

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)**WRITINGS BY THE AUTHOR:****BOOKS**

- *Dissertation sur la musique moderne* (Paris: G.-F. Quillau père, 1743).
- *Les Festes de Ramire, ballet donné à Versailles, le 22 décembre 1745*, by Rousseau and Voltaire (Paris: J.-B.-C. Ballard, 1745).
- *Discours qui a remporté le prix à l'Académie de Dijon, en l'année 1750, sur cette question proposée par la même Académie: "Si le rétablissement des Sciences et des Arts a contribué à épurer les moeurs,"* as "a citizen of Geneva" (Geneva: Barillot et fils, [1750]); translated by the Reverend William Bowyer as *A Discourse on the Arts and Science* (London, 1751).
- *Le Devin du village, intermède représenté à Fontainebleau devant le Roy, les 18 et 24 octobre 1752, et à Paris par l'Académie royale de musique le jeudi premier mars 1753* (Paris: Delormel et fils, 1753).
- *Narcisse, ou l'amant de lui-même . . . représentée par les Comédiens du Roi, le 18 décembre 1752* (Paris: Pissot, 1753).
- *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1755); translated as *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of the Inequality among Mankind* (London: Dodsley, 1762).
- *Lettre à Voltaire* (N.p., 1756); published as *Lettre sur la Providence* (Berlin, 1759).
- *J. J. Rousseau citoyen de Genève, à M. d'Alembert, de l'Académie française, sur son article Genève dans le VII volume de L'Encyclopédie, et particulièrement, sur le projet d'établir un théâtre de comédie en cette ville [Lettre sur les spectacles]* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1758); translated by Allan Bloom as *Politics and the Arts, Letter to M. d'Alembert on the Theatre* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1960).
- *Discours sur l'économie politique, par M. Jean-Jaq. Rousseau, citoyen de Genève [Précédé de la Lettre de M. V[ernes] au libraire et de la Réponse du libraire]* (Geneva: Du Villard fils, 1758); translated as *A Dissertation on Political Economy; To Which Is Added a Treatise on the Social Compact, or the Principles of Political Law* (Albany, N.Y.: Barber & Southwick, 1797).
- *La Reine fantasque. Conte Cacouac, par Mr. R. C. de G.* (Paris: Fleuron, 1758); expanded as *La Reine fantasque, conte, par Jean-Jacques Rousseau, . . . Suivi d'un discours du même auteur sur la question: Quelle est la vertu la plus nécessaire au héros? Et quels sont les héros à qui cette vertu a manqué?* (London: Porphyre, 1762).
- *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse, lettres de deux amans, habitans d'une petite ville au pied des Alpes* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1761); translated by William Kenrick as *Eloisa; or, A Series of Original Letters*, 4 volumes (Dublin: James Hunter / London: R. Griffiths, T. Becket & P. A. de Hondt, 1761).
- *Extrait du projet de paix perpétuelle de M. l'abbé de Saint-Pierre* (Paris: Fleuron, 1761); translated as *A Project for Perpetual Peace* (London: Cooper, 1761).
- *Du Contrat social, ou principes du droit politique* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1762); translated by Kenrick as *A Treatise on the Social Compact; or, The Principles of Political Law* (London: T. Becket & P. A. de Hondt, 1764).
- *Emile, ou de l'éducation* (La Haye & Amsterdam: J. Neaulme, 1762); translated by Kenrick as *Emilius and Sophia; or, A New System of Education*, 4 volumes (London: R. Griffiths, T. Becket & P. A. de Hondt, 1762-1763).
- *Jean Jaques [sic] Rousseau, citoyen de Genève, à M. Christophe de Beaumont, Archevêque de Paris* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1763); translated by Christopher Kelly as *Letter to Beaumont, Letters Written from the Mountain, and Related Writings*, in *Collected Writings of Rousseau*, edited by Grace,

- volume 9 (Hanover, N.H.: Published for Dartmouth College by University Press of New England, 2002).
- *Lettres écrites de la montagne par J.-J. Rousseau en deux parties* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1764); translated by Kelly as *Letter to Beaumont, Letters Written from the Mountain, and Related Writings*, in *Collected Writings of Rousseau*, edited by Eve Grace, volume 9 (Hanover, N.H.: Published for Dartmouth College by University Press of New England, 2002).
 - *De l'Imitation théâtrale, essai tiré des dialogues de Platon* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1764).
 - *Dictionnaire de musique* (Paris: Duchesne, 1767); translated by William Waring as *The Complete Dictionary of Music* (London, 1771).
 - *Discours de M. J.-J. Rousseau, qui n'a point encore été imprimé, sur cette question: Quelle est la vertu la plus nécessaire aux héros, et quels sont les héros à qui cette vertu a manqué?* (Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rey, 1769).
 - *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques. Dialogues--Premier Dialogue d'après le manuscrit de M. Rousseau, laissé entre les mains de M. Brooke Boothby à Lichfield* (Lichfield: J. Jackson, 1780); translated and edited by Judith R. Bush, Roger D. Masters, and Kelly as *Rousseau, Judge of Jean-Jacques. Dialogues* (Hanover, N.H.: Published for Dartmouth College by University Press of New England, 1990)--includes *Projet concernant de nouveaux signes pour la musique, lu par l'auteur à l'Académie des Sciences le 22 août 1742, Dissertation sur la musique moderne, Essai sur l'origine des langues, Lettre à M. l'Abbé Raynal au sujet d'un nouveau mode de musique [inventé par M. Blainville], Examen de deux principes avancés par M. Rameau dans sa brochure: erreurs sur la musique dans l'Encyclopédie, and Lettre à M. Burney, suivie d'une réponse du petit faiseur* (Geneva, 1781); translated as *A Musical Dictionary Comprising a Full Explanation of All the Terms Made Use of in the Histories Theoretical [sic] and Practical Parts of Music; . . . A New Edition to Which Is Added an Appendix Selected from the Dictionnaire de musique of M. Rousseau* (London: J. Robinson, 1769).
 - *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, published posthumously with *Traité sur la musique* (Geneva, 1781); translated by J. F. Moran as *Essay on the Origin of Languages* (New York: Ungar, 1966).
 - *Les Confessions de J.-J. Rousseau suivies des Rêveries du promeneur solitaire* (Geneva & London, 1782); translated as *The Confessions of J. J. Rousseau; with The Reveries of the Solitary Walker*, 2 volumes (London: J. Bew, 1783).
 - *Projet pