with a money question, and for a vagrant of eighteen the

first of all problems is a problem of economics. Rousseau was submitted

to the observation of a kinsman of Madame de Warens,[49] and his verdict

corresponded with that of the notary of Geneva, with whom years before

Rousseau had first tried the critical art of making a living. He

pronounced that in spite of an animated expression, the lad was, if not

thoroughly inept, at least of very slender intelligence, without ideas,

almost without attainments, very narrow indeed in all respects, and that

the honour of one day becoming a village priest was the highest piece of

fortune to which he had any right to aspire.[50] So he was sent to the

seminary, to learn Latin enough for the priestly offices. He began by

conceiving a deadly antipathy to his instructor, whose appearance

happened to be displeasing to him. A second was found,[51] and the

patient and obliging temper, the affectionate and sympathetic manner of

his new teacher made a great impression on the pupil, though the

progress in intellectual acquirement was as unsatisfactory in one case

as in the other. It is characteristic of that subtle impressionableness

to physical comeliness, which in ordinary natures is rapidly effaced by

press of more urgent considerations, but which Rousseau's strongly

sensuous quality retained, that he should have remembered, and thought

worth mentioning years afterwards, that the first of his two teachers at

the seminary of Annecy had greasy black hair, a complexion as of

gingerbread, and bristles in place of beard, while the second had the

most touching expression he ever saw in his life, with fair hair and

large blue eyes, and a glance and a tone which made you feel that he was

one of the band predestined from their birth to unhappy days. While at

Turin, Rousseau had made the acquaintance of another sage and benevolent

priest,[52] and uniting the two good men thirty years after he conceived

and drew the character of the Savoyard Vicar.[53]

Shortly the seminarists reported that, though not vicious, their pupil

was not even good enough for a priest, so deficient was he in

intellectual faculty. It was next decided to try music, and Rousseau

ascended for a brief space into the seventh heaven of the arts. This was

one of the intervals of his life of which he says that he recalls not

only the times, places, persons, but all the surrounding objects, the

temperature of the air, its odour, its colour, a certain local

impression only felt there, and the memory of which stirs the old

transports anew. He never forgot a certain tune, because one Advent

Sunday he heard it from his bed being sung before daybreak on the steps

of the cathedral; nor an old lame carpenter who played the counter-bass,

nor a fair little abbÃ© who played the violin in the choir.[54] Yet he

was in so dreamy, absent, and distracted a state, that neither his

good-will nor his assiduity availed, and he could learn nothing, not

even music. His teacher, one Le MÃ¢itre, belonged to that great class of

irregular and disorderly natures with which Rousseau's destiny, in the

shape of an irregular and disorderly temperament of his own, so

constantly brought him into contact. Le MÃ¢itre could not work without

the inspiration of the wine cup, and thus his passion for his art landed

him a sot. He took offence at a slight put upon him by the precentor of

the cathedral of which he was choir-master, and left Annecy in a furtive

manner along with Rousseau, whom the too comprehensive solicitude of

Madame de Warens despatched to bear him company. They went together as

far as Lyons; here the unfortunate musician happened to fall into an

epileptic fit in the street. Rousseau called for help, informed the

crowd of the poor man's hotel, and then seizing a moment when no one was

thinking about him, turned the street corner and finally disappeared,

the musician being thus "abandoned by the only friend on whom he had a

right to count."[55] It thus appears that a man maybe exquisitely moved

by the sound of bells, the song of birds, the fairness of smiling

gardens, and yet be capable all the time without a qualm of misgiving of

leaving a friend senseless in the road in a strange place. It has ceased

to be wonderful how many ugly and cruel actions are done by people with

an extraordinary sense of the beauty and beneficence of nature. At the

moment Rousseau only thought of getting back to Annecy and Madame de

Warens. "It is not," he says in words of profound warning, which many

men have verified in those two or three hours before the tardy dawn that

swell into huge purgatorial Ã¦ons,--"it is not when we have just done a

bad action, that it torments us; it is when we recall it long after, for

the memory of it can never be thrust out."[56]

II.

When he made his way homewards again, he found to his surprise and

dismay that his benefactress had left Annecy, and had gone for an

indefinite time to Paris. He never knew the secret of this sudden

departure, for no man, he says, was ever so little curious as to the

private affairs of his friends. His heart, completely occupied with the

present, filled its whole capacity and entire space with that, and

except for past pleasures no empty corner was ever left for what was

done with.[57] He says he was too young to take the desertion deeply to

heart. Where he found subsistence we do not know. He was fascinated by a

flashy French adventurer,[58] in whose company he wasted many hours, and

the precious stuff of youthful opportunity. He passed a summer day in

joyful rustic fashion with two damsels whom he hardly ever saw again,

but the memory of whom and of the holiday that they had made with him

remained stamped in his brain, to be reproduced many a year hence in

some of the traits of the new HeloÃ¯sa and her friend Claire.[59] Then he

accepted an invitation from a former waiting-woman of Madame de Warens

to attend her home to Freiburg. On this expedition he paid an hour's

visit to his father, who had settled and remarried at Nyon. Returning

from Freiburg, he came to Lausanne, where, with an audacity that might

be taken for the first presage of mental disturbance, he undertook to

teach music. "I have already," he says, "noted some moments of

inconceivable delirium, in which I ceased to be myself. Behold me now a

teacher of singing, without knowing how to decipher an air. Without the

least knowledge of composition, I boasted of my skill in it before all

the world; and without ability to score the slenderest vaudeville, I

gave myself out for a composer. Having been presented to M. de

Treytorens, a professor of law, who loved music and gave concerts at his

house, I insisted on giving him a specimen of my talent, and I set to

work to compose a piece for his concert with as much effrontery as if I

knew all about it." The performance came off duly, and the strange

impostor conducted it with as much gravity as the profoundest master.

Never since the beginning of opera has the like charivari greeted the

ears of men.[60] Such an opening was fatal to all chance of scholars,

but the friendly tavern-keeper who had first taken him in did not lack

either hope or charity. "How is it," Rousseau cried, many years after

this, "that having found so many good people in my youth, I find so few

in my advanced life? Is their stock exhausted? No; but the class in

which I have to seek them now is not the same as that in which I found

them then. Among the common people, where great passions only speak at

intervals, the sentiments of nature make themselves heard oftener. In

the higher ranks they are absolutely stifled, and under the mask of

sentiment it is only interest or vanity that speaks."[61]

From Lausanne he went to NeuchÃ¢tel, where he had more success, for,

teaching others, he began himself to learn. But no success was marked

enough to make him resist a vagrant chance. One day in his rambles

falling in with an archimandrite of the Greek church, who was traversing

Europe in search of subscriptions for the restoration of the Holy

Sepulchre, he at once attached himself to him in the capacity of

interpreter. In this position he remained for a few weeks, until the

French minister at Soleure took him away from the Greek monk, and

despatched him to Paris to be the attendant of a young officer.[62] A

few days in the famous city, which he now saw for the first time, and

which disappointed his expectations just as the sea and all other

wonders disappointed them,[63] convinced him that here was not what he

sought, and he again turned his face southwards in search of Madame de

Warens and more familiar lands.

The interval thus passed in roaming over the eastern face of France, and

which we may date in the summer of 1732,[64] was always counted by

Rousseau among the happy epochs of his life, though the weeks may seem

grievously wasted to a generation which is apt to limit its ideas of

redeeming the time to the two pursuits of reading books or making money.

He travelled alone and on foot from Soleure to Paris and from Paris back

again to Lyons, and this was part of the training which served him in

the stead of books. Scarcely any great writer since the revival of

letters has been so little literary as Rousseau, so little indebted to

literature for the most characteristic part of his work. He was formed

by life; not by life in the sense of contact with a great number of

active and important persons, or with a great number of persons of any

kind, but in the rarer sense of free surrender to the plenitude of his

own impressions. A world composed of such people, all dispensing with

the inherited portion of human experience, and living independently on

their own stock, would rapidly fall backwards into dissolution. But

there is no more rash idea of the right composition of a society than

one which leads us to denounce a type of character for no better reason

than that, if it were universal, society would go to pieces. There is

very little danger of Rousseau's type becoming common, unless lunar or

other great physical influences arise to work a vast change in the

cerebral constitution of the species. We may safely trust the prodigious

\_vis inertioe\_ of human nature to ward off the peril of an eccentricity

beyond bounds spreading too far. At present, however, it is enough,

without going into the general question, to notice the particular fact

that while the other great exponents of the eighteenth century movement,

Hume, Voltaire, Diderot, were nourishing their natural strength of

understanding by the study and practice of literature, Rousseau, the

leader of the reaction against that movement, was wandering a beggar and

an outcast, craving the rude fare of the peasant's hut, knocking at

roadside inns, and passing nights in caves and holes in the fields, or

in the great desolate streets of towns.

If such a life had been disagreeable to him, it would have lost all the

significance that it now has for us. But where others would have found

affliction, he had consolation, and where they would have lain desperate

and squalid, he marched elate and ready to strike the stars. "Never," he

says, "did I think so much, exist so much, be myself so much, as in the

journeys that I have made alone and on foot. Walking has something about

it which animates and enlivens my ideas. I can hardly think while I am

still; my body must be in motion, to move my mind. The sight of the

country, the succession of agreeable views, open air, good appetite, the

freedom of the alehouse, the absence of everything that could make me

feel dependence, or recall me to my situation--all this sets my soul

free, gives me a greater boldness of thought. I dispose of all nature as

its sovereign lord; my heart, wandering from object to object, mingles

and is one with the things that soothe it, wraps itself up in charming

images, and is intoxicated by delicious sentiment. Ideas come as they

please, not as I please: they do not come at all, or they come in a

crowd, overwhelming me with their number and their force. When I came to

a place I only thought of eating, and when I left it I only thought of

walking. I felt that a new paradise awaited me at the door, and I

thought of nothing but of hastening in search of it."[65]

Here again is a picture of one whom vagrancy assuredly did not

degrade:--"I had not the least care for the future, and I awaited the

answer [as to the return of Madame de Warens to Savoy], lying out in the

open air, sleeping stretched out on the ground or on some wooden bench,

as tranquilly as on a bed of roses. I remember passing one delicious

night outside the town [Lyons], in a road which ran by the side of

either the Rhone or the SaÃ´ne, I forget which of the two. Gardens raised

on a terrace bordered the other side of the road. It had been very hot

all day, and the evening was delightful; the dew moistened the parched

grass, the night was profoundly still, the air fresh without being cold;

the sun in going down had left red vapours in the heaven, and they

turned the water to rose colour; the trees on the terrace sheltered

nightingales, answering song for song. I went on in a sort of ecstasy,

surrendering my heart and every sense to the enjoyment of it all, and

only sighing for regret that I was enjoying it alone. Absorbed in the

sweetness of my musing, I prolonged my ramble far into the night,

without ever perceiving that I was tired. At last I found it out. I lay

down luxuriously on the shelf of a niche or false doorway made in the

wall of the terrace; the canopy of my bed was formed by overarching

tree-tops; a nightingale was perched exactly over my head, and I fell

asleep to his singing. My slumber was delicious, my awaking more

delicious still. It was broad day, and my opening eyes looked on sun and

water and green things, and an adorable landscape. I rose up and gave

myself a shake; I felt hungry and started gaily for the town, resolved

to spend on a good breakfast the two pieces of money which I still had

left. I was in such joyful spirits that I went along the road singing

lustily."[66]

There is in this the free expansion of inner sympathy; the natural

sentiment spontaneously responding to all the delicious movement of the

external world on its peaceful and harmonious side, just as if the world

of many-hued social circumstance which man has made for himself had no

existence. We are conscious of a full nervous elation which is not the

product of literature, such as we have seen so many a time since, and

which only found its expression in literature in Rousseau's case by

accident. He did not feel in order to write, but felt without any

thought of writing. He dreamed at this time of many lofty destinies,

among them that of marshal of France, but the fame of authorship never

entered into his dreams. When the time for authorship actually came,

his work had all the benefit of the absence of self-consciousness, it

had all the disinterestedness, so to say, with which the first fresh

impressions were suffered to rise in his mind.

One other picture of this time is worth remembering, as showing that

Rousseau was not wholly blind to social circumstances, and as

illustrating, too, how it was that his way of dealing with them was so

much more real and passionate, though so much less sagacious in some of

its aspects, than the way of the other revolutionists of the century.

One day, when he had lost himself in wandering in search of some site

which he expected to find beautiful, he entered the house of a peasant,

half dead with hunger and thirst. His entertainer offered him nothing

more restoring than coarse barley bread and skimmed milk. Presently,

after seeing what manner of guest he had, the worthy man descended by a

small trap into his cellar, and brought up some good brown bread, some

meat, and a bottle of wine, and an omelette was added afterwards. Then

he explained to the wondering Rousseau, who was a Swiss, and knew none

of the mysteries of the French fisc, that he hid away his wine on

account of the duties, and his bread on account of the \_taille\_, and

declared that he would be a ruined man if they suspected that he was not

dying of hunger. All this made an impression on Rousseau which he never

forgot. "Here," he says, "was the germ of the inextinguishable hatred

which afterwards grew up in my heart against the vexations that harass

the common people, and against all their oppressors. This man actually

did not dare to eat the bread which he had won by the sweat of his brow,

and only avoided ruin by showing the same misery as reigned

around him."[67]

It was because he had thus seen the wrongs of the poor, not from without

but from within, not as a pitying spectator but as of their own company,

that Rousseau by and by brought such fire to the attack upon the old

order, and changed the blank practice of the elder philosophers into a

deadly affair of ball and shell. The man who had been a servant, who had

wanted bread, who knew the horrors of the midnight street, who had slept

in dens, who had been befriended by rough men and rougher women, who saw

the goodness of humanity under its coarsest outside, and who above all

never tried to shut these things out from his memory, but accepted them

as the most interesting, the most touching, the most real of all his

experiences, might well be expected to penetrate to the root of the

matter, and to protest to the few who usurp literature and policy with

their ideas, aspirations, interests, that it is not they but the many,

whose existence stirs the heart and fills the eye with the great prime

elements of the human lot.

III.

It was, then, some time towards the middle of 1732 that Rousseau arrived

at ChambÃ©ri, and finally took up his residence with Madame de Warens, in

the dullest and most sombre room of a dull and sombre house. She had

procured him employment in connection with a land survey which the

government of Charles Emmanuel III. was then executing. It was only

temporary, and Rousseau's function was no loftier than that of clerk,

who had to copy and reduce arithmetical calculations. We may imagine how

little a youth fresh from nights under the summer sky would relish eight

hours a day of surly toil in a gloomy office, with a crowd of dirty and

ill-smelling fellow-workers.[68] If Rousseau was ever oppressed by any

set of circumstances, his method was invariable: he ran away from them.

So now he threw up his post, and again tried to earn a little money by

that musical instruction in which he had made so many singular and

grotesque endeavours. Even here the virtues which make ordinary life a

possible thing were not his. He was pleased at his lessons while there,

but he could not bear the idea of being bound to be there, nor the

fixing of an hour. In time this experiment for a subsistence came to the

same end as all the others. He next rushed to BesanÃ§on in search of the

musical instruction which he wished to give to others, but his baggage

was confiscated at the frontier, and he had to return.[69] Finally he

abandoned the attempt, and threw himself loyally upon the narrow

resources of Madame de Warens, whom he assisted in some singularly

indefinite way in the transaction of her very indefinite and

miscellaneous affairs,--if we are here, as so often, to give the name of

affairs to a very rapid and heedless passage along a shabby road

to ruin.

The household at this time was on a very remarkable footing. Madame de

Warens was at its head, and Claude Anet, gardener, butler, steward, was

her factotum. He was a discreet person, of severe probity and few words,

firm, thrifty, and sage. The too comprehensive principles of his

mistress admitted him to the closest intimacy, and in due time, when

Madame de Warens thought of the seductions which ensnare the feet of

youth, Rousseau was delivered from them in an equivocal way by

solicitous application of the same maxims of comprehension. "Although

Claude Anet was as young as she was, he was so mature and so grave, that

he looked upon us as two children worthy of indulgence, and we both

looked upon him as a respectable man, whose esteem it was our business

to conciliate. Thus there grew up between us three a companionship,

perhaps without another example like it upon earth. All our wishes, our

cares, our hearts were in common; nothing seemed to pass outside our

little circle. The habit of living together, and of living together

exclusively, became so strong that if at our meals one of the three was

absent, or there came a fourth, all was thrown out; and in spite of our

peculiar relations, a \_tÃªte-Ã -tÃªte\_ was less sweet than a meeting of all

three."[70] Fate interfered to spoil this striking attempt after a new

type of the family, developed on a duandric base. Claude Anet was seized

with illness, a consequence of excessive fatigue in an Alpine expedition

in search of plants, and he came to his end.[71] In him Rousseau always

believed that he lost the most solid friend he ever possessed, "a rare

and estimable man, in whom nature served instead of education, and who

nourished in obscure servitude all the virtues of great men."[72] The

day after his death, Rousseau was speaking of their lost friend to

Madame de Warens with the liveliest and most sincere affliction, when

suddenly in the midst of the conversation he remembered that he should

inherit the poor man's clothes, and particularly a handsome black coat.

A reproachful tear from his Maman, as he always somewhat nauseously

called Madame de Warens, extinguished the vile thought and washed away

its last traces.[73] After all, those men and women are exceptionally

happy, who have no such involuntary meanness of thought standing against

themselves in that unwritten chapter of their lives which even the most

candid persons keep privately locked up in shamefast recollection.

Shortly after his return to ChambÃ©ri, a wave from the great tide of

European affairs surged into the quiet valleys of Savoy. In the February

of 1733, Augustus the Strong died, and the usual disorder followed in

the choice of a successor to him in the kingship of Poland. France was

for Stanislaus, the father-in-law of Lewis XV., while the Emperor

Charles VI. and Anne of Russia were for August III., elector of Saxony.

Stanislaus was compelled to flee, and the French Government, taking up

his quarrel, declared war against the Emperor (October 14, 1733). The

first act of this war, which was to end in the acquisition of Naples and

the two Sicilies by Spanish Bourbons, and of Lorraine by France, was the

despatch of a French expedition to the Milanese under Marshall Villars,

the husband of one of Voltaire's first idols. This took place in the

autumn of 1733, and a French column passed through ChambÃ©ri, exciting

lively interest in all minds, including Rousseau's. He now read the

newspapers for the first time, with the most eager sympathy for the

country with whose history his own name was destined to be so

permanently associated. "If this mad passion," he says, "had only been

momentary, I should not speak of it; but for no visible reason it took

such root in my heart, that when I afterwards at Paris played the stern

republican, I could not help feeling in spite of myself a secret

predilection for the very nation that I found so servile, and the

government I made bold to assail."[74] This fondness for France was

strong, constant, and invincible, and found what was in the eighteenth

century a natural complement in a corresponding dislike of England.[75]

Rousseau's health began to show signs of weakness. His breath became

asthmatic, he had palpitations, he spat blood, and suffered from a slow

feverishness from which he never afterwards became entirely free.[76]

His mind was as feverish as his body, and the morbid broodings which

active life reduces to their lowest degree in most young men, were left

to make full havoc along with the seven devils of idleness and vacuity.

An instinct which may flow from the unrecognised animal lying deep down

in us all, suggested the way of return to wholesomeness. Rousseau

prevailed upon Madame de Warens to leave the stifling streets for the

fresh fields, and to deliver herself by retreat to rural solitude from

the adventurers who made her their prey. Les Charmettes, the modest

farm-house to which they retired, still stands. The modern traveller,

with a taste for relieving an imagination strained by great historic

monuments and secular landmarks, with the sight of spots associated with

the passion and meditation of some far-shining teacher of men, may walk

a short league from where the gray slate roofs of dull ChambÃ©ri bake in

the sun, and ascending a gently mounting road, with high leafy bank on

the right throwing cool shadows over his head, and a stream on the left

making music at his feet, he sees an old red housetop lifted lonely

above the trees. The homes in which men have lived now and again lend

themselves to the beholder's subjective impression; they seemed to be

brooding in forlorn isolation like some life-wearied gray-beard over

ancient and sorrow-stricken memories. At Les Charmettes a pitiful

melancholy penetrates you. The supreme loveliness of the scene, the

sweet-smelling meadows, the orchard, the water-ways, the little vineyard

with here and there a rose glowing crimson among the yellow stunted

vines, the rust-red crag of the Nivolet rising against the sky far

across the broad valley; the contrast between all this peace, beauty,

silence, and the diseased miserable life of the famous man who found a

scanty span of paradise in the midst of it, touches the soul with a

pathetic spell. We are for the moment lifted out of squalor, vagrancy,

and disorder, and seem to hear some of the harmonies which sounded to

this perturbed spirit, soothing it, exalting it, and stirring those

inmost vibrations which in truth make up all the short divine part of a

man's life.[77]

"No day passes," he wrote in the very year in which he died, "in which

I do not recall with joy and tender effusion this single and brief time

in my life, when I was fully myself, without mixture or hindrance, and

when I may say in a true sense that I lived. I may almost say, like the

prefect when disgraced and proceeding to end his days tranquilly in the

country, 'I have passed seventy years on the earth, and I have lived but

seven of them.' But for this brief and precious space, I should perhaps

have remained uncertain about myself; for during all the rest of my life

I have been so agitated, tossed, plucked hither and thither by the

passions of others, that, being nearly passive in a life so stormy, I

should find it hard to distinguish what belonged to me in my own

conduct,--to such a degree has harsh necessity weighed upon me. But

during these few years I did what I wished to do, I was what I wished to

be."[78] The secret of such rare felicity is hardly to be described in

words. It was the ease of a profoundly sensuous nature with every sense

gratified and fascinated. Caressing and undivided affection within

doors, all the sweetness and movement of nature without, solitude,

freedom, and the busy idleness of life in gardens,--these were the

conditions of Rousseau's ideal state. "If my happiness," he says, in

language of strange felicity, "consisted in facts, actions, or words, I

might then describe and represent it in some way; but how say what was

neither said nor done nor even thought, but only enjoyed and felt

without my being able to point to any other object of my happiness than

the very feeling itself? I arose with the sun and I was happy; I went

out of doors and I was happy; I saw Maman and I was happy; I left her

and I was happy; I went among the woods and hills, I wandered about in

the dells, I read, I was idle, I dug in the garden, I gathered fruit, I

helped them indoors, and everywhere happiness followed me. It was not in

any given thing, it was all in myself, and could never leave me for a

single instant."[79] This was a true garden of Eden, with the serpent in

temporary quiescence, and we may count the man rare since the fall who

has found such happiness in such conditions, and not less blessed than

he is rare. The fact that he was one of this chosen company was among

the foremost of the circumstances which made Rousseau seem to so many

men in the eighteenth century as a spring of water in a thirsty land.

All innocent and amiable things moved him. He used to spend hours

together in taming pigeons; he inspired them with such confidence that

they would follow him about, and allow him to take them wherever he

would, and the moment that he appeared in the garden two or three of

them would instantly settle on his arms or his head. The bees, too,

gradually came to put the same trust in him, and his whole life was

surrounded with gentle companionship. He always began the day with the

sun, walking on the high ridge above the slope on which the house lay,

and going through his form of worship. "It did not consist in a vain

moving of the lips, but in a sincere elevation of heart to the author of

the tender nature whose beauties lay spread out before my eyes. This act

passed rather in wonder and contemplation than in requests; and I always

knew that with the dispenser of true blessings, the best means of

obtaining those which are needful for us, is less to ask than to deserve

them."[80] These effusions may be taken for the beginning of the

deistical reaction in the eighteenth century. While the truly scientific

and progressive spirits were occupied in laborious preparation for

adding to human knowledge and systematising it, Rousseau walked with his

head in the clouds among gods, beneficent authors of nature, wise

dispensers of blessings, and the like. "Ah, madam," he once said,

"sometimes in the privacy of my study, with my hands pressed tight over

my eyes or in the darkness of the night, I am of his opinion that there

is no God. But look yonder (pointing with his hand to the sky, with head

erect, and an inspired glance): the rising of the sun, as it scatters

the mists that cover the earth and lays bare the wondrous glittering

scene of nature, disperses at the same moment all cloud from my soul. I

find my faith again, and my God, and my belief in him. I admire and

adore him, and I prostrate myself in his presence."[81] As if that

settled the question affirmatively, any more than the absence of such

theistic emotion in many noble spirits settles it negatively. God became

the highest known formula for sensuous expansion, the synthesis of all

complacent emotions, and Rousseau filled up the measure of his delight

by creating and invoking a Supreme Being to match with fine scenery and

sunny gardens. We shall have a better occasion to mark the attributes of

this important conception when we come to \_Emilius\_, where it was

launched in a panoply of resounding phrases upon a Europe which was

grown too strong for Christian dogma, and was not yet grown strong

enough to rest in a provisional ordering of the results of its own

positive knowledge. Walking on the terrace at Les Charmettes, you are at

the very birth-place of that particular Ãtre SuprÃªme to whom Robespierre

offered the incense of an official festival.

Sometimes the reading of a Jansenist book would make him unhappy by the

prominence into which it brought the displeasing idea of hell, and he

used now and then to pass a miserable day in wondering whether this

cruel destiny should be his. Madame de Warens, whose softness of heart

inspired her with a theology that ought to have satisfied a seraphic

doctor, had abolished hell, but she could not dispense with purgatory

because she did not know what to do with the souls of the wicked, being

unable either to damn them, or to instal them among the good until they

had been purified into goodness. In truth it must be confessed, says

Rousseau, that alike in this world and the other the wicked are

extremely embarrassing.[82] His own search after knowledge of his fate

is well known. One day, amusing himself in a characteristic manner by

throwing stones at trees, he began to be tormented by fear of the

eternal pit. He resolved to test his doom by throwing a stone at a

particular tree; if he hit, then salvation; if he missed, then

perdition. With a trembling hand and beating heart he threw; as he had

chosen a large tree and was careful not to place himself too far away,

all was well.[83] As a rule, however, in spite of the ugly phantoms of

theology, he passed his days in a state of calm. Even when illness

brought it into his head that he should soon know the future lot by more

assured experiment, he still preserved a tranquillity which he justly

qualifies as sensual.

In thinking of Rousseau's peculiar feeling for nature, which acquired

such a decisive place in his character during his life at Les

Charmettes, it is to be remembered that it was entirely devoid of that

stormy and boisterous quality which has grown up in more modern

literature, out of the violent attempt to press nature in her most awful

moods into the service of the great revolt against a social and

religious tradition that can no longer be endured. Of this revolt

Rousseau was a chief, and his passion for natural aspects was connected

with this attitude, but he did not seize those of them which the poet of

\_Manfred\_, for example, forced into an imputed sympathy with his own

rebellion. Rousseau always loved nature best in her moods of quiescence

and serenity, and in proportion as she lent herself to such moods in

men. He liked rivulets better than rivers. He could not bear the sight

of the sea; its infertile bosom and blind restless tumblings filled him

with melancholy. The ruins of a park affected him more than the ruins of

castles.[84] It is true that no plain, however beautiful, ever seemed so

in his eyes; he required torrents, rocks, dark forests, mountains, and

precipices.[85] This does not affect the fact that he never moralised

appalling landscape, as post-revolutionary writers have done, and that

the Alpine wastes which throw your puniest modern into a rapture, had no

attraction for him. He could steep himself in nature without climbing

fifteen thousand feet to find her. In landscape, as has been said by one

with a right to speak, Rousseau was truly a great artist, and you can,

if you are artistic too, follow him with confidence in his wanderings;

he understood that beauty does not require a great stage, and that the

effect of things lies in harmony.[86] The humble heights of the Jura,

and the lovely points of the valley of ChambÃ©ri, sufficed to give him

all the pleasure of which he was capable. In truth a man cannot escape

from his time, and Rousseau at least belonged to the eighteenth century

in being devoid of the capacity for feeling awe, and the taste for

objects inspiring it. Nature was a tender friend with softest bosom, and

no sphinx with cruel enigma. He felt neither terror, nor any sense of

the littleness of man, nor of the mysteriousness of life, nor of the

unseen forces which make us their sport, as he peered over the precipice

and heard the water roaring at the bottom of it; he only remained for

hours enjoying the physical sensation of dizziness with which it turned

his brain, with a break now and again for hurling large stones, and

watching them roll and leap down into the torrent, with as little

reflection and as little articulate emotion as if he had been a

child.[87]

Just as it is convenient for purposes of classification to divide a man

into body and soul, even when we believe the soul to be only a function

of the body, so people talk of his intellectual side and his emotional

side, his thinking quality and his feeling quality, though in fact and

at the roots these qualities are not two but one, with temperament for

the common substratum. During this period of his life the whole of

Rousseau's true force went into his feelings, and at all times feeling

predominated over reflection, with many drawbacks and some advantages of

a very critical kind for subsequent generations of men. Nearly every one

who came into contact with him in the way of testing his capacity for

being instructed pronounced him hopeless. He had several excellent

opportunities of learning Latin, especially at Turin in the house of

Count Gouvon, and in the seminary at Annecy, and at Les Charmettes he

did his best to teach himself, but without any better result than a very

limited power of reading. In learning one rule he forgot the last; he

could never master the most elementary laws of versification; he learnt

and re-learnt twenty times the Eclogues of Virgil, but not a single word

remained with him.[88] He was absolutely without verbal memory, and he

pronounces himself wholly incapable of learning anything from masters.

Madame de Warens tried to have him taught both dancing and fencing; he

could never achieve a minuet, and after three months of instruction he

was as clumsy and helpless with his foil as he had been on the first

day. He resolved to become a master at the chessboard; he shut himself

up in his room, and worked night and day over the books with

indescribable efforts which covered many weeks. On proceeding to the

cafÃ© to manifest his powers, he found that all the moves and

combinations had got mixed up in his head, he saw nothing but clouds on

the board, and as often as he repeated the experiment he only found

himself weaker than before. Even in music, for which he had a genuine

passion and at which he worked hard, he never could acquire any facility

at sight, and he was an inaccurate scorer, even when only copying the

score of others.[89]

Two things nearly incompatible, he writes in an important passage, are

united in me without my being able to think how; an extremely ardent

temperament, lively and impetuous passions, along with ideas that are

very slow in coming to birth, very embarrassed, and which never arise

until after the event. "One would say that my heart and my intelligence

do not belong to the same individual.... I feel all, and see nothing; I

am carried away, but I am stupid.... This slowness of thinking, united

with such vivacity of feeling, possesses me not only in conversation,

but when I am alone and working. My ideas arrange themselves in my head

with incredible difficulty; they circulate there in a dull way and

ferment until they agitate me, fill me with heat, and give me

palpitations; in the midst of this stir I see nothing clearly, I could

not write a single word. Insensibly the violent emotion grows still, the

chaos is disentangled, everything falls into its place, but very slowly

and after long and confused agitation."[90]

So far from saying that his heart and intelligence belonged to two

persons, we might have been quite sure, knowing his heart, that his

intelligence must be exactly what he describes its process to have been.

The slow-burning ecstasy in which he knew himself at his height and was

most conscious of fulness of life, was incompatible with the rapid and

deliberate generation of ideas. The same soft passivity, the same

receptiveness, which made his emotions like the surface of a lake under

sky and breeze, entered also into the working of his intellectual

faculties. But it happens that in this region, in the attainment of

knowledge, truth, and definite thoughts, even receptiveness implies a

distinct and active energy, and hence the very quality of temperament

which left him free and eager for sensuous impressions, seemed to muffle

his intelligence in a certain opaque and resisting medium, of the

indefinable kind that interposes between will and action in a dream. His

rational part was fatally protected by a non-conducting envelope of

sentiment; this intercepted clear ideas on their passage, and even cut

off the direct and true impress of those objects and their relations,

which are the material of clear ideas. He was no doubt right in his

avowal that objects generally made less impression on him than the

recollection of them; that he could see nothing of what was before his

eyes, and had only his intelligence in cases where memories were

concerned; and that of what was said or done in his presence, he felt

and penetrated nothing.[91] In other words, this is to say that his

material of thought was not fact but image. When he plunged into

reflection, he did not deal with the objects of reflection at first hand

and in themselves, but only with the reminiscences of objects, which he

had never approached in a spirit of deliberate and systematic

observation, and with those reminiscences, moreover, suffused and

saturated by the impalpable but most potent essences of a fermenting

imagination. Instead of urgently seeking truth with the patient energy,

the wariness, and the conscience, with the sharpened instruments, the

systematic apparatus, and the minute feelers and tentacles of the

genuine thinker and solid reasoner, he only floated languidly on a

summer tide of sensation, and captured premiss and conclusion in a

succession of swoons. It would be a mistake to contend that no work can

be done for the world by this method, or that truth only comes to those

who chase her with logical forceps. But one should always try to

discover how a teacher of men came by his ideas, whether by careful

toil, or by the easy bequest of generous phantasy.

To give a zest to rural delight, and partly perhaps to satisfy the

intellectual interest which must have been an instinct in one who became

so consummate a master in the great and noble art of composition,

Rousseau, during the time when he lived with Madame de Warens, tried as

well as he knew how to acquire a little knowledge of what fruit the

cultivation of the mind of man had hitherto brought forth. According to

his own account, it was Voltaire's Letters on the English which first

drew him seriously to study, and nothing which that illustrious man

wrote at this time escaped him. His taste for Voltaire inspired him with

the desire of writing with elegance, and of imitating "the fine and

enchanting colour of Voltaire's style"[92]--an object in which he cannot

be held to have in the least succeeded, though he achieved a superb

style of his own. On his return from Turin Madame de Warens had begun in

some small way to cultivate a taste for letters in him, though he had

lost the enthusiasm of his childhood for reading. Saint Evremond,

Puffendorff, the Henriade, and the Spectator happened to be in his room,

and he turned over their pages. The Spectator, he says, pleased him

greatly and did him much good.[93] Madame de Warens was what he calls

protestant in literary taste, and would talk for ever of the great

Bayle, while she thought more of Saint Evremond than she could ever

persuade Rousseau to think. Two or three years later than this he began

to use his own mind more freely, and opened his eyes for the first time

to the greatest question that ever dawns upon any human intelligence

that has the privilege of discerning it, the problem of a philosophy and

a body of doctrine.

His way of answering it did not promise the best results. He read an

introduction to the Sciences, then he took an EncyclopÃ¦dia and tried to

learn all things together, until he repented and resolved to study

subjects apart. This he found a better plan for one to whom long

application was so fatiguing, that he could not with any effect occupy

himself for half an hour on any one matter, especially if following the

ideas of another person.[94] He began his morning's work, after an hour

or two of dispersive chat, with the Port-Royal Logic, Locke's Essay on

the Human Understanding, Malebranche, Leibnitz, Descartes.[95] He found

these authors in a condition of such perpetual contradiction among

themselves, that he formed the chimerical design of reconciling them

with one another. This was tedious, so he took up another method, on

which he congratulated himself to the end of his life. It consisted in

simply adopting and following the ideas of each author, without

comparing them either with one another or with those of other writers,

and above all without any criticism of his own. Let me begin, he said,

by collecting a store of ideas, true or false, but at any rate clear,

until my head is well enough stocked to enable me to compare and choose.

At the end of some years passed "in never thinking exactly, except after

other people, without reflecting so to speak, and almost without

reasoning," he found himself in a state to think for himself. "In spite

of beginning late to exercise my judicial faculty, I never found that it

had lost its vigour, and when I came to publish my own ideas, I was

hardly accused of being a servile disciple."[96]

To that fairly credible account of the matter, one can only say that

this mutually exclusive way of learning the thoughts of others, and

developing thoughts of your own, is for an adult probably the most

mischievous, where it is not the most impotent, fashion in which

intellectual exercise can well be taken. It is exactly the use of the

judicial faculty, criticising, comparing, and defining, which is

indispensable in order that a student should not only effectually

assimilate the ideas of a writer, but even know what those ideas come to

and how much they are worth. And so when he works at ideas of his own, a

judicial faculty which has been kept studiously slumbering for some

years, is not likely to revive in full strength without any preliminary

training. Rousseau was a man of singular genius, and he set an

extraordinary mark on Europe, but this mark would have been very

different if he had ever mastered any one system of thought, or if he

had ever fully grasped what systematic thinking means. Instead of this,

his debt to the men whom he read was a debt of piecemeal, and his

obligation an obligation for fragments; and this is perhaps the worst

way of acquiring an intellectual lineage, for it leaves out the vital

continuity of temper and method. It is a small thing to accept this or

that of Locke's notions upon education or the origin of ideas, if you do

not see the merit of his way of coming by his notions. In short,

Rousseau has distinctions in abundance, but the distinction of knowing

how to think, in the exact sense of that term, was hardly among them,

and neither now nor at any other time did he go through any of that

toilsome and vigorous intellectual preparation to which the ablest of

his contemporaries, Diderot, Voltaire, D'Alembert, Turgot, Condorcet,

Hume, all submitted themselves. His comfortable view was that "the

sensible and interesting conversations of a woman of merit are more

proper to form a young man than all the pedantical philosophy of

books."[97]

Style, however, in which he ultimately became such a proficient, and

which wrought such marvels as only style backed by passion can work,

already engaged his serious attention. We have already seen how Voltaire

implanted in him the first root idea, which so many of us never perceive

at all, that there is such a quality of writing as style. He evidently

took pains with the form of expression and thought about it, in

obedience to some inborn harmonious predisposition which is the source

of all veritable eloquence, though there is no strong trace now nor for

many years to come of any irresistible inclination for literary

composition. We find him, indeed, in 1736 showing consciousness of a

slight skill in writing,[98] but he only thought of it as a possible

recommendation for a secretaryship to some great person. He also appears

to have practised verses, not for their own sake, for he always most

justly thought his own verses mediocre, and they are even worse; but on

the ground that verse-making is a rather good exercise for breaking

one's self to elegant inversions, and learning a greater ease in

prose.[99] At the age of one and twenty he composed a comedy, long

afterwards damned as \_Narcisse\_. Such prelusions, however, were of small

importance compared with the fact of his being surrounded by a moral

atmosphere in which his whole mind was steeped. It is not in the study

of Voltaire or another, but in the deep soft soil of constant mood and

old habit that such a style as Rousseau's has its growth.

It was the custom to return to ChambÃ©ri for the winter, and the day of

their departure from Les Charmettes was always a day blurred and tearful

for Rousseau; he never left it without kissing the ground, the trees,

the flowers; he had to be torn away from it as from a loved companion.

At the first melting of the winter snows they left their dungeon in

ChambÃ©ri, and they never missed the earliest song of the nightingale.

Many a joyful day of summer peace remained vivid in Rousseau's memory,

and made a mixed heaven and hell for him long years after in the

stifling dingy Paris street, and the raw and cheerless air of a

Derbyshire winter.[100] "We started early in the morning," he says,

describing one of these simple excursions on the day of St. Lewis, who

was the very unconscious patron saint of Madame de Warens, "together and

alone; I proposed that we should go and ramble about the side of the

valley opposite to our own, which we had not yet visited. We sent our

provisions on before us, for we were to be out all day. We went from

hill to hill and wood to wood, sometimes in the sun and often in the

shade, resting from time to time and forgetting ourselves for whole

hours; chatting about ourselves, our union, our dear lot, and offering

unheard prayers that it might last. All seemed to conspire for the bliss

of this day. Rain had fallen a short time before; there was no dust, and

the little streams were full; a light fresh breeze stirred the leaves,

the air was pure, the horizon without a cloud, and the same serenity

reigned in our own hearts. Our dinner was cooked in a peasant's cottage,

and we shared it with his family. These Savoyards are such good souls!

After dinner we sought shade under some tall trees, where, while I

collected dry sticks for making our coffee, Maman amused herself by

botanising among the bushes, and the expedition ended in transports of

tenderness and effusion."[101] This is one of such days as the soul

turns back to when the misery that stalks after us all has seized it,

and a man is left to the sting and smart of the memory of

irrecoverable things.

He was resolved to bind himself to Madame de Warens with an inalterable

fidelity for all the rest of his days; he would watch over her with all

the dutiful and tender vigilance of a son, and she should be to him

something dearer than mother or wife or sister. What actually befell was

this. He was attacked by vapours, which he characterises as the disorder

of the happy. One symptom of his disease was the conviction derived from

the rash perusal of surgeon's treatises, that he was suffering from a

polypus in the heart. On the not very chivalrous principle that if he

did not spend Madame de Warens' money, he was only leaving it for

adventurers and knaves, he proceeded to Montpellier to consult the

physicians, and took the money for his expenses out of his

benefactress's store, which was always slender because it was always

open to any hand. While on the road, he fell into an intrigue with a

travelling companion, whom critics have compared to the fair Philina of

Wilhelm Meister. In due time, the Montpellier doctor being unable to

discover a disease, declared that the patient had none. The scenery was

dull and unattractive, and this would have counterbalanced the

weightiest prudential reasons with him at any time. Rousseau debated

whether he should keep tryst with his gay fellow-traveller, or return to

ChambÃ©ri. Remorse and that intractable emptiness of pocket which is the

iron key to many a deed of ingenuous-looking self-denial and Spartan

virtue, directed him homewards. Here he had a surprise, and perhaps

learnt a lesson. He found installed in the house a personage whom he

describes as tall, fair, noisy, coxcombical, flat-faced, flat-souled.

Another triple alliance seemed a thing odious in the eyes of a man whom

his travelling diversions had made a Pharisee for the hour. He

protested, but Madame de Warens was a woman of principle, and declined

to let Rousseau, who had profited by the doctrine of indifference, now

set up in his own favour the contrary doctrine of a narrow and churlish

partiality. So a short, delicious, and never-forgotten episode came to

an end: this pair who had known so much happiness together were happy

together no more, and the air became peopled for Rousseau with wan

spectres of dead joys and fast gathering cares.

The dates of the various events described in the fifth and sixth books

of the Confessions are inextricable, and the order is evidently inverted

more than once. The inversion of order is less serious than the

contradictions between the dates of the Confessions and the more

authentic and unmistakable dates of his letters. For instance, he

describes a visit to Geneva as having been made shortly before Lautrec's

temporary pacification of the civic troubles of that town; and that

event took place in the spring of 1738. This would throw the Montpellier

journey, which he says came after the visit to Geneva, into 1738, but

the letters to Madame de Warens from Grenoble and Montpellier are dated

in the autumn and winter of 1737.[102] Minor verifications attest the

exactitude of the dates of the letters,[103] and we may therefore

conclude that he returned from Montpellier, found his place taken and

lost his old delight in Les Charmettes, in the early part of 1738. In

the tenth of the RÃªveries he speaks of having passed "a space of four or

five years" in the bliss of Les Charmettes, and it is true that his

connection with it in one way and another lasted from the middle of 1736

until about the middle of 1741. But as he left for Montpellier in the

autumn of 1737, and found the obnoxious Vinzenried installed in 1738,

the pure and characteristic felicity of Les Charmettes perhaps only

lasted about a year or a year and a half. But a year may set a deep mark

on a man, and give him imperishable taste of many things bitter

and sweet.

FOOTNOTES:

[38] \_Conf.\_, iii. 177.

[39] Lamartine in \_Raphael\_ defies "a reasonable man to recompose with

any reality the character that Rousseau gives to his mistress, out of

the contradictory elements which he associates in her nature. One of

these elements excludes the other." It is worth while for any who care

for this kind of study to compare Madame de Warens with the Marquise

de Courcelles, whom Sainte-Beuve has well called the Manon Lescaut of

the seventeenth century.

[40] Described by Rousseau in a memorandum for the biographer of M. de

Bernex, printed in \_MÃ©langes\_, pp. 139-144.

[41] De Tavel, by name. Disorderly ideas as to the relations of the

sexes began to appear in Switzerland along with the reformation of

religion. In the sixteenth century a woman appeared at Geneva with the

doctrine that it is as inhuman and as unjustifiable to refuse the

gratification of this appetite in a man as to decline to give food and

drink to the starving. Picot's \_Hist. de GenÃ¨ve\_, vol. ii.

[42] \_Conf.\_, v. 341. Also ii. 83; and vi. 401.

[43] \_Conf.\_, v. 345.

[44] \_Conf.\_, ii. 83.

[45] \_Ib.\_ ii. 82.

[46] \_Ib.\_ iii. 179. See also 200.

[47] \_Conf.\_, iii. 177, 178.

[48] \_Conf.\_, iii. 183.

[49] M. d'Aubonne.

[50] \_Conf.\_, iii 192.

[51] M. Gatier.

[52] M. Gaime.

[53] \_Conf.\_, iii. 204.

[54] \_Ib.\_ iii. 209, 210.

[55] \_Conf.\_, iii. 217-222.

[56] \_Conf.\_, iv. 227.

[57] \_Ib.\_ iii. 224.

[58] One Venture de Villeneuve, who visited him years afterwards

(1755) in Paris, when Rousseau found that the idol of old days was a

crapulent debauchee. \_Ib.\_ viii. 221.

[59] Mdlles. de Graffenried and Galley. \_Conf.\_, iv. 231.

[60] \_Ib.\_ iv. 254-256.

[61] \_Conf.\_, iv. 253.

[62] While in the ambassador's house at Soleure, he was lodged in a

room which had once belonged to his namesake, Jean Baptiste Rousseau

(\_b. 1670--d. 1741\_), whom the older critics astonishingly insist on

counting the first of French lyric poets. There was a third Rousseau,

Pierre [\_b. 1725--d. 1785\_], who wrote plays and did other work now

well forgotten. There are some lines imperfectly commemorative of the

trio--

Trois auteurs que Rousseau l'on nomme, Connus de Paris jusqu'Ã  Rome,

Sont diffÃ©rens; voici par oÃ¹; Rousseau de Paris fut grand homme;

Rousseau de GenÃ¨ve est un fou; Rousseau de Toulouse un atome.

Jean Jacques refers to both his namesakes in his letter to Voltaire,

Jan. 30, 1750. \_Corr.\_, i. 145.

[63] The only object which ever surpassed his expectation was the

great Roman structure near Nismes, the Pont du Gard. \_Conf.\_, vi. 446.

[64] Rousseau gives 1732 as the probable date of his return to

ChambÃ©ri, after his first visit to Paris [\_Conf.\_, v. 305], and the

only objection to this is his mention of the incident of the march of

the French troops, which could not have happened until the winter of

1733, as having taken place "some months" after his arrival.

Musset-Pathay accepts this as decisive, and fixes the return in the

spring of 1733 [i. 12]. My own conjectural chronology is this: Returns

from Turin towards the autumn of 1729; stays at Annecy until the

spring of 1731; passes the winter of 1731-2 at NeuchÃ¢tel; first visits

Paris in spring of 1732; returns to Savoy in the early summer of 1732.

But a precise harmonising of the dates in the Confessions is

impossible; Rousseau wrote them three and thirty years after our

present point [in 1766 at Wootton], and never claimed to be exact in

minuteness of date. Fortunately such matters in the present case are

absolutely devoid of importance.

[65] \_Conf.\_, iv. 279, 280.

[66] \_Conf.\_, iv. 290, 291,

[67] \_Conf.\_, iv. 281-283.

[68] \_Conf.\_, v. 325.

[69] \_Conf.\_, v. 360-364. \_Corr.\_, i. 21-24.

[70] \_Conf.\_, v. 349, 350.

[71] Apparently in the summer of 1736, though, the reference to the

return of the French troops at the peace [\_Ib.\_ v. 365] would place it

in 1735.

[72] \_Ib.\_ v. 356

[73] \_Ib.\_

[74] \_Conf.\_, v. 315, 316.

[75] \_Ib.\_ iv. 276. \_Nouv. HÃ©l.\_, II. xiv. 381, etc.

[76] He refers to the ill-health of his youth, \_Conf.\_, vii. 32, and

describes an ominous head seizure while at ChambÃ©ri, \_Ib.\_ vi. 396.

[77] Rousseau's description of Les Charmettes is at the end of the

fifth book. The present proprietor keeps the house arranged as it used

to be, and has gathered one or two memorials of its famous tenant,

including his poor \_clavecin\_ and his watch. In an outside wall,

HÃ©rault de Sechelles, when Commissioner from the Convention in the

department of Mont Blanc, inserted a little white stone with two most

lapidary stanzas inscribed upon it, about \_gÃ©nie, solitude, fiertÃ©,

gloire, vÃ©ritÃ©, envie\_, and the like.

[78] \_RÃªveries\_, x. 336 (1778).

[79] \_Conf.\_, vi. 393.

[80] \_Conf.\_, vi. 412.

[81] \_MÃ©m. de Mdme. d'Epinay\_, i. 394. (M. Boiteau's edition:

Charpentier. 1865.)

[82] \_Conf.\_, vi. 399.

[83] \_Ib.\_ vi. 424. Goethe made a similar experiment; see Mr. Lewes's

\_Life\_, p. 126.

[84] Bernardin de Saint Pierre tells us this. \_Oeuvres\_ (Ed. 1818),

xii. 70, etc.

[85] \_Conf.\_, iv. 297. See also the description of the scenery of the

Valais, in the \_Nouv. HÃ©l.\_, Pt. I. Let. xxiii.

[86] George Sand in \_Mademoiselle la Quintinie\_ (p. 27), a book

containing some peculiarly subtle appreciations of the Savoy

landscape.

[87] \_Conf.\_, iv. 298.

[88] \_Conf.\_, vi. 416, 422, etc.; iii. 164; iii. 203; v. 347; v. 383,

384. Also vii. 53.

[89] \_Conf.\_, v. 313, 367; iv. 293; ix. 353. Also \_MÃ©m. de Mdme.

d'Epinay\_, ii. 151.

[90] \_Ib.\_ iii. 192, 193.

[91] \_Conf.\_, iv. 301; iii. 195.

[92] \_Conf.\_, v. 372, 373. The mistaken date assigned to the

correspondence between Voltaire and Frederick is one of many instances

how little we can trust the Confessions for minute accuracy, though

their substantial veracity is confirmed by all the collateral evidence

that we have.

[93] \_Ib.\_ iii. 188. For his debt in the way of education to Madame de

Warens, see also \_Ib.\_ vii. 46.

[94] \_Conf.\_, vi. 409.

[95] \_Ib.\_ vi. 413. He adds a suspicious-looking "\_et cetera\_."

[96] \_Conf.\_, vi. 414

[97] \_Conf.\_, iv. 295. See also v. 346.

[98] \_Corr.\_, 1736, pp. 26, 27.

[99] \_Conf.\_, iv. 271, where he says further that he never found

enough attraction in French poetry to make him think of pursuing it.

[100] The first part of the Confessions was written in Wootton in

Derbyshire, in the winter of 1766-1767.

[101] \_Conf.\_, vi. 422.

[102] \_Corr.\_, i. 43, 46, 62, etc.

[103] Musset-Pathay, i. 23, \_n.\_

CHAPTER IV.

THERESA LE VASSEUR.

Men like Rousseau, who are most heedless in letting their delight

perish, are as often as not most loth to bury what they have slain, or

even to perceive that life has gone out of it. The sight of simple

hearts trying to coax back a little warm breath of former days into a

present that is stiff and cold with indifference, is touching enough.

But there is a certain grossness around the circumstances in which

Rousseau now and too often found himself, that makes us watch his

embarrassment with some composure. One cannot easily think of him as a

simple heart, and we feel perhaps as much relief as he, when he resolves

after making all due efforts to thrust out the intruder and bring Madame

de Warens over from theories which had become too practical to be

interesting, to leave Les Charmettes and accept a tutorship at Lyons.

His new patron was a De Mably, elder brother of the philosophic abbÃ© of

the same name (1709-85), and of the still more notable Condillac

(1714-80).

The future author of the most influential treatise on education that has

ever been written, was not successful in the practical and far more

arduous side of that master art.[104] We have seen how little training

he had ever given himself in the cardinal virtues of collectedness and

self-control, and we know this to be the indispensable quality in all

who have to shape young minds for a humane life. So long as all went

well, he was an angel, but when things went wrong, he is willing to

confess that he was a devil. When his two pupils could not understand

him, he became frantic; when they showed wilfulness or any other part of

the disagreeable materials out of which, along with the rest, human

excellence has to be ingeniously and painfully manufactured, he was

ready to kill them. This, as he justly admits, was not the way to render

them either well learned or sage. The moral education of the teacher

himself was hardly complete, for he describes how he used to steal his

employer's wine, and the exquisite draughts which he enjoyed in the

secrecy of his own room, with a piece of cake in one hand and some dear

romance in the other. We should forgive greedy pilferings of this kind

more easily if Rousseau had forgotten them more speedily. These are

surely offences for which the best expiation is oblivion in a throng of

worthier memories.

It is easy to understand how often Rousseau's mind turned from the

deadly drudgery of his present employment to the beatitude of former

days. "What rendered my present condition insupportable was the

recollection of my beloved Charmettes, of my garden, my trees, my

fountain, my orchard, and above all of her for whom I felt myself born

and who gave life to it all. As I thought of her, of our pleasures, our

guileless days, I was seized by a tightness in my heart, a stopping of

my breath, which robbed me of all spirit."[105] For years to come this

was a kind of far-off accompaniment, thrumming melodiously in his ears

under all the discords of a miserable life. He made another effort to

quicken the dead. Throwing up his office with his usual promptitude in

escaping from the irksome, after a residence of something like a year at

Lyons (April, 1740--spring of 1741), he made his way back to his old

haunts. The first half-hour with Madame de Warens persuaded him that

happiness here was really at an end. After a stay of a few months, his

desolation again overcame him. It was agreed that he should go to Paris

to make his fortune by a new method of musical notation which he had

invented, and after a short stay at Lyons, he found himself for the

second time in the famous city which in the eighteenth century had

become for the moment the centre of the universe.[106]

It was not yet, however, destined to be a centre for him. His plan of

musical notation was examined by a learned committee of the Academy, no

member of whom was instructed in the musical art. Rousseau, dumb,

inarticulate, and unready as usual, was amazed at the ease with which

his critics by the free use of sounding phrases demolished arguments and

objections which he perceived that they did not at all understand. His

experience on this occasion suggested to him the most just reflection,

how even without breadth of intelligence, the profound knowledge of any

one thing is preferable in forming a judgment about it, to all possible

enlightenment conferred by the cultivation of the sciences, without

study of the special matter in question. It astonished him that all

these learned men, who knew so many things, could yet be so ignorant

that a man should only pretend to be a judge in his own craft.[107]

His musical path to glory and riches thus blocked up, he surrendered

himself not to despair but to complete idleness and peace of mind. He

had a few coins left, and these prevented him from thinking of a future.

He was presented to one or two great ladies, and with the blundering

gallantry habitual to him he wrote a letter to one of the greatest of

them, declaring his passion for her. Madame Dupin was the daughter of

one, and the wife of another, of the richest men in France, and the

attentions of a man whose acquaintance Madame Beuzenval had begun by

inviting him to dine in the servants' hall, were not pleasing to

her.[108] She forgave the impertinence eventually, and her stepson, M.

Francueil, was Rousseau's patron for some years.[109] On the whole,

however, in spite of his own account of his social ineptitude, there

cannot have been anything so repulsive in his manners as this account

would lead us to think. There is no grave anachronism in introducing

here the impression which he made on two fine ladies not many years

after this. "He pays compliments, yet he is not polite, or at least he

is without the air of politeness. He seems to be ignorant of the usages

of society, but it is easily seen that he is infinitely intelligent. He

has a brown complexion, while eyes that overflow with fire give

animation to his expression. When he has spoken and you look at him, he

appears comely; but when you try to recall him, his image is always

extremely plain. They say that he has bad health, and endures agony

which from some motive of vanity he most carefully conceals. It is

this, I fancy, which gives him from time to time an air of

sullenness."[110] The other lady, who saw him at the same time, speaks

of "the poor devil of an author, who's as poor as Job for you, but with

wit and vanity enough for four.... They say his history is as queer as

his person, and that is saying a good deal.... Madame Maupeou and I

tried to guess what it was. 'In spite of his face,' said she (for it is

certain he is uncommonly plain), 'his eyes tell that love plays a great

part in his romance.' 'No,' said I, 'his nose tells me that it is

vanity.' 'Well then, 'tis both one and the other.'"[111]

One of his patronesses took some trouble to procure him the post of

secretary to the French ambassador at Venice, and in the spring of 1743

our much-wandering man started once more in quest of meat and raiment in

the famous city of the Adriatic. This was one of those steps of which

there are not a few in a man's life, that seem at the moment to rank

foremost in the short line of decisive acts, and then are presently seen

not to have been decisive at all, but mere interruptions conducting

nowhither. In truth the critical moments with us are mostly as points in

slumber. Even if the ancient oracles of the gods were to regain their

speech once more on the earth, men would usually go to consult them on

days when the answer would have least significance, and could guide

them least far. That one of the most heedless vagrants in Europe, and as

it happened one of the men of most extraordinary genius also, should

have got a footing in the train of the ambassador of a great government,

would naturally seem to him and others as chance's one critical stroke

in his life. In reality it was nothing. The Count of Montaigu, his

master, was one of the worst characters with whom Rousseau could for his

own profit have been brought into contact. In his professional quality

he was not far from imbecile. The folly and weakness of the government

at Versailles during the reign of Lewis XV., and its indifference to

competence in every department except perhaps partially in the fisc, was

fairly illustrated in its absurd representative at Venice. The

secretary, whose renown has preserved his master's name, has recorded

more amply than enough the grounds of quarrel between them. Rousseau is

for once eager to assert his own efficiency, and declares that he

rendered many important services for which he was repaid with

ingratitude and persecution.[112] One would be glad to know what the

Count of Montaigu's version of matters was, for in truth Rousseau's

conduct in previous posts makes us wonder how it was that he who had

hitherto always been unfaithful over few things, suddenly touched

perfection when he became lord over many.

There is other testimony, however, to the ambassador's morbid quality,

of which, after that general imbecility which was too common a thing

among men in office to be remarkable, avarice was the most striking

trait. For instance, careful observation had persuaded him that three

shoes are equivalent to two pairs, because there is always one of a pair

which is more worn than its fellow; and hence he habitually ordered his

shoes in threes.[113] It was natural enough that such a master and such

a secretary should quarrel over perquisites. That slightly cringing

quality which we have noticed on one or two occasions in Rousseau's

hungry youthful time, had been hardened out of him by circumstance or

the strengthening of inborn fibre. He would now neither dine in a

servants' hall because a fine lady forgot what was due to a musician,

nor share his fees with a great ambassador who forgot what was due to

himself. These sordid disputes are of no interest now to anybody, and we

need only say that after a period of eighteen months passed in

uncongenial company, Rousseau parted from his count in extreme dudgeon,

and the diplomatic career which he had promised to himself came to the

same close as various other careers had already done.

He returned to Paris towards the end of 1744, burning with indignation

at the unjust treatment which he believed himself to have suffered, and

laying memorial after memorial before the minister at home. He assures

us that it was the justice and the futility of his complaints, that left

in his soul the germ of exasperation against preposterous civil

institutions, "in which the true common weal and real justice are always

sacrificed to some seeming order or other, which is in fact destructive

of all order, and only adds the sanction of public authority to the

oppression of the weak and the iniquity of the strong."[114]

One or two pictures connected with the Venetian episode remain in the

memory of the reader of the Confessions, and among them perhaps with

most people is that of the quarantine at Genoa in Rousseau's voyage to

his new post. The travellers had the choice of remaining on board the

felucca, or passing the time in an unfurnished lazaretto. This, we may

notice in passing, was his first view of the sea; he makes no mention of

the fact, nor does the sight or thought of the sea appear to have left

the least mark in any line of his writings. He always disliked it, and

thought of it with melancholy. Rousseau, as we may suppose, found the

want of space and air in the boat the most intolerable of evils, and

preferred to go alone to the lazaretto, though it had neither

window-sashes nor tables nor chairs nor bed, nor even a truss of straw

to lie down upon. He was locked up and had the whole barrack to himself.

"I manufactured," he says, "a good bed out of my coats and shirts,

sheets out of towels which I stitched together, a pillow out of my old

cloak rolled up. I made myself a seat of one trunk placed flat, and a

table of the other. I got out some paper and my writing-desk, and

arranged some dozen books that I had by way of library. In short I made

myself so comfortable, that, with the exception of curtains and windows,

I was nearly as well off in this absolutely naked lazaretto as in my

lodgings in Paris. My meals were served with much pomp; two grenadiers,

with bayonets at their musket-ends, escorted them; the staircase was my

dining-room, the landing did for table and the lower step for a seat,

and when my dinner was served, they rang a little bell as they withdrew,

to warn me to seat myself at table. Between my meals, when I was neither

writing nor reading, nor busy with my furnishing, I went for a walk in

the Protestant graveyard, or mounted into a lantern which looked out on

to the port, and whence I could see the ships sailing in and out. I

passed a fortnight in this way, and I could have spent the whole three

weeks of the quarantine without feeling an instant's weariness."[115]

These are the occasions when we catch glimpses of the true Rousseau; but

his residence in Venice was on the whole one of his few really sociable

periods. He made friends and kept them, and there was even a certain

gaiety in his life. He used to tell people their fortunes in a way that

an earlier century would have counted unholy.[116] He rarely sought

pleasure in those of her haunts for which the Queen of the Adriatic had

a guilty renown, but he has left one singular anecdote, showing the

degree to which profound sensibility is capable of doing the moralist's

work in a man, and how a stroke of sympathetic imagination may keep one

from sin more effectually than an ethical precept.[117] It is pleasanter

to think of him as working at the formation of that musical taste which

ten years afterwards led him to amaze the Parisians by proving that

French melody was a hollow idea born of national self-delusion. A

Venetian experiment, whose evidence in the special controversy is less

weighty perhaps than Rousseau supposed, was among the facts which

persuaded him that Italian is the language of music. An Armenian who had

never heard any music was invited to listen first of all to a French

monologue, and then to an air of Galuppi's. Rousseau observed in the

Armenian more surprise than pleasure during the performance of the

French piece. The first notes of the Italian were no sooner struck, than

his eyes and whole expression softened; he was enchanted, surrendered

his whole soul to the ravishing impressions of the music, and could

never again be induced to listen to the performance of any

French air.[118]

More important than this was the circumstance that the sight of the

defects of the government of the Venetian Republic first drew his mind

to political speculation, and suggested to him the composition of a

book that was to be called Institutions Politiques.[119] The work, as

thus designed and named, was never written, but the idea of it, after

many years of meditation, ripened first in the Discourse on Inequality,

and then in the Social Contract.

If Rousseau's departure for Venice was a wholly insignificant element in

his life, his return from it was almost immediately followed by an event

which counted for nothing at the moment, which his friends by and by

came to regard as the fatal and irretrievable disaster of his life, but

which he persistently described as the only real consolation that heaven

permitted him to taste in his misery, and the only one that enabled him

to bear his many sore burdens.[120]

He took up his quarters at a small and dirty hotel not far from the

Sorbonne, where he had alighted on the occasion of his second arrival in

Paris.[121] Here was a kitchen-maid, some two-and-twenty years old, who

used to sit at table with her mistress and the guests of the house. The

company was rough, being mainly composed of Irish and Gascon abbÃ©s, and

other people to whom graces of mien and refinement of speech had come

neither by nature nor cultivation. The hostess herself pitched the

conversation in merry Rabelaisian key, and the apparent modesty of her

serving-woman gave a zest to her own licence. Rousseau was moved with

pity for a maid defenceless against a ribald storm, and from pity he

advanced to some warmer sentiment, and he and Theresa Le Vasseur took

each other for better for worse, in a way informal but sufficiently

effective. This was the beginning of a union which lasted for the length

of a generation and more, down to the day of Rousseau's most tragical

ending.[122] She thought she saw in him a worthy soul; and he was

convinced that he saw in her a woman of sensibility, simple and free

from trick, and neither of the two, he says, was deceived in respect of

the other. Her intellectual quality was unique. She could never be

taught to read with any approach to success. She could never follow the

order of the twelve months of the year, nor master a single arithmetical

figure, nor count a sum of money, nor reckon the price of a thing. A

month's instruction was not enough to give knowledge of the hours of the

day on the dial-plate. The words she used were often the direct

opposites of the words that she meant to use.[123]

The marriage choice of others is the inscrutable puzzle of those who

have no eye for the fact that such choice is the great match of cajolery

between purpose and invisible hazard; the blessedness of many lives is

the stake, as intention happens to cheat accident or to be cheated by

it. When the match is once over, deep criticism of a game of pure chance

is time wasted. The crude talk in which the unwise deliver their

judgments upon the conditions of success in the relations between men

and women, has flowed with unprofitable copiousness as to this not very

inviting case. People construct an imaginary Rousseau out of his

writings, and then fetter their elevated, susceptible, sensitive, and

humane creation, to the unfortunate woman who could never be taught that

April is the month after March, or that twice four and a half are nine.

Now we have already seen enough of Rousseau to know for how infinitely

little he counted the gift of a quick wit, and what small store he set

either on literary varnish or on capacity for receiving it. He was

touched in people with whom he had to do, not by attainment, but by

moral fibre or his imaginary impression of their moral fibre. Instead of

analysing a character, bringing its several elements into the balance,

computing the more or less of this faculty or that, he loved to feel its

influence as a whole, indivisible, impalpable, playing without sound or

agitation around him like soft light and warmth and the fostering air.

The deepest ignorance, the dullest incapacity, the cloudiest faculties

of apprehension, were nothing to him in man or woman, provided he could

only be sensible of that indescribable emanation from voice and eye and

movement, that silent effusion of serenity around spoken words, which

nature has given to some tranquillising spirits, and which would have

left him free in an even life of indolent meditation and unfretted

sense. A woman of high, eager, stimulating kind would have been a more

fatal mate for him than the most stupid woman that ever rivalled the

stupidity of man. Stimulation in any form always meant distress to

Rousseau. The moist warmth of the Savoy valleys was not dearer to him

than the subtle inhalations of softened and close enveloping

companionship, in which the one needful thing is not intellectual

equality, but easy, smooth, constant contact of feeling about the

thousand small matters that make up the existence of a day. This is not

the highest ideal of union that one's mind can conceive from the point

of view of intense productive energy, but Rousseau was not concerned

with the conditions of productive energy. He only sought to live, to be

himself, and he knew better than any critics can know for him, what kind

of nature was the best supplement for his own. As he said in an

apophthegm with a deep melancholy lying at the bottom of it,--you never

can cite the example of a thoroughly happy man, for no one but the man

himself knows anything about it.[124] "By the side of people we love,"

he says very truly, "sentiment nourishes the intelligence as well as the

heart, and we have little occasion to seek ideas elsewhere. I lived with

my Theresa as pleasantly as with the finest genius in the

universe."[125]

Theresa Le Vasseur would probably have been happier if she had married a

stout stable-boy, as indeed she did some thirty years hence by way of

gathering up the fragments that were left; but there is little reason to

think that Rousseau would have been much happier with any other mate

than he was with Theresa. There was no social disparity between the two.

She was a person accustomed to hardship and coarseness, and so was he.

And he always systematically preferred the honest coarseness of the

plain people from whom he was sprung and among whom he had lived, to the

more hateful coarseness of heart which so often lurks under fine manners

and a complete knowledge of the order of the months in the year and the

arithmetical table. Rousseau had been a serving-man, and there was no

deterioration in going with a serving-woman.[126] However this may be,

it is certain that for the first dozen years or so of his

partnership--and many others as well as he are said to have found in

this term a limit to the conditions of the original contract,--Rousseau

had perfect and entire contentment in the Theresa whom all his friends

pronounced as mean, greedy, jealous, degrading, as she was avowedly

brutish in understanding. Granting that she was all these things, how

much of the responsibility for his acts has been thus shifted from the

shoulders of Rousseau himself, whose connection with her was from

beginning to end entirely voluntary? If he attached himself deliberately

to an unworthy object by a bond which he was indisputably free to break

on any day that he chose, were not the effects of such a union as much

due to his own character which sought, formed, and perpetuated it, as to

the character of Theresa Le Vasseur? Nothing, as he himself said in a

passage to which he appends a vindication of Theresa, shows the true

leanings and inclinations of a man better than the sort of attachments

which he forms.[127]

It is a natural blunder in a literate and well-mannered society to

charge a mistake against a man who infringes its conventions in this

particular way. Rousseau knew what he was about, as well as politer

persons. He was at least as happy with his kitchen wench as Addison was

with his countess, or Voltaire with his marchioness, and he would not

have been what he was, nor have played the part that he did play in the

eighteenth century, if he had felt anything derogatory or unseemly in a

kitchen wench. The selection was probably not very deliberate; as it

happened, Theresa served as a standing illustration of two of his most

marked traits, a contempt for mere literary culture, and a yet deeper

contempt for social accomplishments and social position. In time he

found out the grievous disadvantages of living in solitude with a

companion who did not know how to think, and whose stock of ideas was so

slight that the only common ground of talk between them was gossip and

quodlibets. But her lack of sprightliness, beauty, grace, refinement,

and that gentle initiative by which women may make even a sombre life so

various, went for nothing with him. What his friends missed in her, he

did not seek and would not have valued; and what he found in her, they

were naturally unable to appreciate, for they never were in the mood for

detecting it. "I have not seen much of happy men," he wrote when near

his end, "perhaps nothing; but I have many a time seen contented hearts,

and of all the objects that have struck me, I believe it is this which

has always given most contentment to myself."[128] This moderate

conception of felicity, which was always so characteristic with him, as

an even, durable, and rather low-toned state of the feelings, accounts

for his prolonged acquiescence in a companion whom men with more elation

in their ideal would assuredly have found hostile even to the most

modest contentment.

"The heart of my Theresa," he wrote long after the first tenderness had

changed into riper emotion on his side, and, alas, into indifference on

hers, "was that of an angel; our attachment waxed stronger with our

intimacy, and we felt more and more each day that we were made for one

another. If our pleasures could be described, their simplicity would

make you laugh; our excursions together out of town, in which I would

munificently expend eight or ten halfpence in some rural tavern; our

modest suppers at my window, seated in front of one another on two small

chairs placed on a trunk that filled up the breadth of the embrasure.

Here the window did duty for a table, we breathed the fresh air, we

could see the neighbourhood and the people passing by, and though on the

fourth story, could look down into the street as we ate. Who shall

describe, who shall feel the charms of those meals, consisting of a

coarse quartern loaf, some cherries, a tiny morsel of cheese, and a pint

of wine which we drank between us? Ah, what delicious seasoning there is

in friendship, confidence, intimacy, gentleness of soul! We used

sometimes to remain thus until midnight, without once thinking of the

time."[129]

Men and women are often more fairly judged by the way in which they bear

the burden of what they have done, than by the prime act which laid the

burden on their lives.[130] The deeper part of us shows in the manner of

accepting consequences. On the whole, Rousseau's relations with this

woman present him in a better light than those with any other person

whatever. If he became with all the rest of the world suspicious, angry,

jealous, profoundly diseased in a word, with her he was habitually

trustful, affectionate, careful, most long-suffering. It sometimes even

occurs to us that his constancy to Theresa was only another side of the

morbid perversity of his relations with the rest of the world. People of

a certain kind not seldom make the most serious and vital sacrifices for

bare love of singularity, and a man like Rousseau was not unlikely to

feel an eccentric pleasure in proving that he could find merit in a

woman who to everybody else was desperate. One who is on bad terms with

the bulk of his fellows may contrive to save his self-respect and

confirm his conviction that they are all in the wrong, by preserving

attachment to some one to whom general opinion is hostile; the private

argument being that if he is capable of this degree of virtue and

friendship in an unfavourable case, how much more could he have

practised it with others, if they would only have allowed him. Whether

this kind of apology was present to his mind or not, Rousseau could

always refer those who charged him with black caprice, to his steady

kindness towards Theresa Le Vasseur. Her family were among the most

odious of human beings, greedy, idle, and ill-humoured, while her mother

had every fault that a woman could have in Rousseau's eyes, including

that worst fault of setting herself up for a fine wit. Yet he bore with

them all for years, and did not break with Madame Le Vasseur until she

had poisoned the mind of her daughter, and done her best by rapacity and

lying to render him contemptible to all his friends.

In the course of years Theresa herself gave him unmistakable signs of a

change in her affections. "I began to feel," he says, at a date of

sixteen or seventeen years from our present point, "that she was no

longer for me what she had been in our happy years, and I felt it all

the more clearly as I was still the same towards her."[131] This was in

1762, and her estrangement grew deeper and her indifference more open,

until at length, seven years afterwards, we find that she had proposed a

separation from him. What the exact reasons for this gradual change may

have been we do not know, nor have we any right in ignorance of the

whole facts to say that they were not adequate and just. There are two

good traits recorded of the woman's character. She could never console

herself for having let her father be taken away to end his days

miserably in a house of charity.[132] And the repudiation of her

children, against which the glowing egoism of maternity always rebelled,

remained a cruel dart in her bosom as long as she lived. We may suppose

that there was that about household life with Rousseau which might have

bred disgusts even in one as little fastidious as Theresa was. Among

other things which must have been hard to endure, we know that in

composing his works he was often weeks together without speaking a word

to her.[133] Perhaps again it would not be difficult to produce some

passages in Rousseau's letters and in the Confessions, which show traces

of that subtle contempt for women that lurks undetected in many who

would blush to avow it. Whatever the causes may have been, from

indifference she passed to something like aversion, and in the one

place where a word of complaint is wrung from him, he describes her as

rending and piercing his heart at a moment when his other miseries were

at their height. His patience at any rate was inexhaustible; now old,

worn by painful bodily infirmities, racked by diseased suspicion and the

most dreadful and tormenting of the minor forms of madness, nearly

friendless, and altogether hopeless, he yet kept unabated the old

tenderness of a quarter of a century before, and expressed it in words

of such gentleness, gravity, and self-respecting strength, as may touch

even those whom his books leave unmoved, and who view his character with

deepest distrust. "For the six-and-twenty years, dearest, that our union

has lasted, I have never sought my happiness except in yours, and have

never ceased to try to make you happy; and you saw by what I did

lately,[134] that your honour and happiness were one as dear to me as

the other. I see with pain that success does not answer my solicitude,

and that my kindness is not as sweet to you to receive, as it is sweet

to me to show. I know that the sentiments of honour and uprightness with

which you were born will never change in you; but as for those of

tenderness and attachment which were once reciprocal between us, I feel

that they now only exist on my side. Not only, dearest of all friends,

have you ceased to find pleasure in my company, but you have to tax

yourself severely even to remain a few minutes with me out of

complaisance. You are at your ease with all the world but me. I do not

speak to you of many other things. We must take our friends with their

faults, and I ought to pass over yours, as you pass over mine. If you

were happy with me I could be content, but I see clearly that you are

not, and this is what makes my heart sore. If I could do better for your

happiness, I would do it and hold my peace; but that is not possible. I

have left nothing undone that I thought would contribute to your

felicity. At this moment, while I am writing to you, overwhelmed with

distress and misery, I have no more true or lively desire than to finish

my days in closest union with you. You know my lot,--it is such as one

could not even dare to describe, for no one could believe it. I never

had, my dearest, other than one single solace, but that the sweetest; it

was to pour out all my heart in yours; when I talked of my miseries to

you, they were soothed; and when you had pitied me, I needed pity no

more. My every resource, my whole confidence, is in you and in you only;

my soul cannot exist without sympathy, and cannot find sympathy except

with you. It is certain that if you fail me and I am forced to live

alone, I am as a dead man. But I should die a thousand times more

cruelly still, if we continued to live together in misunderstanding, and

if confidence and friendship were to go out between us. It would be a

hundred times better to cease to see each other; still to live, and

sometimes to regret one another. Whatever sacrifice may be necessary on

my part to make you happy, be so at any cost, and I shall be content.

We have faults to weep over and to expiate, but no crimes; let us not

blot out by the imprudence of our closing days the sweetness and purity

of those we have passed together."[135] Think ill as we may of

Rousseau's theories, and meanly as we may of some parts of his conduct,

yet to those who can feel the pulsing of a human life apart from a man's

formulÃ¦, and can be content to leave to sure circumstance the tragic

retaliation for evil behaviour, this letter is like one of the great

master's symphonies, whose theme falls in soft strokes of melting pity

on the heart. In truth, alas, the union of this now diverse pair had

been stained by crimes shortly after its beginning. In the estrangement

of father and mother in their late years we may perhaps hear the rustle

and spy the pale forms of the avenging spectres of their lost children.

At the time when the connection with Theresa Le Vasseur was formed,

Rousseau did not know how to gain bread. He composed the musical

diversion of the Muses Galantes, which Rameau rightly or wrongly

pronounced a plagiarism, and at the request of Richelieu he made some

minor re-adaptations in Voltaire's Princesse de Navarre, which Rameau

had set to music--that "farce of the fair" to which the author of ZaÃ¯re

owed his seat in the Academy.[136] But neither task brought him money,

and he fell back on a sort of secretaryship, with perhaps a little of

the valet in it, to Madame Dupin and her son-in-law, M. de Francueil,

for which he received the too moderate income of nine hundred francs. On

one occasion he returned to his room expecting with eager impatience the

arrival of a remittance, the proceeds of some small property which came

to him by the death of his father.[137] He found the letter, and was

opening it with trembling hands, when he was suddenly smitten with shame

at his want of self-control; he placed it unopened on the chimney-piece,

undressed, slept better than usual, and when he awoke the next morning,

he had forgotten all about the letter until it caught his eye. He was

delighted to find that it contained his money, but "I can swear," he

adds, "that my liveliest delight was in having conquered myself." An

occasion for self-conquest on a more considerable scale was at hand. In

these tight straits, he received grievous news from the unfortunate

Theresa. He made up his mind cheerfully what to do; the mother

acquiesced after sore persuasion and with bitter tears; and the new-born

child was dropped into oblivion in the box of the asylum for foundlings.

Next year the same easy expedient was again resorted to, with the same

heedlessness on the part of the father, the same pain and reluctance on

the part of the mother. Five children in all were thus put away, and

with such entire absence of any precaution with a view to their

identification in happier times, that not even a note was kept of the

day of their birth.[138]

People have made a great variety of remarks upon this transaction, from

the economist who turns it into an illustration of the evil results of

hospitals for foundlings in encouraging improvident unions, down to the

theologian who sees in it new proof of the inborn depravity of the human

heart and the fall of man. Others have vindicated it in various ways,

one of them courageously taking up the ground that Rousseau had good

reason to believe that the children were not his own, and therefore was

fully warranted in sending the poor creatures kinless into the

universe.[139] Perhaps it is not too transcendental a thing to hope that

civilisation may one day reach a point when a plea like this shall count

for an aggravation rather than a palliative; when a higher conception of

the duties of humanity, familiarised by the practice of adoption as well

as by the spread of both rational and compassionate considerations as to

the blameless little ones, shall have expelled what is surely as some

red and naked beast's emotion of fatherhood. What may be an excellent

reason for repudiating a woman, can never be a reason for abandoning a

child, except with those whom reckless egoism has made willing to think

it a light thing to fling away from us the moulding of new lives and the

ensuring of salutary nurture for growing souls.

We are, however, dispensed from entering into these questions of the

greater morals by the very plain account which the chief actor has given

us, almost in spite of himself. His crime like most others was the

result of heedlessness, of the overriding of duty by the short dim-eyed

selfishness of the moment. He had been accustomed to frequent a tavern,

where the talk turned mostly upon topics which men with much

self-respect put as far from them, as men with little self-respect will

allow them to do. "I formed my fashion of thinking from what I perceived

to reign among people who were at bottom extremely worthy folk, and I

said to myself, Since it is the usage of the country, as one lives here,

one may as well follow it. So I made up my mind to it cheerfully, and

without the least scruple."[140] By and by he proceeded to cover this

nude and intelligible explanation with finer phrases, about preferring

that his children should be trained up as workmen and peasants rather

than as adventurers and fortune-hunters, and about his supposing that in

sending them to the hospital for foundlings he was enrolling himself a

citizen in Plato's Republic.[141] This is hardly more than the talk of

one become famous, who is defending the acts of his obscurity on the

high principles which fame requires. People do not turn citizens of

Plato's Republic "cheerfully and without the least scruple," and if a

man frequents company where the despatch of inconvenient children to the

hospital was an accepted point of common practice, it is superfluous to

drag Plato and his Republic into the matter. Another turn again was

given to his motives when his mind had become clouded by suspicious

mania. Writing a year or two before his death he had assured himself

that his determining reason was the fear of a destiny for his children a

thousand times worse than the hard life of foundlings, namely, being

spoiled by their mother, being turned into monsters by her family, and

finally being taught to hate and betray their father by his plotting

enemies.[142] This is obviously a mixture in his mind of the motives

which led to the abandonment of the children and justified the act to

himself at the time, with the circumstances that afterwards reconciled

him to what he had done; for now he neither had any enemies plotting

against him, nor did he suppose that he had. As for his wife's family,

he showed himself quite capable, when the time came, of dealing

resolutely and shortly with their importunities in his own case, and he

might therefore well have trusted his power to deal with them in the

case of his children. He was more right when in 1770, in his important

letter to M. de St. Germain, he admitted that example, necessity, the

honour of her who was dear to him, all united to make him entrust his

children to the establishment provided for that purpose, and kept him

from fulfilling the first and holiest of natural duties. "In this, far

from excusing, I accuse myself; and when my reason tells me that I did

what I ought to have done in my situation, I believe that less than my

heart, which bitterly belies it."[143] This coincides with the first

undisguised account given in the Confessions, which has been already

quoted, and it has not that flawed ring of cant and fine words which

sounds through nearly all his other references to this great stain upon

his life, excepting one, and this is the only further document with

which we need concern ourselves. In that,[144] which was written while

the unholy work was actually being done, he states very distinctly that

the motives were those which are more or less closely connected with

most unholy works, motives of money--the great instrument and measure of

our personal convenience, the quantitative test of our self-control in

placing personal convenience behind duty to other people. "If my misery

and my misfortunes rob me of the power of fulfilling a duty so dear,

that is a calamity to pity me for, rather than a crime to reproach me

with. I owe them subsistence, and I procured a better or at least a

surer subsistence for them than I could myself have provided; this

condition is above all others." Next comes the consideration of their

mother, whose honour must be kept. "You know my situation; I gained my

bread from day to day painfully enough; how then should I feed a family

as well? And if I were compelled to fall back on the profession of

author, how would domestic cares and the confusion of children leave me

peace of mind enough in my garret to earn a living? Writings which

hunger dictates are hardly of any use, and such a resource is speedily

exhausted. Then I should have to resort to patronage, to intrigue, to

tricks ... in short to surrender myself to all those infamies, for which

I am penetrated with such just horror. Support myself, my children, and

their mother on the blood of wretches? No, madame, it were better for

them to be orphans than to have a scoundrel for their father.... Why

have I not married, you will ask? Madame, ask it of your unjust laws. It

was not fitting for me to contract an eternal engagement; and it will

never be proved to me that my duty binds me to it. What is certain is

that I have never done it, and that I never meant to do it. But we ought

not to have children when we cannot support them. Pardon me, madame;

nature means us to have offspring, since the earth produces sustenance

enough for all; but it is the rich, it is your class, which robs mine of

the bread of my children.... I know that foundlings are not delicately

nurtured; so much the better for them, they become more robust. They

have nothing superfluous given to them, but they have everything that is

necessary. They do not make gentlemen of them, but peasants or

artisans.... They would not know how to dance, or ride on horseback, but

they would have strong unwearied legs. I would neither make authors of

them, nor clerks; I would not practise them in handling the pen, but the

plough, the file, and the plane, instruments for leading a healthy,

laborious, innocent life.... I deprived myself of the delight of seeing

them, and I have never tasted the sweetness of a father's embrace. Alas,

as I have already told you, I see in this only a claim on your pity, and

I deliver them from misery at my own expense."[145] We may see here that

Rousseau's sophistical eloquence, if it misled others, was at least as

powerful in misleading himself, and it may be noted that this letter,

with its talk of the children of the rich taking bread out of the mouths

of the children of the poor, contains the first of those socialistic

sentences by which the writer in after times gained so famous a name. It

is at any rate clear from this that the real motive of the abandonment

of the children was wholly material. He could not afford to maintain

them, and he did not wish to have his comfort disturbed by

their presence.

There is assuredly no word to be said by any one with firm reason and

unsophisticated conscience in extenuation of this crime. We have only to

remember that a great many other persons in that lax time, when the

structure of the family was undermined alike in practice and

speculation, were guilty of the same crime; that Rousseau, better than

they, did not erect his own criminality into a social theory, but was

tolerably soon overtaken by a remorse which drove him both to confess

his misdeed, and to admit that it was inexpiable; and that the atrocity

of the offence owes half the blackness with which it has always been

invested by wholesome opinion, to the fact that the offender was by and

by the author of the most powerful book by which parental duty has been

commended in its full loveliness and nobility. And at any rate, let

Rousseau be a little free from excessive reproach from all clergymen,

sentimentalists, and others, who do their worst to uphold the common and

rather bestial opinion in favour of reckless propagation, and who, if

they do not advocate the despatch of children to public institutions,

still encourage a selfish incontinence which ultimately falls in burdens

on others than the offenders, and which turns the family into a scene of

squalor and brutishness, producing a kind of parental influence that is

far more disastrous and demoralising than the absence of it in public

institutions can possibly be. If the propagation of children without

regard to their maintenance be either a virtue or a necessity, and if

afterwards the only alternatives are their maintenance in an asylum on

the one hand, and their maintenance in the degradation of a

poverty-stricken home on the other, we should not hesitate to give

people who act as Rousseau acted, all that credit for self-denial and

high moral courage which he so audaciously claimed for himself. It

really seems to be no more criminal to produce children with the

deliberate intention of abandoning them to public charity, as Rousseau

did, than it is to produce them in deliberate reliance on the besotted

maxim that he who sends mouths will send meat, or any other of the

spurious saws which make Providence do duty for self-control, and add to

the gratification of physical appetite the grotesque luxury of

religious unction.

In 1761 the MarÃ©chale de Luxembourg made efforts to discover Rousseau's

children, but without success. They were gone beyond hope of

identification, and the author of \_Emitius\_ and his sons and daughters

lived together in this world, not knowing one another. Rousseau with

singular honesty did not conceal his satisfaction at the fruitlessness

of the charitable endeavours to restore them to him. "The success of

your search," he wrote, "could not give me pure and undisturbed

pleasure; it is too late, too late.... In my present condition this

search interested me more for another person [Theresa] than myself; and

considering the too easily yielding character of the person in question,

it is possible that what she had found already formed for good or for

evil, might turn out a sorry boon to her."[146] We may doubt, in spite

of one or two charming and graceful passages, whether Rousseau was of a

nature to have any feeling for the pathos of infancy, the bright blank

eye, the eager unpurposed straining of the hand, the many turns and

changes in murmurings that yet can tell us nothing. He was both too

self-centred and too passionate for warm ease and fulness of life in all

things, to be truly sympathetic with a condition whose feebleness and

immaturity touch us with half-painful hope.

Rousseau speaks in the Confessions of having married Theresa

five-and-twenty years after the beginning of their acquaintance,[147]

but we hardly have to understand that any ceremony took place which

anybody but himself would recognise as constituting a marriage. What

happened appears to have been this. Seated at table with Theresa and two

guests, one of them the mayor of the place, he declared that she was his

wife. "This good and seemly engagement was contracted," he says, "in all

the simplicity but also in all the truth of nature, in the presence of

two men of worth and honour.... During the short and simple act, I saw

the honest pair melted in tears."[148] He had at this time whimsically

assumed the name of Renou, and he wrote to a friend that of course he

had married in this name, for he adds, with the characteristic insertion

of an irrelevant bit of magniloquence, "it is not names that are

married; no, it is persons." "Even if in this simple and holy ceremony

names entered as a constituent part, the one I bear would have sufficed,

since I recognise no other. If it were a question of property to be

assured, then it would be another thing, but you know very well that is

not our case."[149] Of course, this may have been a marriage according

to the truth of nature, and Rousseau was as free to choose his own rites

as more sacramental performers, but it is clear from his own words about

property that there was no pretence of a marriage in law. He and Theresa

were on profoundly uncomfortable terms about this time,[150] and

Rousseau is not the only person by many thousands who has deceived

himself into thinking that some form of words between man and woman must

magically transform the substance of their characters and lives, and

conjure up new relations of peace and steadfastness.

\* \* \* \* \*

We have, however, been outstripping slow-footed destiny, and have now to

return to the time when Theresa did not drink brandy, nor run after

stable-boys, nor fill Rousseau's soul with bitterness and suspicion, but

sat contentedly with him in an evening taking a stoic's meal in the

window of their garret on the fourth floor, seasoning it with

"confidence, intimacy, gentleness of soul," and that general comfort of

sensation which, as we know to our cost, is by no means an invariable

condition either of duty done externally or of spiritual growth within.

It is perhaps hard for us to feel that we are in the presence of a great

religious reactionist; there is so little sign of the higher graces of

the soul, there are so many signs of the lowering clogs of the flesh.

But the spirit of a man moves in mysterious ways, and expands like the

plants of the field with strange and silent stirrings. It is one of the

chief tests of worthiness and freedom from vulgarity of soul in us, to

be able to have faith that this expansion is a reality, and the most

important of all realities. We do not rightly seize the type of Socrates

if we can never forget that he was the husband of Xanthippe, nor David's

if we can only think of him as the murderer of Uriah, nor Peter's if we

can simply remember that he denied his master. Our vision is only

blindness, if we can never bring ourselves to see the possibilities of

deep mystic aspiration behind the vile outer life of a man, or to

believe that this coarse Rousseau, scantily supping with his coarse

mate, might yet have many glimpses of the great wide horizons that are

haunted by figures rather divine than human.
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CHAPTER V.

THE DISCOURSES.

The busy establishment of local academies in the provincial centres of

France only preceded the outbreak of the revolution by ten or a dozen

years; but one or two of the provincial cities, such as Bordeaux, Rouen,

Dijon, had possessed academies in imitation of the greater body of Paris

for a much longer time. Their activity covered a very varied ground,

from the mere commonplaces of literature to the most practical details

of material production. If they now and then relapsed into inquiries

about the laws of Crete, they more often discussed positive and

scientific theses, and rather resembled our chambers of agriculture than

bodies of more learned pretension. The academy of Dijon was one of the

earliest of these excellent institutions, and on the whole the list of

its theses shows it to have been among the most sensible in respect of

the subjects which it found worth thinking about. Its members, however,

could not entirely resist the intellectual atmosphere of the time. In

1742 they invited discussion of the point, whether the natural law can

conduct society to perfection without the aid of political laws.[151]

In 1749 they proposed this question as a theme for their prize essay:

\_Has the restoration of the sciences contributed to purify or to corrupt

manners?\_ Rousseau was one of fourteen competitors, and in 1750 his

discussion of the academic theme received the prize.[152] This was his

first entry on the field of literature and speculation. Three years

afterwards the same academy propounded another question: \_What is the

origin of inequality among men, and is it authorised by the natural

law?\_ Rousseau again competed, and though his essay neither gained the

prize, nor created as lively an agitation as its predecessor had done,

yet we may justly regard the second as a more powerful supplement to

the first.

It is always interesting to know the circumstances under which pieces

that have moved a world were originally composed, and Rousseau's account

of the generation of his thoughts as to the influence of enlightenment

on morality, is remarkable enough to be worth transcribing. He was

walking along the road from Paris to Vincennes one hot summer afternoon

on a visit to Diderot, then in prison for his Letter on the Blind

(1749), when he came across in a newspaper the announcement of the theme

propounded by the Dijon academy. "If ever anything resembled a sudden

inspiration, it was the movement which began in me as I read this. All

at once I felt myself dazzled by a thousand sparkling lights; crowds of

vivid ideas thronged into my mind with a force and confusion that threw

me into unspeakable agitation; I felt my head whirling in a giddiness

like that of intoxication. A violent palpitation oppressed me; unable to

walk for difficulty of breathing, I sank under one of the trees of the

avenue, and passed half an hour there in such a condition of excitement,

that when I arose I saw that the front of my waistcoat was all wet with

my tears, though I was wholly unconscious of shedding them. Ah, if I

could ever have written the quarter of what I saw and felt under that

tree, with what clearness should I have brought out all the

contradictions of our social system; with what simplicity I should have

demonstrated that man is good naturally, and that by institutions only

is he made bad."[153] Diderot encouraged him to compete for the prize,

and to give full flight to the ideas which had come to him in this

singular way.[154]

People have held up their hands at the amazing originality of the idea

that perhaps sciences and arts have not purified manners. This sentiment

is surely exaggerated, if we reflect first that it occurred to the

academicians of Dijon as a question for discussion, and second that, if

you are asked whether a given result has or has not followed from

certain circumstances, the mere form of the question suggests No quite

as readily as Yes. The originality lay not in the central contention,

but in the fervour, sincerity, and conviction of a most unacademic sort

with which it was presented and enforced. There is less originality in

denouncing your generation as wicked and adulterous than there is in

believing it to be so, and in persuading the generation itself both that

you believe it and that you have good reasons to give. We have not to

suppose that there was any miracle wrought by agency celestial or

infernal in the sudden disclosure of his idea to Rousseau. Rousseau had

been thinking of politics ever since the working of the government of

Venice had first drawn his mind to the subject. What is the government,

he had kept asking himself, which is most proper to form a sage and

virtuous nation? What government by its nature keeps closest to the law?

What is this law? And whence?[155] This chain of problems had led him to

what he calls the historic study of morality, though we may doubt

whether history was so much his teacher as the rather meagrely nourished

handmaid of his imagination. Here was the irregular preparation, the

hidden process, which suddenly burst into light and manifested itself

with an exuberance of energy, that passed to the man himself for an

inward revolution with no precursive sign.

Rousseau's ecstatic vision on the road to Vincennes was the opening of a

life of thought and production which only lasted a dozen years, but

which in that brief space gave to Europe a new gospel. Emilius and the

Social Contract were completed in 1761, and they crowned a work which if

you consider its origin, influence, and meaning with due and proper

breadth, is marked by signal unity of purpose and conception. The key to

it is given to us in the astonishing transport at the foot of the

wide-spreading oak. Such a transport does not come to us of cool and

rational western temperament, but more often to the oriental after

lonely sojourning in the wilderness, or in violent reactions on the road

to Damascus and elsewhere. Jean Jacques detected oriental quality in his

own nature,[156] and so far as the union of ardour with mysticism, of

intense passion with vague dream, is to be defined as oriental, he

assuredly deserves the name. The ideas stirred in his mind by the Dijon

problem suddenly "opened his eyes, brought order into the chaos in his

head, revealed to him another universe. From the active effervescence

which thus began in his soul, came sparks of genius which people saw

glittering in his writings through ten years of fever and delirium, but

of which no trace had been seen in him previously, and which would

probably have ceased to shine henceforth, if he should have chanced to

wish to continue writing after the access was over. Inflamed by the

contemplation of these lofty objects, he had them incessantly present to

his mind. His heart, made hot within him by the idea of the future

happiness of the human race, and by the honour of contributing to it,

dictated to him a language worthy of so high an enterprise ... and for a

moment, he astonished Europe by productions in which vulgar souls saw

only eloquence and brightness of understanding, but in which those who

dwell in the ethereal regions recognised with joy one of their

own."[157]

This was his own account of the matter quite at the end of his life, and

this is the only point of view from which we are secure against the

vulgarity of counting him a deliberate hypocrite and conscious

charlatan. He was possessed, as holier natures than his have been, by an

enthusiastic vision, an intoxicated confidence, a mixture of sacred rage

and prodigious love, an insensate but absolutely disinterested revolt

against the stone and iron of a reality which he was bent on melting in

a heavenly blaze of splendid aspiration and irresistibly persuasive

expression. The last word of this great expansion was Emilius, its first

and more imperfectly articulated was the earlier of the two Discourses.

Rousseau's often-repeated assertion that here was the instant of the

ruin of his life, and that all his misfortunes flowed from that unhappy

moment, has been constantly treated as the word of affectation and

disguised pride. Yet, vain as he was, it may well have represented his

sincere feeling in those better moods when mental suffering was strong

enough to silence vanity. His visions mastered him for these thirteen

years, \_grande mortalis oevi spatium\_. They threw him on to that turbid

sea of literature for which he had so keen an aversion, and from which,

let it be remarked, he fled finally away, when his confidence in the

ease of making men good and happy by words of monition had left him. It

was the torment of his own enthusiasm which rent that veil of placid

living, that in his normal moments he would fain have interposed between

his existence and the tumult of a generation with which he was

profoundly out of sympathy. In this way the first Discourse was the

letting in of much evil upon him, as that and the next and the Social

Contract were the letting in of much evil upon all Europe.

Of this essay the writer has recorded his own impression that, though

full of heat and force, it is absolutely wanting in logic and order, and

that of all the products of his pen, it is the feeblest in reasoning and

the poorest in numbers and harmony. "For," as he justly adds, "the art

of writing is not learnt all at once."[158] The modern critic must be

content to accept the same verdict; only a generation so in love as

this was with anything that could tickle its intellectual curiousness,

would have found in the first of the two Discourses that combination of

speculative and literary merit which was imputed to Rousseau on the

strength of it, and which at once brought him into a place among the

notables of an age that was full of them.[159] We ought to take in

connection with it two at any rate of the vindications of the Discourse,

which the course of controversy provoked from its author, and which

serve to complete its significance. It is difficult to analyse, because

in truth it is neither closely argumentative, nor is it vertebrate, even

as a piece of rhetoric. The gist of the piece, however, runs somewhat in

this wise:--

Before art had fashioned our manners, and taught our passions to use a

too elaborate speech, men were rude but natural, and difference of

conduct announced at a glance difference of character. To-day a vile and

most deceptive uniformity reigns over our manners, and all minds seem as

if they had been cast in a single mould. Hence we never know with what

sort of person we are dealing, hence the hateful troop of suspicions,

fears, reserves, and treacheries, and the concealment of impiety,

arrogance, calumny, and scepticism, under a dangerous varnish of

refinement. So terrible a set of effects must have a cause. History

shows that the cause here is to be found in the progress of sciences and

arts. Egypt, once so mighty, becomes the mother of philosophy and the

fine arts; straightway behold its conquest by Cambyses, by Greeks, by

Romans, by Arabs, finally by Turks. Greece twice conquered Asia, once

before Troy, once in its own homes; then came in fatal sequence the

progress of the arts, the dissolution of manners, and the yoke of the

Macedonian. Rome, founded by a shepherd and raised to glory by

husbandmen, began to degenerate with Ennius, and the eve of her ruin was

the day when she gave a citizen the deadly title of arbiter of good

taste. China, where letters carry men to the highest dignities of the

state, could not be preserved by all her literature from the conquering

power of the ruder Tartar. On the other hand, the Persians, Scythians,

Germans, remain in history as types of simplicity, innocence, and

virtue. Was not he admittedly the wisest of the Greeks, who made of his

own apology a plea for ignorance, and a denunciation of poets, orators,

and artists? The chosen people of God never cultivated the sciences, and

when the new law was established, it was not the learned, but the simple

and lowly, fishers and workmen, to whom Christ entrusted his teaching

and its ministry.[160]

This, then, is the way in which chastisement has always overtaken our

presumptuous efforts to emerge from that happy ignorance in which

eternal wisdom placed us; though the thick veil with which that wisdom

has covered all its operations seemed to warn us that we were not

destined to fatuous research. All the secrets that Nature hides from us

are so many evils against which she would fain shelter us.

Is probity the child of ignorance, and can science and virtue be really

inconsistent with one another? These sounding contrasts are mere

deceits, because if you look nearly into the results of this science of

which we talk so proudly, you will perceive that they confirm the

results of induction from history. Astronomy, for instance, is born of

superstition; geometry from the desire of gain; physics from a futile

curiosity; all of them, even morals, from human pride. Are we for ever

to be the dupes of words, and to believe that these pompous names of

science, philosophy, and the rest, stand for worthy and profitable

realities?[161] Be sure that they do not.

How many errors do we pass through on our road to truth, errors a

thousandfold more dangerous than truth is useful? And by what marks are

we to know truth, when we think that we have found it? And above all, if

we do find it, who of us can be sure that he will make good use of it?

If celestial intelligences cultivated science, only good could result;

and we may say as much of great men of the stamp of Socrates, who are

born to be the guides of others.[162] But the intelligences of common

men are neither celestial nor Socratic.

Again, every useless citizen may be fairly regarded as a pernicious man;

and let us ask those illustrious philosophers who have taught us what

insects reproduce themselves curiously, in what ratio bodies attract

one another in space, what curves have conjugate points, points of

inflection or reflection, what in the planetary revolutions are the

relations of areas traversed in equal times--let us ask those who have

attained all this sublime knowledge, by how much the worse governed,

less flourishing, or less perverse we should have been if they had

attained none of it? Now if the works of our most scientific men and

best citizens lead to such small utility, tell us what we are to think

of the crowd of obscure writers and idle men of letters who devour the

public substance in pure loss.

Then it is in the nature of things that devotion to art leads to luxury,

and luxury, as we all know from our own experience, no less than from

the teaching of history, saps not only the military virtues by which

nations preserve their independence, but also those moral virtues which

make the independence of a nation worth preserving. Your children go to

costly establishments where they learn everything except their duties.

They remain ignorant of their own tongue, though they will speak others

not in use anywhere in the world; they gain the faculty of composing

verses which they can barely understand; without capacity to distinguish

truth from error, they possess the art of rendering them

indistinguishable to others by specious arguments. Magnanimity, equity,

temperance, courage, humanity, have no real meaning to them; and if they

hear speak of God, it breeds more terror than awful fear.

Whence spring all these abuses, if not from the disastrous inequality

introduced among men by the distinction of talents and the cheapening of

virtue?[163] People no longer ask of a man whether he has probity, but

whether he is clever; nor of a book whether it is useful, but whether it

is well written. And after all, what is this philosophy, what are these

lessons of wisdom, to which we give the prize of enduring fame? To

listen to these sages, would you not take them for a troop of

charlatans, all bawling out in the market-place, Come to me, it is only

I who never cheat you, and always give good measure? One maintains that

there is no body, and that everything is mere representation; the other

that there is no entity but matter, and no God but the universe: one

that moral good and evil are chimeras; the other that men are wolves and

may devour one another with the easiest conscience in the world. These

are the marvellous personages on whom the esteem of contemporaries is

lavished so long as they live, and to whom immortality is reserved after

their death. And we have now invented the art of making their

extravagances eternal, and thanks to the use of typographic characters

the dangerous speculations of Hobbes and Spinoza will endure for ever.

Surely when they perceive the terrible disorders which printing has

already caused in Europe, sovereigns will take as much trouble to

banish this deadly art from their states as they once took to

introduce it.

If there is perhaps no harm in allowing one or two men to give

themselves up to the study of sciences and arts, it is only those who

feel conscious of the strength required for advancing their subjects,

who have any right to attempt to raise monuments to the glory of the

human mind. We ought to have no tolerance for those compilers who rashly

break open the gate of the sciences, and introduce into their sanctuary

a populace that is unworthy even to draw near to it. It may be well that

there should be philosophers, provided only and always that the people

do not meddle with philosophising.[164]

In short, there are two kinds of ignorance: one brutal and ferocious,

springing from a bad heart, multiplying vices, degrading the reason, and

debasing the soul: the other "a reasonable ignorance, which consists in

limiting our curiosity to the extent of the faculties we have received;

a modest ignorance, born of a lively love for virtue, and inspiring

indifference only for what is not worthy of filling a man's heart, or

fails to contribute to its improvement; a sweet and precious ignorance,

the treasure of a pure soul at peace with itself, which finds all its

blessedness in inward retreat, in testifying to itself its own

innocence, and which feels no need of seeking a warped and hollow

happiness in the opinion of other people as to its enlightenment."[165]

\* \* \* \* \*

Some of the most pointed assaults in this Discourse, such for instance

as that on the pedantic parade of wit, or that on the excessive

preponderance of literary instruction in the art of education, are due

to Montaigne; and in one way, the Discourse might be described as

binding together a number of that shrewd man's detached hints by means

of a paradoxical generalisation. But the Rousseau is more important than

the Montaigne in it. Another remark to be made is that its vigorous

disparagement of science, of the emptiness of much that is called

science, of the deadly pride of intellect, is an anticipation in a very

precise way of the attitude taken by the various Christian churches and

their representatives now and for long, beginning with De Maistre, the

greatest of the religious reactionaries after Rousseau. The vilification

of the Greeks is strikingly like some vehement passages in De Maistre's

estimate of their share in sophisticating European intellect. At last

Rousseau even began to doubt whether "so chattering a people could ever

have had any solid virtues, even in primitive times."[166] Yet

Rousseau's own thinking about society is deeply marked with opinions

borrowed exactly from these very chatterers. His imagination was

fascinated from the first by the freedom and boldness of Plato's social

speculations, to which his debt in a hundred details of his political

and educational schemes is well known. What was more important than any

obligation of detail was the fatal conception, borrowed partly from the

Greeks and partly from Geneva, of the omnipotence of the Lawgiver in

moulding a social state after his own purpose and ideal. We shall

presently quote the passage in which he holds up for our envy and

imitation the policy of Lycurgus at Sparta, who swept away all that he

found existing and constructed the social edifice afresh from foundation

to roof.[167] It is true that there was an unmistakable decay of Greek

literary studies in France from the beginning of the eighteenth century,

and Rousseau seems to have read Plato only through Ficinus's

translation. But his example and its influence, along with that of Mably

and others, warrant the historian in saying that at no time did Greek

ideas more keenly preoccupy opinion than during this century.[168]

Perhaps we may say that Rousseau would never have proved how little

learning and art do for the good of manners, if Plato had not insisted

on poets being driven out of the Republic. The article on Political

Economy, written by him for the EncyclopÃ¦dia (1755), rings with the

names of ancient rulers and lawgivers; the project of public education

is recommended by the example of Cretans, LacedÃ¦monians, and Persians,

while the propriety of the reservation of a state domain is suggested

by Romulus.

It may be added that one of the not too many merits of the essay is the

way in which the writer, more or less in the Socratic manner, insists on

dragging people out of the refuge of sonorous general terms, with a

great public reputation of much too well-established a kind to be

subjected to the affront of analysis. It is true that Rousseau himself

contributed nothing directly to that analytic operation which Socrates

likened to midwifery, and he set up graven images of his own in place of

the idols which he destroyed. This, however, did not wholly efface the

distinction, which he shares with all who have ever tried to lead the

minds of men into new tracks, of refusing to accept the current coins of

philosophical speech without test or measurement. Such a treatment of

the great trite words which come so easily to the tongue and seem to

weigh for so much, must always be the first step towards bringing

thought back into the region of real matter, and confronting phrases,

terms, and all the common form of the discussion of an age, with the

actualities which it is the object of sincere discussion to penetrate.

The refutation of many parts of Rousseau's main contention on the

principles which are universally accepted among enlightened men in

modern society is so extremely obvious that to undertake it would merely

be to draw up a list of the gratulatory commonplaces of which we hear

quite enough in the literature and talk of our day. In this direction,

perhaps it suffices to say that the Discourse is wholly one-sided,

admitting none of the conveniences, none of the alleviations of

suffering of all kinds, nothing of the increase of mental stature, which

the pursuit of knowledge has brought to the race. They may or may not

counterbalance the evils that it has brought, but they are certainly to

be put in the balance in any attempt at philosophic examination of the

subject. It contains no serious attempt to tell us what those alleged

evils really are, or definitely to trace them one by one, to abuse of

the thirst for knowledge and defects in the method of satisfying it. It

omits to take into account the various other circumstances, such as

climate, government, race, and the disposition of neighbours, which must

enter equally with intellectual progress into whatever demoralisation

has marked the destinies of a nation. Finally it has for the base of its

argument the entirely unsupported assumption of there having once been

in the early history of each society a stage of mild, credulous, and

innocent virtue, from which appetite for the fruit of the forbidden tree

caused an inevitable degeneration. All evidence and all scientific

analogy are now well known to lead to the contrary doctrine, that the

history of civilisation is a history of progress and not of decline from

a primary state. After all, as Voltaire said to Rousseau in a letter

which only showed a superficial appreciation of the real drift of the

argument, we must confess that these thorns attached to literature are

only as flowers in comparison with the other evils that have deluged the

earth. "It was not Cicero nor Lucretius nor Virgil nor Horace, who

contrived the proscriptions of Marius, of Sulla, of the debauched

Antony, of the imbecile Lepidus, of that craven tyrant basely surnamed

Augustus. It was not Marot who produced the St. Bartholomew massacre,

nor the tragedy of the Cid that led to the wars of the Fronde. What

really makes, and always will make, this world into a valley of tears,

is the insatiable cupidity and indomitable insolence of men, from Kouli

Khan, who did not know how to read, down to the custom-house clerk, who

knows nothing but how to cast up figures. Letters nourish the soul, they

strengthen its integrity, they furnish a solace to it,"--and so on in

the sense, though without the eloquence, of the famous passage in

Cicero's defence of Archias the poet.[169] All this, however, in our

time is in no danger of being forgotten, and will be present to the mind

of every reader. The only danger is that pointed out by Rousseau

himself: "People always think they have described what the sciences do,

when they have in reality only described what the sciences ought

to do."[170]

What we are more likely to forget is that Rousseau's piece has a

positive as well as a negative side, and presents, in however vehement

and overstated a way, a truth which the literary and speculative

enthusiasm of France in the eighteenth century, as is always the case

with such enthusiasm whenever it penetrates either a generation or an

individual, was sure to make men dangerously ready to forget.[171] This

truth may be put in different terms. We may describe it as the

possibility of eminent civic virtue existing in people, without either

literary taste or science or speculative curiosity. Or we may express it

as the compatibility of a great amount of contentment and order in a

given social state, with a very low degree of knowledge. Or finally, we

may give the truth its most general expression, as the subordination of

all activity to the promotion of social aims. Rousseau's is an elaborate

and roundabout manner of saying that virtue without science is better

than science without virtue; or that the well-being of a country depends

more on the standard of social duty and the willingness of citizens to

conform to it, than on the standard of intellectual culture and the

extent of its diffusion. In other words, we ought to be less concerned

about the speculative or scientific curiousness of our people than about

the height of their notion of civic virtue and their firmness and

persistency in realising it. It is a moralist's way of putting the

ancient preacher's monition, that they are but empty in whom is not the

wisdom of God. The importance of stating this is in our modern era

always pressing, because there is a constant tendency on the part of

energetic intellectual workers, first, to concentrate their energies on

a minute specialty, leaving public affairs and interests to their own

course. Second, they are apt to overestimate their contributions to the

stock of means by which men are made happier, and what is more serious,

to underestimate in comparison those orderly, modest, self-denying,

moral qualities, by which only men are made worthier, and the continuity

of society is made surer. Third, in consequence of their greater command

of specious expression and their control of the organs of public

opinion, they both assume a kind of supreme place in the social

hierarchy, and persuade the majority of plain men unsuspectingly to take

so very egregious an assumption for granted. So far as Rousseau's

Discourse recalled the truth as against this sort of error it was full

of wholesomeness.

Unfortunately his indignation against the overweening pretensions of the

verse-writer, the gazetteer, and the great band of socialists at large,

led him into a general position with reference to scientific and

speculative energy, which seems to involve a perilous misconception of

the conditions of this energy producing its proper results. It is easy

now, as it was easy for Rousseau in the last century, to ask in an

epigrammatical manner by how much men are better or happier for having

found out this or that novelty in transcendental mathematics, biology,

or astronomy; and this is very well as against the discoverer of small

marvels who shall give himself out for the benefactor of the human

race. But both historical experience and observation of the terms on

which the human intelligence works, show us that we can only make sure

of intellectual activity on condition of leaving it free to work all

round, in every department and in every remotest nook of each

department, and that its most fruitful epochs are exactly those when

this freedom is greatest, this curiosity most keen and minute, and this

waste, if you choose to call the indispensable superfluity of force in a

natural process waste, most copious and unsparing. You will not find

your highest capacity in statesmanship, nor in practical science, nor in

art, nor in any other field where that capacity is most urgently needed

for the right service of life, unless there is a general and vehement

spirit of search in the air. If it incidentally leads to many

industrious futilities and much learned refuse, this is still the sign

and the generative element of industry which is not futile, and of

learning which is something more than mere water spilled upon

the ground.

We may say in fine that this first Discourse and its vindications were a

dim, shallow, and ineffective feeling after the great truth, that the

only normal state of society is that in which neither the love of virtue

has been thrust far back into a secondary place by the love of

knowledge, nor the active curiosity of the understanding dulled,

blunted, and made ashamed by soft, lazy ideals of life as a life only of

the affections. Rousseau now and always fell into the opposite extreme

from that against which his whole work was a protest. We need not

complain very loudly that while remonstrating against the restless

intrepidity of the rationalists of his generation, he passed over the

central truth, namely that the full and ever festal life is found in

active freedom of curiosity and search taking significance, motive,

force, from a warm inner pulse of human love and sympathy. It was not

given to Rousseau to see all this, but it was given to him to see the

side of it for which the most powerful of the men living with him had no

eyes, and the first Discourse was only a moderately successful attempt

to bring his vision before Europe. It was said at the time that he did

not believe a word of what he had written.[172] It is a natural

characteristic of an age passionately occupied with its own set of

ideas, to question either the sincerity or the sanity of anybody who

declares its sovereign conceptions to be no better than foolishness. We

cannot entertain such a suspicion. Perhaps the vehemence of controversy

carries him rather further than he quite meant to go, when he declares

that if he were a chief of an African tribe, he would erect on his

frontier a gallows, on which he would hang without mercy the first

European who should venture to pass into his territory, and the first

native who should dare to pass out of it.[173] And there are many other

extravagances of illustration, but the main position is serious enough,

as represented in the emblematic vignette with which the essay was

printed--the torch of science brought to men by Prometheus, who warns a

satyr that it burns; the satyr, seeing fire for the first time and being

fain to embrace it, is the symbol of the vulgar men who, seduced by the

glitter of literature, insist on delivering themselves up to its

study.[174] Rousseau's whole doctrine hangs compactly together, and we

may see the signs of its growth after leaving his hands in the crude

formula of the first Discourse, if we proceed to the more audacious

paradox of the second.

II.

The Discourse on the Origin of Inequality among men opens with a

description of the natural state of man, which occupies considerably

more than half of the entire performance. It is composed in a vein which

is only too familiar to the student of the literature of the time,

picturing each habit and thought, and each step to new habits and

thoughts, with the minuteness, the fulness, the precision, of one who

narrates circumstances of which he has all his life been the close

eye-witness. The natural man reveals to us every motive, every process

internal and external, every slightest circumstance of his daily life,

and each element that gradually transformed him into the non-natural

man. One who had watched bees or beetles for years could not give us a

more full or confident account of their doings, their hourly goings in

and out, than it was the fashion in the eighteenth century to give of

the walk and conversation of the primeval ancestor. The conditions of

primitive man were discussed by very incompetent ladies and gentlemen at

convivial supper parties, and settled with complete assurance.[175]

Rousseau thought and talked about the state of nature because all his

world was thinking and talking about it. He used phrases and formulas

with reference to it which other people used. He required no more

evidence than they did, as to the reality of the existence of the

supposed set of conditions to which they gave the almost sacramental

name of state of nature. He never thought of asking, any more than

anybody else did in the middle of the eighteenth century, what sort of

proof, how strong, how direct, was to be had, that primeval man had such

and such habits, and changed them in such a way and direction, and for

such reasons. Physical science had reached a stage by this time when its

followers were careful to ask questions about evidence, correct

description, verification. But the idea of accurate method had to be

made very familiar to men by the successes of physical science in the

search after truths of one kind, before the indispensableness of

applying it in the search after truths of all kinds had extended to the

science of the constitution and succession of social states. In this

respect Rousseau was not guiltier than the bulk of his contemporaries.

Voltaire's piercing common sense, Hume's deep-set sagacity,

Montesquieu's caution, prevented them from launching very far on to this

metaphysical sea of nature and natural laws and states, but none of them

asked those critical questions in relation to such matters which occur

so promptly in the present day to persons far inferior to them in

intellectual strength. Rousseau took the notion of the state of nature

because he found it to his hand; he fitted to it his own characteristic

aspirations, expanding and vivifying a philosophic conception with all

the heat of humane passion; and thus, although, at the end of the

process when he had done with it, the state of nature came out blooming

as the rose, it was fundamentally only the dry, current abstraction of

his time, artificially decorated to seduce men into embracing a strange

ideal under a familiar name.

Before analysing the Discourse on Inequality, we ought to make some

mention of a remarkable man whose influence probably reached Rousseau in

an indirect manner through Diderot; I mean Morelly.[176] In 1753 Morelly

published a prose poem called the Basiliade, describing the corruption

of manners introduced by the errors of the lawgiver, and pointing out

how this corruption is to be amended by return to the empire of nature

and truth. He was no doubt stimulated by what was supposed to be the

central doctrine of Montesquieu, then freshly given to the world, that

it is government and institutions which make men what they are. But he

was stimulated into a reaction, and in 1754 he propounded his whole

theory, in a piece which in closeness, consistency, and thoroughness is

admirably different from Rousseau's rhetoric.[177] It lacked the

sovereign quality of persuasiveness, and so fell on deaf ears. Morelly

accepts the doctrine that men are formed by the laws, but insists that

moralists and statesmen have always led us wrong by legislating and

prescribing conduct on the false theory that man is bad, whereas he is

in truth a creature endowed with natural probity. Then he strikes to the

root of society with a directness that Rousseau could not imitate, by

the position that "these laws by establishing a monstrous division of

the products of nature, and even of their very elements--by dividing

what ought to have remained entire, or ought to have been restored to

entireness if any accident had divided them, aided and favoured the

break-up of all sociability." All political and all moral evils are the

effects of this pernicious cause--private property. He says of

Rousseau's first Discourse that the writer ought to have seen that the

corruption of manners which he set down to literature and art really

came from this venomous principle of property, which infects all that

it touches.[178] Christianity, it is true, assailed this principle and

restored equality or community of possessions, but Christianity had the

radical fault of involving such a detachment from earthly affections, in

order to deliver ourselves to heavenly meditation, as brought about a

necessary degeneration in social activity. The form of government is a

matter of indifference, provided you can only assure community of goods.

Political revolutions are at bottom the clash of material interests, and

until you have equalised the one you will never prevent the other.[179]

Let us turn from this very definite position to one of the least

definite productions to be found in all literature.

\* \* \* \* \*

It will seem a little odd that more than half of a discussion on the

origin of inequality among men should be devoted to a glowing imaginary

description, from which no reader could conjecture what thesis it was

designed to support. But we have only to remember that Rousseau's object

was to persuade people that the happier state is that in which

inequality does not subsist, that there had once been such a state, and

that this was first the state of nature, and then the state only one

degree removed from it, in which we now find the majority of savage

tribes. At the outset he defines inequality as a word meaning two

different things; one, natural or physical inequality, such as

difference of age, of health, of physical strength, of attributes of

intelligence and character; the other, moral or political inequality,

consisting in difference of privileges which some enjoy to the detriment

of the rest, such as being richer, more honoured, more powerful. The

former differences are established by nature, the latter are authorised,

if they were not established, by the consent of men.[180] In the state

of nature no inequalities flow from the differences among men in point

of physical advantage and disadvantage, and which remain without

derivative differences so long as the state of nature endures

undisturbed. Nature deals with men as the law of Sparta dealt with the

children of its citizens; she makes those who are well constituted

strong and robust, and she destroys all the rest.

The surface of the earth is originally covered by dense forest, and

inhabited by animals of every species. Men, scattered among them,

imitate their industry, and so rise to the instinct of the brutes, with

this advantage that while each species has only its own, man, without

anything special, appropriates the instincts of all. This admirable

creature, with foes on every side, is forced to be constantly on the

alert, and hence to be always in full possession of all his faculties,

unlike civilised man, whose native force is enfeebled by the mechanical

protections with which he has surrounded himself. He is not afraid of

the wild beasts around him, for experience has taught him that he is

their master. His health is better than ours, for we live in a time when

excess of idleness in some, excess of toil in others, the heating and

over-abundant diet of the rich, the bad food of the poor, the orgies and

excesses of every kind, the immoderate transport of every passion, the

fatigue and strain of spirit,--when all these things have inflicted more

disorders upon us than the vaunted art of medicine has been able to keep

pace with. Even if the sick savage has only nature to hope from, on the

other hand he has only his own malady to be afraid of. He has no fear of

death, for no animal can know what death is, and the knowledge of death

and its terrors is one of the first of man's terrible acquisitions

after abandoning his animal condition.[181] In other respects, such as

protection against weather, such as habitation, such as food, the

savage's natural power of adaptation, and the fact that his demands are

moderate in proportion to his means of satisfying them, forbid us to

consider him physically unhappy. Let us turn to the intellectual and

moral side.

If you contend that men were miserable, degraded, and outcast during

these primitive centuries because the intelligence was dormant, then do

not forget, first, that you are drawing an indictment against

nature,--no trifling blasphemy in those days--and second, that you are

attributing misery to a free creature with tranquil spirit and healthy

body, and that must surely be a singular abuse of the term. We see

around us scarcely any but people who complain of the burden of their

lives; but who ever heard of a savage in full enjoyment of his liberty

ever dreaming of complaint about his life or of self-destruction?

With reference to virtues and vices in a state of nature, Hobbes is

wrong in declaring that man in this state is vicious, as not knowing

virtue. He is not vicious, for the reason that he does not know what

being good is. It is not development of enlightenment nor the

restrictions of law, but the calm of the passions and ignorance of vice,

which keep them from doing ill. \_Tanto plus in illis profitcit vitiorum

ignoratio, quam in his cognitio virtutis.\_

Besides man has one great natural virtue, that of pity, which precedes

in him the use of reflection, and which indeed he shares with some of

the brutes. Mandeville, who was forced to admit the existence of this

admirable quality in man, was absurd in not perceiving that from it flow

all the social virtues which he would fain deny. Pity is more energetic

in the primitive condition than it is among ourselves. It is reflection

which isolates one. It is philosophy which teaches the philosopher to

say secretly at sight of a suffering wretch, Perish if it please thee; I

am safe and sound. They may be butchering a fellow-creature under your

window; all you have to do is to clap your hands to your ears, and argue

a little with yourself to hinder nature in revolt from making you feel

as if you were in the case of the victim.[182] The savage man has not

got this odious gift. In the state of nature it is pity that takes the

place of laws, manners, and virtue. It is in this natural sentiment

rather than in subtle arguments that we have to seek the reluctance that

every man would feel to do ill, even without the precepts of

education.[183]

Finally, the passion of love, which produces such disasters in a state

of society, where the jealousy of lovers and the vengeance of husbands

lead each day to duels and murders, where the duty of eternal fidelity

only serves to occasion adulteries, and where the law of continence

necessarily extends the debauching of women and the practice of

procuring abortion[184]--this passion in a state of nature, where it is

purely physical, momentary, and without any association of durable

sentiment with the object of it, simply leads to the necessary

reproduction of the species and nothing more.

"Let us conclude, then, that wandering in the forests, without industry,

without speech, without habitation, without war, without connection of

any kind, without any need of his fellows or without any desire to harm

them, perhaps even without ever recognising one of them individually,

savage man, subject to few passions and sufficing to himself, had only

the sentiments and the enlightenment proper to his condition. He was

only sensible of his real wants, and only looked because he thought he

had an interest in seeing; and his intelligence made no more progress

than his vanity. If by chance he hit on some discovery, he was all the

less able to communicate it; as he did not know even his own children.

An art perished with its inventor. There was neither education nor

progress; generations multiplied uselessly; and as each generation

always started from the same point, centuries glided away in all the

rudeness of the first ages, the race was already old, the individual

remained always a child."

This brings us to the point of the matter. For if you compare the

prodigious diversities in education and manner of life which reign in

the different orders of the civil condition, with the simplicity and

uniformity of the savage and animal life, where all find nourishment in

the same articles of food, live in the same way, and do exactly the same

things, you will easily understand to what degree the difference between

man and man must be less in the state of nature than in that of

society.[185] Physical inequality is hardly perceived in the state of

nature, and its indirect influences there are almost non-existent.

Now as all the social virtues and other faculties possessed by man

potentially were not bound by anything inherent in him to develop into

actuality, he might have remained to all eternity in his admirable and

most fitting primitive condition, but for the fortuitous concurrence of

a variety of external changes. What are these different changes, which

may perhaps have perfected human reason, while they certainly have

deteriorated the race, and made men bad in making them sociable?

What, then, are the intermediary facts between the state of nature and

the state of civil society, the nursery of inequality? What broke up the

happy uniformity of the first times? First, difference in soil, in

climate, in seasons, led to corresponding differences in men's manner of

living. Along the banks of rivers and on the shores of the sea, they

invented hooks and lines, and were eaters of fish. In the forests they

invented bows and arrows, and became hunters. In cold countries they

covered themselves with the skins of beasts. Lightning, volcanoes, or

some happy chance acquainted them with fire, a new protection against

the rigours of winter. In company with these natural acquisitions, grew

up a sort of reflection or mechanical prudence, which showed them the

kind of precautions most necessary to their security. From this

rudimentary and wholly egoistic reflection there came a sense of the

existence of a similar nature and similar interests in their

fellow-creatures. Instructed by experience that the love of well-being

and comfort is the only motive of human actions, the savage united with

his neighbours when union was for their joint convenience, and did his

best to blind and outwit his neighbours when their interests were

adverse to his own, and he felt himself the weaker. Hence the origin of

certain rude ideas of mutual obligation.[186]

Soon, ceasing to fall asleep under the first tree, or to withdraw into

caves, they found axes of hard stone, which served them to cut wood, to

dig the ground, and to construct hovels of branches and clay. This was

the epoch of a first revolution, which formed the establishment and

division of families, and which introduced a rough and partial sort of

property. Along with rudimentary ideas of property, though not

connected with them, came the rudimentary forms of inequality. When men

were thrown more together, then he who sang or danced the best, the

strongest, the most adroit, or the most eloquent, acquired the most

consideration--that is, men ceased to take uniform and equal place. And

with the coming of this end of equality there passed away the happy

primitive immunity from jealousy, envy, malice, hate.

On the whole, though men had lost some of their original endurance, and

their natural pity had already undergone a certain deterioration, this

period of the development of the human faculties, occupying a just

medium between the indolence of the primitive state and the petulant

activity of our modern self-love, must have been at once the happiest

and the most durable epoch. The more we reflect, the more evident we

find it that this state was the least subject to revolutions and the

best for man. "So long as men were content with their rustic hovels, so

long as they confined themselves to stitching their garments of skin

with spines or fish bones, to decking their bodies with feathers and

shells and painting them in different colours, to perfecting and

beautifying their bows and arrows--in a word, so long as they only

applied themselves to works that one person could do, and to arts that

needed no more than a single hand, then they lived free, healthy, good,

and happy, so far as was compatible with their natural constitution, and

continued to enjoy among themselves the sweetness of independent

intercourse. But from the moment that one man had need of the help of

another, as soon as they perceived it to be useful for one person to

have provisions for two, then equality disappeared, property was

introduced, labour became necessary, and the vast forests changed into

smiling fields, which had to be watered by the sweat of men, and in

which they ever saw bondage and misery springing up and growing ripe

with the harvests."[187]

The working of metals and agriculture have been the two great agents in

this revolution. For the poet it is gold and silver, but for the

philosopher it is iron and corn, that have civilised men and undone the

human race. It is easy to see how the latter of the two arts was

suggested to men by watching the reproducing processes of vegetation. It

is less easy to be sure how they discovered metal, saw its uses, and

invented means of smelting it, for nature had taken extreme precautions

to hide the fatal secret. It was probably the operation of some volcano

which first suggested the idea of fusing ore. From the fact of land

being cultivated its division followed, and therefore the institution of

property in its full shape. From property arose civil society. "The

first man who, having enclosed a piece of ground, could think of saying,

\_This is mine\_, and found people simple enough to believe him, was the

real founder of civil society. How many crimes, wars, murders, miseries,

and horrors would not have been spared to the human race by one who,

plucking up the stakes, or filling in the trench, should have called out

to his fellows: Beware of listening to this impostor; you are undone if

you forget that the earth belongs to no one, and that its fruits are for

all."[188]

Things might have remained equal even in this state, if talents had only

been equal, and if for example the employment of iron and the

consumption of agricultural produce had always exactly balanced one

another. But the stronger did more work; the cleverer got more advantage

from his work; the more ingenious found means of shortening his labour;

the husbandman had more need of metal, or the smith more need of grain;

and while working equally, one got much gain, and the other could

scarcely live. This distinction between Have and Have-not led to

confusion and revolt, to brigandage on the one side and constant

insecurity on the other.

Hence disorders of a violent and interminable kind, which gave rise to

the most deeply designed project that ever entered the human mind. This

was to employ in favour of property the strength of the very persons who

attacked it, to inspire them with other maxims, and to give them other

institutions which should be as favourable to property as natural law

had been contrary to it. The man who conceived this project, after

showing his neighbours the monstrous confusion which made their lives

most burdensome, spoke in this wise: "Let us unite to shield the weak

from oppression, to restrain the proud, and to assure to each the

possession of what belongs to him; let us set up rules of justice and

peace, to which all shall be obliged to conform, without respect of

persons, and which may repair to some extent the caprices of fortune, by

subjecting the weak and the mighty alike to mutual duties. In a word,

instead of turning our forces against one another, let us collect them

into one supreme power to govern us by sage laws, to protect and defend

all the members of the association, repel their common foes, and

preserve us in never-ending concord." This, and not the right of

conquest, must have been the origin of society and laws, which threw new

chains round the poor and gave new might to the rich; and for the profit

of a few grasping and ambitious men, subjected the whole human race

henceforth and for ever to toil and bondage and wretchedness

without hope.

The social constitution thus propounded and accepted was radically

imperfect from the outset, and in spite of the efforts of the sagest

lawgivers, it has always remained imperfect, because it was the work of

chance, and because, inasmuch as it was ill begun, time, while revealing

defects and suggesting remedies, could never repair its vices; \_people

went on incessantly repairing and patching, instead of which it was

indispensable to begin by making a clean surface and by throwing aside

all the old materials, just as Lycurgus did in Sparta\_.

Put shortly, the main positions are these. In the state of nature each

man lived in entire isolation, and therefore physical inequality was as

if it did not exist. After many centuries, accident, in the shape of

difference of climate and external natural conditions, enforcing for the

sake of subsistence some degree of joint labour, led to an increase of

communication among men, to a slight development of the reasoning and

reflective faculties, and to a rude and simple sense of mutual

obligation, as a means of greater comfort in the long run. The first

state was good and pure, but the second state was truly perfect. It was

destroyed by a fresh succession of chances, such as the discovery of the

arts of metal-working and tillage, which led first to the institution of

property, and second to the prominence of the natural or physical

inequalities, which now began to tell with deadly effectiveness. These

inequalities gradually became summed up in the great distinction between

rich and poor; and this distinction was finally embodied in the

constitution of a civil society, expressly adapted to consecrate the

usurpation of the rich, and to make the inequality of condition between

them and the poor eternal.

We thus see that the Discourse, unlike Morelly's terse exposition,

contains no clear account of the kind of inequality with which it deals.

Is it inequality of material possession or inequality of political

right? Morelly tells you decisively that the latter is only an accident,

flowing from the first; that the key to renovation lies in the abolition

of the first. Rousseau mixes the two confusedly together under a single

name, bemoans each, but shrinks from a conclusion or a recommendation

as to either. He declares property to be the key to civil society, but

falls back from any ideas leading to the modification of the institution

lying at the root of all that he deplores.

The first general criticism, which in itself contains and covers nearly

all others, turns on Method. "Conjectures become reasons when they are

the most likely that you can draw from the nature of things," and "it is

for philosophy in lack of history to determine the most likely facts."

In an inductive age this royal road is rigorously closed. Guesses drawn

from the general nature of things can no longer give us light as to the

particular nature of the things pertaining to primitive men, any more

than such guesses can teach us the law of the movement of the heavenly

bodies, or the foundations of jurisprudence. Nor can deduction from

anything but propositions which have themselves been won by laborious

induction, ever lead us to the only kind of philosophy which has fair

pretension to determine the most probable of the missing facts in the

chain of human history. That quantitative and differentiating knowledge

which is science, was not yet thought of in connection with the

movements of our own race upon the earth. It is to be said, further,

that of the two possible ways of guessing about the early state, the

conditions of advance from it, and the rest, Rousseau's guess that all

movement away from it has been towards corruption, is less supported by

subsequent knowledge than the guess of his adversaries, that it has

been a movement progressive and upwards.

This much being said as to incurable vice of method, and there are

fervent disciples of Rousseau now living who will regard one's craving

for method in talking about men as a foible of pedantry, we may briefly

remark on one or two detached objections to Rousseau's story. To begin

with, there is no certainty as to there having ever been a state of

nature of a normal and organic kind, any more than there is any one

normal and typical state of society now. There are infinitely diverse

states of society, and there were probably as many diverse states of

nature. Rousseau was sufficiently acquainted with the most recent

metaphysics of his time to know that you cannot think of a tree in

general, nor of a triangle in general, but only of some particular tree

or triangle.[189] In a similar way he might have known that there never

was any such thing as a state of nature in the general and abstract,

fixed, typical, and single. He speaks of the savage state also, which

comes next, as one, identical, normal. It is, of course, nothing of the

kind. The varieties of belief and habit and custom among the different

tribes of savages, in reference to every object that can engage their

attention, from death and the gods and immortality down to the uses of

marriage and the art of counting and the ways of procuring subsistence,

are infinitely numerous; and the more we know about this vast diversity,

the less easy is it to think of the savage state in general. When

Rousseau extols the savage state as the veritable youth of the world, we

wonder whether we are to think of the negroes of the Gold Coast, or the

Dyaks of Borneo, Papuans or Maoris, Cheyennes or Tierra-del-Fuegians or

the fabled Troglodytes; whether in the veritable youth of the world they

counted up to five or only to two; whether they used a fire-drill, and

if so what kind of drill; whether they had the notion of personal

identity in so weak a shape as to practise the couvade; and a hundred

other points, which we should now require any writer to settle, who

should speak of the savage state as sovereign, one, and indivisible, in

the way in which Rousseau speaks of it, and holds it up to our vain

admiration.

Again, if the savage state supervened upon the state of nature in

consequence of certain climatic accidents of a permanent kind, such as

living on the banks of a river or in a dense forest, how was it that the

force of these accidents did not begin to operate at once? How could the

isolated state of nature endure for a year in face of them? Or what was

the precipitating incident which suddenly set them to work, and drew the

primitive men from an isolation so profound that they barely recognised

one another, into that semi-social state in which the family

was founded?

We cannot tell how the state of nature continued to subsist, or, if it

ever subsisted, how and why it ever came to an end, because the agencies

which are alleged to have brought it to an end must have been coeval

with the appearance of man himself. If gods had brought to men seed,

fire, and the mechanical arts, as in one of the Platonic myths,[190] we

could understand that there was a long stage preliminary to these

heavenly gifts. But if the gods had no part nor lot in it, and if the

accidents that slowly led the human creature into union were as old as

that nature, of which indeed they were actually the component elements,

then man must have quitted the state of nature the very day on which he

was born into it. And what can be a more monstrous anachronism than to

turn a flat-headed savage into a clever, self-conscious, argumentative

utilitarian of the eighteenth century; working the social problem out in

his flat head with a keenness, a consistency, a grasp of first

principles, that would have entitled him to a chair in the institute of

moral sciences, and entering the social union with the calm and

reasonable deliberation of a great statesman taking a critical step in

policy? Aristotle was wiser when he fixed upon sociability as an

ultimate quality of human nature, instead of making it, as Rousseau and

so many others have done, the conclusion of an unimpeachable train of

syllogistic reasoning.[191] Morelly even, his own contemporary, and

much less of a sage than Aristotle, was still sage enough to perceive

that this primitive human machine, "though composed of intelligent

parts, generally operates independently of its reason; its deliberations

are forestalled, and only leave it to look on, while sentiment does its

work."[192] It is the more remarkable that Rousseau should have fallen

into this kind of error, as it was one of his distinctions to have

perceived and partially worked out the principle, that men guide their

conduct rather from passion and instinct than from reasoned

enlightenment.[193] The ultimate quality which he named pity is, after

all, the germ of sociability, which is only extended sympathy. But he

did not firmly adhere to this ultimate quality, nor make any effort

consistently to trace out its various products.

We do not find, however, in Rousseau any serious attempt to analyse the

composition of human nature in its primitive stages. Though constantly

warning his readers very impressively against confounding domesticated

with primitive men, he practically assumes that the main elements of

character must always have been substantially identical with such

elements and conceptions as are found after the addition of many ages of

increasingly complex experience. There is something worth considering in

his notion that civilisation has had effects upon man analogous to those

of domestication upon animals, but he lacked logical persistency enough

to enable him to adhere to his own idea, and work out conclusions

from it.

It might further be pointed out in another direction that he takes for

granted that the mode of advance into a social state has always been one

and the same, a single and uniform process, marked by precisely the same

set of several stages, following one another in precisely the same

order. There is no evidence of this; on the contrary, evidence goes to

show that civilisation varies in origin and process with race and other

things, and that though in all cases starting from the prime factor of

sociableness in man, yet the course of its development has depended on

the particular sets of circumstances with which that factor has had to

combine. These are full of variety, according to climate and racial

predisposition, although, as has been justly said, the force of both

these two elements diminishes as the influence of the past in giving

consistency to our will becomes more definite, and our means of

modifying climate and race become better known. There is no sign that

Rousseau, any more than many other inquirers, ever reflected whether the

capacity for advance into the state of civil society in any highly

developed form is universal throughout the species, or whether there are

not races eternally incapable of advance beyond the savage state.

Progress would hardly be the exception which we know it to be in the

history of communities if there were not fundamental diversities in the

civilisable quality of races. Why do some bodies of men get on to the

high roads of civilisation, while others remain in the jungle and

thicket of savagery; and why do some races advance along one of these

roads, and others advance by different roads?

Considerations of this sort disclose the pinched frame of trim theory

with which Rousseau advanced to set in order a huge mass of boundlessly

varied, intricate, and unmanageable facts. It is not, however, at all

worth while to extend such criticism further than suffices to show how

little his piece can stand the sort of questions which may be put to it

from a scientific point of view. Nothing that Rousseau had to say about

the state of nature was seriously meant for scientific exposition, any

more than the Sermon on the Mount was meant for political economy. The

importance of the Discourse on Inequality lay in its vehement

denunciation of the existing social state. To the writer the question

of the origin of inequality is evidently far less a matter at heart,

than the question of its results. It is the natural inclination of one

deeply moved by a spectacle of depravation in his own time and country,

to extol some other time or country, of which he is happily ignorant

enough not to know the drawbacks. Rousseau wrote about the savage state

in something of the same spirit in which Tacitus wrote the Germania. And

here, as in the Discourse on the influence of science and art upon

virtue, there is a positive side. To miss this in resentment of the

unscientific paradox that lies about it, is to miss the force of the

piece, and to render its enormous influence for a generation after it

was written incomprehensible. We may always be quite sure that no set of

ideas ever produced this resounding effect on opinion, unless they

contained something which the social or spiritual condition of the men

whom they inflamed made true for the time, and true in an urgent sense.

Is it not tenable that the state of certain savage tribes is more

normal, offers a better balance between desire and opportunity, between

faculty and performance, than the permanent state of large classes in

western countries, the broken wreck of civilisation?[194] To admit this

is not to conclude, as Rousseau so rashly concluded, that the movement

away from the primitive stages has been productive only of evil and

misery even to the masses of men, the hewers of wood and the drawers of

water; or that it was occasioned, and has been carried on by the

predominance of the lower parts and principles of human nature. Our

provisional acquiescence in the straitness and blank absence of outlook

or hope of the millions who come on to the earth that greets them with

no smile, and then stagger blindly under dull burdens for a season, and

at last are shovelled silently back under the ground,--our acquiescence

can only be justified in the sight of humanity by the conviction that

this is one of the temporary conditions of a vast process, working

forwards through the impulse and agency of the finer human spirits, but

needing much blood, many tears, uncounted myriads of lives, and

immeasurable geologic periods of time, for its high and beneficent

consummation. There is nothing surprising, perhaps nothing deeply

condemnable, in the burning anger for which this acquiescence is often

changed in the more impatient natures. As against the ignoble host who

think that the present ordering of men, with all its prodigious

inequalities, is in foundation and substance the perfection of social

blessedness, Rousseau was almost in the right. If the only alternative

to the present social order remaining in perpetuity were a retrogression

to some such condition as that of the islanders of the South Sea, a

lover of his fellow-creatures might look upon the result, so far as it

affected the happiness of the bulk of them, with tolerably complete

indifference. It is only the faith that we are moving slowly away from

the existing order, as our ancestors moved slowly away from the old want

of order, that makes the present endurable, and makes any tenacious

effort to raise the future possible.

\* \* \* \* \*

An immense quantity of nonsense has been talked about the equality of

man, for which those who deny that doctrine and those who assert it may

divide the responsibility. It is in reality true or false, according to

the doctrines with which it is confronted. As against the theory that

the existing way of sharing the laboriously acquired fruits and delights

of the earth is a just representation and fair counterpart of natural

inequalities among men in merit and capacity, the revolutionary theory

is true, and the passionate revolutionary cry for equality of external

chance most righteous and unanswerable. But the issues do not end here.

Take such propositions as these:--there are differences in the capacity

of men for serving the community; the well-being of the community

demands the allotment of high function in proportion to high faculty;

the rights of man in politics are confined to a right of the same

protection for his own interests as is given to the interests of others.

As against these principles, the revolutionary deductions from the

equality of man are false. And such pretensions as that every man could

be made equally fit for every function, or that not only each should

have an equal chance, but that he who uses his chance well and sociably

should be kept on a level in common opinion and trust with him who uses

it ill and unsociably, or does not use it at all,--the whole of this is

obviously most illusory and most disastrous, and in whatever decree any

set of men have ever taken it up, to that degree they have paid

the penalty.

What Rousseau's Discourse meant, what he intended it to mean, and what

his first direct disciples understood it as meaning, is not that all men

are born equal. He never says this, and his recognition of natural

inequality implies the contrary proposition. His position is that the

artificial differences, springing from the conditions of the social

union, do not coincide with the differences in capacity springing from

original constitution; that the tendency of the social union as now

organised is to deepen the artificial inequalities, and make the gulf

between those endowed with privileges and wealth and those not so

endowed ever wider and wider. It would have been very difficult a

hundred years ago to deny the truth of this way of stating the case. If

it has to some extent already ceased to be entirely true, and if violent

popular forces are at work making it less and less true, we owe the

origin of the change, among other causes and influences, not least to

the influence of Rousseau himself, and those whom he inspired. It was

that influence which, though it certainly did not produce, yet did as

certainly give a deep and remarkable bias, first to the American

Revolution, and a dozen years afterwards to the French Revolution.

It would be interesting to trace the different fortunes which awaited

the idea of the equality of man in America and in France. In America it

has always remained strictly within the political order, and perhaps

with the considerable exception of the possibles share it may have had,

along with Christian notions of the brotherhood of man, and

statesmanlike notions of national prosperity, in leading to the

abolition of slavery, it has brought forth no strong moral sentiment

against the ethical and economic bases of any part of the social order.

In France, on the other hand, it was the starting-point of movements

that have had all the fervour and intensity of religions, and have made

men feel about social inequalities the burning shame and wrath with

which a Christian saw the flourishing temples of unclean gods. This

difference in the interpretation and development of the first doctrine

may be explained in various ways,--by difference of material

circumstance between America and France; difference of the political and

social level from which the principle of equality had to start; and not

least by difference of intellectual temperament. This last was itself

partly the product of difference in religion, which makes the English

dread the practical enforcement of logical conclusions, while the French

have hitherto been apt to dread and despise any tendency to stop

short of that.

\* \* \* \* \*

Let us notice, finally, the important fact that the appearance of

Rousseau's Discourses was the first sign of reaction against the

historic mode of inquiry into society that had been initiated by

Montesquieu. The Spirit of Laws was published in 1748, with a truly

prodigious effect. It coloured the whole of the social literature in

France during the rest of the century. A history of its influence would

be a history of one of the most important sides of speculative activity.

In the social writings of Rousseau himself there is hardly a chapter

which does not contain tacit reference to Montesquieu's book. The

Discourses were the beginning of a movement in an exactly opposite

direction; that is, away from patient collection of wide multitudes of

facts relating to the conditions of society, towards the promulgation of

arbitrary systems of absolute social dogmas. Mably, the chief dogmatic

socialist of the century, and one of the most dignified and austere

characters, is an important example of the detriment done by the

influence of Rousseau to that of Montesquieu, in the earlier stages of

the conflict between the two schools. Mably (1709-1785), of whom the

remark is to be made that he was for some years behind the scenes of

government as De Tencin's secretary and therefore was versed in affairs,

began his inquiries with Greece and Rome. "You will find everything in

ancient history," he said.[195] And he remained entirely in this groove

of thought until Rousseau appeared. He then gradually left Montesquieu.

"To find the duties of a legislator," he said, "I descend into the

abysses of my heart, I study my sentiments." He opposed the Economists,

the other school that was feeling its way imperfectly enough to a

positive method. "As soon as I see landed property established," he

wrote, "then I see unequal fortunes; and from these unequal fortunes

must there not necessarily result different and opposed interests, all

the vices of riches, all the vices of poverty, the brutalisation of

intelligence, the corruption of civil manners?" and so forth.[196] In

his most important work, published in 1776, we see Rousseau's notions

developed, with a logic from which their first author shrunk, either

from fear, or more probably from want of firmness and consistency as a

reasoner. "It is to equality that nature has attached the preservation

of our social faculties and happiness: and from this I conclude that

legislation will only be taking useless trouble, unless all its

attention is first of all directed to the establishment of equality in

the fortune and condition of citizens."[197] That is to say not only

political equality, but economic communism. "What miserable folly, that

persons who pass for philosophers should go on repeating after one

another that without property there can be no society. Let us leave

illusion. It is property that divides us into two classes, rich and

poor; the first will alway prefer their fortune to that of the state,

while the second will never love a government or laws that leave them in

misery."[198] This was the kind of opinion for which Rousseau's diffuse

and rhetorical exposition of social necessity had prepared France some

twenty years before. After powerfully helping the process of general

dissolution, it produced the first fruits specifically after its own

kind some twenty years later in the system of Baboeuf.[199]

The unflinching application of principles is seldom achieved by the men

who first launch them. The labour of the preliminary task seems to

exhaust one man's stock of mental force. Rousseau never thought of the

subversion of society or its reorganisation on a communistic basis.

Within a few months of his profession of profound lament that the first

man who made a claim to property had not been instantly unmasked as the

arch foe of the race, he speaks most respectfully of property as the

pledge of the engagements of citizens and the foundation of the social

pact, while the first condition of that pact is that every one should be

maintained in peaceful enjoyment of what belongs to him.[200] We need

not impute the apparent discrepancy to insincerity. Rousseau was always

apt to think in a slipshod manner. He sensibly though illogically

accepted wholesome practical maxims, as if they flowed from theoretical

premisses that were in truth utterly incompatible with them.
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CHAPTER VI.

PARIS.

I.

By what subtle process did Rousseau, whose ideal had been a summer life

among all the softnesses of sweet gardens and dappled orchards, turn

into panegyrist of the harsh austerity of old Cato and grim Brutus's

civic devotion? The amiability of eighteenth century France--and France

was amiable in spite of the atrocities of White Penitents at Toulouse,

and black Jansenists at Paris, and the men and women who dealt in

\_lettres-de-cachet\_ at Versailles--was revolted by the name of the cruel

patriot who slew his son for the honour of discipline.[201] How came

Rousseau of all men, the great humanitarian of his time, to rise to the

height of these unlovely rigours?

The answer is that he was a citizen of Geneva transplanted. He had been

bred in puritan and republican tradition, with love of God and love of

law and freedom and love of country all penetrating it, and then he had

been accidentally removed to a strange city that was in active ferment

with ideas that were the direct abnegation of all these. In Paris the

idea of a God was either repudiated along with many other ancestral

conceptions, or else it was fatally entangled with the worst

superstition and not seldom with the vilest cruelties. The idea of

freedom was unknown, and the idea of law was benumbed by abuses and

exceptions. The idea of country was enfeebled in some and displaced in

others by a growing passion for the captivating something styled

citizenship of the world. If Rousseau could have ended his days among

the tranquil lakes and hills of Savoy, Geneva might possibly never have

come back to him. For it depends on circumstance, which of the chances

that slumber within us shall awake, and which shall fall unroused with

us into the darkness. The fact of Rousseau ranking among the greatest of

the writers of the French language, and the yet more important fact that

his ideas found their most ardent disciples and exploded in their most

violent form in France, constantly make us forget that he was not a

Frenchman, but a Genevese deeply imbued with the spirit of his native

city. He was thirty years old before he began even temporarily to live

in France: he had only lived there some five or six years when he wrote

his first famous piece, so un-French in all its spirit; and the ideas of

the Social Contract were in germ before he settled in France at all.

There have been two great religious reactions, and the name of Geneva

has a fundamental association with each of them. The first was that

against the paganised Catholicism of the renaissance, and of this

Calvin was a prime leader; the second was that against the materialism

of the eighteenth century, of which the prime leader was Rousseau. The

diplomatist was right who called Geneva the fifth part of the world. At

the congress of Vienna, some one, wearied at the enormous place taken by

the hardly visible Geneva in the midst of negotiations involving

momentous issues for the whole habitable globe, called out that it was

after all no more than a grain of sand. But he was not wrong who made

bold to reply, "Geneva is no grain of sand; 'tis a grain of musk that

perfumes all Europe."[202] We have to remember that it was at all events

as a grain of musk ever pervading the character of Rousseau. It happened

in later years that he repudiated his allegiance to her, but however

bitterly a man may quarrel with a parent, he cannot change blood, and

Rousseau ever remained a true son of the city of Calvin. We may perhaps

conjecture without excessive fancifulness that the constant spectacle

and memory of a community, free, energetic, and prosperous, whose

institutions had been shaped and whose political temper had been

inspired by one great lawgiver, contributed even more powerfully than

what he had picked up about Lycurgus and LacedÃ¦mon, to give him a turn

for Utopian speculation, and a conviction of the artificiality and easy

modifiableness of the social structure. This, however, is less certain

than that he unconsciously received impressions in his youth from the

circumstances of Geneva, both as to government and religion, as to

freedom, order, citizenship, manners, which formed the deepest part of

him on the reflective side, and which made themselves visible whenever

he exchanged the life of beatified sense for moods of speculative

energy, "Never," he says, "did I see the walls of that happy city, I

never went into it, without feeling a certain faintness at my heart, due

to excess of tender emotion. At the same time that the noble image of

freedom elevated my soul, those of equality, of union, of gentle

manners, touched me even to tears."[203] His spirit never ceased to

haunt city and lake to the end, and he only paid the debt of an owed

acknowledgment in the dedication of his Discourse on Inequality to the

republic of Geneva.[204] It was there it had its root. The honour in

which industry was held in Geneva, the democratic phrases that

constituted the dialect of its government, the proud tradition of the

long battle which had won and kept its independence, the severity of its

manners, the simplicity of its pleasures,--all these things awoke in his

memory as soon as ever occasion drew him to serious thought. More than

that, he had in a peculiar manner drawn in with the breath of his

earliest days in this theocratically constituted city, the vital idea

that there are sacred things and objects of reverence among men. And

hence there came to him, though with many stains and much misdirection,

the most priceless excellence of a capacity for devout veneration.

There is certainly no real contradiction between the quality of

reverence and the more equivocal quality of a sensuous temperament,

though a man may well seem on the surface, as the first succeeds the

second in rule over him, to be the contradiction to his other self. The

objects of veneration and the objects of sensuous delight are externally

so unlike and so incongruous, that he who follows both in their turns is

as one playing the part of an ironical chorus in the tragi-comic drama

of his own life. You may perceive these two to be mere imperfect or

illusory opposites, when you confront a man like Rousseau with the true

opposite of his own type; with those who are from their birth analysts

and critics, keen, restless, urgent, inexorably questioning. That

energetic type, though not often dead or dull on the side of sense, yet

is incapable of steeping itself in the manifold delights of eye and ear,

of nostril and touch, with the peculiar intensity of passive absorption

that seeks nothing further nor deeper than unending continuance of this

profound repose of all filled sensation, just as it is incapable of the

kindred mood of elevated humility and joyful unasking devoutness in the

presence of emotions and dim thoughts that are beyond the compass

of words.

The citizen of Geneva with this unseen fibre of Calvinistic veneration

and austerity strong and vigorous within him, found a world that had

nothing sacred and took nothing for granted; that held the past in

contempt, and ever like old Athenians asked for some new thing; that

counted simplicity of life an antique barbarism, and literary

curiousness the master virtue. There were giants in this world, like the

panurgic Diderot. There were industrious, worthy, disinterested men, who

used their minds honestly and actively with sincere care for truth, like

D'Holbach. There was poured around the whole, like a high stimulating

atmosphere to the stronger, and like some evil mental aphrodisiac to the

weaker, the influence of Voltaire, the great indomitable chieftain of

them all. Intellectual size half redeems want of perfect direction by

its generous power and fulness. It was not the strong men, atheists and

philosophisers as they were, who first irritated Rousseau into revolt

against their whole system of thought in all its principles. The dissent

between him and them was fundamental and enormous, and in time it flamed

out into open war. Conflict of theory, however, was brought home to him

first by slow-growing exasperation at the follies in practice of the

minor disciples of the gospel of knowing and acting, as distinguished

from his own gospel of placid being. He craved beliefs that should

uphold men in living their lives, substantial helps on which they might

lean without examination and without mistrust: his life in Paris was

thrown among people who lived in the midst of open questions, and

revelled in a reflective and didactic morality, which had no root in the

heart and so made things easy for the practical conscience. He sought

tranquillity and valued life for its own sake, not as an arena and a

theme for endless argument and debate: he found friends who knew no

higher pleasure than the futile polemics of mimic philosophy over

dessert, who were as full of quibble as the wrong-headed interlocutors

in a Platonic dialogue, and who babbled about God and state of nature,

about virtue and the spirituality of the soul, much as Boswell may have

done when Johnson complained of him for asking questions that would make

a man hang himself. The highest things were thus brought down to the

level of the cheapest discourse, and subjects which the wise take care

only to discuss with the wise, were here everyday topics for all comers.

The association with such high themes of those light qualities of tact,

gaiety, complaisance, which are the life of the superficial commerce of

men and women of the world, probably gave quite as much offence to

Rousseau as the doctrines which some of his companions had the honest

courage or the heedless fatuity to profess. It was an outrage to all the

serious side of him to find persons of quality introducing materialism

as a new fashion, and atheism as the liveliest of condiments. The

perfume of good manners only made what he took for bad principles the

worse, and heightened his impatience at the flippancy of pretensions to

overthrow the beliefs of a world between two wines.

Doctrine and temperament united to set him angrily against the world

around him. The one was austere and the other was sensuous, and the

sensuous temperament in its full strength is essentially solitary. The

play of social intercourse, its quick transitions, and incessant

demands, are fatal to free and uninterrupted abandonment to the flow of

soft internal emotions. Rousseau, dreaming, moody, indolently,

meditative, profoundly enwrapped in the brooding egoism of his own

sensations, had to mix with men and women whose egoism took the contrary

form of an eager desire to produce flashing effects on other people. We

may be sure that as the two sides of his character--his notions of

serious principle, and his notions of personal comfort--both went in the

same direction, the irritation and impatience with which they inspired

him towards society did not lessen with increased communication, but

naturally deepened with a more profoundly settled antipathy.

Rousseau lived in Paris for twelve years, from his return from Venice in

1744 until his departure in 1756 for the rustic lodge in a wood which

the good-will of Madame d'Epinay provided for him. We have already seen

one very important side of his fortunes during these years, in the

relations he formed with Theresa, and the relations which he repudiated

with his children. We have heard too the new words with which during

these years he first began to make the hearts of his contemporaries wax

hot within them. It remains to examine the current of daily circumstance

on which his life was embarked, and the shores to which it was

bearing him.

His patrons were at present almost exclusively in the circle of

finance. Richelieu, indeed, took him for a moment by the hand, but even

the introduction to him was through the too frail wife of one of the

greatest of the farmers general.[205] Madame Dupin and Madame d'Epinay,

his two chief patronesses, were also both of them the wives of magnates

of the farm. The society of the great people of this world was marked by

all the glare, artificiality, and sentimentalism of the epoch, but it

had also one or two specially hollow characteristics of its own. As is

always the case when a new rich class rises in the midst of a community

possessing an old caste, the circle of Parisian financiers made it their

highest social aim to thrust and strain into the circle of the

Versailles people of quality. They had no normal life of their own, with

independent traditions and self-respect; and for the same reason that an

essentially worn-out aristocracy may so long preserve a considerable

degree of vigour and even of social utility under certain circumstances

by means of tenacious pride in its own order, a new plutocracy is

demoralised from the very beginning of its existence by want of a

similar kind of pride in itself, and by the ignoble necessity of craving

the countenance of an upper class that loves to despise and humiliate

it. Besides the more obvious evils of a position resting entirely on

material opulence, and maintaining itself by coarse and glittering

ostentation, there is a fatal moral hollowness which infects both

serious conduct and social diversion. The result is seen in imitative

manners, affected culture, and a mixture of timorous self-consciousness

within and noisy self-assertion without, which completes the most

distasteful scene that any collected spirit can witness.

Rousseau was, as has been said, the secretary of Madame Dupin and her

stepson Francueil. He occasionally went with them to Chenonceaux in

Touraine, one of Henry the Second's castles built for Diana of Poitiers,

and here he fared sumptuously every day. In Paris his means, as we know,

were too strait. For the first two years he had a salary of nine hundred

francs; then his employers raised it to as much as fifty louis. For the

first of the Discourses the publisher gave him nothing, and for the

second he had to extract his fee penny by penny, and after long waiting.

His comic opera, the Village Soothsayer, was a greater success; it

brought him the round sum of two hundred louis from the court, and some

five and twenty more from the bookseller, and so, he says, "the

interlude, which cost me five or six weeks of work, produced nearly as

much money as Emilius afterwards did, which had cost me twenty years of

meditation and three years of composition."[206] Before the arrival of

this windfall, M. Francueil, who was receiver-general, offered him the

post of cashier in that important department, and Rousseau attended for

some weeks to receive the necessary instructions. His progress was tardy

as usual, and the complexities of accounts were as little congenial to

him as notarial complexities had been three and twenty years previously.

It is, however, one of the characteristics of times of national break-up

not to be peremptory in exacting competence, and Rousseau gravely sat at

the receipt of custom, doing the day's duty with as little skill as

liking. Before he had been long at his post, his official chief going on

a short journey left him in charge of the chest, which happened at the

moment to contain no very portentous amount. The disquiet with which the

watchful custody of this moderate treasure harassed and afflicted

Rousseau, not only persuaded him that nature had never designed him to

be the guardian of money chests, but also threw him into a fit of very

painful illness. The surgeons let him understand that within six months

he would be in the pale kingdoms. The effect of such a hint on a man of

his temper, and the train of reflections which it would be sure to set

aflame, are to be foreseen by us who know Rousseau's fashion of dealing

with the irksome. Why sacrifice the peace and charm of the little

fragment of days left to him, to the bondage of an office for which he

felt nothing but disgust? How reconcile the austere principles which he

had just adopted in his denunciation of sciences and arts, and his

panegyric on the simplicity of the natural life, with such duties as he

had to perform? And how preach disinterestedness and frugality from amid

the cashboxes of a receiver-general? Plainly it was his duty to pass in

independence and poverty the little time that was yet left to him, to

bring all the forces of his soul to bear in breaking the fetters of

opinion, and to carry out courageously whatever seemed best to himself,

without suffering the judgment of others to interpose the slightest

embarrassment or hindrance.[207]

With Rousseau, to conceive a project of this kind for simplifying his

life was to hasten urgently towards its realisation, because such

projects harmonised with all his strongest predispositions. His design

mastered and took whole possession of him. He resolved to earn his

living by copying music, as that was conformable to his taste, within

his capacity, and compatible with entire personal freedom. His patron

did as the world is so naturally ready to do with those who choose the

stoic's way; he declared that Rousseau was gone mad.[208] Talk like this

had no effect on a man whom self-indulgence led into a path that others

would only have been forced into by self-denial. Let it be said,

however, that this is a form of self-indulgence of which society is

never likely to see an excess, and meanwhile we may continue to pay it

some respect as assuredly leaning to virtue's side. Rousseau's many

lapses from grace perhaps deserve a certain gentleness of treatment,

after the time when with deliberation and collected effort he set

himself to the hard task of fitting his private life to his public

principles. Anything that heightens the self-respect of the race is good

for us to behold, and it is a permanent source of comfort to all who

thirst after reality in teachers, whether their teaching happens to be

our own or not, to find that the prophet of social equality was not a

fine gentleman, nor the teacher of democracy a hanger-on to the silly

skirts of fashion.

Rousseau did not merely throw up a post which would one day have made

him rich. Stoicism on the heroic, peremptory scale is not so difficult

as the application of the same principle to trifles. Besides this

greater sacrifice, he gave up the pleasant things for which most men

value the money that procures them, and instituted an austere sumptuary

reform in truly Genevese spirit. His sword was laid aside; for flowing

peruke was substituted the small round wig; he left off gilt buttons and

white stockings, and he sold his watch with the joyful and singular

thought that he would never again need to know the time. One sacrifice

remained to be made. Part of his equipment for the Venetian embassy had

been a large stock of fine linen, and for this he retained a particular

affection, for both now and always Rousseau had a passion for personal

cleanliness, as he had for corporeal wholesomeness. He was seasonably

delivered from bondage to his fine linen by aid from without. One

Christmas Eve it lay drying in a garret in the rather considerable

quantity of forty-two shirts, when a thief, always suspected to be the

brother of Theresa, broke open the door and carried off the treasure,

leaving Rousseau henceforth to be the contented wearer of coarser

stuffs.[209]

We may place this reform towards the end of the year 1750, or the

beginning of 1751, when his mind was agitated by the busy discussion

which his first Discourse excited, and by the new ideas of literary

power which its reception by the public naturally awakened in him. "It

takes," wrote Diderot, "right above the clouds; never was such a

success."[210] We can hardly have a surer sign of a man's fundamental

sincerity than that his first triumph, the first revelation to him of

his power, instead of seducing him to frequent the mischievous and

disturbing circle of his applauders, should throw him inwards upon

himself and his own principles with new earnestness and refreshed

independence. Rousseau very soon made up his mind what the world was

worth to him; and this, not as the ordinary sentimentalist or satirist

does, by way of set-off against the indulgence of personal foibles, but

from recognition of his own qualities, of the bounds set to our capacity

of life, and of the limits of the world's power to satisfy us. "When my

destiny threw me into the whirlpool of society," he wrote in his last

meditation on the course of his own life, "I found nothing there to

give a moment's solace to my heart. Regret for my sweet leisure followed

me everywhere; it shed indifference or disgust over all that might have

been within my reach, leading to fortune and honours. Uncertain in the

disquiet of my desires, I hoped for little, I obtained less, and I felt

even amid gleams of prosperity that if I obtained all that I supposed

myself to be seeking, I should still not have found the happiness for

which my heart was greedily athirst, though without distinctly knowing

its object. Thus everything served to detach my affections from society,

even before the misfortunes which were to make me wholly a stranger to

it. I reached the age of forty, floating between indigence and fortune,

between wisdom and disorder, full of vices of habit without any evil

tendency at heart, living by hazard, distracted as to my duties without

despising them, but often without much clear knowledge what they

were."[211]

A brooding nature gives to character a connectedness and unity that is

in strong contrast with the dispersion and multiformity of the active

type. The attractions of fame never cheated Rousseau into forgetfulness

of the commanding principle that a man's life ought to be steadily

composed to oneness with itself in all its parts, as by mastery of an

art of moral counterpoint, and not crowded with a wild mixture of aim

and emotion like distracted masks in high carnival. He complains of the

philosophers with whom he came into contact, that their philosophy was

something foreign to them and outside of their own lives. They studied

human nature for the sake of talking learnedly about it, not for the

sake of self-knowledge; they laboured to instruct others, not to

enlighten themselves within. When they published a book, its contents

only interested them to the extent of making the world accept it,

without seriously troubling themselves whether it were true or false,

provided only that it was not refuted. "For my own part, when I desired

to learn, it was to know things myself, and not at all to teach others.

I always believed that before instructing others it was proper to begin

by knowing enough for one's self; and of all the studies that I have

tried to follow in my life in the midst of men, there is hardly one that

I should not have followed equally if I had been alone, and shut up in a

desert island for the rest of my days."[212]

When we think of Turgot, whom Rousseau occasionally met among the

society which he denounces, such a denunciation sounds a little

outrageous. But then Turgot was perhaps the one sane Frenchman of the

first eminence in the eighteenth century. Voltaire chose to be an exile

from the society of Paris and Versailles as pertinaciously as Rousseau

did, and he spoke more bitterly of it in verse than Rousseau ever spoke

bitterly of it in prose.[213] It was, as has been so often said, a

society dominated by women, from the king's mistress who helped to ruin

France, down to the financier's wife who gave suppers to flashy men of

letters. The eighteenth century salon has been described as having three

stages; the salon of 1730, still retaining some of the stately

domesticity, elegance, dignity of the age of Lewis XIV.; that of 1780,

grave, cold, dry, given to dissertation; and between the two, the salon

of 1750, full of intellectual stir, brilliance, frivolous originality,

glittering wastefulness.[214] Though this division of time must not be

pressed too closely, it is certain that the era of Rousseau's advent in

literature with his Discourses fell in with the climax of social

unreality in the surface intercourse of France, and that the same date

marks the highest point of feminine activity and power.

The common mixture of much reflective morality in theory with much

light-hearted immorality in practice, never entered so largely into

manners. We have constantly to wonder how they analysed and defined the

word Virtue, to which they so constantly appealed in letters,

conversation, and books, as the sovereign object for our deepest and

warmest adoration. A whole company of transgressors of the marriage law

would melt into floods of tears over a hymn to virtue, which they must

surely have held of too sacred an essence to mix itself with any one

virtue in particular, except that very considerable one of charitably

letting all do as they please. It is much, however, that these tears,

if not very burning, were really honest. Society, though not believing

very deeply in the supernatural, was not cursed with an arid, parching,

and hardened scepticism about the genuineness of good emotions in a man,

and so long as people keep this baleful poison out of their hearts,

their lives remain worth having.

It is true that cynicism in the case of some women of this time

occasionally sounded in a diabolic key, as when one said, "It is your

lover to whom you should never say that you don't believe in God; to

one's husband that does not matter, because in the case of a lover one

must reserve for one's self some door of escape, and devotional scruples

cut everything short."[215] Or here: "I do not distrust anybody, for

that is a deliberate act; but I do not trust anybody, and there is no

trouble in this."[216] Or again in the word thrown to a man vaunting the

probity of some one: "What! can a man of intelligence like you accept

the prejudice of \_meum\_ and \_tuum\_?"[217] Such speech, however, was

probably most often a mere freak of the tongue, a mode and fashion, as

who should go to a masked ball in guise of Mephistopheles, without

anything more Mephistophelian about him than red apparel and peaked

toes. "She was absolutely charming," said one of a new-comer; "she did

not utter one single word that was not a paradox."[218] This was the

passing taste. Human nature is able to keep itself wholesome in

fundamentals even under very great difficulties, and it is as wise as it

is charitable in judging a sharp and cynical tone to make large

allowances for mere costume and assumed character.

In respect of the light companionship of common usage, however, it is

exactly the costume which comes closest to us, and bad taste in that is

most jarring and least easily forgiven. There is a certain stage in an

observant person's experience of the heedlessness, indolence, and native

folly of men and women--and if his observation be conducted in a

catholic spirit, he will probably see something of this not merely in

others--when the tolerable average sanity of human arrangements strikes

him as the most marvellous of all the fortunate accidents in the

universe. Rousseau could not even accept the fact of this miraculous

result, the provisional and temporary sanity of things, and he

confronted society with eyes of angry chagrin. A great lady asked him

how it was that she had not seen him for an age. "Because when I wish to

see you, I wish to see no one but you. What do you want me to do in the

midst of your society? I should cut a sorry figure in a circle of

mincing tripping coxcombs; they do not suit me." We cannot wonder that

on some occasion when her son's proficiency was to be tested before a

company of friends, Madame d'Epinay prayed Rousseau to be of them, on

the ground that he would be sure to ask the child outrageously absurd

questions, which would give gaiety to the affair.[219] As it happened,

the father was unwise. He was a man of whom it was said that he had

devoured two million francs, without either saying or doing a single

good thing. He rewarded the child's performance with the gift of a

superb suit of cherry-coloured velvet, extravagantly trimmed with costly

lace; the peasant from whose sweat and travail the money had been wrung,

went in heavy rags, and his children lived as the beasts of the field.

The poor youth was ill dealt with. "That is very fine," said rude

Duclos, "but remember that a fool in lace is still a fool." Rousseau, in

reply to the child's importunity, was still blunter: "Sir, I am no judge

of finery, I am only a judge of man; I wished to talk with you a little

while ago, but I wish so no longer."[220]

Marmontel, whose account may have been coloured by retrospection in

later years, says that before the success of the first Discourse,

Rousseau concealed his pride under the external forms of a politeness

that was timid even to obsequiousness; in his uneasy glance you

perceived mistrust and observant jealousy; there was no freedom in his

manner, and no one ever observed more cautiously the hateful precept to

live with your friends as though they were one day to be your

enemies.[221] Grimm's description is different and more trustworthy.

Until he began to affect singularity, he says, Rousseau had been gallant

and overflowing with artificial compliment, with manners that were

honeyed and even wearisome in their soft elaborateness. All at once he

put on the cynic's cloak, and went to the other extreme. Still in spite

of an abrupt and cynical tone he kept much of his old art of elaborate

fine speeches, and particularly in his relations with women.[222] Of his

abruptness, he tells a most displeasing tale. "One day Rousseau told us

with an air of triumph, that as he was coming out of the opera where he

had been seeing the first representation of the Village Soothsayer, the

Duke of ZweibrÃ¼cken had approached him with much politeness, saying,

'Will you allow me to pay you a compliment?' and that he replied, 'Yes,

if it be very short.' Everybody was silent at this, until I said to him

laughingly, 'Illustrious citizen and co-sovereign of Geneva, since there

resides in you a part of the sovereignty of the republic, let me

represent to you that, for all the severity of your principles, you

should hardly refuse to a sovereign prince the respect due to a

water-carrier, and that if you had met a word of good-will from a

water-carrier with an answer as rough and brutal as that, you would have

had to reproach yourself with a most unseasonable piece of

impertinence.'"[223]

There were still more serious circumstances when exasperation at the

flippant tone about him carried him beyond the ordinary bounds of that

polite time. A guest at table asked contemptuously what was the use of a

nation like the French having reason, if they did not use it. "They mock

the other nations of the earth, and yet are the most credulous of all."

ROUSSEAU: "I forgive them for their credulity, but not for condemning

those who are credulous in some other way." Some one said that in

matters of religion everybody was right, but that everybody should

remain in that in which he had been born. ROUSSEAU, with warmth: "Not

so, by God, if it is a bad one, for then it can do nothing but harm."

Then some one contended that religion always did some good, as a kind of

rein to the common people who had no other morality. All the rest cried

out at this in indignant remonstrance, one shrewd person remarking that

the common people had much livelier fear of being hanged than of being

damned. The conversation was broken off for a moment by the hostess

calling out, "After all, one must nourish the tattered affair we call

our body, so ring and let them bring us the joint." This done, the

servants dismissed, and the door shut, the discussion was resumed with

such vehemence by Duclos and Saint Lambert, that, says the lady who

tells us the story, "I feared they were bent on destroying all religion,

and I prayed for some mercy to be shown at any rate to natural

religion." There was not a whit more sympathy for that than for the

rest. Rousseau declared himself \_paullo infirmior\_, and clung to the

morality of the gospel as the natural morality which in old times

constituted the whole and only creed. "But what is a God," cried one

impetuous disputant, "who gets angry and is appeased again?" Rousseau

began to murmur between grinding teeth, and a tide of pleasantries set

in at his expense, to which came this: "If it is a piece of cowardice to

suffer ill to be spoken of one's friend behind his back, 'tis a crime to

suffer ill to be spoken of one's God, who is present; and for my part,

sirs, I believe in God." "I admit," said the atheistic champion, "that

it is a fine thing to see this God bending his brow to earth and

watching with admiration the conduct of a Cato. But this notion is, like

many others, very useful in some great heads, such as Trajan, Marcus

Aurelius, Socrates, where it can only produce heroism, but it is the

germ of all madnesses." ROUSSEAU: "Sirs, I leave the room if you say

another word more," and he was rising to fulfil his threat, when the

entry of a new-comer stopped the discussion.[224]

His words on another occasion show how all that he saw helped to keep up

a fretted condition of mind, in one whose soft tenacious memory turned

daily back to simple and unsophisticated days among the green valleys,

and refused to acquiesce in the conditions of changed climate. So

terrible a thing is it to be the bondsman of reminiscence. Madame

d'Epinay was suspected, wrongfully as it afterwards proved, of having

destroyed some valuable papers belonging to a dead relative. There was

much idle and cruel gossip in an ill-natured world. Rousseau, her

friend, kept steadfast silence: she challenged his opinion. "What am I

to say?" he answered; "I go and come, and all that I hear outrages and

revolts me. I see the one so evidently malicious and so adroit in their

injustice; the other so awkward and so stupid in their good intentions,

that I am tempted (and it is not the first time) to look on Paris as a

cavern of brigands, of whom every traveller in his turn is the victim.

What gives me the worst idea of society is to see how eager each person

is to pardon himself, by reason of the number of the people who are like

him."[225]

Notwithstanding his hatred of this cavern of brigands, and the little

pains he took to conceal his feelings from any individual brigand,

whether male or female, with whom he had to deal, he found out that "it

is not always so easy as people suppose to be poor and independent."

Merciless invasion of his time in every shape made his life weariness.

Sometimes he had the courage to turn and rend the invader, as in the

letter to a painter who sent him the same copy of verses three times,

requiring immediate acknowledgment. "It is not just," at length wrote

the exasperated Rousseau, "that I should be tyrannised over for your

pleasure; not that my time is precious, as you say; it is either passed

in suffering or it is lost in idleness; but when I cannot employ it

usefully for some one, I do not wish to be hindered from wasting it in

my own fashion. A single minute thus usurped is what all the kings of

the universe could not give me back, and it is to be my own master that

I flee from the idle folk of towns,--people as thoroughly wearied as

they are thoroughly wearisome,--who, because they do not know what to do

with their own time, think they have a right to waste that of

others."[226] The more abruptly he treated visitors, persecuting

dinner-givers, and all the tribe of the importunate, the more obstinate

they were in possessing themselves of his time. In seizing the hours

they were keeping his purse empty, as well as keeping up constant

irritation in his soul. He appears to have earned forty sous for a

morning's work, and to have counted this a fair fee, remarking modestly

that he could not well subsist on less.[227] He had one chance of a

pension, which he threw from him in a truly characteristic manner.

When he came to Paris he composed his musical diversion of the Muses

Galantes, which was performed (1745) in the presence of Rameau, under

the patronage of M. de la PopeliniÃ¨re. Rameau apostrophised the unlucky

composer with much violence, declaring that one-half of the piece was

the work of a master, while the other was that of a person entirely

ignorant of the musical rudiments; the bad work therefore was

Rousseau's own, and the good was a plagiarism.[228] This repulse did not

daunt the hero. Five or six years afterwards on a visit to Passy, as he

was lying awake in bed, he conceived the idea of a pastoral interlude

after the manner of the Italian comic operas. In six days the Village

Soothsayer was sketched, and in three weeks virtually completed. Duclos

procured its rehearsal at the Opera, and after some debate it was

performed before the court at Fontainebleau. The Plutarchian stoic, its

author, went from Paris in a court coach, but his Roman tone deserted

him, and he felt shamefaced as a schoolboy before the great world, such

divinity doth hedge even a Lewis XV., and even in a soul of Genevan

temper. The piece was played with great success, and the composer was

informed that he would the next day have the honour of being presented

to the king, who would most probably mark his favour by the bestowal of

a pension.[229] Rousseau was tossed with many doubts. He would fain have

greeted the king with some word that should show sensibility to the

royal graciousness, without compromising republican severity, "clothing

some great and useful truth in a fine and deserved compliment." This

moral difficulty was heightened by a physical one, for he was liable to

an infirmity which, if it should overtake him in presence of king and

courtiers, would land him in an embarrassment worse than death. What

would become of him if mind or body should fail, if either he should be

driven into precipitate retreat, or else there should escape him,

instead of the great truth wrapped delicately round in veracious

panegyric, a heavy, shapeless word of foolishness? He fled in terror,

and flung up the chance of pension and patronage. We perceive the born

dreamer with a phantasmagoric imagination, seizing nothing in just

proportion and true relation, and paralysing the spirit with terror of

unrealities; in short, with the most fatal form of moral cowardice,

which perhaps it is a little dangerous to try to analyse into

finer names.

When Rousseau got back to Paris he was amazed to find that Diderot spoke

to him of this abandonment of the pension with a fire that he could

never have expected from a philosopher, Rousseau plainly sharing the

opinion of more vulgar souls that philosopher is but fool writ large.

"He said that if I was disinterested on my own account, I had no right

to be so on that of Madame Le Vasseur and her daughter, and that I owed

it to them not to let pass any possible and honest means of giving them

bread.... This was the first real dispute I had with him, and all our

quarrels that followed were of the same kind; he laying down for me what

he insisted that I should do, and I refusing because I thought that I

ought not to do it."[230]

Let us abstain, at this and all other points, from being too sure that

we easily see to the bottom of our Rousseau. When we are most ready to

fling up the book and to pronounce him all selfishness and sophistry,

some trait is at hand to revive moral interest in him, and show him

unlike common men, reverent of truth and human dignity. There is a

slight anecdote of this kind connected with his visit to Fontainebleau.

The day after the representation of his piece, he happened to be taking

his breakfast in some public place. An officer entered, and, proceeding

to describe the performance of the previous day, told at great length

all that had happened, depicted the composer with much minuteness, and

gave a circumstantial account of his conversation. In this story, which

was told with equal assurance and simplicity, there was not a word of

truth, as was clear from the fact that the author of whom he spoke with

such intimacy sat unknown and unrecognised before his eyes. The effect

on Rousseau was singular enough. "The man was of a certain age; he had

no coxcombical or swaggering air; his expression bespoke a man of merit,

and his cross of St. Lewis showed that he was an old officer. While he

was retailing his untruths, I grew red in the face, I lowered my eyes, I

sat on thorns; I tried to think of some means of believing him to have

made a mistake in good faith. At length trembling lest some one should

recognise me and confront him, I hastened to finish my chocolate without

saying a word; and stooping down as I passed in front of him, I went

out as fast as possible, while the people present discussed his tale. I

perceived in the street that I was bathed in sweat, and I am sure that

if any one had recognised me and called me by name before I got out,

they would have seen in me the shame and embarrassment of a culprit,

simply from a feeling of the pain the poor man would have had to suffer

if his lie had been discovered."[231] One who can feel thus vividly

humiliated by the meanness of another, assuredly has in himself the

wholesome salt of respect for the erectness of his fellows; he has the

rare sentiment that the compromise of integrity in one of them is as a

stain on his own self-esteem, and a lowering of his own moral stature.

There is more deep love of humanity in this than in giving many alms,

and it was not the less deep for being the product of impulse and

sympathetic emotion, and not of a logical sorites.

Another scene in a cafÃ© is worth referring to, because it shows in the

same way that at this time Rousseau's egoism fell short of the

fatuousness to which disease or vicious habit eventually depraved it. In

1752 he procured the representation of his comedy of Narcisse, which he

had written at the age of eighteen, and which is as well worth reading

or playing as most comedies by youths of that amount of experience of

the ways of the world and the heart of man. Rousseau was amazed and

touched by the indulgence of the public, in suffering without any sign

of impatience even a second representation of his piece. For himself,

he could not so much as sit out the first; quitting the theatre before

it was over, he entered the famous cafÃ© de Procope at the other side of

the street, where he found critics as wearied as himself. Here he called

out, "The new piece has fallen flat, and it deserved to fall flat; it

wearied me to death. It is by Rousseau of Geneva, and I am that very

Rousseau."[232] The relentless student of mental pathology is very

likely to insist that even this was egoism standing on its head and not

on its feet, choosing to be noticed for an absurdity, rather than not be

noticed at all. It may be so, but this inversion of the ordinary form of

vanity is rare enough to be not unrefreshing, and we are very loth to

hand Rousseau wholly over to the pathologist before his hour has come.

II.

In the summer of 1754 Rousseau, in company with his Theresa, went to

revisit the city of his birth, partly because an exceptionally

favourable occasion presented itself, but in yet greater part because he

was growing increasingly weary of the uncongenial world in which he

moved. On his road he turned aside to visit her who had been more than

even his birth-place to him. He felt the shock known to all who cherish

a vision for a dozen years, and then suddenly front the changed reality.

He had not prepared himself by recalling the commonplace which we only

remember for others, how time wears hard and ugly lines into the face

that recollection at each new energy makes lovelier with an added

sweetness. "I saw her," he says, "but in what a state, O God, in what

debasement! Was this the same Madame de Warens, in those days so

brilliant, to whom the priest of Pontverre had sent me! How my heart was

torn by the sight!" Alas, as has been said with a truth that daily

experience proves to those whom pity and self-knowledge have made most

indulgent, as to those whom pinched maxims have made most

rigorous,--\_morality is the nature of things\_.[233] We may have a humane

tenderness for our Manon Lescaut, but we have a deep presentiment all

the time that the poor soul must die in a penal settlement. It is partly

a question of time; whether death comes fast enough to sweep you out of

reach of the penalties which the nature of things may appoint, but which

in their fiercest shape are mostly of the loitering kind. Death was

unkind to Madame de Warens, and the unhappy creature lived long enough

to find that morality does mean something after all; that the old hoary

world has not fixed on prudence in the outlay of money as a good thing,

out of avarice or pedantic dryness of heart; nor on some continence and

order in the relations of men and women as a good thing, out of

cheerless grudge to the body, but because the breach of such virtues is

ever in the long run deadly to mutual trust, to strength, to freedom, to

collectedness, which are the reserve of humanity against days of ordeal.

Rousseau says that he tried hard to prevail upon his fallen benefactress

to leave Savoy, to come and take up her abode peacefully with him, while

he and Theresa would devote their days to making her happy. He had not

forgotten her in the little glimpse of prosperity; he had sent her money

when he had it.[234] She was sunk in indigence, for her pension had long

been forestalled, but still she refused to change her home. While

Rousseau was at Geneva she came to see him. "She lacked money to

complete her journey; I had not enough about me; I sent it to her an

hour afterwards by Theresa. Poor Maman! Let me relate this trait of her

heart. The only trinket she had left was a small ring; she took it from

her finger to place it on Theresa's, who instantly put it back, as she

kissed the noble hand and bathed it with her tears." In after years he

poured bitter reproaches upon himself for not quitting all to attach his

lot to hers until her last hour, and he professes always to have been

haunted by the liveliest and most enduring remorse.[235] Here is the

worst of measuring duty by sensation instead of principle; if the

sensations happen not to be in right order at the critical moment, the

chance goes by, never to return, and then, as memory in the best of

such temperaments is long though not without intermittence, old

sentiment revives and drags the man into a burning pit. Rousseau appears

not to have seen her again, but the thought of her remained with him to

the end, like a soft vesture fragrant with something of the sweet

mysterious perfume of many-scented night in the silent garden at

Charmettes. She died in a hovel eight years after this, sunk in disease,

misery, and neglect, and was put away in the cemetery on the heights

above ChambÃ©ri.[236] Rousseau consoled himself with thoughts of another

world that should reunite him to her and be the dawn of new happiness;

like a man who should illusorily confound the last glistening of a

wintry sunset seen through dark yew-branches, with the broad-beaming

strength of the summer morning. "If I thought," he said, "that I should

not see her in the other life, my poor imagination would shrink from the

idea of perfect bliss, which I would fain promise myself in it."[237] To

pluck so gracious a flower of hope on the edge of the sombre unechoing

gulf of nothingness into which our friend has slid silently down, is a

natural impulse of the sensitive soul, numbing remorse and giving a

moment's relief to the hunger and thirst of a tenderness that has been

robbed of its object. Yet would not men be more likely to have a deeper

love for those about them, and a keener dread of filling a house with

aching hearts, if they courageously realised from the beginning of their

days that we have none of this perfect companionable bliss to promise

ourselves in other worlds, that the black and horrible grave is indeed

the end of our communion, and that we know one another no more?

The first interview between Rousseau and Madame de Warens was followed

by his ludicrous conversion to Catholicism (1728); the last was

contemporary with his re-conversion to the faith in which he had been

reared. The sight of Geneva gave new fire to his Republican enthusiasm;

he surrendered himself to transports of patriotic zeal. The thought of

the Parisian world that he had left behind, its frivolity, its

petulance, its disputation over all things in heaven and on the earth,

its profound deadness to all civic activity, quickened his admiration

for the simple, industrious, and independent community from which he

never forgot that he was sprung. But no Catholic could enjoy the rights

of citizenship. So Rousseau proceeded to reflect that the Gospel is the

same for all Christians, and the substance of dogma only differs,

because people interposed with explanations of what they could not

understand; that therefore it is in each country the business of the

sovereign to fix both the worship and the amount and quality of

unintelligible dogma; that consequently it is the citizen's duty to

admit the dogma, and follow the worship by law appointed. "The society

of the EncyclopÃ¦dists, far from shaking my faith, had confirmed it by my

natural aversion for partisanship and controversy. The reading of the

Bible, especially of the Gospel, to which I had applied myself for

several years, had made me despise the low and childish interpretation

put upon the words of Christ by the people who were least worthy to

understand him. In a word, philosophy by drawing me towards the

essential in religion, had drawn me away from that stupid mass of

trivial formulas with which men had overlaid and darkened it."[238] We

may be sure that if Rousseau had a strong inclination towards a given

course of action, he would have no difficulty in putting his case in a

blaze of the brightest light, and surrounding it with endless emblems

and devices of superlative conviction. In short, he submitted himself

faithfully to the instruction of the pastor of his parish; was closely

catechised by a commission of members of the consistory; received from

them a certificate that he had satisfied the requirements of doctrine in

all points; was received to partake of the Communion, and finally

restored to all his rights as a citizen.[239]

This was no farce, such as Voltaire played now and again at the expense

of an unhappy bishop or unhappier parish priest; nor such as Rousseau

himself had played six-and-twenty years before, at the expense of those

honest Catholics of Turin whose helpful donation of twenty francs had

marked their enthusiasm over a soul that had been lost and was found

again. He was never a Catholic, any more than he was ever an atheist,

and if it might be said in one sense that he was no more a Protestant

than he was either of these two, yet he was emphatically the child of

Protestantism. It is hardly too much to say that one bred in Catholic

tradition and observance, accustomed to think of the whole life of men

as only a manifestation of the unbroken life of the Church, and of all

the several communities of men as members of that great organisation

which binds one order to another, and each generation to those that have

gone before and those that come after, would never have dreamed that

monstrous dream of a state of nature as a state of perfection. He would

never have held up to ridicule and hate the idea of society as an

organism with normal parts and conditions of growth, and never have left

the spirit of man standing in bald isolation from history, from his

fellows, from a Church, from a mediator, face to face with the great

vague phantasm. Nor, on the other hand, is it likely that one born and

reared in the religious school of authority with its elaborately

disciplined hierarchy, would have conceived that passion for political

freedom, that zeal for the rights of peoples against rulers, that

energetic enthusiasm for a free life, which constituted the fire and

essence of Rousseau's writing. As illustration of this, let us remark

how Rousseau's teaching fared when it fell upon a Catholic country like

France: so many of its principles were assimilated by the revolutionary

schools as were wanted for violent dissolvents, while the rest dropped

away, and in this rejected portion was precisely the most vital part of

his system. In other words, in no country has the power of collective

organisation been so pressed and exalted as in revolutionised France,

and in no country has the free life of the individual been made to count

for so little. With such force does the ancient system of temporal and

spiritual organisation reign in the minds of those who think most

confidently that they have cast it wholly out of them. The use of reason

may lead a man far, but it is the past that has cut the groove.

In re-embracing the Protestant confession, therefore, Rousseau was not

leaving Catholicism, to which he had never really passed over; he was

only undergoing in entire gravity of spirit a formality which reconciled

him with his native city, and reunited those strands of spiritual

connection with it which had never been more than superficially parted.

There can be little doubt that the four months which he spent in Geneva

in 1754 marked a very critical time in the formation of some of the most

memorable of his opinions. He came from Paris full of inarticulate and

smouldering resentment against the irreverence and denial of the

materialistic circle which used to meet at the house of D'Holbach. What

sort of opinions he found prevailing among the most enlightened of the

Genevese pastors we know from an abundance of sources. D'Alembert had

three or four years later than this to suffer a bitter attack from

them, but the account of the creed of some of the ministers which he

gave in his article on Geneva in the Encyclopedia, was substantially

correct. "Many of them," he wrote, "have ceased to believe in the

divinity of Jesus Christ. Hell, one of the principal points in our

belief, is no longer one with many of the Genevese pastors, who contend

that it is an insult to the Divinity to imagine that a being full of

goodness and justice can be capable of punishing our faults by an

eternity of torment. In a word, they have no other creed than pure

Socinianism, rejecting everything that they call mysteries, and

supposing the first principle of a true religion to be that it shall

propose nothing for belief which clashes with reason. Religion here is

almost reduced to the adoration of one single God, at least among nearly

all who do not belong to the common people; and a certain respect for

Jesus Christ and the Scriptures is nearly the only thing that

distinguishes the Christianity of Geneva from pure Deism."[240] And it

would be easy to trace the growth of these rationalising tendencies.

Throughout the seventeenth century men sprang up who anticipated some of

the rationalistic arguments of the eighteenth, in denying the Trinity,

and so forth,[241] but the time was not then ripe. The general

conditions grew more favourable. Burnet, who was at Geneva in 1685-6,

says that though there were not many among the Genevese of the first

form of learning, "yet almost everybody here has a good tincture of a

learned education."[242] The pacification of civic troubles in 1738 was

followed by a quarter of a century of extreme prosperity and

contentment, and it is in such periods that the minds of men previously

trained are wont to turn to the great matters of speculation. There was

at all times a constant communication, both public and private, going on

between Geneva and Holland, as was only natural between the two chief

Protestant centres of the Continent. The controversy of the seventeenth

century between the two churches was as keenly followed in Geneva as at

Leyden, and there is more than one Genevese writer who deserves a place

in the history of the transition in the beginning of the eighteenth

century from theology proper to that metaphysical theology, which was

the first marked dissolvent of dogma within the Protestant bodies. To

this general movement of the epoch, of course, Descartes supplied the

first impulse. The leader of the movement in Geneva, that is of an

attempt to pacify the Christian churches on the basis of some such Deism

as was shortly to find its passionate expression in the Savoyard

Vicar's Confession of Faith, was John Alphonse Turretini (1661-1737). He

belonged to a family of Italian refugees from Lucca, and his grandfather

had been sent on a mission to Holland for aid in defence of Geneva

against Catholic Savoy. He went on his travels in 1692; he visited

Holland, where he saw Bayle, and England, where he saw Newton, and

France, where he saw Bossuet. Chouet initiated him into the mysteries of

Descartes. All this bore fruit when he returned home, and his eloquent

exposition of rationalistic ideas aroused the usual cry of heresy from

the people who justly insist that Deism is not Christianity. There was

much stir for many years, but he succeeded in holding his own and in

finding many considerable followers.[243] For example, some three years

or so after his death, a work appeared in Geneva under the title of \_La

Religion Essentielle a l'Homme\_, showing that faith in the existence of

a God suffices, and treating with contempt the belief in the

inspiration of the Gospels.[244]

Thus we see what vein of thought was running through the graver and more

active minds of Geneva about the time of Rousseau's visit. Whether it be

true or not that the accepted belief of many of the preachers was a pure

Deism, it is certain that the theory was fully launched among them, and

that those who could not accept it were still pressed to refute it, and

in refuting, to discuss. Rousseau's friendships were according to his

own account almost entirely among the ministers of religion and the

professors of the academy, precisely the sort of persons who would be

most sure to familiarise him, in the course of frequent conversations,

with the current religious ideas and the arguments by which they were

opposed or upheld. We may picture the effect on his mind of the

difference in tone and temper in these grave, candid, and careful men,

and the tone of his Parisian friends in discussing the same high themes;

how this difference would strengthen his repugnance, and corroborate his

own inborn spirit of veneration; how he would here feel himself in his

own world. For as wise men have noticed, it is not so much difference of

opinion that stirs resentment in us, at least in great subjects where

the difference is not trivial but profound, as difference in gravity of

humour and manner of moral approach. He returned to Paris (Oct. 1754)

warm with the resolution to give up his concerns there, and in the

spring go back once and for all to the city of liberty and virtue, where

men revered wisdom and reason instead of wasting life in the frivolities

of literary dialectic.[245]

The project, however, grew cool. The dedication of his Discourse on

Inequality to the Republic was received with indifference by some and

indignation by others.[246] Nobody thought it a compliment, and some

thought it an impertinence. This was one reason which turned his purpose

aside. Another was the fact that the illustrious Voltaire now also

signed himself Swiss, and boasted that if he shook his wig the powder

flew over the whole of the tiny Republic. Rousseau felt certain that

Voltaire would make a revolution in Geneva, and that he should find in

his native country the tone, the air, the manners which were driving him

from Paris. From that moment he counted Geneva lost. Perhaps he ought to

make head against the disturber, but what could he do alone, timid and

bad talker as he was, against a man arrogant, rich, supported by the

credit of the great, of brilliant eloquence, and already the very idol

of women and young men?[247] Perhaps it would not be uncharitable to

suspect that this was a reason after the event, for no man was ever so

fond as Rousseau, or so clever a master in the art, of covering an

accident in a fine envelope of principle, and, as we shall see, he was

at this time writing to Voltaire in strains of effusive panegyric. In

this case he almost tells us that the one real reason why he did not

return to Geneva was that he found a shelter from Paris close at hand.

Even before then he had begun to conceive characteristic doubts whether

his fellow-citizens at Geneva would not be nearly as hostile to his love

of living solitarily and after his own fashion as the good people

of Paris.

Rousseau has told us a pretty story, how one day he and Madame d'Epinay

wandering about the park came upon a dilapidated lodge surrounded by

fruit gardens, in the skirts of the forest of Montmorency; how he

exclaimed in delight at its solitary charm that here was the very place

of refuge made for him; and how on a second visit he found that his good

friend had in the interval had the old lodge pulled down, and replaced

by a pretty cottage exactly arranged for his own household. "My poor

bear," she said, "here is your place of refuge; it was you who chose it,

'tis friendship offers it; I hope it will drive away your cruel notion

of going from me."[248] Though moved to tears by such kindness,

Rousseau did not decide on the spot, but continued to waver for some

time longer between this retreat and return to Geneva.

In the interval Madame d'Epinay had experience of the character she was

dealing with. She wrote to Rousseau pressing him to live at the cottage

in the forest, and begging him to allow her to assist him in assuring

the moderate annual provision which he had once accidentally declared to

mark the limit of his wants.[249] He wrote to her bitterly in reply,

that her proposition struck ice into his soul, and that she could have

but sorry appreciation of her own interests in thus seeking to turn a

friend into a valet. He did not refuse to listen to what she proposed,

if only she would remember that neither he nor his sentiments were for

sale.[250] Madame d'Epinay wrote to him patiently enough in return, and

then Rousseau hastened to explain that his vocabulary needed special

appreciation, and that he meant by the word valet "the degradation into

which the repudiation of his principles would throw his soul. The

independence I seek is not immunity from work; I am firm for winning my

own bread, I take pleasure in it; but I mean not to subject myself to

any other duty, if I can help it. I will never pledge any portion of my

liberty, either for my own subsistence or that of any one else. I intend

to work, but at my own will and pleasure, and even to do nothing, if it

happens to suit me, without any one finding fault except my

stomach."[251] We may call this unamiable, if we please, but in a

frivolous world amiability can hardly go with firm resolve to live an

independent life after your own fashion. The many distasteful sides of

Rousseau's character ought not to hinder us from admiring his

steadfastness in refusing to sacrifice his existence to the first person

who spoke him civilly. We may wish there had been more of rugged

simplicity in his way of dealing with temptations to sell his birthright

for a mess of pottage; less of mere irritability. But then this

irritability is one side of soft temperament. The soft temperament is

easily agitated, and this unpleasant disturbance does not stir up true

anger nor lasting indignation, but only sends quick currents of eager

irritation along the sufferer's nerves. Rousseau, quivering from head to

foot with self-consciousness, is sufficiently unlike our plain Johnson,

the strong-armoured; yet persistent withstanding of the patron is as

worthy of our honour in one instance as in the other. Indeed, resistance

to humiliating pressure is harder for such a temper as Rousseau's, in

which deliberate endeavour is needed, than it is for the naturally

stoical spirit which asserts itself spontaneously and rises

without effort.

When our born solitary, wearied of Paris and half afraid of the too

friendly importunity of Geneva, at length determined to accept Madame

d'Epinay's offer of the Hermitage on conditions which left him an

entire sentiment of independence of movement and freedom from all sense

of pecuniary obligation, he was immediately exposed to a very copious

torrent of pleasantry and remonstrance from the highly social circle who

met round D'Holbach's dinner-table. They deemed it sheer midsummer

madness, or even a sign of secret depravity, to quit their cheerful

world for the dismal solitude of woods and fields. "Only the bad man is

alone," wrote Diderot in words which Rousseau kept resentfully in his

memory as long as he lived. The men and women of the eighteenth century

had no comprehension of solitude, the strength which it may impart to

the vigorous, the poetic graces which it may shed about the life of

those who are less than vigorous; and what they did not comprehend, they

dreaded and abhorred, and thought monstrous in the one man who did

comprehend it. They were all of the mind of Socrates when he said to

PhÃ¦drus, "Knowledge is what I love, and the men who dwell in the town

are my teachers, not trees and landscape."[252] Sarcasms fell on him

like hail, and the prophecies usual in cases where a stray soul does not

share the common tastes of the herd. He would never be able to live

without the incense and the amusements of the town; he would be back in

a fortnight; he would throw up the whole enterprise within three

months.[253] Amid a shower of such words, springing from men's perverse

blindness to the binding propriety of keeping all propositions as to

what is the best way of living in respect of place, hours,

companionship, strictly relative to each individual case, Rousseau

stubbornly shook the dust of the city from off his feet, and sought new

life away from the stridulous hum of men. Perhaps we are better pleased

to think of the unwearied Diderot spending laborious days in factories

and quarries and workshops and forges, while friendly toilers patiently

explained to him the structure of stocking looms and velvet looms, the

processes of metal-casting and wire-drawing and slate-cutting, and all

the other countless arts and ingenuities of fabrication, which he

afterwards reproduced to a wondering age in his spacious and magnificent

repertory of human thought, knowledge, and practical achievement. And it

is yet more elevating to us to think of the true stoic, the great

high-souled Turgot, setting forth a little later to discharge beneficent

duty in the hard field of his distant Limousin commissionership,

enduring many things and toiling late and early for long years, that the

burden of others might be lighter, and the welfare of the land more

assured. But there are many paths for many men, and if only magnanimous

self-denial has the power of inspiration, and can move us with the deep

thrill of the heroic, yet every truthful protest, even of excessive

personality, against the gregarious trifling of life in the social

groove, has a side which it is not ill for us to consider, and perhaps

for some men and women in every generation to seek to imitate.
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CHAPTER VII.

THE HERMITAGE.

It would have been a strange anachronism if the decade of the

EncyclopÃ¦dia and the Seven Years' War had reproduced one of those scenes

which are as still resting-places amid the ceaseless forward tramp of

humanity, where some holy man turned away from the world, and with

adorable seriousness sought communion with the divine in mortification

of flesh and solitude of spirit. Those were the retreats of firm hope

and beatified faith. The hope and faith of the eighteenth century were

centred in action, not in contemplation, and the few solitaries of that

epoch, as well as of another nearer to our own, fled away from the

impotence of their own will, rather than into the haven of satisfied

conviction and clear-eyed acceptance. Only one of them--Wordsworth, the

poetic hermit of our lakes--impresses us in any degree like one of the

great individualities of the ages when men not only craved for the

unseen, but felt the closeness of its presence over their heads and

about their feet. The modern anchorite goes forth in the spirit of the

preacher who declared all the things that are under the sun to be

vanity, not in the transport of the saint who knew all the things that

are under the sun to be no more than the shadow of a dream in the light

of a celestial brightness to come.

Rousseau's mood, deeply tinged as it was by bitterness against society

and circumstance, still contained a strong positive element in his

native exultation in all natural objects and processes, which did not

leave him vacantly brooding over the evil of the world he had quitted.

The sensuousness that penetrated him kept his sympathy with life

extraordinarily buoyant, and all the eager projects for the disclosure

of a scheme of wisdom became for a time the more vividly desired, as the

general tide of desire flowed more fully within him. To be surrounded

with the simplicity of rural life was with him not only a stimulus, but

an essential condition to free intellectual energy. Many a time, he

says, when making excursions into the country with great people, "I was

so tired of fine rooms, fountains, artificial groves and flower beds,

and the still more tiresome people who displayed all these; I was so

worn out with pamphlets, card-playing, music, silly jokes, stupid airs,

great suppers, that as I spied a poor hawthorn copse, a hedge, a

farmstead, a meadow, as in passing through a hamlet I snuffed the odour

of a good chervil omelette, as I heard from a distance the rude refrain

of the shepherd's songs, I used to wish at the devil the whole tale of

rouge and furbelows."[254] He was no anchorite proper, one weary of the

world and waiting for the end, but a man with a strong dislike for one

kind of life and a keen liking for another kind. He thought he was now

about to reproduce the old days of the Charmettes, true to his

inveterate error that one may efface years and accurately replace a

past. He forgot that instead of the once vivacious and tender

benefactress who was now waiting for slow death in her hovel, his

house-mates would be a poor dull drudge and her vile mother. He forgot,

too, that since those days the various processes of intellectual life

had expanded within him, and produced a busy fermentation which makes a

man's surroundings very critical. Finally, he forgot that in proportion

as a man suffers the smooth course of his thought to depend on anything

external, whether on the greenness of the field or the gaiety of the

street or the constancy of friends, so comes he nearer to chance of

making shipwreck. Hence his tragedy, though the very root of the tragedy

lay deeper,--in temperament.

I.

Rousseau's impatience drove him into the country almost before the walls

of his little house were dry (April 9, 1756). "Although it was cold, and

snow still lay upon the ground, the earth began to show signs of life;

violets and primroses were to be seen; the buds on the trees were

beginning to shoot; and the very night of my arrival was marked by the

first song of the nightingale. I heard it close to my window in a wood

that touched the house. After a light sleep I awoke, forgetting that I

was transplanted; I thought myself still in the Rue de Grenelle, when in

an instant the warbling of the birds made me thrill with delight. My

very first care was to surrender myself to the impression of the rustic

objects about me. Instead of beginning by arranging things inside my

quarters, I first set about planning my walks, and there was not a path

nor a copse nor a grove round my cottage which I had not found out

before the end of the next day. The place, which was lonely rather than

wild, transported me in fancy to the end of the world, and no one could

ever have dreamed that we were only four leagues from Paris."[255]

This rural delirium, as he justly calls it, lasted for some days, at the

end of which he began seriously to apply himself to work. But work was

too soon broken off by a mood of vehement exaltation, produced by the

stimulus given to all his senses by the new world of delight in which he

found himself. This exaltation was in a different direction from that

which had seized him half a dozen years before, when he had discarded

the usage and costume of politer society, and had begun to conceive an

angry contempt for the manners, prejudices, and maxims of his time.

Restoration to a more purely sensuous atmosphere softened this

austerity. No longer having the vices of a great city before his eyes,

he no longer cherished the wrath which they had inspired in him. "When I

did not see men, I ceased to despise them; and when I had not the bad

before my eyes, I ceased to hate them. My heart, little made as it is

for hate, now did no more than deplore their wretchedness, and made no

distinction between their wretchedness and their badness. This state, so

much more mild, if much less sublime, soon dulled the glowing enthusiasm

that had long transported me."[256] That is to say, his nature remained

for a moment not exalted but fairly balanced. It was only for a moment.

And in studying the movements of impulse and reflection in him at this

critical time of his life, we are hurried rapidly from phase to phase.

Once more we are watching a man who lived without either intellectual or

spiritual direction, swayed by a reminiscence, a passing mood, a

personality accidentally encountered, by anything except permanent aim

and fixed objects, and who would at any time have surrendered the most

deliberately pondered scheme of persistent effort to the fascination of

a cottage slumbering in a bounteous landscape. Hence there could be no

normally composed state for him; the first soothing effect of the rich

life of forest and garden on a nature exasperated by the life of the

town passed away, and became transformed into an exaltation that swept

the stoic into space, leaving sensuousness to sovereign and uncontrolled

triumph, until the delight turned to its inevitable ashes and

bitterness.

At first all was pure and delicious. In after times when pain made him

gloomily measure the length of the night, and when fever prevented him

from having a moment of sleep, he used to try to still his suffering by

recollection of the days that he had passed in the woods of Montmorency,

with his dog, the birds, the deer, for his companions. "As I got up with

the sun to watch his rising from my garden, if I saw the day was going

to be fine, my first wish was that neither letters nor visits might come

to disturb its charm. After having given the morning to divers tasks

which I fulfilled with all the more pleasure that I could put them off

to another time if I chose, I hastened to eat my dinner, so as to escape

from the importunate and make myself a longer afternoon. Before one

o'clock, even on days of fiercest heat, I used to start in the blaze of

the sun, along with my faithful Achates, hurrying my steps lest some one

should lay hold of me before I could get away. But when I had once

passed a certain corner, with what beating of the heart, with what

radiant joy, did I begin to breathe freely, as I felt myself safe and my

own master for the rest of the day! Then with easier pace I went in

search of some wild and desert spot in the forest, where there was

nothing to show the hand of man, or to speak of servitude and

domination; some refuge where I could fancy myself its discoverer, and

where no inopportune third person came to interfere between nature and

me. She seemed to spread out before my eyes a magnificence that was

always new. The gold of the broom and the purple of the heather struck

my eyes with a glorious splendour that went to my very heart; the

majesty of the trees that covered me with their shadow, the delicacy of

the shrubs that surrounded me, the astonishing variety of grasses and

flowers that I trod under foot, kept my mind in a continual alternation

of attention and delight.... My imagination did not leave the earth thus

superbly arrayed without inhabitants. I formed a charming society, of

which I did not feel myself unworthy; I made a golden age to please my

own fancy, and filling up these fair days with all those scenes of my

life that had left sweet memories behind, and all that my heart could

yet desire or hope in scenes to come, I waxed tender even to shedding

tears over the true pleasures of humanity, pleasures so delicious, so

pure, and henceforth so far from the reach of men. Ah, if in such

moments any ideas of Paris, of the age, of my little aureole as author,

came to trouble my dreams, with what disdain did I drive them out, to

deliver myself without distraction to the exquisite sentiments of which

I was so full. Yet in the midst of it all, the nothingness of my

chimeras sometimes broke sadly upon my mind. Even if every dream had

suddenly been transformed into reality, it would not have been enough;

I should have dreamed, imagined, yearned still." Alas, this deep

insatiableness of sense, the dreary vacuity of soul that follows fulness

of animal delight, the restless exactingness of undirected imagination,

was never recognised by Rousseau distinctly enough to modify either his

conduct or his theory of life. He filled up the void for a short space

by that sovereign aspiration, which changed the dead bones of old

theology into the living figure of a new faith. "From the surface of the

earth I raised my ideas to all the existences in nature, to the

universal system of things, to the incomprehensible Being who embraces

all. Then with mind lost in that immensity, I did not think, I did not

reason, I did not philosophise; with a sort of pleasure I felt

overwhelmed by the weight of the universe, I surrendered myself to the

ravishing confusion of these vast ideas. I loved to lose myself in

imagination in immeasurable space; within the limits of real existences

my heart was too tightly compressed; in the universe I was stifled; I

would fain have launched myself into the infinite. I believe that if I

had unveiled all the mysteries of nature, I should have found myself in

a less delicious situation than that bewildering ecstasy to which my

mind so unreservedly delivered itself, and which sometimes transported

me until I cried out, 'O mighty Being! O mighty Being!' without power of

any other word or thought."[257]

It is not wholly insignificant that though he could thus expand his

soul with ejaculatory delight in something supreme, he could not endure

the sight of one of his fellow-creatures. "If my gaiety lasted the whole

night, that showed that I had passed the day alone; I was very different

after I had seen people, for I was rarely content with others and never

with myself. Then in the evening I was sure to be in taciturn or

scolding humour." It is not in every condition that effervescent passion

for ideal forms of the religious imagination assists sympathy with the

real beings who surround us. And to this let us add that there are

natures in which all deep emotion is so entirely associated with the

ideal, that real and particular manifestations of it are repugnant to

them as something alien; and this without the least insincerity, though

with a vicious and disheartening inconsistency. Rousseau belonged to

this class, and loved man most when he saw men least. Bad as this was,

it does not justify us in denouncing his love of man as artificial; it

was one side of an ideal exaltation, which stirred the depths of his

spirit with a force as genuine as that which is kindled in natures of

another type by sympathy with the real and concrete, with the daily walk

and conversation and actual doings and sufferings of the men and women

whom we know. The fermentation which followed his arrival at the

Hermitage, in its first form produced a number of literary schemes. The

idea of the Political Institutions, first conceived at Venice, pressed

upon his meditations. He had been earnestly requested to compose a

treatise on education. Besides this, his thoughts wandered confusedly

round the notion of a treatise to be called Sensitive Morality, or the

Materialism of the Sage, the object of which was to examine the

influence of external agencies, such as light, darkness, sound, seasons,

food, noise, silence, motion, rest, on our corporeal machine, and thus

indirectly upon the soul also. By knowing these and acquiring the art of

modifying them according to our individual needs, we should become surer

of ourselves and fix a deeper constancy in our lives. An external system

of treatment would thus be established, which would place and keep the

soul in the condition most favourable to virtue.[258] Though the

treatise was never completed, and the sketch never saw the light, we

perceive at least that Rousseau would have made the means of access to

character wide enough, and the material influences that impress it and

produce its caprices, multitudinous enough, instead of limiting them

with the medical specialist to one or two organs, and one or two of the

conditions that affect them. Nor, on the other hand, do the words in

which he sketches his project in the least justify the attribution to

him of the doctrine of the absolute power of the physical constitution

over the moral habits, whether that doctrine would be a credit or a

discredit to his philosophical thoroughness of perception. No one denies

the influence of external conditions on the moral habits, and Rousseau

says no more than that he proposed to consider the extent and the

modifiableness of this influence. It was not then deemed essential for a

spiritualist thinker to ignore physical organisation.

A third undertaking of a more substantial sort was to arrange and edit

the papers and printed works of the AbbÃ© de Saint Pierre (1658-1743),

confided to him through the agency of Saint Lambert, and partly also of

Madame Dupin, the warm friend of that singular and good man.[259] This

task involved reading, considering, and picking extracts from

twenty-three diffuse and chaotic volumes, full of prolixity and

repetition. Rousseau, dreamer as he was, yet had quite keenness of

perception enough to discern the weakness of a dreamer of another sort;

and he soon found out that the AbbÃ© de Saint Pierre's views were

impracticable, in consequence of the author's fixed idea that men are

guided rather by their lights than by their passions. In fact, Saint

Pierre was penetrated with the eighteenth-century faith to a peculiar

degree. As with Condorcet afterwards, he was led by his admiration for

the extent of modern knowledge to adopt the principle that perfected

reason is capable of being made the base of all institutions, and would

speedily terminate all the great abuses of the world. "He went wrong,"

says Rousseau, "not merely in having no other passion but that of

reason, but by insisting on making all men like himself, instead of

taking them as they are and as they will continue to be." The critic's

own error in later days was not very different from this, save that it

applied to the medium in which men live, rather than to themselves, by

refusing to take complex societies as they are, even as starting-points

for higher attempts at organisation. Rousseau had occasionally seen the

old man, and he preserved the greatest veneration for his memory,

speaking of him as the honour of his age and race, with a fulness of

enthusiasm very unusual towards men, though common enough towards

inanimate nature. The sincerity of this respect, however, could not make

the twenty-three volumes which the good man had written, either fewer in

number or lighter in contents, and after dealing as well as he could

with two important parts of Saint Pierre's works, he threw up the

task.[260] It must not be supposed that Rousseau would allow that

fatigue or tedium had anything to do with a resolve which really needed

no better justification. As we have seen before, he had amazing skill in

finding a certain ingeniously contrived largeness for his motives. Saint

Pierre's writings were full of observations on the government of France,

some of them remarkably bold in their criticism, but he had not been

punished for them because the ministers always looked upon him as a

kind of preacher rather than a genuine politician, and he was allowed to

say what he pleased, because it was observed that no one listened to

what he said. Besides, he was a Frenchman, and Rousseau was not, and

hence the latter, in publishing Saint Pierre's strictures on French

affairs, was exposing himself to a sharp question why he meddled with a

country that did not concern him. "It surprised me," says Rousseau,

"that the reflection had not occurred to me earlier," but this

coincidence of the discovery that the work was imprudent, with the

discovery that he was weary of it, will surprise nobody versed in study

of a man who lives in his sensations, and yet has vanity enough to

dislike to admit it.

The short remarks which Rousseau appended to his abridgment of Saint

Pierre's essays on Perpetual Peace, and on a Polysynodia, or Plurality

of Councils, are extremely shrewd and pointed, and would suffice to show

us, if there were nothing else to do so, the right kind of answer to

make to the more harmful dreams of the Social Contract. Saint Pierre's

fault is said, with entire truth, to be a failure to make his views

relative to men, to times, to circumstances; and there is something that

startles us when we think whose words we are reading, in the declaration

that, "whether an existing government be still that of old times, or

whether it have insensibly undergone a change of nature, it is equally

imprudent to touch it: if it is the same, it must be respected, and if

it has degenerated, that is due to the force of time and circumstance,

and human sagacity is powerless." Rousseau points to France, asking his

readers to judge the peril of once moving by an election the enormous

masses comprising the French monarchy; and in another place, after a

wise general remark on the futility of political machinery without men

of a certain character, he illustrates it by this scornful question:

When you see all Paris in a ferment about the rank of a dancer or a wit,

and the affairs of the academy or the opera making everybody forget the

interest of the ruler and the glory of the nation, what can you hope

from bringing political affairs close to such a people, and removing

them from the court to the town?[261] Indeed, there is perhaps not one

of these pages which Burke might not well have owned.[262]

A violent and prolonged crisis followed this not entirely unsuccessful

effort after sober and laborious meditation. Rousseau was now to find

that if society has its perils, so too has solitude, and that if there

is evil in frivolous complaisance for the puppet-work of a world that is

only a little serious, so there is evil in a passionate tenderness for

phantoms of an imaginary world that is not serious at all. To the pure

or stoical soul the solitude of the forest is strength, but then the

imagination must know the yoke. Rousseau's imagination, in no way of the

strongest either as receptive or inventive, was the free accomplice of

his sensations. The undisciplined force of animal sensibility gradually

rose within him, like a slowly welling flood. The spectacle does not

either brighten or fortify the student's mind, yet if there are such

states, it is right that those who care to speak of human nature should

have an opportunity of knowing its less glorious parts. They may be

presumed to exist, though in less violent degree, in many people whom we

meet in the street and at the table, and there can be nothing but danger

in allowing ourselves to be so narrowed by our own virtuousness,

viciousness being conventionally banished to the remoter region of the

third person, as to forget the presence of "the brute brain within the

man's." In Rousseau's case, at any rate, it was no wicked broth nor

magic potion that "confused the chemic labour of the blood," but the too

potent wine of the joyful beauty of nature herself, working misery in a

mental structure that no educating care nor envelope of circumstance had

ever hardened against her intoxication. Most of us are protected against

this subtle debauch of sensuous egoism by a cool organisation, while

even those who are born with senses and appetites of great strength and

keenness, are guarded by accumulated discipline of all kinds from

without, especially by the necessity for active industry which brings

the most exaggerated native sensibility into balance. It is the constant

and rigorous social parade which keeps the eager regiment of the senses

from making furious rout. Rousseau had just repudiated all social

obligation, and he had never gone through external discipline. He was at

an age when passion that has never been broken in has the beak of the

bald vulture, tearing and gnawing a man; but its first approach is in

fair shapes.

Wandering and dreaming "in the sweetest season of the year, in the month

of June, under the fresh groves, with the song of the nightingale and

the soft murmuring of the brooks in his ear," he began to wonder

restlessly why he had never tasted in their plenitude the vivid

sentiments which he was conscious of possessing in reserve, or any of

that intoxicating delight which he felt potentially existent in his

soul. Why had he been created with faculties so exquisite, to be left

thus unused and unfruitful? The feeling of his own quality, with this of

a certain injustice and waste superadded, brought warm tears which he

loved to let flow. Visions of the past, from girl playmates of his youth

down to the Venetian courtesan, thronged in fluttering tumult into his

brain. He saw himself surrounded by a seraglio of houris whom he had

known, until his blood was all aflame and his head in a whirl. His

imagination was kindled into deadly activity. "The impossibility of

reaching to the real beings plunged me into the land of chimera; and

seeing nothing actual that rose to the height of my delirium, I

nourished it in an ideal world, which my creative imagination had soon

peopled with beings after my heart's desire. In my continual ecstasies,

I made myself drunk with torrents of the most delicious sentiments that

ever entered the heart of man. Forgetting absolutely the whole human

race, I invented for myself societies of perfect creatures, as heavenly

for their virtues as their beauties; sure, tender, faithful friends,

such as I never found in our nether world. I had such a passion for

haunting this empyrean with all its charming objects, that I passed

hours and days in it without counting them as they went by; and losing

recollection of everything else, I had hardly swallowed a morsel in hot

haste, before I began to burn to run off in search of my beloved groves.

If, when I was ready to start for the enchanted world, I saw unhappy

mortals coming to detain me on the dull earth, I could neither moderate

nor hide my spleen, and, no longer master over myself, I used to give

them greeting so rough that it might well be called brutal."[263]

This terrific malady was something of a very different kind from the

tranquil sensuousness of the days in Savoy, when the blood was young,

and life was not complicated with memories, and the sweet freshness of

nature made existence enough. Then his supreme expansion had been

attended with a kind of divine repose, and had found edifying voice in

devout acknowledgment in the exhilaration of the morning air of the

goodness and bounty of a beneficent master. In this later and more

pitiable time the beneficent master hid himself, and creation was only

not a blank because it was veiled by troops of sirens not in the flesh.

Nature without the association of some living human object, like Madame

de Warens, was a poison to Rousseau, until the advancing years which

slowly brought decay of sensual force thus brought the antidote. At our

present point we see one stricken with an ugly disease. It was almost

mercy when he was laid up with a sharp attack of the more painful, but

far less absorbing and frightful disorder, to which Rousseau was subject

all his life long. It gave pause to what he misnames his angelic loves.

"Besides that one can hardly think of love when suffering anguish, my

imagination, which is animated by the country and under the trees,

languishes and dies in a room and under roof-beams." This interval he

employed with some magnanimity, in vindicating the ways and economy of

Providence, in the letter to Voltaire which we shall presently examine.

The moment he could get out of doors again into the forest, the

transport returned, but this time accompanied with an active effort in

the creative faculties of his mind to bring the natural relief to these

over-wrought paroxysms of sensual imagination. He soothed his emotions

by associating them with the life of personages whom he invented, and by

introducing into them that play and movement and changing relation which

prevented them from bringing his days to an end in malodorous fever. The

egoism of persistent invention and composition was at least better than

the egoism of mere unreflecting ecstasy in the charm of natural

objects, and took off something from the violent excess of sensuous

force. His thought became absorbed in two female figures, one dark and

the other fair, one sage and the other yielding, one gentle and the

other quick, analogous in character but different, not handsome but

animated by cheerfulness and feeling. To one of these he gave a lover,

to whom the other was a tender friend. He planted them all, after much

deliberation and some changes, on the shores of his beloved lake at

Vevay, the spot where his benefactress was born, and which he always

thought the richest and loveliest in all Europe.

This vicarious or reflected egoism, accompanied as it was by a certain

amount of productive energy, seemed to mark a return to a sort of moral

convalescence. He walked about the groves with pencil and tablets,

assigning this or that thought or expression to one or other of the

three companions of his fancy. When the bad weather set in, and he was

confined to the house (the winter of 1756-7), he tried to resume his

ordinary indoor labour, the copying of music and the compilation of his

Musical Dictionary. To his amazement he found that this was no longer

possible. The fever of that literary composition of which he had always

such dread had strong possession of him. He could see nothing on any

side but the three figures and the objects about them made beautiful by

his imagination. Though he tried hard to dismiss them, his resistance

was vain, and he set himself to bringing some order into his thoughts

"so as to produce a kind of romance." We have a glimpse of his mental

state in the odd detail, that he could not bear to write his romance on

anything but the very finest paper with gilt edges; that the powder with

which he dried the ink was of azure and sparkling silver; and that he

tied up the quires with delicate blue riband.[264] The distance from all

this to the state of nature is obviously very great indeed. It must not

be supposed that he forgot his older part as Cato, Brutus, and the other

Plutarchians. "My great embarrassment," he says honestly, "was that I

should belie myself so clearly and thoroughly. After the severe

principles I had just been laying down with so much bustle, after the

austere maxims I had preached so energetically, after so many biting

invectives against the effeminate books that breathed love and soft

delights, could anything be imagined more shocking, more unlooked-for,

than to see me inscribe myself with my own hand among the very authors

on whose books I had heaped this harsh censure? I felt this

inconsequence in all its force, I taxed myself with it, I blushed over

it, and was overcome with mortification; but nothing could restore me to

reason."[265] He adds that perhaps on the whole the composition of the

New HeloÃ¯sa was turning his madness to the best account. That may be

true, but does not all this make the bitter denunciation, in the Letter

to D'Alembert, of love and of all who make its representation a

considerable element in literature or the drama, at the very time when

he was composing one of the most dangerously attractive romances of his

century, a rather indecent piece of invective? We may forgive

inconsistency when it is only between two of a man's theories, or two

self-concerning parts of his conduct, but hardly when it takes the form

of reviling in others what the reviler indulgently permits to himself.

We are more edified by the energy with which Rousseau refused connivance

with the public outrages on morality perpetrated by a patron. M.

d'Epinay went to pay him a visit at the Hermitage, taking with him two

ladies with whom his relations were less than equivocal, and for whom

among other things he had given Rousseau music to copy. "They were

curious to see the eccentric man," as M. d'Epinay afterwards told his

scandalised wife, for it was in the manners of the day on no account to

parade even the most notorious of these unblessed connections. "He was

walking in front of the door; he saw me first; he advanced cap in hand;

he saw the ladies; he saluted us, put on his cap, turned his back, and

stalked off as fast as he could. Can anything be more mad?"[266] In the

miserable and intricate tangle of falsity, weakness, sensuality, and

quarrel, which make up this chapter in Rousseau's life, we are glad of

even one trait of masculine robustness. We should perhaps be still more

glad if the unwedded Theresa were not visible in the background of this

scene of high morals.

II.

The New HeloÃ¯sa was not to be completed without a further extension of

morbid experience of a still more burning kind than the sufferings of

compressed passion. The feverish torment of mere visions of the air

swarming impalpable in all his veins, was replaced when the earth again

began to live and the sap to stir in plants, by the more concentred fire

of a consuming passion for one who was no dryad nor figure of a dream.

In the spring of 1757 he received a visit from Madame d'Houdetot, the

sister-in-law of Madame d'Epinay.[267] Her husband had gone to the war

(we are in the year of Rossbach), and so had her lover, Saint Lambert,

whose passion had been so fatal to Voltaire's Marquise du ChÃ¢telet eight

years before. She rode over in man's guise to the Hermitage from a house

not very far off, where she was to pass her retreat during the absence

of her two natural protectors. Rousseau had seen her before on various

occasions; she had been to the Hermitage the previous year, and had

partaken of its host's homely fare.[268] But the time was not ripe; the

force of a temptation is not from without but within. Much, too,

depended with our hermit on the temperature; one who would have been a

very ordinary mortal to him in cold and rain, might grow to Aphrodite

herself in days when the sun shone hot and the air was aromatic. His

fancy was suddenly struck with the romantic guise of the female

cavalier, and this was the first onset of a veritable intoxication,

which many men have felt, but which no man before or since ever invited

the world to hear the story of. He may truly say that after the first

interview with her in this disastrous spring, he was as one who had

thirstily drained a poisoned bowl. A sort of palsy struck him. He lay

weeping in his bed at night, and on days when he did not see the

sorceress he wept in the woods.[269] He talked to himself for hours, and

was of a black humour to his house-mates. When approaching the object of

this deadly fascination, his whole organisation seemed to be dissolved.

He walked in a dream that filled him with a sense of sickly torture,

commixed with sicklier delight.

People speak with precisely marked division of mind and body, of will,

emotion, understanding; the division is good in logic, but its

convenient lines are lost to us as we watch a being with soul all

blurred, body all shaken, unstrung, poisoned, by erotic mania, rising in

slow clouds of mephitic steam from suddenly heated stagnancies of the

blood, and turning the reality of conduct and duty into distant

unmeaning shadows. If such a disease were the furious mood of the brute

in spring-time, it would be less dreadful, but shame and remorse in the

ever-struggling reason of man or woman in the grip of the foul thing,

produces an aggravation of frenzy that makes the mental healer tremble.

Add to all this lurking elements of hollow rage that his passion was not

returned; of stealthy jealousy of the younger man whose place he could

not take, and who was his friend besides; of suspicion that he was a

little despised for his weakness by the very object of it, who saw that

his hairs were sprinkled with gray,--and the whole offers a scene of

moral humiliation that half sickens, half appals, and we turn away with

dismay as from a vision of the horrid loves of heavy-eyed and scaly

shapes that haunted the warm primeval ooze.

Madame d'Houdetot, the unwilling enchantress bearing in an unconscious

hand the cup of defilement, was not strikingly singular either in

physical or mental attraction. She was now seven-and-twenty. Small-pox,

the terrible plague of the country, had pitted her face and given a

yellowish tinge to her complexion; her features were clumsy and her brow

low; she was short-sighted, and in old age at any rate was afflicted by

an excessive squint. This homeliness was redeemed by a gentle and

caressing expression, and by a sincerity, a gaiety of heart, and free

sprightliness of manner, that no trouble could restrain. Her figure was

very slight, and there was in all her movements at once awkwardness and

grace. She was natural and simple, and had a fairly good judgment of a

modest kind, in spite of the wild sallies in which her spirits sometimes

found vent. Capable of chagrin, she was never prevented by it from

yielding to any impulse of mirth. "She weeps with the best faith in the

world, and breaks out laughing at the same moment; never was anybody so

happily born," says her much less amiable sister-in-law.[270] Her

husband was indifferent to her. He preserved an attachment to a lady

whom he knew before his marriage, whose society he never ceased to

frequent, and who finally died in his arms in 1793. Madame d'Houdetot

found consolation in the friendship of Saint Lambert. "We both of us,"

said her husband, "both Madame d'Houdetot and I, had a vocation for

fidelity, only there was a mis-arrangement." She occasionally composed

verses of more than ordinary point, but she had good sense enough not to

write them down, nor to set up on the strength of them for poetess and

wit.[271] Her talk in her later years, and she lived down to the year of

Leipsic, preserved the pointed sententiousness of earlier time. One day,

for instance, in the era of the Directory, a conversation was going on

as to the various merits and defects of women; she heard much, and then

with her accustomed suavity of voice contributed this light

summary:--"Without women, the life of man would be without aid at the

beginning, without pleasure in the middle, and without solace at the

end."[272]

We may be sure that it was not her power of saying things of this sort

that kindled Rousseau's flame, but rather the sprightly naturalness,

frankness, and kindly softness of a character which in his opinion

united every virtue except prudence and strength, the two which Rousseau

would be least likely to miss. The bond of union between them was

subtle. She found in Rousseau a sympathetic listener while she told the

story of her passion for Saint Lambert, and a certain contagious force

produced in him a thrill which he never felt with any one else before or

after. Thus, as he says, there was equally love on both sides, though it

was not reciprocal. "We were both of us intoxicated with passion, she

for her lover, I for her; our sighs and sweet tears mingled. Tender

confidants, each of the other, our sentiments were of such close kin

that it was impossible for them not to mix; and still she never forgot

her duty for a moment, while for myself, I protest, I swear, that if

sometimes drawn astray by my senses, still"--still he was a paragon of

virtue, subject to rather new definition. We can appreciate the author

of the New HeloÃ¯sa; we can appreciate the author of Emilius; but this

strained attempt to confound those two very different persons by

combining tearful erotics with high ethics, is an exhibition of

self-delusion that the most patient analyst of human nature might well

find hard to suffer. "The duty of privation exalted my soul. The glory

of all the virtues adorned the idol of my heart in my sight; to soil its

divine image would have been to annihilate it," and so forth.[273]

Moon-lighted landscape gave a background for the sentimentalist's

picture, and dim groves, murmuring cascades, and the soft rustle of the

night air, made up a scene which became for its chief actor "an immortal

memory of innocence and delight." "It was in this grove, seated with her

on a grassy bank, under an acacia heavy with flowers, that I found

expression for the emotions of my heart in words that were worthy of

them. 'Twas the first and single time of my life; but I was sublime, if

you can use the word of all the tender and seductive things that the

most glowing love can bring into the heart of a man. What intoxicating

tears I shed at her knees, what floods she shed in spite of herself! At

length in an involuntary transport, she cried out, 'Never was man so

tender, never did man love as you do! But your friend Saint Lambert

hears us, and my heart cannot love twice.'"[274] Happily, as we learn

from another source, a breath of wholesome life from without brought the

transcendental to grotesque end. In the climax of tears and

protestations, an honest waggoner at the other side of the park wall,

urging on a lagging beast launched a round and far-sounding oath out

into the silent night. Madame d'Houdetot answered with a lively

continuous peal of young laughter, while an angry chill brought back the

discomfited lover from an ecstasy that was very full of peril.[275]

Rousseau wrote in the New HeloÃ¯sa very sagely that you should grant to

the senses nothing when you mean to refuse them anything. He admits that

the saying was falsified by his relations with Madame d'Houdetot.

Clearly the credit of this happy falsification was due to her rather

than to himself. What her feelings were, it is not very easy to see.

Honest pity seems to have been the strongest of them. She was idle and

unoccupied, and idleness leaves the soul open for much stray generosity

of emotion, even towards an importunate lover. She thought him mad, and

she wrote to Saint Lambert to say so. "His madness must be very strong,"

said Saint Lambert, "since she can perceive it."[276]

Character is ceaselessly marching, even when we seem to have sunk into a

fixed and stagnant mood. The man is awakened from his dream of passion

by inexorable event; he finds the house of the soul not swept and

garnished for a new life, but possessed by demons who have entered

unseen. In short, such profound disorder of spirit, though in its first

stage marked by ravishing delirium, never escapes a bitter sequel. When

a man lets his soul be swept away from the narrow track of conduct

appointed by his relations with others, still the reality of such

relations survives. He may retreat to rural lodges; that will not save

him either from his own passion, or from some degree of that kinship

with others which instantly creates right and wrong like a wall of brass

around him. Let it be observed that the natures of finest stuff suffer

most from these forced reactions, and it was just because Rousseau had

innate moral sensitiveness, and a man like Diderot was without it, that

the first felt his fall so profoundly, while the second was unconscious

of having fallen at all.

One day in July Rousseau went to pay his accustomed visit. He found

Madame d'Houdetot dejected, and with the flush of recent weeping on her

cheeks. A bird of the air had carried the matter. As usual, the matter

was carried wrongly, and apparently all that Saint Lambert suspected was

that Rousseau's high principles had persuaded Madame d'Houdetot of the

viciousness of her relations with her lover.[277] "They have played us

an evil turn," cried Madame d'Houdetot; "they have been unjust to me,

but that is no matter. Either let us break off at once, or be what you

ought to be."[278] This was Rousseau's first taste of the ashes of

shame into which the lusciousness of such forbidden fruit, plucked at

the expense of others, is ever apt to be transformed. Mortification of

the considerable spiritual pride that was yet alive after this lapse,

was a strong element in the sum of his emotion, and it was pointed by

the reflection which stung him so incessantly, that his monitress was

younger than himself. He could never master his own contempt for the

gallantry of grizzled locks.[279] His austerer self might at any rate

have been consoled by knowing that this scene was the beginning of the

end, though the end came without any seeking on his part and without

violence. To his amazement, one day Saint Lambert and Madame d'Houdetot

came to the Hermitage, asking him to give them dinner, and much to the

credit of human nature's elasticity, the three passed a delightful

afternoon. The wronged lover was friendly, though a little stiff, and he

passed occasional slights which Rousseau would surely not have forgiven,

if he had not been disarmed by consciousness of guilt. He fell asleep,

as we can well imagine that he might do, while Rousseau read aloud his

very inadequate justification of Providence against Voltaire.[280]

In time he returned to the army, and Rousseau began to cure himself of

his mad passion. His method, however, was not unsuspicious, for it

involved the perilous assistance of Madame d'Houdetot. Fortunately her

loyalty and good sense forced a more resolute mode upon him. He found,

or thought he found her distracted, emharrassed, indifferent. In despair

at not being allowed to heal his passionate malady in his own fashion,

he did the most singular thing that he could have done under the

circumstances. He wrote to Saint Lambert.[281] His letter is a prodigy

of plausible duplicity, though Rousseau in some of his mental states had

so little sense of the difference between the actual and the imaginary,

and was moreover so swiftly borne away on a flood of fine phrases, that

it is hard to decide how far this was voluntary, and how far he was his

own dupe. Voluntary or not, it is detestable. We pass the false whine

about "being abandoned by all that was dear to him," as if he had not

deliberately quitted Paris against the remonstrance of every friend he

had; about his being "solitary and sad," as if he was not ready at this

very time to curse any one who intruded on his solitude, and hindered

him of a single half-hour in the desert spots that he adored.

Remembering the scenes in moon-lighted groves and elsewhere, we read

this:--"Whence comes her coldness to me? Is it possible that you can

have suspected me of wronging you with her, and of turning perfidious in

consequence of an unseasonably rigorous virtue? A passage in one of your

letters shows a glimpse of some such suspicion. No, no, Saint Lambert,

the breast of J.J. Rousseau never held the heart of a traitor, and I

should despise myself more than you suppose, if I had ever tried to rob

you of her heart.... Can you suspect that her friendship for me may hurt

her love for you? Surely natures endowed with sensibility are open to

all sorts of affections, and no sentiment can spring up in them which

does not turn to the advantage of the dominant passion. Where is the

lover who does not wax the more tender as he talks to his friend of her

whom he loves? And is it not sweeter for you in your banishment that

there should be some sympathetic creature to whom your mistress loves to

talk of you, and who loves to hear?"

Let us turn to another side of his correspondence. The way in which the

sympathetic creature in the present case loved to hear his friend's

mistress talk of him, is interestingly shown in one or two passages from

a letter to her; as when he cries, "Ah, how proud would even thy lover

himself be of thy constancy, if he only knew how much it has

surmounted.... I appeal to your sincerity. You, the witness and the

cause of this delirium, these tears, these ravishing ecstasies, these

transports which were never made for mortal, say, have I ever tasted

your favours in such a way that I deserve to lose them?... Never once

did my ardent desires nor my tender supplications dare to solicit

supreme happiness, without my feeling stopped by the inner cries of a

sorrow-stricken soul.... O Sophie, after moments so sweet, the idea of

eternal privation is too frightful for one who groans that he cannot

identify himself with thee. What, are thy tender eyes never again to be

lowered with a delicious modesty, intoxicating me with pleasure? What,

are my burning lips never again to lay my very soul on thy heart along

with my kisses? What, may I never more feel that heavenly shudder, that

rapid and devouring fire, swifter than lightning?"[282].... We see a

sympathetic creature assuredly, and listen to the voice of a nature

endowed with sensibility even more than enough, but with decency,

loyalty, above all with self-knowledge, far less than enough.

One more touch completes the picture of the fallen desperate man. He

takes great trouble to persuade Saint Lambert that though the rigour of

his principles constrains him to frown upon such breaches of social law

as the relations between Madame d'Houdetot and her lover, yet he is so

attached to the sinful pair that he half forgives them. "Do not

suppose," he says, with superlative gravity, "that you have seduced me

by your reasons; I see in them the goodness of your heart, not your

justification. I cannot help blaming your connection: you can hardly

approve it yourself; and so long as you both of you continue dear to me,

I will never leave you in careless security as to the innocence of your

state. Yet love such as yours deserves considerateness.... I feel

respect for a union so tender, and cannot bring myself to attempt to

lead it to virtue along the path of despair" (p. 401).

Ignorance of the facts of the case hindered Saint Lambert from

appreciating the strange irony of a man protesting about leading to

virtue along the path of despair a poor woman whom he had done as much

as he could to lead to vice along the path of highly stimulated sense.

Saint Lambert was as much a sentimentalist as Rousseau was, but he had a

certain manliness, acquired by long contact with men, which his

correspondent only felt in moods of severe exaltation. Saint Lambert

took all the blame on himself. He had desired that his mistress and his

friend should love one another; then he thought he saw some coolness in

his mistress, and he set the change down to his friend, though not on

the true grounds. "Do not suppose that I thought you perfidious or a

traitor; I knew the austerity of your principles; people had spoken to

me of it; and she herself did so with a respect that love found hard to

bear." In short, he had suspected Rousseau of nothing worse than being

over-virtuous, and trying in the interest of virtue to break off a

connection sanctioned by contemporary manners, but not by law or

religion. If Madame d'Houdetot had changed, it was not that she had

ceased to honour her good friend, but only that her lover might be

spared a certain chagrin, from suspecting the excess of scrupulosity and

conscience in so austere an adviser.[283]

It is well known how effectively one with a germ of good principle in

him is braced by being thought better than he is. With this letter in

his hands and its words in his mind, Rousseau strode off for his last

interview with Madame d'Houdetot. Had Saint Lambert, he says, been less

wise, less generous, less worthy, I should have been a lost man. As it

was, he passed four or five hours with her in a delicious calm,

infinitely more delightful than the accesses of burning fever which had

seized him before. They formed the project of a close companionship of

three, including the absent lover; and they counted on the project

coming more true than such designs usually do, "since all the feelings

that can unite sensitive and upright hearts formed the foundation of it,

and we three united talents enough as well as knowledge enough to

suffice to ourselves, without need of aid or supplement from others."

What happened was this. Madame d'Houdetot for the next three or four

months, which were among the most bitter in Rousseau's life, for then

the bitterness which became chronic was new and therefore harder to be

borne, wrote him the wisest, most affectionate, and most considerate

letters that a sincere and sensible woman ever wrote to the most

petulant, suspicious, perverse, and irrestrainable of men. For patience

and exquisite sweetness of friendship some of these letters are

matchless, and we can only conjecture the wearing querulousness of the

letters to which they were replies. If through no fault of her own she

had been the occasion of the monstrous delirium of which he never shook

off the consequences, at least this good soul did all that wise counsel

and grave tenderness could do, to bring him out of the black slough of

suspicion and despair into which he was plunged.[284] In the beginning

of 1758 there was a change. Rousseau's passion for her somehow became

known to all the world; it reached the ears of Saint Lambert, and was

the cause of a passing disturbance between him and his mistress. Saint

Lambert throughout acted like a man who is thoroughly master of himself.

At first, we learn, he ceased for a moment to see in Rousseau the virtue

which he sought in him, and which he was persuaded that he found in him.

"Since then, however," wrote Madame d'Houdetot, "he pities you more for

your weakness than he reproaches you, and we are both of us far from

joining the people who wish to blacken your character; we have and

always shall have the courage to speak of you with esteem."[285] They

saw one another a few times, and on one occasion the Count and Countess

d'Houdetot, Saint Lambert, and Rousseau all sat at table together,

happily without breach of the peace.[286] One curious thing about this

meeting was that it took place some three weeks after Rousseau and Saint

Lambert had interchanged letters on the subject of the quarrel with

Diderot, in which each promised the other contemptuous oblivion.[287]

Perpetuity of hate is as hard as perpetuity of love for our poor

short-spanned characters, and at length the three who were once to have

lived together in self-sufficing union, and then in their next mood to

have forgotten one another instantly and for ever, held to neither of

the extremes, but settled down into an easier middle path of indifferent

good-will. The conduct of all three, said the most famous of them, may

serve for an example of the way in which sensible people separate, when

it no longer suits them to see one another.[288] It is at least certain

that in them Rousseau lost two of the most unimpeachably good friends

that he ever possessed.

III.

The egoistic character that loves to brood and hates to act, is big with

catastrophe. We have now to see how the inevitable law accomplished

itself in the case of Rousseau. In many this brooding egoism produces a

silent and melancholy insanity; with him it was developed into something

of acridly corrosive quality. One of the agents in this disastrous

process was the wearing torture of one of the most painful of disorders.

This disorder, arising from an internal malformation, harassed him from

his infancy to the day of his death. Our fatuous persistency in reducing

man to the spiritual, blinds the biographer to the circumstance that the

history of a life is the history of a body no less than that of a soul.

Many a piece of conduct that divides the world into two factions of

moral assailants and moral vindicators, provoking a thousand ingenuities

of ethical or psychological analysis, ought really to have been nothing

more than an item in a page of a pathologist's case-book. We are not to

suspend our judgment on action; right and wrong can depend on no man's

malformations. In trying to know the actor, it is otherwise; here it is

folly to underestimate the physical antecedents of mental phenomena. In

firm and lofty character, pain is mastered; in a character so little

endowed with cool tenacious strength as Rousseau's, pain such as he

endured was enough to account, not for his unsociality, which flowed

from temperament, but for the bitter, irritable, and suspicious form

which this unsociality now first assumed. Rousseau was never a saintly

nature, but far the reverse, and in reading the tedious tale of his

quarrels with Grimm and Madame d'Epinay and Diderot--a tale of

labyrinthine nightmares--let us remember that we may even to this point

explain what happened, without recourse to the too facile theory of

insanity, unless one defines that misused term so widely as to make many

sane people very uncomfortable.

His own account was this: "In my quality of solitary, I am more

sensitive than another; if I am wrong with a friend who lives in the

world, he thinks of it for a moment, and then a thousand distractions

make him forget it for the rest of the day; but there is nothing to

distract me as to his wrong towards me; deprived of my sleep, I busy

myself with him all night long; solitary in my walks, I busy myself with

him from sunrise until sunset; my heart has not an instant's relief, and

the harshness of a friend gives me in one day years of anguish. In my

quality of invalid, I have a title to the considerateness that humanity

owes to the weakness or irritation of a man in agony. Who is the friend,

who is the good man, that ought not to dread to add affliction to an

unfortunate wretch tormented with a painful and incurable malady?"[289]

We need not accept this as an adequate extenuation of perversities, but

it explains them without recourse to the theory of uncontrollable

insanity. Insanity came later, the product of intellectual excitation,

public persecution, and moral reaction after prolonged tension.

Meanwhile he may well be judged by the standards of the sane; knowing

his temperament, his previous history, his circumstances, we have no

difficulty in accounting for his conduct. Least of all is there any need

for laying all the blame upon his friends. There are writers whom

enthusiasm for the principles of Jean Jacques has driven into fanatical

denigration of every one whom he called his enemy, that is to say,

nearly every one whom he ever knew.[290] Diderot said well, "Too many

honest people would be wrong, if Jean Jacques were right."

The first downright breach was with Grimm, but there were angry passages

during the year 1757, not only with him, but with Diderot and Madame

d'Epinay as well. Diderot, like many other men of energetic nature

unchastened by worldly wisdom, was too interested in everything that

attracted his attention to keep silence over the indiscretion of a

friend. He threw as much tenacity and zeal into a trifle, if it had once

struck him, as he did into the EncyclopÃ¦dia. We have already seen how

warmly he rated Jean Jacques for missing the court pension. Then he

scolded and laughed at him for turning hermit. With still more

seriousness he remonstrated with him for remaining in the country

through the winter, thus endangering the life of Theresa's aged mother.

This stirred up hot anger in the Hermitage, and two or three bitter

letters were interchanged,[291] those of Diderot being pronounced by a

person who was no partisan of Rousseau decidedly too harsh.[292] Yet

there is copious warmth of friendship in these very letters, if only the

man to whom they were written had not hated interference in his affairs

as the worst of injuries. "I loved Diderot tenderly, I esteemed him

sincerely," says Rousseau, "and I counted with entire confidence upon

the same sentiments in him. But worn out by his unwearied obstinacy in

everlastingly thwarting my tastes, my inclinations, my ways of living,

everything that concerned myself only; revolted at seeing a younger man

than myself insist with all his might on governing me like a child;

chilled by his readiness in giving his promise and his negligence in

keeping it; tired of so many appointments which he made and broke, and

of his fancy for repairing them by new ones to be broken in their turn;

provoked at waiting for him to no purpose three or four times a month on

days which he had fixed, and of dining alone in the evening, after going

on as far as St. Denis to meet him and waiting for him all day,--I had

my heart already full of a multitude of grievances."[293] This

irritation subsided in presence of the storms that now rose up against

Diderot. He was in the thick of the dangerous and mortifying

distractions stirred up by the foes of the EncyclopÃ¦dia. Rousseau in

friendly sympathy went to see him; they embraced, and old wrongs were

forgotten until new arose.[294]

There is a less rose-coloured account than this. Madame d'Epinay assigns

two motives to Rousseau: a desire to find an excuse for going to Paris,

in order to avoid seeing Saint Lambert; secondly, a wish to hear

Diderot's opinion of the two first parts of the New HeloÃ¯sa. She says

that he wanted to borrow a portfolio in which to carry the manuscripts

to Paris; Rousseau says that they had already been in Diderot's

possession for six months.[295] As her letters containing this very

circumstantial story were written at the moment, it is difficult to

uphold the Confessions as valid authority against them. Thirdly,

Rousseau told her that he had not taken his manuscripts to Paris (p.

302), whereas Grimm writing a few days later (p. 309) mentions that he

has received a letter from Diderot, to the effect that Rousseau's visit

had no other object than the revision of these manuscripts. The scene is

characteristic. "Rousseau kept him pitilessly at work from Saturday at

ten o'clock in the morning till eleven at night on Monday, hardly giving

him time to eat and drink. The revision at an end, Diderot chats with

him about a plan he has in his head, and begs Rousseau to help him in

contriving some incident which he cannot yet arrange to his taste. 'It

is too difficult,' replies the hermit coldly, 'it is late, and I am not

used to sitting up. Good night; I am off at six in the morning, and 'tis

time for bed.' He rises from his chair, goes to bed, and leaves Diderot

petrified at his behaviour. The day of his departure, Diderot's wife saw

that her husband was in bad spirits, and asked the reason. 'It is that

man's want of delicacy,' he replied, 'which afflicts me; he makes me

work like a slave, but I should never have found that out, if he had not

so drily refused to take an interest in me for a quarter of an hour.'

'You are surprised at that,' his wife answered; 'do you not know him? He

is devoured with envy; he goes wild with rage when anything fine appears

that is not his own. You will see him one day commit some great crime

rather than let himself be ignored. I declare I would not swear that he

will not join the ranks of the Jesuits, and undertake their

vindication.'"

Of course we cannot be sure that Grimm did not manipulate these letters

long after the event, but there is nothing in Rousseau's history to make

us perfectly sure that he was incapable either of telling a falsehood to

Madame d'Epinay, or of being shamelessly selfish in respect of Diderot.

I see no reason to refuse substantial credit to Grimm's account, and the

points of coincidence between that and the Confessions make its truth

probable.[296]

Rousseau's relations with Madame d'Epinay were more complex, and his

sentiments towards her underwent many changes. There was a prevalent

opinion that he was her lover, for which no real foundation seems to

have existed.[297] Those who disbelieved that he had reached this

distinction, yet made sure that he had a passion for her, which may or

may not have been true.[298] Madame d'Epinay herself was vain enough to

be willing that this should be generally accepted, and it is certain

that she showed a friendship for him which, considering the manners of

the time, was invitingly open to misconception. Again, she was jealous

of her sister-in-law, Madame d'Houdetot, if for no other reason than

that the latter, being the wife of a Norman noble, had access to the

court, and this was unattainable by the wife of a farmer-general. Hence

Madame d'Epinay's barely-concealed mortification when she heard of the

meetings in the forest, the private suppers, the moonlight rambles in

the park. When Saint Lambert first became uneasy as to the relations

between Rousseau and his mistress, and wrote to her to say that he was

so, Rousseau instantly suspected that Madame d'Epinay had been his

informant. Theresa confirmed the suspicion by tales of baskets and

drawers ransacked by Madame d'Epinay in search of Madame d'Houdetot's

letters to him. Whether these tales were true or not, we can never know;

we can only say that Madame d'Epinay was probably not incapable of these

meannesses, and that there is no reason to suppose that she took the

pains to write directly to Saint Lambert a piece of news which she was

writing to Grimm, knowing that he was then in communication with Saint

Lambert. She herself suspected that Theresa had written to Saint

Lambert,[299] but it may be doubted whether Theresa's imagination could

have risen to such feat as writing to a marquis, and a marquis in what

would have seemed to her to be remote and inaccessible parts of the

earth. All this, however, has become ghostly for us; a puzzle that can

never be found out, nor be worth finding out. Rousseau was persuaded

that Madame d'Epinay was his betrayer, and was seized by one of his

blackest and most stormful moods. In reply to an affectionate letter

from her, inquiring why she had not seen him for so long, he wrote thus:

"I can say nothing to you yet. I wait until I am better informed, and

this I shall be sooner or later. Meanwhile, be certain that accused

innocence will find a champion ardent enough to make calumniators

repent, whoever they may be." It is rather curious that so strange a

missive as this, instead of provoking Madame d'Epinay to anger, was

answered by a warmer and more affectionate letter than the first. To

this Rousseau replied with increased vehemence, charged with dark and

mysteriously worded suspicion. Still Madame d'Epinay remained willing to

receive him. He began to repent of his imprudent haste, because it would

certainly end by compromising Madame d'Houdetot, and because, moreover,

he had no proof after all that his suspicions had any foundation. He

went instantly to the house of Madame d'Epinay; at his approach she

threw herself on his neck and melted into tears. This unexpected

reception from so old a friend moved him extremely; he too wept

abundantly. She showed no curiosity as to the precise nature of his

suspicions or their origin, and the quarrel came to an end.[300]

Grimm's turn followed. Though they had been friends for many years,

there had long been a certain stiffness in their friendship. Their

characters were in fact profoundly antipathetic. Rousseau we

know,--sensuous, impulsive, extravagant, with little sense of the

difference between reality and dreams. Grimm was exactly the opposite;

judicious, collected, self-seeking, coldly upright. He was a German

(born at Ratisbon), and in Paris was first a reader to the Duke of Saxe

Gotha, with very scanty salary. He made his way, partly through the

friendship of Rousseau, into the society of the Parisian men of letters,

rapidly acquired a perfect mastery of the French language, and with the

inspiring help of Diderot, became an excellent critic. After being

secretary to sundry high people, he became the literary correspondent of

various German sovereigns, keeping them informed of what was happening

in the world of art and letters, just as an ambassador keeps his

government informed of what happens in politics. The sobriety,

impartiality, and discrimination of his criticism make one think highly

of his literary judgment; he had the courage, or shall we say he

preserved enough of the German, to defend both Homer and Shakespeare

against the unhappy strictures of Voltaire.[301] This is not all,

however; his criticism is conceived in a tone which impresses us with

the writer's integrity. And to this internal evidence we have to add the

external corroboration that in the latter part of his life he filled

various official posts, which implied a peculiar confidence in his

probity on the part of those who appointed him. At the present moment

(1756-57), he was acting as secretary to Marshal d'EstrÃ©es, commander of

the French army in Westphalia at the outset of the Seven Years' War. He

was an able and helpful man, in spite of his having a rough manner,

powdering his face, and being so monstrously scented as to earn the name

of the musk-bear. He had that firmness and positivity which are not

always beautiful, but of which there is probably too little rather than

too much in the world, certainly in the France of his time, and of which

there was none at all in Rousseau. Above all things he hated

declamation. Apparently cold and reserved, he had sensibility enough

underneath the surface to go nearly out of his mind for love of a singer

at the opera who had a thrilling voice. As he did not believe in the

metaphysical doctrine about the freedom of the will, he accepted from

temperament the necessity which logic confirmed, of guiding the will by

constant pressure from without. "I am surprised," Madame d'Epinay said

to him, "that men should be so little indulgent to one another." "Nay,

the want of indulgence comes of our belief in freedom; it is because the

established morality is false and bad, inasmuch as it starts from this

false principle of liberty." "Ah, but the contrary principle, by making

one too indulgent, disturbs order." "It does nothing of the kind. Though

man does not wholly change, he is susceptible of modification; you can

improve him; hence it is not useless to punish him. The gardener does

not cut down a tree that grows crooked; he binds up the branch and keeps

it in shape; that is the effect of public punishment."[302] He applied

the same doctrine, as we shall see, to private punishment for social

crookedness.

It is easy to conceive how Rousseau's way of ordering himself would

gradually estrange so hard a head as this. What the one thought a

weighty moral reformation, struck the other as a vain desire to attract

attention. Rousseau on the other hand suspected Grimm of intriguing to

remove Theresa from him, as well as doing his best to alienate all his

friends. The attempted alienation of Theresa consisted in the secret

allowance to her mother and her by Grimm and Diderot of some sixteen

pounds a year.[303] Rousseau was unaware of this, but the whisperings

and goings and comings to which it gave rise, made him darkly uneasy.

That the suspicions in other respects were in a certain sense not wholly

unfounded, is shown by Grimm's own letters to Madame d'Epinay. He

disapproved of her installing Rousseau in the Hermitage, and warned her

in a very remarkable prophecy that solitude would darken his

imagination.[304] "He is a poor devil who torments himself, and does not

dare to confess the true subject of all his sufferings, which is in his

cursed head and his pride; he raises up imaginary matters, so as to have

the pleasure of complaining of the whole human race."[305] More than

once he assures her that Rousseau will end by going mad, it being

impossible that so hot and ill-organised a head should endure

solitude.[306] Rousseauite partisans usually explain all this by

supposing that Grimm was eager to set a woman for whom he had a passion,

against a man who was suspected of having a passion for her; and it is

possible that jealousy may have stimulated the exercise of his natural

shrewdness. But this shrewdness, added to entire want of imagination and

a very narrow range of sympathy, was quite enough to account for Grimm's

harsh judgment, without the addition of any sinister sentiment. He was

perfectly right in suspecting Rousseau of want of loyalty to Madame

d'Epinay, for we find our hermit writing to her in strains of perfect

intimacy, while he was writing of her to Madame d'Houdetot as "your

unworthy sister."[307] On the other hand, while Madame d'Epinay was

overwhelming him with caressing phrases, she was at the same moment

describing him to Grimm as a master of impertinence and intractableness.

As usual where there is radical incompatibility of character, an

attempted reconciliation between Grimm and Rousseau (some time in the

early part of October 1757) had only made the thinly veiled antipathy

more resolute. Rousseau excused himself for wrongs of which in his heart

he never thought himself guilty. Grimm replied by a discourse on the

virtues of friendship and his own special aptitude for practising them.

He then conceded to the impetuous penitent the kiss of peace, in a

slight embrace which was like the accolade given by a monarch to new

knights.[308] The whole scene is ignoble. We seem to be watching an

unclean cauldron, with Theresa's mother, a cringing and babbling crone,

standing witch-like over it and infusing suspicion, falsehood, and

malice. When minds are thus surcharged, any accident suffices to

release the evil creatures that lurk in an irritated imagination.

One day towards the end of the autumn of 1757, Rousseau learned to his

unbounded surprise that Madame d'Epinay had been seized with some

strange disorder, which made it advisable that she should start without

any delay for Geneva, there to place herself under the care of Tronchin,

who was at that time the most famous doctor in Europe. His surprise was

greatly increased by the expectation which he found among his friends

that he would show his gratitude for her many kindnesses to him, by

offering to bear her company on her journey, and during her stay in a

town which was strange to her and thoroughly familiar to him. It was to

no purpose that he protested how unfit was one invalid to be the nurse

of another; and how great an incumbrance a man would be in a coach in

the bad season, when for many days he was absolutely unable to leave his

chamber without danger. Diderot, with his usual eagerness to guide a

friend's course, wrote him a letter urging that his many obligations,

and even his grievances in respect of Madame d'Epinay, bound him to

accompany her, as he would thus repay the one and console himself for

the other. "She is going into a country where she will be like one

fallen from the clouds. She is ill; she will need amusement and

distraction. As for winter, are you worse now than you were a month

back, or than you will be at the opening of the spring? For me, I

confess that if I could not bear the coach, I would take a staff and

follow her on foot."[309] Rousseau trembled with fury, and as soon as

the transport was over, he wrote an indignant reply, in which he more or

less politely bade the panurgic one to attend to his own affairs, and

hinted that Grimm was making a tool of him. Next he wrote to Grimm

himself a letter, not unfriendly in form, asking his advice and

promising to follow it, but hardly hiding his resentment. By this time

he had found out the secret of Madame d'Epinay's supposed illness and

her anxiety to pass some months away from her family, and the share

which Grimm had in it. This, however, does not make many passages of his

letter any the less ungracious or unseemly. "If Madame d'Epinay has

shown friend' ship to me, I have shown more to her.... As for benefits,

first of all I do not like them, I do not want them, and I owe no thanks

for any that people may burden me with by force. Madame d'Epinay, being

so often left alone in the country, wished me for company; it was for

that she had kept me. After making one sacrifice to friendship, I must

now make another to gratitude. A man must be poor, must be without a

servant, must be a hater of constraint, and he must have my character,

before he can know what it is for me to live in another person's house.

For all that, I lived two years in hers, constantly brought into bondage

with the finest harangues about liberty, served by twenty domestics, and

cleaning my own shoes every morning, overloaded with gloomy indigestion,

and incessantly sighing for my homely porringer.... Consider how much

money an hour of the life and the time of a man is worth; compare the

kindnesses of Madame d'Epinay with the sacrifice of my native country

and two years of serfdom; and then tell me whether the obligation is

greater on her side or mine." He then urges with a torrent of impetuous

eloquence the thoroughly sound reasons why it was unfair and absurd for

him, a beggar and an invalid, to make the journey with Madame d'Epinay,

rich and surrounded by attendants. He is particularly splenetic that the

philosopher Diderot, sitting in his own room before a good fire and

wrapped in a well-lined dressing-gown, should insist on his doing his

five and twenty leagues a day on foot, through the mud in winter.[310]

The whole letter shows, as so many incidents in his later life showed,

how difficult it was to do Rousseau a kindness with impunity, and how

little such friends as Madame d'Epinay possessed the art of soothing

this unfortunate nature. They fretted him by not leaving him

sufficiently free to follow his own changing moods, while he in turn

lost all self-control, and yielded in hours of bodily torment to angry

and resentful fancies. But let us hasten to an end. Grimm replied to his

eloquent manifesto somewhat drily, to the effect that he would think the

matter over, and that meanwhile Rousseau had best keep quiet in his

hermitage. Rousseau burning with excitement at once conceived a thousand

suspicions, wholly unable to understand that a cold and reserved German

might choose to deliberate at length, and finally give an answer with

brevity. "After centuries of expectation in the cruel uncertainty in

which this barbarous man had plunged me"--that is after eight or ten

days, the answer came, apparently not without a second direct

application for one.[311] It was short and extremely pointed, not

complaining that Rousseau had refused to accompany Madame d'Epinay but

protesting against the horrible tone of the apology which he had sent to

him for not accompanying her. "It has made me quiver with indignation;

so odious are the principles it contains, so full is it of blackness and

duplicity. You venture to talk to me of your slavery, to me who for more

than two years have been the daily witness of all the marks of the

tenderest and most generous friendship that you have received at the

hands of that woman. If I could pardon you, I should think myself

unworthy of having a single friend. I will never see you again while I

live, and I shall think myself happy if I can banish the recollection of

your conduct from my mind."[312] A flash of manly anger like this is

very welcome to us, who have to thread a tedious way between morbid

egoistic irritation on the one hand, and sly pieces of equivocal

complaisance on the other. The effect on Rousseau was terrific. In a

paroxysm he sent Grimm's letter back to him, with three or four lines in

the same key. He wrote note after note to Madame d'Houdetot, in

shrieks. "Have I a single friend left, man or woman? One word, only one

word, and I can live." A day or two later: "Think of the state I am in.

I can bear to be abandoned by all the world, but you! You who know me so

well! Great God! am I a scoundrel? a scoundrel, I!"[313] And so on,

raving. It was to no purpose that Madame d'Houdetot wrote him soothing

letters, praying him to calm himself, to find something to busy himself

with, to remain at peace with Madame d'Epinay, "who had never appeared

other than the most thoughtful and warm-hearted friend to him."[314] He

was almost ready to quarrel with Madame d'Houdetot herself because she

paid the postage of her letters, which he counted an affront to his

poverty.[315] To Madame d'Epinay he had written in the midst of his

tormenting uncertainty as to the answer which Grimm would make to his

letter. It was an ungainly assertion that she was playing a game of

tyranny and intrigue at his cost. For the first time she replied with

spirit and warmth. "Your letter is hardly that of a man who, on the eve

of my departure, swore to me that he could never in his life repair the

wrongs he had done me." She then tersely remarks that it is not natural

to pass one's life in suspecting and insulting one's friends, and that

he abuses her patience. To this he answered with still greater terseness

that friendship was extinct between them, and that he meant to leave the

Hermitage, but as his friends desired him to remain there until the

spring he would with her permission follow their counsel. Then she, with

a final thrust of impatience, in which we perhaps see the hand of Grimm:

"Since you meant to leave the Hermitage, and felt you ought to do so, I

am astonished that your friends could detain you. For me, I don't

consult mine as to my duties, and I have nothing more to say to you as

to yours." This was the end. Rousseau returned for a moment from ignoble

petulance to dignity and self-respect. He wrote to her that if it is a

misfortune to make a mistake in the choice of friends, it is one not

less cruel to awake from so sweet an error, and two days before he

wrote, he left her house. He found a cottage at Montmorency, and

thither, nerved with fury, through snow and ice he carried his scanty

household goods (Dec. 15, 1757).[316]

We have a picture of him in this fatal month. Diderot went to pay him a

visit (Dec. 5). Rousseau was alone at the bottom of his garden. As soon

as he saw Diderot, he cried in a voice of thunder and with his eyes all

aflame: "What have you come here for?" "I want to know whether you are

mad or malicious." "You have known me for fifteen years; you are well

aware how little malicious I am, and I will prove to you that I am not

mad: follow me." He then drew Diderot into a room, and proceeded to

clear himself, by means of letters, of the charge of trying to make a

breach between Saint Lambert and Madame d'Houdetot. They were in fact

letters that convicted him, as we know, of trying to persuade Madame

d'Houdetot of the criminality of her relations with her lover, and at

the same time to accept himself in the very same relation. Of all this

we have heard more than enough already. He was stubborn in the face of

Diderot's remonstrance, and the latter left him in a state which he

described in a letter to Grimm the same night. "I throw myself into your

arms, like one who has had a shock of fright: that man intrudes into my

work; he fills me with trouble, and I am as if I had a damned soul at my

side. May I never see him again; he would make me believe in devils and

hell."[317] And thus the unhappy man who had began this episode in his

life with confident ecstasy in the glories and clear music of spring,

ended it looking out from a narrow chamber upon the sullen crimson of

the wintry twilight and over fields silent in snow, with the haggard

desperate gaze of a lost spirit.
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CHAPTER VIII.

MUSIC.

Simplification has already been used by us as the key-word to Rousseau's

aims and influence. The scheme of musical notation with which he came to

try his fortune in Paris in 1741, his published vindication of it, and

his musical compositions afterwards all fall under this term. Each of

them was a plea for the extrication of the simple from the cumbrousness

of elaborated pedantry, and for a return to nature from the unmeaning

devices of false art. And all tended alike in the popular direction,

towards the extension of enjoyment among the common people, and the

glorification of their simple lives and moods, in the art designed for

the great.

The Village Soothsayer was one of the group of works which marked a

revolution in the history of French music, by putting an end to the

tyrannical tradition of Lulli and Rameau, and preparing the way through

a middle stage of freshness, simplicity, naturalism, up to the noble

severity of Gluck (1714-1787). This great composer, though a Bohemian by

birth, found his first appreciation in a public that had been trained

by the Italian pastoral operas, of which Rousseau's was one of the

earliest produced in France. GrÃ©tri, the Fleming (1741-1813), who had a

hearty admiration for Jean Jacques, and out of a sentiment of piety

lived for a time in his Hermitage, came in point of musical excellence

between the group of Rousseau, Philidor, Duni, and the rest, and Gluck.

"I have not produced exaltation in people's heads by tragical

superlative," GrÃ©tri said, "but I have revealed the accent of truth,

which I have impressed deeper in men's hearts."[318] These words express

sufficiently the kind of influence which Rousseau also had. Crude as the

music sounds to us who are accustomed to more sumptuous schools, we can

still hear in it the note which would strike a generation weary of

Rameau. It was the expression in one way of the same mood which in

another way revolted against paint, false hair, and preposterous costume

as of savages grown opulent. Such music seems without passion or

subtlety or depth or magnificence. Thus it had hardly any higher than a

negative merit, but it was the necessary preparation for the acceptance

of a more positive style, that should replace both the elaborate false

art of the older French composers and the too colourless realism of the

pastoral comic opera, by the austere loveliness and elevation of \_Orfeo\_

and \_Alceste\_.

In 1752 an Italian company visited Paris, and performed at the Opera a

number of pieces by Pergolese, and other composers of their country. A

violent war arose, which agitated Paris far more intensely than the

defeat of Rossbach and the loss of Canada did afterwards. The quarrel

between the Parliament and the Clergy was at its height. The Parliament

had just been exiled, and the gravest confusion threatened the State.

The operatic quarrel turned the excitement of the capital into another

channel. Things went so far that the censor was entreated to prohibit

the printing of any work containing the damnable doctrine and position

that Italian music is good. Rousseau took part enthusiastically with the

Italians.[319] His Letter on French Music (1753) proved to the great

fury of the people concerned, that the French had no national music, and

that it would be so much the worse for them if they ever had any. Their

language, so proper to be the organ of truth and reason, was radically

unfit either for poetry or music. All national music must derive its

principal characteristics from the language. Now if there is a language

in Europe fit for music, it is certainly the Italian, for it is sweet,

sonorous, harmonious, and more accentuated than any other, and these are

precisely the four qualities which adapt a language to singing. It is

sweet because the articulations are not composite, because the meeting

of consonants is both infrequent and soft, and because a great number of

the syllables being only formed of vowels, frequent elisions make its

pronunciation more flowing. It is sonorous because most of the vowels

are full, because it is without composite diphthongs, because it has

few or no nasal vowels. Again, the inversions of the Italian are far

more favourable to true melody than the didactic order of French. And so

onwards, with much close grappling of the matter. French melody does not

exist; it is only a sort of modulated plain-song which has nothing

agreeable in itself, which only pleases with the aid of a few capricious

ornaments, and then only pleases those who have agreed to find it

beautiful.[320]

The letter contains a variety of acute remarks upon music, and includes

a vigorous protest against fugues, imitations, double designs, and the

like. Scarcely any one succeeds in them, and success even when obtained

hardly rewards the labour. As for counterfugues, double fugues, and

"other difficult fooleries that the ear cannot endure nor the reason

justify," they are evidently relics of barbarism and bad taste which

only remain, like the porticoes of our gothic churches, to the disgrace

of those who had patience enough to construct them.[321] The last

phrase-and both Voltaire and Turgot used gothic architecture as the

symbol for the supreme of rudeness and barbarism--shows that even a man

who seems to run counter to the whole current of his time yet does not

escape its influence.

Grimm, after remarking on the singularity of a demonstration of the

impossibility of setting melody to French words on the part of a writer

who had just produced the Village Soothsayer, informs us that the letter

created a furious uproar, and set all Paris in a blaze. He had himself

taken the side of the Italians in an amusing piece of pleasantry, which

became a sort of classic model for similar facetiousness in other

controversies of the century. The French, as he said, forgive everything

in favour of what makes them laugh, but Rousseau talked reason and

demolished the pretensions of French music with great sounding strokes

as of an axe.[322] Rousseau expected to be assassinated, and gravely

assures us that there was a plot to that effect, as well as a design to

put him in the Bastille. This we may fairly surmise to have been a

fiction of his own imagination, and the only real punishment that

overtook him was the loss of his right to free admission to the Opera.

After what he had said of the intolerable horrors of French music, the

directors of the theatre can hardly be accused of vindictiveness in

releasing him from them.[323] Some twenty years after (1774), when Paris

was torn asunder by the violence of the two great factions of the

Gluckists and Piccinists, Rousseau retracted his opinion as to the

impossibility of wedding melody to French words.[324] He went as often

as he could to hear the works both of GrÃ©tri and Gluck, and \_Orfeo\_

delighted him, while the \_Fausse magie\_ of the former moved him to say

to the composer, "Your music stirs sweet sensations to which I thought

my heart had long been closed."[325] This being so, and life being as

brief as art is long, we need not further examine the controversy. It

may be worth adding that Rousseau wrote some of the articles on music

for the EncyclopÃ¦dia, and that in 1767 he published a not inconsiderable

Musical Dictionary of his own.

His scheme of a new musical notation and the principles on which he

defended it are worth attention, because some of the ideas are now

accepted as the base of a well-known and growing system of musical

instruction. The aim of the scheme, let us say to begin with, was at

once practical and popular; to reduce the difficulty of learning music

to the lowest possible point, and so to bring the most delightful of the

arts within the reach of the largest possible number of people. Hence,

although he maintains the fitness of his scheme for instrumental as well

as vocal performances, it is clearly the latter which he has most at

heart, evidently for the reason that this is the kind of music most

accessible to the thousands, and it was always the thousands of whom

Rousseau thought. This is the true distinction of music, it is for the

people; and the best musical notation is that which best enables persons

to sing at sight. The difficulty of the old notation had come

practically before him as a teacher. The quantity of details which the

pupil was forced to commit to memory before being able to sing from the

open book, struck him then as the chief obstacle to anything like

facility in performance, and without some of this facility he rightly

felt that music must remain a luxury for the few. So genuine was his

interest in the matter, that he was not very careful to fight for the

originality of his own scheme. Our present musical signs, he said, are

so imperfect and so inconvenient that it is no wonder that several

persons have tried to re-cast or amend them; nor is it any wonder that

some of them should have hit upon the same device in selecting the signs

most natural and proper, such as numerical figures. As much, however,

depends on the way of dealing with these figures, as with their

adoption, and here he submitted that his own plan was as novel as it was

advantageous.[326] Thus we have to bear in mind that Rousseau's scheme

was above all things a practical device, contrived for making the

teaching and the learning of musical elements an easier process.[327]

The chief element of the project consists in the substitution of a

relative series of notes or symbols in place of an absolute series. In

the common notation any given note, say the A of the treble clef, is

uniformly represented by the same symbol, namely, the position of second

space in the clef, whatever key it may belong to. Rousseau, insisting on

the varying quality impressed on any tone of a given pitch by the

key-note of the scale to which it belongs, protested against the same

name being given to the tone, however the quality of it might vary. Thus

Re or D, which is the second tone in the key of C, ought, according to

him, to have a different name when found as the fifth in the key of G,

and in every case the name should at once indicate the interval of a

tone from its key-note. His mode of effecting this change is as follows.

The names \_ut, re\_, and the rest, are kept for the fixed order of the

tones, C, D, E, and the rest. The key of a piece is shown by prefixing

one of these symbols, and this determines the absolute quality of the

melody as to pitch. That settled, every tone is expressed by a number

bearing a relation to the key-note. This tonic note is represented by

one, the other six tones of the scale are expressed by the numbers from

two to seven. In the popular Tonic Sol-Fa notation, which corresponds

so closely to Rousseau's in principle, the key-note is always styled Do,

and the other symbols, \_mi\_, \_la\_, and the rest, indicate at once the

relative position of these tones in their particular key or scale. Here

the old names were preserved as being easily sung; Rousseau selected

numbers because he supposed that they best expressed the generation of

the sounds.[328]

Rousseau attempted to find a theoretic base for this symbolic

establishment of the relational quality of tones, and he dimly guessed

that the order of the harmonics or upper tones of a given tonic would

furnish a principle for forming the familiar major scale,[329] but his

knowledge of the order was faulty. He was perhaps groping after the idea

by which Professor Helmholtz has accounted for the various mental

effects of the several intervals in a key--namely, the degree of natural

affinity, measured by means of the upper tones, existing between the

given tone and its tonic. Apart from this, however, the practical value

of his ideas in instruction in singing is clearly shown by the

circumstance that at any given time many thousands of young children are

now being taught to read melody in the Sol-Fa notation in a few weeks.

This shows how right Rousseau was in continually declaring the ease of

hitting a particular tone, when the relative position of the tone in

respect to the key-note is clearly manifested. A singer in trying to hit

the tone is compelled to measure the interval between it and the

preceding tone, and the simplest and easiest mode of doing this is to

associate every tone with the tonics, thus constituting it a term of a

relation with this fundamental tone.

Rousseau made a mistake when he supposed that his ideas were just as

applicable to instrumental as they were to vocal music. The requirements

of the singer are not those of the player. To a performer on the piano,

who has to light rapidly and simultaneously on a number of tones, or to

a violinist who has to leap through several octaves with great rapidity,

the most urgent need is that of a definite and fixed mark, by which the

absolute pitch of each successive tone may be at once recognised.

Neither of these has any time to think about the melodious relation of

the tones; it is quite as much as they can do to find their place on the

key-board or the string. Rousseau's scheme, or any similar one, fails to

supply the clear and obvious index to pitch supplied by the old system.

Old Rameau pointed this out to Rousseau when the scheme was laid before

him, and Rousseau admitted that the objection was decisive,[330] though

his admission was not practically deterrent.

His device for expressing change of octave by means of points would

render the rapid seizing of a particular tone by the performer still

more difficult, and it is strange that he should have preferred this to

the other plan suggested, of indicating height of octave by visible

place above or below a horizontal line. Again, his attempt to simplify

the many varieties of musical time by reducing them all to the two modes

of double and triple time, though laudable enough, yet implies an

imperfect recognition of the full meaning of time, by omitting all

reference to the distribution of accent and to the average time value of

the tones in a particular movement.
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CHAPTER IX.

VOLTAIRE AND D'ALEMBERT.

Everybody in the full tide of the eighteenth century had something to do

with Voltaire, from serious personages like Frederick the Great and

Turgot, down to the sorriest poetaster who sent his verses to be

corrected or bepraised. Rousseau's debt to him in the days of his

unformed youth we have already seen, as well as the courtesies with

which they approached one another, when Richelieu employed the

struggling musician to make some modifications in the great man's

unconsidered court-piece. Neither of them then dreamed that their two

names were destined to form the great literary antithesis of the

century. In the ten years that elapsed between their first interchange

of letters and their first fit of coldness, it must have been tolerably

clear to either of them, if either of them gave thought to the matter,

that their dissidence was increasing and likely to increase. Their

methods were different, their training different, their points of view

different, and above all these things, their temperaments were different

by a whole heaven's breadth.

A great number of excellent and pointed half-truths have been uttered

by various persons in illustration of all these contrasts. The

philosophy of Voltaire, for instance, is declared to be that of the

happy, while Rousseau is the philosopher of the unhappy. Voltaire steals

away their faith from those who doubt, while Rousseau strikes doubt into

the mind of the unbeliever. The gaiety of the one saddens, while the

sadness of the other consoles. If we pass from the marked divergence in

tendencies, which is imperfectly hinted at in such sayings as these, to

the divergence between them in all the fundamental conditions of

intellectual and moral life, then the variation which divided the

revolutionary stream into two channels, flowing broadly apart through

unlike regions and climates down to the great sea, is intelligible

enough. Voltaire was the arch-representative of all those elements in

contemporary thought, its curiosity, irreverence, intrepidity,

vivaciousness, rationality, to which, as we have so often had to say,

Rousseau's temperament and his Genevese spirit made him profoundly

antipathetic. Voltaire was the great high priest, robed in the dazzling

vestments of poetry and philosophy and history, of that very religion of

knowledge and art which Rousseau declared to be the destroyer of the

felicity of men. The glitter has faded away from Voltaire's philosophic

raiment since those days, and his laurel bough lies a little leafless.

Still this can never make us forget that he was in his day and

generation one of the sovereign emancipators, because he awoke one

dormant set of energies, just as Rousseau presently came to awake

another set. Each was a power, not merely by virtue of some singular

preeminence of understanding or mysterious unshared insight of his own,

but for a far deeper reason. No partial and one-sided direction can

permanently satisfy the manifold aspirations and faculties of the human

mind in the great average of common men, and it is the common average of

men to whom exceptional thinkers speak, whom they influence, and by whom

they are in turn influenced, depressed, or buoyed up, just as a painter

or a dramatist is affected. Voltaire's mental constitution made him

eagerly objective, a seeker of true things, quivering for action,

admirably sympathetic with all life and movement, a spirit restlessly

traversing the whole world. Rousseau, far different from this, saw in

himself a reflected microcosm of the outer world, and was content to

take that instead of the outer world, and as its truest version. He made

his own moods the premisses from which he deduced a system of life for

humanity, and so far as humanity has shared his moods or some parts of

them, his system was true, and has been accepted. To him the bustle of

the outer world was only a hindrance to that process of self-absorption

which was his way of interpreting life. Accessible only to interests of

emotion and sense, he was saved from intellectual sterility, and made

eloquent, by the vehemence of his emotion and the fire of his senses. He

was a master example of sensibility, as Voltaire was a master example

of clear-eyed penetration.

This must not be taken for a rigid piece of mutually exclusive division,

for the edges of character are not cut exactly sharp, as words are.

Especially when any type is intense, it seems to meet and touch its

opposite. Just as Voltaire's piercing activity and soundness of

intelligence made him one of the humanest of men, so Rousseau's

emotional susceptibility endowed him with the gift of a vision that

carried far into the social depths. It was a very early criticism on the

pair, that Voltaire wrote on more subjects, but that Rousseau was the

more profound. In truth one was hardly much more profound than the

other. Rousseau had the sonorousness of speech which popular confusion

of thought is apt to identify with depth. And he had seriousness. If

profundity means the quality of seeing to the heart of subjects,

Rousseau had in a general way rather less of it than the shrewd-witted

crusher of the Infamous. What the distinction really amounts to is that

Rousseau had a strong feeling for certain very important aspects of

human life, which Voltaire thought very little about, or never thought

about at all, and that while Voltaire was concerned with poetry,

history, literature, and the more ridiculous parts of the religious

superstition of his time, Rousseau thought about social justice and duty

and God and the spiritual consciousness of men, with a certain attempt

at thoroughness and system. As for the substance of his thinking, as we

have already seen in the Discourses, and shall soon have an opportunity

of seeing still more clearly, it was often as thin and hollow as if he

had belonged to the company of the epigrammatical, who, after all, have

far less of a monopoly of shallow thinking than is often supposed. The

prime merit of Rousseau, in comparing him with the brilliant chief of

the rationalistic school of the time, is his reverence; reverence for

moral worth in however obscure intellectual company, for the dignity of

human character and the loftiness of duty, for some of those cravings of

the human mind after the divine and incommensurable, which may indeed

often be content with solutions proved by long time and slow experience

to be inadequate, but which are closely bound up with the highest

elements of nobleness of soul.

It was this spiritual part of him which made Rousseau a third great

power in the century, between the EncyclopÃ¦dic party and the Church. He

recognised a something in men, which the EncyclopÃ¦dists treated as a

chimera imposed on the imagination by theologians and others for their

own purposes. And he recognised this in a way which did not offend the

rational feeling of the times, as the Catholic dogmas offended it. In a

word he was religious. In being so, he separated himself from Voltaire

and his school, who did passably well without religion. Again, he was a

puritan. In being this, he was cut off from the intellectually and

morally unreformed church, which was then the organ of religion in

France. Nor is this all. It was Rousseau, and not the feeble

controversialists put up from time to time by the Jesuits and other

ecclesiastical bodies, who proved the effective champion of religion,

and the only power who could make head against the triumphant onslaught

of the Voltaireans. He gave up Christian dogmas and mysteries, and,

throwing himself with irresistible ardour upon the emotions in which all

religions have their root and their power, he breathed new life into

them, he quickened in men a strong desire to have them satisfied, and he

beat back the army of emancipators with the loud and incessantly

repeated cry that they were not come to deliver the human mind, but to

root out all its most glorious and consolatory attributes. This immense

achievement accomplished,--the great framework of a faith in God and

immortality and providential government of the world thus preserved, it

was an easy thing by and by for the churchmen to come back, and once

more unpack and restore to their old places the temporarily discredited

paraphernalia of dogma and mystery. How far all this was good or bad for

the mental elevation of France and Europe, we shall have a better

opportunity of considering presently.

We have now only to glance at the first skirmishes between the religious

reactionist, on the one side, and, on the other, the leader of the

school who believed that men are better employed in thinking as

accurately, and knowing as widely, and living as humanely, as all those

difficult processes are possible, than in wearying themselves in futile

search after gods who dwell on inaccessible heights.

\* \* \* \* \*

Voltaire had acknowledged Rousseau's gift of the second Discourse with

his usual shrewd pleasantry: "I have received your new book against the

human race, and thank you for it. Never was such cleverness used in the

design of making us all stupid. One longs in reading your book to walk

on all fours. But as I have lost that habit for more than sixty years, I

feel unhappily the impossibility of resuming it. Nor can I embark in

search of the savages of Canada, because the maladies to which I am

condemned render a European surgeon necessary to me; because war is

going on in those regions; and because the example of our actions has

made the savages nearly as bad as ourselves. So I content myself with

being a very peaceable savage in the solitude which I have chosen near

your native place, where you ought to be too." After an extremely

inadequate discussion of one or two points in the essay,[331] he

concludes:--"I am informed that your health is bad; you ought to come to

set it up again in your native air, to enjoy freedom, to drink with me

the milk of our cows and browse our grass."[332] Rousseau replied to all

this in a friendly way, recognising Voltaire as his chief, and actually

at the very moment when he tells us that the corrupting presence of the

arrogant and seductive man at Geneva helped to make the idea of

returning to Geneva odious to him, hailing him in such terms as

these:--"Sensible of the honour you do my country, I share the gratitude

of my fellow-citizens, and hope that it will increase when they have

profited by the lessons that you of all men are able to give them.

Embellish the asylum you have chosen; enlighten a people worthy of your

instruction; and do you who know so well how to paint virtue and

freedom, teach us to cherish them in our walls."[333]

Within a year, however, the bright sky became a little clouded. In 1756

Voltaire published one of the most sincere, energetic, and passionate

pieces to be found in the whole literature of the eighteenth century,

his poem on the great earthquake of Lisbon (November 1755). No such word

had been heard in Europe since the terrible images in which Pascal had

figured the doom of man. It was the reaction of one who had begun life

by refuting Pascal with doctrines of cheerfulness drawn from the

optimism of Pope and Leibnitz, who had done Pope's Essay on Man

(1732-34) into French verse as late as 1751,[334] and whose imagination,

already sombred by the triumphant cruelty and superstition which raged

around him, was suddenly struck with horror by a catastrophe which, in a

world where whatever is is best, destroyed hundreds of human creatures

in the smoking ashes and engulfed wreck of their city. How, he cried,

can you persist in talking of the deliberate will of a free and

benevolent God, whose eternal laws necessitated such an appalling climax

of misery and injustice as this? Was the disaster retributive? If so,

why is Lisbon in ashes, while Paris dances? The enigma is desperate and

inscrutable, and the optimist lives in the paradise of the fool. We ask

in vain what we are, where we are, whither we go, whence we came. We are

tormented atoms on a clod of earth, whom death at last swallows up, and

with whom destiny meanwhile makes cruel sport. The past is only a

disheartening memory, and if the tomb destroys the thinking creature,

how frightful is the present!

Whatever else we may say of Voltaire's poem, it was at least the first

sign of the coming reaction of sympathetic imagination against the

polished common sense of the great Queen Anne school, which had for more

than a quarter of a century such influence in Europe.[335] It is a

little odd that Voltaire, the most brilliant and versatile branch of

this stock, should have broken so energetically away from it, and that

he should have done so, shows how open and how strong was the feeling in

him for reality and actual circumstance.

Rousseau was amazed that a man overwhelmed as Voltaire was with

prosperity and glory, should declaim against the miseries of this life

and pronounce that all is evil and vanity. "Voltaire in seeming always

to believe in God, never really believed in anybody but the devil, since

his pretended God is a maleficent being who according to him finds all

his pleasure in working mischief. The absurdity of this doctrine is

especially revolting in a man crowned with good things of every sort,

and who from the midst of his own happiness tries to fill his

fellow-creatures with despair, by the cruel and terrible image of the

serious calamities from which he is himself free."[336]

As if any doctrine could be more revolting than this which Rousseau so

quietly takes for granted, that if it is well with me and I am free from

calamities, then there must needs be a beneficent ruler of the universe,

and the calamities of all the rest of the world, if by chance they catch

the fortunate man's eye, count for nothing in our estimate of the method

of the supposed divine government. It is hard to imagine a more

execrable emotion than the complacent religiosity of the prosperous.

Voltaire is more admirable in nothing than in the ardent humanity and

far-spreading lively sympathy with which he interested himself in all

the world's fortunes, and felt the catastrophe of Lisbon as profoundly

as if the Geneva at his gates had been destroyed. He relished his own

prosperity keenly enough, but his prosperity became ashes in his mouth

when he heard of distress or wrong, and he did not rest until he had

moved heaven and earth to soothe the distress and repair the wrong. It

was his impatience in the face of the evils of the time which wrung from

him this desperate cry, and it is precisely because these evils did not

touch him in his own person, that he merits the greater honour for the

surpassing energy and sincerity of his feeling for them.

Rousseau, however, whose biographer has no such stories to tell as those

of Calas and La Barre, Sirven and Lally, but only tales of a maiden

wrongfully accused of theft, and a friend left senseless on the pavement

of a strange town, and a benefactress abandoned to the cruelty of her

fate, still was moved in the midst of his erotic visions in the forest

of Montmorency to speak a jealous word in vindication of the divine

government of our world. For him at any rate life was then warm and the

day bright and the earth very fair, and he lauded his gods accordingly.

It was his very sensuousness, as we are so often saying, that made him

religious. The optimism which Voltaire wished to destroy was to him a

sovereign element of comfort. "Pope's poem," he says, "softens my

misfortunes and inclines me to patience, while yours sharpens all my

pains, excites me to murmuring, and reduces me to despair. Pope and

Leibnitz exhort me to resignation by declaring calamities to be a

necessary effect of the nature and constitution of the universe. You

cry, Suffer for ever, unhappy wretch; if there be a God who created

thee, he could have stayed thy pains if he would: hope for no end to

them, for there is no reason to be discerned for thy existence, except

to suffer and to perish."[337] Rousseau then proceeds to argue the

matter, but he says nothing really to the point which Pope had not said

before, and said far more effectively. He begins, however, originally

enough by a triumphant reference to his own great theme of the

superiority of the natural over the civil state. Moral evil is our own

work, the result of our liberty; so are most of our physical evils,

except death, and that is mostly an evil only from the preparations that

we make for it. Take the case of Lisbon. Was it nature who collected the

twenty thousand houses, all seven stories high? If the people of Lisbon

had been dispersed over the face of the country, as wild tribes are,

they would have fled at the first shock, and they would have been seen

the next day twenty leagues away, as gay as if nothing had happened. And

how many of them perished in the attempt to rescue clothes or papers or

money? Is it not true that the person of a man is now, thanks to

civilisation, the least part of himself, and is hardly worth saving

after loss of the rest? Again, there are some events which lose much of

their horror when we look at them closely. A premature death is not

always a real evil and may be a relative good; of the people crushed to

death under the ruins of Lisbon, many no doubt thus escaped still worse

calamities. And is it worse to be killed swiftly than to await death in

prolonged anguish?[338]

The good of the whole is to be sought before the good of the part.

Although the whole material universe ought not to be dearer to its

Creator than a single thinking and feeling being, yet the system of the

universe which produces, preserves, and perpetuates all thinking and

feeling beings, ought to be dearer to him than any one of them, and he

may, notwithstanding his goodness, or rather by reason of his goodness,

sacrifice something of the happiness of individuals to the preservation

of the whole. "That the dead body of a man should feed worms or wolves

or plants is not, I admit, a compensation for the death of such a man;

but if in the system of this universe, it is necessary for the

preservation of the human race that there should be a circulation of

substance between men, animals, vegetables, then the particular mishap

of an individual contributes to the general good. I die, I am eaten by

worms; but my children, my brothers, will live as I have lived; my body

enriches the earth of which they will consume the fruits; and so I do,

by the order of nature and for all men, what Codrus, Curtius, the Decii,

and a thousand others, did of their own free will for a small part of

men." (p. 305.)

All this is no doubt very well said, and we are bound to accept it as

true doctrine. Although, however, it may make resignation easier by

explaining the nature of evil, it does not touch the point of Voltaire's

outburst, which is that evil exists, and exists in shapes which it is a

mere mockery to associate with the omnipotence of a benevolent

controller of the world's forces. According to Rousseau, if we go to the

root of what he means, there is no such thing as evil, though much that

to our narrow and impatient sight has the look of it. This may be true

if we use that fatal word in an arbitrary and unreal sense, for the

avoidable, the consequent without antecedent, or antecedent without

consequent. If we consent to talk in this way, and only are careful to

define terms so that there is no doubt as to their meaning, it is hardly

deniable that evil is a mere word and not a reality, and whatever is is

indeed right and best, because no better is within our reach. Voltaire,

however, like the man of sense that he was, exclaimed that at any rate

relatively to us poor creatures the existence of pain, suffering, waste,

whether caused or uncaused, whether in accordance with stern immutable

law or mere divine caprice, is a most indisputable reality: from our

point of view it is a cruel puerility to cry out at every calamity and

every iniquity that all is well in the best of possible worlds, and to

sing hymns of praise and glory to the goodness and mercy of a being of

supreme might, who planted us in this evil state and keeps us in it.

Voltaire's is no perfect philosophy; indeed it is not a philosophy at

all, but a passionate ejaculation; but it is perfect in comparison with

a cut and dried system like this of Rousseau's, which rests on a mocking

juggle with phrases, and the substitution by dexterous sleight of hand

of one definition for another.

Rousseau really gives up the battle, by confessing frankly that the

matter is beyond the light of reason, and that, "if the theist only

founds his sentiment on probabilities, the atheist with still less

precision only founds his on the alternative possibilities." The

objections on both sides are insoluble, because they turn on things of

which men can have no veritable idea; "yet I believe in God as strongly

as I believe any other truth, because believing and not believing are

the last things in the world that depend on me." So be it. But why take

the trouble to argue in favour of one side of an avowedly insoluble

question? It was precisely because he felt that the objections on both

sides cannot be answered, that Voltaire, hastily or not, cried out that

he faced the horrors of such a catastrophe as the Lisbon earthquake

without a glimpse of consolation. The upshot of Rousseau's remonstrance

only amounted to this, that he could not furnish one with any

consolation out of the armoury of reason, that he himself found this

consolation, but in a way that did not at all depend upon his own effort

or will, and was therefore as incommunicable as the advantage of having

a large appetite or being six feet high. The reader of Rousseau becomes

accustomed to this way of dealing with subjects of discussion. We see

him using his reason as adroitly as he knows how for three-fourths of

the debate, and then he suddenly flings himself back with a triumphant

kind of weariness into the buoyant waters of emotion and sentiment. "You

sir, who are a poet," once said Madame d'Epinay to Saint Lambert, "will

agree with me that the existence of a Being, eternal, all powerful, and

of sovereign intelligence, is at any rate the germ of the finest

enthusiasm."[339] To take this position and cleave to it may be very

well, but why spoil its dignity and repose by an unmeaning and

superfluous flourish of the weapons of the reasoner?

With the same hasty change of direction Rousseau says the true question

is not whether each of us suffers or not, but whether it is good that

the universe should be, and whether our misfortunes were inevitable in

its constitution. Then within a dozen lines he admits that there can be

no direct proof either way; we must content ourselves with settling it

by means of inference from the perfections of God. Of course, it is

clear that in the first place what Rousseau calls the true question

consists of two quite distinct questions. Is the universe in its present

ordering on the whole good relatively either to men, or to all sentient

creatures? Next was evil an inevitable element in that ordering? Second,

this way of putting it does not in the least advance the case against

Voltaire, who insisted that no fine phrases ought to hide from us the

dreadful power and crushing reality of evil and the desolate plight in

which we are left. This is no exhaustive thought, but a deep cry of

anguish at the dark lot of men, and of just indignation against the

philosophy which to creatures asking for bread gave the brightly

polished stone of sentimental theism. Rousseau urged that Voltaire

robbed men of their only solace. What Voltaire really did urge was that

the solace derived from the attribution of humanity and justice to the

Supreme Being, and from the metaphysical account of evil, rests on too

narrow a base either to cover the facts, or to be a true solace to any

man who thinks and observes. He ought to have gone on, if it had only

been possible in those times, to persuade his readers that there is no

solace attainable, except that of an energetic fortitude, and that we do

best to go into life not in a softly lined silken robe, but with a sharp

sword and armour thrice tempered. As between himself and Rousseau, he

saw much the more keenly of the two, and this was because he approached

the matter from the side of the facts, while the latter approached it

from the side of his own mental comfort and the preconceptions

involved in it.

The most curious part of this curious letter is the conclusion, where

Rousseau, loosely wandering from his theme, separates Voltaire from the

philosopher, and beseeches him to draw up a moral code or profession of

civil faith that should contain positively the social maxims that

everybody should be bound to admit, and negatively the intolerant maxims

that everybody should be forced to reject as seditious. Every religion

in accord with the code should be allowed, and every religion out of

accord with it proscribed, or a man might be free to have no other

religion but the code itself.

Voltaire was much too clear-headed a person to take any notice of

nonsense like this. Rousseau's letter remained unanswered, nor is there

any reason to suppose that Voltaire ever got through it, though Rousseau

chose to think that \_Candide\_ (1759) was meant for a reply to him.[340]

He is careful to tell us that he never read that incomparable satire,

for which one would be disposed to pity any one except Rousseau, whose

appreciation of wit, if not of humour also, was probably more deficient

than in any man who ever lived, either in Geneva or any other country

fashioned after Genevan guise. Rousseau's next letter to Voltaire was

four years later, and by that time the alienation which had no

definitely avowed cause, and can be marked by no special date, had

become complete. "I hate you, in fact," he concluded, "since you have so

willed it; but I hate you like a man still worthier to have loved you,

if you had willed it. Of all the sentiments with which my heart was full

towards you, there only remains the admiration that we cannot refuse to

your fine genius, and love for your writings. If there is nothing in you

which I can honour but your talents, that is no fault of mine."[341] We

know that Voltaire did not take reproach with serenity, and he behaved

with bitter violence towards Rousseau in circumstances when silence

would have been both more magnanimous and more humane. Rousseau

occasionally, though not very often, retaliated in the same vein.[342]

On the whole his judgment of Voltaire, when calmly given, was not meant

to be unkind. "Voltaire's first impulse," he said, "is to be good; it is

reflection that makes him bad."[343] Tronchin had said in the same way

that Voltaire's heart was the dupe of his understanding. Rousseau is

always trying to like him, he always recognises him as the first man of

the time, and he subscribed his mite for the erection of a statue to

him. It was the satire and mockery in Voltaire which irritated Rousseau

more than the doctrines or denial of doctrine which they cloaked; in his

eyes sarcasm was always the veritable dialect of the evil power. It says

something for the sincerity of his efforts after equitable judgment,

that he should have had the patience to discern some of the fundamental

merit of the most remorseless and effective mocker that ever made

superstition look mean, and its doctors ridiculous.

II.

Voltaire was indirectly connected with Rousseau's energetic attack upon

another great EncyclopÃ¦dist leader, the famous Letter to D'Alembert on

Stage Plays. "There," Rousseau said afterwards, "is my favourite book,

my Benjamin, because I produced it without effort, at the first

inspiration, and in the most lucid moments of my life."[344] Voltaire,

who to us figures so little as a poet and dramatist, was to himself and

to his contemporaries of this date a poet and dramatist before all else,

the author of \_ZaÃ¯re\_ and \_Mahomet\_, rather than of \_Candide\_ and the

\_Philosophical Dictionary\_. D'Alembert was Voltaire's staunchest

henchman. He only wrote his article on Geneva for the EncyclopÃ¦dia to

gratify the master. Fresh from a visit to him when he composed it, he

took occasion to regret that the austerity of the tradition of the city

deprived it of the manifold advantages of a theatre. This suggestion had

its origin partly in a desire to promote something that would please the

eager vanity of the dramatist whom Geneva now had for so close a

neighbour, and who had just set her the example by setting up a theatre

of his own; and partly, also, because it gave the writer an opportunity

of denouncing the intolerant rigour with which the church nearer home

treated the stage and all who appeared on it. Geneva was to set an

example that could not be resisted, and France would no longer see

actors on the one hand pensioned by the government, and on the other an

object of anathema, excommunicated by priests and regarded with contempt

by citizens.[345]

The inveterate hostility of the church to the theatre was manifested by

the French ecclesiastics in the full eighteenth century as bitterly as

ever. The circumstance that Voltaire was the great play-writer of the

time would not tend to soften their traditional prejudice, and the

persecution of players by priests was in some sense an episode of the

war between the priest and the philosophers. The latter took up the

cause of the stage partly because they hoped to make the drama an

effective rival to the teaching of pulpit and confessional, partly from

their natural sympathy with an elevated form of intellectual

manifestation, and partly from their abhorrence of the practical

inhumanity with which the officers of the church treated stage

performers. While people of quality eagerly sought the society of those

who furnished them as much diversion in private as in public, the church

refused to all players the marriage blessing; when an actor or actress

wished to marry, they were obliged to renounce the stage, and the

Archbishop of Paris diligently resisted evasion or subterfuge.[346] The

atrocities connected with the refusal of burial, as well in the case of

players as of philosophers, are known to all readers in a dozen

illustrious instances, from MoliÃ¨re and Adrienne Lecouvreur downwards.

Here, as along the whole line of the battle between new light and old

prejudice, Rousseau took part, if not with the church, at least against

its adversaries. His point of view was at bottom truly puritanical.

Jeremy Collier in his \_Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of

the English Stage\_ (1698) takes up quite a different position. This once

famous piece was not a treatment of the general question, but an attack

on certain specific qualities of the plays of his time--their indecency

of phrase, their oaths, their abuse of the clergy, the gross libertinism

of the characters. One can hardly deny that this was richly deserved by

the English drama of the Restoration, and Collier's strictures were not

applicable, nor meant to apply, either to the ancients, for he has a

good word even for Aristophanes, or to the French drama. Bossuet's

loftier denunciation, like Rousseau's, was puritanical, and it extended

to the whole body of stage plays. He objected to the drama as a school

of concupiscence, as a subtle or gross debaucher of the gravity and

purity of the understanding, as essentially a charmer of the senses, and

therefore the most equivocal and untrustworthy of teachers. He appeals

to the fathers, to Scripture, to Plato, and even to Christ, who cried,

\_Woe unto you that laugh\_.[347] There is a fine austerity about

Bossuet's energetic criticism; it is so free from breathless eagerness,

and so severe without being thinly bitter. The churchmen of a generation

or two later had fallen from this height into gloomy peevishness.

Rousseau's letter on the theatre, it need hardly be said, is meant to be

an appeal to the common sense and judgment of his readers, and not

conceived in the ecclesiastical tone of unctuous anathema and fulgurant

menace. It is no bishop's pastoral, replete with solecisms of thought

and idiom, but a piece of firm dialectic in real matter. His position is

this: that the moral effect of the stage can never be salutary in

itself, while it may easily be extremely pernicious, and that the habit

of frequenting the theatre, the taste for imitating the style of the

actors, the cost in money, the waste in time, and all the other

accessory conditions, apart from the morality of the matter represented,

are bad things in themselves, absolutely and in every circumstance.

Secondly, these effects in all kinds are specially bad in relation to

the social condition and habits of Geneva.[348] The first part of the

discussion is an ingenious answer to some of the now trite pleas for

the morality of the drama, such as that tragedy leads to pity through

terror, that comedy corrects men while amusing them, that both make

virtue attractive and vice hateful.[349] Rousseau insists with abundance

of acutely chosen illustration that the pity that is awaked by tragedy

is a fleeting emotion which subsides when the curtain falls; that comedy

as often as not amuses men at the expense of old age, uncouth virtue,

paternal carefulness, and other objects which we should be taught rather

to revere than to ridicule; and that both tragedy and comedy, instead of

making vice hateful, constantly win our sympathy for it. Is not the

French stage, he asks, as much the triumph of great villains, like

Catilina, Mahomet, Atreus, as of illustrious heroes?

This rude handling of accepted commonplace is always one of the most

interesting features in Rousseau's polemic. It was of course a

characteristic of the eighteenth century always to take up the ethical

and high prudential view of whatever had to be justified, and Rousseau

seems from this point to have been successful in demolishing arguments

which might hold of Greek tragedy at its best, but which certainly do

not hold of any other dramatic forms. The childishness of the old

criticism which attaches the label of some moral from the copybook to

each piece, as its lesson and point of moral aim, is evident. In

repudiating this Rousseau was certainly right.[350] Both the assailants

and the defenders of the stage, however, commit the double error, first

of supposing that the drama is always the same thing, from the Agamemnon

down to the last triviality of a London theatre, and next of pitching

the discussion in too high a key, as if the effect or object of a stage

play in the modern era, where grave sentiment clothes itself in other

forms, were substantially anything more serious than an evening's

amusement. Apart from this, and in so far as the discussion is confined

to the highest dramatic expression, the true answer to Rousseau is now a

very plain one. The drama does not work in the sphere of direct

morality, though like everything else in the world it has a moral or

immoral aspect. It is an art of ideal presentation, not concerned with

the inculcation of immediate practical lessons, but producing a stir in

all our sympathetic emotions, quickening the imagination, and so

communicating a wider life to the character of the spectator. This is

what the drama in the hands of a worthy master does; it is just what

noble composition in music does, and there is no more directly

moralising effect in the one than in the other. You must trust to the

sum of other agencies to guide the interest and sympathy thus quickened

into channels of right action. Rousseau, like most other

controversialists, makes an attack of which the force rests on the

assumption that the special object of the attack is the single

influencing element and the one decisive instrument in making men had or

good. What he says about the drama would only be true if the public went

to the play all day long, and were accessible to no other moral force

whatever, modifying and counteracting such lessons as they might learn

at the theatre. He failed here as in the wider controversy on the

sciences and arts, to consider the particular subject of discussion in

relation to the whole of the general medium in which character moves,

and by whose manifold action and reaction it is incessantly affected and

variously shaped.

So when he passed on from the theory of dramatic morality to the matter

which he had more at heart, namely, the practical effects of introducing

the drama into Geneva, he keeps out of sight all the qualities in the

Genevese citizen which would protect him against the evil influence of

the stage, though it is his anxiety for the preservation of these very

qualities that gives all its fire to his eloquence. If the citizen

really was what Rousseau insisted that he was, then his virtues would

surely neutralise the evil of the drama; if not, the drama would do him

no harm. We need not examine the considerations in which Rousseau

pointed out the special reasons against introducing a theatre into his

native town. It would draw the artisans away from their work, cause

wasteful expenditure of money in amusements, break up the harmless and

inexpensive little clubs of men and the social gatherings of women. The

town was not populous enough to support a theatre, therefore the

government would have to provide one, and this would mean increased

taxation. All this was the secondary and merely colourable support by

argumentation, of a position that had been reached and was really held

by sentiment. Rousseau hated the introduction of French plays in the

same way that Cato hated the introduction of fine talkers from Greece.

It was an innovation, and so habitual was it with Rousseau to look on

all movement in the direction of what the French writers called taste

and cultivation as depraving, that he cannot help taking for granted

that any change in manners associated with taste must necessarily be a

change for the worse. Thus the Letter to D'Alembert was essentially a

supplement to the first Discourse; it was an application of its

principles to a practical case. It was part of his general reactionary

protest against philosophers, poets, men of letters, and all their

works, without particular apprehension on the side of the drama. Hence

its reasoning is much less interesting than its panegyric on the

simplicity, robust courage, and manliness of the Genevese, and its

invective against the effeminacy and frivolity of the Parisian. One of

the most significant episodes in the discussion is the lengthy criticism

on the immortal Misanthrope of MoliÃ¨re. Rousseau admits it for the

masterpiece of the comic muse, though with characteristic perversity he

insists that the hero is not misanthropic enough, nor truly misanthropic

at all, because he flies into rage at small things affecting himself,

instead of at the large follies of the race. Again, he says that MoliÃ¨re

makes Alceste ridiculous, virtuous as he is, in order to win the

applause of the pit. It is for the character of Philinte, however, that

Rousseau reserves all his spleen. He takes care to describe him in terms

which exactly hit Rousseau's own conception of his philosophic enemies,

who find all going well because they have no interest in anything going

better; who are content with everybody, because they do not care for

anybody; who round a full table maintain that it is not true that the

people are hungry. As criticism, one cannot value this kind of analysis.

D'Alembert replied with a much more rational interpretation of the great

comedy, but finding himself seized with the critic's besetting

impertinence of improving masterpieces, he suddenly stopped with the

becoming reflection--"But I perceive, sir, that I am giving lessons to

MoliÃ¨re."[351]

The constant thought of Paris gave Rousseau an admirable occasion of

painting two pictures in violent contrast, each as over-coloured as the

other by his mixed conceptions of the Plutarchian antique and imaginary

pastoral. We forget the depravation of the stage and the ill living of

comedians in magnificent descriptions of the manly exercises and

cheerful festivities of the free people on the shores of the Lake of

Geneva, and in scornful satire on the Parisian seraglios, where some

woman assembles a number of men who are more like women than their

entertainers. We see on the one side the rude sons of the republic,

boxing, wrestling, running, in generous emulation, and on the other the

coxcombs of cultivated Paris imprisoned in a drawing-room, "rising up,

sitting down, incessantly going and coming to the fire-place, to the

window, taking up a screen and putting it down again a hundred times,

turning over books, flitting from picture to picture, turning and

pirouetting about the room, while the idol stretched motionless on a

couch all the time is only alive in her tongue and eyes" (p. 161). If

the rough patriots of the Lake are less polished in speech, they are all

the weightier in reason; they do not escape by a pleasantry or a

compliment; each feeling himself attacked by all the forces of his

adversary, he is obliged to employ all his own to defend himself, and

this is how a mind acquires strength and precision. There may be here

and there a licentious phrase, but there is no ground for alarm in that.

It is not the least rude who are always the most pure, and even a rather

clownish speech is better than that artificial style in which the two

sexes seduce one another, and familiarise themselves decently with vice.

'Tis true our Swiss drinks too much, but after all let us not calumniate

even vice; as a rule drinkers are cordial and frank, good, upright,

just, loyal, brave, and worthy folk. Wherever people have most

abhorrence of drunkenness, be sure they have most reason to fear lest

its indiscretion should betray intrigue and treachery. In Switzerland it

is almost thought well of, while at Naples they hold it in horror; but

at bottom which is the more to be dreaded, the intemperance of the Swiss

or the reserve of the Italian? It is hardly surprising to learn that the

people of Geneva were as little gratified by this well-meant panegyric

on their jollity as they had been by another writer's friendly eulogy on

their Socinianism.[352]

The reader who was not moved to turn brute and walk on all fours by the

pictures of the state of nature in the Discourses, may find it more

difficult to resist the charm of the brotherly festivities and simple

pastimes which in the Letter to D'Alembert the patriot holds up to the

admiration of his countrymen and the envy of foreigners. The writer is

in Sparta, but he tempers his Sparta with a something from Charmettes.

Never before was there so attractive a combination of martial austerity

with the grace of the idyll. And the interest of these pictures is much

more than literary; it is historic also. They were the original version

of those great gatherings in the Champ de Mars and strange suppers of

fraternity during the progress of the Revolution in Paris, which have

amused the cynical ever since, but which pointed to a not unworthy

aspiration. The fine gentlemen whom Rousseau did so well to despise had

then all fled, and the common people under Rousseauite leaders were

doing the best they could to realise on the banks of the Seine the

imaginary joymaking and simple fellowship which had been first dreamed

of for the banks of Lake Leman, and commended with an eloquence that

struck new chords in minds satiated or untouched by the brilliance of

mere literature. There was no real state of things in Geneva

corresponding to the gracious picture which Rousseau so generously

painted, and some of the citizens complained that his account of their

social joys was as little deserved as his ingenious vindication of their

hearty feeling for barrel or bottle was little founded.[353]

The glorification of love of country did little for the Genevese for

whom it was meant, but it penetrated many a soul in the greater nation

that lay sunk in helpless indifference to its own ruin. Nowhere else

among the writers who are the glory of France at this time, is any

serious eulogy of patriotism. Rousseau glows with it, and though he

always speaks in connection with Geneva, yet there is in his words a

generous breadth and fire which gave them an irresistible

contagiousness. There are many passages of this fine persuasive force in

the Letter to D'Alembert; perhaps this, referring to the citizens of

Geneva who had gone elsewhere in search of fortune, is as good as

another. Do you think that the opening of a theatre, he asks, will bring

them back to their mother city? No; "each of them must feel that he can

never find anywhere else what he has left behind in his own land; an

invincible charm must call him back to the spot that he ought never to

have quitted; the recollection of their first exercises, their first

pleasures, their first sights, must remain deeply graven in their

hearts; the soft impressions made in the days of their youth must abide

and grow stronger with advancing years, while a thousand others wax dim;

in the midst of the pomp of great cities and all their cheerless

magnificence, a secret voice must for ever cry in the depth of the

wanderer's soul, Ah, where are the games and holidays of my youth? Where

is the concord of the townsmen, where the public brotherhood? Where is

pure joy and true mirth? Where are peace, freedom, equity? Let us hasten

to seek all these. With the heart of a Genevese, with a city as smiling,

a landscape as full of delight, a government as just, with pleasures so

true and so pure, and all that is needed to be able to relish them, how

is it that we do not all adore our birth-land? It was thus in old times

that by modest feasts and homely games her citizens were called back by

that Sparta which I can never quote often enough as an example for us;

thus in Athens in the midst of fine art, thus in Susa in the very bosom

of luxury and soft delights, the wearied Spartan sighed after his coarse

pastimes and exhausting exercises" (p. 211).[354]

Any reference to this powerfully written, though most sophistical

piece, would be imperfect which should omit its slightly virulent

onslaught upon women and the passion which women inspire. The modern

drama, he said, being too feeble to rise to high themes, has fallen back

on love; and on this hint he proceeds to a censure of love as a poetic

theme, and a bitter estimate of women as companions for men, which might

have pleased Calvin or Knox in his sternest mood. The same eloquence

which showed men the superior delights of the state of nature, now shows

the superior fitness of the oriental seclusion of women; it makes a

sympathetic reader tremble at the want of modesty, purity, and decency,

in the part which women are allowed to take by the infatuated men of a

modern community.

All this, again, is directed against "that philosophy of a day, which is

born and dies in the corner of a city, and would fain stifle the cry of

nature and the unanimous voice of the human race" (p. 131). The same

intrepid spirits who had brought reason to bear upon the current notions

of providence, inspiration, ecclesiastical tradition, and other

unlighted spots in the human mind, had perceived that the subjection of

women to a secondary place belonged to the same category, and could not

any more successfully be defended by reason. Instead of raging against

women for their boldness, their frivolousness, and the rest, as our

passionate sentimentalist did, the opposite school insisted that all

these evils were due to the folly of treating women with gallantry

instead of respect, and to the blindness of refusing an equally vigorous

and masculine education to those who must be the closest companions of

educated man. This was the view forced upon the most rational observers

of a society where women were so powerful, and so absolutely unfit by

want of intellectual training for the right use of social power.

D'Alembert expressed this view in a few pages of forcible pleading in

his reply to Rousseau,[355] and some thirty-two years later, when all

questions had become political (1790), Condorcet ably extended the same

line of argument so as to make it cover the claims of women to all the

rights of citizenship.[356] From the nature of the case, however, it is

impossible to confute by reason a man who denies that the matter in

dispute is within the decision and jurisdiction of reason, and who

supposes that his own opinion is placed out of the reach of attack when

he declares it to be the unanimous voice of the human race. We may

remember that the author of this philippic against love was at the very

moment brooding over the New HeloÃ¯sa, and was fresh from strange

transports at the feet of the Julie whom we know.

The Letter on the Stage was the definite mark of Rousseau's schism from

the philosophic congregation. Has Jean Jacques turned a father of the

church? asked Voltaire. Deserters who fight against their country ought

to be hung. The little flock are falling to devouring one another. This

arch-madman, who might have been something, if he would only have been

guided by his brethren of the EncyclopÃ¦dia, takes it into his head to

make a band of his own. He writes against the stage, after writing a bad

play of his own. He finds four or five rotten staves of Diogenes' tub,

and instals himself therein to bark at his friends.[357] D'Alembert was

more tolerant, but less clear-sighted. He insisted that the little flock

should do its best to heal divisions instead of widening them. Jean

Jacques, he said, "is a madman who is very clever, and who is only

clever when he is in a fever; it is best therefore neither to cure nor

to insult him."

Rousseau made the preface to the Letter on the Stage an occasion for a

proclamation of his final breach with Diderot. "I once," he said,

"possessed a severe and judicious Aristarchus; I have him no longer, and

wish for him no longer." To this he added in a footnote a passage from

Ecclesiasticus, to the effect that if you have drawn a sword on a friend

there still remains a way open, and if you have spoken cheerless words

to him concord is still possible, but malicious reproach and the

betrayal of a secret--these things banish friendship beyond return. This

was the end of his personal connection with the men whom he always

contemptuously called the Holbachians. After 1760 the great stream

divided into two; the rationalist and the emotional schools became

visibly antipathetic, and the voice of the epoch was no longer single or

undistracted.
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[353] Tronchin, for instance, in a letter to Rousseau, in M.

Streckeisen-Moultou's collection, i. 325.

[354] A troop of comedians had been allowed to play for a short time

in Geneva, with many protests, during the mediation of 1738. In 1766,

eight years after Rousseau's letter, the government gave permission

for the establishment of a theatre in the town. It was burnt down in

1768, and Voltaire spitefully hinted that the catastrophe was the

result of design, instigated by Rousseau (\_Corr.\_ v. 299, April 26,

1768). The theatre was not re-erected until 1783, when the oligarchic

party regained the ascendancy and brought back with them the drama,

which the democrats in their reign would not permit.

[355] \_Lettre Ã  J.J. Rousseau\_, pp. 265-271.

[356] \_Oeuv.\_, x. 121.

[357] To Thieriot, Sept. 17, 1758. To D'Alembert, Oct. 20, 1761. \_Ib.\_

March 19, 1761.
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ROUSSEAU.

CHAPTER I.

MONTMORENCY--THE NEW HELOÃSA.

The many conditions of intellectual productiveness are still hidden in

such profound obscurity that we are unable to explain why a period of

stormy moral agitation seems to be in certain natures the

indispensable antecedent of their highest creative effort. Byron is

one instance, and Rousseau is another, in which the current of

stimulating force made this rapid way from the lower to the higher

parts of character, and only expended itself after having traversed

the whole range of emotion and faculty, from their meanest, most

realistic, most personal forms of exercise, up to the summit of what

is lofty and ideal. No man was ever involved in such an odious

complication of moral maladies as beset Rousseau in the winter of

1758. Yet within three years of this miserable epoch he had completed

not only the New HeloÃ¯sa, which is the monument of his fall, but the

Social Contract, which was the most influential, and Emilius, which

was perhaps the most elevated and spiritual, of all the productions of

the prolific genius of France in the eighteenth century. A poor

light-hearted Marmontel thought that the secret of Rousseau's success

lay in the circumstance that he began to write late, and it is true

that no other author, so considerable as Rousseau, waited until the

age of fifty for the full vigour of his inspiration. No tale of years,

however, could have ripened such fruit without native strength and

incommunicable savour. Nor can the mechanical movement of those better

ordered characters which keep the balance of the world even, impart to

literature that peculiar quality, peculiar but not the finest, that

comes from experience of the black unlighted abysses of the soul.

The period of actual production was externally calm. The New HeloÃ¯sa

was completed in 1759, and published in 1761. The Social Contract was

published in the spring of 1762, and Emilius a few weeks later.

Throughout this period Rousseau was, for the last time in his life, at

peace with most of his fellows. Though he never relented from his

antipathy to the Holbachians, for the time it slumbered, until a more

real and serious persecution than any which he imputed to them,

transformed his antipathy into a gloomy frenzy.

The new friends whom he made at Montmorency were among the greatest

people in the kingdom. The Duke of Luxembourg (1702-64) was a marshal

of France, and as intimate a friend of the king as the king was

capable of having. The MarÃ©chale de Luxembourg (1707-87) had been one

of the most beautiful, and continued to be one of the most brilliant

leaders of the last aristocratic generation that was destined to sport

on the slopes of the volcano. The former seems to have been a loyal

and homely soul; the latter, restless, imperious, penetrating,

unamiable. Their dealings with Rousseau were marked by perfect

sincerity and straightforward friendship. They gave him a convenient

apartment in a small summer lodge in the park, to which he retreated

when he cared for a change from his narrow cottage. He was a constant

guest at their table, where he met the highest personages in France.

The marshal did not disdain to pay him visits, or to walk with him, or

to discuss his private affairs. Unable as ever to shine in

conversation, yet eager to show his great friends that they had to do

with no common mortal, Rousseau bethought him of reading the New

HeloÃ¯sa aloud to them. At ten in the morning he used to wait upon the

marÃ©chale, and there by her bedside he read the story of the love, the

sin, the repentance of Julie, the distraction of Saint Preux, the

wisdom of Wolmar, and the sage friendship of Lord Edward, in tones

which enchanted her both with his book and its author for all the rest

of the day, as all the women in France were so soon to be

enchanted.[1] This, as he expected, amply reconciled her to the

uncouthness and clumsiness of his conversation, which was at least as

maladroit and as spiritless in the presence of a duchess as it was in

presences less imposing.

One side of character is obviously tested by the way in which a man

bears himself in his relations with those of greater social

consideration. Rousseau was taxed by some of his plebeian enemies with

a most unheroic deference to his patrician friends. He had a dog whose

name was \_Duc\_. When he came to sit at a duke's table, he changed his

dog's name to \_Turc\_.[2] Again, one day in a transport of tenderness

he embraced the old marshal--the duchess embraced Rousseau ten times a

day, for the age was effusive--"Ah, monsieur le marÃ©chal, I used to

hate the great before I knew you, and I hate them still more, since

you make me feel so strongly how easy it would be for them to have

themselves adored."[3] On another occasion he happened to be playing

at chess with the Prince of Conti, who had come to visit him in his

cottage.[4] In spite of the signs and grimaces of the attendants, he

insisted on beating the prince in a couple of games. Then he said with

respectful gravity, "Monseigneur, I honour your serene highness too

much not to beat you at chess always."[5] A few days after, the

vanquished prince sent him a present of game which Rousseau duly

accepted. The present was repeated, but this time Rousseau wrote to

Madame de Boufflers that he would receive no more, and that he loved

the prince's conversation better than his gifts.[6] He admits that

this was an ungracious proceeding, and that to refuse game "from a

prince of the blood who throws such good feeling into the present, is

not so much the delicacy of a proud man bent on preserving his

independence, as the rusticity of an unmannerly person who does not

know his place."[7] Considering the extreme virulence with which

Rousseau always resented gifts even of the most trifling kind from his

friends, one may perhaps find some inconsistency in this condemnation

of a sort of conduct to which he tenaciously clung on all other

occasions. If the fact of the donor being a prince of the blood is

allowed to modify the quality of the donation, that is hardly a

defensible position in the austere citizen of Geneva. Madame de

Boufflers,[8] the intimate friend of our sage Hume, and the yet more

intimate friend of the Prince of Conti, gave him a judicious warning

when she bade him beware of laying himself open to a charge of

affectation, lest it should obscure the brightness of his virtue and

so hinder its usefulness. "Fabius and Regulus would have accepted such

marks of esteem, without feeling in them any hurt to their

disinterestedness and frugality."[9] Perhaps there is a flutter of

self-consciousness that is not far removed from this affectation, in

the pains which Rousseau takes to tell us that after dining at the

castle, he used to return home gleefully to sup with a mason who was

his neighbour and his friend.[10] On the whole, however, and so far as

we know, Rousseau conducted himself not unworthily with these high

people. His letters to them are for the most part marked by

self-respect and a moderate graciousness, though now and again he

makes rather too much case of the difference of rank, and asserts his

independence with something too much of protestation.[11] Their

relations with him are a curious sign of the interest which the

members of the great world took in the men who were quietly preparing

the destruction both of them and their world. The MarÃ©chale de

Luxembourg places this squalid dweller in a hovel on her estate in the

place of honour at her table, and embraces his Theresa. The Prince of

Conti pays visits of courtesy and sends game to a man whom he employs

at a few sous an hour to copy manuscript for him. The Countess of

Boufflers, in sending him the money, insists that he is to count her

his warmest friend.[12] When his dog dies, the countess writes to

sympathise with his chagrin, and the prince begs to be allowed to

replace it.[13] And when persecution and trouble and infinite

confusion came upon him, they all stood as fast by him as their own

comfort would allow. Do we not feel that there must have been in the

unhappy man, besides all the recorded pettinesses and perversities

which revolt us in him, a vein of something which touched men, and

made women devoted to him, until he splenetically drove both men and

women away from him? With Madame d'Epinay and Madame d'Houdetot, as

with the dearer and humbler patroness of his youth, we have now parted

company. But they are instantly succeeded by new devotees. And the

lovers of Rousseau, in all degrees, were not silly women led captive

by idle fancy. Madame de Boufflers was one of the most distinguished

spirits of her time. Her friendship for him was such, that his

sensuous vanity made Rousseau against all reason or probability

confound it with a warmer form of emotion, and he plumes himself in a

manner most displeasing on the victory which he won over his own

feelings on the occasion.[14] As a matter of fact he had no feelings

to conquer, any more than the supposed object of them ever bore him

any ill-will for his indifference, as in his mania of suspicion he

afterwards believed.

There was a calm about the too few years he passed at Montmorency,

which leaves us in doubt whether this mania would ever have afflicted

him, if his natural irritation had not been made intense and

irresistible by the cruel distractions that followed the publication

of Emilius. He was tolerably content with his present friends. The

simplicity of their way of dealing with him contrasted singularly, as

he thought, with the never-ending solicitudes, as importunate as they

were officious, of the patronising friends whom he had just cast

off.[15] Perhaps, too, he was soothed by the companionship of persons

whose rank may have flattered his vanity, while unlike Diderot and his

old literary friends in Paris, they entered into no competition with

him in the peculiar sphere of his own genius. Madame de Boufflers,

indeed, wrote a tragedy, but he told her gruffly enough that it was a

plagiarism from Southerne's Oroonoko.[16] That Rousseau was

thoroughly capable of this pitiful emotion of sensitive literary

jealousy is proved, if by nothing else, by his readiness to suspect

that other authors were jealous of him. No one suspects others of a

meanness of this kind unless he is capable of it himself. The

resounding success which followed the New HeloÃ¯sa and Emilius put an

end to these apprehensions. It raised him to a pedestal in popular

esteem as high as that on which Voltaire stood triumphant. That very

success unfortunately brought troubles which destroyed Rousseau's last

chance of ending his days in full reasonableness.

Meanwhile he enjoyed his final interval of moderate wholesomeness and

peace. He felt his old healthy joy in the green earth. One of the

letters commemorates his delight in the great scudding south-west

winds of February, soft forerunners of the spring, so sweet to all who

live with nature.[17] At the end of his garden was a summer-house, and

here even on wintry days he sat composing or copying. It was not music

only that he copied. He took a curious pleasure in making transcripts

of his romance, and he sold them to the Duchess of Luxembourg and

other ladies for some moderate fee.[18] Sometimes he moved from his

own lodging to the quarters in the park which his great friends had

induced him to accept. "They were charmingly neat; the furniture was

of white and blue. It was in this perfumed and delicious solitude, in

the midst of woods and streams and choirs of birds of every kind,

with the fragrance of the orange-flower poured round me, that I

composed in a continual ecstasy the fifth book of Emilius. With what

eagerness did I hasten every morning at sunrise to breathe the balmy

air! What good coffee I used to make under the porch in company with

my Theresa! The cat and the dog made up the party. That would have

sufficed me for all the days of my life, and I should never have known

weariness." And so to the assurance, so often repeated under so many

different circumstances, that here was a true heaven upon earth, where

if fates had only allowed he would have known unbroken innocence and

lasting happiness.[19]

Yet he had the wisdom to warn others against attempting a life such as

he craved for himself. As on a more memorable occasion, there came to

him a young man who would fain have been with him always, and whom he

sent away exceeding sorrowful. "The first lesson I should give you

would be not to surrender yourself to the taste you say you have for

the contemplative life. It is only an indolence of the soul, to be

condemned at any age, but especially so at yours. Man is not made to

meditate, but to act. Labour therefore in the condition of life in

which you have been placed by your family and by providence: that is

the first precept of the virtue which you wish to follow. If residence

at Paris, joined to the business you have there, seems to you

irreconcilable with virtue, do better still, and return to your own

province. Go live in the bosom of your family, serve and solace your

honest parents. There you will be truly fulfilling the duties that

virtue imposes on you."[20] This intermixture of sound sense with

unutterable perversities almost suggests a doubt how far the

perversities were sincere, until we remember that Rousseau even in the

most exalted part of his writings was careful to separate immediate

practical maxims from his theoretical principles of social

philosophy.[21]

Occasionally his good sense takes so stiff and unsympathetic a form as

to fill us with a warmer dislike for him than his worst paradoxes

inspire. A correspondent had written to him about the frightful

persecutions which were being inflicted on the Protestants in some

district of France. Rousseau's letter is a masterpiece in the style of

Eliphaz the Temanite. Our brethren must surely have given some pretext

for the evil treatment to which they were subjected. One who is a

Christian must learn to suffer, and every man's conduct ought to

conform to his doctrine. Our brethren, moreover, ought to remember

that the word of God is express upon the duty of obeying the laws set

up by the prince. The writer cannot venture to run any risk by

interceding in favour of our brethren with the government. "Every one

has his own calling upon the earth; mine is to tell the public harsh

but useful truths. I have preached humanity, gentleness, tolerance, so

far as it depended upon me; 'tis no fault of mine if the world has not

listened. I have made it a rule to keep to general truths; I produce

no libels, no satires; I attack no man, but men; not an action, but a

vice."[22] The worst of the worthy sort of people, wrote Voltaire, is

that they are such cowards: a man groans over a wrong, he holds his

tongue, he takes his supper, and he forgets all about it.[23] If

Voltaire could not write like FÃ©nelon, at least he could never talk

like Tartufe; he responded to no tale of wrong with words about his

mission, with strings of antitheses, but always with royal anger and

the spring of alert and puissant endeavour. In an hour of oppression

one would rather have been the friend of the saviour of the Calas and

of Sirven, than of the vindicator of theism.

Rousseau, however, had good sense enough in less equivocal forms than

this. For example, in another letter he remonstrates with a

correspondent for judging the rich too harshly. "You do not bear in

mind that having from their childhood contracted a thousand wants

which we are without, then to bring them down to the condition of the

poor, would be to make them more miserable than the poor. We should be

just towards all the world, even to those who are not just to us. Ah,

if we had the virtues opposed to the vices which we reproach in them,

we should soon forget that such people were in the world. One word

more. To have any right to despise the rich, we ought ourselves to be

prudent and thrifty, so as to have no need of riches."[24] In the

observance of this just precept Rousseau was to the end of his life

absolutely without fault. No one was more rigorously careful to make

his independence sure by the fewness of his wants and by minute

financial probity. This firm limitation of his material desires was

one cause of his habitual and almost invariable refusal to accept

presents, though no doubt another cause was the stubborn and

ungracious egoism which made him resent every obligation.

It is worth remembering in illustration of the peculiar susceptibility

and softness of his character where women were concerned--it was not

quite without exception--that he did not fly into a fit of rage over

their gifts, as he did over those of men. He remonstrated, but in

gentler key. "What could I do with four pullets?" he wrote to a lady

who had presented them to him. "I began by sending two of them to

people to whom I am indifferent. That made me think of the difference

there is between a present and a testimony of friendship. The first

will never find in me anything but a thankless heart; the second....

Ah, if you had only given me news of yourself without sending me

anything else, how rich and how grateful you would have made me;

instead of that the pullets are eaten, and the best thing I can do is

to forget all about them; let us say no more."[25] Rude and repellent

as this may seem, and as it is, there is a rough kind of playfulness

about it, when compared with the truculence which he was not slow to

exhibit to men. If a friend presumed to thank him for any service, he

was peremptorily rebuked for his ignorance of the true qualities of

friendship, with which thankfulness has no connection. He

ostentatiously refused to offer thanks for services himself, even to a

woman whom he always treated with so much consideration as the

MarÃ©chale de Luxembourg. He once declared boldly that modesty is a

false virtue,[26] and though he did not go so far as to make gratitude

the subject of a corresponding formula of denunciation, he always

implied that this too is really one of the false virtues. He confessed

to Malesherbes, without the slightest contrition, that he was

ungrateful by nature.[27] To Madame d'Epinay he once went still

further, declaring that he found it hard not to hate those who had

used him well.[28] Undoubtedly he was right so far as this, that

gratitude answering to a spirit of exaction in a benefactor is no

merit; a service done in expectation of gratitude is from that fact

stripped of the quality which makes gratitude due, and is a mere piece

of egoism in altruistic disguise. Kindness in its genuine forms is a

testimony of good feeling, and conventional speech is perhaps a little

too hard, as well as too shallow and unreal, in calling the recipient

evil names because he is unable to respond to the good feeling.

Rousseau protested against a conception of friendship which makes of

what ought to be disinterested helpfulness a title to everlasting

tribute. His way of expressing this was harsh and unamiable, but it

was not without an element of uprightness and veracity. As in his

greater themes, so in his paradoxes upon private relations, he hid

wholesome ingredients of rebuke to the unquestioning acceptance of

common form. "I am well pleased," he said to a friend, "both with thee

and thy letters, except the end, where thou say'st thou art more mine

than thine own. For there thou liest, and it is not worth while to

take the trouble to \_thee\_ and \_thou\_ a man as thine intimate, only to

tell him untruths."[29] Chesterfield was for people with much

self-love of the small sort, probably a more agreeable person to meet

than Doctor Johnson, but Johnson was the more wholesome companion for

a man.

Occasionally, though not very often, he seems to have let spleen take

the place of honest surliness, and so drifted into clumsy and

ill-humoured banter, of a sort that gives a dreary shudder to one

fresh from Voltaire. "So you have chosen for yourself a tender and

virtuous mistress! I am not surprised; all mistresses are that. You

have chosen her in Paris! To find a tender and virtuous mistress in

Paris is to have not such bad luck. You have made her a promise of

marriage? My friend, you have made a blunder; for if you continue to

love, the promise is superfluous, and if you do not, then it is no

avail. You have signed it with your blood? That is all but tragic; but

I don't know that the choice of the ink in which he writes, gives

anything to the fidelity of the man who signs."[30]

We can only add that the health in which a man writes may possibly

excuse the dismal quality of what he writes, and that Rousseau was now

as always the prey of bodily pain which, as he was conscious, made him

distraught. "My sufferings are not very excruciating just now," he

wrote on a later occasion, "but they are incessant, and I am not out

of pain a single moment day or night, and this quite drives me mad. I

feel bitterly my wrong conduct and the baseness of my suspicions; but

if anything can excuse me, it is my mournful state, my loneliness,"

and so on.[31] This prolonged physical anguish, which was made more

intense towards the end of 1761 by the accidental breaking of a

surgical instrument,[32] sometimes so nearly wore his fortitude away

as to make him think of suicide.[33] In Lord Edward's famous letter on

suicide in the New HeloÃ¯sa, while denying in forcible terms the right

of ending one's days merely to escape from intolerable mental

distress, he admits that inasmuch as physical disorders only grow

incessantly worse, violent and incurable bodily pain may be an excuse

for a man making away with himself; he ceases to be a human being

before dying, and in putting an end to his life he only completes his

release from a body that embarrasses him, and contains his soul no

longer.[34] The thought was often present to him in this form.

Eighteen months later than our last date, the purpose grew very

deliberate under an aggravation of his malady, and he seriously looked

upon his own case as falling within the conditions of Lord Edward's

exception.[35] It is difficult, in the face of outspoken declarations

like these, to know what writers can be thinking of when, with respect

to the controversy on the manner of Rousseau's death, they pronounce

him incapable of such a dereliction of his own most cherished

principles as anything like self-destruction would have been.

As he sat gnawed by pain, with surgical instruments on his table, and

sombre thoughts of suicide in his head, the ray of a little episode of

romance shone in incongruously upon the scene. Two ladies in Paris,

absorbed in the New HeloÃ¯sa, like all the women of the time,

identified themselves with the Julie and the Claire of the novel that

none could resist. They wrote anonymously to the author, claiming

their identification with characters fondly supposed to be immortal.

"You will know that Julie is not dead, and that she lives to love you;

I am not this Julie, you perceive it by my style; I am only her

cousin, or rather her friend, as Claire was." The unfortunate Saint

Preux responded as gallantly as he could be expected to do in the

intervals of surgery. "You do not know that the Saint Preux to whom

you write is tormented with a cruel and incurable disorder, and that

the very letter he writes to you is often interrupted by distractions

of a very different kind."[36] He figures rather uncouthly, but the

unknown fair were not at first disabused, and one of them never was.

Rousseau was deeply suspicious. He feared to be made the victim of a

masculine pleasantry. From women he never feared anything. His letters

were found too short, too cold. He replied to the remonstrance by a

reference of extreme coarseness. His correspondents wrote from the

neighbourhood of the Palais Royal, then and for long after the haunt

of mercenary women. "You belong to your quarter more than I thought,"

he said brutally.[37] The vulgarity of the lackey was never quite

obliterated in him, even when the lackey had written Emilius. This

was too much for the imaginary Claire. "I have given myself three good

blows on my breast for the correspondence that I was silly enough to

open between you," she wrote to Julie, and she remained implacable.

The Julie, on the contrary, was faithful to the end of Rousseau's

life. She took his part vehemently in the quarrel with Hume, and wrote

in defence of his memory after he was dead. She is the most remarkable

of all the instances of that unreasoning passion which the New HeloÃ¯sa

inflamed in the breasts of the women of that age. Madame Latour

pursued Jean Jacques with a devotion that no coldness could repulse.

She only saw him three times in all, the first time not until 1766,

when he was on his way through Paris to England. The second time, in

1772, she visited him without mentioning her name, and he did not

recognise her; she brought him some music to copy, and went away

unknown. She made another attempt, announcing herself: he gave her a

frosty welcome, and then wrote to her that she was to come no more.

With a strange fidelity she bore him no grudge, but cherished his

memory and sorrowed over his misfortunes to the day of her death. He

was not an idol of very sublime quality, but we may think kindly of

the idolatress.[38] Worshippers are ever dearer to us than their

graven images. Let us turn to the romance which touched women in this

way, and helped to give a new spirit to an epoch.

II.

As has been already said, it is the business of criticism to separate

what is accidental in form, transitory in manner, and merely local in

suggestion, from the general ideas which live under a casual and

particular literary robe. And so we have to distinguish the external

conditions under which a book like the New HeloÃ¯sa is produced, from

the living qualities in the author which gave the external conditions

their hold upon him, and turned their development in one direction

rather than another. We are only encouraging poverty of spirit, when

we insist on fixing our eyes on a few of the minutiÃ¦ of construction,

instead of patiently seizing larger impressions and more durable

meanings; when we stop at the fortuitous incidents of composition,

instead of advancing to the central elements of the writer's

character.

These incidents in the case of the New HeloÃ¯sa we know; the sensuous

communion with nature in her summer mood in the woods of Montmorency,

the long hours and days of solitary expansion, the despairing passion

for the too sage Julie of actual experience. But the power of these

impressions from without depended on secrets of conformation within.

An adult with marked character is, consciously or unconsciously, his

own character's victim or sport. It is his whole system of impulses,

ideas, pre-occupations, that make those critical situations ready,

into which he too hastily supposes that an accident has drawn him. And

this inner system not only prepares the situation; it forces his

interpretation of the situation. Much of the interest of the New

HeloÃ¯sa springs from the fact that it was the outcome, in a sense of

which the author himself was probably unconscious, of the general

doctrine of life and conduct which he only professed to expound in

writings of graver pretension. Rousseau generally spoke of his romance

in phrases of depreciation, as the monument of a passing weakness. It

was in truth as entirely a monument of the strength, no less than the

weakness, of his whole scheme, as his weightiest piece. That it was

not so deliberately, only added to its effect. The slow and musing air

which underlies all the assumption of ardent passion, made a way for

the doctrine into sensitive natures, that would have been untouched by

the pretended ratiocination of the Discourses, and the didactic manner

of the Emilius.

Rousseau's scheme, which we must carefully remember was only present

to his own mind in an informal and fragmentary way, may be shortly

described as an attempt to rehabilitate human nature in as much of the

supposed freshness of primitive times, as the hardened crust of civil

institutions and social use might allow. In this survey, however

incoherently carried out, the mutual passion of the two sexes was the

very last that was likely to escape Rousseau's attention. Hence it was

with this that he began. The Discourses had been an attack upon the

general ordering of society, and an exposition of the mischief that

society has done to human nature at large. The romance treated one set

of emotions in human nature particularly, though it also touches the

whole emotional sphere indirectly. And this limitation of the field

was accompanied by a total revolution in the method. Polemic was

abandoned; the presence of hostility was forgotten in appearance, if

not in the heart of the writer; instead of discussion, presentation;

instead of abstract analysis of principles, concrete drawing of

persons and dramatic delineation of passion. There is, it is true, a

monstrous superfluity of ethical exposition of most doubtful value,

but then that, as we have already said, was in the manners of the

time. All people in those days with any pretensions to use their

minds, wrote and talked in a superfine ethical manner, and violently

translated the dictates of sensibility into formulas of morality. The

important thing to remark is not that this semi-didactic strain is

present, but that there is much less of it, and that it takes a far

more subordinate place, than the subject and the reigning taste would

have led us to expect. It is true, also, that Rousseau declared his

intention in the two characters of Julie and of Wolmar, who eventually

became Julie's husband, of leading to a reconciliation between the two

great opposing parties, the devout and the rationalistic; of teaching

them the lesson of reciprocal esteem, by showing the one that it is

possible to believe in a God without being a hypocrite, and the other

that it is possible to be an unbeliever without being a scoundrel.[39]

This intention, if it was really present to Rousseau's mind while he

was writing, and not an afterthought characteristically welcomed for

the sake of giving loftiness and gravity to a composition of which he

was always a little ashamed, must at any rate have been of a very pale

kind. It would hardly have occurred to a critic, unless Rousseau had

so emphatically pointed it out, that such a design had presided over

the composition, and contemporary readers saw nothing of it. In the

first part of the story, which is wholly passionate, it is certainly

not visible, and in the second part neither of the two contending

factions was likely to learn any lesson with respect to the other.

Churchmen would have insisted that Wolmar was really a Christian

dressed up as an atheist, and philosophers would hardly have accepted

Julie as a type of the too believing people who broke Calas on the

wheel, and cut off La Barre's head.

French critics tell us that no one now reads the New HeloÃ¯sa in France

except deliberate students of the works of Rousseau, and certainly few

in this generation read it in our own country.[40] The action is very

slight, and the play of motives very simple, when contrasted with the

ingenuity of invention, the elaborate subtleties of psychological

analysis, the power of rapid change from one perturbing incident or

excited humour to another, which mark the modern writer of sentimental

fiction. As the title warns us, it is a story of a youthful tutor and

a too fair disciple, straying away from the lessons of calm philosophy

into the heated places of passion. The high pride of Julie's father

forbade all hope of their union, and in very desperation the unhappy

pair lost the self-control of virtue, and threw themselves into the

pit that lies so ready to our feet. Remorse followed with quick step,

for Julie had with her purity lost none of the other lovelinesses of a

dutiful character. Her lover was hurried away from the country by the

generous solicitude of an English nobleman, one of the bravest,

tenderest, and best of men. Julie, left undisturbed by her lover's

presence, stricken with affliction at the death of a sweet and

affectionate mother, and pressed by the importunities of a father whom

she dearly loved, in spite of all the disasters which his will had

brought upon her, at length consented to marry a foreign baron from

some northern court. Wolmar was much older than she was; a devotee of

calm reason, without a system and without prejudices, benevolent,

orderly, above all things judicious. The lover meditated suicide, from

which he was only diverted by the arguments of Lord Edward, who did

more than argue; he hurried the forlorn man on board the ship of

Admiral Anson, then just starting for his famous voyage round the

world. And this marks the end of the first episode.

Rousseau always urged that his story was dangerous for young girls,

and maintained that Richardson was grievously mistaken in supposing

that they could be instructed by romances. It was like setting fire to

the house, he said, for the sake of making the pumps play.[41] As he

admitted so much, he is not open to attack on this side, except from

those who hold the theory that no books ought to be written which may

not prudently be put into the hands of the young,--a puerile and

contemptible doctrine that must emasculate all literature and all art,

by excluding the most interesting of human relations and the most

powerful of human passions. There is not a single composition of the

first rank outside of science, from the Bible downwards, that could

undergo the test. The most useful standard for measuring the

significance of a book in this respect is found in the manners of the

time, and the prevailing tone of contemporary literature. In trying to

appreciate the meaning of the New HeloÃ¯sa and its popularity, it is

well to think of it as a delineation of love, in connection not only

with such a book as the Pucelle, where there is at least wit, but with

a story like Duclos's, which all ladies both read and were not in the

least ashamed to acknowledge that they had read; or still worse, such

an abomination as Diderot's first stories; or a story like Laclos's,

which came a generation later, and with its infinite briskness and

devilry carried the tradition of artistic impurity to as vigorous a

manifestation as it is capable of reaching.[42] To a generation whose

literature is as pure as the best English, American, and German

literature is in the present day, the New HeloÃ¯sa might without doubt

be corrupting. To the people who read CrÃ©billon and the Pucelle, it

was without doubt elevating.

The case is just as strong if we turn from books to manners. Without

looking beyond the circle of names that occur in Rousseau's own

history, we see how deep the depravity had become. Madame d'Epinay's

gallant sat at table with the husband, and the husband was perfectly

aware of the relations between them. M. d'Epinay had notorious

relations with two public women, and was not ashamed to refer to them

in the presence of his wife, and even to seek her sympathy on an

occasion when one of them was in some trouble. Not only this, but

husband and lover used to pursue their debaucheries in the town

together in jovial comradeship. An opera dancer presided at the table

of a patrician abbÃ© in his country house, and he passed weeks in her

house in the town. As for shame, says Barbier on one occasion, "'tis

true the king has a mistress, but who has not?--except the Duke of

Orleans; he has withdrawn to Ste. GeneviÃ¨ve, and is thoroughly

despised in consequence, and rightly."[43] Reeking disorder such as

all this illustrates, made the passion of the two imaginary lovers of

the fair lake seem like a breath from the garden of Eden. One virtue

was lost in that simple paradise, but even that loss was followed by

circumstances of mental pain and far circling distress, which banished

the sin into a secondary place; and what remained to strike the

imagination of the time were delightful pictures of fast union between

two enchanting women, of the patience and compassionateness of a grave

mother, of the chivalrous warmth and helpfulness of a loyal friend.

Any one anxious to pick out sensual strokes and turns of grossness

could make a small collection of such defilements from the New HeloÃ¯sa

without any difficulty. They were in Rousseau's character, and so they

came out in his work. Saint Preux afflicts us with touches of this

kind, just as we are afflicted with similar touches in the

Confessions. They were not noticed at that day, when people's ears did

not affect to be any chaster than the rest of them.

A historian of opinion is concerned with the general effect that was

actually produced by a remarkable book, and with the causes that

produced it. It is not his easy task to produce a demonstration that

if the readers had all been as wise and as virtuous as the moralist

might desire them to be, or if they had all been discriminating and

scientific critics, not this, but a very different impression would

have followed. Today we may wonder at the effect of the New HeloÃ¯sa.

A long story told in letters has grown to be a form incomprehensible

and intolerable to us. We find Richardson hard to be borne, and he put

far greater vivacity and wider variety into his letters than Rousseau

did, though he was not any less diffuse, and he abounds in repetitions

as Rousseau does not. Rousseau was absolutely without humour; that

belongs to the keenly observant natures, and to those who love men in

the concrete, not only humanity in the abstract. The pleasantries of

Julie's cousin, for instance, are heavy and misplaced. Thus the whole

book is in one key, without the dramatic changes of Richardson, too

few even as those are. And who now can endure that antique fashion of

apostrophising men and women, hot with passion and eager with all

active impulses, in oblique terms of abstract qualities, as if their

passion and their activity were only the inconsiderable embodiment of

fine general ideas? We have not a single thrill, when Saint Preux

being led into the chamber where his mistress is supposed to lie

dying, murmurs passionately, "What shall I now see in the same place

of refuge where once all breathed the ecstasy that intoxicated my

soul, in this same object who both caused and shared my transports!

the image of death, virtue unhappy, beauty expiring!"[44] This

rhetorical artificiality of phrase, so repulsive to the more realistic

taste of a later age, was as natural then as that facility of shedding

tears, which appears so deeply incredible a performance to a

generation that has lost that particular fashion of sensibility,

without realising for the honour of its ancestors the physiological

truth of the power of the will over the secretions.

The characters seem as stiff as some of the language, to us who are

accustomed to an Asiatic luxuriousness of delineation. Yet the New

HeloÃ¯sa was nothing less than the beginning of that fresh, full,

highly-coloured style which has now taught us to find so little charm

in the source and original of it. Saint Preux is a personage whom no

widest charity, literary, philosophic, or Christian, can make

endurable. Egoism is made thrice disgusting by a ceaseless redundance

of fine phrases. The exaggerated conceits of love in our old poets

turn graciously on the lover's eagerness to offer every sacrifice at

the feet of his mistress. Even Werther, stricken creature as he was,

yet had the stoutness to blow his brains out, rather than be the

instrument of surrounding the life of his beloved with snares. Saint

Preux's egoism is unbrightened by a single ray of tender abnegation,

or a single touch of the sweet humility of devoted passion. The slave

of his sensations, he has no care beyond their gratification. With

some rotund nothing on his lips about virtue being the only path to

happiness, his heart burns with sickly desire. He writes first like a

pedagogue infected by some cantharidean philter, and then like a

pedagogue without the philter, and that is the worse of the two.

Lovelace and the Count of Valmont are manly and hopeful characters in

comparison. Werther, again, at least represents a principle of

rebellion, in the midst of all his self-centred despair, and he

retains strength enough to know that his weakness is shameful. His

despair, moreover, is deeply coloured with repulsed social

ambition.[45] He feels the world about him. His French prototype, on

the contrary, represents nothing but the unalloyed selfishness of a

sensual love for which there is no universe outside of its own fevered

pulsation.

Julie is much less displeasing, partly perhaps for the reason that she

belongs to the less displeasing sex. At least, she preserves

fortitude, self-control, and profound considerateness for others. At a

certain point her firmness even moves a measure of enthusiasm. If the

New HeloÃ¯sa could be said to have any moral intention, it is here

where women learn from the example of Julie's energetic return to

duty, the possibility and the satisfaction of bending character back

to comeliness and honour. Excellent as this is from a moral point of

view, the reader may wish that Julie had been less of a preacher, as

well as less of a sinner. And even as sinner, she would have been more

readily forgiven if she had been less deliberate. A maiden who

sacrifices her virtue in order that the visible consequences may force

her parents to consent to a marriage, is too strategical to be

perfectly touching. As was said by the cleverest, though not the

greatest, of all the women whose youth was fascinated by Rousseau,

when one has renounced the charms of virtue, it is at least well to

have all the charms that entire surrender of heart can bestow.[46] In

spite of this, however, Julie struck the imagination of the time, and

struck it in a way that was thoroughly wholesome. The type taught men

some respect for the dignity of women, and it taught women a firmer

respect for themselves. It is useless, even if it be possible, to

present an example too lofty for the comprehension of an age. At this

moment the most brilliant genius in the country was filling France

with impish merriment at the expense of the greatest heroine that

France had then to boast. In such an atmosphere Julie had almost the

halo of saintliness.

We may say all we choose about the inconsistency, the excess of

preaching, the excess of prudence, in the character of Julie. It was

said pungently enough by the wits of the time.[47] Nothing that could

be said on all this affected the fact, that the women between 1760

and the Revolution were intoxicated by Rousseau's creation to such a

pitch that they would pay any price for a glass out of which Rousseau

had drunk, they would kiss a scrap of paper that contained a piece of

his handwriting, and vow that no woman of true sensibility could

hesitate to consecrate her life to him, if she were only certain to be

rewarded by his attachment.[48] The booksellers were unable to meet

the demand. The book was let out at the rate of twelve sous a volume,

and the volume could not be detained beyond an hour. All classes

shared the excitement, courtiers, soldiers, lawyers, and

bourgeois.[49] Stories were told of fine ladies, dressed for the ball,

who took the book up for half an hour until the time should come for

starting; they read until midnight, and when informed that the

carriage waited, answered not a word, and when reminded by and by that

it was two o'clock, still read on, and then at four, having ordered

the horses to be taken out of the carriage, disrobed, went to bed, and

passed the remainder of the night in reading. In Germany the effect

was just as astonishing. Kant only once in his life failed to take his

afternoon walk, and this unexampled omission was due to the witchery

of the New HeloÃ¯sa. Gallantry was succeeded by passion, expansion,

exaltation; moods far more dangerous for society, as all enthusiasm is

dangerous, but also far higher and pregnant with better hopes for

character. To move the sympathetic faculties is the first step towards

kindling all the other energies which make life wiser and more

fruitful. It is especially worth noticing that nothing in the

character of Julie concentrates this outburst of sympathy in

subjective broodings. Julie is the representative of one recalled to

the straight path by practical, wholesome, objective sympathy for

others, not of one expiring in unsatisfied yearnings for the sympathy

of others for herself, and in moonstruck subjective aspirations. The

women who wept over her romance read in it the lesson of duty, not of

whimpering introspection. The danger lay in the mischievous

intellectual direction which Rousseau imparted to this effusion.

The stir which the Julie communicated to the affections in so many

ways, marked progress, but in all the elements of reason she was the

most perilous of reactionaries. So hard it is with the human mind,

constituted as it is, to march forward a space further to the light,

without making some fresh swerve obliquely towards old darkness. The

great effusion of natural sentiment was in the air before the New

HeloÃ¯sa appeared, to condense and turn it into definite channels. One

beautiful character, Vauven argues (1715-1747), had begun to teach the

culture of emotional instinct in some sayings of exquisite sweetness

and moderation, as that "Great thoughts come from the heart." But he

came too soon, and, alas for us all, he died young, and he made no

mark. Moderation never can make a mark in the epochs when men are

beginning to feel the urgent spirit of a new time. Diderot strove with

more powerful efforts, in the midst of all his herculean labours for

the acquisition and ordering of knowledge, in the same direction

towards the great outer world of nature, and towards the great inner

world of nature in the human breast. His criticisms on the paintings

of each year, mediocre as the paintings were, are admirable even now

for their richness and freshness. If Diderot had been endowed with

emotional tenacity, as he was with tenacity of understanding and of

purpose, the student of the eighteenth century would probably have

been spared the not perfectly agreeable task of threading a way along

the sinuosities of the character and work of Rousseau. But Rousseau

had what Diderot lacked--sustained ecstatic moods, and fervid trances;

his literary gesture was so commanding, his apparel so glistening, his

voice so rich in long-drawn notes of plangent vibration. His words

are the words of a prophet; a prophet, it is understood, who had lived

in Paris, and belonged to the eighteenth century, and wrote in French

instead of Hebrew. The mischief of his work lay in this, that he

raised feeling, now passionate, now quietest, into the supreme place

which it was to occupy alone, and not on an equal throne and in equal

alliance with understanding. Instead of supplementing reason, he

placed emotion as its substitute. And he made this evil doctrine come

from the lips of a fictitious character, who stimulated fancy and

fascinated imagination. Voltaire laughed at the \_baisers Ã¢cres\_ of

Madame de Wolmar, and declared that a criticism of the Marquis of

XimÃ©nÃ¨s had crushed the wretched romance.[50] But Madame de Wolmar was

so far from crushed, that she turned the flood of feeling which her

own charms, passion, remorse, and conversion had raised, in a

direction that Voltaire abhorred, and abhorred in vain.

It is after the marriage of Julie to Wolmar that the action of the

story takes the turn which sensible men like Voltaire found laughable.

Saint Preux is absent with Admiral Anson for some years. On his return

to Europe he is speedily invited by the sage Wolmar, who knows his

past history perfectly well, to pay them a visit. They all meet with

leapings on the neck and hearty kisses, the unprejudiced Wolmar

preserving an open, serene, and smiling air. He takes his young friend

to a chamber, which is to be reserved for him and for him only. In a

few days he takes an opportunity of visiting some distant property,

leaving his wife and Saint Preux together, with the sublime of

magnanimity. At the same time he confides to Claire his intention of

entrusting to Saint Preux the education of his children. All goes

perfectly well, and the household presents a picture of contentment,

prosperity, moderation, affection, and evenly diffused happiness,

which in spite of the disagreeableness of the situation is even now

extremely charming. There is only one cloud. Julie is devoured by a

source of hidden chagrin. Her husband, "so sage, so reasonable, so far

from every kind of vice, so little under the influence of human

passions, is without the only belief that makes virtue precious, and

in the innocence of an irreproachable life he carries at the bottom of

his heart the frightful peace of the wicked."[51] He is an atheist.

Julie is now a pietest, locking herself for hours in her chambers,

spending days in self-examination and prayer, constantly reading the

pages of the good FÃ©nelon.[52] "I fear," she writes to Saint Preux,

"that you do not gain all you might from religion in the conduct of

your life, and that philosophic pride disdains the simplicity of the

Christian. You believe prayers to be of scanty service. That is not,

you know, the doctrine of Saint Paul, nor what our Church professes.

We are free, it is true, but we are ignorant, feeble, prone to ill.

And whence should light and force come, if not from him who is their

very well-spring?... Let us be humble, to be sage; let us see our

weakness, and we shall be strong."[53] This was the opening of the

deistical reaction; it was thus, associated with everything that

struck imagination and moved the sentiment of his readers, that

Rousseau brought back those sophistical conclusions which Pascal had

drawn from premisses of dark profound truth, and that enervating

displacement of reason by celestial contemplation, which FÃ©nelon had

once made beautiful by the persuasion of virtuous example. He was

justified in saying, as he afterwards did, that there was nothing in

the Savoyard Vicar's Profession of Faith which was not to be found in

the letters of Julie. These were the effective preparations for that

more famous manifesto; they surrounded belief with all the attractions

of an interesting and sympathetic preacher, and set it to a harmony of

circumstance that touched softer fibres.

For, curiously enough, while the first half of the romance is a scene

of disorderly passion, the second is the glorification of the family.

A modern writer of genius has inveighed with whimsical bitterness

against the character of Wolmar,--supposed, we may notice in passing,

to be partially drawn from D'Holbach,--a man performing so long an

experiment on these two souls, with the terrible curiosity of a

surgeon engaged in vivisection.[54] It was, however, much less

difficult for contemporaries than it is for us to accept so

unwholesome and prurient a situation. They forgot all the evil that

was in it, in the charm of the account of Wolmar's active, peaceful,

frugal, sunny household. The influence of this was immense.[55] It may

be that the overstrained scene where Saint Preux waits for Julie in

her room, suggested the far lovelier passage of Faust in the chamber

of the hapless Margaret. But we may, at least, be sure that Werther

(1774) would not have found Charlotte cutting bread and butter, if

Saint Preux had not gone to see Julie take cream and cakes with her

children and her female servants. And perhaps the other and nobler

Charlotte of the \_Wahlverwandtschaften\_ (1809) would not have detained

us so long with her moss hut, her terrace, her park prospect, if Julie

had not had her elysium, where the sweet freshness of the air, the

cool shadows, the shining verdure, flowers diffusing fragrance and

colour, water running with soft whisper, and the song of a thousand

birds, reminded the returned traveller of Tinian and Juan Fernandez.

There is an animation, a variety, an accuracy, a realistic brightness

in this picture, which will always make it enchanting, even to those

who cannot make their way through any other letter in the New

HeloÃ¯sa.[56] Such qualities place it as an idyllic piece far above

such pieces in Goethe's two famous romances. They have a clearness

and spontaneous freshness which are not among the bountiful gifts of

Goethe. There are other admirable landscapes in the New HeloÃ¯sa,

though not too many of them, and the minute and careful way in which

Rousseau made their features real to himself, is accidentally shown in

his urgent prayer for exactitude in the engraving of the striking

scene where Saint Preux and Julie visit the monuments of their old

love for one another.[57] "I have traversed all Rousseau's ground with

the HeloÃ¯sa before me," said Byron, "and am struck to a degree I

cannot express, with the force and accuracy of his descriptions and

the beauty of their reality."[58] They were memories made true by long

dreaming, by endless brooding. The painter lived with these scenes

ever present to the inner eye. They were his real world, of which the

tamer world of meadow and woodland actually around him only gave

suggestion. He thought of the green steeps, the rocks, the mountain

pines, the waters of the lake, "the populous solitude of bees and

birds," as of some divine presence, too sublime for personality. And

they were always benign, standing in relief with the malignity or

folly of the hurtful insect, Man. He was never a manichÃ¦an towards

nature. To him she was all good and bounteous. The demon forces that

so fascinated Byron were to Rousseau invisible. These were the

compositions that presently inspired the landscapes of \_Paul and

Virginia\_ (1788), of \_Atala\_ and \_RenÃ©\_ (1801), and of \_Obermann\_

(1804), as well as those punier imitators who resemble their masters

as the hymns of a methodist negro resemble the psalms of David. They

were the outcome of eager and spontaneous feeling for nature, and not

the mere hackneyed common-form and inflated description of the

literary pastoral.[59]

This leads to another great and important distinction to be drawn

between Rousseau and the school whom in other respects he inspired.

The admirable Sainte Beuve perplexes one by his strange remark, that

the union of the poetry of the family and the hearth with the poetry

of nature is essentially wanting to Rousseau.[60] It only shows that

the great critic had for the moment forgotten the whole of the second

part of the New HeloÃ¯sa, and his failure to identify Cowper's allusion

to the \_matinÃ©e Ã  l'anglaise\_ certainly proves that he had at any rate

forgotten one of the most striking and delicious scenes of the hearth

in French literature.[61] The tendency to read Rousseau only in the

Byronic sense is one of those foregone conclusions which are

constantly tempting the critic to travel out of his record. Rousseau

assuredly had a Byronic side, but he is just as often a Cowper done

into splendid prose. His pictures are full of social animation and

domestic order. He had exalted the simplicity of the savage state in

his Discourses, but when he came to constitute an ideal life, he found

it in a household that was more, and not less, systematically

disciplined than those of the common society around him. The paradise

in which his Julie moved with Wolmar and Saint Preux, was no more and

no less than an establishment of the best kind of the rural

middle-class, frugal, decorous, wholesome, tranquilly austere. No most

sentimental savage could have found it endurable, or could himself

without profound transformation of his manners have been endured in

it. The New HeloÃ¯sa ends by exalting respectability, and putting the

spirit of insurrection to shame. Self-control, not revolt, is its last

word.

This is what separates Rousseau here and throughout from SÃ©nancour,

Byron, and the rest. He consummates the triumph of will, while their

reigning mood is grave or reckless protest against impotence of will,

the little worth of common aims, the fretting triviality of common

rules. Franklin or Cobbett might have gloried in the regularity of

Madame de Wolmar's establishment. The employment of the day was marked

out with precision. By artful adjustment of pursuits, it was contrived

that the men-servants should be kept apart from the maid-servants,

except at their repasts. The women, namely, a cook, a housemaid, and a

nurse, found their pastime in rambles with their mistress and her

children, and lived mainly with them. The men were amused by games for

which their master made regulated provision, now for summer, now for

winter, offering prizes of a useful kind for prowess and adroitness.

Often on a Sunday night all the household met in an ample chamber,

and passed the evening in dancing. When Saint Preux inquired whether

this was not a rather singular infraction of puritan rule, Julie

wisely answered that pure morality is so loaded with severe duties,

that if you add to them the further burden of indifferent forms, it

must always be at the cost of the essential.[62] The servants were

taken from the country, never from the town. They entered the

household young, were gradually trained, and never went away except to

establish themselves.

The vulgar and obvious criticism on all this is that it is utopian,

that such households do not generally exist, because neither masters

nor servants possess the qualities needed to maintain these relations

of unbroken order and friendliness. Perhaps not; and masters and

servants will be more and more removed from the possession of such

qualities, and their relations further distant from such order and

friendliness, if writers cease to press the beauty and serviceableness

of a domesticity that is at present only possible in a few rare cases,

or to insist on the ugliness, the waste of peace, the deterioration of

character, that are the results of our present system. Undoubtedly it

is much easier for Rousseau to draw his picture of semi-patriarchal

felicity, than for the rest of us to realise it. It was his function

to press ideals of sweeter life on his contemporaries, and they may be

counted fortunate in having a writer who could fulfil this function

with Rousseau's peculiar force of masterly persuasion. His scornful

diatribes against the domestic police of great houses, and the

essential inhumanity of the ordinary household relations, are both

excellent and of permanent interest. There is the full breath of a new

humaneness in them. They were the right way of attacking the

decrepitude of feudal luxury and insolence, and its imitation among

the great farmers-general. This criticism of the conditions of

domestic service marks a beginning of true democracy, as distinguished

from the mere pulverisation of aristocracy. It rests on the claim of

the common people to an equal consideration, as equally useful and

equally capable of virtue and vice; and it implies the essential

priority of social over political reform.

The story abounds in sumptuary detail. The table partakes of the

general plenty, but this plenty is not ruinous. The senses are

gratified without daintiness. The food is common, but excellent of its

kind. The service is simple, yet exquisite. All that is mere show, all

that depends on vulgar opinion, all fine and elaborate dishes whose

value comes of their rarity, and whose names you must know before

finding any goodness in them, are banished without recall. Even in

such delicacies as they permit themselves, our friends abstain every

day from certain things which are reserved for feasts on special

occasions, and which are thus made more delightful without being more

costly. What do you suppose these delicacies are? Rare game, or fish

from the sea, or dainties from abroad? Better than all that; some

delicious vegetable of the district, one of the savoury things that

grow in our garden, some fish from the lake dressed in a peculiar way,

some cheese from our mountains. The service is modest and rustic, but

clean and smiling. Neither gold-laced liveries in sight of which you

die of hunger, nor tall crystals laden with flowers for your only

dessert, here take the place of honest dishes. Here people have not

the art of nourishing the stomach through the eyes, but they know how

to add grace to good cheer, to eat heartily without inconvenience, to

drink merrily without losing reason, to sit long at table without

weariness, and always to rise from it without disgust.[63]

One singularity in this ideal household was the avoidance of those

middle exchanges between production and consumption, which enrich the

shopkeeper but impoverish his customers. Not one of these exchanges is

made without loss, and the multiplication of these losses would weaken

even a man of fortune. Wolmar seeks those real exchanges in which the

convenience of each party to the bargain serves as profit for both.

Thus the wool is sent to the factories, from which they receive cloth

in exchange; wine, oil, and bread are produced in the house; the

butcher pays himself in live cattle; the grocer receives grain in

return for his goods; the wages of the labourers and the

house-servants are derived from the produce of the land which they

render valuable.[64] It was reserved for Fourier, Cabet, and the rest,

to carry to its highest point this confusion of what is so

fascinating in a book with what is practicable in society.

The expatiation on the loveliness of a well-ordered interior may

strike the impatient modern as somewhat long, and the movement as very

slow, just as people complain of the same things in Goethe's

\_Wahlverwandtschaften\_. Such complaint only proves inability, which is

or is not justifiable, to seize the spirit of the writer. The

expatiation was long and the movement slow, because Rousseau was full

of his thoughts; they were a deep and glowing part of himself, and did

not merely skim swiftly and lightly through his mind. Anybody who

takes the trouble may find out the difference between this expression

of long mental brooding, and a merely elaborated diction.[65] The

length is an essential part of the matter. The whole work is the

reflection of a series of slow inner processes, the many careful

weavings of a lonely and miserable man's dreams. And Julie expressed

the spirit and the joy of these dreams when she wrote, "People are

only happy before they are happy. Man, so eager and so feeble, made to

desire all and obtain little, has received from heaven a consoling

force which brings all that he desires close to him, which subjects it

to his imagination, which makes it sensible and present before him,

which delivers it over to him. The land of chimera is the only one in

this world that is worth dwelling in, and such is the nothingness of

the human lot, that except the being who exists in and by himself,

there is nothing beautiful except that which does not exist."[66]

Closely connected with the vigorous attempt to fascinate his public

with the charm of a serene, joyful, and ordered house, is the

restoration of marriage in the New HeloÃ¯sa to a rank among high and

honourable obligations, and its representation as the best support of

an equable life of right conduct and fruitful harmonious emotion.

Rousseau even invested it with the mysterious dignity as of some

natural sacrament. "This chaste knot of nature is subject neither to

the sovereign power nor to paternal authority," he cried, "but only to

the authority of the common Father." And he pointed his remark by a

bitter allusion to a celebrated case in which a great house had

prevailed on the courts to annul the marriage of an elder son with a

young actress, though her character was excellent, and though she had

befriended him when he was abandoned by everybody else.[67] This was

one of the countless democratic thrusts in the book. In the case of

its heroine, however, the author associated the sanctity of marriage

not only with equality but with religion. We may imagine the spleen

with which the philosophers, with both their hatred of the faith, and

their light esteem of marriage bonds, read Julie's eloquent account of

her emotions at the moment of her union with Wolmar. "I seemed to

behold the organ of Providence and to hear the voice of God, as the

minister gravely pronounced the words of the holy service. The purity,

the dignity, the sanctity of marriage, so vividly set forth in the

words of scripture; its chaste and sublime duties, so important to the

happiness, order, and peace of the human race, so sweet to fulfil even

for their own sake--all this made such an impression on me that I

seemed to feel within my breast a sudden revolution. An unknown power

seemed all at once to arrest the disorder of my affections, and to

restore them to accordance with the law of duty and of nature. The

eternal eye that sees everything, I said to myself, now reads to the

depth of my heart."[68] She has all the well-known fervour of the

proselyte, and never wearies of extolling the peace of the wedded

state. Love is no essential to its perfection. "Worth, virtue, a

certain accord not so much in condition and age as in character and

temper, are enough between husband and wife; and this does not prevent

the growth from such a union of a very tender attachment, which is

none the less sweet for not being exactly love, and is all the more

lasting."[69] Years after, when Saint Preux has returned and is

settled in the household, she even tries to persuade him to imitate

her example, and find contentment in marriage with her cousin. The

earnestness with which she presses the point, the very sensible but

not very delicate references to the hygienic drawbacks of celibacy,

and the fact that the cousin whom she would fain have him marry, had

complaisantly assisted them in their past loves, naturally drew the

fire of Rousseau's critical enemies.

Such matters did not affect the general enthusiasm. When people are

weary of a certain way of surveying life, and have their faces eagerly

set in some new direction, they read in a book what it pleases them to

read; they assimilate as much as falls in with their dominant mood,

and the rest passes away unseen. The French public were bewitched by

Julie, and were no more capable of criticising her than Julie was

capable of criticising Saint Preux in the height of her passion for

him. When we say that Rousseau was the author of this movement, all we

mean is that his book and its chief personage awoke emotion to

self-consciousness, gave it a dialect, communicated an impulse in

favour of social order, and then very calamitously at the same moment

divorced it from the fundamental conditions of progress, by divorcing

it from disciplined intelligence and scientific reason.

Apart from the general tendency of the New HeloÃ¯sa in numberless

indirect ways to bring the manners of the great into contempt, by the

presentation of the happiness of a simple and worthy life, thrifty,

self-sufficing, and homely, there is one direct protest of singular

eloquence and gravity. Julie's father is deeply revolted at the bare

notion of marrying his daughter to a teacher. Rousseau puts his

vigorous remonstrance against pride of birth into the mouth of an

English nobleman. This is perhaps an infelicitous piece of

prosopopoeia, but it is interesting as illustrative of the idea of

England in the eighteenth century as the home of stout-hearted

freedom. We may quote one piece from the numerous bits of very

straightforward speaking in which our representative expressed his

mind as to the significance of birth. "My friend has nobility," cried

Lord Edward, "not written in ink on mouldering parchments, but graven

in his heart in characters that can never be effaced. For my own part,

by God, I should be sorry to have no other proof of my merit but that

of a man who has been in his grave these five hundred years. If you

know the English nobility, you know that it is the most enlightened,

the best informed, the wisest, the bravest in Europe. That being so, I

don't care to ask whether it is the oldest or not. We are not, it is

true, the slaves of the prince, but his friends; nor the tyrants of

the people, but their leaders. We hold the balance true between

people, and monarch. Our first duty is towards the nation, our second

towards him who governs; it is not his will but his right that we

consider.... We suffer no one in the land to say \_God and my sword\_,

nor more than this, \_God and my right\_."[70] All this was only

putting Montesquieu into heroics, it is true, but a great many people

read the romance who were not likely to read the graver book. And

there was a wide difference between the calm statement of a number of

political propositions about government, and their transformation into

dramatic invective against the arrogance of all social inequality that

does not correspond with inequalities of worth.

There is no contradiction between this and the social quietism of

other parts of the book. Moral considerations and the paramount place

that they hold in Rousseau's way of thinking, explain at once his

contempt for the artificial privileges and assumptions of high rank,

and his contempt for anything like discontent with the conditions of

humble rank. Simplicity of life was his ideal. He wishes us to despise

both those who have departed from it, and those who would depart from

it if they could. So Julie does her best to make the lot of the

peasants as happy as it is capable of being made, without ever helping

them to change it for another. She teaches them to respect their

natural condition in respecting themselves. Her prime maxim is to

discourage change of station and calling, but above all to dissuade

the villager, whose life is the happiest of all, from leaving the true

pleasures of his natural career for the fever and corruption of

towns.[71] Presently a recollection of the sombre things that he had

seen in his rambles through France crossed Rousseau's pastoral

visions, and he admitted that there were some lands in which the

publican devours the fruits of the earth; where the misery that covers

the fields, the bitter greed of some grasping farmer, the inflexible

rigour of an inhuman master, take something from the charm of his

rural scenes. "Worn-out horses ready to expire under the blows they

receive, wretched peasants attenuated by hunger, broken by weariness,

clad in rags, hamlets all in ruins--these things offer a mournful

spectacle to the eye: one is almost sorry to be a man, as we think of

the unhappy creatures on whose blood we have to feed."[72]

Yet there is no hint in the New HeloÃ¯sa of the socialism which Morelly

and Mably flung themselves upon, as the remedy for all these desperate

horrors. Property, in every page of the New HeloÃ¯sa, is held in full

respect; the master has the honourable burden of patriarchal duty; the

servant the not less honourable burden of industry and faithfulness;

disobedience or vice is promptly punished with paternal rigour and

more than paternal inflexibility. The insurrectionary quality and

effect of Rousseau's work lay in no direct preaching or vehement

denunciation of the abuses that filled France with cruelty on the one

hand and sodden misery on the other. It lay in pictures of a social

state in which abuses and cruelty cannot exist, nor any miseries save

those which are inseparable from humanity. The contrast between the

sober, cheerful, prosperous scenes of romance, and the dreariness of

the reality of the field life of France,--this was the element that

filled generous souls with an intoxicating transport.

Rousseau's way of dealing with the portentous questions that lay about

that tragic scene of deserted fields, ruined hamlets, tottering

brutes, and hunger-stricken men, may be gathered from one of the many

traits in Julie which endeared her to that generation, and might

endear her even to our own if it only knew her. Wolmar's house was

near a great high-road, and so was daily haunted by beggars. Not one

of these was allowed to go empty away. And Julie had as many excellent

reasons to give for her charity, as if she had been one of the

philosophers of whom she thought so surpassingly ill. If you look at

mendicancy merely as a trade, what is the harm of a calling whose end

is to nourish feelings of humanity and brotherly love? From the point

of view of talent, why should I not pay the eloquence of a beggar who

stirs my pity, as highly as that of a player who makes me shed tears

over imaginary sorrows? If the great number of beggars is burdensome

to the state, of how many other professions that people encourage, may

you not say the same? How can I be sure that the man to whom I give

alms is not an honest soul, whom I may save from perishing? In short,

whatever we may think of the poor wretches, if we owe nothing to the

beggar, at least we owe it to ourselves to pay honour to suffering

humanity or to its image.[73] Nothing could be more admirably

illustrative of the author's confidence that the first thing for us to

do is to satisfy our fine feelings, and that then all the rest shall

be added unto us. The doctrine spread so far, that Necker,--a sort of

Julie in a frock-coat, who had never fallen, the incarnation of this

doctrine on the great stage of affairs,--was hailed to power to ward

off the bankruptcy of the state by means of a good heart and moral

sentences, while Turgot with science and firmness for his resources

was driven away as an economist and a philosopher.

At a first glance, it may seem that there was compensation for the

triumph of sentiment over reason, and that if France was ruined by the

dreams in which Rousseau encouraged the nation to exult, she was saved

by the fervour and resoluteness of the aspirations with which he

filled the most generous of her children. No wide movement, we may be

sure, is thoroughly understood until we have mastered both its

material and its ideal sides. Materially, Rousseau's work was

inevitably fraught with confusion because in this sphere not to be

scientific, not to be careful in tracing effects to their true causes,

is to be without any security that the causes with which we try to

deal will lead to the effects that we desire. A Roman statesman who

had gone to the Sermon on the Mount for a method of staying the

economic ruin of the empire, its thinning population, its decreasing

capital, would obviously have found nothing of what he sought. But the

moral nature of man is redeemed by teaching that may have no bearing

on economics, or even a bearing purely mischievous, and which has to

be corrected by teaching that probably goes equally far in the

contrary direction of moral mischief. In the ideal sphere, the

processes are very complex. In measuring a man's influence within it

we have to balance. Rousseau's action was undoubtedly excellent in

leading men and women to desire simple lives, and a more harmonious

social order. Was this eminent benefit more than counterbalanced by

the eminent disadvantage of giving a reactionary intellectual

direction? By commending irrational retrogression from active use of

the understanding back to dreamy contemplation?

To one teacher is usually only one task allotted. We do not reproach

want of science to the virtuous and benevolent Channing; his goodness

and effusion stirred women and the young, just as Rousseau did, to

sentimental but humane aspiration. It was this kind of influence that

formed the opinion which at last destroyed American slavery. We owe a

place in the temple that commemorates human emancipation, to every man

who has kindled in his generation a brighter flame of moral

enthusiasm, and a more eager care for the realisation of good and

virtuous ideals.

III.

The story of the circumstances of the publication of Emilius and the

persecution which befell its author in consequence, recalls us to the

distinctively evil side of French history in this critical epoch, and

carries us away from light into the thick darkness of political

intrigue, obscurantist faction, and a misgovernment which was at once

tyrannical and decrepit. It is almost impossible for us to realise the

existence in the same society of such boundless license of thought,

and such unscrupulous restraint upon its expression. Not one of

Rousseau's three chief works, for instance, was printed in France. The

whole trade in books was a sort of contraband, and was carried on with

the stealth, subterfuge, daring, and knavery that are demanded in

contraband dealings. An author or a bookseller was forced to be as

careful as a kidnapper of coolies or the captain of a slaver would be

in our own time. He had to steer clear of the court, of the

parliament, of Jansenists, of Jesuits, of the mistresses of the king

and the minister, of the friends of the mistresses, and above all of

that organised hierarchy of ignorance and oppression in all times and

places where they raise their masked heads,--the bishops and

ecclesiastics of every sort and condition. Palissot produced his

comedy to please the devout at the expense of the philosophers (1760).

Madame de Robecq, daughter of Rousseau's marshal of Luxembourg,

instigated and protected him, for Diderot had offended her.[74]

Morellet replied in a piece in which the keen vision of feminine spite

detected a reference to Madame de Robecq. Though dying, she still had

relations with Choiseul, and so Morellet was flung into the

Bastile.[75] Diderot was thrown for three months into Vincennes, where

we saw him on a memorable occasion, for his Letter on the Blind

(1748), nominally because it was held to contain irreligious doctrine,

really because he had given offence to D'Argenson's mistress by

hinting that she might be very handsome, but that her judgment on

scientific experiment was of no value.[76]

The New HeloÃ¯sa could not openly circulate in France so long as it

contained the words, "I would rather be the wife of a charcoal-burner

than the mistress of a king." The last word was altered to "prince,"

and then Rousseau was warned that he would offend the Prince de Conti

and Madame de Boufflers.[77] No work of merit could appear without

more or less of slavish mutilation, and no amount of slavish

mutilation could make the writer secure against the accidental grudge

of people who had influence in high quarters.[78]

If French booksellers in the stirring intellectual time of the

eighteenth century needed all the craft of a smuggler, their morality

was reduced to an equally low level in dealing not only with the

police, but with their own accomplices, the book-writers. They excused

themselves from paying proper sums to authors, on the ground that they

were robbed of the profits that would enable them to pay such sums, by

the piracy of their brethren in trade. But then they all pirated the

works of one another. The whole commerce was a mass of fraud and

chicane, and every prominent author passed his life between two fires.

He was robbed, his works were pirated, and, worse than robbery and

piracy, they were defaced and distorted by the booksellers. On the

other side he was tormented to death by the suspicion and timidity,

alternately with the hatred and active tyranny of the administration.

As we read the story of the lives of all these strenuous men, their

struggles, their incessant mortifications, their constantly reviving

and ever irrepressible vigour and interest in the fight, we may wish

that the shabbiness and the pettiness of the daily lives of some of

them had faded away from memory, and left us nothing to think of in

connection with their names but the alertness, courage, tenacity,

self-sacrifice, and faith with which they defended the cause of human

emancipation and progress. Happily the mutual hate of the Christian

factions, to which liberty owes at least as much as charity owes to

their mutual love, prevented a common union for burning the

philosophers as well as their books. All torments short of this they

endured, and they had the great merit of enduring them without any

hope of being rewarded after their death, as truly good men must

always be capable of doing.

Rousseau had no taste for martyrdom, nor any intention of courting it

in even its slightest forms. Holland was now the great printing press

of France, and when we are counting up the contributions of

Protestantism to the enfranchisement of Europe, it is just to remember

the indispensable services rendered by the freedom of the press in

Holland to the dissemination of French thought in the eighteenth

century, as well as the shelter that it gave to the French thinkers in

the seventeenth, including Descartes, the greatest of them all. The

monstrous tediousness of printing a book at Amsterdam or the Hague,

the delay, loss, and confusion in receiving and transmitting the

proofs, and the subterranean character of the entire process,

including the circulation of the book after it was once fairly

printed, were as grievous to Rousseau as to authors of more impetuous

temper. He agreed with Rey, for instance, the Amsterdam printer, to

sell him the Social Contract for 1000 francs. The manuscript had then

to be cunningly conveyed to Amsterdam. Rousseau wrote it out in very

small characters, sealed it carefully up, and entrusted it to the care

of the chaplain of the Dutch embassy, who happened to be a native of

Vaud. In passing the barrier, the packet fell into the hands of the

officials. They tore it open and examined it, happily unconscious that

they were handling the most explosive kind of gunpowder that they had

ever meddled with. It was not until the chaplain claimed it in the

name of ambassadorial privilege, that the manuscript was allowed to go

on its way to the press.[79] Rousseau repeats a hundred times, not

only in the Confessions, but also in letters to his friends, how

resolutely and carefully he avoided any evasion of the laws of the

country in which he lived. The French government was anxious enough on

all grounds to secure for France the production of the books of which

France was the great consumer, but the severity of its censorship

prevented this.[80] The introduction of the books, when printed, was

tolerated or connived at, because the country would hardly have

endured to be deprived of the enjoyment of its own literature. By a

greater inconsistency the reprinting of a book which had once found

admission into the country, was also connived at. Thus M. de

Malesherbes, out of friendship for Rousseau, wished to have an edition

of the New HeloÃ¯sa printed in France, and sold for the benefit of the

author. That he should have done so is a curious illustration of the

low morality engendered by a repressive system imperfectly carried

out. For Rousseau had sold the book to Rey. Rey had treated with a

French bookseller in the usual way, that is, had sent him half the

edition printed, the bookseller paying either in cash or other books

for all the copies he received. Therefore to print an independent

edition in Paris was to injure, not Rey the foreigner, but the French

bookseller who stood practically in Rey's place. It was setting two

French booksellers to ruin one another. Rousseau emphatically declined

to receive any profit from such a transaction. But, said Malesherbes,

you sold to Rey a right which you had not got, the right of sole

proprietorship, excluding the competition of a pirated reprint. Then,

answered Rousseau, if the right which I sold happens to prove less

than I thought, it is clear that far from taking advantage of my

mistake, I owe to Rey compensation for any loss that he may

suffer.[81]

The friendship of Malesherbes for the party of reason was shown on

numerous occasions. As director of the book trade he was really the

censor of the literature of the time.[82] The story of his service to

Diderot is well known--how he warned Diderot that the police were

about to visit his house and overhaul his papers, and how when Diderot

despaired of being able to put them out of sight in his narrow

quarters, Malesherbes said, "Then send them all to me," and took care

of them until the storm was overpast. The proofs of the New HeloÃ¯sa

came through his hands, and now he made himself Rousseau's agent in

the affairs relative to the printing of Emilius. Rousseau entrusted

the whole matter to him and to Madame de Luxembourg, being confident

that, in acting through persons of such authority and position, he

should be protected against any unwitting illegality. Instead of being

sent to Rey, the manuscript was sold to a bookseller in Paris for six

thousand francs.[83] A long time elapsed before any proofs reached the

author, and he soon perceived that an edition was being printed in

France as well as in Holland. Still, as Malesherbes was in some sort

the director of the enterprise, the author felt no alarm. Duclos came

to visit him one day, and Rousseau read aloud to him the Savoyard

Vicar's Profession of Faith. "What, citizen," he cried, "and that is

part of a book that they are printing at Paris! Be kind enough not to

tell any one that you read this to me."[84] Still Rousseau remained

secure. Then the printing came to a standstill, and he could not find

out the reason, because Malesherbes was away, and the printer did not

take the trouble to answer his letters. "My natural tendency," he

says, and as the rest of his life only too abundantly proved, "is to

be afraid of darkness; mystery always disturbs me, it is utterly

antipathetic to my character, which is open even to the pitch of

imprudence. The aspect of the most hideous monster would alarm me

little, I verily believe; but if I discern at night a figure in a

white sheet, I am sure to be terrified out of my life."[85] So he at

once fancied that by some means the Jesuits had got possession of his

book, and knowing him to be at death's door, designed to keep the

Emilius back until he was actually dead, when they would publish a

truncated version of it to suit their own purposes.[86] He wrote

letter upon letter to the printer, to Malesherbes, to Madame de

Luxembourg, and if answers did not come, or did not come exactly when

he expected them, he grew delirious with anxiety. If he dropped his

conviction that the Jesuits were plotting the ruin of his book and the

defilement of his reputation, he lost no time in fastening a similar

design upon the Jansenists, and when the Jansenists were acquitted,

then the turn of the philosophers came. We have constantly to remember

that all this time the unfortunate man was suffering incessant pain,

and passing his nights in sleeplessness and fever. He sometimes threw

off the black dreams of unfathomable suspicion, and dreamed in their

stead of some sunny spot in pleasant Touraine, where under a mild

climate and among a gentle people he should peacefully end his

days.[87] At other times he was fond of supposing M. de Luxembourg

not a duke, nor a marshal of France, but a good country squire living

in some old mansion, and himself not an author, not a maker of books,

but with moderate intelligence and slight attainment, finding with the

squire and his dame the happiness of his life, and contributing to the

happiness of theirs.[88] Alas, in spite of all his precautions, he had

unwittingly drifted into the stream of great affairs. He and his book

were sacrificed to the exigencies of faction; and a persecution set

in, which destroyed his last chance of a composed life, by giving his

reason, already disturbed, a final blow from which it never recovered.

Emilius appeared in the crisis of the movement against the Jesuits.

That formidable order had offended Madame de Pompadour by a refusal to

recognise her power and position,--a manly policy, as creditable to

their moral vigour as it was contrary to the maxims which had made

them powerful. They had also offended Choiseul by the part they had

taken in certain hostile intrigues at Versailles. The parliaments had

always been their enemies. This was due first to the jealousy with

which corporations of lawyers always regard corporations of

ecclesiastics, and next to their hatred of the bull Unigenitus, which

had been not only an infraction of French liberties, but the occasion

of special humiliation to the parliaments. Then the hostility of the

parliaments to the Jesuits was caused by the harshness with which the

system of confessional tickets was at this time being carried out.

Finally, the once powerful house of Austria, the protector of all

retrograde interests, was now weakened by the Seven Years' War; and

was unable to bring effective influence to bear on Lewis XV. At last

he gave his consent to the destruction of the order. The commercial

bankruptcy of one of their missions was the immediate occasion of

their fall, and nothing could save them. "I only know one man," said

Grimm, "in a position to have composed an apology for the Jesuits in

fine style, if it had been in his way to take the side of that tribe,

and this man is M. Rousseau." The parliaments went to work with

alacrity, but they were quite as hostile to the philosophers as they

were to the Jesuits, and hence their anxiety to show that they were no

allies of the one even when destroying the other.

Contemporaries seldom criticise the shades and variations of

innovating speculation with any marked nicety. Anything with the stamp

of rationality on its phrases or arguments was roughly set down to the

school of the philosophers, and Rousseau was counted one of their

number, like Voltaire or HelvÃ©tius. The Emilius appeared in May 1762.

On the 11th of June the parliament of Paris ordered the book to be

burnt by the public executioner, and the writer to be arrested. For

Rousseau always scorned the devices of Voltaire and others; he

courageously insisted on placing his name on the title-page of all his

works,[89] and so there was none of the usual difficulty in

identifying the author. The grounds of the proceedings were alleged

irreligious tendencies to be found in the book.[90]

The indecency of the requisition in which the advocate-general

demanded its proscription, was admitted even by people who were least

likely to defend Rousseau.[91] The author was charged with saying not

only that man may be saved without believing in God, but even that the

Christian religion does not exist--paradox too flagrant even for the

writer of the Discourse on Inequality. No evidence was produced either

that the alleged assertions were in the book, or that the name of the

author was really the name on its title-page. Rousseau fared no worse,

but better, than his fellows, for there was hardly a single man of

letters of that time who escaped arbitrary imprisonment.

The unfortunate author had news of the ferment which his work was

creating in Paris, and received notes of warning from every hand, but

he could not believe that the only man in France who believed in God

was to be the victim of the defenders of Christianity.[92] On the 8th

of June he spent a merry day with two friends, taking their dinner in

the fields. "Ever since my youth I had a habit of reading at night in

my bed until my eyes grew heavy. Then I put out the candle, and tried

to fall asleep for a few minutes, but they seldom lasted long. My

ordinary reading at night was the Bible, and I have read it

continuously through at least five or six times in this way. That

night, finding myself more wakeful than usual, I prolonged my reading,

and read through the whole of the book which ends with the Levite of

Ephraim, and which if I mistake not is the book of Judges. The story

affected me deeply, and I was busy over it in a kind of dream, when

all at once I was roused by lights and noises."[93]

It was two o'clock in the morning. A messenger had come in hot haste

to carry him to Madame de Luxembourg. News had reached her of the

proposed decree of the parliament. She knew Rousseau well enough to be

sure that if he were seized and examined, her own share and that of

Malesherbes in the production of the condemned book would be made

public, and their position uncomfortably compromised. It was to their

interest that he should avoid arrest by flight, and they had no

difficulty in persuading him to fall in with their plans. After a

tearful farewell with Theresa, who had hardly been out of his sight

for seventeen years, and many embraces from the greater ladies of the

castle, he was thrust into a chaise and despatched on the first stage

of eight melancholy years of wandering and despair, to be driven from

place to place, first by the fatuous tyranny of magistrates and

religious doctors, and then by the yet more cruel spectres of his own

diseased imagination, until at length his whole soul became the home

of weariness and torment.
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CHAPTER II.

PERSECUTION.[94]

Those to whom life consists in the immediate consciousness of

their own direct relations with the people and circumstances that are

in close contact with them, find it hard to follow the moods of a man

to whom such consciousness is the least part of himself, and such

relations the least real part of his life. Rousseau was no sooner in

the post-chaise which was bearing him away towards Switzerland, than

the troubles of the previous day at once dropped into a pale and

distant past, and he returned to a world where was neither parliament,

nor decree for burning books, nor any warrant for personal arrest. He

took up the thread where harassing circumstances had broken it, and

again fell musing over the tragic tale of the Levite of Ephraim. His

dream absorbed him so entirely as to take specific literary form, and

before the journey was at an end he had composed a long impassioned

version of the Bible story. Though it has Rousseau's usual fine

sonorousness in a high degree, no man now reads it; the author himself

always preserved a certain tenderness for it.[95] The contrast

between this singular quietism and the angry stir that marked

Voltaire's many flights in post-chaises, points like all else to the

profound difference between the pair. Contrast with Voltaire's shrill

cries under any personal vexation, this calm utterance:--"Though the

consequences of this affair have plunged me into a gulf of woes from

which I shall never come up again so long as I live, I bear these

gentlemen no grudge. I am aware that their object was not to do me any

harm, but only to reach ends of their own. I know that towards me they

have neither liking nor hate. I was found in their way, like a pebble

that you thrust aside with the foot without even looking at it. They

ought not to say they have performed their duty, but that they have

done their business."[96] A new note from a persecuted writer.

Rousseau, in spite of the belief which henceforth possessed him that

he was the victim of a dark unfathomable plot, and in spite of passing

outbreaks of gloomy rage, was incapable of steady glowing and active

resentments. The world was not real enough to him for this. A throng

of phantoms pressed noiselessly before his sight, and dulled all sense

of more actual impression. "It is amazing," he wrote, "with what ease

I forget past ill, however fresh it may be. In proportion as the

anticipation of it alarms and confuses me when I see it coming, so

the memory of it returns feebly to my mind and dies out the moment

after it has arrived. My cruel imagination, which torments itself

incessantly in anticipating woes that are still unborn, makes a

diversion for my memory, and hinders me from recalling those which

have gone. I exhaust disaster beforehand. The more I have suffered in

foreseeing it, the more easily do I forget it; while on the contrary,

being incessantly busy with my past happiness, I recall it and brood

and ruminate over it, so as to enjoy it over again whenever I

wish."[97] The same turn of humour saved him from vindictiveness. "I

concern myself too little with the offence, to feel much concern about

the offender. I only think of the hurt that I have received from him,

on account of the hurt that he may still do me; and if I were sure he

would do me no more, what he had already done would be forgotten

straightway." Though he does not carry the analysis any further, we

may easily perceive that the same explanation covers what he called

his natural ingratitude. Kindness was not much more vividly understood

by him than malice. It was only one form of the troublesome

interposition of an outer world in his life; he was fain to hurry back

from it to the real world of his dreams. If any man called practical

is tempted to despise this dreaming creature, as he fares in his

chaise from stage to stage, let him remember that one making that

journey through France less than thirty years later might have seen

the castles of the great flaring in the destruction of a most

righteous vengeance, the great themselves fleeing ignobly from the

land to which their selfishness, and heedlessness, and hatred of

improvement, and inhuman pride had been a curse, while the legion of

toilers with eyes blinded by the oppression of ages were groping with

passionate uncertain hand for that divine something which they thought

of as justice and right. And this was what Rousseau both partially

foresaw and helped to prepare,[98] while the common politicians, like

Choiseul or D'Aiguillon, played their poor game--the elemental forces

rising unseen into tempest around them.

He reached the territory of the canton of Berne, and alighted at the

house of an old friend at Yverdun,[99] where native air, the beauty of

the spot, and the charms of the season, immediately repaired all

weariness and fatigue.[100] Friends at Geneva wrote letters of sincere

feeling, joyful that he had not followed the precedent of Socrates too

closely by remaining in the power of a government eager to destroy

him.[101] A post or two later brought worse news. The Council at

Geneva ordered not only Emilius, but the Social Contract also, to be

publicly burnt, and issued a warrant of arrest against their author,

if he should set foot in the territory of the republic (June

19).[102] Rousseau could hardly believe it possible that the free

Government which he had held up to the reverence of Europe, could have

condemned him unheard, but he took occasion in a highly characteristic

manner to chide severely a friend at Geneva who had publicly taken his

part.[103] Within a fortnight this blow was followed by another. His

two books were reported to the senate of Berne, and Rousseau was

informed by one of the authorities that a notification was on its way

admonishing him to quit the canton within the space of fifteen

days.[104] This stroke he avoided by flight to Motiers, a village in

the principality of NeuchÃ¢tel (July 10), then part of the dominions of

the King of Prussia.[105] Rousseau had some antipathy to Frederick,

both because he had beaten the French, whom Rousseau loved, and

because his maxims and his conduct alike seemed to trample under foot

respect for the natural law and not a few human duties. He had

composed a verse to the effect that Frederick thought like a

philosopher and acted like a king, philosopher and king notoriously

being words of equally evil sense in his dialect. There was also a

passage in Emilius about Adrastus, King of the Daunians, which was

commonly understood to mean Frederick, King of the Prussians. Still

Rousseau was acute enough to know that mean passions usually only rule

the weak, and have little hold over the strong. He boldly wrote both

to the king and to Lord Marischal, the governor of the principality,

informing them that he was there, and asking permission to remain in

the only asylum left for him upon the earth.[106] He compared himself

loftily to Coriolanus among the Volscians, and wrote to the king in a

vein that must have amused the strong man. "I have said much ill of

you, perhaps I shall still say more; yet, driven from France, from

Geneva, from the canton of Berne, I am come to seek shelter in your

states. Perhaps I was wrong in not beginning there; this is eulogy of

which you are worthy. Sire, I have deserved no grace from you, and I

seek none, but I thought it my duty to inform your majesty that I am

in your power, and that I am so of set design. Your majesty will

dispose of me as shall seem good to you."[107] Frederick, though no

admirer of Rousseau or his writings,[108] readily granted the required

permission. He also, says Lord Marischal, "gave me orders to furnish

him his small necessaries if he would accept them; and though that

king's philosophy be very different from that of Jean Jacques, yet he

does not think that a man of an irreproachable life is to be

persecuted because his sentiments are singular. He designs to build

him a hermitage with a little garden, which I find he will not accept,

nor perhaps the rest, which I have not yet offered him."[109] When the

offer of the flour, wine, and firewood was at length made in as

delicate terms as possible, Rousseau declined the gift on grounds

which may raise a smile, but which are not without a rather touching

simplicity.[110] "I have enough to live on for two or three years," he

said, "but if I were dying of hunger, I would rather in the present

condition of your good prince, and not being of any service to him, go

and eat grass and grub up roots, than accept a morsel of bread from

him."[111] Hume might well call this a phenomenon in the world of

letters, and one very honourable for the person concerned.[112] And we

recognise its dignity the more when we contrast it with the baseness

of Voltaire, who drew his pension from the King of Prussia while

Frederick was in his most urgent straits, and while the poet was

sportively exulting to all his correspondents in the malicious

expectation that he would one day have to allow the King of Prussia

himself a pension.[113] And Rousseau was a poor man, living among the

poor and in their style. His annual outlay at this time was covered by

the modest sum of sixty louis.[114] What stamps his refusal of

Frederick's gifts as true dignity, is the fact that he not only did

not refuse money for any work done, but expected and asked for it.

Malesherbes at this very time begged him to collect plants for him.

Joyfully, replied Rousseau, "but as I cannot subsist without the aid

of my own labour, I never meant, in spite of the pleasure that it

might otherwise have been to me, to offer you the use of my time for

nothing."[115] In the same year, we may add, when the tremendous

struggle of the Seven Years' War was closing, the philosopher wrote a

second terse epistle to the king, and with this their direct

communication came to an end. "Sire, you are my protector and my

benefactor; I would fain repay you if I can. You wish to give me

bread; is there none of your own subjects in want of it? Take that

sword away from my sight, it dazzles and pains me. It has done its

work only too well; the sceptre is abandoned. Great is the career for

kings of your stuff, and you are still far from the term; time

presses, you have not a moment to lose. Fathom well your heart, O

Frederick! Can you dare to die without having been the greatest of

men? Would that I could see Frederick, the just and the redoubtable,

covering his states with multitudes of men to whom he should be a

father; then will J.J. Rousseau, the foe of kings, hasten to die at

the foot of his throne."[116] Frederick, strong as his interest was in

all curious persons who could amuse him, was too busy to answer this,

and Rousseau was not yet recognised as Voltaire's rival in power and

popularity.

Motiers is one of the half-dozen decent villages standing in the flat

bottom of the Val de Travers, a widish valley that lies between the

gorges of the Jura and the Lake of NeuchÃ¢tel, and is famous in our day

for its production of absinthe and of asphalt. The flat of the valley,

with the Reuss making a bald and colourless way through the midst of

it, is nearly treeless, and it is too uniform to be very pleasing. In

winter the climate is most rigorous, for the level is high, and the

surrounding hills admit the sun's rays late and cut them off early.

Rousseau's description, accurate and recognisable as it is,[117]

strikes an impartial tourist as too favourable. But when a piece of

scenery is a home to a man, he has an eye for a thousand outlines,

changes of light, soft variations of colour; the landscape lives for

him with an unspoken suggestion and intimate association, to all of

which the swift passing stranger is very cold.

His cottage, which is still shown, was in the midst of the other

houses, and his walks, which were at least as important to him as the

home in which he dwelt, lay mostly among woody heights with streaming

cascades. The country abounded in natural curiosities of a humble

sort, and here that interest in plants which had always been strong in

him, began to grow into a passion. Rousseau had so curious a feeling

about them, that when in his botanical expeditions he came across a

single flower of its kind, he could never bring himself to pluck it.

His sight, though not good for distant objects, was of the very finest

for things held close; his sense of smell was so acute and subtle

that, according to a good witness, he might have classified plants by

odours, if language furnished as many names as nature supplies

varieties of fragrance.[118] He insisted in all botanising and other

walking excursions on going bareheaded, even in the heat of the

dog-days; he declared that the action of the sun did him good. When

the days began to turn, the summer was straightway at an end for him:

"My imagination," he said, in a phrase which went further through his

life than he supposed, "at once brings winter." He hated rain as much

as he loved sun, so he must once have lost all the mystic fascination

of the green Savoy lakes gleaming luminous through pale showers, and

now again must have lost the sombre majesty of the pines of his valley

dripping in torn edges of cloud, and all those other sights in

landscape that touch subtler parts of us than comforted sense.

One of his favourite journeys was to Colombier, the summer retreat of

Lord Marischal. For him he rapidly conceived the same warm friendship

which he felt for the Duke of Luxembourg, whom he had just left. And

the sagacious, moderate, silent Scot had as warm a liking for the

strange refugee who had come to him for shelter, or shall we call it a

kind of shaggy compassion, as of a faithful inarticulate creature. His

letters, which are numerous enough, abound in expressions of hearty

good-will. These, if we reflect on the genuine worth, veracity,

penetration, and experience of the old man who wrote them, may fairly

be counted the best testimony that remains to the existence of

something sterling at the bottom of Rousseau's character.[119] It is

here no insincere fine lady of the French court, but a homely and

weather-beaten Scotchman, who speaks so often of his refugee's

rectitude of heart and true sensibility.[120]

He insisted on being allowed to settle a small sum on Theresa, who

had joined Rousseau at Motiers, and in other ways he showed a true

solicitude and considerateness both for her and for him.[121] It was

his constant dream, that on his return to Scotland, Jean Jacques

should accompany him, and that with David Hume, they would make a trio

of philosophic hermits; that this was no mere cheery pleasantry is

shown by the pains he took in settling the route for the journey.[122]

The plan only fell through in consequence of Frederick's cordial

urgency that his friend should end his days with him; he returned to

Prussia and lived at Sans Souci until the close, always retaining

something of his good-will for "his excellent savage," as he called

the author of the Discourses. They had some common antipathies,

including the fundamental one of dislike to society, and especially to

the society of the people of NeuchÃ¢tel, the Gascons of Switzerland.

"Rousseau is gay in company," Lord Marischal wrote to Hume, "polite,

and what the French call \_aimable\_, and gains ground daily in the

opinion of even the clergy here. His enemies elsewhere continue to

persecute him, and he is pestered with anonymous letters."[123]

Some of these were of a humour that disclosed the master hand.

Voltaire had been universally suspected of stirring up the feeling of

Geneva against its too famous citizen,[124] though for a man of less

energy the affair of the Calas, which he was now in the thick of,

might have sufficed. Voltaire's letters at this time show how hard he

found it in the case of Rousseau to exercise his usual pity for the

unfortunate. He could not forget that the man who was now tasting

persecution had barked at philosophers and stage-plays; that he was a

false brother, who had fatuously insulted the only men who could take

his part; that he was a Judas who had betrayed the sacred cause.[125]

On the whole, however, we ought probably to accept his word, though

not very categorically given,[126] that he had nothing to do with the

action taken against Rousseau. That action is quite adequately

explained, first by the influence of the resident of France at Geneva,

which we know to have been exerted against the two fatal books,[127]

and second by the anxiety of the oligarchic party to keep out of their

town a man whose democratic tendencies they now knew so well and so

justly dreaded.[128] Moultou, a Genevese minister, in the full tide

of devotion and enthusiasm for the author of Emilius, met Voltaire at

the house of a lady in Geneva. All will turn out well, cried the

patriarch; "the syndics will say M. Rousseau, you have done ill to

write what you have written; promise for the future to respect the

religion of your country. Jean Jacques will promise, and perhaps he

will say that the printer took the liberty of adding a sheet or two to

his book." "Never," cried the ardent Moultou; "Jean Jacques never puts

his name to works to disown them after."[129] Voltaire disowned his

own books with intrepid and sustained mendacity, yet he bore no grudge

to Moultou for his vehemence. He sent for him shortly afterwards,

professed an extreme desire to be reconciled with Rousseau, and would

talk of nothing else. "I swear to you," wrote Moultou, "that I could

not understand him the least in the world; he is a marvellous actor; I

could have sworn that he loved you."[130] And there really was no

acting in it. The serious Genevese did not see that he was dealing

with "one all fire and fickleness, a child."

Rousseau soon found out that he had excited not only the band of

professed unbelievers, but also the tormenting wasps of orthodoxy. The

doctors of the Sorbonne, not to be outdone in fervour for truth by the

lawyers of the parliament, had condemned Emilius as a matter of

course. In the same spirit of generous emulation, Christopher de

Beaumont, "by the divine compassion archbishop of Paris, Duke of Saint

Cloud, peer of France, commander of the order of the Holy Ghost," had

issued (Aug. 20, 1762) one of those hateful documents in which

bishops, Catholic and Protestant, have been wont for the last century

and a half to hide with swollen bombastic phrase their dead and

decomposing ideas. The windy folly of these poor pieces is usually in

proportion to the hierarchic rank of those who promulgate them, and an

archbishop owes it to himself to blaspheme against reason and freedom

in superlatives of malignant unction. Rousseau's reply (Nov. 18, 1762)

is a masterpiece of dignity and uprightness. Turning to it from the

mandate which was its provocative, we seem to grasp the hand of a man,

after being chased by a nightmare of masked figures. Rousseau never

showed the substantial quality of his character more surely and

unmistakably than in controversy. He had such gravity, such austere

self-command, such closeness of grip. Most of us feel pleasure in

reading the matchless banter with which Voltaire assailed his

theological enemies. Reading Rousseau's letter to De Beaumont we

realise the comparative lowness of the pleasure which Voltaire had

given us. We understand how it was that Rousseau made fanatics, while

Voltaire only made sceptics. At the very first words, the mitre, the

crosier, the ring, fall into the dust; the Archbishop of Paris, the

Duke of Saint Cloud, the peer of France, the commander of the Holy

Ghost, is restored from the disguises of his enchantment, and becomes

a human being. We hear the voice of a man hailing a man. Voltaire

often sank to the level of ecclesiastics. Rousseau raised the

archbishop to his own level, and with magnanimous courtesy addressed

him as an equal. "Why, my lord, have I anything to say to you? What

common tongue can we use? How are we to understand one another? And

what is there between me and you?" And he persevered in this distant

lofty vein, hardly permitting himself a single moment of acerbity. We

feel the ever-inspiring breath of seriousness and sincerity. This was

because, as we repeat so often, Rousseau's ideas, all engendered of

dreams as they were, yet lived in him and were truly rooted in his

character. He did not merely say, as any of us can say so fluently,

that he craved reality in human relations, that distinctions of rank

and post count for nothing, that our lives are in our own hands and

ought not to be blown hither and thither by outside opinion and words

heedlessly scattered; that our faith, whatever it may be, is the most

sacred of our possessions, organic, indissoluble, self-sufficing; that

our passage across the world, if very short, is yet too serious to be

wasted in frivolous disrespect for ourselves, and angry disrespect for

others. All this was actually his mind. And hence the little

difficulty he had in keeping his retort to the archbishop, as to his

other antagonists, on a worthy level.

Only once or twice does his sense of the reckless injustice with which

he had been condemned, and of the persecution which was inflicted on

him by one government after another, stir in him a blaze of high

remonstrance. "You accuse me of temerity," he cried; "how have I

earned such a name, when I only propounded difficulties, and even that

with so much reserve; when I only advanced reasons, and even that with

so much respect; when I attacked no one, nor even named one? And you,

my lord, how do you dare to reproach with temerity a man of whom you

speak with such scanty justice and so little decency, with so small

respect and so much levity? You call me impious, and of what impiety

can you accuse me--me who never spoke of the Supreme Being except to

pay him the honour and glory that are his due, nor of man except to

persuade all men to love one another? The impious are those who

unworthily profane the cause of God by making it serve the passions of

men. The impious are those who, daring to pass for the interpreters of

divinity, and judges between it and man, exact for themselves the

honours that are due to it only. The impious are those who arrogate to

themselves the right of exercising the power of God upon earth, and

insist on opening and shutting the gates of heaven at their own good

will and pleasure. The impious are those who have libels read in the

church. At this horrible idea my blood is enkindled, and tears of

indignation fall from my eyes. Priests of the God of peace, you shall

render an account one day, be very sure, of the use to which you have

dared to put his house.... My lord, you have publicly insulted me:

you are now convicted of heaping calumny upon me. If you were a

private person like myself, so that I could cite you before an

equitable tribunal, and we could both appear before it, I with my

book, and you with your mandate, assuredly you would be declared

guilty; you would be condemned to make reparation as public as the

wrong was public. But you belong to a rank that relieves you from the

necessity of being just, and I am nothing. Yet you who profess the

gospel, you, a prelate appointed to teach others their duty, you know

what your own duty is in such a case. Mine I have done: I have nothing

more to say to you, and I hold my peace."[131]

The letter was as good in dialectic as it was in moral tone. For this

is a little curious, that Rousseau, so diffuse in expounding his

opinions, and so unscientific in his method of coming to them, should

have been one of the keenest and most trenchant of the

controversialists of a very controversial time. Some of his strokes in

defence of his first famous assault on civilisation are as hard, as

direct, and as effective as any in the records of polemical

literature. We will give one specimen from the letter to the

Archbishop of Paris; it has the recommendation of touching an argument

that is not yet quite universally recognised for slain. The Savoyard

Vicar had dwelt on the difficulty of accepting revelation as the voice

of God, on account of the long distance of time between us, and the

questionableness of the supporting testimony. To which the archbishop

thus:--"But is there not then an infinity of facts, even earlier than

those of the Christian revelation, which it would be absurd to doubt?

By what way other than that of human testimony has our author himself

known the Sparta, the Athens, the Rome, whose laws, manners, and

heroes he extols with such assurance? How many generations of men

between him and the historians who have preserved the memory of these

events?" First, says Rousseau in answer, "it is in the order of things

that human circumstances should be attested by human evidence, and

they can be attested in no other way. I can only know that Rome and

Sparta existed, because contemporaries assure me that they existed. In

such a case this intermediate communication is indispensable. But why

is it necessary between God and me? Is it simple or natural that God

should have gone in search of Moses to speak to Jean Jacques Rousseau?

Second, nobody is obliged to believe that Sparta once existed, and

nobody will be devoured by eternal flames for doubting it. Every fact

of which we are not witnesses is only established by moral proofs, and

moral proofs have various degrees of strength. Will the divine justice

hurl me into hell for missing the exact point at which a proof becomes

irresistible? If there is in the world an attested story, it is that

of vampires; nothing is wanting for judicial proof,--reports and

certificates from notables, surgeons, clergy, magistrates. But who

believes in vampires, and shall we all be damned for not believing?

Third, \_my constant experience and that of all men is stronger in

reference to prodigies than the testimony of some men\_."

He then strikes home with a parable. The AbbÃ© PÃ¢ris had died in the

odour of Jansenist sanctity (1727), and extraordinary doings went on

at his tomb; the lame walked, men and women sick of the palsy were

made whole, and so forth. Suppose, says Rousseau, that an inhabitant

of the Rue St. Jacques speaks thus to the Archbishop of Paris, "My

lord, I know that you neither believe in the beatitude of St. Jean de

PÃ¢ris, nor in the miracles which God has been pleased publicly to work

upon his tomb in the sight of the most enlightened and most populous

city in the world; but I feel bound to testify to you that I have just

seen the saint in person raised from the dead in the spot where his

bones were laid." The man of the Rue St. Jacques gives all the detail

of such a circumstance that could strike a beholder. "I am persuaded

that on hearing such strange news, you will begin by interrogating him

who testifies to its truth, as to his position, his feelings, his

confessor, and other such points; and when from his air, as from his

speech, you have perceived that he is a poor workman, and when having

no confessional ticket to show you, he has confirmed your notion that

he is a Jansenist, Ah, ah, you will say to him, you are a

convulsionary, and have seen Saint PÃ¢ris resuscitated. There is

nothing wonderful in that; you have seen so many other wonders!" The

man would insist that the miracle had been seen equally by a number of

other people, who though Jansenists, it is true, were persons of sound

sense, good character, and excellent reputation. Some would send the

man to Bedlam, "but you after a grave reprimand, will be content with

saying: I know that two or three witnesses, good people and of sound

sense, may attest the life or the death of a man, but I do not know

how many more are needed to establish the resurrection of a Jansenist.

Until I find that out, go, my son, and try to strengthen your brain: I

give you a dispensation from fasting, and here is something for you to

make your broth with. That is what you would say, and what any other

sensible man would say in your place. Whence I conclude that even

according to you and to every other sensible man, the moral proofs

which are sufficient to establish facts that are in the order of moral

possibilities, are not sufficient to establish facts of another order

and purely supernatural."[132]

Perhaps, however, the formal denunciation by the Archbishop of Paris

was less vexatious than the swarming of the angrier hive of ministers

at his gates. "If I had declared for atheism," he says bitterly, "they

would at first have shrieked, but they would soon have left me in

peace like the rest. The people of the Lord would not have kept watch

over me; everybody would not have thought he was doing me a high

favour in not treating me as a person cut off from communion, and I

should have been quits with all the world. The holy women in Israel

would not have written me anonymous letters, and their charity would

not have breathed devout insults. They would not have taken the

trouble to assure me in all humility of heart that I was a castaway,

an execrable monster, and that the world would have been well off if

some good soul had been at the pains to strangle me in my cradle.

Worthy people on their side would not torment themselves and torment

me to bring me back to the way of salvation; they would not charge at

me from right and left, nor stifle me under the weight of their

sermons, nor force me to bless their zeal while I cursed their

importunity, nor to feel with gratitude that they are obeying a call

to lay me in my very grave with weariness."[133]

He had done his best to conciliate the good opinion of his vigilant

neighbours. Their character for contentious orthodoxy was well known.

It was at NeuchÃ¢tel that the controversy as to the eternal punishment

of the wicked raged with a fury that ended in a civil outbreak. The

peace of the town was violently disturbed, ministers were suspended,

magistrates were interdicted, life was lost, until at last Frederick

promulgated his famous bull:--"Let the parsons who make for themselves

a cruel and barbarous God, be eternally damned as they desire and

deserve; and let those parsons who conceive God gentle and merciful,

enjoy the plenitude of his mercy."[134] When Rousseau came within the

territory, preparations were made to imitate the action of Paris,

Geneva, and Berne. It was only the king's express permission that

saved him from a fourth proscription. The minister at Motiers was of

the less inhuman stamp, and Rousseau, feeling that he could not,

without failing in his engagements and his duty as a citizen, neglect

the public profession of the faith to which he had been restored eight

years before, attended the religious services with regularity. He even

wrote to the pastor a letter in vindication of his book, and

protesting the sincerity of his union with the reformed

congregation.[135] The result of this was that the pastor came to tell

him how great an honour he held it to count such a member in his

flock, and how willing he was to admit him without further examination

to partake of the communion.[136] Rousseau went to the ceremony with

eyes full of tears and a heart swelling with emotion. We may respect

his mood as little or as much as we please, but it was certainly more

edifying than the sight of Voltaire going through the same rite,

merely to harass a priest and fill a bishop with fury.

In all other respects he lived a harmless life during the three years

of his sojourn in the Val de Travers. As he could never endure what he

calls the inactive chattering of the parlour--people sitting in front

of one another with folded hands and nothing in motion except the

tongue--he learnt the art of making laces; he used to carry his pillow

about with him, or sat at his own door working like the women of the

village, and chatting with the passers-by. He made presents of his

work to young women about to marry, always on the condition that they

should suckle their children when they came to have them. If a little

whimsical, it was a harmless and respectable pastime. It is pleasanter

to think of a philosopher finding diversion in weaving laces, than of

noblemen making it the business of their lives to run after ribands. A

society clothed in breeches was incensed about the same time by

Rousseau's adoption of the Armenian costume, the vest, the furred

bonnet, the caftan, and the girdle. There was nothing very wonderful

in this departure from use. An Armenian tailor used often to visit

some friends at Montmorency. Rousseau knew him, and reflected that

such a dress would be of singular comfort to him in the circumstances

of his bodily disorder.[137] Here was a solid practical reason for

what has usually been counted a demonstration of a turned brain.

Rousseau had as good cause for going about in a caftan as Chatham had

for coming to the House of Parliament wrapped in flannel. Vanity and a

desire to attract notice may, we admit, have had something to do with

Rousseau's adoption of an uncommon way of dressing. Shrewd wits like

the Duke of Luxembourg and his wife did not suppose that it was so.

We, living a hundred years after, cannot possibly know whether it was

so or not, and our estimate of Rousseau's strange character would be

very little worth forming, if it only turned on petty singularities of

this kind. The foolish, equivocally gifted with the quality of

articulate speech, may, if they choose, satisfy their own self-love by

reducing all action out of the common course to a series of variations

on the same motive in others. Men blessed by the benignity of

experience will be thankful not to waste life in guessing evil about

unknowable trifles.

During his stay at Motiers Rousseau's time was hardly ever his own.

Visitors of all nations, drawn either by respect for his work or by

curiosity to see a man who had been prescribed by so many governments,

came to him in throngs. His partisans at Geneva insisted on sending

people to convince themselves how good a man they were persecuting. "I

had never been free from strangers for six weeks," he writes. "Two

days after, I had a Westphalian gentleman and one from Genoa; six days

later, two persons from Zurich, who stayed a week; then a Genevese,

recovering from an illness, and coming for change of air, fell ill

again, and he has only just gone away."[138] One visitor, writing home

to his wife of the philosopher to whom he had come on a pilgrimage,

describes his manners in terms which perhaps touch us with

surprise:--"Thou hast no idea how charming his society is, what true

politeness there is in his manners, what a depth of serenity and

cheerfulness in his talk. Didst thou not expect quite a different

picture, and figure to thyself an eccentric creature, always grave and

sometimes even abrupt? Ah, what a mistake! To an expression of great

mildness he unites a glance of fire, and eyes of a vivacity the like

of which never was seen. When you handle any matter in which he takes

an interest, then his eyes, his lips, his hands, everything about him

speaks. You would be quite wrong to picture in him an everlasting

grumbler. Not at all; he laughs with those who laugh, he chats and

jokes with children, he rallies his housekeeper."[139] He was not so

civil to all the world, and occasionally turned upon his pursuers with

a word of most sardonic roughness.[140] But he could also be very

generous. We find him pressing a loan from his scanty store on an

outcast adventurer, and warning him, "When I lend (which happens

rarely enough), 'tis my constant maxim never to count on repayment,

nor to exact it."[141] He received hundreds of letters, some seeking

an application of his views on education to a special case, others

craving further exposition of his religious doctrines. Before he had

been at Motiers nine months he had paid ten louis for the postage of

letters, which after all contained little more than reproaches,

insults, menaces, imbecilities.[142]

Not the least curious of his correspondence at this time is that with

the Prince of WÃ¼rtemberg, then living near Lausanne.[143] The prince

had a little daughter four months old, and he was resolved that her

upbringing should be carried on as the author of Emilius might please

to direct. Rousseau replied courteously that he did not pretend to

direct the education of princes or princesses.[144] His undaunted

correspondent sent him full details of his babe's habits and

faculties, and continued to do so at short intervals, with the

fondness of a young mother or an old nurse. Rousseau was interested,

and took some trouble to draw up rules for the child's nurture and

admonition. One may smile now and then at the prince's ingenuous zeal,

but his fervid respect and devotion for the teacher in whom he thought

he had found the wisest man that ever lived, and who had at any rate

spoken the word that kindled the love of virtue and truth in him, his

eagerness to know what Rousseau thought right, and his equal eagerness

in trying to do it, his care to arrange his household in a simple and

methodical way to please his master, his discipular patience when

Rousseau told him that his verses were poor, or that he was too fond

of his wife,--all this is a little uncommon in a prince, and deserves

a place among the ample mass of other evidence of the power which

Rousseau's pictures of domestic simplicity and wise and humane

education had in the eighteenth century. It gives us a glimpse, close

and direct, of the naturalist revival reaching up into high places.

But the trade of philosopher in such times is perhaps an irksome one,

and Rousseau was the private victim of his public action. His prince

sent multitudes of Germans to visit the sage, and his letters, endless

with their details of the nursery, may well have become a little

tedious to a worn-out creature who only wanted to be left alone.[145]

The famous Prince Henry, Frederick's brother, thought a man happy who

could have the delight of seeing Rousseau as often as he chose.[146]

People forgot the other side of this delight, and the unlucky

philosopher found in a hundred ways alike from enemies and the friends

whose curiosity makes them as bad as enemies, that the pedestal of

glory partakes of the nature of the pillory or the stocks.

It is interesting to find the famous English names of Gibbon and

Boswell in the list of the multitudes with whom he had to do at this

time.[147] The former was now at Lausanne, whither he had just

returned from that memorable visit to England which persuaded him that

his father would never endure his alliance with the daughter of an

obscure Swiss pastor. He had just "yielded to his fate, sighed as a

lover, and obeyed as a son." "How sorry I am for our poor Mademoiselle

Curchod," writes Moultou to Rousseau; "Gibbon whom she loves, and to

whom she has sacrificed, as I know, some excellent matches, has come

to Lausanne, but cold, insensible, and as entirely cured of his old

passion as she is far from cure. She has written me a letter that

makes my heart ache." He then entreats Rousseau to use his influence

with Gibbon, who is on the point of starting for Motiers, by extolling

to him the lady's worth and understanding.[148] "I hope Mr. Gibbon

will not come," replied the sage; "his coldness makes me think ill of

him. I have been looking over his book again [the \_Essai sur l'Ã©tude

de la littÃ©rature\_, 1761]; he runs after brilliance too much, and is

strained and stilted. Mr. Gibbon is not the man for me, and I do not

think he is the man for Mademoiselle Curchod either."[149] Whether

Gibbon went or not, we do not know. He knew in after years what had

been said of him by Jean Jacques, and protested with mild pomp that

this extraordinary man should have been less precipitate in

condemning the moral character and the conduct of a stranger.[150]

Boswell, as we know, had left Johnson "rolling his majestic frame in

his usual manner" on Harwich beach in 1763, and was now on his

travels. Like many of his countrymen, he found his way to Lord

Marischal, and here his indomitable passion for making the personal

acquaintance of any one who was much talked about, naturally led him

to seek so singular a character as the man who was now at Motiers.

What Rousseau thought of one who was as singular a character as

himself in another direction, we do not know.[151] Lord Marischal

warned Rousseau that his visitor is of excellent disposition, but full

of visionary ideas, even having seen spirits--a serious proof of

unsoundness to a man who had lived in the very positive atmosphere of

Frederick's court at Berlin. "I only hope," says the sage Scot, of the

Scot who was not sage, "that he may not fall into the hands of people

who will turn his head: he was very pleased with the reception you

gave him."[152] As it happens, he was the means of sending Boswell to

a place where his head was turned, though not very mischievously.

Rousseau was at that time full of Corsican projects, of which this is

the proper place for us very briefly to speak.

The prolonged struggles of the natives of Corsica to assert their

independence of the oppressive administration of the Genoese, which

had begun in 1729, came to end for a moment in 1755, when Paoli

(1726-1807) defeated the Genoese, and proceeded to settle the

government of the island. In the Social Contract Rousseau had said,

"There is still in Europe one country capable of legislation, and that

is the island of Corsica. The valour and constancy with which this

brave people has succeeded in recovering and defending its liberty,

entitle it to the good fortune of having some wise man to teach them

how to preserve it. I have a presentiment that this little isle will

one day astonish Europe,"[153]--a presentiment that in a sense came

true enough long after Rousseau was gone, in a man who was born on the

little island seven years later than the publication of this passage.

Some of the Corsican leaders were highly flattered, and in August

1764, Buttafuoco entered into correspondence with Rousseau for the

purpose of inducing him to draw up a set of political institutions and

a code of laws. Paoli himself was too shrewd to have much belief in

the application of ideal systems, and we are assured that he had no

intention of making Rousseau the Solon of his island, but only of

inducing him to inflame the gallantry of its inhabitants by writing a

history of their exploits.[154] Rousseau, however, did not understand

the invitation in this narrower sense. He replied that the very idea

of such a task as legislation transported his soul, and he entered

into it with the liveliest ardour. He resolved to quarter himself with

Theresa in a cottage in some lonely district in the island; in a year

he would collect the necessary information as to the manners and

opinions of the inhabitants, and three years afterwards he would

produce a set of institutions that should be fit for a free and

valorous people.[155] In the midst of this enthusiasm (May 1765) he

urged Boswell to visit Corsica, and gave him a letter to Paoli, with

results which we know in the shape of an Account of Corsica (1768),

and in a feverishness of imagination upon the subject for many a long

day afterwards. "Mind your own affairs," at length cried Johnson

sternly to him, "and leave the Corsicans to theirs; I wish you would

empty your head of Corsica."[156] At the end of 1765, the immortal

hero-worshipper on his return expected to come upon his hero at

Motiers, but finding that he was in Paris wrote him a wonderful letter

in wonderful French. "You will forget all your cares for many an

evening, while I tell you what I have seen. I owe you the deepest

obligation for sending me to Corsica. The voyage has done me

marvellous good. It has made me as if all the lives of Plutarch had

sunk into my soul.... I am devoted to the Corsicans heart and soul; if

you, illustrious Rousseau, the philosopher whom they have chosen to

help them by your lights to preserve and enjoy the liberty which they

have acquired with so much heroism--if you have cooled towards these

gallant islanders, why then I am sorry for you, that is all I can

say."[157]

Alas, by this time the gallant islanders had been driven out of

Rousseau's mind by personal mishaps. First, Voltaire or some other

enemy had spread the rumour that the invitation to become the Lycurgus

of Corsica was a practical joke, and Rousseau's suspicious temper

found what he took for confirmation of this in some trifling incidents

with which we certainly need not concern ourselves.[158] Next, a very

real storm had burst upon him which drove him once more to seek a new

place of shelter, other than an island occupied by French troops. For

France having begun by despatching auxiliaries to the assistance of

the Genoese (1764), ended by buying the island from the Genoese

senate, with a sort of equity of redemption (1768)--an iniquitous

transaction, as Rousseau justly called it, equally shocking to

justice, humanity, reason, and policy.[159] Civilisation would have

been saved one of its sorest trials if Genoa could have availed

herself of her equity, and so have delivered France from the

acquisition of the most terrible citizen that ever scourged a

state.[160]

The condemnation of Rousseau by the Council in 1762 had divided Geneva

into two camps, and was followed by a prolonged contention between his

partisans and his enemies. The root of the contention was political

rather than theological. To take Rousseau's side was to protest

against the oligarchic authority which had condemned him, and the

quarrel about Emilius was only an episode in the long war between the

popular and aristocratic parties. This strife, after coming to a

height for the first time in 1734, had abated after the pacification

of 1738, but the pacification was only effective for a time, and the

roots of division were still full of vitality. The lawfulness of the

authority and the regularity of the procedure by which Rousseau had

been condemned, offered convenient ground for carrying on the dispute,

and its warmth was made more intense by the suggestion on the popular

side that perhaps the religion of the book which the oligarchs had

condemned was more like Christianity than the religion of the

oligarchs who condemned it.

Rousseau was too near the scene of the quarrel, too directly involved

in its issues, too constantly in contact with the people who were

engaged in it, not to feel the angry buzzings very close about his

ears. If he had been as collected and as self-possessed as he loved to

fancy, they would have gone for very little in the life of the day.

But Rousseau never stood on the heights whence a strong man surveys

with clear eye and firm soul the unjust or mean or furious moods of

the world. Such achievement is not hard for the creature who is

wrapped up in himself; who is careless of the passions of men about

him, because he thinks they cannot hurt him, and not because he has

measured them, and deliberately assigned them a place among the

elements in which a man's destiny is cast. It is only hard for one who

is penetrated by true interest in the opinion and action of his

fellows, thus to keep both sympathy warm and self-sufficience true.

The task was too hard for Rousseau, though his patience under long

persecution far surpassed that of any of the other oppressed teachers

of the time. In the spring of 1763 he deliberately renounced in all

due forms his rights of burgess-ship and citizenship in the city and

republic of Geneva.[161] And at length he broke forth against his

Genevese persecutors in the Letters from the Mountain (1764), a long

but extremely vigorous and adroit rejoinder to the pleas which his

enemies had put forth in Tronchin's Letters from the Country. If any

one now cares to satisfy himself how really unjust and illegal the

treatment was, which Rousseau received at the hands of the authorities

of his native city, he may do so by examining these most forcible

letters. The second part of them may interest the student of political

history by its account of the working of the institutions of the

little republic. We seem to be reading over again the history of a

Greek city; the growth of a wealthy class in face of an increasing

number of poor burgesses, the imposition of burdens in unfair

proportions upon the metoikoi, the gradual usurpation of legislative

and administrative function (including especially the judicial) by the

oligarchs, and the twisting of democratic machinery to oligarchic

ends; then the growth of staseis or violent factions, followed by

metabolÃ© or overthrow of the established constitution, ending in

foreign intervention. The Four Hundred at Athens would have treated

any Social Contract that should have appeared in their day, just as

sternly as the Two Hundred or the Twenty-five treated the Social

Contract that did appear, and for just the same reasons.

Rousseau proved his case with redundancy of demonstration. A body of

burgesses had previously availed themselves (Nov. 1763) of a legal

right, and made a technical representation to the Lesser Council that

the laws had been broken in his case. The Council in return availed

itself of an equally legal right, its \_droit nÃ©gatif\_, and declined to

entertain the representation, without giving any reasons.

Unfortunately for Rousseau's comfort, the ferment which his new

vindication of his cause stirred up, did not end with the condemnation

and burning of his manifesto. For the parliament of Paris ordered the

Letters from the Mountain to be burned, and the same decree and the

same faggot served for that and for Voltaire's Philosophical

Dictionary (April 1765).[162] It was also burned at the Hague (Jan.

22). An observer by no means friendly to the priests noticed that at

Paris it was not the fanatics of orthodoxy, but the encyclopÃ¦dists and

their flock, who on this occasion raised the storm and set the zeal of

the magistrates in motion.[163] The vanity and egoism of rationalistic

sects can be as fatal to candour, justice, and compassion as the

intolerant pride of the great churches.

Persecution came nearer to Rousseau and took more inconvenient shapes

than this. A terrible libel appeared (Feb. 1765), full of the coarsest

calumnies. Rousseau, stung by their insolence and falseness, sent it

to Paris to be published there with a prefatory note, stating that it

was by a Genevese pastor whom he named. This landed him in fresh

mortification, for the pastor disavowed the libel, Rousseau declined

to accept the disavowal, and sensible men were wearied by acrimonious

declarations, explanations, protests.[164] Then the clergy of

NeuchÃ¢tel were not able any longer to resist the opportunity of

inflicting such torments as they could, upon a heretic whom they might

more charitably have left to those ultimate and everlasting torments

which were so precious to their religious imagination. They began to

press the pastor of the village where Rousseau lived, and with whom he

had hitherto been on excellent terms. The pastor, though he had been

liberal enough to admit his singular parishioner to the communion, in

spite of the Savoyard Vicar, was not courageous enough to resist the

bigotry of the professional body to which he belonged. He warned

Rousseau not to present himself at the next communion. The philosopher

insisted that he had a right to do this, until formally cast out by

the consistory. The consistory, composed mainly of a body of peasants

entirely bound to their minister in matters of religion, cited him to

appear, and answer such questions as might test his loyalty to the

faith. Rousseau prepared a most deliberate vindication of all that he

had written, which he intended to speak to his rustic judges. The eve

of the morning on which he had to appear, he knew his discourse by

heart; when morning came he could not repeat two sentences. So he fell

back on the instrument over which he had more mastery than he had over

tongue or memory, and wrote what he wished to say. The pastor, in whom

irritated egoism was probably by this time giving additional heat to

professional zeal, was for fulminating a decree of excommunication,

but there appears to have been some indirect interference with the

proceedings of the consistory by the king's officials at NeuchÃ¢tel,

and the ecclesiastical bolt was held back.[165] Other weapons were not

wanting. The pastor proceeded to spread rumours among his flock that

Rousseau was a heretic, even an atheist, and most prodigious of all,

that he had written a book containing the monstrous doctrine that

women have no souls. The pulpit resounded with sermons proving to the

honest villagers that antichrist was quartered in their parish in very

flesh. The Armenian apparel gave a high degree of plausibleness to

such an opinion, and as the wretched man went by the door of his

neighbours, he heard cursing and menace, while a hostile pebble now

and again whistled past his ear. His botanising expeditions were

believed to be devoted to search for noxious herbs, and a man who

died in the agonies of nephritic colic, was supposed to have been

poisoned by him.[166] If persons went to the post-office for letters

for him, they were treated with insult.[167] At length the ferment

against him grew hot enough to be serious. A huge block of stone was

found placed so as to kill him when he opened his door; and one night

an attempt was made to stone him in his house.[168] Popular hate shown

with this degree of violence was too much for his fortitude, and after

a residence of rather more than three years (September 8-10, 1765), he

fled from the inhospitable valley to seek refuge he knew not where.

In his rambles of a previous summer he had seen a little island in the

lake of Bienne, which struck his imagination and lived in his memory.

Thither he now, after a moment of hesitation, turned his steps, with

something of the same instinct as draws a child towards a beam of the

sun. He forgot or was heedless of the circumstance that the isle of

St. Peter lay in the jurisdiction of the canton of Berne, whose

government had forbidden him their territory. Strong craving for a

little ease in the midst of his wretchedness extinguished thought of

jurisdictions and proscriptive decrees.

The spot where he now found peace for a brief space usually

disappoints the modern hunter for the picturesque, who after wearying

himself with the follies of a capital seeks the most violent tonic

that he can find in the lonely terrors of glacier and peak, and sees

only tameness in a pygmy island, that offers nothing sublimer than a

high grassy terrace, some cool over-branching avenues, some mimic

vales, and meadows and vineyards sloping down to the sheet of blue

water at their feet. Yet, as one sits here on a summer day, with tired

mowers sleeping on their grass heaps in the sun, in a stillness

faintly broken by the timid lapping of the water in the sedge, or the

rustling of swift lizards across the heated sand, while the Bernese

snow giants line a distant horizon with mysterious solitary shapes, it

is easy to know what solace life in such a scene might bring to a man

distracted by pain of body and pain and weariness of soul. Rousseau

has commemorated his too short sojourn here in the most perfect of all

his compositions.[169]

"I found my existence so charming, and led a life so

agreeable to my humour, that I resolved here to end my days.

My only source of disquiet was whether I should be allowed

to carry my project out. In the midst of the presentiments

that disturbed me, I would fain have had them make a

perpetual prison of my refuge, to confine me in it for all

the rest of my life. I longed for them to cut off all chance

and all hope of leaving it; to forbid me holding any

communication with the mainland, so that, knowing nothing

of what was going on in the world, I might have forgotten

the world's existence, and people might have forgotten mine

too. They only suffered me to pass two months in the island,

but I could have passed two years, two centuries, and all

eternity, without a moment's weariness, though I had not,

with my companion, any other society than that of the

steward, his wife, and their servants. They were in truth

honest souls and nothing more, but that was just what I

wanted.... Carried thither in a violent hurry, alone and

without a thing, I afterwards sent for my housekeeper, my

books, and my scanty possessions, of which I had the delight

of unpacking nothing, leaving my boxes and chests just as

they had come, and dwelling in the house where I counted on

ending my days, exactly as if it were an inn whence I must

needs set forth on the morrow. All things went so well, just

as they were, that to think of ordering them better were to

spoil them. One of my greatest joys was to leave my books

safely fastened up in their boxes, and to be without even a

case for writing. When any luckless letter forced me to take

up a pen for an answer, I grumblingly borrowed the steward's

inkstand, and hurried to give it back to him with all the

haste I could, in the vain hope that I should never have

need of the loan any more. Instead of meddling with those

weary quires and reams and piles of old books, I filled my

chamber with flowers and grasses, for I was then in my first

fervour for botany. Having given up employment that would be

a task to me, I needed one that would be an amusement, nor

cause me more pains than a sluggard might choose to take. I

undertook to make the \_Flora petrinsularis\_, and to describe

every single plant on the island, in detail enough to occupy

me for the rest of my days. In consequence of this fine

scheme, every morning after breakfast, which we all took in

company, I used to go with a magnifying glass in my hand and

my Systema NaturÃ¦ under my arm, to visit some district of

the island. I had divided it for that purpose into small

squares, meaning to go through them one after another in

each season of the year. At the end of two or three hours I

used to return laden with an ample harvest, a provision for

amusing myself after dinner indoors, in case of rain. I

spent the rest of the morning in going with the steward, his

wife, and Theresa, to see the labourers and the harvesting,

and I generally set to work along with them; many a time

when people from Berne came to see me, they found me perched

on a high tree, with a bag fastened round my waist; I kept

filling it with fruit and then let it down to the ground

with a rope. The exercise I had taken in the morning and the

good humour that always comes from exercise, made the repose

of dinner vastly pleasant to me. But if dinner was kept up

too long, and fine weather invited me forth, I could not

wait, but was speedily off to throw myself all alone into a

boat, which, when the water was smooth enough, I used to

pull out to the middle of the lake. There, stretched at full

length in the boat's bottom, with my eyes turned up to the

sky, I let myself float slowly hither and thither as the

water listed, sometimes for hours together, plunged in a

thousand confused delicious musings, which, though they had

no fixed nor constant object, were not the less on that

account a hundred times dearer to me than all that I had

found sweetest in what they call the pleasures of life.

Often warned by the going down of the sun that it was time

to return, I found myself so far from the island that I was

forced to row with all my might to get in before it was

pitch dark. At other times, instead of losing myself in the

midst of the waters, I had a fancy to coast along the green

shores of the island, where the clear waters and cool

shadows tempted me to bathe. But one of my most frequent

expeditions was from the larger island to the less; there I

disembarked and spent my afternoon, sometimes in mimic

rambles among wild elders, persicaries, willows, and shrubs

of every species, sometimes settling myself on the top of a

sandy knoll, covered with turf, wild thyme, flowers, even

sainfoin and trefoil that had most likely been sown there in

old days, making excellent quarters for rabbits. They might

multiply in peace without either fearing anything or harming

anything. I spoke of this to the steward. He at once had

male and female rabbits brought from NeuchÃ¢tel, and we went

in high state, his wife, one of his sisters, Theresa, and I,

to settle them in the little islet. The foundation of our

colony was a feast-day. The pilot of the Argonauts was not

prouder than I, as I bore my company and the rabbits in

triumph from our island to the smaller one....

When the lake was too rough for me to sail, I spent my

afternoon in going up and down the island, gathering plants

to right and left; seating myself now in smiling lonely

nooks to dream at my ease, now on little terraces and

knolls, to follow with my eyes the superb and ravishing

prospect of the lake and its shores, crowned on one side by

the neighbouring hills, and on the other melting into rich

and fertile plains up to the feet of the pale blue mountains

on their far-off edge.

As evening drew on, I used to come down from the high ground

and sit on the beach at the water's brink in some hidden

sheltering place. There the murmur of the waves and their

agitation, charmed all my senses and drove every other

movement away from my soul; they plunged it into delicious

dreamings, in which I was often surprised by night. The flux

and reflux of the water, its ceaseless stir-swelling and

falling at intervals, striking on ear and sight, made up for

the internal movements which my musings extinguished; they

were enough to give me delight in mere existence, without

taking any trouble of thinking. From time to time arose some

passing thought of the instability of the things of this

world, of which the face of the waters offered an image; but

such light impressions were swiftly effaced in the

uniformity of the ceaseless motion, which rocked me as in a

cradle; it held me with such fascination that even when

called at the hour and by the signal appointed, I could not

tear myself away without summoning all my force.

After supper, when the evening was fine, we used to go all

together for a saunter on the terrace, to breathe the

freshness of the air from the lake. We sat down in the

arbour, laughing, chatting, or singing some old song, and

then we went home to bed, well pleased with the day, and

only craving another that should be exactly like it on the

morrow....

All is in a continual flux upon the earth. Nothing in it

keeps a form constant and determinate; our affections,

fastening on external things, necessarily change and pass

just as they do. Ever in front of us or behind us, they

recall the past that is gone, or anticipate a future that in

many a case is destined never to be. There is nothing solid

to which the heart can fix itself. Here we have little more

than a pleasure that comes and passes away; as for the

happiness that endures, I cannot tell if it be so much as

known among men. There is hardly in the midst of our

liveliest delights a single instant when the heart could

tell us with real truth--"\_I would this instant might last

for ever\_." And how can we give the name of happiness to a

fleeting state that all the time leaves the heart unquiet

and void, that makes us regret something gone, or still long

for something to come?

But if there is a state in which the soul finds a situation

solid enough to comport with perfect repose, and with the

expansion of its whole faculty, without need of calling back

the past, or pressing on towards the future; where time is

nothing for it, and the present has no ending; with no mark

for its own duration and without a trace of succession;

without a single other sense of privation or delight, of

pleasure or pain, of desire or apprehension, than this

single sense of existence--so long as such a state endures,

he who finds himself in it may talk of bliss, not with a

poor, relative, and imperfect happiness such as people find

in the pleasures of life, but with a happiness full,

perfect, and sufficing, that leaves in the soul no conscious

unfilled void. Such a state was many a day mine in my

solitary musings in the isle of St. Peter, either lying in

my boat as it floated on the water, or seated on the banks

of the broad lake, or in other places than the little isle

on the brink of some broad stream, or a rivulet murmuring

over a gravel bed.

What is it that one enjoys in a situation like this? Nothing

outside of one's self, nothing except one's self and one's

own existence.... But most men, tossed as they are by

unceasing passion, have little knowledge of such a state;

they taste it imperfectly for a few moments, and then retain

no more than an obscure confused idea of it, that is too

weak to let them feel its charm. It would not even be good

in the present constitution of things, that in their

eagerness for these gentle ecstasies, they should fall into

a disgust for the active life in which their duty is

prescribed to them by needs that are ever on the increase.

But a wretch cut off from human society, who can do nothing

here below that is useful and good either for himself or for

other people, may in such a state find for all lost human

felicities many recompenses, of which neither fortune nor

men can ever rob him.

'Tis true that these recompenses cannot be felt by all

souls, nor in all situations. The heart must be in peace,

nor any passion come to trouble its calm. There must be in

the surrounding objects neither absolute repose nor excess

of agitation, but a uniform and moderated movement without

shock, without interval. With no movement, life is only

lethargy. If the movement be unequal or too strong, it

awakes us; by recalling us to the objects around, it

destroys the charm of our musing, and plucks us from within

ourselves, instantly to throw us back under the yoke of

fortune and man, in a moment to restore us to all the

consciousness of misery. Absolute stillness inclines one to

gloom. It offers an image of death: then the help of a

cheerful imagination is necessary, and presents itself

naturally enough to those whom heaven has endowed with such

a gift. The movement which does not come from without then

stirs within us. The repose is less complete, it is true;

but it is also more agreeable when light and gentle ideas,

without agitating the depths of the soul, only softly skim

the surface. This sort of musing we may taste whenever there

is tranquillity about us, and I have thought that in the

Bastile, and even in a dungeon where no object struck my

sight, I could have dreamed away many a thrice pleasurable

day.

But it must be said that all this came better and more

happily in a fruitful and lonely island, where nothing

presented itself to me save smiling pictures, where nothing

recalled saddening memories, where the fellowship of the few

dwellers there was gentle and obliging, without being

exciting enough to busy me incessantly, where, in short, I

was free to surrender myself all day long to the promptings

of my taste or to the most luxurious indolence.... As I came

out from a long and most sweet musing fit, seeing myself

surrounded by verdure and flowers and birds, and letting my

eyes wander far over romantic shores that fringed a wide

expanse of water bright as crystal, I fitted all these

attractive objects into my dreams; and when at last I slowly

recovered myself and recognised what was about me, I could

not mark the point that cut off dream from reality, so

equally did all things unite to endear to me the lonely

retired life I led in this happy spot! Why can that life not

come back to me again? Why can I not go finish my days in

the beloved island, never to quit it, never again to see in

it one dweller from the mainland, to bring back to me the

memory of all the woes of every sort that they have

delighted in heaping on my head for all these long years?...

Freed from the earthly passions engendered by the tumult of

social life, my soul would many a time lift itself above

this atmosphere, and commune beforehand with the heavenly

intelligences, into whose number it trusts to be ere long

taken."

The exquisite dream, thus set to words of most soothing music, came

soon to its end. The full and perfect sufficience of life was abruptly

disturbed. The government of Berne gave him notice to quit the island

and their territory within fifteen days. He represented to the

authorities that he was infirm and ill, that he knew not whither to

go, and that travelling in wintry weather would be dangerous to his

life. He even made the most extraordinary request that any man in

similar straits ever did make. "In this extremity," he wrote to their

representative, "I only see one resource for me, and however frightful

it may appear, I will adopt it, not only without repugnance, but with

eagerness, if their excellencies will be good enough to give their

consent. It is that it should please them for me to pass the rest of

my days in prison in one of their castles, or such other place in

their states as they may think fit to select. I will there live at my

own expense, and I will give security never to put them to any cost. I

submit to be without paper or pen, or any communication from without,

except so far as may be absolutely necessary, and through the channel

of those who shall have charge of me. Only let me have left, with the

use of a few books, the liberty to walk occasionally in a garden, and

I am content. Do not suppose that an expedient, so violent in

appearance, is the fruit of despair. My mind is perfectly calm at this

moment; I have taken time to think about it, and it is only after

profound consideration that I have brought myself to this decision.

Mark, I pray you, that if this seems an extraordinary resolution, my

situation is still more so. The distracted life that I have been made

to lead for several years without intermission would be terrible for a

man in full health; judge what it must be for a miserable invalid worn

down with weariness and misfortune, and who has now no wish save only

to die in a little peace."[170]

That the request was made in all sincerity we may well believe. The

difference between being in prison and being out of it was really not

considerable to a man who had the previous winter been confined to his

chamber for eight months without a break.[171] In other respects the

world was as cheerless as any prison could be. He was an exile from

the only places he knew, and to him a land unknown was terrible. He

had thought of Vienna, and the Prince of WÃ¼rtemburg had sought the

requisite permission for him, but the priests were too strong in the

court of the house of Austria.[172] Madame d'Houdetot offered him a

resting-place in Normandy, and Saint Lambert in Lorraine.[173] He

thought of Potsdam. Rey, the printer, pressed him to go to Holland. He

wondered if he should have strength to cross the Alps and make his way

to Corsica. Eventually he made up his mind to go to Berlin, and he

went as far as Strasburg on his road thither.[174] Here he began to

fear the rude climate of the northern capital; he changed his plans,

and resolved to accept the warm invitations that he had received to

cross over to England. His friends used their interest to procure a

passport for him,[175] and the Prince of Conti offered him an

apartment in the privileged quarter of the Temple, on his way through

Paris. His own purpose seems to have been irresolute to the last, but

his friends acted with such energy and bustle on his behalf that the

English scheme was adopted, and he found himself in Paris (Dec. 17,

1765), on his way to London, almost before he had deliberately

realised what he was doing. It was a step that led him into many fatal

vexations, as we shall presently see. Meanwhile we may pause to

examine the two considerable books which had involved his life in all

this confusion and perplexity.
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CHAPTER III.

THE SOCIAL CONTRACT.

The dominant belief of the best minds of the latter half of

the eighteenth century was a passionate faith in the illimitable

possibilities of human progress. Nothing short of a general overthrow

of the planet could in their eyes stay the ever upward movement of

human perfectibility. They differed as to the details of the

philosophy of government which they deduced from this philosophy of

society, but the conviction that a golden era of tolerance,

enlightenment, and material prosperity was close at hand, belonged to

them all. Rousseau set his face the other way. For him the golden era

had passed away from our globe many centuries ago. Simplicity had fled

from the earth. Wisdom and heroism had vanished from out of the minds

of leaders. The spirit of citizenship had gone from those who should

have upheld the social union in brotherly accord. The dream of human

perfectibility which nerved men like Condorcet, was to Rousseau a sour

and fantastic mockery. The utmost that men could do was to turn their

eyes to the past, to obliterate the interval, to try to walk for a

space in the track of the ancient societies. They would hardly

succeed, but endeavour might at least do something to stay the plague

of universal degeneracy. Hence the fatality of his system. It placed

the centre of social activity elsewhere than in careful and rational

examination of social conditions, and in careful and rational effort

to modify them. As we began by saying, it substituted a retrograde

aspiration for direction, and emotion for the discovery of law. We can

hardly wonder, when we think of the intense exaltation of spirit

produced both by the perfectibilitarians and the followers of

Rousseau, and at the same time of the political degradation and

material disorder of France, that so violent a contrast between the

ideal and the actual led to a great volcanic outbreak. Alas, the

crucial difficulty of political change is to summon new force without

destroying the sound parts of a structure which it has taken so many

generations to erect. The Social Contract is the formal denial of the

possibility of successfully overcoming the difficulty.

"Although man deprives himself in the civil state of many advantages

which he holds from nature, yet he acquires in return others so great,

his faculties exercise and develop themselves, his ideas extend, his

sentiments are ennobled, his whole soul is raised to such a degree,

that if the abuses of this new condition did not so often degrade him

below that from which he has emerged, he would be bound to bless

without ceasing the happy moment which rescued him from it for ever,

and out of a stupid and blind animal made an intelligent being and a

man."[176] The little parenthesis as to the frequent degradation

produced by the abuses of the social condition, does not prevent us

from recognising in the whole passage a tolerably complete surrender

of the main position which was taken up in the two Discourses. The

short treatise on the Social Contract is an inquiry into the just

foundations and most proper form of that very political society, which

the Discourses showed to have its foundation in injustice, and to be

incapable of receiving any form proper for the attainment of the full

measure of human happiness.

Inequality in the same way is no longer denounced, but accepted and

defined. Locke's influence has begun to tell. The two principal

objects of every system of legislation are declared to be liberty and

equality. By equality we are warned not to understand that the degrees

of power and wealth should be absolutely the same, but that in respect

of power, such power should be out of reach of any violence, and be

invariably exercised in virtue of the laws; and in respect of riches,

that no citizen should be wealthy enough to buy another, and none poor

enough to sell himself. Do you say this equality is a mere chimera? It

is precisely because the force of things is constantly tending to

destroy equality, that the force of legislation ought as constantly to

be directed towards upholding it.[177] This is much clearer than the

indefinite way of speaking which we have already noticed in the second

Discourse. It means neither more nor less than that equality before

the law which is one of the elementary marks of a perfectly free

community.

The idea of the law being constantly directed to counteract the

tendencies to violent inequalities in material possessions among

different members of a society, is too vague to be criticised. Does it

cover and warrant so sweeping a measure as the old \_seisachtheia\_ of

Solon, voiding all contracts in which the debtor had pledged his land

or his person; or such measures as the agrarian laws of Licinius and

the Gracchi? Or is it to go no further than to condemn such a law as

that which in England gives unwilled lands to the eldest son? We can

only criticise accurately a general idea of this sort in connection

with specific projects in which it is applied. As it stands, it is no

more than the expression of what the author thinks a wise principle of

public policy. It assumes the existence of property just as completely

as the theory of the most rigorous capitalist could do; it gives no

encouragement, as the Discourse did, to the notion of an equality in

being without property. There is no element of communism in a

principle so stated, but it suggests a social idea, based on the moral

claim of men to have equality of opportunity. This ideal stamped

itself on the minds of Robespierre and the other revolutionary

leaders, and led to practical results in the sale of the Church and

other lands in small lots, so as to give the peasant a market to buy

in. The effect of the economic change thus introduced happened to work

in the direction in which Rousseau pointed, for it is now known that

the most remarkable and most permanent of the consequences of the

revolution in the ownership of land was the erection, between the two

extreme classes of proprietors, of an immense body of middle-class

freeholders. This state is not equality, but gradation, and there is

undoubtedly an immense difference between the two. Still its origin is

an illustration on the largest scale in history of the force of

legislation being exerted to counteract an irregularity that had

become unbearable.[178]

Notwithstanding the disappearance of the more extravagant elements of

the old thesis, the new speculation was far from being purged of the

fundamental errors that had given such popularity to its predecessors.

"If the sea," he says in one place, "bathes nothing but inaccessible

rocks on your coasts, remain barbarous ichthyophagi; you will live all

the more tranquilly for it, better perhaps, and assuredly more

happily."[179] Apart from an outburst like this, the central idea

remained the same, though it was approached from another side and with

different objects. The picture of a state of nature had lost none of

its perilous attraction, though it was hung in a slightly changed

light. It remained the starting-point of the right and normal

constitution of civil society, just as it had been the starting-point

of the denunciation of civil society as incapable of right

constitution, and as necessarily and for ever abnormal. Equally with

the Discourses, the Social Contract is a repudiation of that historic

method which traces the present along a line of ascertained

circumstances, and seeks an improved future in an unbroken

continuation of that line. The opening words, which sent such a thrill

through the generation to which they were uttered in two continents,

"Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains," tell us at the

outset that we are as far away as ever from the patient method of

positive observation, and as deeply buried as ever in deducing

practical maxims from a set of conditions which never had any other

than an abstract and phantasmatic existence. How is a man born free?

If he is born into isolation, he perishes instantly. If he is born

into a family, he is at the moment of his birth committed to a state

of social relation, in however rudimentary a form; and the more or

less of freedom which this state may ultimately permit to him, depends

upon circumstances. Man was hardly born free among Romans and

Athenians, when both law and public opinion left a father at perfect

liberty to expose his new-born infant. And the more primitive the

circumstances, the later the period at which he gains freedom. A child

was not born free in the early days of the Roman state, when the

\_patria potestas\_ was a vigorous reality. Nor, to go yet further back,

was he born free in the times of the Hebrew patriarchs, when Abraham

had full right of sacrificing his son, and Jephthah of sacrificing his

daughter.

But to speak thus is to speak what we do know. Rousseau was not open

to such testimony. "My principles," he said in contempt of Grotius,

"are not founded on the authority of poets; they come from the nature

of things and are based on reason."[180] He does indeed in one place

express his reverence for the Judaic law, and administers a just

rebuke to the philosophic arrogance which saw only successful

impostors in the old legislators.[181] But he paid no attention to

the processes and usages of which this law was the organic expression,

nor did he allow himself to learn from it the actual conditions of the

social state which accepted it. It was Locke, whose essay on civil

government haunts us throughout the Social Contract, who had taught

him that men are born free, equal, and independent. Locke evaded the

difficulty of the dependence of childhood by saying that when the son

comes to the estate that made his father a free man, he becomes a free

man too.[182] What of the old Roman use permitting a father to sell

his son three times? In the same metaphysical spirit Locke had laid

down the absolute proposition that "conjugal society is made by a

voluntary compact between man and woman."[183] This is true of a small

number of western societies in our own day, but what of the primitive

usages of communal marriages, marriages by capture, purchase, and the

rest? We do not mean it as any discredit to writers upon government in

the seventeenth century that they did not make good out of their own

consciousness the necessary want of knowledge about primitive

communities. But it is necessary to point out, first, that they did

not realise all the knowledge within their reach, and next that, as a

consequence of this, their propositions had a quality that vitiated

all their speculative worth. Filmer's contention that man is not

naturally free was truer than the position of Locke and Rousseau, and

it was so because Filmer consulted and appealed to the most authentic

of the historic records then accessible.[184]

It is the more singular that Rousseau should have thus deliberately

put aside all but the most arbitrary and empirical historical lessons,

and it shows the extraordinary force with which men may be mastered by

abstract prepossessions, even when they have a partial knowledge of

the antidote; because Rousseau in several places not only admits, but

insists upon, the necessity of making institutions relative to the

state of the community, in respect of size, soil, manners, occupation,

morality, character. "It is in view of such relations as these that we

must assign to each people a particular system, which shall be the

best, not perhaps in itself, but for the state for which it is

destined."[185] In another place he calls attention to manners,

customs, above all to opinion, as the part of a social system on which

the success of all the rest depends; particular rules being only the

arching of the vault, of which manners, though so much tardier in

rising, form a key-stone that can never be disturbed.[186] This was

excellent so far as it went, but it was one of the many great truths,

which men may hold in their minds without appreciating their full

value. He did not see that these manners, customs, opinions, have old

roots which must be sought in a historic past; that they are connected

with the constitution of human nature, and that then in turn they

prepare modifications of that constitution. His narrow, symmetrical,

impatient humour unfitted him to deal with the complex tangle of the

history of social growths. It was essential to his mental comfort that

he should be able to see a picture of perfect order and logical system

at both ends of his speculation. Hence, he invented, to begin with,

his ideal state of nature, and an ideal mode of passing from that to

the social state. He swept away in his imagination the whole series of

actual incidents between present and past; and he constructed a system

which might be imposed upon all societies indifferently by a

legislator summoned for that purpose, to wipe out existing uses, laws,

and institutions, and make afresh a clear and undisturbed beginning of

national life. The force of habit was slowly and insensibly to be

substituted for that of the legislator's authority, but the existence

of such habits previously as forces to be dealt with, and the

existence of certain limits of pliancy in the conditions of human

nature and social possibility, are facts of which the author of the

Social Contract takes not the least account.

Rousseau knew hardly any history, and the few isolated pieces of old

fact which he had picked up in his very slight reading were exactly

the most unfortunate that a student in need of the historic method

could possibly have fallen in with. The illustrations which are

scantily dispersed in his pages,--and we must remark that they are no

more than illustrations for conclusions arrived at quite independently

of them, and not the historical proof and foundations of his

conclusions,--are nearly all from the annals of the small states of

ancient Greece, and from the earlier times of the Roman republic. We

have already pointed out to what an extent his imagination was struck

at the time of his first compositions by the tale of Lycurgus. The

influence of the same notions is still paramount. The hopelessness of

giving good laws to a corrupt people is supposed to be demonstrated by

the case of Minos, whose legislation failed in Crete because the

people for whom he made laws were sunk in vices; and by the further

example of Plato, who refused to give laws to the Arcadians and

Cyrenians, knowing that they were too rich and could never suffer

equality.[187] The writer is thinking of Plato's Laws, when he says

that just as nature has fixed limits to the stature of a well-formed

man, outside of which she produces giants and dwarfs, so with

reference to the best constitution for a state, there are bounds to

its extent, so that it may be neither too large to be capable of good

government, nor too small to be independent and self-sufficing. The

further the social bond is extended, the more relaxed it becomes, and

in general a small state is proportionally stronger than a large

one.[188] In the remarks with which he proceeds to corroborate this

position, we can plainly see that he is privately contrasting an

independent Greek community with the unwieldy oriental monarchy

against which at one critical period Greece had to contend. He had

never realised the possibility of such forms of polity as the Roman

Empire, or the half-federal dominion of England which took such

enormous dimensions in his time, or the great confederation of states

which came to birth two years before he died. He was the servant of

his own metaphor, as the Greek writers so often were. His argument

that a state must be of a moderate size because the rightly shapen man

is neither dwarf nor giant, is exactly on a par with Aristotle's

argument to the same effect, on the ground that beauty demands size,

and there must not be too great nor too small size, because a ship

sails badly if it be either too heavy or too light.[189] And when

Rousseau supposes the state to have ten thousand inhabitants, and

talks about the right size of its territory,[190] who does not think

of the five thousand and forty which the Athenian Stranger prescribed

to Cleinias the Cretan as the exactly proper number for the perfectly

formed state?[191] The prediction of the short career which awaits a

state that is cursed with an extensive and accessible seaboard,

corresponds precisely with the Athenian Stranger's satisfaction that

the new city is to be eighty stadia from the coast.[192] When Rousseau

himself began to think about the organisation of Corsica, he praised

the selection of Corte as the chief town of a patriotic

administration, because it was far from the sea, and so its

inhabitants would long preserve their simplicity and uprightness.[193]

And in later years still, when meditating upon a constitution for

Poland, he propounded an economic system essentially Spartan; the

people were enjoined to think little about foreigners, to give

themselves little concern about commerce, to suppress stamped paper,

and to put a tithe upon the land.[194]

The chapter on the Legislator is in the same region. We are again

referred to Lycurgus; and to the circumstance that Greek towns usually

confided to a stranger the sacred task of drawing up their laws. His

experience in Venice and the history of his native town supplemented

the examples of Greece. Geneva summoned a stranger to legislate for

her, and "those who only look on Calvin as a theologian have a scanty

idea of the extent of his genius; the preparation of our wise edicts,

in which he had so large a part, do him as much honour as his

Institutes."[195] Rousseau's vision was too narrow to let him see the

growth of government and laws as a co-ordinate process, flowing from

the growth of all the other parts and organs of society, and advancing

in more or less equal step along with them. He could begin with

nothing short of an absolute legislator, who should impose a system

from without by a single act, a structure hit upon once for all by his

individual wisdom, not slowly wrought out by many minds, with popular

assent and co-operation, at the suggestion of changing social

circumstances and need.[196]

All this would be of very trifling importance in the history of

political literature, but for the extraordinary influence which

circumstances ultimately bestowed upon it. The Social Contract was the

gospel of the Jacobins, and much of the action of the supreme party in

France during the first months of the year 1794 is only fully

intelligible when we look upon it as the result and practical

application of Rousseau's teaching. The conception of the situation

entertained by Robespierre and Saint Just was entirely moulded on all

this talk about the legislators of Greece and Geneva. "The transition

of an oppressed nation to democracy is like the effort by which nature

rose from nothingness to existence. You must entirely refashion a

people whom you wish to make free--destroy its prejudices, alter its

habits, limit its necessities, root up its vices, purify its desires.

The state therefore must lay hold on every human being at his birth,

and direct his education with powerful hand. Solon's weak confidence

threw Athens into fresh slavery, while Lycurgus's severity founded the

republic of Sparta on an immovable basis."[197] These words, which

come from a decree of the Committee of Public Safety, might well be

taken for an excerpt from the Social Contract. The fragments of the

institutions by which Saint Just intended to regenerate his country,

reveal a man with the example of Lycurgus before his eyes in every

line he wrote.[198] When on the eve of the Thermidorian revolution

which overthrew him and his party, he insisted on the necessity of a

dictatorship, he was only thinking of the means by which he should at

length obtain the necessary power for forcing his regenerating

projects on the country; for he knew that Robespierre, whom he named

as the man for the dictatorship, accepted his projects, and would lend

the full force of the temporal arm to the propagation of ideas which

they had acquired together from Jean Jacques, and from the Greeks to

whom Jean Jacques had sent them for example and instruction.[199] No

doubt the condition of France after 1792 must naturally have struck

any one too deeply imbued with the spirit of the Social Contract to

look beneath the surface of the society with which the Convention had

to deal, as urgently inviting a lawgiver of the ancient stamp. The old

order in church and state had been swept away, no organs for the

performance of the functions of national life were visible, the moral

ideas which had bound the social elements together in the extinct

monarchy seemed to be permanently sapped. A politician who had for

years been dreaming about Minos and Lycurgus and Calvin, especially if

he lived in a state with such a tradition of centralisation as ruled

in France, was sure to suppose that here was the scene and the moment

for a splendid repetition on an immense scale of those immortal

achievements. The futility of the attempt was the practical and ever

memorable illustration of the defect of Rousseau's geometrical method.

It was one thing to make laws for the handful of people who lived in

Geneva in the sixteenth century, united in religious faith, and

accepting the same form and conception of the common good. It was a

very different thing to try to play Calvin over some twenty-five

millions of a heterogeneously composed nation, abounding in variations

of temperament, faith, laws, and habits and weltering in unfathomable

distractions. The French did indeed at length invite a heaven-sent

stranger from Corsica to make laws for them, but not until he had set

his foot upon their neck; and even Napoleon Bonaparte, who had begun

life like the rest of his generation by writing Rousseauite essays,

made a swift return to the historic method in the equivocal shape of

the Concordat.

Not only were Rousseau's schemes of polity conceived from the point of

view of a small territory with a limited population. "You must not,"

he says in one place, "make the abuses of great states an objection to

a writer who would fain have none but small ones."[200] Again, when he

said that in a truly free state the citizens performed all their

services to the community with their arms and none by money, and that

he looked upon the corvÃ©e (or compulsory labour on the public roads)

as less hostile to freedom than taxes,[201] he showed that he was

thinking of a state not greatly passing the dimensions of a parish.

This was not the only defect of his schemes. They assumed a sort of

state of nature in the minds of the people with whom the lawgiver had

to deal. Saint Just made the same assumption afterwards, and trusted

to his military school to erect on these bare plots whatever

superstructure he might think fit to appoint. A society that had for

so many centuries been organised and moulded by a powerful and

energetic church, armed with a definite doctrine, fixing the same

moral tendencies in a long series of successive generations, was not

in the naked mental state which the Jacobins postulated. It was not

prepared to accept free divorce, the substitution of friendship for

marriage, the displacement of the family by the military school, and

the other articles in Saint Just's programme of social renovation. The

twelve apostles went among people who were morally swept and

garnished, and they went armed with instruments proper to seize the

imagination of their hearers. All moral reformers seek the ignorant

and simple, poor fishermen in one scene, labourers and women in

another, for the good reason that new ideas only make way on ground

that is not already too heavily encumbered with prejudices. But France

in 1793 was in no condition of this kind. Opinion in all its spheres

was deepened by an old and powerful organisation, to a degree which

made any attempt to abolish the opinion, as the organisation appeared

to have been abolished, quite hopeless until the lapse of three or

four hundred years had allowed due time for dissolution. After all it

was not until the fourth century of our era that the work of even the

twelve apostles began to tell decisively and quickly. As for the

Lycurgus of whom the French chattered, if such a personality ever

existed out of the region of myth, he came to his people armed with an

oracle from the gods, just as Moses did, and was himself regarded as

having a nature touched with divinity. No such pretensions could well

be made by any French legislator within a dozen years or so of the

death of Voltaire.

Let us here remark that it was exactly what strikes us as the

desperate absurdity of the assumptions of the Social Contract, which

constituted the power of that work, when it accidentally fell into the

hands of men who surveyed a national system wrecked in all its parts.

The Social Contract is worked out precisely in that fashion which, if

it touches men at all, makes them into fanatics. Long trains of

reasoning, careful allegation of proofs, patient admission on every

hand of qualifying propositions and multitudinous limitations, are

essential to science, and produce treatises that guide the wise

statesman in normal times. But it is dogma that gives fervour to a

sect. There are always large classes of minds to whom anything in the

shape of a vigorously compact system is irresistibly fascinating, and

to whom the qualification of a proposition, or the limitation of a

theoretic principle is distressing or intolerable. Such persons always

come to the front for a season in times of distraction, when the party

that knows its own aims most definitely is sure to have the best

chance of obtaining power. And Rousseau's method charmed their

temperament. A man who handles sets of complex facts is necessarily

slow-footed, but one who has only words to deal with, may advance with

a speed, a precision, a consistency, a conclusiveness, that has a

magical potency over men who insist on having politics and theology

drawn out in exact theorems like those of Euclid.

Rousseau traces his conclusions from words, and develops his system

from the interior germs of phrases. Like the typical schoolman, he

assumes that analysis of terms is the right way of acquiring new

knowledge about things; he mistakes the multiplication of propositions

for the discovery of fresh truth. Many pages of the Social Contract

are mere logical deductions from verbal definitions: the slightest

attempt to confront them with actual fact would have shown them to be

not only valueless, but wholly meaningless, in connection with real

human nature and the visible working of human affairs. He looks into

the word, or into his own verbal notion, and tells us what is to be

found in that, whereas we need to be told the marks and qualities that

distinguish the object which the word is meant to recall. Hence arises

his habit of setting himself questions, with reference to which we

cannot say that the answers are not true, but only that the questions

themselves were never worth asking. Here is an instance of his method

of supposing that to draw something from a verbal notion is to find

out something corresponding to fact. "We can distinguish in the

magistrate three essentially different wills: 1st, the will peculiar

to him as an individual, which only tends to his own particular

advantage; 2nd, the common will of the magistrates, which refers only

to the advantage of the prince [\_i.e.\_ the government], and this we

may name corporate will, which is general in relation to the

government, and particular in relation to the state of which the

government is a part; 3rd, the will of the people or sovereign will,

which is general, as well in relation to the state considered as a

whole, as in relation to the government considered as part of the

whole."[202] It might be hard to prove that all this is not true, but

then it is unreal and comes to nothing, as we see if we take the

trouble to turn it into real matter. Thus a member of the British

House of Commons, who is a magistrate in Rousseau's sense, has three

essentially different wills: first, as a man, Mr. So-and-so; second,

his corporate will, as member of the chamber, and this will is general

in relation to the legislature, but particular in relation to the

whole body of electors and peers; third, his will as a member of the

great electoral body, which is a general will alike in relation to the

electoral body and to the legislature. An English publicist is

perfectly welcome to make assertions of this kind, if he chooses to do

so, and nobody will take the trouble to deny them. But they are

nonsense. They do not correspond to the real composition of a member

of parliament, nor do they shed the smallest light upon any part

either of the theory of government in general, or the working of our

own government in particular. Almost the same kind of observation

might be made of the famous dogmatic statements about sovereignty.

"Sovereignty, being only the exercise of the general will, can never

be alienated, and the sovereign, who is only a collective being, can

only be represented by himself: the power may be transmitted, but not

the will;"[203] sovereignty is indivisible, not only in principle, but

in object;[204] and so forth. We shall have to consider these remarks

from another point of view. At present we refer to them as

illustrating the character of the book, as consisting of a number of

expansions of definitions, analysed as words, not compared with the

facts of which the words are representatives. This way of treating

political theory enabled the writer to assume an air of certitude and

precision, which led narrow deductive minds completely captive. Burke

poured merited scorn on the application of geometry to politics and

algebraic formulas to government, but then it was just this seeming

demonstration, this measured accuracy, that filled Rousseau's

disciples with a supreme and undoubting confidence which leaves the

modern student of these schemes in amazement unspeakable. The thinness

of Robespierre's ideas on government ceases to astonish us, when we

remember that he had not trained himself to look upon it as the art of

dealing with huge groups of conflicting interests, of hostile

passions, of hardly reconcilable aims, of vehemently opposed forces.

He had disciplined his political intelligence on such meagre and

unsubstantial argumentation as the following:--"Let us suppose the

state composed of ten thousand citizens. The sovereign can only be

considered collectively and as a body; but each person, in his quality

as subject, is considered as an individual unit; thus the sovereign is

to the subject as ten thousand is to one; in other words, each member

of the state has for his share only the ten-thousandth part of the

sovereign authority, though he is submitted to it in all his own

entirety. If the people be composed of a hundred thousand men, the

condition of the subjects does not change, and each of them bears

equally the whole empire of the laws, while his suffrage, reduced to a

hundred-thousandth, has ten times less influence in drawing them up.

Then, the subject remaining still only one, the relation of the

sovereign augments in the ratio of the number of the citizens. Whence

it follows that, the larger the state becomes, the more does liberty

diminish."[205]

Apart from these arithmetical conceptions, and the deep charm which

their assurance of expression had for the narrow and fervid minds of

which England and Germany seem to have got finally rid in Anabaptists

and Fifth Monarchy men, but which still haunted France, there were

maxims in the Social Contract of remarkable convenience for the

members of a Committee of Public Safety. "How can a blind multitude,"

the writer asks in one place, "which so often does not know its own

will, because it seldom knows what is good for it, execute of itself

an undertaking so vast and so difficult as a system of

legislation?"[206] Again, "as nature gives to each man an absolute

power over all his members, so the social pact gives to the body

politic an absolute power over all its members; and it is this same

power which, when directed by the general will, bears, as I have said,

the name of sovereignty."[207] Above all, the little chapter on a

dictatorship is the very foundation of the position of the

Robespierrists in the few months immediately preceding their fall. "It

is evidently the first intention of the people that the state should

not perish," and so on, with much criticism of the system of

occasional dictatorships, as they were resorted to in old Rome.[208]

Yet this does not in itself go much beyond the old monarchic doctrine

of Prerogative, as a corrective for the slowness and want of immediate

applicability of mere legal processes in cases of state emergency; and

it is worth noticing again and again that in spite of the shriekings

of reaction, the few atrocities of the Terror are an almost invisible

speck compared with the atrocities of Christian churchmen and lawful

kings, perpetrated in accordance with their notion of what constituted

public safety. So far as Rousseau's intention goes, we find in his

writings one of the strongest denunciations of the doctrine of public

safety that is to be found in any of the writings of the century. "Is

the safety of a citizen," he cries, "less the common cause than the

safety of the state? They may tell us that it is well that one should

perish on behalf of all. I will admire such a sentence in the mouth of

a virtuous patriot, who voluntarily and for duty's sake devotes

himself to death for the salvation of his country. But if we are to

understand that it is allowed to the government to sacrifice an

innocent person for the safety of the multitude, I hold this maxim for

one of the most execrable that tyranny has ever invented, and the most

dangerous that can be admitted."[209] It may be said that the

Terrorists did not sacrifice innocent life, but the plea is frivolous

on the lips of men who proscribed whole classes. You cannot justly

draw a capital indictment against a class. Rousseau, however, cannot

fairly be said to have had a share in the responsibility for the more

criminal part of the policy of 1793, any more than the founder of

Christianity is responsible for the atrocities that have been

committed by the more ardent worshippers of his name, and justified by

stray texts caught up from the gospels. HelvÃ©tius had said, "All

becomes legitimate and even virtuous on behalf of the public safety."

Rousseau wrote in the margin, "The public safety is nothing unless

individuals enjoy security."[210] The author of a theory is not

answerable for the applications which may be read into it by the

passions of men and the exigencies of a violent crisis. Such

applications show this much and no more, that the theory was

constructed with an imperfect consideration of the qualities of human

nature, with too narrow a view of the conditions of society, and

therefore with an inadequate appreciation of the consequences which

the theory might be drawn to support.

It is time to come to the central conception of the Social Contract,

the dogma which made of it for a time the gospel of a nation, the

memorable doctrine of the sovereignty of peoples. Of this doctrine

Rousseau was assuredly not the inventor, though the exaggerated

language of some popular writers in France leads us to suppose that

they think of him as nothing less. Even in the thirteenth century the

constitution of the Orders, and the contests of the friars with the

clergy, had engendered faintly democratic ways of thinking.[211] Among

others the great Aquinas had protested against the juristic doctrine

that the law is the pleasure of the prince. The will of the prince, he

says, to be a law, must be directed by reason; law is appointed for

the common good, and not for a special or private good: it follows

from this that only the reason of the multitude, or of a prince

representing the multitude, can make a law.[212] A still more

remarkable approach to later views was made by Marsilio of Padua,

physician to Lewis of Bavaria, who wrote a strong book on his master's

side, in the great contest between him and the pope (1324). Marsilio

in the first part of his work not only lays down very elaborately the

proposition that laws ought to be made by the "\_universitas civium\_";

he places this sovereignty of the people on the true basis (which

Rousseau only took for a secondary support to his original compact),

namely, the greater likelihood of laws being obeyed in the first

place, and being good laws in the second, when they are made by the

body of the persons affected. "No one knowingly does hurt to himself,

or deliberately asks what is unjust, and on that account all or a

great majority must wish such law as best suits the common interest of

the citizens."[213] Turning from this to the Social Contract, or to

Locke's essay on Government, the identity in doctrine and

correspondence in dialect may teach us how little true originality

there can he among thinkers who are in the same stage; how a

metaphysician of the thirteenth century and a metaphysician of the

eighteenth hit on the same doctrine; and how the true classification

of thinkers does not follow intervals of time, but is fixed by

differences of method. It is impossible that in the constant play of

circumstances and ideas in the minds of different thinkers, the same

combinations of form and colour in a philosophic arrangement of such

circumstances and ideas should not recur. Signal novelties in thought

are as limited as signal inventions in architectural construction. It

is only one of the great changes in method, that can remove the limits

of the old combinations, by bringing new material and fundamentally

altering the point of view.

In the sixteenth century there were numerous writers who declared the

right of subjects to depose a bad sovereign, but this position is to

be distinguished from Rousseau's doctrine. Thus, if we turn to the

great historic event of 1581, the rejection of the yoke of Spain by

the Dutch, we find the Declaration of Independence running, "that if a

prince is appointed by God over the land, it is to protect them from

harm, even as a shepherd to the guardianship of his flock. The

subjects are not appointed by God for the behoof of the prince, but

the prince for his subjects, without whom he is no prince." This is

obviously divine right, fundamentally modified by a popular

principle, accepted to meet the exigencies of the occasion, and to

justify after the event a measure which was dictated by urgent need

for practical relief. Such a notion of the social compact was still

emphatically in the semi-patriarchal stage, and is distinct as can be

from the dogma of popular sovereignty as Rousseau understood it. But

it plainly marked a step on the way. It was the development of

Protestant principles which produced and necessarily involved the

extreme democratic conclusion. Time was needed for their full

expansion in this sense, but the result could only have been avoided

by a suppression of the Reformation, and we therefore count it

inevitable. Bodin (1577) had defined sovereignty as residing in the

supreme legislative authority, without further inquiry as to the

source or seat of that authority, though he admits the vague position

which even Lewis XIV. did not deny, that the object of political

society is the greatest good of every citizen or the whole state. In

1603 a Protestant professor of law in Germany, Althusen by name,

published a treatise of Politics, in which the doctrine of the

sovereignty of peoples was clearly formulated, to the profound

indignation both of Jesuits and of Protestant jurists.[214] Rousseau

mentions his name;[215] it does not appear that he read Althusen's

rather uncommon treatise, but its teaching would probably have a place

in the traditions of political theorising current at Geneva, to the

spirit of whose government it was so congenial. Hooker, vindicating

episcopacy against the democratic principles of the Puritans, had

still been led, apparently by way of the ever dominant idea of a law

natural, to base civil government on the assent of the governed, and

had laid down such propositions as these: "Laws they are not, which

public approbation hath not made so. Laws therefore human, of what

kind soever, are available by consent," and so on.[216] The views of

the Ecclesiastical Polity were adopted by Locke, and became the

foundation of the famous essay on Civil Government, from which popular

leaders in our own country drew all their weapons down to the outbreak

of the French Revolution. Grotius (1625) starting from the principle

that the law of nature enjoins that we should stand by our agreements,

then proceeded to assume either an express, or at any rate a tacit and

implied, promise on the part of all who become members of a community,

to obey the majority of the body, or a majority of those to whom

authority has been delegated.[217] This is a unilateral view of the

social contract, and omits the element of reciprocity which in

Rousseau's idea was cardinal.

Locke was Rousseau's most immediate inspirer, and the latter affirmed

himself to have treated the same matters exactly on Locke's

principles. Rousseau, however, exaggerated Locke's politics as greatly

as Condillac exaggerated his metaphysics. There was the important

difference that Locke's essay on Civil Government was the

justification in theory of a revolution which had already been

accomplished in practice, while the Social Contract, tinged as it was

by silent reference in the mind of the writer to Geneva, was yet a

speculation in the air. The circumstances under which it was written

gave to the propositions of Locke's piece a reserve and moderation

which savour of a practical origin and a special case. They have not

the wide scope and dogmatic air and literary precision of the

corresponding propositions in Rousseau. We find in Locke none of those

concise phrases which make fanatics. But the essential doctrine is

there. The philosopher of the Revolution of 1688 probably carried its

principles further than most of those who helped in the Revolution had

any intention to carry them, when he said that "the legislature being

only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends, there remains still in

the people a supreme power to remove or alter the legislative."[218]

It may be questioned how many of the peers of that day would have

assented to the proposition that the people--and did Locke mean by the

people the electors of the House of Commons, or all males over

twenty-one, or all householders paying rates?--could by any expression

of their will abolish the legislative power of the upper chamber, or

put an end to the legislative and executive powers of the crown. But

Locke's statements are direct enough, though he does not use so terse

a label for his doctrine as Rousseau affixed to it.

Again, besides the principle of popular sovereignty, Locke most likely

gave to Rousseau the idea of the origin of this sovereignty in the

civil state in a pact or contract, which was represented as the

foundation and first condition of the civil state. From this naturally

flowed the connected theory, of a perpetual consent being implied as

given by the people to each new law. We need not quote passages from

Locke to demonstrate the substantial correspondence of assumption

between him and the author of the Social Contract. They are found in

every chapter.[219] Such principles were indispensable for the defence

of a Revolution like that of 1688, which was always carefully marked

out by its promoters, as well as by its eloquent apologist and

expositor a hundred years later, the great Burke, as above all things

a revolution within the pale of the law or the constitution. They

represented the philosophic adjustment of popular ideas to the

political changes wrought by shifting circumstances, as distinguished

from the biblical or Hebraic method of adjusting such ideas, which had

prevailed in the contests of the previous generation.

Yet there was in the midst of those contests one thinker of the first

rank in intellectual power, who had constructed a genuine philosophy

of government. Hobbes's speculations did not fit in with the theory of

either of the two bodies of combatants in the Civil War. They were

each in the theological order of ideas, and neither of them sought or

was able to comprehend the application of philosophic principles to

their own case or to that of their adversaries.[220] Hebrew precedents

and bible texts, on the one hand; prerogative of use and high church

doctrine, on the other. Between these was no space for the acceptance

of a secular and rationalistic theory, covering the whole field of a

social constitution. Now the influence of Hobbes upon Rousseau was

very marked, and very singular. There were numerous differences

between the philosopher of Geneva and his predecessor of Malmesbury.

The one looked on men as good, the other looked on them as bad. The

one described the state of nature as a state of peace, the other as a

state of war. The one believed that laws and institutions had depraved

man, the other that they had improved him.[221] But these differences

did not prevent the action of Hobbes on Rousseau. It resulted in a

curious fusion between the premisses and the temper of Hobbes and the

conclusions of Locke. This fusion produced that popular absolutism of

which the Social Contract was the theoretical expression, and Jacobin

supremacy the practical manifestation. Rousseau borrowed from Hobbes

the true conception of sovereignty, and from Locke the true conception

of the ultimate seat and original of authority, and of the two

together he made the great image of the sovereign people. Strike the

crowned head from that monstrous figure which is the frontispiece of

the Leviathan, and you have a frontispiece that will do excellently

well for the Social Contract. Apart from a multitude of other

obligations, good and bad, which Rousseau owed to Hobbes, as we shall

point out, we may here mention that of the superior accuracy of the

notion of law in the Social Contract over the notion of law in

Montesquieu's work. The latter begins, as everybody knows, with a

definition inextricably confused: "Laws are necessary relations

flowing from the nature of things, and in this sense all beings have

their laws, divinity has its laws, the material world has its laws,

the intelligences superior to men have their laws, the beasts have

their laws, man has his laws.... There is a primitive reason, and laws

are the relations to be found between that and the different beings,

and the relations of these different beings among one another."[222]

Rousseau at once put aside these divergent meanings, made the proper

distinction between a law of nature and the imperative law of a state,

and justly asserted that the one could teach us nothing worth knowing

about the other.[223] Hobbes's phraseology is much less definite than

this, and shows that he had not himself wholly shaken off the same

confusion as reigned in Montesquieu's account a century later. But

then Hobbes's account of the true meaning of sovereignty was so clear,

firm, and comprehensive, as easily to lead any fairly perspicuous

student who followed him, to apply it to the true meaning of law. And

on this head of law not so much fault is to be found with Rousseau, as

on the head of larger constitutional theory. He did not look long

enough at given laws, and hence failed to seize all their distinctive

qualities; above all he only half saw, if he saw at all, that a law is

a command and not a contract, and his eyes were closed to this,

because the true view was incompatible with his fundamental assumption

of contract as the base of the social union.[224] But he did at all

events grasp the quality of generality as belonging to laws proper,

and separated them justly from what he calls decrees, which we are now

taught to name occasional or particular commands.[225] This is worth

mentioning, because it shows that, in spite of his habits of

intellectual laxity, Rousseau was capable, where he had a clear-headed

master before him, of a very considerable degree of precision of

thought, however liable it was to fall into error or deficiency for

want of abundant comparison with bodies of external fact. Let us now

proceed to some of the central propositions of the Social Contract.

1. The origin of society dates from the moment when the obstacles

which impede the preservation of men in a state of nature are too

strong for such forces as each individual can employ in order to keep

himself in that state. At this point they can only save themselves by

aggregation. Problem: to find a form of association which defends and

protects with the whole common force the person and property of each

associate, and by which, each uniting himself to all, still only obeys

himself, and remains as free as he was before. Solution: a social

compact reducible to these words, "Each of us places in common his

person and his whole power under the supreme direction of the general

will; and we further receive each member as indivisible part of the

whole." This act of association constitutes a moral and collective

body, a public person.

The practical importance and the mischief of thus suffering society to

repose on conventions which the human will had made, lay in the

corollary that the human will is competent at any time to unmake them,

and also therefore to devise all possible changes that fell short of

unmaking them. This was the root of the fatal hypothesis of the

dictator, or divinely commissioned lawgiver. External circumstance and

human nature alike were passive and infinitely pliable; they were the

material out of which the legislator was to devise conventions at

pleasure, without apprehension as to their suitableness either to the

conditions of society among which they were to work, or to the

passions and interests of those by whom they were to be carried out,

and who were supposed to have given assent to them. It would be unjust

to say that Rousseau actually faced this position and took the

consequences. He expressly says in more places than one that the

science of Government is only a science of combinations, applications,

and exceptions, according to time, place, and circumstance.[226] But

to base society on conventions is to impute an element of

arbitrariness to these combinations and applications, and to make them

independent, as they can never be, of the limits inexorably fixed by

the nature of things. The notion of compact is the main source of all

the worst vagaries in Rousseau's political speculation.

It is worth remarking in the history of opinion, that there was at

this time in France a little knot of thinkers who were nearly in full

possession of the true view of the limits set by the natural ordering

of societies to the power of convention and the function of the

legislators. Five years after the publication of the Social Contract,

a remarkable book was written by one of the economic sect of the

Physiocrats, the later of whom, though specially concerned with the

material interests of communities, very properly felt the necessity of

connecting the discussion of wealth with the assumption of certain

fundamental political conditions. They felt this, because it is

impossible to settle any question about wages or profits, for

instance, until you have first settled whether you are assuming the

principles of liberty and property. This writer with great consistency

found the first essential of all social order in conformity of

positive law and institution to those qualities of human nature, and

their relations with those material instruments of life, which, and

not convention, were the true origin, as they are the actual grounds,

of the perpetuation of our societies.[227] This was wiser than

Rousseau's conception of the lawgiver as one who should change human

nature, and take away from man the forces that are naturally his own,

to replace them by others comparatively foreign to him.[228] Rousseau

once wrote, in a letter about RiviÃ¨re's book, that the great problem

in politics, which might be compared with the quadrature of the circle

in geometry, is to find a form of government which shall place law

above man.[229] A more important problem, and not any less difficult

for the political theoriser, is to mark the bounds at which the

authority of the law is powerless or mischievous in attempting to

control the egoistic or non-social parts of man. This problem Rousseau

ignored, and that he should do so was only natural in one who

believed that man had bound himself by a convention, strictly to

suppress his egoistic and non-social parts, and who based all his

speculation on this pact as against the force, or the paternal

authority, or the will of a Supreme Being, in which other writers

founded the social union.

2. The body thus constituted by convention is the sovereign. Each

citizen is a member of the sovereign, standing in a definite relation

to individuals \_qua\_ individuals; he is also as an individual a member

of the state and subject to the sovereign, of which from the first

point of view he is a component element. The sovereign and the body

politic are one and the same thing.[230]

Of the antecedents and history of this doctrine enough has already

been said. Its general truth as a description either of what is, or

what ought to be and will be, demands an ampler discussion than there

is any occasion to carry on here. We need only point out its place as

a kind of intermediate dissolvent for which the time was most ripe. It

breaks up the feudal conception of political authority as a property

of land-ownership, noble birth, and the like, and it associates this

authority widely and simply with the bare fact of participation in any

form of citizenship in the social union. The later and higher idea of

every share of political power as a function to be discharged for the

good of the whole body, and not merely as a right to be enjoyed for

the advantage of its possessor, was a form of thought to which

Rousseau did not rise. That does not lessen the effectiveness of the

blow which his doctrine dealt to French feudalism, and which is its

main title to commemoration in connection with his name.

The social compact thus made is essentially different from the social

compact which Hobbes described as the origin of what he calls

commonwealths by institution, to distinguish them from commonwealths

by acquisition, that is to say, states formed by conquest or resting

on hereditary rule. "A commonwealth," Hobbes says, "is said to be

instituted when a multitude of men do agree and covenant, every one

with every one, that to whatsoever man or assembly of men shall be

given by the major part the right to present the person of them all,

that is to say, to be their representative; every one ... shall

authorise all the actions and judgments of that man or assembly of

men, in the same manner as if they were his own, to the end to live

peaceably among themselves, and be protected against other men."[231]

But Rousseau's compact was an act of association among equals, who

also remained equals. Hobbes's compact was an act of surrender on the

part of the many to one or a number. The first was the constitution of

civil society, the second was the erection of a government. As nobody

now believes in the existence of any such compact in either one form

or the other, it would be superfluous to inquire which of the two is

the less inaccurate. All we need do is to point out that there was

this difference. Rousseau distinctly denied the existence of any

element of contract in the erection of a government; there is only one

contract in the state, he said, and it is that of association.[232]

Locke's notion of the compact which was the beginning of every

political society is indefinite on this point; he speaks of it

indifferently as an agreement of a body of free men to unite and

incorporate into a society, and an agreement to set up a

government.[233] Most of us would suppose the two processes to be as

nearly identical as may be; Rousseau drew a distinction, and from this

distinction he derived further differences.

Here, we may remark, is the starting-point in the history of the ideas

of the revolution, of one of the most prominent of them all, that of

Fraternity. If the whole structure of society rests on an act of

partnership entered into by equals on behalf of themselves and their

descendants for ever, the nature of the union is not what it would be,

if the members of the union had only entered it to place their

liberties at the feet of some superior power. Society in the one case

is a covenant of subjection, in the other a covenant of social

brotherhood. This impressed itself deeply on the feelings of men like

Robespierre, who were never so well pleased as when they could find

for their sentimentalism a covering of neat political logic. The same

idea of association came presently to receive a still more remarkable

and momentous extension, when it was translated from the language of

mere government into that of the economic organisation of communities.

Rousseau's conception went no further than political association, as

distinct from subjection. Socialism, which came by and by to the front

place, carried the idea to its fullest capacity, and presented all the

relations of men with one another as fixed by the same bond. Men had

entered the social union as brethren, equal, and co-operators, not

merely for purposes of government, but for purposes of mutual succour

in all its aspects. This naturally included the most important of all,

material production. They were not associated merely as equal

participants in political sovereignty; they were equal participants in

all the rest of the increase made to the means of human happiness by

united action. Socialism is the transfer of the principle of fraternal

association from politics, where Rousseau left it, to the wider sphere

of industrial force.

It is perhaps worth notice that another famous revolutionary term

belongs to the same source. All the associates of this act of union,

becoming members of the city, are as such to be called Citizens, as

participating in the sovereign authority.[234] The term was in

familiar use enough among the French in their worst days, but it was

Rousseau's sanction which marked it in the new times with a sort of

sacramental stamp. It came naturally to him, because it was the name

of the first of the two classes which constituted the active portion

of the republic of Geneva, and the only class whose members were

eligible to the chief magistracies.

3. We next have a group of propositions setting forth the attributes

of sovereignty. It is inalienable.[235] It is indivisible.

These two propositions, which play such a part in the history of some

of the episodes of the French Revolution, contain no more than was

contended for by Hobbes, and has been accepted in our own times by

Austin. When Hobbes says that "to the laws which the sovereign maketh,

the sovereign is not subject, for if he were subject to the civil laws

he were subject to himself, which were not subjection but freedom,"

his notion of sovereignty is exactly that expressed by Rousseau in his

unexplained dogma of the inalienableness of sovereignty. So Rousseau

means no more by the dogma that sovereignty is indivisible, than

Austin meant when he declared of the doctrine that the legislative

sovereign powers and the executive sovereign powers belong in any

society to distinct parties, that it is a supposition too palpably

false to endure a moment's examination.[236] The way in which this

account of the indivisibleness of sovereignty was understood during

the revolution, twisted it into a condemnation of the dreaded idea of

Federalism. It might just as well have been interpreted to condemn

alliances between nations; for the properties of sovereignty are

clearly independent of the dimensions of the sovereign unit. Another

effect of this doctrine was the rejection by the Constituent Assembly

of the balanced parliamentary system, which the followers of

Montesquieu would fain have introduced on the English model. Whether

that was an evil or a good, publicists will long continue to dispute.

4. The general will of the sovereign upon an object of common interest

is expressed in a law. Only the sovereign can possess this law-making

power, because no one but the sovereign has the right of declaring the

general will. The legislative power cannot be exerted by delegation or

representation. The English fancy that they are a free nation, but

they are grievously mistaken. They are only free during the election

of members of parliament; the members once chosen, the people are

slaves, nay, as people they have ceased to exist.[237] It is

impossible for the sovereign to act, except when the people are

assembled. Besides such extraordinary assemblies as unforeseen events

may call for, there must be fixed periodical meetings that nothing can

interrupt or postpone. Do you call this chimerical? Then you have

forgotten the Roman comitia, as well as such gatherings of the people

as those of the Macedonians and the Franks and most other nations in

their primitive times. What has existed is certainly possible.[238]

It is very curious that Rousseau in this part of his subject should

have contented himself with going back to Macedonia and Rome, instead

of pointing to the sovereign states that have since become confederate

with his native republic. A historian in our own time has described

with an enthusiasm that equals that of the Social Contract, how he saw

the sovereign people of Uri and the sovereign people of Appenzell

discharge the duties of legislation and choice of executive, each in

the majesty of its corporate person.[239] That Rousseau was influenced

by the free sovereignty of the states of the Swiss confederation, as

well as by that of his own city, we may well believe. Whether he was

or not, it must always be counted a serious misfortune that a writer

who was destined to exercise such power in a crisis of the history of

a great nation, should have chosen his illustrations from a time and

from societies so remote, that the true conditions of their political

system could not possibly be understood with any approach to reality,

while there were, within a few leagues of his native place,

communities where the system of a sovereign public in his own sense

was actually alive and flourishing and at work. From them the full

meaning of his theories might have been practically gathered, and

whatever useful lessons lay at the bottom of them might have been made

plain. As it was, it came to pass singularly enough that the effect of

the French Revolution was the suppression, happily only for a time, of

the only governments in Europe where the doctrine of the favourite

apostle of the Revolution was a reality. The constitution of the

Helvetic Republic in 1798 was as bad a blow to the sovereignty of

peoples in a true sense, as the old house of Austria or Charles of

Burgundy could ever have dealt. That constitution, moreover, was

directly opposed to the Social Contract in setting up what it called

representative democracy, for representative democracy was just what

Rousseau steadily maintained to be a nullity and a delusion.

The only lesson which the Social Contract contained for a statesman

bold enough to take into his hands the reconstruction of France,

undoubtedly pointed in the direction of confederation. At one place,

where he became sensible of the impotence which his assumption of a

small state inflicted on his whole speculation, Rousseau said he would

presently show how the good order of a small state might be united to

the external power of a great people. Though he never did this, he

hints in a footnote that his plan belonged to the theory of

confederations, of which the principles were still to be

established.[240] When he gave advice for the renovation of the

wretched constitution of Poland, he insisted above all things that

they should apply themselves to extend and perfect the system of

federate governments, "the only one that unites in itself all the

advantages of great and small states."[241] A very few years after the

appearance of his book, the great American union of sovereign states

arose to point the political moral. The French revolutionists missed

the force alike of the practical example abroad, and of the theory of

the book which they took for gospel at home. How far they were driven

to this by the urgent pressure of foreign war, or whether they would

have followed the same course without that interference, merely in

obedience to the catholic and monarchic absolutism which had sunk so

much deeper into French character than people have been willing to

admit, we cannot tell. The fact remains that the Jacobins, Rousseau's

immediate disciples, at once took up the chain of centralised

authority where it had been broken off by the ruin of the monarchy.

They caught at the letter of the dogma of a sovereign people, and lost

its spirit. They missed the germ of truth in Rousseau's scheme,

namely, that for order and freedom and just administration the unit

should not be too large to admit of the participation of the persons

concerned in the management of their own public affairs. If they had

realised this and applied it, either by transforming the old monarchy

into a confederacy of sovereign provinces, or by some less sweeping

modification of the old centralised scheme of government, they might

have saved France.[242] But, once more, men interpret a political

treatise on principles which either come to them by tradition; or

else spring suddenly up from roots of passion.[243]

5. The government is the minister of the sovereign. It is an

intermediate body set up between sovereign and subjects for their

mutual correspondence, charged with the execution of the laws and the

maintenance of civil and political freedom. The members comprising it

are called magistrates or kings, and to the whole body so composed,

whether of one or of more than one, is given the name of prince. If

the whole power is centred in the hands of a single magistrate, from

whom all the rest hold their authority, the government is called a

monarchy. If there are more persons simply citizens than there are

magistrates, this is an aristocracy.[244] If more citizen magistrates

than simple private citizens, that is a democracy. The last government

is as a general rule best fitted for small states, and the first for

large ones--on the principle that the number of the supreme

magistrates ought to be in the inverse ratio of that of the citizens.

But there is a multitude of circumstances which may furnish reasons

for exceptions to this general rule.

This common definition of the three forms of governments according to

the mere number of the participants in the chief magistracy, though

adopted by Hobbes and other writers, is certainly inadequate and

uninstructive, without some further qualification. Aristotle, for

instance, furnishes such a qualification, when he refers to the

interests in which the government is carried on, whether the interest

of a small body or of the whole of the citizens.[245] Montesquieu's

well-known division, though logically faulty, still has the merit of

pointing to conditions of difference among forms of government,

outside of and apart from the one fact of the number of the sovereign.

To divide governments, as Montesquieu did, into republics, monarchies,

and despotisms, was to use two principles of division, first the

number of the sovereign, and next something else, namely, the

difference between a constitutional and an absolute monarch. Then he

returned to the first principle of division, and separated a republic

into a government of all, which is a democracy, and a government by a

part, which is aristocracy.[246] Still, to have introduced the element

of law-abidingness in the chief magistracy, whether of one or more,

was to have called attention to the fact that no single distinction is

enough to furnish us with a conception of the real and vital

differences which may exist between one form of government and

another.[247]

The important fact about a government lies quite as much in the

qualifying epithet which is to be affixed to any one of the three

names, as in the name itself. We know nothing about a monarchy, until

we have been told whether it is absolute or constitutional; if

absolute, whether it is administered in the interests of the realm,

like that of Prussia under Frederick the Great, or in the interests of

the ruler, like that of an Indian principality under a native prince;

if constitutional, whether the real power is aristocratic, as in Great

Britain a hundred years ago, or plutocratic, as in Great Britain

to-day, or popular, as it may be here fifty years hence. And so with

reference to each of the other two forms; neither name gives us any

instruction, except of a merely negative kind, until it has been made

precise by one or more explanatory epithets. What is the common

quality of the old Roman republic, the republics of the Swiss

confederation, the republic of Venice, the American republic, the

republic of Mexico? Plainly the word republic has no further effect

beyond that of excluding the idea of a recognised dynasty.

Rousseau is perhaps less open to this kind of criticism than other

writers on political theory, for the reason that he distinguishes the

constitution of the state from the constitution of the government. The

first he settles definitely. The whole body of the people is to be

sovereign, and to be endowed alone with what he conceived as the only

genuinely legislative power. The only question which he considers open

is as to the form in which the \_delegated executive authority\_ shall

be organised. Democracy, the immediate government of all by all, he

rejects as too perfect for men; it requires a state so small that each

citizen knows all the others, manners so simple that the business may

be small and the mode of discussion easy, equality of rank and fortune

so general as not to allow of the overriding of political equality by

material superiority, and so forth.[248] Monarchy labours under a

number of disadvantages which are tolerably obvious. "One essential

and inevitable defect, which must always place monarchic below

republican government, is that in the latter the public voice hardly

ever promotes to the first places any but capable and enlightened men

who fill them with honour; whereas those who get on in monarchies, are

for the most part small busybodies, small knaves, small intriguers, in

whom the puny talents which are the secret of reaching substantial

posts in courts, only serve to show their stupidity to the public as

soon as they have made their way to the front. The people is far less

likely to make a blunder in a choice of this sort, than the prince,

and a man of true merit is nearly as rare in the ministry, as a fool

at the head of the government of a republic."[249] There remains

aristocracy. Of this there are three sorts: natural, elective, and

hereditary. The first can only thrive among primitive folk, while the

third is the worst of all governments. The second is the best, for it

is aristocracy properly so called. If men only acquire rule in virtue

of election, then purity, enlightenment, experience, and all the other

grounds of public esteem and preference, become so many new guarantees

that the administration shall be wise and just. It is the best and

most natural order that the wisest should govern the multitude,

provided you are sure that they will govern the multitude for its

advantage, and not for their own. If aristocracy of this kind requires

one or two virtues less than a popular executive, it also demands

others which are peculiar to itself, such as moderation in the rich

and content in the poor. For this form comports with a certain

inequality of fortune, for the reason that it is well that the

administration of public affairs should be confided to those who are

best able to give their whole time to it. At the same time it is of

importance that an opposite choice should occasionally teach the

people that in the merit of men there are more momentous reasons of

preference than wealth.[250] Rousseau, as we have seen, had pronounced

English liberty to be no liberty at all, save during the few days once

in seven years when the elections to parliament take place. Yet this

scheme of an elective aristocracy was in truth a very near approach

to the English form as it is theoretically presented in our own day,

with a suffrage gradually becoming universal. If the suffrage were

universal, and if its exercise took place once a year, our system, in

spite of the now obsolescent elements of hereditary aristocracy and

nominal monarchy, would be as close a realisation of the scheme of the

Social Contract as any representative system permits. If Rousseau had

further developed his notions of confederation, the United States

would most have resembled his type.

6. What is to be the attitude of the state in respect of religion?

Certainly not that prescribed by the policy of the middle ages. The

separation of the spiritual from the temporal power, indicated by

Jesus Christ, and developed by his followers in the course of many

subsequent generations, was in Rousseau's eyes most mischievous,

because it ended in the subordination of the temporal power to the

spiritual, and that is incompatible with an efficient polity. Even the

kings of England, though they style themselves heads of the church,

are really its ministers and servants.[251]

The last allegation evinces Rousseau's usual ignorance of history, and

need not be discussed, any more than his proposition on which he lays

so much stress, that Christians cannot possibly be good soldiers, nor

truly good citizens, because their hearts being fixed upon another

world, they must necessarily be indifferent to the success or failure

of such enterprises as they may take up in this.[252] In reading the

Social Contract, and some other of the author's writings besides, we

have constantly to interpret the direct, positive, categorical form of

assertion into something of this kind--"Such and such consequences

ought logically to follow from the meaning of the name, or the

definition of a principle, or from such and such motives." The change

of this moderate form of provisional assertion into the unconditional

statement that such and such consequences have actually followed,

constantly lands the author in propositions which any reader who tests

them by an appeal to the experience of mankind, written and unwritten,

at once discovers to be false and absurd. Rousseau himself took less

trouble to verify his conclusions by such an appeal to experience than

any writer that ever lived in a scientific age. The other remark to be

made on the above section is that the rejection of the Christian or

ecclesiastical division of the powers of the church and the powers of

the state, is the strongest illustration that could be found of the

debt of Rousseau's conception of a state to the old pagan conception.

It was the main characteristic of the polities which Christian

monotheism and feudalism together succeeded in replacing, to recognise

no such division as that between church and state, pope and emperor.

Rousseau resumed the old conception. But he adjusted it in a certain

degree to the spirit of his own time, and imposed certain

philosophical limitations upon it. His scheme is as follows.

Religion, he says, in its relation to the state, may be considered as

of three kinds. First, natural religion, without temple, altar, or

rite, the true and pure theism of the natural conscience of man.

Second, local, civil, or positive religion, with dogmas, rites,

exercises; a theology of a primitive people, exactly co-extensive with

all the rights and all the duties of men. Third, a religion like the

Christianity of the Roman church, which gives men two sets of laws,

two chiefs, two countries, submits them to contradictory duties, and

prevents them from being able to be at once devout and patriotic. The

last of these is so evidently pestilent as to need no discussion. The

second has the merit of teaching men to identify duty to their gods

with duty to their country; under this to die for the land is

martyrdom, to break its laws impiety, and to subject a culprit to

public execration is to devote him to the anger of the gods. But it is

bad, because it is at bottom a superstition, and because it makes a

people sanguinary and intolerant. The first of all, which is now

styled a Christian theism, having no special relation with the body

politic, adds no force to the laws. There are many particular

objections to Christianity flowing from the fact of its not being a

kingdom of this world, and this above all, that Christianity only

preaches servitude and dependence.[253] What then is to be done? The

sovereign must establish a purely civil profession of faith. It will

consist of the following positive dogmas:--the existence of a

divinity, powerful, intelligent, beneficent and foreseeing; the life

to come; the happiness of the just, the chastisement of the wicked;

the sanctity of the social contract and the laws. These articles of

belief are imposed, not as dogmas of religion exactly, but as

sentiments of sociability. If any one declines to accept them, he

ought to be exiled, not for being impious, but for being unsociable,

incapable of sincere attachment to the laws, or of sacrificing his

life to his duty. If any one, after publicly recognising these dogmas,

carries himself as if he did not believe them, let him be punished by

death, for he has committed the worst of crimes, he has lied before

the laws.[254]

Rousseau thus, unconsciously enough, brought to its climax that

reaction against the absorption of the state in the church which had

first taken a place in literature in the controversy between legists

and canonists, and had found its most famous illustration in the De

MonarchiÃ¢ of the great poet of catholicism. The division of two

co-equal realms, one temporal, the other spiritual, was replaced in

the Genevese thinker by what he admitted to be "pure Hobbism." This,

the rigorous subordination of the church to the state, was the end, so

far as France went, of the speculative controversy which had occupied

Europe for so many ages, as to the respective powers of pope and

emperor, of positive law and law divine. The famous civil constitution

of the clergy (1790), which was the expression of Rousseau's principle

as formulated by his disciples in the Constituent Assembly, was the

revolutionary conclusion to the world-wide dispute, whose most

melodramatic episode had been the scene in the courtyard of Canossa.

Rousseau's memorable prescription, banishing all who should not

believe in God, or a future state, or in rewards and punishments for

the deeds done in the body, and putting to death any who, after

subscribing to the required profession, should seem no longer to hold

it, has naturally created a very lively horror in a tolerant

generation like our own, some of whose finest spirits have rejected

deliberately and finally the articles of belief, without which they

could not have been suffered to exist in Rousseau's state. It seemed

to contemporaries, who were enthusiastic above all things for humanity

and infinite tolerance, these being the prizes of the long conflict

which they hoped they were completing, to be a return to the horrors

of the Holy Office. Men were as shocked as the modern philosopher is,

when he finds the greatest of the followers of Socrates imposing in

his latest piece the penalty of imprisonment for five years, to be

followed in case of obduracy by death, on one who should not believe

in the gods set up for the state by the lawmaker.[255] And we can

hardly comfort ourselves, as Milton did about Plato, who framed laws

which no city ever yet received, and "fed his fancy with making many

edicts to his airy burgomasters, which they who otherwise admire him,

wish had been rather buried and excused in the genial cups of an

academic night-sitting."[256] Rousseau's ideas fell among men who were

most potent and corporeal burgomasters. In the winter of 1793 two

parties in Paris stood face to face; the rationalistic, Voltairean

party of the Commune, named improperly after HÃ©bert, but whose best

member was Chaumette, and the sentimental, Rousseauite party, led by

Robespierre. The first had industriously desecrated the churches, and

consummated their revolt against the gods of the old time by the

public worship of the Goddess of Reason, who was prematurely set up

for deity of the new time. Robespierre retaliated with the mummeries

of the Festival of the Supreme Being, and protested against atheism as

the crime of aristocrats. Presently the atheistic party succumbed.

Chaumette was not directly implicated in the proceedings which led to

their fall, but he was by and by accused of conspiring with HÃ©bert,

Clootz, and the rest, "to destroy all notion of Divinity and base the

government of France on atheism." "They attack the immortality of the

soul," cried Saint Just, "the thought which consoled Socrates in his

dying moments, and their dream is to raise atheism into a worship."

And this was the offence, technically and officially described, for

which Chaumette and Clootz were sent to the guillotine (April 1794),

strictly on the principle which had been laid down in the Social

Contract, and accepted by Robespierre.[257]

It would have been odd in any writer less firmly possessed with the

infallibility of his own dreams than Rousseau was, that he should not

have seen the impossibility in anything like the existing conditions

of human nature, of limiting the profession of civil faith to the

three or four articles which happened to constitute his own belief.

Having once granted the general position that a citizen may be

required to profess some religious faith, there is no speculative

principle, and there is no force in the world, which can fix any bound

to the amount or kind of religious faith which the state has the right

thus to exact. Rousseau said that a man was dangerous to the city who

did not believe in God, a future state, and divine reward and

retribution. But then Calvin thought a man dangerous who did not

believe both that there is only one God, and also that there are

three Gods. And so Chaumette went to the scaffold, and Servetus to the

stake, on the one common principle that the civil magistrate is

concerned with heresy. And HÃ©bert was only following out the same

doctrine in a mild and equitable manner, when he insisted on

preventing the publication of a book in which the author professed his

belief in a God. A single step in the path of civil interference with

opinion leads you the whole way.

The history of the Protestant churches is enough to show the pitiable

futility of the proviso for religious tolerance with which Rousseau

closed his exposition. "If there is no longer an exclusive national

religion, then every creed ought to be tolerated which tolerates other

creeds, so long as it contains nothing contrary to the duties of the

citizen. But whoever dares to say, \_Out of the church, no salvation\_,

ought to be banished from the state." The reason for which Henry IV.

embraced the Roman religion--namely, that in that he might be saved,

in the opinion alike of Protestants and Catholics, whereas in the

reformed faith, though he was saved according to Protestants, yet

according to Catholics he was necessarily damned,--ought to have made

every honest man, and especially every prince, reject it. It was the

more curious that Rousseau did not see the futility of drawing the

line of tolerance at any given set of dogmas, however simple and

slight and acceptable to himself they might be, because he invited

special admiration for D'Argenson's excellent maxim that "in the

republic everybody is perfectly free in what does not hurt

others."[258] Surely this maxim has very little significance or value,

unless we interpret it as giving entire liberty of opinion, because no

opinion whatever can hurt others, until it manifests itself in act,

including of course speech, which is a kind of act. Rousseau admitted

that over and above the profession of civil faith, a citizen might

hold what opinions he pleased, in entire freedom from the sovereign's

cognisance or jurisdiction; "for as the sovereign has no competence in

the other world, the fate of subjects in that other world is not his

affair, provided they are good citizens in this." But good citizenship

consists in doing or forbearing from certain actions, and to punish

men on the inference that forbidden action is likely to follow from

the rejection of a set of opinions, or to exact a test oath of

adherence to such opinions on the same principle, is to concede the

whole theory of civil intolerance, however little Rousseau may have

realised the perfectly legitimate applications of his doctrine. It was

an unconscious compromise. He was thinking of Calvin in practice and

Hobbes in theory, and he was at the same time influenced by the

moderate spirit of his time, and the comparatively reasonable

character of his personal belief. He praised Hobbes as the only author

who had seen the right remedy for the conflict of the spiritual and

temporal jurisdictions, by proposing to unite the two heads of the

eagle, and reducing all to political unity, without which never will

either state or government be duly constituted. But Hobbes was

consistent without flinching. He refused to set limits to the

religious prescriptions which a sovereign might impose, for "even when

the civil sovereign is an infidel, every one of his own subjects that

resisteth him, sinneth against the laws of God (for such are the laws

of nature), and rejecteth the counsel of the apostles, that

admonisheth all Christians to obey their princes.... And for their

faith, it is internal and invisible: they have the licence that Naaman

had, and need not put themselves into danger for it; but if they do,

they ought to expect their reward in heaven, and not complain of their

lawful sovereign."[259] All this flowed from the very idea and

definition of sovereignty, which Rousseau accepted from Hobbes, as we

have already seen. Such consequences, however, stated in these bold

terms, must have been highly revolting to Rousseau; he could not

assent to an exercise of sovereignty which might be atheistic,

Mahometan, or anything else unqualifiedly monstrous. He failed to see

the folly of trying to unite the old notions of a Christian

commonwealth with what was fundamentally his own notion of a

commonwealth after the ancient type. He stripped the pagan republics,

which he took for his model, of their national and official

polytheism, and he put on in its stead a scanty remnant of theism

slightly tinged with Christianity.

Then he practically accepted Hobbes's audacious bidding to the man who

should not be able to accept the state creed, to go courageously to

martyrdom, and leave the land in peace. For the modern principle,

which was contained in D'Argenson's saying previously quoted, that the

civil power does best absolutely and unreservedly to ignore

spirituals, he was not prepared either by his emancipation from the

theological ideas of his youth, or by his observation of the working

and tendencies of systems, which involved the state in some more or

less close relations with the church, either as superior, equal, or

subordinate. Every test is sure to insist on mental independence

ending exactly where the speculative curiosity of the time is most

intent to begin.

Let us now shortly confront Rousseau's ideas with some of the

propositions belonging to another method of approaching the philosophy

of government, that have for their key-note the conception of

expediency or convenience, and are tested by their conformity to the

observed and recorded experience of mankind. According to this method,

the ground and origin of society is not a compact; that never existed

in any known case, and never was a condition of obligation either in

primitive or developed societies, either between subjects and

sovereign, or between the equal members of a sovereign body. The true

ground is an acceptance of conditions which came into existence by the

sociability inherent in man, and were developed by man's spontaneous

search after convenience. The statement that while the constitution

of man is the work of nature, that of the state is the work of

art,[260] is as misleading as the opposite statement that governments

are not made but grow.[261] The truth lies between them, in such

propositions as that institutions owe their existence and development

to deliberate human effort, working in accordance with circumstances

naturally fixed both in human character and in the external field of

its activity. The obedience of the subject to the sovereign has its

root not in contract but in force,--the force of the sovereign to

punish disobedience. A man does not consent to be put to death if he

shall commit a murder, for the reason alleged by Rousseau, namely, as

a means of protecting his own life against murder.[262] There is no

consent in the transaction. Some person or persons, possessed of

sovereign authority, promulgated a command that the subject should not

commit murder, and appointed penalties for such commission and it was

not a fictitious assent to these penalties, but the fact that the

sovereign was strong enough to enforce them, which made the command

valid.

Supposing a law to be passed in an assembly of the sovereign people by

a majority; what binds a member of the minority to obedience?

Rousseau's answer is this:--When the law is proposed, the question

put is not whether they approve or reject the proposition, but whether

it is conformable to the general will: the general will appears from

the votes: if the opinion contrary to my own wins the day, that only

proves that I was mistaken, and that what I took for the general will

was not really so.[263] We can scarcely imagine more nonsensical

sophistry than this. The proper answer evidently is, that either

experience or calculation has taught the citizens in a popular

government that in the long run it is most expedient for the majority

of votes to decide the law. In other words, the inconvenience to the

minority of submitting to a law which they dislike, is less than the

inconvenience of fighting to have their own way, or retiring to form a

separate community. The minority submit to obey laws which were made

against their will, because they cannot avoid the necessity of

undergoing worse inconveniences than are involved in this submission.

The same explanation partially covers what is unfortunately the more

frequent case in the history of the race, the submission of the

majority to the laws imposed by a minority of one or more. In both

these cases, however, as in the general question of the source of our

obedience to the laws, deliberate and conscious sense of convenience

is as slight in its effect upon conduct here, as it is in the rest of

the field of our moral motives. It is covered too thickly over and

constantly neutralised by the multitudinous growths of use, by the

many forms of fatalistic or ascetic religious sentiment, by physical

apathy of race, and all other conditions that interpose to narrow or

abrogate the authority of pure reason over human conduct. Rousseau,

expounding his conception of a normal political state, was no doubt

warranted in leaving these complicating conditions out of account,

though to do so is to rob any treatise on government of much of its

possible value. The same excuse cannot warrant him in basing his

political institutions upon a figment, instead of upon the substantial

ground of propositions about human nature, which the average of

experience in given races and at given stages of advancement has shown

to be true within those limits. There are places in his writings where

he reluctantly admits that men are only moved by their interests, and

he does not even take care to qualify this sufficiently.[264] But

throughout the Social Contract we seem to be contemplating the

erection of a machine which is to work without reference to the only

forces that can possibly impart movement to it.

The consequence of this is that Rousseau gives us not the least help

towards the solution of any of the problems of actual government,

because these are naturally both suggested and guided by

considerations of expediency and improvement. It is as if he had never

really settled the ends for which government exists, beyond the

construction of the symmetrical machine of government itself. He is a

geometer, not a mechanician; or shall we say that he is a mechanician,

and not a biologist concerned with the conditions of a living

organism. The analogy of the body politic to the body natural was as

present to him as it had been to all other writers on society, but he

failed to seize the only useful lessons which such an analogy might

have taught him--diversity of structure, difference of function,

development of strength by exercise, growth by nutrition--all of which

might have been serviceably translated into the dialect of political

science, and might have bestowed on his conception of political

society more of the features of reality. We see no room for the free

play of divergent forces, the active rivalry of hostile interests, the

regulated conflict of multifarious personal aims, which can never be

extinguished, except in moments of driving crisis, by the most sincere

attachment to the common causes of the land. Thus the modern question

which is of such vital interest for all the foremost human societies,

of the union of collective energy with the encouragement of individual

freedom, is, if not wholly untouched, at least wholly unillumined by

anything that Rousseau says. To tell us that a man on entering a

society exchanges his natural liberty for civil liberty which is

limited by the general will,[265] is to give us a phrase, where we

seek a solution. To say that if it is the opposition of private

interests which made the establishment of societies necessary, it is

the accord of those interests which makes them possible,[266] is to

utter a truth which feeds no practical curiosity. The opposition of

private interests remains, in spite of the yoke which their accord has

imposed upon it, but which only controls and does not suppress such an

opposition. What sort of control? What degree? What bounds?

So again let us consider the statement that the instant the government

usurps the sovereignty, then the social pact is broken, and all the

citizens, restored by right to their natural liberty, are forced but

not morally obliged to obey.[267] He began by telling his readers that

man, though born free, is now everywhere in chains; and therefore it

would appear that in all existing cases the social pact has been

broken, and the citizens living under the reign of force, are free to

resume their natural liberty, if they are only strong enough to do so.

This declaration of the general duty of rebellion no doubt had its

share in generating that fervid eagerness that all other peoples

should rise and throw off the yoke, which was one of the most

astonishing anxieties of the French during their revolution. That was

not the worst quality of such a doctrine. It made government

impossible, by basing the right or duty of resistance on a question

that could not be reached by positive evidence, but must always be

decided by an arbitrary interpretation of an arbitrarily imagined

document. The moderate proposition that resistance is lawful if a

government is a bad one, and if the people are strong enough to

overthrow it, and if their leaders have reason to suppose they can

provide a less bad one in its place, supplies tests that are capable

of application. Our own writers in favour of the doctrine of

resistance partly based their arguments upon the historic instances of

the Old Testament, and it is one of the most striking contributions of

Protestantism to the cause of freedom, that it sent people in an

admiring spirit to the history of the most rebellious nation that ever

existed, and so provided them in Hebrew insurgency with a corrective

for the too submissive political teaching of the Gospel. But these

writers have throughout a tacit appeal to expediency, as writers might

always be expected to have, who were really meditating on the

possibility of their principles being brought to the test of practice.

There can be no evidence possible, with a test so vague as the fact of

the rupture of a compact whose terms are authentically known to nobody

concerned. Speak of bad laws and good, wise administration or unwise,

just government or unjust, extravagant or economical, civically

elevating or demoralising; all these are questions which men may apply

themselves to settle with knowledge, and with a more or less definite

degree of assurance. But who can tell how he is to find out whether

sovereignty has been usurped, and the social compact broken? Was there

a usurpation of sovereignty in France not many years ago, when the

assumption of power by the prince was ratified by many millions of

votes?

The same case, we are told, namely, breach of the social compact and

restoration of natural liberty, occurs when the members of the

government usurp separately the power which they ought only to

exercise in a body.[268] Now this description applies very fairly to

the famous episode in our constitutional history, connected with

George the Third's first attack of madness in 1788. Parliament cannot

lawfully begin business without a declaration of the cause of summons

from the crown. On this occasion parliament both met and deliberated

without communication from the crown. What was still more important

was a vote of the parliament itself, authorising the passing of

letters patent under the great seal for opening parliament by

commission, and for giving assent to a Regency Bill. This was a

distinct usurpation of regal authority. Two members of the government

(in Rousseau's sense of the term), namely the houses of parliament,

usurped the power which they ought only to have exercised along with

the crown.[269] The Whigs denounced the proceeding as a fiction, a

forgery, a phantom, but if they had been readers of the Social

Contract, and if they had been bitten by its dogmatic temper, they

would have declared the compact of union violated, and all British

citizens free to resume their natural rights. Not even the bitter

virulence of faction at that time could tempt any politician to take

up such a line, though within half a dozen years each of the

democratic factions in France had worked at the overthrow of every

other in turn, on the very principle which Rousseau had formulated and

Robespierre had made familiar, that usurped authority is a valid

reason for annihilating a government, no matter under what

circumstances, nor how small the chance of replacing it by a better,

nor how enormous the peril to the national well-being in the process.

The true opposite to so anarchic a doctrine is assuredly not that of

passive obedience either to chamber or monarch, but the right and duty

of throwing off any government which inflicts more disadvantages than

it confers advantages. Rousseau's whole theory tends inevitably to

substitute a long series of struggles after phrases and shadows in the

new era, for the equally futile and equally bloody wars of dynastic

succession which have been the great curse of the old. Men die for a

phrase as they used to die for a family. The other theory, which all

English politicians accept in their hearts, and so many commanding

French politicians have seemed in their hearts to reject, was first

expounded in direct view of Rousseau's teaching by Paley.[270] Of

course the greatest, widest, and loftiest exposition of the bearings

of expediency on government and its conditions, is to be found in the

magnificent and immortal pieces of Burke, some of them suggested by

absolutist violations of the doctrine in our own affairs, and some of

them by anarchic violation of it in the affairs of France, after the

seed sown by Rousseau had brought forth fruit.

We should, however, be false to our critical principle, if we did not

recognise the historical effect of a speculation scientifically

valueless. There has been no attempt to palliate either the

shallowness or the practical mischievousness of the Social Contract.

But there is another side to its influence. It was the match which

kindled revolutionary fire in generous breasts throughout Europe. Not

in France merely, but in Germany as well, its phrases became the

language of all who aspired after freedom. Schiller spoke of Rousseau

as one who "converted Christians into human beings," and the \_Robbers\_

(1778) is as if it had been directly inspired by the doctrine that

usurped sovereignty restores men to their natural rights. Smaller men

in the violent movement which seized all the youth of Germany at that

time, followed the same lead, if they happened to have any feeling

about the political condition of their enslaved countries.

There was alike in France and Germany a craving for a return to nature

among the whole of the young generation.[271] The Social Contract

supplied a dialect for this longing on one side, just as the Emilius

supplied it on another. Such parts in it as people did not understand

or did not like, they left out. They did not perceive its direction

towards that "perfect Hobbism," which the author declared to be the

only practical alternative to a democracy so austere as to be

intolerable. They grasped phrases about the sovereignty of the people,

the freedom for which nature had destined man, the slavery to which

tyrants and oppressors had brought him. Above all they were struck by

the patriotism which shines so brightly in every page, like the fire

on the altar of one of those ancient cities which had inspired the

writer's ideal.

Yet there is a marked difference in the channels along which

Rousseau's influence moved in the two countries. In France it was

drawn eventually into the sphere of direct politics. In Germany it

inspired not a great political movement, but an immense literary

revival. In France, as we have already said, the patriotic flame

seemed extinct. The ruinous disorder of the whole social system made

the old love of country resemble love for a phantom, and so much of

patriotic speech as survived was profoundly hollow. Even a man like

Turgot was not so much a patriot as a passionate lover of improvement,

and with the whole school of which this great spirit was the noblest

and strongest, a generous citizenship of the world had replaced the

narrower sentiment which had inflamed antique heroism. Rousseau's

exaltation of the Greek and Roman types in all their concentration and

intensity, touches mortals of commoner mould. His theory made the

native land what it had been to the citizens of earlier date, a true

centre of existence, round which all the interests of the community,

all its pursuits, all its hopes, grouped themselves with entire

singleness of convergence, just as religious faith is the centre of

existence to a church. It was the virile and patriotic energy thus

evoked which presently saved France from partition.

We complete the estimate of the positive worth and tendencies of the

Social Contract by adding to this, which was for the time the cardinal

service, of rekindling the fire of patriotism, the rapid deduction

from the doctrine of the sovereignty of peoples of the great truth,

that a nation with a civilised polity does not consist of an order or

a caste, but of the great body of its members, the army of toilers who

make the most painful of the sacrifices that are needed for the

continuous nutrition of the social organisation. As Condorcet put it,

and he drew inspiration partly from the intellectual school of

Voltaire, and partly from the social school of Rousseau, all

institutions ought to have for their aim the physical, intellectual,

and moral amelioration of the poorest and most numerous class.[272]

This is the People. Second, there gradually followed from the

important place given by Rousseau to the idea of equal association, as

at once the foundation and the enduring bond of a community, those

schemes of Mutualism, and all the other shapes of collective action

for a common social good, which have possessed such commanding

attraction for the imagination of large classes of good men in France

ever since. Hitherto these forms have been sterile and deceptive, and

they must remain so, until the idea of special function has been

raised to an equal level of importance with that of united forces

working together to a single end.

In these ways the author of the Social Contract did involuntarily and

unconsciously contribute to the growth of those new and progressive

ideas, in which for his own part he lacked all faith. PrÃ¦-Newtonians

knew not the wonders of which Newton was to find the key; and so we,

grown weary of waiting for the master intelligence who may effect the

final combination of moral and scientific ideas needed for a new

social era, may be inclined to lend a half-complacent ear to the arid

sophisters who assume that the last word of civilisation has been

heard in existing arrangements. But we may perhaps take courage from

history to hope that generations will come, to whom our system of

distributing among a few the privileges and delights that are procured

by the toil of the many, will seem just as wasteful, as morally

hideous, and as scientifically indefensible, as that older system

which impoverished and depopulated empires, in order that a despot or

a caste might have no least wish ungratified, for which the lives or

the hard-won treasure of others could suffice.
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CHAPTER IV.

EMILIUS.

One whose most intense conviction was faith in the goodness

of all things and creatures as they are first produced by nature, and

so long as they remain unsophisticated by the hand and purpose of man,

was in some degree bound to show a way by which this evil process of

sophistication might be brought to the lowest possible point, and the

best of all natural creatures kept as near as possible to his high

original. Rousseau, it is true, held in a sense of his own the

doctrine of the fall of man. That doctrine, however, has never made

people any more remiss in the search after a virtue, which if they

ought to have regarded it as hopeless according to strict logic, is

still indispensable in actual life. Rousseau's way of believing that

man had fallen was so coloured at once by that expansion of sanguine

emotion which marked his century, and by that necessity for repose in

idyllic perfection of simplicity which marked his own temperament,

that enthusiasm for an imaginary human creature effectually shut out

the dogma of his fatal depravation. "How difficult a thing it is,"

Madame d'Epinay once said to him, "to bring up a child." "Assuredly

it is," answered Rousseau; "because the father and mother are not made

by nature to bring it up, nor the child to be brought up."[273] This

cynical speech can only have been an accidental outbreak of spleen. It

was a contradiction to his one constant opinion that nature is all

good and bounteous, and that the inborn capacity of man for reaching

true happiness knows no stint.

In writing Emilius, he sat down to consider what man is, and what can

be made of him. Here, as in all the rest of his work, he only obeyed

the tendencies of his time in choosing a theme. An age touched by the

spirit of hope inevitably turns to the young; for with the young lies

fulfilment. Such epochs are ever pressing with the question, how is

the future to be shaped? Our answer depends on the theory of human

disposition, and in these epochs the theory is always optimistic.

Rousseau was saved, as so many thousands of men have been alike in

conduct and speculation, by inconsistency, and not shrinking from two

mutually contradictory trains of thought. Society is corrupt, and

society is the work of man. Yet man, who has engendered this corrupted

birth, is good and whole. The strain in the argument may be pardoned

for the hopefulness of the conclusion. It brought Rousseau into

harmony with the eager effort of the time to pour young character into

finer mould, and made him the most powerful agent in giving to such

efforts both fervour and elevation. While others were content with

the mere enunciation of maxims and precepts, he breathed into them the

spirit of life, and enforced them with a vividness of faith that

clothed education with the augustness and unction of religion. The

training of the young soul to virtue was surrounded with something of

the awful holiness of a sacrament; and those who laboured in this

sanctified field were exhorted to a constancy of devotion, and were

promised a fulness of recompense, that raised them from the rank of

drudges to a place of highest honour among the ministers of nature.

Everybody at this time was thinking about education, partly perhaps on

account of the suppression of the Jesuits, the chief instructors of

the time, and a great many people were writing about it. The AbbÃ© de

Saint Pierre had had new ideas on education, as on all the greater

departments of human interest. Madame d'Epinay wrote considerations

upon the bringing up of the young.[274] Madame de Grafigny did the

same in a less grave shape.[275] She received letters from the

precociously sage Turgot, abounding in the same natural and sensible

precepts which ten years later were commended with more glowing

eloquence in the pages of Emilius.[276] Grimm had an elaborate scheme

for a treatise on education.[277] HelvÃ©tius followed his exploration

of the composition of the human mind, by a treatise on the training

proper for the intellectual and moral faculties. Education by these

and other writers was being conceived in a wider sense than had been

known to ages controlled by ecclesiastical collegians. It slowly came

to be thought of in connection with the family. The improvement of

ideas upon education was only one phase of that great general movement

towards the restoration of the family, which was so striking a

spectacle in France after the middle of the century. Education now

came to comprehend the whole system of the relations between parents

and their children, from earliest infancy to maturity. The direction

of this wider feeling about such relations tended strongly towards an

increased closeness in them, more intimacy, and a more continuous

suffusion of tenderness and long attachment. All this was part of the

general revival of naturalism. People began to reflect that nature was

not likely to have designed infants to be suckled by other women than

their own mothers, nor that they should be banished from the society

of those who are most concerned in their well-being, from the cheerful

hearth and wise affectionate converse of home, to the frigid

discipline of colleges and convents and the unamiable monition of

strangers.

Then the rising rebellion against the church and its faith perhaps

contributed something towards a movement which, if it could not break

the religious monopoly of instruction, must at least introduce the

parent as a competitor with the priestly instructor for influence over

the ideas, habits, and affections of his children. The rebellion was

aimed against the spirit as well as the manner of the established

system. The church had not fundamentally modified the significance of

the dogma of the fall and depravity of man; education was still

conceived as a process of eradication and suppression of the mystical

old Adam. The new current flowed in channels far away from that black

folly of superstition. Men at length ventured once more to look at one

another with free and generous gaze. The veil of the temple was rent,

and the false mockeries of the shrine of the Hebrew divinity made

plain to scornful eyes. People ceased to see one another as guilty

victims cowering under a divine curse. They stood erect in

consciousness of manhood. The palsied conception of man, with his

large discourse of reason looking before and after, his lofty and

majestic patience in search for new forms of beauty and new secrets of

truth, his sense of the manifold sweetness and glory and awe of the

universe, above all, his infinite capacity of loyal pity and love for

his comrades in the great struggle, and his high sorrow for his own

wrong-doing,--the palsied and crushing conception of this excellent

and helpful being as a poor worm, writhing under the vindictive and

meaningless anger of an omnipotent tyrant in the large heavens, only

to be appeased by sacerdotal intervention, was fading back into those

regions of night, whence the depth of human misery and the

obscuration of human intelligence had once permitted its escape, to

hang evilly over the western world for a season. So vital a change in

the point of view quickly touched the theory and art of the upbringing

of the young. Education began to figure less as the suppression of the

natural man, than his strengthening and development; less as a process

of rooting out tares, more as the grateful tending of shoots abounding

in promise of richness. What had been the most drearily mechanical of

duties, was transformed into a task that surpassed all others in

interest and hope. If man be born not bad but good, under no curse,

but rather the bestower and receiver of many blessings, then the

entire atmosphere of young life, in spite of the toil and the peril,

is made cheerful with the sunshine and warmth of the great folded

possibilities of excellence, happiness, and well-doing.

I.

Locke in education, as in metaphysics and in politics, was the pioneer

of French thought. In education there is less room for scientific

originality. The sage of a parish, provided only she began her trade

with an open and energetic mind, may here pass philosophers. Locke was

nearly as sage, as homely, as real, as one of these strenuous women.

The honest plainness of certain of his prescriptions for the

preservation of physical health perhaps keeps us somewhat too near the

earth. His manner throughout is marked by the stout wisdom of the

practical teacher, who is content to assume good sense in his hearers,

and feels no necessity for kindling a blaze or raising a tempest. He

gives us a practical manual for producing a healthy, instructed,

upright, well-mannered young English squire, who shall be rightly

fitted to take his own life sensibly in hand, and procure from it a

fair amount of wholesome satisfaction both for himself and the people

with whom he is concerned. Locke's treatise is one of the most

admirable protests in the world against effeminacy and pedantry, and

parents already moved by grave desire to do their duty prudently to

their sons, will hardly find another book better suited to their ends.

Besides Locke, we must also count Charron, and the amazing educator of

Gargantua, and Montaigne before either, among the writers whom

Rousseau had read, with that profit and increase which attends the

dropping of the good ideas of other men into fertile minds.

There is an immense class of natures, and those not the lowest, which

the connection of duty with mere prudence does not carry far enough.

They only stir when something has moved their feeling for the ideal,

and raised the mechanical offices of the narrow day into association

with the spaciousness and height of spiritual things. To these

Rousseau came. For both the tenour and the wording of the most

striking precepts of the Emilius, he owes much to Locke. But what was

so realistic in him becomes blended in Rousseau with all the power and

richness and beauty of an ideal that can move the most generous parts

of human character. The child is treated as the miniature of humanity;

it thus touches the whole sphere of our sympathies, warms our

curiosity as to the composition of man's nature, and becomes the very

eye and centre of moral and social aspirations.

Accordingly Rousseau almost at once begins by elaborating his

conception of the kind of human creature which it is worth while to

take the trouble to rear, and the only kind which pure nature will

help you in perfecting. Hence Emilius, besides being a manual for

parents, contains the lines of a moral type of life and character for

all others. The old thought of the Discourses revives in full vigour.

The artifices of society, the perverting traditions of use, the feeble

maxims of indolence, convention, helpless dependence on the aid or the

approval of others, are routed at the first stroke. The old regimen of

accumulated prejudice is replaced, in dealing alike with body and

soul, by the new system of liberty and nature. In saying this we have

already said that the exaltation of Spartan manners which runs through

Rousseau's other writings has vanished, and that every trace of the

much-vaunted military and public training has yielded before the

attractive thought of tender parents and a wisely ruled home. Public

instruction, we learn, can now no longer exist, because there is no

longer such a thing as country, and therefore there can no longer be

citizens. Only domestic education can now help us to rear the man

according to nature,--the man who knows best among us how to bear

the mingled good and ill of our life.

The artificial society of the time, with its aspirations after a

return to nature, was moved to the most energetic enthusiasm by

Rousseau's famous exhortations to mothers to nourish their own little

ones. Morelly, as we have seen, had already enjoined the adoption of

this practice. So too had Buffon. But Morelly's voice had no

resonance, Buffon's reasons were purely physical, and children were

still sent out to nurse, until Rousseau's more passionate moral

entreaties awoke maternal conscience. "Do these tender mothers," he

exclaimed, "who, when they have got rid of their infants, surrender

themselves gaily to all the diversions of the town, know what sort of

usage the child in the village is receiving, fastened in his swaddling

band? At the least interruption that comes, they hang him up by a nail

like a bundle of rags, and there the poor creature remains thus

crucified, while the nurse goes about her affairs. Every child found

in this position had a face of purple; as the violent compression of

the chest would not allow the blood to circulate, it all went to the

head, and the victim was supposed to be very quiet, just because it

had not strength enough to cry out."[278] But in Rousseau, as in

Beethoven, a harsh and rugged passage is nearly always followed by

some piece of exquisite and touching melody. The force of these

indignant pictures was heightened and relieved by moving appeal to

all the tender joys of maternal solicitude, and thoughts of all that

this solicitude could do for the happiness of the home, the father,

and the young. The attraction of domestic life is pronounced the best

antidote to the ill living of the time. The bustle of children, which

you now think so importunate, gradually becomes delightful; it brings

father and mother nearer to one another; and the lively animation of a

family added to domestic cares, makes the dearest occupation of the

wife, and the sweetest of all his amusements to the husband. If women

will only once more become mothers again, men will very soon become

fathers and husbands.[279]

The physical effect of this was not altogether wholesome. Rousseau's

eloquence excited women to an inordinate pitch of enthusiasm for the

duty of suckling their infants, but his contemptuous denunciation of

the gaieties of Paris could not extinguish the love of amusement.

Quid quod libelli Stoici inter sericos

Jacere pulvillos amant?

So young mothers tried as well as they could to satisfy both desires,

and their babes were brought to them at all unseasonable hours, while

they were full of food and wine, or heated with dancing or play, and

there received the nurture which, but for Rousseau, they would have

drawn in more salutary sort from a healthy foster-mother in the

country. This, however, was only an incidental drawback to a movement

which was in its main lines full of excellent significance. The

importance of giving freedom to the young limbs, of accustoming the

body to rudeness and vicissitude of climate, of surrounding youth with

light and cheerfulness and air, and even a tiny detail such as the

propriety of substituting for coral or ivory some soft substance

against which the growing teeth might press a way without irritation,

all these matters are handled with a fervid reality of interest that

gives to the tedium of the nursery a genuine touch of the poetic.

Swathings, bandages, leading-strings, are condemned with a warmth like

that with which the author had denounced comedy.[280] The city is held

up to indignant reprobation as the gulf of infant life, just as it had

been in his earlier pieces as the gulf of all the loftiest energies of

the adult life. Every child ought to be born and nursed in the

country, and it would be all the better if it remained in the country

to the last day of its existence. You must accustom it little by

little to the sight of disagreeable objects, such as toads and snakes;

also in the same gradual manner to the sound of alarming noises,

beginning with snapping a cap in a pistol. If the infant cries from

pain which you cannot remove, make no attempt to soothe it; your

caresses will not lessen the anguish of its colic, while the child

will remember what it has to do in order to be coaxed and to get its

own way. The nurse may amuse it by songs and lively cries, but she is

not to din useless words into its ears; the first articulations that

come to it should be few, easy, distinct, frequently repeated, and

only referring to objects which may be shown to the child. "Our

unlucky facility in cheating ourselves with words that we do not

understand, begins earlier than we suppose." Let there be no haste in

inducing the child to speak articulately. The evil of precipitation in

this respect is not that children use and hear words without sense,

but that they use and hear them in a different sense from our own,

without our perceiving it. Mistakes of this sort, committed thus

early, have an influence, even after they are cured, over the turn of

the mind for the rest of the creature's life. Hence it is a good thing

to keep a child's vocabulary as limited as possible, lest it should

have more words than ideas, and should say more than it can possibly

realise in thought.[281]

In moral as in intellectual habits, the most perilous interval in

human life is that between birth and the age of twelve. The great

secret is to make the early education purely negative; a process of

keeping the heart, naturally so good, clear of vice, and the

intelligence, naturally so true, clear of error. Take for first,

second, and third precept, to follow nature and leave her free to the

performance of her own tasks. Until the age of reason, there can be no

idea of moral beings or social relations. Therefore, says Rousseau, no

moral discussion. Locke's maxim in favour of constantly reasoning with

children was a mistake. Of all the faculties of man, reason, which is

only a compound of the rest, is that which is latest in development,

and yet it is this which we are to use to develop those which come

earliest of all. Such a course is to begin at the end, and to turn the

finished work into an instrument. "In speaking to children in these

early years a language which they do not comprehend, we accustom them

to cheat themselves with words, to criticise what is said to them, to

think themselves as wise as their masters, to become disputatious and

mutinous." If you forget that nature meant children to be children

before growing into men, you only force a fruit that has neither

ripeness nor savour, and must soon go bad; you will have youthful

doctors and old infants.

To all this, however, there is certainly another side which Rousseau

was too impetuous to see. Perfected reason is truly the tardiest of

human endowments, but it can never be perfected at all unless the

process be begun, and, within limits, the sooner the beginning is

made, the earlier will be the ripening. To know the grounds of right

conduct is, we admit, a different thing from feeling a disposition to

practise it. But nobody will deny the expediency of an intelligent

acquaintance with the reasons why one sort of conduct is bad, and its

opposite good, even if such an acquaintance can never become a

substitute for the spontaneous action of thoroughly formed habit. For

one thing, cases are constantly arising in a man's life that demand

the exercise of reason, to settle the special application of

principles which may have been acquired without knowledge of their

rational foundation. In such cases, which are the critical and testing

points of character, all depends upon the possession of a more or less

justly trained intelligence, and the habit of using it. Now, as we

have said, it is one of the great merits of the Emilius that it calls

such attention to the early age at which mental influences begin to

operate. Why should the gradual formation of the master habit of using

the mind be any exception?

Belief in the efficacy of preaching is the bane of educational

systems. Verbal lessons seem as if they ought to be so deeply

effective, if only the will and the throng of various motives which

guide it, instantly followed impression of a truth upon the

intelligence. And they are, moreover, so easily communicated, saving

the parent a lifetime of anxious painstaking in shaping his own

character, after such a pattern as shall silently draw all within its

influence to pursuit of good and honourable things. The most valuable

of Rousseau's notions about education, though he by no means

consistently adhered to them, was his urgent contempt for this

fatuous substitution of spoken injunctions and prohibitions, for the

deeper language of example, and the more living instruction of visible

circumstance. The vast improvements that have since taken place in the

theory and the art of education all over Europe, and of which he has

the honour of being the first and most widely influential promoter,

may all be traced to the spread of this wise principle, and its

adoption in various forms. The change in the up-bringing of the young

exactly corresponds to the change in the treatment of the insane. We

may look back to the old system of endless catechisms, apophthegms,

moral fables, and the rest of the paraphernalia of moral didactics,

with the same horror with which we regard the gags, strait-waistcoats,

chains, and dark cells, of poor mad people before the intervention of

Pinel.

It is clear now to everybody who has any opinion on this most

important of all subjects, that spontaneousness is the first quality

in connection with right doing, which you can develop in the young,

and this spontaneousness of habit is best secured by associating it

with the approval of those to whom the child looks. Sympathy, in a

word, is the true foundation from which to build up the structure of

good habit. The young should be led to practise the elementary parts

of right conduct from the desire to please, because that is a securer

basis than the conclusions of an embryo reason, applied to the most

complex conditions of action, while the grounds on which action is

justified or condemned may be made plain in the fulness of time, when

the understanding is better able to deal with the ideas and terms

essential to the matter. You have two aims to secure, each without

sacrifice of the other. These are, first, that the child shall grow up

with firm and promptly acting habit; second, that it shall retain

respect for reason and an open mind. The latter may be acquired in the

less immature years, but if the former be not acquired in the earlier

times, a man grows up with a drifting unsettledness of will, that

makes his life either vicious by quibbling sophistries, or helpless

for want of ready conclusions.

The first idea which is to be given to a child, little as we might

expect such a doctrine from the author of the Second Discourse, is

declared to be that of property. And he can only acquire this idea by

having something of his own. But how are we to teach him the

significance of a thing being one's own? It is a prime rule to attempt

to teach nothing by a verbal lesson; all instruction ought to be left

to experience.[282] Therefore you must contrive some piece of

experience which shall bring this notion of property vividly into a

child's mind; the following for instance. Emilius is taken to a piece

of garden; his instructor digs and dresses the ground for him, and the

boy takes possession by sowing some beans. "We come every day to water

them, and see them rise out of the ground with transports of joy. I

add to this joy by saying, This belongs to you. Then explaining the

term, I let him feel that he has put into the ground this time,

labour, trouble, his person in short; that there is in this bit of

ground something of himself which he may maintain against every comer,

as he might withdraw his own arm from the hand of another man who

would fain retain it in spite of him." One day Emilius comes to his

beloved garden, watering-pot in hand, and finds to his anguish and

despair that all the beans have been plucked up, that the ground has

been turned over, and that the spot is hardly recognisable. The

gardener comes up, and explains with much warmth that he had sown the

seed of a precious Maltese melon in that particular spot long before

Emilius had come with his trumpery beans, and that therefore it was

his land; that nobody touches the garden of his neighbour, in order

that his own may remain untouched; and that if Emilius wants a piece

of garden, he must pay for it by surrendering to the owner half the

produce.[283] Thus, says Rousseau, the boy sees how the notion of

property naturally goes back to the right of the first occupant as

derived from labour. We should have thought it less troublesome, as it

is certainly more important, to teach a boy the facts of property

positively and imperatively. This rather elaborate ascent to origins

seems an exaggerated form of that very vice of over-instructing the

growing reason in abstractions, which Rousseau had condemned so short

a time before.

Again, there is the very strong objection to conveying lessons by

artificially contrived incidents, that children are nearly always

extremely acute in suspecting and discovering such contrivances. Yet

Rousseau recurs to them over and over again, evidently taking delight

in their ingenuity. Besides the illustration of the origin and

significance of property, there is the complex fancy in which a

juggler is made to combine instruction as to the properties of the

magnet with certain severe moral truths.[284] The tutor interests

Emilius in astronomy and geography by a wonderful stratagem indeed.

The poor youth loses his way in a wood, is overpowered by hunger and

weariness, and then is led on by his cunning tutor to a series of

inferences from the position of the sun and so forth, which convince

him that his home is just over the hedge, where it is duly found to

be.[285] Here, again, is the way in which the instructor proposes to

stir activity of limb in the young Emilius. "In walking with him of an

afternoon, I used sometimes to put in my pocket two cakes of a sort he

particularly liked; we each of us ate one. One day he perceived that I

had three cakes; he could easily have eaten six; he promptly

despatches his own, to ask me for the third. Nay, I said to him, I

could well eat it myself, or we would divide it, but I would rather

see it made the prize of a running match between the two little boys

there." The little boys run their race, and the winner devours the

cake. This and subsequent repetitions of the performance at first

only amused Emilius, but he presently began to reflect, and perceiving

that he also had two legs, he began privately to try how fast he could

run. When he thought he was strong enough, he importuned his tutor for

the third cake, and on being refused, insisted on being allowed to

compete for it. The habit of taking exercise was not the only

advantage gained. The tutor resorted to a variety of further

stratagems in order to induce the boy to find out and practise visual

compass, and so forth.[286] If we consider, as we have said, first the

readiness of children to suspect a stratagem wherever instruction is

concerned, and next their resentment on discovering artifice of that

kind, all this seems as little likely to be successful as it is

assuredly contrary to Rousseau's general doctrine of leaving

circumstances to lead.

In truth Rousseau's appreciation of the real nature of spontaneousness

in the processes of education was essentially inadequate, and that it

was so, arose from a no less inadequate conception of the right

influence upon the growing character, of the great principle of

authority. His dread lest the child should ever be conscious of the

pressure of a will external to its own, constituted a fundamental

weakness of his system. The child, we are told with endless

repetition, ought always to be led to suppose that it is following its

own judgment or impulses, and has only them and their consequences to

consider. But Rousseau could not help seeing, as he meditated on the

actual development of his Emilius, that to leave him thus to the

training of accident would necessarily end in many fatal gaps and

chasms. Yet the hand and will of the parent or the master could not be

allowed to appear. The only alternative, therefore, was the secret

preparation of artificial sets of circumstances, alike in work and in

amusement. Jean Paul was wiser than Jean Jacques. "Let not the teacher

after the work also order and regulate the games. It is decidedly

better not to recognise or make any order in games, than to keep it up

with difficulty and send the zephyrets of pleasure through artistic

bellows and air-pumps to the little flowers."[287]

The spontaneousness which we ought to seek, does not consist in

promptly willing this or that, independently of an authority imposed

from without, but in a self-acting desire to do what is right under

all its various conditions, including what the child finds pleasant to

itself on the one hand, and what it has good reason to suppose will be

pleasant to its parents on the other. "You must never," Rousseau

gravely warns us, "inflict punishment upon children as punishment; it

should always fall upon them as a natural consequence of their

ill-behaviour."[288] But why should one of the most closely following

of all these consequences be dissembled or carefully hidden from

sight, namely, the effect of ill-behaviour upon the contentment of the

child's nearest friend? Why are the effects of conduct upon the

actor's own physical well-being to be the only effects honoured with

the title of being natural? Surely, while we leave to the young the

widest freedom of choice, and even habitually invite them to decide

for themselves between two lines of conduct, we are bound afterwards

to state our approval or disapproval of their decision, so that on the

next occasion they may take this anger or pleasure in others into

proper account in their rough and hasty forecast, often less hasty

than it seems, of the consequences of what they are about to do. One

of the most important of educating influences is lost, if the young

are not taught to place the feelings of others in a front place, when

they think in their own simple way of what will happen to them from

yielding to a given impulse. Rousseau was quite right in insisting on

practical experience of consequences as the only secure foundation for

self-acting habit; he was fatally wrong in mutilating this experience

by the exclusion from it of the effects of perceiving, resisting,

accepting, ignoring, all will and authority from without. The great,

and in many respects so admirable, school of Rousseauite

philanthropists, have always been feeble on this side, alike in the

treatment of the young by their instructors, and the treatment of

social offenders by a government.

Again, consider the large group of excellent qualities which are

associated with affectionate respect for a more fully informed

authority. In a world where necessity stands for so much, it is no

inconsiderable gain to have learnt the lesson of docility on easy

terms in our earliest days. If in another sense the will of each

individual is all-powerful over his own destinies, it is best that

this idea of firm purpose and a settled energy that will not be

denied, should grow up in the young soul in connection with a riper

wisdom and an ampler experience than its own; for then, when the time

for independent action comes, the force of the association will

continue. Finally, although none can be vicariously wise, none sage by

proxy, nor any pay for the probation of another, yet is it not a

puerile wastefulness to send forth the young all bare to the ordeal,

while the armour of old experience and tempered judgment hangs idle on

the wall? Surely it is thus by accumulation of instruction from

generation to generation, that the area of right conduct in the world

is extended. Such instruction must with youth be conveyed by military

word of command as often as by philosophical persuasion of its worth.

Nor is the atmosphere of command other than bracing, even to those who

are commanded. If education is to be mainly conducted by force of

example, it is a dreadful thing that the child is ever to have before

its eyes as living type and practical exemplar the pale figure of

parents without passions, and without a will as to the conduct of

those who are dependent on them. Even a slight excess of anger,

impatience, and the spirit of command, would be less demoralising to

the impressionable character than the constant sight of a man

artificially impassive. Rousseau is perpetually calling upon men to

try to lay aside their masks; yet the model instructor whom he has

created for us is to be the most artfully and elaborately masked of

all men; unless he happens to be naturally without blood and without

physiognomy.

Rousseau, then, while he put away the old methods which imprisoned the

young spirit in injunctions and over-solicitous monitions, yet did

none the less in his own scheme imprison it in a kind of hothouse,

which with its regulated temperature and artificially contrived access

of light and air, was in many respects as little the method of nature,

that is to say it gave as little play for the spontaneous working and

growth of the forces of nature in the youth's breast, as that regimen

of the cloister which he so profoundly abhorred. Partly this was the

result of a ludicrously shallow psychology. He repeats again and again

that self-love is the one quality in the youthful embryo of character,

from which you have to work. From this, he says, springs the desire of

possessing pleasure and avoiding pain, the great fulcrum on which the

lever of experience rests. Not only so, but from this same

unslumbering quality of self-love you have to develop regard for

others. The child's first affection for his nurse is a result of the

fact that she serves his comfort, and so down to his passion in later

years for his mistress. Now this is not the place for a discussion as

to the ultimate atom of the complex moral sentiments of men and women,

nor for an examination of the question whether the faculty of

sympathy has or has not an origin independent of self-love. However

that may be, no one will deny that sympathy appears in good natures

extremely early, and is susceptible of rapid cultivation from the very

first. Here is the only adequate key to that education of the

affections, from their rudimentary expansion in the nursery, until

they include the complete range of all the objects proper to them.

One secret of Rousseau's omission of this, the most important of all

educating agencies, from the earlier stages of the formation of

character, was the fact which is patent enough in every page, that he

was not animated by that singular tenderness and almost mystic

affection for the young, which breathes through the writings of some

of his German followers, of Richter above all others, and which

reveals to those who are sensible of it, the hold that may so easily

be gained for all good purposes upon the eager sympathy of the

youthful spirit. The instructor of Emilius speaks the words of a wise

onlooker, sagely meditating on the ideal man, rather than of a parent

who is living the life of his child through with him. Rousseau's

interest in children, though perfectly sincere, was still Ã¦sthetic,

moral, reasonable, rather than that pure flood of full-hearted feeling

for them, which is perhaps seldom stirred except in those who have

actually brought up children of their own. He composed a vindication

of his love for the young in an exquisite piece;[289] but it has none

of the yearnings of the bowels of tenderness.

II.

Education being the art of preparing the young to grow into

instruments of happiness for themselves and others, a writer who

undertakes to speak about it must naturally have some conception of

the kind of happiness at which his art aims. We have seen enough of

Rousseau's own life to know what sort of ideal he would be likely to

set up. It is a healthier epicureanism, with enough stoicism to make

happiness safe in case that circumstances should frown. The man who

has lived most is not he who has counted most years, but he who has

most felt life.[290] It is mere false wisdom to throw ourselves

incessantly out of ourselves, to count the present for nothing, ever

to pursue without ceasing a future which flees in proportion as we

advance, to try to transport ourselves from whence we are not, to some

place where we shall never be.[291] He is happiest who suffers fewest

pains, and he is most miserable who feels fewest pleasures. Then we

have a half stoical strain. The felicity of man here below is only a

negative state, to be measured by the more or less of the ills he

undergoes. It is in the disproportion between desires and faculties

that our misery consists. Happiness, therefore, lies not in

diminishing our desires, nor any more in extending our faculties, but

in diminishing the excess of desire over faculty, and in bringing

power and will into perfect balance.[292] Excepting health, strength,

respect for one's self, all the goods of this life reside in opinion;

excepting bodily pain and remorse of conscience, all our ills are in

imagination. Death is no evil; it is only made so by half-knowledge

and false wisdom. "Live according to nature, be patient, and drive

away physicians; you will not avoid death, but you will only feel it

once, while they on the other hand would bring it daily before your

troubled imagination, and their false art, instead of prolonging your

days, only hinders you from enjoying them. Suffer, die, or recover;

but above all things live, live up to your last hour." It is

foresight, constantly carrying us out of ourselves, that is the true

source of our miseries.[293] O man, confine thy existence within

thyself, and thou wilt cease to be miserable. Thy liberty, thy power,

reach exactly as far as thy natural forces, and no further; all the

rest is slavery and illusion. The only man who has his own will is he

who does not need in order to have it the arms of another person at

the end of his own.[294]

The training that follows from this is obvious. The instructor has

carefully to distinguish true or natural need from the need which is

only fancied, or which only comes from superabundance of life.

Emilius, who is brought up in the country, has nothing in his room to

distinguish it from that of a peasant.[295] If he is taken to a

luxurious banquet, he is bidden, instead of heedlessly enjoying it, to

reflect austerely how many hundreds or thousands of hands have been

employed in preparing it.[296] His preference for gay colours in his

clothes is to be consulted, because this is natural and becoming to

his age, but the moment he prefers a stuff merely because it is rich,

behold a sophisticated creature.[297] The curse of the world is

inequality, and inequality springs from the multitude of wants, which

cause us to be so much the more dependent. What makes man essentially

good is to have few wants, and to abstain from comparing himself with

others; what makes him essentially bad, is to have many wants, and to

cling much to opinion.[298] Hence, although Emilius happened to have

both wealth and good birth, he is not brought up to be a gentleman,

with the prejudices and helplessness and selfishness too naturally

associated with that abused name.

This cardinal doctrine of limitation of desire, with its corollary of

self-sufficience, contains in itself the great maxim that Emilius and

every one else must learn some trade. To work is an indispensable duty

in the social man. Rich or poor, powerful or weak, every idle citizen

is a knave. And every boy must learn a real trade, a trade with his

hands. It is not so much a matter of learning a craft for the sake of

knowing one, as for the sake of conquering the prejudices which

despise it. Labour for glory, if you have not to labour from

necessity. Lower yourself to the condition of the artisan, so as to be

above your own. In order to reign in opinion, begin by reigning over

it. All things well considered, the trade most to be preferred is

that of carpenter; it is clean, useful, and capable of being carried

on in the house; it demands address and diligence in the workman, and

though the form of the work is determined by utility, still elegance

and taste are not excluded.[299] There are few prettier pictures than

that where Sophie enters the workshop, and sees in amazement her young

lover at the other end, in his white shirt-sleeves, his hair loosely

fastened back, with a chisel in one hand and a mallet in the other,

too intent upon his work to perceive even the approach of his

mistress.[300]

When the revolution came, and princes and nobles wandered in indigent

exile, the disciples of Rousseau pointed in unkind triumph to the

advantage these unfortunate wretches would have had if they had not

been too puffed up with the vanity of feudalism to follow the prudent

example of Emilius in learning a craft. That Rousseau should have laid

so much stress on the vicissitudes of fortune, which might cause even

a king to be grateful one day that he had a trade at the end of his

arms, is sometimes quoted as a proof of his foresight of troublous

times. This, however, goes too far, because, apart from the instances

of such vicissitudes among the ancients, the King of Syracuse keeping

school at Corinth, or Alexander, son of Perseus, becoming a Roman

scrivener, he actually saw Charles Edward, the Stuart pretender,

wandering from court to court in search of succour and receiving only

rebuffs; and he may well have known that after the troubles of 1738 a

considerable number of the oligarchs of his native Geneva had gone

into exile, rather than endure the humiliation of their party.[301]

Besides all this, the propriety of being able to earn one's bread by

some kind of toil that would be useful in even the simplest societies,

flowed necessarily from every part of his doctrine of the aims of life

and the worth of character. He did, however, say, "We approach a state

of crisis and an age of revolutions," which proved true, but he added

too much when he pronounced it impossible that the great monarchies of

Europe could last long.[302] And it is certain that the only one of

the great monarchies which did actually fall would have had a far

better chance of surviving if Lewis XVI. had been as expert in the

trade of king as he was in that of making locks and bolts.

From this semi-stoical ideal there followed certain social notions,

of which Rousseau had the distinction of being the most powerful

propagator. As has so often been said, his contemporaries were willing

to leave social questions alone, provided only the government would

suffer the free expression of opinion in literature and science.

Rousseau went deeper. His moral conception of individual life and

character contained in itself a social conception, and he did not

shrink from boldly developing it. The rightly constituted man suffices

for himself and is free from prejudices. He has arms, and knows how to

use them; he has few wants, and knows how to satisfy them. Nurtured in

the most absolute freedom, he can think of no worse ill than

servitude. He attaches himself to the beauty which perishes not,

limiting his desires to his condition, learning to lose whatever may

be taken away from him, to place himself above events, and to detach

his heart from loved objects without a pang.[303] He pities miserable

kings, who are the bondsmen of all that seems to obey them; he pities

false sages, who are fast bound in the chains of their empty renown;

he pities the silly rich, martyrs to their own ostentation.[304] All

the sympathies of such a man therefore naturally flow away from these,

the great of the earth, to those who lead the stoic's life perforce.

"It is the common people who compose the human race; what is not the

people is hardly worth taking into account. Man is the same in all

ranks; that being so, the ranks which are most numerous deserve most

respect. Before one who reflects, all civil distinctions vanish: he

marks the same passions and the same feelings in the clown as in the

man covered with reputation; he can only distinguish their speech, and

a varnish more or less elaborately laid on. Study people of this

humble condition; you will perceive that under another sort of

language, they have as much intelligence as you, and more good sense.

Respect your species: reflect that it is essentially made up of the

collection of peoples; that if every king and every philosopher were

cut off from among them, they would scarcely be missed, and the world

would go none the worse."[305] As it is, the universal spirit of the

law in every country is invariably to favour the strong against the

weak, and him who has, against him who has not. The many are

sacrificed to the few. The specious names of justice and subordination

serve only as instruments for violence and arms for iniquity. The

ostentatious orders who pretend to be useful to the others, are in

truth only useful to themselves at the expense of the others.[306]

This was carrying on the work which had already been begun in the New

HeloÃ¯sa, as we have seen, but in the Emilius it is pushed with a

gravity and a directness, that could not be imparted to the picture of

a fanciful and arbitrarily chosen situation. The only writer who has

approached Rousseau, so far as I know, in fulness and depth of

expression in proclaiming the sorrows and wrongs of the poor blind

crowd, who painfully drag along the car of triumphant civilisation

with its handful of occupants, is the author of the Book of the

People. Lamennais even surpasses Rousseau in the profundity of his

pathos; his pictures of the life of hut and hovel are as sincere and

as touching; and there is in them, instead of the anger and bitterness

of the older author, righteous as that was, a certain heroism of pity

and devoted sublimity of complaint, which lift the soul up from

resentment into divine moods of compassion and resolve, and stir us

like a tale of noble action.[307] It was Rousseau, however, who first

sounded the note of which the religion that had once been the champion

and consoler of the common people, seemed long to have lost even the

tradition. Yet the teaching was not constructive, because the ideal

man was not made truly social. Emilius is brought up in something of

the isolation of the imaginary savage of the state of nature. He

marries, and then he and his wife seem only fitted to lead a life of

detachment from the interests of the world in which they are placed.

Social or political education, that is the training which character

receives from the medium in which it grows, is left out of account,

and so is the correlative process of preparation for the various

conditions and exigencies which belong to that medium, until it is too

late to take its natural place in character. Nothing can be clumsier

than the way in which Rousseau proposes to teach Emilius the existence

and nature of his relations with his fellows. And the reason of this

was that he had never himself in the course of his ruminations,

willingly thought of Emilius as being in a condition of active social

relation, the citizen of a state.

III.

There appear to be three dominant states of mind, with groups of

faculties associated with each of them, which it is the business of

the instructor firmly to establish in the character of the future man.

The first is a resolute and unflinching respect for Truth; for the

conclusions, that is to say, of the scientific reason, comprehending

also a constant anxiety to take all possible pains that such

conclusions shall be rightly drawn. Connected with this is the

discipline of the whole range of intellectual faculties, from the

simple habit of correct observation, down to the highly complex habit

of weighing and testing the value of evidence. This very important

branch of early discipline, Rousseau for reasons of his own which we

have already often referred to, cared little about, and he throws very

little light upon it, beyond one or two extremely sensible precepts of

the negative kind, warning us against beginning too soon and forcing

an apparent progress too rapidly. The second fundamental state in a

rightly formed character is a deep feeling for things of the spirit

which are unknown and incommensurable; a sense of awe, mystery,

sublimity, and the fateful bounds of life at its beginning and its

end. Here is the Religious side, and what Rousseau has to say of this

we shall presently see. It is enough now to remark that Emilius was

never to hear the name of a God or supreme being until his reason was

fairly ripened. The third state, which is at least as difficult to

bring to healthy perfection as either of the other two, is a passion

for Justice.

The little use which Rousseau made of this momentous and

much-embracing word, which names the highest peak of social virtue, is

a very striking circumstance. The reason would seem to be that his

sense of the relations of men with one another was not virile enough

to comprehend the deep austerer lines which mark the brow of the

benignant divinity of Justice. In the one place in his writings where

he speaks of justice freely, he shows a narrowness of idea, which was

perhaps as much due to intellectual confusion as to lack of moral

robustness. He says excellently that "love of the human race is

nothing else in us but love of justice," and that "of all the virtues,

justice is that which contributes most to the common good of men."

While enjoining the discipline of pity as one of the noblest of

sentiments, he warns us against letting it degenerate into weakness,

and insists that we should only surrender ourselves to it when it

accords with justice.[308] But that is all. What constitutes justice,

what is its standard, what its source, what its sanction, whence the

extraordinary holiness with which its name has come to be invested

among the most highly civilised societies of men, we are never told,

nor do we ever see that our teacher had seen the possibility of such

questions being asked. If they had been propounded to him, he would,

it is most likely, have fallen back upon the convenient mystery of the

natural law. This was the current phrase of that time, and it was

meant to embody a hypothetical experience of perfect human relations

in an expression of the widest generality. If so, this would have to

be impressed upon the mind of Emilius in the same way as other

mysteries. As a matter of fact, Emilius was led through pity up to

humanity, or sociality in an imperfect signification, and there he was

left without a further guide to define the marks of truly social

conduct.

This imperfection was a necessity, inseparable from Rousseau's

tenacity in keeping society in the background of the picture of life

which he opened to his pupil. He said, indeed, "We must study society

by men, and men by society; those who would treat politics and

morality apart will never understand anything about either one or the

other."[309] This is profoundly true, but we hardly see in the

morality which is designed for Emilius the traces of political

elements. Yet without some gradually unfolded presentation of society

as a whole, it is scarcely possible to implant the idea of justice

with any hope of large fertility. You may begin at a very early time

to develop, even from the primitive quality of self-love, a notion of

equity and a respect for it, but the vast conception of social justice

can only find room in a character that has been made spacious by

habitual contemplation of the height and breadth and close

compactedness of the fabric of the relations that bind man to man, and

of the share, integral or infinitesimally fractional, that each has in

the happiness or woe of other souls. And this contemplation should

begin when we prepare the foundation of all the other maturer habits.

Youth can hardly recognise too soon the enormous unresting machine

which bears us ceaselessly along, because we can hardly learn too soon

that its force and direction depend on the play of human motives, of

which our own for good or evil form an inevitable part when the ripe

years come. To one reared with the narrow care devoted to Emilius, or

with the capricious negligence in which the majority are left to grow

to manhood, the society into which they are thrown is a mere moral

wilderness. They are to make such way through it as they can, with

egotism for their only trusty instrument. This egotism may either be a

bludgeon, as with the most part, or it may be a delicately adjusted

and fastidiously decorated compass, as with an Emilius. In either case

is no perception that the gross outer contact of men with another is

transformed by worthiness of common aim and loyal faith in common

excellences, into a thing beautiful and generous. It is our business

to fix and root the habit of thinking of that \_moral\_ union, into

which, as Kant has so admirably expressed it, the \_pathological\_

necessities of situation that first compelled social concert, have

been gradually transmuted. Instead of this, it is exactly the

primitive pathological conditions that a narrow theory of education

brings first into prominence; as if knowledge of origins were

indispensable to a right attachment to the transformed conditions of a

maturer system.

It has been said that Rousseau founds all morality upon personal

interest, perhaps even more specially than HelvÃ©tius himself. The

accusation is just. Emilius will enter adult life without the germs of

that social conscience, which animates a man with all the associations

of duty and right, of gratitude for the past and resolute hope for the

future, in face of the great body of which he finds himself a part. "I

observe," says Rousseau, "that in the modern ages men have no hold

upon one another save through force and interest, while the ancients

on the other hand acted much more by persuasion and the affections of

the soul."[310] The reason was that with the ancients, supposing him

to mean the Greeks and Romans, the social conscience was so much wider

in its scope than the comparatively narrow fragment of duty which is

supposed to come under the sacred power of conscience in the more

complex and less closely contained organisation of a modern state. The

neighbours to whom a man owed duty in those times comprehended all the

members of his state. The neighbours of the modern preacher of duty

are either the few persons with whom each of us is brought into actual

and palpable contact, or else the whole multitude of dwellers on the

earth,--a conception that for many ages to come will remain with the

majority of men and women too vague to exert an energetic and

concentrating influence upon action, and will lead them no further

than an uncoloured and nerveless cosmopolitanism.

What the young need to have taught to them in this too little

cultivated region, is that they are born not mere atoms floating

independent and apart for a season through a terraqueous medium, and

sucking up as much more than their share of nourishment as they can

seize; nor citizens of the world with no more definite duty than to

keep their feelings towards all their fellows in a steady simmer of

bland complacency; but soldiers in a host, citizens of a polity whose

boundaries are not set down in maps, members of a church the

handwriting of whose ordinances is not in the hieroglyphs of idle

mystery, nor its hope and recompense in the lands beyond death. They

need to be taught that they owe a share of their energies to the great

struggle which is in ceaseless progress in all societies in an endless

variety of forms, between new truth and old prejudice, between love of

self or class and solicitous passion for justice, between the

obstructive indolence and inertia of the many and the generous mental

activity of the few. This is the sphere and definition of the social

conscience. The good causes of enlightenment and justice in all

lands,--here is the church militant in which we should early seek to

enrol the young, and the true state to which they should be taught

that they owe the duties of active and arduous citizenship. These are

the struggles with which the modern instructor should associate those

virtues of fortitude, tenacity, silent patience, outspoken energy,

readiness to assert ourselves and readiness to efface ourselves,

willingness to suffer and resolution to inflict suffering, which men

of old knew how to show for their gods or their sovereign. But the

ideal of Emilius was an ideal of quietism; to possess his own soul in

patience, with a suppressed intelligence, a suppressed sociality,

without a single spark of generous emulation in the courses of

strong-fibred virtue, or a single thrill of heroical pursuit after so

much as one great forlorn cause.

"If it once comes to him, in reading these parallels of the famous

ancients, to desire to be another rather than himself, were this other

Socrates, were he Cato, you have missed the mark; he who begins to

make himself a stranger to himself, is not long before he forgets

himself altogether."[311] But if a man only nurses the conception of

his own personality, for the sake of keeping his own peace and

self-contained comfort at a glow of easy warmth, assuredly the best

thing that can befall him is that he should perish, lest his example

should infect others with the same base contagion. Excessive

personality when militant is often wholesome, excessive personality

that only hugs itself is under all circumstances chief among unclean

things. Thus even Rousseau's finest monument of moral enthusiasm is

fatally tarnished by the cold damp breath of isolation, and the very

book which contained so many elements of new life for a state, was at

bottom the apotheosis of social despair.

IV.

The great agent in fostering the rise to vigour and uprightness of a

social conscience, apart from the yet more powerful instrument of a

strong and energetic public spirit at work around the growing

character, must be found in the study of history rightly directed with

a view to this end. It is here, in observing the long processes of

time and appreciating the slowly accumulating sum of endeavour, that

the mind gradually comes to read the great lessons how close is the

bond that links men together. It is here that he gradually begins to

acquire the habit of considering what are the conditions of wise

social activity, its limits, its objects, its rewards, what is the

capacity of collective achievement, and of what sort is the

significance and purport of the little span of time that cuts off the

yesterday of our society from its to-morrow.

Rousseau had very rightly forbidden the teaching of history to young

children, on the ground that the essence of history lies in the moral

relations between the bare facts which it recounts, and that the terms

and ideas of these relations are wholly beyond the intellectual grasp

of the very young.[312] He might have based his objections equally

well upon the impossibility of little children knowing the meaning of

the multitude of descriptive terms which make up a historical manual,

or realising the relations between events in bare point of time,

although childhood may perhaps be a convenient period for some

mechanical acquisition of dates. According to Rousseau, history was to

appear very late in the educational course, when the youth was almost

ready to enter the world. It was to be the finishing study, from which

he should learn not sociality either in its scientific or its higher

moral sense, but the composition of the heart of man, in a safer way

than through actual intercourse with society. Society might make him

either cynical or frivolous. History would bring him the same

information, without subjecting him to the same perils. In society you

only hear the words of men; to know man you must observe his actions,

and actions are only unveiled in history.[313] This view is hardly

worth discussing. The subject of history is not the heart of man, but

the movements of societies. Moreover, the oracles of history are

entirely dumb to one who seeks from them maxims for the shaping of

daily conduct, or living instruction as to the motives, aims,

caprices, capacities of self-restraint, self-sacrifice, of those with

whom the occasions of life bring us into contact.

It is true that at the close of the other part of his education,

Emilius was to travel and there find the comment upon the completed

circle of his studies.[314] But excellent as travel is for some of the

best of those who have the opportunity, still for many it is

valueless for lack of the faculty of curiosity. For the great

majority it is impossible for lack of opportunity. To trust so much as

Rousseau did to the effect of travelling, is to leave a large chasm in

education unbridged.

It is interesting, however, to notice some of Rousseau's notions about

history as an instrument for conveying moral instruction, a few of

them are so good, others are so characteristically narrow. "The worst

historians for a young man," he says, "are those who judge. The facts,

the facts; then let him judge for himself. If the author's judgment is

for ever guiding him, he is only seeing with the eye of another, and

as soon as this eye fails him, he sees nothing." Modern history is not

fit for instruction, not only because it has no physiognomy, all our

men being exactly like one another, but because our historians, intent

on brilliance above all other things, think of nothing so much as

painting highly coloured portraits, which for the most part represent

nothing at all.[315] Of course such a judgment as this implies an

ignorance alike of the ends and meaning of history, which, considering

that he was living in the midst of a singular revival of historical

study, is not easy to pardon. If we are to look only to perfection of

form and arrangement, it may have been right for one living in the

middle of the last century to place the ancients in the first rank

without competitors. But the author of the Discourse upon literature

and the arts might have been expected to look beyond composition, and

the contemporary of Voltaire's \_Essai sur les Moeurs\_ (1754-1757)

might have been expected to know that the profitable experience of the

human race did not close with the fall of the Roman republic. Among

the ancient historians, he counted Thucydides to be the true model,

because he reports facts without judging, and omits none of the

circumstances proper for enabling us to judge of them for

ourselves--though how Rousseau knew what facts Thucydides has omitted,

I am unable to divine. Then come CÃ¦sar's Commentaries and Xenophon's

Retreat of the Ten Thousand. The good Herodotus, without portraits and

without maxims, but abounding in details the most capable of

interesting and pleasing, would perhaps be the best of historians, if

only these details did not so often degenerate into puerilities. Livy

is unsuited to youth, because he is political and a rhetorician.

Tacitus is the book of the old; you must have learnt the art of

reading facts, before you can be trusted with maxims.

The drawback of histories such as those of Thucydides and CÃ¦sar,

Rousseau admits to be that they dwell almost entirely on war, leaving

out the true life of nations, which belongs to the unwritten

chronicles of peace. This leads him to the equally just reflection

that historians while recounting facts omit the gradual and

progressive causes which led to them. "They often find in a battle

lost or won the reason of a revolution, which even before the battle

was already inevitable. War scarcely does more than bring into full

light events determined by moral causes, which historians can seldom

penetrate."[316] A third complaint against the study which he began by

recommending as a proper introduction to the knowledge of man, is that

it does not present men but actions, or at least men only in their

parade costume and in certain chosen moments, and he justly reproaches

writers alike of history and biography, for omitting those trifling

strokes and homely anecdotes, which reveal the true physiognomy of

character. "Remain then for ever, without bowels, without nature;

harden your hearts of cast iron in your trumpery decency, and make

yourselves despicable by force of dignity."[317] And so after all, by

a common stroke of impetuous inconsistency, he forsakes history, and

falls back upon the ancient biographies, because, all the low and

familiar details being banished from modern style, however true and

characteristic, men are as elaborately tricked out by our authors in

their private lives as they were tricked out upon the stage of the

world.

V.

As women are from the constitution of things the educators of us all

at the most critical periods, and mainly of their own sex from the

beginning to the end of education, the writer of the most imperfect

treatise on this world-interesting subject can hardly avoid saying

something on the upbringing of women. Such a writer may start from

one of three points of view; he may consider the woman as destined to

be a wife, or a mother, or a human being; as the companion of a man,

as the rearer of the young, or as an independent personality, endowed

with gifts, talents, possibilities, in less or greater number, and

capable, as in the case of men, of being trained to the worst or the

best uses. Of course to every one who looks into life, each of these

three ideals melts into the other two, and we can only think of them

effectively when they are blended. Yet we test a writer's appreciation

of the conditions of human progress by observing the function which he

makes most prominent. A man's whole thought of the worth and aim of

womanhood depends upon the generosity and elevation of the ideal which

is silently present in his mind, while he is specially meditating the

relations of woman as wife or as mother. Unless he is really capable

of thinking of them as human beings, independently of these two

functions, he is sure to have comparatively mean notions in connection

with them in respect of the functions which he makes paramount.

Rousseau breaks down here. The unsparing fashion in which he developed

the theory of individualism in the case of Emilius, and insisted on

man being allowed to grow into the man of nature, instead of the man

of art and manufacture, might have led us to expect that when he came

to speak of women, he would suffer equity and logic to have their way,

by giving equally free room in the two halves of the human race, for

the development of natural force and capacity. If, as he begins by

saying, he wishes to bring up Emilius, not to be a merchant nor a

physician nor a soldier nor to the practice of any other special

calling, but to be first and above all a man, why should not Sophie

too be brought up above all to be a human being, in whom the special

qualifications of wifehood and motherhood may be developed in their

due order? Emilius is a man first, a husband and a father afterwards

and secondarily. How can Sophie be a companion for him, and an

instructor for their children, unless she likewise has been left in

the hands of nature, and had the same chances permitted to her as were

given to her predestined mate? Again, the pictures of the New HeloÃ¯sa

would have led us to conceive the ideal of womanly station not so much

in the wife, as in the house-mother, attached by esteem and sober

affection to her husband, but having for her chief functions to be the

gentle guardian of her little ones, and the mild, firm, and prudent

administrator of a cheerful and well-ordered household. In the last

book of the Emilius, which treats of the education of girls, education

is reduced within the compass of an even narrower ideal than this. We

are confronted with the oriental conception of women. Every principle

that has been followed in the education of Emilius is reversed in the

education of women. Opinion, which is the tomb of virtue among men, is

among women its high throne. The whole education of women ought to be

relative to men; to please them, to be useful to them, to make

themselves loved and honoured by them, to console them, to render

their lives agreeable and sweet to them,--these are the duties which

ought to be taught to women from their childhood. Every girl ought to

have the religion of her mother, and every wife that of her husband.

Not being in a condition to judge for themselves, they ought to

receive the decision of fathers and husbands as if it were that of the

church. And since authority is the rule of faith for women, it is not

so much a matter of explaining to them the reasons for belief, as for

expounding clearly to them what to believe. Although boys are not to

hear of the idea of God until they are fifteen, because they are not

in a condition to apprehend it, yet girls who are still less in a

condition to apprehend it, are \_therefore\_ to have it imparted to them

at an earlier age. Woman is created to give way to man, and to suffer

his injustice. Her empire is an empire of gentleness, mildness, and

complaisance. Her orders are caresses, and her threats are tears.

Girls must not only be made laborious and vigilant; they must also

very early be accustomed to being thwarted and kept in restraint. This

misfortune, if they feel it one, is inseparable from their sex, and if

ever they attempt to escape from it, they will only suffer misfortunes

still more cruel in consequence.[318]

After a series of oriental and obscurantist propositions of this kind,

it is of little purpose to tell us that women have more intelligence

and men more genius; that women observe, while men reason; that men

will philosophise better upon the human heart, while women will be

more skilful in reading it.[319] And it is a mere mockery to end the

matter by a fervid assurance, that in spite of prejudices that have

their origin in the manners of the time, the enthusiasm for what is

worthy and noble is no more foreign to women than it is to men, and

that there is nothing which under the guidance of nature may not be

obtained from them as well as from ourselves.[320] Finally there is a

complete surrender of the obscurantist position in such a sentence as

this: "I only know for either sex two really distinct classes; one the

people who think, the other the people who do not think, and this

difference comes almost entirely from education. A man of the first of

these classes ought not to marry into the other; for the greatest

charm of companionship is wanting, when in spite of having a wife he

is reduced to think by himself. It is only a cultivated spirit that

provides agreeable commerce, and 'tis a cheerless thing for a father

of a family who loves his home, to be obliged to shut himself up

within himself, and to have no one about him who understands him.

Besides, how is a woman who has no habits of reflection to bring up

her children?"[321] Nothing could be more excellently urged. But how

is a woman to have habits of reflection, when she has been constantly

brought up in habits of the closest mental bondage, trained always to

consider her first business to be the pleasing of some man, and her

instruments not reasonable persuasion but caressing and crying?

This pernicious nonsense was mainly due, like nearly all his most

serious errors, to Rousseau's want of a conception of improvement in

human affairs. If he had been filled with that conception as Turgot,

Condorcet, and others were, he would have been forced as they were, to

meditate upon changes in the education and the recognition accorded to

women, as one of the first conditions of improvement. For lack of

this, he contributed nothing to the most important branch of the

subject that he had undertaken to treat. He was always taunting the

champions of reigning systems of training for boys, with the vicious

or feeble men whom he thought he saw on every hand around him. The

same kind of answer obviously meets the current idea, which he adopted

with a few idyllic decorations of his own, of the type of the

relations between men and women. That type practically reduces

marriage in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred to a dolorous

parody of a social partnership. It does more than any one other cause

to keep societies back, because it prevents one half of the members of

a society from cultivating all their natural energies. Thus it

produces a waste of helpful quality as immeasurable as it is

deplorable, and besides rearing these creatures of mutilated faculty

to be the intellectually demoralising companions of the remaining half

of their own generation, makes them the mothers and the earliest and

most influential instructors of the whole of the generation that comes

after.[322] Of course, if any one believes that the existing

arrangements of a western community are the most successful that we

can ever hope to bring into operation, we need not complain of

Rousseau. If not, then it is only reasonable to suppose that a

considerable portion of the change will be effected in the hitherto

neglected and subordinate half of the race. That reconstitution of the

family, which Rousseau and others among his contemporaries rightly

sought after as one of the most pressing needs of the time, was

essentially impossible, so long as the typical woman was the adornment

of a semi-philosophic seraglio, a sort of compromise between the

frowzy ideal of an English bourgeois and the impertinent ideal of a

Parisian gallant. Condorcet and others made a grievous mistake in

defending the free gratification of sensual passion, as one of the

conditions of happiness and making the most of our lives.[323] But

even this was not at bottom more fatal to the maintenance and order of

the family, than Rousseau's enervating notion of keeping women in

strict intellectual and moral subjection was fatal to the family as

the true school of high and equal companionship, and the fruitful

seed-ground of wise activities and new hopes for each fresh

generation.

This was one side of Rousseau's reactionary tendencies. Fortunately

for the revolution of thirty years later, which illustrated the

gallery of heroic women with some of its most splendid names, his

power was in this respect neutralised by other stronger tendencies in

the general spirit of the age. The aristocracy of sex was subjected to

the same destructive criticism as the aristocracy of birth. The same

feeling for justice which inspired the demand for freedom and equality

of opportunity among men, led to the demand for the same freedom and

equality of opportunity between men and women. All this was part of

the energy of the time, which Rousseau disliked with undisguised

bitterness. It broke inconveniently in upon his quietest visions. He

had no conception, with his sensuous brooding imagination, never

wholly purged of grossness, of that high and pure type of women whom

French history so often produced in the seventeenth century, and who

were not wanting towards the close of the eighteenth, a type in which

devotion went with force, and austerity with sweetness, and divine

candour and transparent innocence with energetic loyalty and

intellectual uprightness and a firmly set will. Such thoughts were not

for Rousseau, a dreamer led by his senses. Perhaps they are for none

of us any more. When we turn to modern literature from the pages in

which FÃ©nelon speaks of the education of girls, who does not feel that

the world has lost a sacred accent, as if some ineffable essence has

passed out from our hearts?

The fifth book of Emilius is not a chapter on the education of women,

but an idyll. We have already seen the circumstances under which

Rousseau composed it, in a profound and delicious solitude, in the

midst of woods and streams, with the fragrance of the orange-flower

poured around him, and in continual ecstasy. As an idyll it is

delicious; as a serious contribution to the hardest of problems it is

naught. The sequel, by a stroke of matchless whimsicality, unless it

be meant, as it perhaps may have been, for a piece of deep tragic

irony, is the best refutation that Rousseau's most energetic adversary

could have desired. The Sophie who has been educated on the oriental

principle, has presently to confess a flagrant infidelity to the

blameless Emilius, her lord.[324]

VI.

Yet the sum of the merits of Emilius as a writing upon education is

not to be lightly counted. Its value lies, as has been said of the New

HeloÃ¯sa, in the spirit which animates it and communicates itself with

vivid force to the reader. It is one of the seminal books in the

history of literature, and of such books the worth resides less in the

parts than in the whole. It touched the deeper things of character. It

filled parents with a sense of the dignity and moment of their task.

It cleared away the accumulation of clogging prejudices and obscure

inveterate usage, which made education one of the dark formalistic

arts. It admitted floods of light and air into the tightly closed

nurseries and schoolrooms. It effected the substitution of growth for

mechanism. A strong current of manliness, wholesomeness, simplicity,

self-reliance, was sent by it through Europe, while its eloquence was

the most powerful adjuration ever addressed to parental affection to

cherish the young life in all love and considerate solicitude. It was

the charter of youthful deliverance. The first immediate effect of

Emilius in France was mainly on the religious side. It was the

Christian religion that needed to be avenged, rather than education

that needed to be amended, and the press overflowed with replies to

that profession of faith which we shall consider in the next chapter.

Still there was also an immense quantity of educational books and

pamphlets, which is to be set down, first to the suppression of the

Jesuits, the great educating order, and the vacancy which they left;

and next to the impulse given by the Emilius to a movement from which

the book itself had originally been an outcome.[325] But why try to

state the influence of Emilius on France in this way? To strike the

account truly would be to write the history of the first French

Revolution.[326] All mothers, as Michelet says, were big with

Emilius. "It is not without good reason that people have noted the

children born at this glorious moment, as animated by a superior

spirit, by a gift of flame and genius. It is the generation of

revolutionary Titans: the other generation not less hardy in science.

It is Danton, Vergniaud, Desmoulins; it is AmpÃ¨re, La Place, Cuvier,

Geoffroy Saint Hilaire."[327]

In Germany Emilius had great power. There it fell in with the

extraordinary movement towards naturalness and freedom of which we

have already spoken.[328] Herder, whom some have called the Rousseau

of the Germans, wrote with enthusiasm to his then beloved Caroline of

the "divine Emilius," and he never ceased to speak of Rousseau as his

inspirer and his master.[329] Basedow (1723), that strange, restless,

and most ill-regulated person, was seized with an almost phrenetic

enthusiasm for Rousseau's educational theories, translated them into

German, and repeated them in his works over and over again with an

incessant iteration. Lavater (1741-1801), who differed from Basedow in

being a fervent Christian of soft mystic faith, was thrown into

company with him in 1774, and grew equally eager with him in the cause

of reforming education in the Rousseauite sense.[330] Pestalozzi

(1746-1827), the most systematic, popular, and permanently successful

of all the educational reformers, borrowed his spirit and his

principles mainly from the Emilius, though he gave larger extension

and more intelligent exactitude to their application. Jean Paul the

Unique, in the preface to his Levana, or Doctrine of Education (1806),

one of the most excellent of all books on the subject, declares that

among previous works to which he owes a debt, "first and last he names

Rousseau's Emilius; no preceding work can be compared to his; in no

previous work on education was the ideal so richly combined with the

actual," and so forth.[331] It was not merely a Goethe, a Schiller, a

Herder, whom Rousseau fired with new thoughts. The smaller men, such

as Fr. Jacobi, Heinse, Klinger, shared the same inspiration. The

worship of Rousseau penetrated all classes, and touched every degree

of intelligence.[332]

In our own country Emilius was translated as soon as it appeared, and

must have been widely read, for a second version of the translation

was called for in a very short time. So far as a cursory survey gives

one a right to speak, its influence here in the field of education is

not very perceptible. That subject did not yet, nor for some time to

come, excite much active thought in England. Rousseau's speculations

on society both in the Emilius and elsewhere seem to have attracted

more attention. Reference has already been made to Paley.[333] Adam

Ferguson's celebrated Essay on the History of Civil Society (1767) has

many allusions, direct and indirect, to Rousseau.[334] Kames's

Sketches of the History of Man (1774) abounds still more copiously in

references to Emilius, sometimes to controvert its author, more often

to cite him as an authority worthy of respect, and Rousseau's crude

notions about women are cited with special acceptance.[335] Cowper was

probably thinking of the Savoyard Vicar when he wrote the energetic

lines in the Task, beginning "Haste now, philosopher, and set him

free," scornfully defying the deist to rescue apostate man.[336] Nor

should we omit what was counted so important a book in its day as

Godwin's Enquiry concerning Political Justice (1793). It is perhaps

more French in its spirit than any other work of equal consequence in

our literature of politics, and in its composition the author was

avowedly a student of Rousseau, as well as of the members of the

materialistic school.

In fine we may add that Emilius was the first expression of that

democratic tendency in education, which political and other

circumstances gradually made general alike in England, France, and

Germany; a tendency, that is, to look on education as a process

concerning others besides the rich and the well-born. As has often

been remarked, Ascham, Milton, Locke, FÃ©nelon, busy themselves about

the instruction of young gentlemen and gentlewomen. The rest of the

world are supposed to be sufficiently provided for by the education of

circumstance. Since the middle of the eighteenth century this

monopolising conception has vanished, along with and through the same

general agencies as the corresponding conception of social monopoly.

Rousseau enforced the production of a natural and self-sufficing man

as the object of education, and showed, or did his best to show, the

infinite capacity of the young for that simple and natural

cultivation. This easily and directly led people to reflect that such

a capacity was not confined to the children of the rich, nor the hope

of producing a natural and sufficing man narrowed to those who had

every external motive placed around them for being neither natural nor

self-sufficing.

Voltaire pronounced Emilius a stupid romance, but admitted that it

contained fifty pages which he would have bound in morocco. These, we

may be sure, concerned religion; in truth it was the Savoyard Vicar's

profession of faith which stirred France far more than the upbringing

of the natural man in things temporal. Let us pass to that eloquent

document which is inserted in the middle of the Emilius, as the

expression of the religious opinion that best befits the man of

nature--a document most hyperbolically counted by some French

enthusiasts for the spiritualist philosophy and the religion of

sentiment, as the noblest monument of the eighteenth century.

FOOTNOTES:

[273] \_MÃ©m. de Mdme. d'Epinay\_, ii. 276, 278.

[274] \_Lettres Ã  mon Fils\_ (1758), and \_Les Conversations d'Emilie\_

(1783).

[275] \_Lettres PÃ©ruviennes.\_

[276] \_Oeuv.\_, ii. 785-794.

[277] \_Corr. Lit.\_, iii. 65.

[278] \_Emile\_, I. 27.

[279] It is interesting to recall a similar movement in the Roman

society of the second century of our era. See the advice of Favorinus

to mothers, in Aulus Gellius, xii. 1. M. Boissier, contrasting the

solicitude of Tacitus and Marcus Aurelius for the infant young with

the brutality of Cicero, remarks that in the time of Seneca men

discussed in the schools the educational theories of Rousseau's

Emilius. (\_La Relig. Romaine\_, ii. 202.)

[280] See also his diatribe against whalebone and tight-lacing for

girls, V. 27.

[281] \_Emile\_, I. 93, etc.

[282] \_Emile\_, II. 141.

[283] \_Emile\_, II. 156-160.

[284] \_Emile\_, III. 338-345.

[285] III. 358, etc.

[286] \_Emile\_, II. 263-267.

[287] \_Levana\_, ch. iii. Â§ 54.

[288] \_Emile\_, II. 163.

[289] The Ninth Promenade (\_RÃªveries\_, 309).

[290] \_Emile\_, I. 23.

[291] II. 109.

[292] II. 111.

[293] \_Emile\_, II. 113-117.

[294] II. 121.

[295] II. 143.

[296] \_Emile\_, III. 382.

[297] II. 227.

[298] IV. 10.

[299] \_Emile\_, III. 394.

[300] V. 199.

[301] The reader will not forget the famous supper-party of princes in

\_Candide\_.

[302] \_Emile\_, III. 392, and note. A still more remarkable passage, as

far as it goes, is that in the \_Confessions\_ (xi. 136):--"The

disasters of an unsuccessful war, all of which came from the fault of

the government, the incredible disorder of the finances, the continual

dissensions of the administration, divided as it was among two or

three ministers at open war with one another, and who for the sake of

hurting one another dragged the kingdom into ruin; the general

discontent of the people, and of all the orders of the state; the

obstinacy of a wrong-headed woman, who, always sacrificing her better

judgment, if indeed she had any, to her tastes, dismissed the most

capable from office, to make room for her favourites ... all this

prospect of a coming break-up made me think of seeking shelter

elsewhere."

[303] \_Emile\_, V. 220.

[304] IV. 85.

[305] \_Emile\_, IV. 38, 39. Hence, we suppose, the famous reply to

Lavoisier's request that his life might be spared from the guillotine

for a fortnight, in order that he might complete some experiments,

that the Republic has no need of chemists.

[306] IV. 65. Jefferson, who was American minister in France from 1784

to 1789, and absorbed a great many of the ideas then afloat, writes in

words that seem as if they were borrowed from Rousseau:--"I am

convinced that those societies (as the Indians) which live without

government, enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree

of happiness than those who live under European governments. Among the

former public opinion is in the state of law, and restrains morals as

powerfully as laws ever did anywhere. Among the latter, under pretence

of governing, they have divided their nation into two classes, wolves

and sheep. I do not exaggerate; this is a true picture of Europe."

Tucker's \_Life of Jefferson\_, i. 255.

[307] Lamennais was influenced by Rousseau throughout. In the \_Essay

on Indifference\_ he often appeals to him as the vindicator of the

religious sentiment (\_e.g.\_ i. 21, 52, iv. 375, etc. Ed. 1837). The

same influence is seen still more markedly in the \_Words of a

Believer\_ (1835), when dogma had departed, and he was left with a kind

of dual deism, thus being less estranged from Rousseau than in the

first days (\_e.g.\_ Â§ xix. "Tous naissent Ã©gaux," etc., Â§ xxi., etc.)

The \_Book of the People\_ is thoroughly Rousseauite.

[308] \_Emile\_, IV. 105.

[309] \_Emile\_, IV. 63.

[310] \_Emile\_, IV. 273.

[311] \_Emile\_, IV. 83.

[312] \_Emile\_, II. 185. See the previous page for some equally prudent

observations on the folly of teaching geography to little children.

[313] \_Emile\_, IV. 68.

[314] V. 231, etc.

[315] \_Emile\_, IV. 71.

[316] \_Emile\_, IV. 73.

[317] IV. 77.

[318] \_Emile\_, V. 22, 53, 54, 101, 128-132.

[319] \_Emile\_, V. 78.

[320] V. 122.

[321] V. 129, 130.

[322] Well did Jean Paul say, "If we regard all life as an educational

institution, a circumnavigator of the world is less influenced by all

the nations he has seen than by his nurse."--\_Levana.\_

[323] \_Tableau des ProgrÃ¨s de l'Esprit Humain.\_ \_Oeuv.\_, vi. pp. 264,

523-526, and elsewhere. [Ed. 1847-1849.]

[324] \_Emile et Sophie\_, i.

[325] For an account of some of these, see Grimm's \_Corr. Lit.\_, iii.

211, 252, 347, etc. Also \_Corr. InÃ©d.\_, p. 143.

[326] For the early date at which Rousseau's power began to meet

recognition, see D'Alembert to Voltaire, July 31, 1762.

[327] \_Louis xv. et xvi.\_, p. 226.

[328] See above, vol. ii. p. 193.

[329] Hettner, III. iii., 2, p. 27, \_s.v.\_ Herder.

[330] The suggestion of the speculation with which Lavater's name is

most commonly associated, is to be found in the Emilius. "It is

supposed that physiognomy is only a development of features already

marked by nature. For my part, I should think that besides this

development, the features of a man's countenance form themselves

insensibly and take their expression from the frequent and habitual

wearing into them of certain affections of the soul. These affections

mark themselves in the countenance, nothing is more certain; and when

they grow into habits, they must leave durable impressions upon it."

IV. 49, 50.

[331] Author's Preface, x.

[332] See an excellent page in M. Joret's \_Herder\_, 322.

[333] See above, vol. ii. p. 191.

[334] \_E.g.\_ pp. 8, 198, 204, 205.

[335] \_E.g.\_ Bk. I. Â§ 5, p. 279. Â§ 6, p. 406, 419, etc. (the portion

concerning the female sex).

[336] Vv. 670-703. We have already seen (above, vol. ii. p. 41, \_n.\_)

that Cowper had read Emilius, and the mocking reference to the Deist

as "an Orpheus and omnipotent in song," coincides with Rousseau's

comparison of the Savoyard Vicar to "the divine Orpheus singing the

first hymn" (\_Emile\_, IV. 205).

CHAPTER V.

THE SAVOYARD VICAR.

The band of dogmatic atheists who met round D'Holbach's

dinner-table indulged a shallow and futile hope, if it was not an

ungenerous one, when they expected the immediate advent of a

generation with whom a humane and rational philosophy should displace,

not merely the superstitions which had grown around the Christian

dogma, but every root and fragment of theistic conception. A hope of

this kind implied a singularly random idea, alike of the hold which

Christianity had taken of the religious emotion in western Europe, and

of the durableness of those conditions in human character, to which

some belief in a deity with a greater or fewer number of good

attributes brings solace and nourishment. A movement like that of

Christianity does not pass through a group of societies, and then

leave no trace behind. It springs from many other sources besides that

of adherence to the truth of its dogmas. The stream of its influence

must continue to flow long after adherence to the letter has been

confined to the least informed portions of a community. The

EncyclopÃ¦dists knew that they had sapped religious dogma and shaken

ecclesiastical organisation. They forgot that religious sentiment on

the one hand, and habit of respect for authority on the other, were

both of them still left behind. They had convinced themselves by a

host of persuasive analogies that the universe is an automatic

machine, and man only an industrious particle in the stupendous whole;

that a final cause is not cognisable by our limited intelligence; and

that to make emotion in this or any other respect a test of objective

truth and a ground of positive belief, is to lower both truth and the

reason which is its single arbiter. They forgot that imagination is as

active in man as his reason, and that a craving for mental peace may

become much stronger than passion for demonstrated truth. Christianity

had given to this craving in western Europe a definite mould, which

was not to be effaced in a day, and one or two of its lines mark a

permanent and noble acquisition to the highest forces of human nature.

There will have to be wrought a profounder and more far-spreading

modification than any which the French atheists could effect, before

all debilitating influences in the old creed can be effaced, its

elevating influences finally separated from them, and then permanently

preserved in more beneficent form and in an association less

questionable to the understanding.

Neither a purely negative nor a direct attack can ever suffice. There

must be a coincidence of many silently oppugnant forces, emotional,

scientific, and material. And, above all, there must be the slow

steadfast growth of some replacing faith, which shall retain all the

elements of moral beauty that once gave light to the old belief that

has disappeared, and must still possess a living force in the new.

Here we find the good side of a religious reaction such as that which

Rousseau led in the last century, and of which the Savoyard Vicar's

profession of faith was the famous symbol. Evil as this reaction was

in many respects, and especially in the check which it gave to the

application of positive methods and conceptions to the most important

group of our beliefs, yet it had what was the very signal merit under

the circumstances of the time, of keeping the religious emotions alive

in association with a tolerant, pure, lofty, and living set of

articles of faith, instead of feeding them on the dead superstitions

which were at that moment the only practical alternative. The deism of

Rousseau could not in any case have acquired the force of the

corresponding religious reaction in England, because the former never

acquired a compact and vigorous external organisation, as the latter

did, especially in Wesleyanism and Evangelicalism, the most remarkable

of its developments. In truth the vague, fluid, purely subjective

character of deism disqualifies it from forming the doctrinal basis of

any great objective and visible church, for it is at bottom the

sublimation of individualism. But in itself it was a far less

retrogressive, as well as a far less powerful, movement. It kept fewer

of those dogmas which gradual change of intellectual climate had

reduced to the condition of rank superstitions. It preserved some of

its own, which a still further extension of the same change is

assuredly destined to reduce to the same condition; but, nevertheless,

along with them it cherished sentiments which the world will never

willingly let die.

The one cardinal service of the Christian doctrine, which is of course

to be distinguished from the services rendered to civilisation in

early times by the Christian church, has been the contribution to the

active intelligence of the west, of those moods of holiness, awe,

reverence, and silent worship of an Unseen not made with hands, which

the Christianising Jews first brought from the east. Of the fabric

which four centuries ago looked so stupendous and so enduring, with

its magnificent whole and its minutely reticulated parts of belief and

practice, this gradual creation of a new temperament in the religious

imagination of Western Europe and the countries that take their mental

direction from her, is perhaps the only portion that will remain

distinctly visible, after all the rest has sunk into the repose of

histories of opinion. Whether this be the case or not, the fact that

these deeper moods are among the richest acquisitions of human nature,

will not be denied either by those who think that Christianity

associates them with objects destined permanently to awake them in

their loftiest form, or by others who believe that the deepest moods

of which man is capable, must ultimately ally themselves with

something still more purely spiritual than the anthropomorphised

deities of the falling church. And if so, then Rousseau's deism, while

intercepting the steady advance of the rationalistic assault and

diverting the current of renovating energy, still did something to

keep alive in a more or less worthy shape those parts of the slowly

expiring system which men have the best reasons for cherishing.

Let us endeavour to characterise Rousseau's deism with as much

precision as it allows. It was a special and graceful form of a

doctrine which, though susceptible, alike in theory and in the

practical history of religious thought, of numberless wide varieties

of significance, is commonly designated by the name of deism, without

qualification. People constantly speak as if deism only came in with

the eighteenth century. It would be impossible to name any century

since the twelfth, in which distinct and abundant traces could not be

found within the dominion of Christianity of a belief in a

supernatural power apart from the supposed disclosure of it in a

special revelation.[337] A prÃ¦ter-christian deism, or the principle of

natural religion, was inevitably contained in the legal conception of

a natural law, for how can we dissociate the idea of law from the idea

of a definite lawgiver? The very scholastic disputations themselves,

by the sharpness and subtlety which they gave to the reasoning

faculty, set men in search of novelties, and these novelties were not

always of a kind which orthodox views of the Christian mysteries could

have sanctioned. It has been said that religion is at the cradle of

every nation, and philosophy at its grave; it is at least true that

the cradle of philosophy is the open grave of religion. Wherever there

is argumentation, there is sure to be scepticism. When people begin to

reason, a shadow has already fallen across faith, though the reasoners

might have shrunk with horror from knowledge of the goal of their

work, and though centuries may elapse before the shadow deepens into

eclipse. But the church was strong and alert in the times when free

thought vainly tried to rear a dangerous head in Italy. With the

Protestant revolution came slowly a wider freedom, while the prolonged

and tempestuous discussion between the old church and the reformed

bodies, as well as the manifold variations among those bodies at

strife with one another, stimulated the growth of religious thought in

many directions that tended away from the exclusive pretensions of

Christianity to be the oracle of the divine Spirit. The same feeling

which thrust aside the sacerdotal interposition between the soul of

man and its sovereign creator and inspirer, gradually worked towards

the dethronement of those mediators other than sacerdotal, in whom the

moral timidity of a dark and stricken age had once sought shade from

the too dazzling brightness of the All-powerful and the Everlasting.

The assertion of the rights and powers of the individual reason within

the limits of the sacred documents, began in less than a hundred years

to grow into an assertion of the same rights and powers beyond those

limits. The rejection of tradition as a substitute for independent

judgment, in interpreting or supplementing the records of revelation,

gradually impaired the traditional authority both of the records

themselves, and of the central doctrines which all churches had in one

shape or another agreed to accept. The Trinitarian controversy of the

sixteenth century must have been a stealthy solvent. The deism of

England in the eighteenth century, which Voltaire was the prime agent

in introducing in its negative, colourless, and essentially futile

shape into his own country, had its main effect as a process of

dissolution.

All this, however, down to the deistical movement which Rousseau found

in progress at Geneva in 1754,[338] was distinctly the outcome in a

more or less marked way of a rationalising and philosophic spirit, and

not of the religious spirit. The sceptical side of it with reference

to revealed religion, predominated over the positive side of it with

reference to natural religion. The wild pantheism of which there were

one or two extraordinary outbursts during the latter part of the

middle ages, to mark the mystical influence which Platonic studies

uncorrected by science always exert over certain temperaments, had

been full of religiosity, such as it was. These had all passed away

with a swift flash. There were, indeed, mystics like the author of the

immortal \_De Imitatione\_, in whom the special qualities of Christian

doctrine seem to have grown pale in a brighter flood of devout

aspiration towards the perfections of a single Being. But this was not

the deism with which either Christianity on the one side, or atheism

on the other, had ever had to deal in France. Deism, in its formal

acceptation, was either an idle piece of vaporous sentimentality, or

else it was the first intellectual halting-place for spirits who had

travelled out of the pale of the old dogmatic Christianity, and lacked

strength for the continuance of their onward journey. In the latter

case, it was only another name either for the shrewd rough conviction

of the man of the world, that his universe could not well be imagined

to go on without a sort of constitutional monarch, reigning but not

governing, keeping evil-doers in order by fear of eternal punishment,

and lending a sacred countenance to the indispensable doctrines of

property, the gradation of rank and station, and the other moral

foundations of the social structure. Or else it was a name for a

purely philosophic principle, not embraced with fervour as the basis

of a religion, but accepted with decorous satisfaction as the

alternative to a religion; not seized upon as the mainspring of

spiritual life, but held up as a shield in a controversy.

The deism which the Savoyard Vicar explained to Emilius in his

profession of faith was pitched in a very different tone from this.

Though the Vicar's conception of the Deity was lightly fenced round

with rationalistic supports of the usual kind, drawn from the

evidences of will and intelligence in the vast machinery of the

universe, yet it was essentially the product not of reason, but of

emotional expansion, as every fundamental article of a faith that

touches the hearts of many men must always be. The Savoyard Vicar did

not believe that a God had made the great world, and rules it with

majestic power and supreme justice, in the same way in which he

believed that any two sides of a triangle are greater than the third

side. That there is a mysterious being penetrating all creation with

force, was not a proposition to be demonstrated, but only the poor

description in words of an habitual mood going far deeper into life

than words can ever carry us. Without for a single moment falling off

into the nullities of pantheism, neither did he for a single moment

suffer his thought to stiffen and grow hard in the formal lines of a

theological definition or a systematic credo. It remains firm enough

to give the religious imagination consistency and a centre, yet

luminous enough to give the spiritual faculty a vivifying

consciousness of freedom and space. A creed is concerned with a number

of affirmations, and is constantly held with honest strenuousness by

multitudes of men and women who are unfitted by natural temperament

for knowing what the glow of religious emotion means to the human

soul,--for not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, enters the kingdom of

heaven. The Savoyard Vicar's profession of faith was not a creed, and

so has few affirmations; it was a single doctrine, melted in a glow of

contemplative transport. It is impossible to set about disproving it,

for its exponent repeatedly warns his disciple against the idleness of

logomachy, and insists that the existence of the Divinity is traced

upon every heart in letters that can never be effaced, if we are only

content to read them with lowliness and simplicity. You cannot

demonstrate an emotion, nor prove an aspiration. How reason, asks the

Savoyard Vicar, about that which we cannot conceive? Conscience is the

best of all casuists, and conscience affirms the presence of a being

who moves the universe and ordains all things, and to him we give the

name of God.

"To this name I join the ideas of intelligence, power, will, which I

have united in one, and that of goodness, which is a necessary

consequence flowing from them. But I do not know any the better for

this the being to whom I have given the name; he escapes equally from

my senses and my understanding; the more I think of him, the more I

confound myself. I have full assurance that he exists, and that he

exists by himself. I recognise my own being as subordinate to his and

all the things that are known to me as being absolutely in the same

case. I perceive God everywhere in his works; I feel him in myself; I

see him universally around me. But when I fain would seek where he is,

what he is, of what substance, he glides away from me, and my troubled

soul discerns nothing."[339]

"In fine, the more earnestly I strive to contemplate his infinite

essence, the less do I conceive it. But it is, and that suffices me.

The less I conceive it, the more I adore. I bow myself down, and say

to him, O being of beings, I am because thou art; to meditate

ceaselessly on thee by day and night, is to raise myself to my

veritable source and fount. The worthiest use of my reason is to make

itself as naught before thee. It is the ravishment of my soul, it is

the solace of my weakness, to feel myself brought low before the awful

majesty of thy greatness."[340]

Souls weary of the fierce mockeries that had so long been flying like

fiery shafts against the far Jehovah of the Hebrews, and the silent

Christ of the later doctors and dignitaries, and weary too of the

orthodox demonstrations that did not demonstrate, and leaden

refutations that could not refute, may well have turned with ardour to

listen to this harmonious spiritual voice, sounding clear from a

region towards which their hearts yearned with untold aspiration, but

from which the spirit of their time had shut them off with brazen

barriers. It was the elevation and expansion of man, as much as it was

the restoration of a divinity. To realise this, one must turn to such

a book as HelvÃ©tius's, which was supposed to reveal the whole inner

machinery of the heart. Man was thought of as a singular piece of

mechanism principally moved from without, not as a conscious organism,

receiving nourishment and direction from the medium in which it is

placed, but reacting with a life of its own from within. It was this

free and energetic inner life of the individual which the Savoyard

Vicar restored to lawful recognition, and made once more the centre of

that imaginative and spiritual existence, without which we live in a

universe that has no sun by day nor any stars by night. A writer in

whom learning has not extinguished enthusiasm, compares this to the

advance made by Descartes, who had given certitude to the soul by

turning thought confidently upon itself; and he declares that the

Savoyard Vicar is for the emancipation of sentiment what the Discourse

upon Method was for the emancipation of the understanding.[341] There

is here a certain audacity of panegyric; still the fact that Rousseau

chose to link the highest forms of man's ideal life with a fading

projection of the lofty image which had been set up in older days,

ought not to blind us to the excellent energies which, notwithstanding

defect of association, such a vindication of the ideal was certain to

quicken. And at least the lines of that high image were nobly traced.

Yet who does not feel that it is a divinity for fair weather?

Rousseau, with his fine sense of a proper and artistic setting,

imagined the Savoyard Vicar as leading his youthful convert at break

of a summer day to the top of a high hill, at whose feet the Po flowed

between fertile banks; in the distance the immense chain of the Alps

crowned the landscape; the rays of the rising sun projected long level

shadows from the trees, the slopes, the houses, and accented with a

thousand lines of light the most magnificent of panoramas.[342] This

was the fitting suggestion, so serene, warm, pregnant with power and

hope, and half mysterious, of the idea of godhead which the man of

peace after an interval of silent contemplation proceeded to expound.

Rousseau's sentimental idea at least did not revolt moral sense; it

did not afflict the firmness of intelligence; nor did it silence the

diviner melodies of the soul. Yet, once more, the heavens in which

such a deity dwells are too high, his power is too impalpable, the

mysterious air which he has poured around his being is too awful and

impenetrable, for the rays from the sun of such majesty to reach more

than a few contemplative spirits, and these only in their hours of

tranquillity and expansion. The thought is too vague, too far, to

bring comfort and refreshment to the mass of travailing men, or to

invest duty with the stern ennobling quality of being done, "if I have

grace to use it so as ever in the great Taskmaster's eye."

The Savoyard Vicar was consistent with the sublimity of his own

conception. He meditated on the order of the universe with a reverence

too profound to allow him to mingle with his thoughts meaner desires

as to the special relations of that order to himself. "I penetrate all

my faculties," he said, "with the divine essence of the author of the

world; I melt at the thought of his goodness, and bless all his gifts,

but I do not pray to him. What should I ask of him? That for me he

should change the course of things, and in my favour work miracles?

Could I, who must love above all else the order established by his

wisdom and upheld by his providence, presume to wish such order

troubled for my sake? Nor do I ask of him the power of doing

righteousness; why ask for what he has given me? Has he not bestowed

on me conscience to love what is good, reason to ascertain it, freedom

to choose it? If I do ill, I have no excuse; I do it because I will

it. To pray to him to change my will, is to seek from him what he

seeks from me; it is to wish no longer to be human, it is to wish

something other than what is, it is to wish disorder and evil."[343]

We may admire both the logical consistency of such self-denial and the

manliness which it would engender in the character that were strong

enough to practise it. But a divinity who has conceded no right of

petition is still further away from our lives than the divinities of

more popular creeds.

Even the fairest deism is of its essence a faith of egotism and

complacency. It does not incorporate in the very heart of the

religious emotion the pitifulness and sorrow which Christianity first

clothed with associations of sanctity, and which can never henceforth

miss their place in any religious system to be accepted by men. Why is

this? Because a religion that leaves them out, or thrusts them into a

hidden corner, fails to comprehend at least one half, and that the

most touching and impressive half, of the most conspicuous facts of

human life. Rousseau was fuller of the capacity of pity than ordinary

men, and this pity was one of the deepest parts of himself. Yet it did

not enter into the composition of his religious faith, and this shows

that his religious faith, though entirely free from suspicion of

insincerity or ostentatious assumption, was like deism in so many

cases, whether rationalistic or emotional, a kind of gratuitously

adopted superfluity, not the satisfaction of a profound inner craving

and resistless spiritual necessity. He speaks of the good and the

wicked with the precision and assurance of the most pharisaic

theologian, and he begins by asking of what concern it is to him

whether the wicked are punished with eternal torment or not, though he

concludes more graciously with the hope that in another state the

wicked, delivered from their malignity, may enjoy a bliss no less than

his own.[344] But the divine pitifulness which we owe to

Christianity, and which will not be the less eagerly cherished by

those who repudiate Christian tradition and doctrines, enjoins upon us

that we should ask, Who are the wicked, and which is he that is

without sin among us? Rousseau answered this glibly enough by some

formula of metaphysics, about the human will having been left and

constituted free by the creator of the world; and that man is the bad

man who abuses his freedom. Grace, fate, destiny, force of

circumstances, are all so many names for the protests which the frank

sense of fact has forced from man against this miserably inadequate

explanation of the foundations of moral responsibility.

Whatever these foundations may be, the theories of grace and fate had

at any rate the quality of connecting human conduct with the will of

the gods. Rousseau's deism, severing the influence of the Supreme

Being upon man, at the very moment when it could have saved him from

the guilt that brings misery,--that is at the moment when conduct

begins to follow the preponderant motives or the will,--did thus

effectually cut off the most admirable and fertile group of our

sympathies from all direct connection with religious sentiment.

Toiling as manfully as we may through the wilderness of our seventy

years, we are to reserve our deepest adoration for the being who has

left us there, with no other solace than that he is good and just and

all-powerful, and might have given us comfort and guidance if he

would. This was virtually the form which Pelagius had tried to impose

upon Christianity in the fifth century, and which the souls of men,

thirsting for consciousness of an active divine presence, had then

under the lead of Augustine so energetically cast away from them. The

faith to which they clung while rejecting this great heresy, though

just as transcendental, still had the quality of satisfying a

spiritual want. It was even more readily to be accepted by the human

intelligence, for it endowed the supreme power with the father's

excellence of compassion, and presented for our reverence and

gratitude and devotion a figure who drew from men the highest love for

the God whom they had not seen, along with the warmest pity and love

for their brethren whom they had seen.

The Savoyard Vicar's own position to Christianity was one of

reverential scepticism. "The holiness of the gospel," he said, "is an

argument that speaks to my heart and to which I should even be sorry

to find a good answer. Look at the books of the philosophers with all

their pomp; how puny they are by the side of that! Is there here the

tone of an enthusiast or an ambitious sectary? What gentleness, what

purity, in his manners, what touching grace in his teaching, what

loftiness in his maxims! Assuredly there was something more than human

in such teaching, such a character, such a life, such a death. If the

life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death

of Jesus are those of a god. Shall we say that the history of the

gospels is invented at pleasure? My friend, that is not the fashion of

invention; and the facts about Socrates are less attested than the

facts about Christ.[345] Yet with all that, this same gospel abounds

in things incredible, which are repugnant to reason, and which it is

impossible for any sensible man to conceive or admit. What are we to

do in the midst of all these contradictions? To be ever modest and

circumspect, my son; to respect in silence what one can neither reject

nor understand, and to make one's self lowly before the great being

who alone knows the truth."[346]

"I regard all particular religions as so many salutary institutions,

which prescribe in every country a uniform manner of honouring God by

public worship. I believe them all good, so long as men serve God

fittingly in them. The essential worship is the worship of the heart.

God never rejects this homage, under whatever form it be offered to

him. In other days I used to say mass with the levity which in time

infects even the gravest things, when we do them too often. Since

acquiring my new principles I celebrate it with more veneration; I am

overwhelmed by the majesty of the Supreme Being, by his presence, by

the insufficiency of the human mind, which conceives so little what

pertains to its author. When I approach the moment of consecration, I

collect myself for performing the act with all the feelings required

by the church, and the majesty of the sacrament; I strive to

annihilate my reason before the supreme intelligence, saying, 'Who art

thou, that thou shouldest measure infinite power?'"[347]

A creed like this, whatever else it may be, is plainly a powerful

solvent of every system of exclusive dogma. If the one essential to

true worship, the worship of the heart and the inner sentiment, be

mystic adoration of an indefinable Supreme, then creeds based upon

books, prophecies, miracles, revelations, all fall alike into the

second place among things that may be lawful and may be expedient, but

that can never be exacted from men by a just God as indispensable to

virtue in this world or to bliss in the next. No better answer has

ever been given to the exclusive pretensions of sect, Christian,

Jewish, or Mahometan, than that propounded by the Savoyard Vicar with

such energy, closeness, and most sarcastic fire.[348] It was turning

an unexpected front upon the presumptuousness of all varieties of

theological infallibilists, to prove to them that if you insist upon

acceptance of this or that special revelation, over and above the

dictates of natural religion, then you are bound not only to grant,

but imperatively to enjoin upon all men, a searching inquiry and

comparison, that they may spare no pains in an affair of such

momentous issue in proving to themselves that this, and none of the

competing revelations, is the veritable message of eternal safety.

"Then no other study will be possible but that of religion: hardly

shall one who has enjoyed the most robust health, employed his time

and used his reason to best purpose, and lived the greatest number of

years, hardly shall such an one in his extreme age be quite sure what

to believe, and it will be a marvel if he finds out before he dies, in

what faith he ought to have lived." The superiority of the sceptical

parts of the Savoyard Vicar's profession, as well as those of the

Letters from the Mountain to which we referred previously, over the

biting mockeries which Voltaire had made the fashionable method of

assault, lay in this fact. The latter only revolted and irritated all

serious temperaments to whom religion is a matter of honest concern,

while the former actually appealed to their religious sense in support

of his doubts; and the more intelligent and sincere this sense

happened to be, the more surely would Rousseau's gravely urged

objections dissolve the hard particles of dogmatic belief. His

objections were on a moral level with the best side of the religion

that they oppugned. Those of Voltaire were only on a level with its

lowest side, and that was the side presented by the gross and

repulsive obscurantism of the functionaries of the church.

Unfortunately Rousseau had placed in the hands of the partisans of

every exclusive revelation an instrument which was quite enough to

disperse all his objections to the winds, and which was the very

instrument that defended his own cherished religion. If he was

satisfied with replying to the atheist and the materialist, that he

knew there is a supreme God, and that the soul must have here and

hereafter an existence apart from the body, because he found these

truths ineffaceably written upon his own heart, what could prevent the

Christian or the Mahometan from replying to Rousseau that the New

Testament or the Koran is the special and final revelation from the

Supreme Power to his creatures? If you may appeal to the voice of the

heart and the dictate of the inner sentiment in one case, why not in

the other also? A subjective test necessarily proves anything that any

man desires, and the accident of the article proved appearing either

reasonable or monstrous to other people, cannot have the least bearing

on its efficacy or conclusiveness.

Deism like the Savoyard Vicar's opens no path for the future, because

it makes no allowance for the growth of intellectual conviction, and

binds up religion with mystery, with an object whose attributes can

neither be conceived nor defined, with a Being too all-embracing to be

able to receive anything from us, too august, self-contained, remote,

to be able to bestow on us the humble gifts of which we have need. The

temperature of thought is slowly but without an instant's recoil

rising to a point when a mystery like this, definite enough to be

imposed as a faith, but too indefinite to be grasped by understanding

as a truth, melts away from the emotions of religion. Then those

instincts of holiness, without which the world would be to so many of

its highest spirits the most dreary of exiles, will perhaps come to

associate themselves less with unseen divinities, than with the long

brotherhood of humanity seen and unseen. Here we shall move with an

assurance that no scepticism and no advance of science can ever shake,

because the benefactions which we have received from the strenuousness

of human effort can never be doubted, and each fresh acquisition in

knowledge or goodness can only kindle new fervour. Those who have the

religious imagination struck by the awful procession of man from the

region of impenetrable night, by his incessant struggle with the

hardness of the material world, and his sublimer struggle with the

hard world of his own egotistic passions, by the pain and sacrifice by

which generation after generation has added some small piece to the

temple of human freedom or some new fragment to the ever incomplete

sum of human knowledge, or some fresh line to the types of strong or

beautiful character,--those who have an eye for all this may indeed

have no ecstasy and no terror, no heaven nor hell, in their religion,

but they will have abundant moods of reverence, deep-seated gratitude,

and sovereign pitifulness.

And such moods will not end in sterile exaltation, or the deathly

chills of spiritual reaction. They will bring forth abundant fruit in

new hope and invigorated endeavour. This devout contemplation of the

experience of the race, instead of raising a man into the clouds,

brings him into the closest, loftiest, and most conscious relations

with his kind, to whom he owes all that is of value in his own life,

and to whom he can repay his debt by maintaining the beneficent

tradition of service, by cherishing honour for all the true and sage

spirits that have shone upon the earth, and sorrow and reprobation for

all the unworthier souls whose light has gone out in baseness. A man

with this faith can have no foul spiritual pride, for there is no

mysteriously accorded divine grace in which one may be a larger

participant than another. He can have no incentives to that mutilation

with which every branch of the church, from the oldest to the youngest

and crudest, has in its degree afflicted and retarded mankind, because

the key-note of his religion is the joyful energy of every faculty,

practical, reflective, creative, contemplative, in pursuit of a

visible common good. And he can be plunged into no fatal and

paralysing despair by any doctrine of mortal sin, because active faith

in humanity, resting on recorded experience, discloses the many

possibilities of moral recovery, and the work that may be done for men

in the fragment of days, redeeming the contrite from their burdens by

manful hope. If religion is our feeling about the highest forces that

govern human destiny, then as it becomes more and more evident how

much our destiny is shaped by the generation of the dead who have

prepared the present, and by the purport of our hopes and the

direction of our activity for the generations that are to fill the

future, the religious sentiment will more and more attach itself to

the great unseen host of our fellows who have gone before us and who

are to come after. Such a faith is no rag of metaphysic floating in

the sunshine of sentimentalism, like Rousseau's faith. It rests on a

positive base, which only becomes wider and firmer with the widening

of experience and the augmentation of our skill in interpreting it.

Nor is it too transcendent for practical acceptance. One of the most

scientific spirits of the eighteenth century, while each moment

expecting the knock of the executioner at his door, found as religious

a solace as any early martyr had ever found in his barbarous

mysteries, when he linked his own efforts for reason and freedom with

the eternal chain of the destinies of man. "This contemplation," he

wrote and felt, "is for him a refuge into which the rancour of his

persecutors can never follow him; in which, living in thought with man

reinstated in the rights and the dignity of his nature, he forgets man

tormented and corrupted by greed, by base fear, by envy; it is here

that he truly abides with his fellows, in an elysium that his reason

has known how to create for itself, and that his love for humanity

adorns with all purest delights."[349]

This, to the shame of those wavering souls who despair of progress at

the first moment when it threatens to leave the path that they have

marked out for it, was written by a man at the very close of his days,

when every hope that he had ever cherished seemed to one without the

eye of faith to be extinguished in bloodshed, disorder, and barbarism.

But there is a still happier season in the adolescence of generous

natures that have been wisely fostered, when the horizons of the

dawning life are suddenly lighted up with a glow of aspiration towards

good and holy things. Commonly, alas, this priceless opportunity is

lost in a fit of theological exaltation, which is gradually choked out

by the dusty facts of life, and slowly moulders away into dry

indifference. It would not be so, but far different, if the Savoyard

Vicar, instead of taking the youth to the mountain-top, there to

contemplate that infinite unseen which is in truth beyond

contemplation by the limited faculties of man, were to associate these

fine impulses of the early prime with the visible, intelligible, and

still sublime possibilities of the human destiny,--that imperial

conception, which alone can shape an existence of entire proportion in

all its parts, and leave no natural energy of life idle or athirst. Do

you ask for sanctions! One whose conscience has been strengthened from

youth in this faith, can know no greater bitterness than the stain

cast by wrong act or unworthy thought on the high memories with which

he has been used to walk, and the discord wrought in hopes that have

become the ruling harmony of his days.
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CHAPTER VI.

ENGLAND.[350]

There is in an English collection a portrait of Jean Jacques,

which was painted during his residence in this country by a provincial

artist. Singular and displeasing as it is, yet this picture lights up

for us many a word and passage in Rousseau's life here and elsewhere,

which the ordinary engravings, and the trim self-complacency of the

statue on the little island at Geneva, would leave very

incomprehensible. It is almost as appalling in its realism as some of

the dark pits that open before the reader of the Confessions. Hard

struggles with objective difficulty and external obstacle wear deep

furrows in the brow; they throw into the glance a solicitude, half

penetrating and defiant, half dejected. When a man's hindrances have

sprung up from within, and the ill-fought battle of his days has been

with his own passions and morbid broodings and unchastened dreams, the

eye and the facial lines tell the story of that profound moral defeat

which is unlighted by the memories of resolute combat with evil and

weakness, and leaves only eternal desolation and the misery that is

formless. Our English artist has produced a vision from that prose

Inferno which is made so populous in the modern epoch by impotence of

will. Those who have seen the picture may easily understand how

largely the character of the original must have been pregnant with

harassing confusion and distress.

Four years before this (1762), Hume, to whom Lord Marischal had told

the story of Rousseau's persecutions, had proffered his services, and

declared his eagerness to help in finding a proper refuge for him in

England. There had been an exchange of cordial letters,[351] and then

the matter had lain quiet, until the impossibility of remaining longer

in NeuchÃ¢tel had once more set his friends on procuring a safe

establishment for their rather difficult refugee. Rousseau's

appearance in Paris had created the keenest excitement. "People may

talk of ancient Greece as they please," wrote Hume from Paris, "but no

nation was ever so proud of genius as this, and no person ever so much

engaged their attention as Rousseau! Voltaire and everybody else are

quite eclipsed by him." Even Theresa Le Vasseur, who was declared very

homely and very awkward, was more talked of than the Princess of

Morocco or the Countess of Egmont, on account of her fidelity towards

him. His very dog had a name and reputation in the world.[352]

Rousseau is always said to have liked the stir which his presence

created, but whether this was so or not, he was very impatient to be

away from it as soon as possible.

In company with Hume, he left Paris in the second week of January

1766. They crossed from Calais to Dover by night in a passage that

lasted twelve hours. Hume, as the orthodox may be glad to know, was

extremely ill, while Rousseau cheerfully passed the whole night upon

deck, taking no harm, though the seamen were almost frozen to

death.[353] They reached London on the thirteenth of January, and the

people of London showed nearly as lively an interest in the strange

personage whom Hume had brought among them, as the people of Paris had

done. A prince of the blood at once went to pay his respects to the

Swiss philosopher. The crowd at the playhouse showed more curiosity

when the stranger came in than when the king and queen entered. Their

majesties were as interested as their subjects, and could scarcely

keep their eyes off the author of Emilius. George III., then in the

heyday of his youth, was so pleased to have a foreigner of genius

seeking shelter in his kingdom, that he readily acceded to Conway's

suggestion, prompted by Hume, that Rousseau should have a pension

settled on him. The ever illustrious Burke, then just made member of

Parliament, saw him nearly every day, and became persuaded that "he

entertained no principle either to influence his heart, or guide his

understanding, but vanity."[354] Hume, on the contrary, thought the

best things of his client; "He has an excellent warm heart, and in

conversation kindles often to a degree of heat which looks like

inspiration; I love him much, and hope that I have some share in his

affections.... He is a very modest, mild, well-bred, gentle-spirited

and warm-hearted man, as ever I knew in my life. He is also to

appearance very sociable. I never saw a man who seems better

calculated for good company, nor who seems to take more pleasure in

it." "He is a very agreeable, amiable man; but a great humorist. The

philosophers of Paris foretold to me that I could not conduct him to

Calais without a quarrel; but I think I could live with him all my

life in mutual friendship and esteem. I believe one great source of

our concord is that neither he nor I are disputatious, which is not

the case with any of them. They are also displeased with him, because

they think he over-abounds in religion; and it is indeed remarkable

that the philosopher of this age who has been most persecuted, is by

far the most devout."[355]

What the Scotch philosopher meant by calling his pupil a humorist, may

perhaps be inferred from the story of the trouble he had in prevailing

upon Rousseau to go to the play, though Garrick had appointed a

special occasion and set apart a special box for him. When the hour

came, Rousseau declared that he could not leave his dog behind him.

"The first person," he said, "who opens the door, Sultan will run into

the streets in search of me and will be lost." Hume told him to lock

Sultan up in the room, and carry away the key in his pocket. This was

done, but as they proceeded downstairs, the dog began to howl; his

master turned back and avowed he had not resolution to leave him in

that condition. Hume, however, caught him in his arms, told him that

Mr. Garrick had dismissed another company in order to make room for

him, that the king and queen were expecting to see him, and that

without a better reason than Sultan's impatience it would be

ridiculous to disappoint them. Thus, a little by reason, but more by

force, he was carried off.[356] Such a story, whatever else we may

think of it, shows at least a certain curious and not untouching

simplicity. And singularity which made Rousseau like better to keep

his dog company at home, than to be stared at by a gaping pit, was too

private in its reward to be the result of that vanity and affectation

with which he was taxed by men who lived in another sphere of motive.

There was considerable trouble in settling Rousseau. He was eager to

leave London almost as soon as he arrived in it. Though pleased with

the friendly reception which had been given him, he pronounced London

to be as much devoted to idle gossip and frivolity as other capitals.

He spent a few weeks in the house of a farmer at Chiswick, thought

about fixing himself in the Isle of Wight, then in Wales, then

somewhere in our fair Surrey, whose scenery, one is glad to know,

greatly attracted him. Finally arrangements were made by Hume with Mr.

Davenport for installing him in a house belonging to the latter, at

Wootton, near Ashbourne, in the Peak of Derbyshire.[357] Hither

Rousseau proceeded with Theresa, at the end of March. Mr. Davenport

was a gentleman of large property, and as he seldom inhabited this

solitary house, was very willing that Rousseau should take up his

abode there without payment. This, however, was what Rousseau's

independence could not brook, and he insisted that his entertainer

should receive thirty pounds a year for the board of himself and

Theresa.[358] So here he settled, in an extremely bitter climate,

knowing no word of the language of the people about him, with no

companionship but Theresa's, and with nothing to do but walk when the

weather was fair, play the harpsicord when it rained, and brood over

the incidents which had occurred to him since he had left Switzerland

six months before. The first fruits of this unfortunate leisure were a

bitter quarrel with Hume, one of the most famous and far-resounding of

all the quarrels of illustrious men, but one about which very little

needs now be said. The merits of it are plain, and all significance

that may ever have belonged to it is entirely dead. The incubation of

his grievances began immediately after his arrival at Wootton, but two

months elapsed before they burst forth in full flame.[359]

The general charge against Hume was that he was a member of an

accursed triumvirate; Voltaire and D'Alembert were the other partners;

and their object was to blacken the character of Rousseau and render

his life miserable. The particular acts on which this belief was

established were the following:--

(1) While Rousseau was in Paris, there appeared a letter nominally

addressed to him by the King of Prussia, and written in an ironical

strain, which persuaded Jean Jacques himself that it was the work of

Voltaire.[360] Then he suspected D'Alembert. It was really the

composition of Horace Walpole, who was then in Paris. Now Hume was the

friend of Walpole, and had given Rousseau a card of introduction to

him for the purpose of entrusting Walpole with the carriage of some

papers. Although the false letter produced the liveliest amusement at

Rousseau's cost, first in Paris and then in London, Hume, while

feigning to be his warm friend and presenting him to the English

public, never took any pains to tell the world that the piece was a

forgery, nor did he break with its wicked author.[361] (2) When

Rousseau assured Hume that D'Alembert was a cunning and dishonourable

man, Hume denied it with an amazing heat, although he well knew the

latter to be Rousseau's enemy.[362] (3) Hume lived in London with the

son of Tronchin, the Genevese surgeon, and the most mortal of all the

foes of Jean Jacques.[363] (4) When Rousseau first came to London, his

reception was a distinguished triumph for the victim of persecution

from so many governments. England was proud of being his place of

refuge, and justly vaunted the freedom of her laws and administration.

Suddenly and for no assignable cause the public tone changed, the

newspapers either fell silent or else spoke unfavourably, and Rousseau

was thought of no more. This must have been due to Hume, who had much

influence among people of credit, and who went about boasting of the

protection which he had procured for Jean Jacques in Paris.[364] (5)

Hume resorted to various small artifices for preventing Rousseau from

making friends, for procuring opportunities of opening Rousseau's

letters, and the like.[365] (6) A violent satirical letter against

Rousseau appeared in the English newspapers, with allusions which

could only have been supplied by Hume. (7) On the first night after

their departure from Paris, Rousseau, who occupied the same room with

Hume, heard him call out several times in the middle of the night in

the course of his dreams, \_Je tiens Jean Jacques Rousseau\_, with

extreme vehemence--which words, in spite of the horribly sardonic tone

of the dreamer, he interpreted favourably at the time, but which later

event proved to have been full of malign significance.[366] (8)

Rousseau constantly found Hume eyeing him with a glance of sinister

and diabolic import that filled him with an astonishing disquietude,

though he did his best to combat it. On one of these occasions he was

seized with remorse, fell upon Hume's neck, embraced him warmly, and,

suffocated with sobs and bathed in tears, cried out in broken accents,

\_No, no, David Hume is no traitor\_, with many protests of affection.

The phlegmatic Hume only returned his embrace with politeness, stroked

him gently on the back, and repeated several times in a tranquil

voice, \_Quoi, mon cher monsieur! Eh! mon cher monsieur! Quoi donc, mon

cher monsieur!\_[367] (9) Although for many weeks Rousseau had kept a

firm silence to Hume, neglecting to answer letters that plainly called

for answer, and marking his displeasure in other unmistakable ways,

yet Hume had never sought any explanation of what must necessarily

have struck him as so singular, but continued to write as if nothing

had happened. Was not this positive proof of a consciousness of

perfidy?

Some years afterwards he substituted another shorter set of

grievances, namely, that Hume would not suffer Theresa to sit at table

with him; that he made a show of him; and that Hume had an engraving

executed of himself, which made him as beautiful as a cherub, while in

another engraving, which was a pendant to his own, Jean Jacques was

made as ugly as a bear.[368]

It would be ridiculous for us to waste any time in discussing these

charges. They are not open to serious examination, though it is

astonishing to find writers in our own day who fully believe that Hume

was a traitor, and behaved extremely basely to the unfortunate man

whom he had inveigled over to a barbarous island. The only part of the

indictment about which there could be the least doubt, was the

possibility of Hume having been an accomplice in Walpole's very small

pleasantry. Some of his friends in Paris suspected that he had had a

hand in the supposed letter from the King of Prussia. Although the

letter constituted no very malignant jest, and could not by a sensible

man have been regarded as furnishing just complaint against one who,

like Walpole, was merely an impudent stranger, yet if it could be

shown that Hume had taken an active part either in the composition or

the circulation of a spiteful bit of satire upon one towards whom he

was pretending a singular affection, then we should admit that he

showed such a want of sense of the delicacy of friendship as amounted

to something like treachery. But a letter from Walpole to Hume sets

this doubt at rest. "I cannot be precise as to the time of my writing

the King of Prussia's letter, but ... I not only suppressed the letter

while you stayed there, out of delicacy to you, but it was the reason

why, out of delicacy to myself, I did not go to see him as you often

proposed to me, thinking it wrong to go and make a cordial visit to a

man, with a letter in my pocket to laugh at him."[369]

With this all else falls to the ground. It would be as unwise in us,

as it was in Rousseau himself, to complicate the hypotheses. Men do

not act without motives, and Hume could have no motive in entering

into any plot against Rousseau, even if the rival philosophers in

France might have motives. We know the character of our David Hume

perfectly well, and though it was not faultless, its fault certainly

lay rather in an excessive desire to make the world comfortable for

everybody, than in anything like purposeless malignity, of which he

never had a trace. Moreover, all that befell Rousseau through Hume's

agency was exceedingly to his advantage. Hume was not without vanity,

and his letters show that he was not displeased at the addition to his

consequence which came of his patronage of a man who was much talked

about and much stared at. But, however this was, he did all for

Rousseau that generosity and thoughtfulness could do. He was at great

pains in establishing him; he used his interest to procure for him the

grant of a pension from the king; when Rousseau provisionally refused

the pension rather than owe anything to Hume, the latter, still

ignorant of the suspicion that was blackening in Rousseau's mind,

supposed that the refusal came from the fact of the pension being kept

private, and at once took measures with the minister to procure the

removal of the condition of privacy. Besides undeniable acts like

these, the state of Hume's mind towards his curious ward is abundantly

shown in his letters to all his most intimate friends, just as

Rousseau's gratitude to him is to be read in all his early letters

both to Hume and other persons. In the presence of such facts on the

one side, and in the absence of any particle of intelligible evidence

to neutralise them on the other, to treat Rousseau's charges with

gravity is irrational.

If Hume had written back in a mild and conciliatory strain, there can

be no doubt that the unfortunate victim of his own morbid imagination

would, for a time at any rate, have been sobered and brought to a

sense of his misconduct. But Hume was incensed beyond control at what

he very pardonably took for a masterpiece of atrocious ingratitude. He

reproached Rousseau in terms as harsh as those which Grimm had used

nine years before. He wrote to all his friends, withdrawing the kindly

words he had once used of Rousseau's character, and substituting in

their place the most unfavourable he could find. He gave the

philosophic circle in Paris exquisite delight by the confirmation

which his story furnished of their own foresight, when they had warned

him that he was taking a viper to his bosom. Finally, in spite of the

advice of Adam Smith, of one of the greatest of men, Turgot, and one

of the smallest, Horace Walpole, he published a succinct account of

the quarrel, first in French, and then in English. This step was

chiefly due to the advice of the clique of whom D'Alembert was the

spokesman, though it is due to him to mention that he softened various

expressions in Hume's narrative, which he pronounced too harsh. It may

be true that a council of war never fights; a council of men of

letters always does. The governing committee of a literary,

philosophical, or theological clique form the very worst advisers any

man can have.

Much must be forgiven to Hume, stung as he was by what appeared the

most hateful ferocity in one on whom he had heaped acts of affection.

Still, one would have been glad on behalf of human dignity, if he had

suffered with firm silence petulant charges against which the

consciousness of his own uprightness should have been the only answer.

That high pride, of which there is too little rather than too much in

the world, and which saves men from waste of themselves and others in

pitiful accusations, vindications, retaliations, should have helped

humane pity in preserving him from this poor quarrel. Long afterwards

Rousseau said, "England, of which they paint such fine pictures in

France, has so cheerless a climate; my soul, wearied with many shocks,

was in a condition of such profound melancholy, that in all that

passed I believe I committed many faults. But are they comparable to

those of the enemies who persecuted me, supposing them even to have

done no more than published our private quarrels?"[370] An ampler

contrition would have been more seemly in the first offender, but

there is a measure of justice in his complaint. We need not, however,

reproach the good Hume. Before six months were over, he admits that he

is sometimes inclined to blame his publication, and always to regret

it.[371] And his regret was not verbal merely. When Rousseau had

returned to France, and was in danger of arrest, Hume was most urgent

in entreating Turgot to use his influence with the government to

protect the wretched wanderer, and Turgot's answer shows both how

sincere this humane interposition was, and how practically

serviceable.[372]

Meanwhile there ensued a horrible fray in print. Pamphlets appeared in

Paris and London in a cloud. The Succinct Exposure was followed by

succinct rejoinders. Walpole officiously printed his own account of

his own share in the matter. Boswell officiously wrote to the

newspapers defending Rousseau and attacking Walpole. King George

followed the battle with intense curiosity. Hume with solemn

formalities sent the documents to the British Museum. There was

silence only in one place, and that was at Wootton. The unfortunate

person who had done all the mischief printed not a word.

The most prompt and quite the least instructive of the remarks

invariably made upon any one who has acted in an unusual manner, is

that he must be mad. This universal criticism upon the unwonted really

tells us nothing, because the term may cover any state of mind from a

warranted dissent from established custom, down to absolute dementia.

Rousseau was called mad when he took to wearing convenient clothes and

living frugally. He was called mad when he quitted the town and went

to live in the country. The same facile explanation covered his

quarrel with importunate friends at the Hermitage. Voltaire called him

mad for saying that if there were perfect harmony of taste and

temperament between the king's daughter and the executioner's son, the

pair ought to be allowed to marry. We who are not forced by

conversational necessities to hurry to a judgment, may hesitate to

take either taste for the country, or for frugal living, or even for

democratic extravagances, as a mark of a disordered mind.[373] That

Rousseau's conduct towards Hume was inconsistent with perfect mental

soundness is quite plain. But to say this with crude trenchancy,

teaches us nothing. Instead of paying ourselves with phrases like

monomania, it is more useful shortly to trace the conditions which

prepared the way for mental derangement, because this is the only

means of understanding either its nature, or the degree to which it

extended. These conditions in Rousseau's case are perfectly simple and

obvious to any one who recognises the principle, that the essential

facts of such mental disorder as his must be sought not in the

symptoms, but from the whole range of moral and intellectual

constitution, acted on by physical states and acting on them in turn.

Rousseau was born with an organisation of extreme sensibility. This

predisposition was further deepened by the application in early youth

of mental influences specially calculated to heighten juvenile

sensibility. Corrective discipline from circumstance and from formal

instruction was wholly absent, and thus the particular excess in his

temperament became ever more and more exaggerated, and encroached at a

rate of geometrical progression upon all the rest of his impulses and

faculties; these, if he had been happily placed under some of the many

forms of wholesome social pressure, would then on the contrary have

gradually reduced his sensibility to more normal proportion. When the

vicious excess had decisively rooted itself in his character, he came

to Paris, where it was irritated into further activity by the

uncongeniality of all that surrounded him. Hence the growth of a

marked unsociality, taking literary form in the Discourses, and

practical form in his retirement from the town. The slow depravation

of the affective life was hastened by solitude, by sensuous expansion,

by the long musings of literary composition. Well does Goethe's

Princess warn the hapless Tasso:--

Dieser Pfad

Verleitet uns, durch einsames GebÃ¼sch,

Durch stille ThÃ¤ler fortzuwandern; mehr

Und mehr verwÃ¶hnt sich das GemÃ¼th und strebt

Die goldne Zeit, die ihm von aussen mangelt,

In seinem Innern wieder herzustellen,

So wenig der Versuch gelingen will.

Then came harsh and unjust treatment prolonged for many months, and

this introduced a slight but genuinely misanthropic element of

bitterness into what had hitherto been an excess of feeling about

himself, rather than any positive feeling of hostility or suspicion

about others. Finally and perhaps above all else, he was the victim of

tormenting bodily pain, and of sleeplessness which resulted from it.

The agitation and excitement of the journey to England, completed the

sum of the conditions of disturbance, and as soon as ever he was

settled at Wootton, and had leisure to brood over the incidents of

the few weeks since his arrival in England, the disorder which had

long been spreading through his impulses and affections, suddenly but

by a most natural sequence extended to the faculties of his

intelligence, and he became the prey of delusion, a delusion which was

not yet fixed, but which ultimately became so.

"He has only \_felt\_ during the whole course of his life," wrote Hume

sympathetically; "and in this respect his sensibility rises to a pitch

beyond what I have seen any example of; but it still gives him a more

acute feeling of pain than of pleasure. He is like a man who was

stripped not only of his clothes, but of his skin, and turned out in

that situation to combat with the rude and boisterous elements."[374]

A morbid affective state of this kind and of such a degree of

intensity, was the sure antecedent of a morbid intellectual state,

general or partial, depressed or exalted. One who is the prey of

unsound feelings, if they are only marked enough and persistent

enough, naturally ends by a correspondingly unsound arrangement of all

or some of his ideas to match. The intelligence is seduced into

finding supports in misconception of circumstances, for a

misconception of human relation which had its root in disordered

emotion. This completes the breach of correspondence between the man's

nature and the external facts with which he has to deal, though the

breach may not, and in Rousseau's case certainly did not, extend along

the whole line of feeling and judgment. Rousseau's delusion about

Hume's sinister feeling and designs, which was the first definite

manifestation of positive unsoundness in the sphere of the

intelligence, was a last result of the gradual development of an

inherited predisposition to affective unsoundness, which unhappily for

the man's history had never been counteracted either by a strenuous

education, or by the wholesome urgencies of life.

We have only to remember that with him, as with the rest of us, there

was entire unity of nature, without cataclysm or marvel or

inexplicable rupture of mental continuity. All the facts came in an

order that might have been foretold; they all lay together, with their

foundations down in physical temperament; the facts which made

Rousseau's name renowned and his influence a great force, along with

those which made his life a scandal to others and a misery to himself.

The deepest root of moral disorder lies in an immoderate expectation

of happiness, and this immoderate unlawful expectation was the mark

both of his character and his work. The exaltation of emotion over

intelligence was the secret of his most striking production; the same

exaltation, by gaining increased mastery over his whole existence, at

length passed the limit of sanity and wrecked him. The tendency of the

dominant side of a character towards diseased exaggeration is a fact

of daily observation. The ruin which the excess of strong religious

imagination works in natures without the quality of energetic

objective reaction, was shown in the case of Rousseau's contemporary,

Cowper. This gentle poet's delusions about the wrath of God were

equally pitiable and equally a source of torment to their victim, with

Rousseau's delusions about the malignity of his mysterious plotters

among men. We must call such a condition unsound, but the important

thing is to remember that insanity was only a modification of certain

specially marked tendencies of the sufferer's sanity.

The desire to protect himself against the defamation of his enemies

led him at this time to compose that account of his own life, which is

probably the only one of his writings that continues to be generally

read. He composed the first part of the Confessions at Wootton, during

the autumn and winter of 1766. The idea of giving his memoirs to the

public was an old one, originally suggested by one of his publishers.

To write memoirs of one's own life was one of the fancies of the time,

but like all else, it became in Rousseau's hand something more

far-reaching and sincere than a passing fashion. Other people wrote

polite histories of their outer lives, amply coloured with romantic

decorations. Rousseau with unquailing veracity plunged into the inmost

depths, hiding nothing that would be likely to make him either

ridiculous or hateful in common opinion, and inventing nothing that

could attract much sympathy or much admiration. Though, as has been

pointed out already, the Confessions abound in small inaccuracies of

date, hardly to be avoided by an oldish man in reference to the facts

of his boyhood, whether a Rousseau or a Goethe, and though one or two

of the incidents are too deeply coloured with the hues of sentimental

reminiscence, and one or two of them are downright impossible, yet

when all these deductions have been made, the substantial truthfulness

of what remains is made more evident with every addition to our

materials for testing them. When all the circumstances of Rousseau's

life are weighed, and when full account has been taken of his proved

delinquencies, we yet perceive that he was at bottom a character as

essentially sincere, truthful, careful of fact and reality, as is

consistent with the general empire of sensation over untrained

intelligence.[375] As for the egotism of the Confessions, it is hard

to see how a man is to tell the story of his own life without egotism.

And it may be worth adding that the self-feeling which comes to the

surface and asserts itself, is in a great many cases far less vicious

and debilitating than the same feeling nursed internally with a

troglodytish shyness. But Rousseau's egotism manifested itself

perversely. This is true to a certain small extent, and one or two of

the disclosures in the Confessions are in very nauseous matter, and

are made moreover in a very nauseous manner. There are some vices

whose grotesqueness stirs us more deeply than downright atrocities,

and we read of certain puerilities avowed by Rousseau, with a livelier

impatience than old Benvenuto Cellini quickens in us, when he

confesses to a horrible assassination. This morbid form of

self-feeling is only less disgusting than the allied form which

clothes itself in the phrases of religious exaltation. And there is

not much of it. Blot out half a dozen pages from the Confessions, and

the egotism is no more perverted than in the confessions of Augustine

or of Cardan.

These remarks are not made to extenuate Rousseau's faults, or to raise

the popular estimate of his character, but simply in the interests of

a greater precision of criticism. In England criticism has nearly

always been of the most vulgar superficiality in respect to Rousseau,

from the time of Horace Walpole downwards. The Confessions in their

least agreeable parts, or rather especially in those parts, are the

expression on a new side and in a peculiar way of the same notion of

the essential goodness of nature and the importance of understanding

nature and restoring its reign, which inspired the Discourses and

Emilius. "I would fain show to my fellows," he began, "a man in all

the truth of nature," and he cannot be charged with any failure to

keep his word. He despised opinion, and hence was careless to observe

whether or no this revelation of human nakedness was likely to add to

the popular respect for nature and the natural man. After all,

considering that literature is for the most part a hollow and

pretentious phantasmagoria of mimic figures posing in breeches and

peruke, we may try to forgive certain cruel blows to the dignified

assumptions, solemn words, and high heels of convention, in one who

would not lie, nor dissemble kinship with the four-footed. Intense

subjective preoccupations in markedly emotional natures all tend to

come to the same end. The distance from Rousseau's odious erotics to

the glorified ecstasies of many a poor female saint is not far. In any

case, let us know the facts about human nature, and the pathological

facts no less than the others. These are the first thing, and the

second, and the third also.

The exaltation of the opening page of the Confessions is shocking. No

monk nor saint ever wrote anything more revolting in its blasphemous

self-feeling. But the exaltation almost instantly became calm, when

the course of the story necessarily drew the writer into dealings with

objective facts, even muffled as they were by memory and imagination.

The broodings over old reminiscence soothed him, the labour of

composition occupied him, and he forgot, as the modern reader would

never know from internal evidence, that he was preparing a vindication

of his life and character against the infamies with which Hume and

others were supposed to be industriously blackening them. While he was

writing this famous composition, severed by so vast a gulf from the

modes of English provincial life, he was on good terms with one or two

of the great people in his neighbourhood, and kept up a gracious and

social correspondence with them. He was greatly pleased by a

compliment that was paid to him by the government, apparently through

the interest of General Conway. The duty that had been paid upon

certain boxes forwarded to Rousseau from Switzerland was recouped by

the treasury,[376] and the arrangements for the annual pension of one

hundred pounds were concluded and accepted by him, after he had duly

satisfied himself that Hume was not the indirect author of the

benefaction.[377] The weather was the worst possible, but whenever it

allowed him to go out of doors, he found delight in climbing the

heights around him in search of curious mosses; for he had now come to

think the discovery of a single new plant a hundred times more useful

than to have the whole human race listening to your sermons for half a

century.[378] "This indolent and contemplative life that you do not

approve," he wrote to the elder Mirabeau, "and for which I pretend to

make no excuses, becomes every day more delicious to me: to wander

alone among the trees and rocks that surround my dwelling; to muse or

rather to extravagate at my ease, and as you say to stand gaping in

the air; when my brain gets too hot, to calm it by dissecting some

moss or fern; in short, to surrender myself without restraint to my

phantasies, which, heaven be thanked, are all under my own

control,--all that is for me the height of enjoyment, to which I can

imagine nothing superior in this world for a man of my age and in my

condition."[379]

This contentment did not last long. The snow kept him indoors. The

excitement of composition abated. Theresa harassed him by ignoble

quarrels with the women in the kitchen. His delusions returned with

greater force than before. He believed that the whole English nation

was in a plot against him, that all his letters were opened before

reaching London and before leaving it, that all his movements were

closely watched, and that he was surrounded by unseen guards to

prevent any attempt at escape.[380] At length these delusions got such

complete mastery over him, that in a paroxysm of terror he fled away

from Wootton, leaving money, papers, and all else behind him. Nothing

was heard of him for a fortnight, when Mr. Davenport received a letter

from him dated at Spalding in Lincolnshire. Mr. Davenport's conduct

throughout was marked by a humanity and patience that do him the

highest honour. He confesses himself "quite moved to read poor

Rousseau's mournful epistle." "You shall see his letter," he writes to

Hume, "the first opportunity; but God help him, I can't for pity give

a copy; and 'tis so much mixed with his own poor little private

concerns, that it would not be right in me to do it."[381] This is

the generosity which makes Hume's impatience and that of his

mischievous advisers in Paris appear petty. Rousseau had behaved quite

as ill to Mr. Davenport as he had done to Hume, and had received at

least equal services from him.[382] The good man at once sent a

servant to Spalding in search of his unhappy guest, but Rousseau had

again disappeared. The parson of the parish had passed several hours

of each day in his company, and had found him cheerful and

good-humoured. He had had a blue coat made for himself, and had

written a long letter to the lord chancellor, praying him to appoint a

guard, at Rousseau's own expense, to escort him in safety out of the

kingdom where enemies were plotting against his life.[383] He was next

heard of at Dover (May 18), whence he wrote a letter to General

Conway, setting forth his delusion in full form.[384] He is the victim

of a plot; the conspirators will not allow him to leave the island,

lest he should divulge in other countries the outrages to which he has

been subjected here; he perceives the sinister manoeuvres that will

arrest him if he attempts to put his foot on board ship. But he warns

them that his tragical disappearance cannot take place without

creating inquiry. Still if General Conway will only let him go, he

gives his word of honour that he will not publish a line of the

memoirs he has written, nor ever divulge the wrongs which he has

suffered in England. "I see my last hour approaching," he concluded;

"I am determined, if necessary, to advance to meet it, and to perish

or be free; there is no longer any other alternative." On the same

evening on which he wrote this letter (about May 20-22), the forlorn

creature took boat and landed at Calais, where he seems at once to

have recovered his composure and a right mind.
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CHAPTER VII.

THE END.

Before leaving England, Rousseau had received more than one

long and rambling letter from a man who was as unlike the rest of

mankind as he was unlike them himself. This was the Marquis of

Mirabeau (1715-89), the violent, tyrannical, pedantic, humoristic sire

of a more famous son. Perhaps we might say that Mirabeau and Rousseau

were the two most singular originals then known to men, and Mirabeau's

originality was in some respects the more salient of the two. There is

less of the conventional tone of the eighteenth century Frenchman in

him than in any other conspicuous man of the time, though like many

other headstrong and despotic souls he picked up the current notions

of philanthropy and human brotherhood. He really was by very force of

temperament that rebel against the narrowness, trimness, and moral

formalism of the time which Rousseau only claimed and attempted to be,

with the secondary degree of success that follows vehemence without

native strength. Mirabeau was a sort of Swift, who had strangely taken

up the trade of friendship for man and adopted the phrases of

perfectibility; while Rousseau on the other hand was meant for a

FÃ©nelon, save that he became possessed of unclean devils.

Mirabeau, like Jean Jacques himself, was so impressed by the marked

tenor of contemporary feeling, its prudential didactics, its

formulistic sociality, that his native insurgency only found vent in

private life, while in public he played pedagogue to the human race.

Friend of Quesnai and orthodox economist as he was, he delighted in

Rousseau's books: "I know no morality that goes deeper than yours; it

strikes like a thunderbolt, and advances with the steady assurance of

truth, for you are always true, according to your notions for the

moment." He wrote to tell him so, but he told him at the same time at

great length, and with a caustic humour and incoherency less academic

than Rabelaisian, that he had behaved absurdly in his quarrel with

Hume. There is nothing more quaint than the appearance of a few of the

sacramental phrases of the sect of the economists, floating in the

midst of a copious stream of egoistic whimsicalities. He concludes

with a diverting enumeration of all his country seats and demesnes,

with their respective advantages and disadvantages, and prays Rousseau

to take up his residence in whichever of them may please him

best.[385]

Immediately on landing at Calais Rousseau informed Mirabeau, and

Mirabeau lost no time in conveying him stealthily, for the warrant of

the parliament of Paris was still in force, to a house at Fleury. But

the Friend of Men, to use his own account of himself, "bore letters as

a plum-tree bears plums," and wrote to his guest with strange

humoristic volubility and droll imperturbable temper, as one who knew

his Jean Jacques. He exhorts him in many sheets to harden himself

against excessive sensibility, to be less pusillanimous, to take

society more lightly, as his own light estimate of its worth should

lead him to do. "No doubt its outside is a shifting surface-picture,

nay even ridiculous, if you will; but if the irregular and ceaseless

flight of butterflies wearies you in your walk, it is your own fault

for looking continuously at what was only made to adorn and vary the

scene. But how many social virtues, how much gentleness and

considerateness, how many benevolent actions, remain at the bottom of

it all."[386] Enormous manifestoes of the doctrine of perfectibility

were not in the least degree either soothing or interesting to

Rousseau, and the thrusts of shrewd candour at his expense might touch

his fancy on a single occasion, but not oftener. Two humorists are

seldom successful in amusing one another. Besides, Mirabeau insisted

that Jean Jacques should read this or that of his books. Rousseau

answered that he would try, but warned him of the folly of it. "I do

not engage always to follow what you say, because it has always been

painful to me to think, and fatiguing to follow the thoughts of other

people, and at present I cannot do so at all."[387] Though they

continued to be good friends, Rousseau only remained three or four

weeks at Fleury. His old acquaintance at Montmorency, the Prince of

Conti, partly perhaps from contrition at the rather unchivalrous

fashion in which his great friends had hustled the philosopher away at

the time of the decree of the parliament of Paris, offered him refuge

at one of his country seats at Trye near Gisors. Here he installed

Rousseau under the name of Renou, either to silence the indiscreet

curiosity of neighbours, or to gratify a whim of Rousseau himself.

Rousseau remained for a year (June 1767-June 1768), composing the

second part of the Confessions, in a condition of extreme mental

confusion. Dusky phantoms walked with him once more. He knew the

gardener, the servants, the neighbours, all to be in the pay of Hume,

and that he was watched day and night with a view to his

destruction.[388] He entirely gave up either reading or writing, save

a very small number of letters, and he declared that to take up the

pen even for these was like lifting a load of iron. The only interest

he had was botany, and for this his passion became daily more intense.

He appears to have been as contented as a child, so long as he could

employ himself in long expeditions in search of new plants, in

arranging a herbarium, in watching the growth of the germ of some rare

seed which needed careful tending. But the story had once more the

same conclusion. He fled from Trye, as he had fled from Wootton. He

meant apparently to go to ChambÃ©ri, drawn by the deep magnetic force

of old memories that seemed long extinct. But at Grenoble on his way

thither he encountered a substantial grievance. A man alleged that he

had lent Rousseau a few francs seven years previously. He was

undoubtedly mistaken, and was fully convicted of his mistake by proper

authorities, but Rousseau's correspondents suffered none the less for

that. We all know when monomania seizes a man, how adroitly and how

eagerly it colours every incident. The mistaken claim was proof

demonstrative of that frightful and tenebrous conspiracy, which they

might have thought a delusion hitherto, but which, alas, this showed

to be only too tragically real; and so on, through many pages of

droning wretchedness.[389] Then we find him at Bourgoin, where he

spent some months in shabby taverns, and then many months more at

Monquin on adjoining uplands.[390] The estrangement from Theresa, of

which enough has been said already,[391] was added to his other

torments. He resolved, as so many of the self-tortured have done

since, to go in search of happiness to the western lands beyond the

Atlantic, where the elixir of bliss is thought by the wearied among us

to be inexhaustible and assured. Almost in the same page he turns his

face eastwards, and dreams of ending his days peacefully among the

islands of the Grecian archipelago. Next he gravely, not only

designed, but actually took measures, to return to Wootton. All was no

more than the momentary incoherent purpose of a sick man's dream, the

weary distraction of one who had deliberately devoted himself to

isolation from his fellows, without first sitting down carefully to

count the cost, or to measure the inner resources which he possessed

to meet the deadly strain that isolation puts on every one of a man's

mental fibres. Geographical loneliness is to some a condition of their

fullest strength, but most of the few who dare to make a moral

solitude for themselves, find that they have assuredly not made peace.

Such solitude, as South said of the study of the Apocalypse, either

finds a man mad, or leaves him so. Not all can play the stoic who

will, and it is still more certain that one who like Rousseau has lain

down with the doctrine that in all things imaginable it is impossible

for him to do at all what he cannot do with pleasure, will end in a

condition of profound and hopeless impotence in respect to pleasure

itself.

In July 1770, he made his way to Paris, and here he remained eight

years longer, not without the introduction of a certain degree of

order into his outer life, though the clouds of vague suspicion and

distrust, half bitter, half mournful, hung heavily as ever upon his

mind. The Dialogues, which he wrote at this period (1775-76) to

vindicate his memory from the defamation that was to be launched in a

dark torrent upon the world at the moment of his death, could not

possibly have been written by a man in his right mind. Yet the best of

the Musings, which were written still nearer the end, are masterpieces

in the style of contemplative prose. The third, the fifth, the

seventh, especially abound in that even, full, mellow gravity of tone

which is so rare in literature, because the deep absorption of spirit

which is its source is so rare in life. They reveal Rousseau to us

with a truth beyond that attained in any of his other pieces--a

mournful sombre figure, looming shadowily in the dark glow of sundown

among sad and desolate places. There is nothing like them in the

French tongue, which is the speech of the clear, the cheerful, or the

august among men; nothing like this sonorous plainsong, the strangely

melodious expression in the music of prose of a darkened spirit which

yet had imaginative visions of beatitude.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is interesting to look on one or two pictures of the last waste and

obscure years of the man, whose words were at this time silently

fermenting for good and for evil in many spirits--a Schiller, a

Herder, a Jeanne Phlipon, a Robespierre, a Gabriel Mirabeau, and many

hundreds of those whose destiny was not to lead, but ingenuously to

follow. Rousseau seems to have repulsed nearly all his ancient

friends, and to have settled down with dogged resolve to his old trade

of copying music. In summer he rose at five, copied music until

half-past seven; munched his breakfast, arranging on paper during the

process such plants as he had gathered the previous afternoon; then he

returned to his work, dined at half-past twelve, and went forth to

take coffee at some public place. He would not return from his walk

until nightfall, and he retired at half-past ten. The pavements of

Paris were hateful to him because they tore his feet, and, said he,

with deeply significant antithesis, "I am not afraid of death, but I

dread pain." He always found his way as fast as possible to one of the

suburbs, and one of his greatest delights was to watch Mont ValÃ©rien

in the sunset. "Atheists," he said calumniously, "do not love the

country; they like the environs of Paris, where you have all the

pleasures of the city, good cheer, books, pretty women; but if you

take these things away, then they die of weariness." The note of every

bird held him attentive, and filled his mind with delicious images. A

graceful story is told of two swallows who made a nest in Rousseau's

sleeping-room, and hatched the eggs there. "I was no more than a

doorkeeper for them," he said, "for I kept opening the window for them

every moment. They used to fly with a great stir round my head, until

I had fulfilled the duties of the tacit convention between these

swallows and me."

In January 1771, Bernardin de St. Pierre, author of the immortal \_Paul

and Virginia\_ (1788), finding himself at the Cape of Good Hope, wrote

to a friend in France just previously to his return to Europe,

counting among other delights that of seeing two summers in one

year.[392] Rousseau happened to see the letter, and expressed a desire

to make the acquaintance of a man who in returning home should think

of that as one of his chief pleasures. To this we owe the following

pictures of an interior from St. Pierre's hand:--

In the month of June in 1772, a friend having offered to

take me to see Jean Jacques Rousseau, he brought me to a

house in the Rue PlÃ¢triÃ¨re, nearly opposite to the HÃ´tel de

la Poste. We mounted to the fourth story. We knocked, and

Madame Rousseau opened the door. "Come in, gentlemen," she

said, "you will find my husband." We passed through a very

small antechamber, where the household utensils were neatly

arranged, and from that into a room where Jean Jacques was

seated in an overcoat and a white cap, busy copying music.

He rose with a smiling face, offered us chairs, and resumed

his work, at the same time taking a part in conversation. He

was thin and of middle height. One shoulder struck me as

rather higher than the other ... otherwise he was very well

proportioned. He had a brown complexion, some colour on his

cheek-bones, a good mouth, a well-made nose, a rounded and

lofty brow, and eyes full of fire. The oblique lines falling

from the nostrils to the extremity of the lips, and marking

a physiognomy, in his case expressed great sensibility and

something even painful. One observed in his face three or

four of the characteristics of melancholy--the deep receding

eyes and the elevation of the eyebrows; you saw profound

sadness in the wrinkles of the brow; a keen and even caustic

gaiety in a thousand little creases at the corners of the

eyes, of which the orbits entirely disappeared when he

laughed.... Near him was a spinette on which from time to

time he tried an air. Two little beds of blue and white

striped calico, a table, and a few chairs, made the stock of

his furniture. On the walls hung a plan of the forest and

park of Montmorency, where he had once lived, and an

engraving of the King of England, his old benefactor. His

wife was sitting mending linen; a canary sang in a cage hung

from the ceiling; sparrows came for crumbs on to the sills

of the windows, which on the side of the street were open;

while in the window of the antechamber we noticed boxes and

pots filled with such plants as it pleases nature to sow.

There was in the whole effect of his little establishment an

air of cleanness, peace, and simplicity, which was

delightful.

A few days after, Rousseau returned the visit. "He wore a round wig,

well powdered and curled, carrying a hat under his arm, and in a full

suit of nankeen. His whole exterior was modest, but extremely neat."

He expressed his passion for good coffee, saying that this and ice

were the only two luxuries for which he cared. St. Pierre happened to

have brought some from the Isle of Bourbon, so on the following day he

rashly sent Rousseau a small packet, which at first produced a polite

letter of thanks; but the day after the letter of thanks came one of

harsh protest against the ignominy of receiving presents which could

not be returned, and bidding the unfortunate donor to choose between

taking his coffee back or never seeing his new friend again. A fair

bargain was ultimately arranged, St. Pierre receiving in exchange for

his coffee some curious root or other, and a book on ichthyology.

Immediately afterwards he went to dine with his sage. He arrived at

eleven in the forenoon, and they conversed until half-past twelve.

Then his wife laid the cloth. He took a bottle of wine, and

as he put it on the table, asked whether we should have

enough, or if I was fond of drinking. "How many are there of

us," said I. "Three," he said; "you, my wife, and myself."

"Well," I went on, "when I drink wine and am alone, I drink

a good half-bottle, and I drink a trifle more when I am with

friends." "In that case," he answered, "we shall not have

enough; I must go down into the cellar." He brought up a

second bottle. His wife served two dishes, one of small

tarts, and another which was covered. He said, showing me

the first, "That is your dish and the other is mine." "I

don't eat much pastry," I said, "but I hope to be allowed to

taste what you have got." "Oh, they are both common," he

replied; "but most people don't care for this. 'Tis a Swiss

dish; a compound of lard, mutton, vegetables, and

chestnuts." It was excellent. After these two dishes, we had

slices of beef in salad; then biscuits and cheese; after

which his wife served the coffee.

\* \* \* \* \*

One morning when I was at his house, I saw various domestics

either coming for rolls of music, or bringing them to him to

copy. He received them standing and uncovered. He said to

some, "The price is so much," and received the money; to

others, "How soon must I return my copy?" "My mistress would

like to have it back in a fortnight." "Oh, that's out of the

question: I have work, I can't do it in less than three

weeks." I inquired why he did not take his talents to better

market. "Ah," he answered, "there are two Rousseaus in the

world; one rich, or who might have been if he had chosen; a

man capricious, singular, fantastic; this is the Rousseau of

the public; the other is obliged to work for his living, the

Rousseau whom you see."[393]

They often took long rambles together, and all proceeded most

harmoniously, unless St. Pierre offered to pay for such refreshment as

they might take, when a furious explosion was sure to follow. Here is

one more picture, without explosion.

\_An Easter Monday Excursion to Mont ValÃ©rien.\_

We made an appointment at a cafÃ© in the Champs ElysÃ©es. In

the morning we took some chocolate. The wind was westerly,

and the air fresh. The sun was surrounded by white clouds,

spread in masses over an azure sky. Reaching the Bois de

Boulogne by eight o'clock, Jean Jacques set to work

botanising. As he collected his little harvest, we kept

walking along. We had gone through part of the wood, when in

the midst of the solitude we perceived two young girls, one

of whom was arranging the other's hair.--[Reminded them of

some verses of Virgil.]....

Arrived on the edge of the river, we crossed the ferry with

a number of people whom devotion was taking to Mont

ValÃ©rien. We climbed an extremely stiff slope, and were

hardly on the top before hunger overtook us and we began to

think of dining. Rousseau then led the way towards a

hermitage, where he knew we could make sure of hospitality.

The brother who opened to us, conducted us to the chapel,

where they were reciting the litanies of providence, which

are extremely beautiful.... When we had prayed, Jean Jacques

said to me with genuine feeling: "Now I feel what is said in

the gospel, 'Where several of you are gathered together in

my name, there will I be in the midst of them.' There is a

sentiment of peace and comfort here that penetrates the

soul." I replied, "If FÃ©nelon were alive, you would be a

Catholic." "Ah," said he, the tears in his eyes, "if FÃ©nelon

were alive, I would seek to be his lackey."

Presently we were introduced into the refectory; we seated

ourselves during the reading. The subject was the injustice

of the complainings of man: God has brought him from

nothing, he oweth him nothing. After the reading, Rousseau

said to me in a voice of deep emotion: "Ah, how happy is the

man who can believe...." We walked about for some time in

the cloister and the gardens. They command an immense

prospect. Paris in the distance reared her towers all

covered with light, and made a crown to the far-spreading

landscape. The brightness of the view contrasted with the

great leaden clouds that rolled after one another from the

west, and seemed to fill the valley.... In the afternoon

rain came on, as we approached the Porte Maillot. We took

shelter along with a crowd of other holiday folk under some

chestnut-trees whose leaves were coming out. One of the

waiters of a tavern perceiving Jean Jacques, rushed to him

full of joy, exclaiming, "What, is it you, \_mon bonhomme\_?

Why, it is a whole age since we have seen you." Rousseau

replied cheerfully, "'Tis because my wife has been ill, and

I myself have been out of sorts." "\_Mon pauvre bonhomme\_,"

replied the lad, "you must not stop here; come in, come in,

and I will find room for you." He hurried us along to a room

upstairs, where in spite of the crowd he procured for us

chairs and a table, and bread and wine. I said to Jean

Jacques, "He seems very familiar with you." He answered,

"Yes, we have known one another some years. We used to come

here in fine weather, my wife and I, to eat a cutlet of an

evening."[394]

Things did not continue to go thus smoothly. One day St. Pierre went

to see him, and was received without a word, and with stiff and gloomy

mien. He tried to talk, but only got monosyllables; he took up a book,

and this drew a sarcasm which sent him forth from the room. For more

than two months they did not meet. At length they had an accidental

encounter at a street corner. Rousseau accosted St. Pierre, and with a

gradually warming sensibility proceeded thus: "There are days when I

want to be alone and crave privacy. I come back from my solitary

expeditions so calm and contented. There I have not been wanting to

anybody, nor has anybody been wanting to me," and so on.[395] He

expressed this humour more pointedly on some other occasion, when he

said that there were times in which he fled from the eyes of men as

from Parthian arrows. As one said who knew from experience, the fate

of his most intimate friend depended on a word or a gesture.[396]

Another of them declared that he knew Rousseau's style of discarding a

friend by letter so thoroughly, that he felt confident he could supply

Rousseau's place in case of illness or absence.[397] In much of this

we suspect that the quarrel was perfectly justified. Sociality meant a

futile display before unworthy and condescending curiosity. "It is not

I whom they care for," he very truly said, "but public opinion and

talk about me, without a thought of what real worth I may have." Hence

his steadfast refusal to go out to dine or sup. The mere impertinence

of the desire to see him was illustrated by some coxcombs who insisted

with a famous actress of his acquaintance, that she should invite the

strange philosopher to meet them. She was aware that no known force

would persuade Rousseau to come, so she dressed up her tailor as

philosopher, bade him keep a silent tongue, and vanish suddenly

without a word of farewell. The tailor was long philosophically

silent, and by the time that wine had loosened his tongue, the rest of

the company were too far gone to perceive that the supposed Rousseau

was chattering vulgar nonsense.[398] We can believe that with admirers

of this stamp Rousseau was well pleased to let tailors or others stand

in his place. There were some, however, of a different sort, who

flitted across his sight and then either vanished of their own accord,

or were silently dismissed, from Madame de Genlis up to GrÃ©try and

Gluck. With Gluck he seems to have quarrelled for setting his music to

French words, when he must have known that Italian was the only tongue

fit for music.[399] Yet it was remarked that no one ever heard him

speak ill of others. His enemies, the figures of his delusion, were

vaguely denounced in many dronings, but they remained in dark shadow

and were unnamed. When Voltaire paid his famous last visit to the

capital (1778), some one thought of paying court to Rousseau by making

a mock of the triumphal reception of the old warrior, but Rousseau

harshly checked the detractor. It is true that in 1770-71 he gave to

some few of his acquaintances one or more readings of the Confessions,

although they contained much painful matter for many people still

living, among the rest for Madame d'Epinay. She wrote justifiably

enough to the lieutenant of police, praying that all such readings

might be prohibited, and it is believed that they were so

prohibited.[400]

In 1769, when Polish anarchy was at its height, as if to show at once

how profound the anarchy was, and how profound the faith among many

minds in the power of the new French theories, an application was made

to Mably to draw up a scheme for the renovation of distracted Poland.

Mably's notions won little esteem from the persons who had sought for

them, and in 1771 a similar application was made to Rousseau in his

Parisian garret. He replied in the Considerations on the Government of

Poland, which are written with a good deal of vigour of expression,

but contain nothing that needs further discussion. He hinted to the

Poles with some shrewdness that a curtailment of their territory by

their neighbours was not far off,[401] and the prediction was rapidly

fulfilled by the first partition of Poland in the following year.

He was asked one day of what nation he had the highest opinion. He

answered, the Spanish. The Spanish nation, he said, has a character;

if it is not rich, it still preserves all its pride and self-respect

in the midst of its poverty; and it is animated by a single spirit,

for it has not been scourged by the conflicting opinions of

philosophy.[402]

He was extremely poor for these last eight years of his life. He seems

to have drawn the pension which George III. had settled on him, for

not more than one year. We do not know why he refused to receive it

afterwards. A well-meaning friend, when the arrears amounted to

between six and seven thousand francs, applied for it on his behalf,

and a draft for the money was sent. Rousseau gave the offender a

vigorous rebuke for meddling in affairs that did not concern him, and

the draft was destroyed. Other attempts to induce him to draw this

money failed equally.[403] Yet he had only about fifty pounds a year

to live on, together with the modest amount which he earned by copying

music.[404]

The sting of indigence began to make itself felt towards 1777. His

health became worse and he could not work. Theresa was waxing old, and

could no longer attend to the small cares of the household. More than

one person offered them shelter and provision, and the old

distractions as to a home in which to end his days began once again.

At length M. Girardin prevailed upon him to come and live at

Ermenonville, one of his estates some twenty miles from Paris. A dense

cloud of obscure misery hangs over the last months of this forlorn

existence.[405] No tragedy had ever a fifth act so squalid. Theresa's

character seems to have developed into something truly bestial.

Rousseau's terrors of the designs of his enemies returned with great

violence. He thought he was imprisoned, and he knew that he had no

means of escape. One day (July 2, 1778), suddenly and without a single

warning symptom, all drew to an end; the sensations which had been the

ruling part of his life were affected by pleasure and pain no more,

the dusky phantoms all vanished into space. The surgeons reported that

the cause of his death was apoplexy, but a suspicion has haunted the

world ever since, that he destroyed himself by a pistol-shot. We

cannot tell. There is no inherent improbability in the fact of his

having committed suicide. In the New HeloÃ¯sa he had thrown the

conditions which justified self-destruction into a distinct formula.

Fifteen years before, he declared that his own case fell within the

conditions which he had prescribed, and that he was meditating

action.[406] Only seven years before, he had implied that a man had

the right to deliver himself of the burden of his own life, if its

miseries were intolerable and irremediable.[407] This, however, counts

for nothing in the absence of some kind of positive evidence, and of

that there is just enough to leave the manner of his end a little

doubtful.[408] Once more, we cannot tell.

By the serene moonrise of a summer night, his body was put under the

ground on an island in the midst of a small lake, where poplars throw

shadows over the still water, silently figuring the destiny of

mortals. Here it remained for sixteen years. Then amid the roar of

cannon, the crash of trumpet and drum, and the wild acclamations of a

populace gone mad in exultation, terror, fury, it was ordered that the

poor dust should be transported to the national temple of great men.
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Rousseau invited to legislate for, ii. 99-102;

bought by France, ii. 102.

Cowper, i. 20;

ii. 41;

on Rousseau, ii. 41 \_n.\_;

lines in the Task, ii. 253;

his delusions, ii. 301.

Cynicism, Rousseau's assumption of, i. 206.

D'AIGUILLON, ii. 72.

D'Alembert, i. 89;

Voltaire's staunchest henchman, i. 321;

his article on Geneva, i. 321;

on Stage Plays, i. 326, \_n.\_;

on Position of Women in Society, i. 335;

on Rousseau's letter on the Theatre, i. 336;

suspected by Rousseau of having written the pretended letter from

Frederick of Prussia, ii. 288;

advises Hume to publish account of Rousseau's quarrel with him,

ii. 294.

D'Argenson, ii. 180.

Dates of Rousseau's letters to be relied on, not those of the

Confessions, i. 93.

Davenport, Mr., provides Rousseau with a home at Wootton, ii. 286;

his kindness to Rousseau, ii. 306.

Deism, Rousseau's, ii. 260-275;

that of others, ii. 262-265;

shortcomings of Rousseau's, ii. 270.

Democracy defined, ii. 168;

rejected by Rousseau, as too perfect for men, ii. 171.

D'Epinay, Madame, i. 194, 195, 205;

gives the Hermitage to Rousseau, i. 229, \_n.\_;

his quarrels with, i. 271;

his relations with, i. 273, 276;

journey to Geneva of, i. 284;

squabbles arising out of, between, and Rousseau, Diderot, and

Grimm, i. 285-290;

mentioned, ii. 7, 26, 197;

wrote on education, ii. 199;

applies to secretary of police to prohibit Rousseau's readings

from his Confessions, ii. 324.

D'Epinay, Monsieur, i. 254; ii. 26.

Descartes, i. 87, 225; ii. 267.

Deux Ponts, Duc de, Rousseau's rude reply to, i. 207.

D'Holbach, i. 192;

Rousseau's dislike of his materialistic friends, i. 223;

ii. 37, 256.

D'Houdetot, Madame, i. 255-270;

Madame d'Epinay's jealousy of, i. 278;

mentioned, ii. 7;

offers Rousseau a home in Normandy, ii. 117.

Diderot, i. 64, 89, 133;

tries to manage Rousseau, i. 213;

his domestic misconduct, i. 215;

leader of the materialistic party, i. 223;

on Solitary Life, i. 232;

his active life, i. 233;

without moral sensitiveness, i. 262;

mentioned, i. 262, 269, 271;

ii. 8;

his relations with Rousseau, i. 271;

accused of pilfering Goldoni's new play, i. 275;

his relations and contentions with Rousseau, i. 275, 276;

lectures Rousseau about Madame d'Epinay, i. 284;

visits Rousseau after his leaving the Hermitage, i. 289;

Rousseau's final breach with, i. 336;

his criticism, and plays, ii. 34;

his defects, ii. 34;

thrown into prison, ii. 57;

his difficulties with the EncyclopÃ¦dists, ii. 57;

his papers saved from the police by Malesherbes, ii. 62.

Dijon, academy of, i. 132.

Discourses, The, Circumstances of the composition of the first

Discourse, i. 133-136;

summary of it, i. 138-145

disastrous effect of the progress of sciences and arts, i.

140, 141;

error more dangerous than truth useful, i. 141;

uselessness of learning and art, i. 141, 142;

terrible disorders caused in Europe by the art of printing, i.

143;

two kinds of ignorance, i. 144;

the relation of this Discourse to Montaigne, i. 145;

its one-sidedness and hollowness, i. 148;

shown by Voltaire, i. 148;

its positive side, i. 149, 150;

second Discourse, origin of the Inequality of Man, i. 154;

summary of it, i. 159, 170;

state of nature, i. 150, 162;

Hobbes's mistake, i. 161;

what broke up the "state of nature," i. 164;

its preferableness, i. 166, 167;

origin of society and laws, i. 168;

"new state of nature," i. 169;

main position of the Discourse, i. 169;

its utter inclusiveness, i. 170;

criticism on its method, i. 170;

on its matter, i. 172;

wanting in evidence, i. 172;

further objections to it, i. 173;

assumes uniformity of process, i. 176;

its unscientific character, i. 177;

its real importance, i. 178;

its protest against the mockery of civilisation, i. 178;

equality of man, i. 181;

different effects of this doctrine in France and the United States

explained, i. 182, 183;

discovers a reaction against the historical method of Montesquieu,

i. 183, 184;

pecuniary results of, i. 196;

Diderot's praise of first Discourse, i. 200;

Voltaire's acknowledgement of gift of second Discourse, i. 308;

the, an attack on the general ordering of society, ii. 22;

referred to, ii. 41.

Drama, its proper effect, i. 326;

what would be that of its introduction into Geneva, i. 327;

true answer to Rousseau's contentions, i. 329.

Dramatic morality, i. 326.

Drinkers, Rousseau's estimate of, i. 330.

Drunkenness, how esteemed in Switzerland and Naples, i. 331.

Duclos, i. 206;

ii. 62.

Duni, i. 292.

Dupin, Madame de, Rousseau secretary to, i. 120;

her position in society, i. 195;

Rousseau's country life with, i. 196;

friend of the AbbÃ© de Saint Pierre, i. 244.

EDUCATION, interest taken in, in France in Rousseau's time, ii. 193,

194;

its new direction ii. 195;

Locke, the pioneer of, ii. 202, 203;

Rousseau's special merit in connection with, ii. 203;

his views on (see Emilius, \_passim\_, as well as for general

consideration of) what it is, ii. 219;

plans of, of Locke and others, designed for the higher class, ii.

254;

Rousseau's for all, ii. 254.

\_Emile\_, i. 136, 196.

Emilius, character of, ii. 2, 3;

particulars of the publication of, ii. 59, 60;

effect of, on Rousseau's fortunes, ii. 62-64;

ordered to be burnt by public executioner at Paris, ii. 65;

at Geneva, ii. 72;

condemned by the Sorbonne, ii. 82;

supplied (as also did the Social Contract) dialect for the longing

in France and Germany to return to nature, ii. 193;

substance of, furnished by Locke, ii. 202;

examination of, ii. 197-280;

mischief produced by its good advice, ii. 206, 207;

training of young children, ii. 207, 208;

constantly reasoning with them a mistake of Locke's, ii. 209;

Rousseau's central idea, disparagement of the reasoning faculty,

ii. 209, 210;

theories of education, practice better than precept, ii. 211;

the idea of property, the first that Rousseau would have given to

a child, ii. 212;

modes of teaching, ii. 214, 215;

futility of such methods, ii. 215, 216;

where Rousseau is right, and where wrong, ii. 219, 220;

effect of his own want of parental love, ii. 220;

teaches that everybody should learn a trade, ii. 223;

no special foresight, ii. 224, 225;

supremacy of the common people insisted upon, ii. 226, 227;

three dominant states of mind to be established by the instructor,

ii. 229, 230;

Rousseau's incomplete notion of justice, ii. 231;

ideal of Emilius, ii. 232, 233;

forbids early teaching of history, ii. 237, 238;

disparages modern history, ii. 239;

criticism on the old historians, ii. 240;

education of women, ii. 241;

Rousseau's failure here, ii. 242, 243;

inconsistent with himself, ii. 244, 245;

worthlessness of his views, ii. 249;

real merits of the work, ii. 249;

its effect in Germany, ii. 251, 252;

not much effect on education in England, ii. 252;

Emilius the first expression of democratic teaching in education,

ii. 254;

Rousseau's deism, ii. 258, 260, 264-267, 269, 270, 276;

its inadequacy for the wants of men, ii. 267-270;

his position towards Christianity, ii. 270-276;

real satisfaction of the religious emotions, ii. 275-280.

EncyclopÃ¦dia, The, D'Alembert's article on Geneva in, i. 321.

EncyclopÃ¦dists, the society of, confirms Rousseau's religious

faith, i. 221;

referred to, ii. 257.

Evil, discussions on Rousseau's, Voltaire's, and De Maistre's

teachings concerning, i. 313, \_n.\_, 318;

different effect of existence of, on Rousseau and Voltaire, i. 319.

FÃNELON, ii. 37, 248;

Rousseau's veneration for, ii. 321.

Ferguson, Adam, ii. 253.

Filmer contends that a man is not naturally free, ii. 126.

Foundling Hospital, Rousseau sends his children to the, i. 120.

France, debt of, to Rousseau, i. 3;

Rousseau the one great religious writer of, in the eighteenth

century, i. 26;

his wanderings in the east of, i. 61;

his fondness for, i. 62-72;

establishment of local academies in, i. 132;

decay in, of Greek literary studies, i. 146;

effects in, of doctrine of equality of man, i. 182;

effects in, of Montesquieu's "Spirit of Laws," i. 183;

amiability of, in the eighteenth century, i. 187;

effect of Rousseau's writings in, i. 187;

collective organisation in, i. 222;

St. Pierre's strictures on government of, i. 244;

Rousseau on government of, i. 246;

effect of Rousseau's spiritual element on, i. 306;

patriotism wanting in, i. 332;

difficulties of authorship in, ii. 55-64;

buys Corsica from the Genoese, ii. 102;

state of, after 1792, apparently favourable to the carrying out of

Rousseau's political views, ii. 131, 132;

in 1793, ii. 135;

haunted by narrow and fervid minds, ii. 142.

Francueil, Rousseau's patron, i. 99;

grandfather of Madame George Sand, i. 99, \_n.\_;

Rousseau's salary from, i. 120;

country-house of, i. 196.

Franklin, Benjamin, ii. 42.

Frederick of Prussia, relations between, and Rousseau, ii. 73-78;

"famous bull" of, ii. 90.

Freeman on Growth of English Constitution, ii. 164.

French, principles of, revolution, i. 1, 2, 3;

process and ideas of, i. 4;

Rousseau of old, stock, i. 8;

poetry, Rousseau on, i. 90, \_ib. n.\_;

melody, i. 105;

academy, thesis for prize, i. 150, \_n.\_;

philosophers, i. 202,

music, i. 291;

music, its pretensions demolished by Rousseau, i. 294;

ecclesiastics opposed to the theatre, ii. 322;

stage, Rousseau on, i. 325;

morals, depravity of, ii. 26, 27;

Barbier on, ii. 26;

thought, benefit, or otherwise of revolution on, ii. 54;

history, evil side of, in Rousseau's time, ii. 56;

indebted to Holland for freedom of the press, ii. 59;

catholic and monarchic absolutism sunk deep into the character of

the, ii. 167.

French Convention, story of member of the, ii. 134, \_n.\_

GALUPPI, effect of his music, i. 105.

Geneva, i. 8;

characteristics of its people, i. 9;

Rousseau's visit to, i. 93;

influence of, on Rousseau, i. 94;

he revisits it in 1754, i. 186-190, 218;

turns Protestant again there, i. 220;

religious opinion in, i. 223 (also i. 224, \_n.\_);

Rousseau thinks of taking up his abode in, i. 228;

Voltaire at, i. 308;

D'Alembert's article on, in EncyclopÃ¦dia, i. 321;

Rousseau's notions of effect of

introducing the drama at, i. 327;

council of, order public burning of Emilius and the Social

Contract, and arrest of the author if he came there, ii. 72;

the only place where the Social Contract was actually burnt, ii. 73,

\_n.\_;

Voltaire suspected to have had a hand in the matter, ii. 81;

council of, divided into two camps by Rousseau's condemnation, in

1762, ii. 102;

Rousseau renounces his citizenship in, ii. 104;

working of the republic, ii. 104.

Genevese, Bishop Burnet on, i. 225;

Rousseau's distrust of, i. 228;

his panegyric on, i. 328;

manners of, according to Rousseau, i. 330;

their complaint of it, i. 331.

Genlis, Madame de, ii. 323.

Genoa, Rousseau in quarantine at, i. 103;

Corsica sold to France by, ii. 102.

Germany, sentimental movements in, ii. 33.

Gibbon, Edward, at Lausanne, ii. 96.

Girardin, St. Marc, on Rousseau, i. 111, \_n.\_;

on Rousseau's discussions, ii. 11, \_n.\_;

offers Rousseau a home, ii. 326.

Gluck, i. 291, 296;

Rousseau quarrels with, for setting his music to French words, ii.

323.

Goethe, i. 20.

Goguet on Society, ii. 127, \_n.\_;

on tacit conventions, ii. 148, \_n.\_;

on law, ii. 153, \_n.\_

Goldoni, Diderot accused of pilfering his new play, i. 275.

Gothic architecture denounced by Voltaire and Turgot, i. 294.

Gouvon, Count, Rousseau servant to, i. 42.

Government, disquisitions on, ii. 131-206;

remarks on, ii. 131-141;

early democratic ideas of, ii. 144-148;

Hobbes' philosophy of, ii. 151;

Rousseau's science of, ii. 155, 156;

De la RiviÃ¨re's science of, ii. 156, \_n.\_;

federation recommended by Rousseau to the Poles, ii. 166;

three forms of government defined, ii. 169;

definition inadequate, ii. 169;

Montesquieu's definition, ii. 169;

Rousseau's distinction between \_tyrant\_ and \_despot\_, ii.

169, \_n.\_;

his objection to democracy, ii. 172;

to monarchy, ii. 173;

consideration of aristocracy, ii. 174;

his own scheme, ii. 175;

Hobbes's "Passive Obedience," ii. 181, 182;

social conscience theory, ii. 183-187;

government made impossible by Rousseau's doctrine of social

contract, ii. 188-192;

Burke on expediency in, ii. 192;

what a civilised nation is, ii. 194;

Jefferson on, ii. 227, 228, \_n.\_

Governments, earliest, how composed, i. 169.

Graffigny, Madame de, ii. 199.

Gratitude, Rousseau on, ii. 14, 15;

explanation of his want of, ii. 70.

Greece, importance of history of, i. 184, and \_ib.\_ \_n.\_

Greek ideas, influence of, in France in the eighteenth century, i.

146.

Grenoble, i. 93.

GrÃ©try, i. 292, 296; ii. 323.

Grimm,

description of Rousseau by, i. 206;

Rousseau's quarrels with, i. 279;

letter of, about Rousseau and Diderot, i. 275;

relations of, with Rousseau, i. 279;

some account of his life, i. 279;

his conversation with Madame d'Epinay, i. 281;

criticism on Rousseau, i. 281;

natural want of sympathy between the two, i. 282;

Rousseau's quarrel with, i. 285-290; ii. 65, 199.

Grotius, on Government, ii. 148.

HÃBERT, ii. 178;

prevents publication of a book in which the author professed his

belief in a god, ii. 179.

Helmholtz, i. 299.

HelvÃ©tius, i. 191; ii. 65, 199.

Herder, ii. 251;

Rousseau's influence on, ii. 315.

Hermitage, the, given to Rousseau by Madame d'Epinay, i. 229 (also

\_ib.\_ \_n.\_);

what his friends thought of it, i. 231;

sale of, after the Revolution, i. 237, \_n.\_;

reasons for Rousseau's leaving, i. 286.

Hildebrand, i. 4.

Hobbes, i. 143, 161;

his "Philosophy of Government," ii. 151;

singular influence of, upon Rousseau, ii. 151, 183;

essential difference between his views and those of Rousseau, ii.

159;

on Sovereignty, ii. 162;

Rousseau's definition of the three forms of government adopted

by, inadequate, ii. 168;

would reduce spiritual and temporal jurisdiction to one political

unity, ii. 183.

Holbachians, i. 337; ii. 2.

Hooker, on Civil Government, ii. 148.

HÃ´tel St. Quentin, Rousseau at, i. 106.

Hume, David, i. 64, 89;

his deep-set sagacity, i. 156, ii. 6, 75;

suspected of tampering with Boswell's letter, ii. 98, \_n.\_;

on Boswell, ii. 101, \_n.\_;

his eagerness to find Rousseau a refuge in England, ii. 282, 283;

his account of Rousseau, ii. 284;

finds him a home at Wootton, ii. 286;

Rousseau's quarrel with, ii. 286-291 (also ii. 290, \_n.\_);

his innocence of Walpole's letter, ii. 292;

his conduct in the quarrel, ii. 293;

saves Rousseau from arrest of French Government, ii. 295;

on Rousseau's sensitiveness, ii. 299.

IMAGINATION, Rousseau's, i. 247.

JACOBINS, the, Rousseau's Social Contract, their gospel, ii. 132,

133;

their mistake, ii. 136;

convenience to them of some of the maxims of the Social Contract,

ii. 142;

Jacobin supremacy and Hobbism, ii. 152;

how they might have saved France, ii. 167.

Jansen, his propositions, i. 81.

Jansenists, Rousseau's suspicions of, ii. 63;

mentioned, ii. 89.

Jean Paul, ii. 216, 252.

Jefferson, ii. 227, \_n.\_

Jesuits, Rousseau's suspicions of the, ii. 64;

the, and parliaments, ii. 65;

movement against, ii. 65;

suppression of the, leads to increased thought about education,

ii. 199.

Johnson, ii. 15, 98.

KAMES, Lord, ii. 253.

LAMENNAIS, influenced by Rousseau, ii. 228.

Language, origin of, i. 161.

Latour, Madame, ii. 19, \_ib. n.\_

Lavater favourable to education on Rousseau's plan, ii. 251 (also

\_ib.\_ \_n.\_)

Lavoisier, reply to his request for a fortnight's respite, ii. 227,

\_n.\_

Law, not a contract, ii. 153.

Lecouvreur, Adrienne, refused Christian burial on account of her

being an actress, i. 323.

Leibnitz, i. 87;

his optimism, i. 309;

on the constitution of the universe, i. 312.

Lessing, on Pope, i. 310, \_n.\_

"Letters from the Mountain," ii. 104;

burned, by command, at Paris and the Hague, ii. 105.

Liberty, English, Rousseau's notion of, ii. 163, \_n.\_

Life, Rousseau's condemnation of the contemplative, i. 10;

his idea of household, i. 41;

easier for him to preach than for others to practise, i. 43.

Lisbon, earthquake of, Voltaire on, i. 310;

Rousseau's letter to Voltaire on, i. 310, 311.

Locke, his Essay, i. 87;

his notions, i. 87;

his influence upon Rousseau, ii. 121-126;

on Marriage, ii. 126;

on Civil Government, ii. 149, 150, \_n.\_;

indefiniteness of his views, ii. 160;

the pioneer of French thought on education, ii. 202, 203;

Rousseau's indebtedness to, ii. 203;

his mistake in education, ii. 209;

subjects of his theories, ii. 254.

Lulli (music), i. 291.

Luther, i. 4.

Luxembourg, the Duke of, gives Rousseau a home, ii. 2-7, 9.

Luxembourg, the MarÃ©chale de, in vain seeks Rousseau's children,

i. 128;

helps to get Emilius published, ii. 63-64, 67.

Lycurgus, ii. 129, 131;

influence of, upon Saint Just, ii. 133.

Lyons, Rousseau a tutor at, i. 95-97.

MABLY, De, i. 95;

his socialism, i. 184;

applied to for scheme for the government of Poland, ii. 324.

Maistre, De, i. 145;

on Optimism, i. 314.

Maitre, Le, teaches Rousseau music, i. 58.

Malebranche, i. 87.

Malesherbes, Rousseau confesses his ungrateful nature to, ii. 14;

his dishonest advice to Rousseau, ii. 60;

helps Diderot, ii. 62;

and Rousseau in the publishing of Emilius, ii. 62, 63;

endangered by it, ii. 67;

asks Rousseau to collect plants for him, ii. 76.

Man, his specific distinction from other animals, i. 161;

his state of nature, i. 161;

Hobbes wrong concerning this, i. 161;

equality of, i. 180;

effects of this doctrine in France and in the United States, i.

182;

not naturally free, ii. 126.

Mandeville, i. 162.

Manners, Rousseau's, Marmontel, and Grimm on, i. 205, 206;

Rousseau on Swiss, i. 329, 330;

depravity of French, in the eighteenth century, ii. 25, 26.

Marischal, Lord, friendship between, and Rousseau, ii. 79-81;

account of, ii. 80;

on Boswell, ii. 98

Marmontel, on Rousseau's manners, i. 206;

on his success, ii. 2.

Marriage, design of the New HeloÃ¯sa to exalt, ii. 46-48, \_ib.\_

\_n.\_

Marsilio, of Padua, on Law, ii. 145.

Men, inequality of, Rousseau's second Discourse (see Discourses),

dedicated to the republic of Geneva, i. 190;

how received there, i. 228.

Mirabeau the elder, Rousseau's letter to, from Wootton, ii. 305, 306;

his character, ii. 309-312;

receives Rousseau at Fleury, ii. 311.

Mirabeau, Gabriel, Rousseau's influence on, ii. 315.

MoliÃ¨re (Misanthrope of), Rousseau's criticism on, i. 329;

D'Alembert on, i. 329.

Monarchy, Rousseau's objection to, ii. 171.

Montaigu, Count de, avarice of, i. 101, 102.

Montaigne, Rousseau's obligations to, i. 145;

influence of, on Rousseau, ii. 203.

Montesquieu, "incomplete positivity" of, i. 156;

on Government, i. 157;

effect of his Spirit of Laws on Rousseau, i. 183;

confused definition of laws, ii. 153;

balanced parliamentary system of, ii. 163;

his definition of forms of government, ii. 169.

Montmorency, Rousseau goes to live there, i. 229;

his life at, ii. 2-9.

Montpellier, i. 92.

Morals, state of, in France in the eighteenth century, ii. 26.

Morellet, thrown into the Bastile, ii. 57.

Morelly, his indirect influence on Rousseau, i. 156;

his socialistic theory, i. 157, 158;

his rules for organising a model community, i. 158, \_n.\_;

his terse exposition of inequality contrasted with that of Rousseau,

i. 170;

on primitive human nature, i. 175;

his socialism, ii. 52;

influence of his "model community" upon St. Just, ii. 133,

\_n.\_;

advice to mothers, ii. 205.

Motiers, Rousseau's home there, ii. 77;

attends divine service at, ii. 91;

life at, ii. 91, 93.

Moultou (pastor of Motiers), his enthusiasm for Rousseau, ii. 82.

Music, Rousseau undertakes to teach, i. 60;

Rousseau's opinion concerning Italian, i. 105;

effect of Galuppi's, i. 105;

Rousseau earns his living by copying, i. 196; ii. 315;

Rameau's criticism on Rousseau's \_Muses Galantes\_, i. 211;

French, i. 291;

Rousseau's letter on, i. 292;

Italian, denounced at Paris, i. 292;

Rousseau utterly condemns French, i. 294;

quarrels with Gluck for setting his, to French words, ii. 323.

Musical notation, Rousseau's, i. 291;

his Musical Dictionary, i. 296;

his notation explained, i. 296-301;

his system inapplicable to instruments, i. 301.

NAPLES, drunkenness, how regarded in, i. 331.

\_Narcisse\_, Rousseau's condemnation of his own comedy of, i.

215.

Nature, Rousseau's love of, i. 234-241; ii. 39;

state of, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Hume on, i. 156-158;

Rousseau's, in Second Discourse, i. 171-180;

his starting-point of right, and normal constitution of civil

society, ii. 124. See State of Nature.

Necker, ii. 54, 98, \_n.\_

NeuchÃ¢tel, flight to principality of, by Rousseau, ii. 73;

history of, ii. 73, \_n.\_;

outbreak at, arising from religious controversy, ii. 90;

preparations for driving Rousseau out of, defeated by Frederick of

Prussia, ii. 90;

clergy of, against Rousseau, ii. 106.

New HeloÃ¯sa, first conception of, i. 250;

monument of Rousseau's fall, ii. 1;

when completed and published, ii. 2;

read aloud to the Duchess de Luxembourg, ii. 3;

letter on suicide in, ii. 16;

effects upon Parisian ladies of reading the, ii. 18, 19;

criticism on, ii. 20-55;

his scheme proposed in it, ii. 21;

its story, ii. 24;

its purity, contrasted with contemporary and later French

romances, ii. 24;

its general effect, ii. 27;

Rousseau absolutely without humour, ii. 27;

utter selfishness of hero of, ii. 30;

its heroine, ii. 30;

its popularity, ii. 231, 232;

burlesque on it, ii. 31, \_n.\_;

its vital defect, ii. 35;

difference between Rousseau, Byron, and others, ii. 42;

sumptuary details of the story, ii. 44, 45;

its democratic tendency, ii. 49, 50;

the bearing of its teaching, ii. 54;

hindrances to its circulation in France, ii. 57;

Malesherbes's low morality as to publishing, ii. 61.

OPTIMISM of Pope and Leibnitz, i. 309-310;

discussed, ii. 128-130.

Origin of inequality among men, i. 156. See also Discourses.

PALEY, ii. 191, \_n.\_

Palissot, ii. 56.

Paris, Rousseau's first visit to, i. 61;

his second, i. 63, 97, 102;

third visit, i. 106;

effect in, of his first Discourse, i. 139, \_n.\_;

opinions in, on religion, laws, etc., i. 185;

"mimic philosophy" there, i. 193;

society in, in Rousseau's time, i. 202-211;

his view of it, i. 210;

composes there his \_Muses Galantes\_, i. 211;

returns to, from Geneva, i. 228;

his belief of the unfitness of its people for political affairs,

i. 246;

goes to, in 1741, with his scheme of musical notation, i. 291;

effect there of his letter on music, i. 295;

Rousseau's imaginary contrast between, and Geneva, i. 329;

Emilius ordered to be publicly burnt in, ii. 65;

parliament of, orders "Letters from the Mountain" to be burnt,

ii. 295;

also Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary, ii. 295;

Danton's scheme for municipal administration of, ii. 168,

\_n.\_;

two parties (those of Voltaire and of Rousseau) in, in 1793, ii.

178;

excitement in, at Rousseau's appearance in 1765, ii. 283;

he goes to live there in 1770, ii. 314;

Voltaire's last visit to, ii. 323, 324.

PÃ¢ris, AbbÃ©, miracles at his tomb, ii. 88.

Parisian frivolity, i. 193, 220, 329.

Parliament and Jesuits, ii. 64.

Pascal, ii. 37.

Passy, Rousseau composes the "Village Soothsayer" at, i. 212.

Paul, St., effect of, on western society, i. 4.

Peasantry, French, oppression of, i. 67, 68.

Pedigree of Rousseau, i. 8, \_n.\_

Pelagius, ii. 272.

Peoples, sovereignty of, Rousseau not the inventor of doctrine of,

ii. 144-148;

taught by Althusen, i. 147;

constitution of Helvetic Republic in 1798, a blow at, ii. 165.

Pergolese, i. 292.

Pestalozzi indebted to Emilius, ii. 252.

Philidor, i. 292.

Philosophers, of Rousseau's time, contradicting each other, i. 87;

Rousseau's complaint of the, i. 202;

war between the, and the priests, i. 322;

Rousseau's reactionary protest against, i. 328;

troubles of, ii. 59;

parliaments hostile to, ii. 64.

Philosophy, Rousseau's disgust at mimic, at Paris, i. 193;

drew him to the essential in religion, i. 220;

Voltaire's no perfect, i. 318.

Phlipon, Jean Marie, Rousseau's influence on, ii. 315.

Plato, his republic, i. 122;

his influence on Rousseau, i. 146, 325, \_n.\_;

Milton on his Laws, ii. 178.

Plays (stage), Rousseau's letter on, to D'Alembert, i. 321;

his views of, i. 323;

Jeremy Collier and Bossuet on, i. 323;

in Geneva, i. 333, 334, \_n.\_;

Rousseau, Voltaire, and D'Alembert on, i. 332-337.

Plutarch, Rousseau's love for, i. 13.

Plutocracy, new, faults of, i. 195.

Pompadour, Madame de, and the Jesuits, ii. 64.

Pontverre (priest) converts Rousseau to Romanism, i. 31-35.

Pope, his Essay on Man translated by Voltaire, i. 309;

Berlin Academy and Lessing on it, i. 310, \_n.\_;

criticism on it by Rousseau, i. 312;

its general position reproduced by Rousseau, i. 315.

PopeliniÃ¨re, M. de, i. 211.

Positive knowledge, i. 78.

Press, freedom of the, ii. 59.

PrÃ©vost, AbbÃ©, i. 48.

\_Projet pour l'Education\_, i. 96, \_n.\_

Property, private, evils ascribed to i. 157, 185;

Robespierre disclaimed the intention of attacking, i. 123,

\_n.\_

Protestant principles, effect of development of, ii. 146-147.

Protestantism, his conversion to, i. 220;

its influence on Rousseau, i. 221.

RAMEAU on Rousseau's \_Muses Galantes\_, i. 119, 211;

mentioned, i. 291.

Rationalism, i. 224, 225;

influence of Descartes on, i. 225.

Reason, De Saint Pierre's views of, i. 244.

Reform, essential priority of social over political, ii. 43.

Religion, simplification of, i. 3;

ideas of, in Paris, i. 186, 187, 207, 208;

Rousseau's view of, i. 220;

doctrines of, in Geneva, i. 223-227, also \_n.\_;

curious project concerning it, by Rousseau, i. 317;

separation of spiritual and temporal powers deemed mischievous by

Rousseau, ii. 173;

in its relation to the state may be considered as of three kinds,

ii. 175;

duty of the sovereign to establish a civil confession of faith,

ii. 176, 177;

positive dogmas of this, ii. 176;

Rousseau's "pure Hobbism," ii. 177.

See Savoyard Vicar (Emilius), ii. 256, 281.

Renou, Rousseau assumes name of, i. 129; ii. 312.

Revelation, Christian, Rousseau's controversy on, with Archbishop of

Paris, ii. 86-91.

\_RÃªveries\_, Rousseau's relinquishing society, i. 199;

description of his life in the isle of St. Peter, in the, ii.

109-115;

their style ii. 314.

Revolution, French, principles of, i. 1, 2;

benefits of, or otherwise, ii. 54;

Baboeuf on, ii. 123, 124, \_n.\_;

the starting point in the history of its ideas, ii. 160.

Revolutionary process and ideal i. 4, 5.

Revolutionists, difference among, i. 2.

Richardson (the novelist), ii. 25, 28.

Richelieu's brief patronage of Rousseau, i. 195, 302.

RiviÃ¨re, de la, origin of society, ii. 156, 157;

anecdote of, ii. 156, 157, \_n.\_

Robecq, Madame de, ii. 56.

Robespierre, ii. 123, 134, 160, 178, 179;

his "sacred right of insurrection," ii. 188, \_n.\_;

Rousseau's influence on, ii. 315.

Rousseau, Didier, i. 8.

Rousseau, Jean Baptiste, i. 61, \_n.\_

Rousseau, Jean Jacques, influence of his writings on France and the

American colonists, i. 1, 2;

on Robespierre, Paine, and Chateaubriand, i. 3;

his place as a leader, i. 3;

starting-point, of his mental habits, i. 4;

personality of, i. 4;

influence on the common people, i. 5;

his birth and ancestry, i. 8;

pedigree, i. 8, \_n.\_;

parents, i. 10, 11;

influence upon him of his father's character, i. 11, 12;

his reading in childhood, i. 12, 13;

love of Plutarch, i. 13;

early years, i. 13, 14;

sent to school at Bossey, i. 15;

deterioration of his moral character there, i. 17;

indignation at an unjust punishment, i. 17, 18;

leaves school, i. 20;

youthful life at Geneva, i. 21, 22;

his remarks on its character, i. 24;

anecdotes of it, i. 22, 24;

his leading error as to the education of the young, i. 25, 26;

religious training, i. 25;

apprenticeship, i. 26;

boyish doings, i. 27;

harshness of his master, i. 27;

runs away, i. 29;

received by the priest of Confignon, i. 31;

sent to Madame de Warens, i. 84;

at Turin, i. 35;

hypocritical conversion to Roman Catholicism, i. 37;

motive, i. 38;

registry of his baptism, i. 38, \_n.\_;

his forlorn condition, i. 39;

love of music, i. 39;

becomes servant to Madame de Vercellis, i. 39;

his theft, lying, and excuses for it, i. 39, 40;

becomes servant to Count of Gouvon, i. 42;

dismissed, i. 43;

returns to Madame de Warens, i. 45;

his temperament, i. 46, 47;

in training for the priesthood, but pronounced too stupid, i. 57;

tries music, i. 57;

shamelessly abandons his companion, i. 58;

goes to Freiburg, NeuchÃ¢tel, and Paris, i. 61, 62;

conjectural chronology of his movements about this time. i. 62,

\_n.\_;

love of vagabond life, i. 62-68;

effect upon him of his intercourse with the poor, i. 68;

becomes clerk to a land surveyor at ChambÃ©ri, i. 69;

life there, i. 69-72;

ill-health and retirement to Les Charmettes, i. 73;

his latest recollection of this time, i. 75-77;

his "form of worship," i. 77;

love of nature, i. 77, 78;

notion of deity, i. 77;

peculiar intellectual feebleness, i. 81;

criticism on himself, i. 83;

want of logic in his mental constitution, i. 85;

effect on him of Voltaire's Letters on the English, i. 85;

self-training, i. 86;

mistaken method of it, i. 86, 87;

writes a comedy, i. 89;

enjoyment of rural life at Les Charmettes, i. 91, 92;

robs Madame de Warens, i. 92;

leaves her, i. 93;

discrepancy between dates of his letters and the Confessions, i.

93;

takes a tutorship at Lyons, i. 95;

condemns the practice of writing Latin, i. 96, \_n.\_;

resigns his tutorship, and goes to Paris, i. 97;

reception there, i. 98-100;

appointed secretary to French Ambassador at Venice, i. 100-106;

in quarantine at Genoa, i. 104;

his estimate of French melody, i. 105;

returns to Paris, i. 106;

becomes acquainted with Theresa Le Vasseur, i. 106;

his conduct criticised, i. 107-113;

simple life, i. 113;

letter to her, i. 115-119;

his poverty, i. 119;

becomes secretary to Madame Dupin and her son-in-law, M. de

Francueil, i. 119;

sends his children to the foundling hospital, i. 120, 121;

paltry excuses for the crime, i. 121-126;

his pretended marriage under the name of Renou, i. 129;

his Discourses, i. 132-186 (see Discourses);

writes essays for academy of Dijon, i. 132;

origin of first essay, i. 133-137;

his "visions" for thirteen years, i. 138;

evil effect upon himself of the first Discourse, i. 138;

of it, the second Discourse and the Social Contract upon Europe,

i. 138;

his own opinion of it, i. 138, 139;

influence of Plato upon him, i. 146;

second Discourse, i. 154;

his "State of Nature," i. 159;

no evidence for it, i. 172;

influence of Montesquieu on him, i. 183;

inconsistency of his views, i. 124;

influence of Geneva upon him, i. 187, 188;

his disgust at Parisian philosophers, i. 191, 192;

the two sides of his character, i. 193;

associates in Paris, i. 193;

his income, i. 196, 197, \_n.\_;

post of cashier, i. 196;

throws it up, i. 197, 198;

determines to earn his living by copying music, i. 198, 199;

change of manners, i. 201;

dislike of the manners of his time, i. 202, 203;

assumption of a seeming cynicism, i. 206;

Grimm's rebuke of it, i. 206;

Rousseau's protest against atheism, i. 208, 209;

composes a musical interlude, the Village Soothsayer, i. 212;

his nervousness loses him the chance of a pension, i. 213;

his moral simplicity, i. 214, 215;

revisits Geneva, i. 216;

re-conversion to Protestantism, i. 220;

his friends at Geneva, i. 227;

their effect upon him, i. 227;

returns to Paris, i. 227;

the Hermitage offered him by Madame d'Epinay, i. 229, 230 (and

\_ib. n.\_);

retires to it against the protests of his friends, i. 231;

his love of nature, i. 234, 235, 236;

first days at the Hermitage, i. 237;

rural delirium, i. 237;

dislike of society, i. 242;

literary scheme, i. 242, 243;

remarks on Saint Pierre, i. 246;

violent mental crisis, i. 247;

employs his illness in writing to Voltaire on Providence, i. 250,

251;

his intolerance of vice in others, i. 254;

acquaintance with Madame de Houdetot, i. 255-269;

source of his irritability, i. 270, 271;

blind enthusiasm of his admirers, i. 273, also \_ib. n.\_;

quarrels with Diderot, i. 275;

Grimm's account of them, i. 276;

quarrels with Madame d'Epinay, i. 276, 288;

relations with Grimm, i. 279;

want of sympathy between the two, i. 279;

declines to accompany Madame d'Epinay to Geneva, i. 285;

quarrels with Grimm, i. 285;

leaves the Hermitage, i. 289, 290;

aims in music, i. 291;

letter on French music, i. 293, 294;

writes on music in the EncyclopÃ¦dia, i. 296;

his Musical Dictionary, i. 296;

scheme and principles of his new musical notation, i. 269;

explained, i. 298, 299;

its practical value, i. 299;

his mistake, i. 300;

minor objections, i. 300;

his temperament and Genevan spirit, i. 303;

compared with Voltaire, i. 304, 305;

had a more spiritual element than Voltaire, i. 306;

its influence in France, i. 307;

early relations with Voltaire, i. 308;

letter to him on his poem on the earthquake at Lisbon, i. 312,

313, 314;

reasons in a circle, i. 316;

continuation of argument against Voltaire, i. 316, 317;

curious notion about religion, i. 317;

quarrels with Voltaire, i. 318, 319;

denounces him as a "trumpet of impiety," i. 320, \_n.\_;

letter to D'Alembert on Stage Plays, i. 321;

true answer to his theory, i. 323, 324;

contrasts Paris and Geneva, i. 327, 328;

his patriotism, i. 329, 330, 331;

censure of love as a poetic theme, i. 334, 335;

on Social Position of Women, i. 335;

Voltaire and D'Alembert's criticism on his Letter on Stage Plays,

i. 336, 337;

final break with Diderot, i. 336;

antecedents of his highest creative efforts, ii. 1;

friends at Montmorency, ii. 2;

reads the New HeloÃ¯sa to the MarÃ©chale de Luxembourg, ii. 2;

unwillingness to receive gifts, ii. 5;

his relations with the Duke and Duchess de Luxembourg, ii. 7;

misunderstands the friendliness of Madame de Boufflers, ii. 7;

calm life at Montmorency, ii. 8;

literary jealousy, ii. 8;

last of his peaceful days, ii. 9;

advice to a young man against the contemplative life, ii. 10;

offensive form of his "good sense" concerning persecution of

Protestants, ii. 11, 12;

cause of his unwillingness to receive gifts, ii. 13, 14;

owns his ungrateful nature, ii. 15;

ill-humoured banter, ii. 15;

his constant bodily suffering, ii. 16;

thinks of suicide, ii. 16;

correspondence with the readers of the New HeloÃ¯sa, ii. 19, 20;

the New HeloÃ¯sa, criticism on, ii. 20-55 (see New HeloÃ¯sa);

his publishing difficulties, ii. 56;

no taste for martyrdom, ii. 59, 60;

curious discussion between, ii. 59;

and Malesherbes, ii. 60;

indebted to Malesherbes in the publication of Emilius, ii. 61, 62;

suspects Jesuits, Jansenists, and philosophers of plotting to

crush the book, ii. 63;

himself counted among the latter, ii. 65;

Emilius ordered to be burnt by public executioner, on the charge

of irreligious tendency, and its author to be arrested, ii. 65;

his flight, ii. 67;

literary composition on the journey to Switzerland, ii. 69;

contrast between him and Voltaire, ii. 70;

explanation of his "natural ingratitude," ii. 71;

reaches the canton of Berne, and ordered to quit it, ii. 72;

Emilius and Social Contract condemned to be publicly burnt at

Geneva, and author arrested if he came there, ii. 72, 73;

takes refuge at Motiers, in dominions of Frederick of Prussia, ii.

73;

characteristic letters to the king, ii. 74, 77;

declines pecuniary help from him, ii. 75;

his home and habits at Motiers, ii. 77, 78;

Voltaire supposed to have stirred up animosity against him at

Geneva, ii. 81;

Archbishop of Paris writes against him, ii. 83;

his reply, and character as a controversialist, ii. 83-90;

life at Val de Travers (Motiers), ii. 91-95;

his generosity, ii. 93;

corresponds with the Prince of WÃ¼rtemberg on the education of the

prince's daughter, ii. 95, 96;

on Gibbon, ii. 96;

visit from Boswell, ii. 98;

invited to legislate for Corsica, ii. 99, \_n.\_;

urges Boswell to go there, ii. 100;

denounces its sale by the Genoese, ii. 102;

renounces his citizenship of Geneva, ii. 103;

his Letters from the Mountain, ii. 104;

the letters condemned to be burned at Paris and the Hague, ii.

105;

libel upon, ii. 105;

religious difficulties with his pastor, ii. 106;

ill-treatment of, in parish, ii. 106;

obliged to leave it, ii. 108;

his next retreat, ii. 108;

account in the \_RÃªveries\_ of his short stay there, ii. 109-115;

expelled by government of Berne, ii. 116;

makes an extraordinary request to it, ii. 116, 117;

difficulties in finding a home, ii. 117;

short stay at Strasburg, ii. 117, \_n.\_;

decides on going to England, ii. 118;

his Social Contract, and criticism on, ii. 119, 196 (see Social

Contract);

scanty acquaintance with history, ii. 129;

its effects on his political writings, ii. 129, 136;

his object in writing Emilius, ii. 198;

his confession of faith, under the character of the Savoyard Vicar

(see Emilius), ii. 257-280;

excitement caused by his appearance in Paris in 1765, ii. 282;

leaves for England in company with Hume, ii. 283;

reception in London, ii. 283, 284;

George III. gives him a pension, ii. 284;

his love for his dog, ii. 286;

finds a home at Wootton, ii. 286;

quarrels with Hume, ii. 287;

particulars in connection with it, ii. 287-296;

his approaching insanity at this period, ii. 296;

the preparatory conditions of it, ii. 297-301;

begins writing the Confessions, ii. 301;

their character, ii. 301-304;

life at Wootton, ii. 305, 306;

sudden flight thence, ii. 306;

kindness of Mr. Davenport, ii. 306, 307;

his delusion, ii. 307;

returns to France, ii. 308;

received at Fleury by the elder Mirabeau, ii. 310, 311;

the prince of Conti next receives him at Trye, ii. 312;

composes the second part of the Confessions here, ii. 312;

delusion returns, ii. 312, 313;

leaves Trye, and wanders about the country, ii. 312, 313;

estrangement from Theresa, ii. 313;

goes to Paris, ii. 314;

writes his Dialogues there, ii. 314;

again earns his living by copying music, ii. 315;

daily life in, ii. 315, 316;

Bernardin St. Pierre's account of him, ii. 317-321;

his veneration for FÃ©nelon, ii. 321;

his unsociality, ii. 322;

checks a detractor of Voltaire, ii. 324;

draws up his Considerations on the Government of Poland, ii. 324;

estimate of the Spanish, ii. 324;

his poverty, ii. 325;

accepts a home at Ermenonville from M. Girardin, ii. 326;

his painful condition, ii. 326;

sudden death, ii. 326;

cause of it unknown, ii. 326 (see also \_ib. n.\_);

his interment, ii. 326;

finally removed to Paris, ii. 328.

SAINTE BEUVE on Rousseau and Madame d'Epinay, i. 279, \_n.\_;

on Rousseau, ii. 40.

Saint Germain, M. de, Rousseau's letter to, i. 123.

Saint Just, ii. 132, 133;

his political regulations, ii. 133, \_n.\_;

base of his system, ii. 136;

against the atheists, ii. 179.

Saint Lambert, i. 244;

offers Rousseau a home in Lorraine, ii. 117.

Saint Pierre, AbbÃ© de, Rousseau arranges papers of, i. 244;

his views concerning reason, \_ib.\_;

boldness of his observations, i. 245.

Saint Pierre, Bernardin de, account of his visit to Rousseau at

Paris, ii. 317-321.

Sand, Madame G., i. 81, \_n.\_;

Savoy landscape, i. 99, \_n.\_;

ancestry of, i. 121, \_n.\_

Savages, code of morals of, i. 178-179, \_n.\_

Savage state, advantages of, Rousseau's letter to Voltaire, i. 312.

Savoy, priests of, proselytisers, i. 30, 31, 33 (also \_ib.\_ \_n.\_)

Savoyard Vicar, the, origin of character of, ii. 257-280 (see

Emilius).

Schiller on Rousseau, ii. 192 (also \_ib.\_ \_n.\_);

Rousseau's influence on, ii. 315.

Servetus, ii. 180.

Simplification, the revolutionary process and ideal of, i. 4;

in reference to Rousseau's music, i. 291.

Social conscience, theory and definition of, ii. 234, 235;

the great agent in fostering, ii. 237.

Social Contract, the, ill effect of, on Europe, i. 138;

beginning of its composition, i. 177;

ideas of, i. 188;

its harmful dreams, i. 246;

influence of, ii. 1;

price of, and difficulties in publishing, ii. 59;

ordered to be burnt at Geneva, ii. 72, 73, 104;

detailed criticism of, ii. 119-196;

Rousseau diametrically opposed to the dominant belief of his day

in human perfectibility, ii. 119;

object of the work, ii. 120;

main position of the two Discourses given up in it, ii. 120;

influenced by Locke, ii. 120;

its uncritical, illogical principles, ii. 123, 124;

its impracticableness, ii. 128;

nature of his illustrations, ii. 128-133;

the "gospel of the Jacobins," ii. 132, 133;

the desperate absurdity of its assumptions gave it power in the

circumstances of the times, ii. 135-141;

some of its maxims very convenient for ruling Jacobins, ii. 142;

its central conception, the sovereignty of peoples, ii. 144;

Rousseau not its inventor, ii. 144, 145;

this to be distinguished from doctrine of right of subjects to

depose princes, ii. 146;

Social Contract idea of government, probably derived from Locke,

ii. 150;

falseness of it, ii. 153, 154;

origin of society, ii. 154;

ill effects on Rousseau's political speculation, ii. 155;

what constitutes the sovereignty, ii. 158;

Rousseau's Social Contract different from that of Hobbes, ii. 159;

Locke's indefiniteness on, ii. 160;

attributes of sovereignty, ii. 163;

confederation, ii. 164, 165;

his distinction between \_tyrant\_ and \_despot\_, ii. 169,

\_n.\_;

distinguishes constitution of the state from that of the government,

ii. 170;

scheme of an elective aristocracy, ii. 172;

similarity to the English form of government, ii. 173;

the state in respect to religion, ii. 173;

habitually illogical form of his statements, ii. 173, 174;

duty of sovereign to establish civil profession of faith, ii. 175,

176;

infringement of it to be punished, even by death, ii. 176;

Rousseau's Hobbism, ii. 177;

denial of his social compact theory, ii. 183, 184;

futility of his disquisitions on, ii. 185, 186;

his declaration of general duty of rebellion (arising out of the

universal breach of social compact) considered, ii. 188;

it makes government impossible, ii. 188;

he urges that usurped authority is another valid reason for

rebellion, ii. 190;

practical evils of this, ii. 192;

historical effect of the Social Contract, ii. 192-195.

Social quietism of some parts of New HeloÃ¯sa, ii. 49.

Socialism: Morelly, and De Mably, ii. 52;

what it is, ii. 159.

Socialistic theory of Morelly, i. 158, 159 (also i. 158, \_n.\_)

Society, Aristotle on, i. 174;

D'Alembert's statements on, i. 174, \_n.\_;

Parisian, Rousseau on, i. 209;

dislike of, i. 242;

Rousseau's origin of, ii. 153;

true grounds of, ii. 155, 156.

Socrates, i. 131, 140, 232; ii. 72, 273.

Solitude, eighteenth century notions of, i. 231, 232.

Solon, ii. 133.

Sorbonne, the, condemns Emilius, ii. 82.

Spectator, the, Rousseau's liking for, i. 86.

Spinoza, dangerous speculations of, i. 143.

StaÃ«l, Madame de, i. 217, \_n.\_

Stage players, how treated in France, i. 322.

Stage plays (see Plays).

State of Nature, Rousseau's, i. 159, 160;

Hobbes on, i. 161 (see Nature).

Suicide, Rousseau on, ii. 16;

a mistake to pronounce him incapable of, ii. 19.

Switzerland, i. 330.

TACITUS, i. 177.

Theatre, Rousseau's letter, objecting to the, i. 133;

his error in the matter, i. 134.

Theology, metaphysical, Descartes' influence on, i. 226.

Theresa (see Le Vasseur).

Thought, school of, division between rationalists and emotionalists,

i. 337.

Tonic Sol-fa notation, close correspondence of the, to Rousseau's

system, i. 299.

Tronchin on Voltaire, i. 319, \_n.\_, 321.

Turgot, i. 89;

his discourses at the Sorbonne in 1750, i. 155;

the one sane eminent Frenchman of eighteenth century, i. 202;

his unselfish toil, i. 233; ii. 193;

mentioned, ii. 246, 294.

Turin, Rousseau at, i. 34-43;

leaves it, i. 45;

tries to learn Latin at, i. 91.

Turretini and other rationalisers, i. 226;

his works, i. 226, \_n.\_

UNIVERSE, constitution of, discussion on, i. 311-317.

VAGABOND life, Rousseau's love of, i. 63, 68.

Val de Travers, ii. 77; Rousseau's life in, ii. 91-95.

Vasseur, Theresa Le, Rousseau's first acquaintance with, i. 106,

107, also \_ib.\_ \_n.\_;

their life together, i. 110-113;

well befriended, ii. 80, \_n.\_;

her evil character, ii. 326.

Vauvenargues on emotional instinct, ii. 34.

Venice, Rousseau at, i. 100-106.

Vercellis, Madame de, Rousseau servant to, i. 39.

Verdelin, Madame de, her kindness to Theresa, ii. 80, \_n.\_;

to Rousseau, ii. 118, \_n.\_

Village Soothsayer, the (\_Devin du Village\_), composed at

Passy, performed at Fontainebleau and Paris, i. 212;

marked a revolution in French Music, i. 291.

Voltaire, i. 2, 21, 63;

effect on Rousseau of his Letters on the English, i. 86;

spreads a derogatory report about Rousseau, i. 101, \_n.\_;

his "Princesse de Navarre," i. 119;

criticism on Rousseau's first Discourse, i. 147;

effect on his work of his common sense, i. 155;

avoids the society of Paris, i. 202;

his conversion to Romanism, i. 220, 221;

strictures on Homer and Shakespeare, i. 280;

his position in the eighteenth century, i. 301;

general difference between, and Rousseau, i. 301;

clung to the rationalistic school of his day, i. 305;

on Rousseau's second Discourse, i. 308;

his poem on the earthquake of Lisbon, i. 309, 310;

his sympathy with suffering, i. 311, 312;

entreated by Rousseau to draw up a civil profession of religious

faith, i. 317;

denounced by Rousseau as a "trumpet of impiety," i. 317, 320,

\_n.\_;

his satire and mockery irritated Rousseau, i. 319;

what he was to his contemporaries, i. 321;

the great play-writer of the time, i. 321;

his criticism of Rousseau's Letter on the Theatre, i. 336;

his indignation at wrong, ii. 11;

ridicule of the New HeloÃ¯sa, ii. 34;

less courageous than Rousseau, ii. 65;

contrast between the two, i. 99, ii. 75;

supposed to have stirred up animosity at Geneva against Rousseau,

ii. 81;

denies it, ii. 81;

his notion of how the matter would end, ii. 81;

his fickleness, ii. 83;

on Rousseau's connection with Corsica, ii. 101;

his Philosophical Dictionary burnt by order at Paris, ii. 105;

his opinion of Emilius, ii. 257;

prime agent in introducing English deism into France, ii. 262;

suspected by Rousseau of having written the pretended letter from

the King of Prussia, ii. 288;

last visit to Paris, ii. 324.

WALKING, Rousseau's love of, i. 63.

Walpole, Horace, writer of the pretended letter from the King of

Prussia, ii. 288, \_n.\_;

advises Hume not to publish his account of Rousseau's quarrel with

him, ii. 295.

War arising out of the succession to the crown of Poland, i. 72.

Warens, Madame de, Rousseau's introduction to, i. 34;

her personal appearance, i. 34;

receives Rousseau into her house, i. 43;

her early life, i. 48;

character of, i. 49-51;

goes to Paris, i. 59;

receives Rousseau at ChambÃ©ri, and gets him employment, i. 69;

her household, i. 70;

removes to Les Charmettes, i. 73;

cultivates Rousseau's taste for letters, i. 85;

Saint Louis, her patron saint, i. 91;

revisited by Rousseau in 1754, i. 216;

her death in poverty and wretchedness, i. 217, 218 (also i. 219,

\_n.\_)

Wesleyanism, ii. 258.

Women, Condorcet on social position of, i. 335;

D'Alembert and Condorcet on, i. 335.

Wootton, Rousseau's home at, ii. 286.

World, divine government of, Rousseau vindicates, i. 312.

WÃ¼rtemberg, correspondence between Prince of, and Rousseau, on the

education of the little princess, ii. 95;

becomes reigning duke, ii. 95, \_n.\_;

seeks permission for Rousseau to live in Vienna, ii. 117.

THE END.
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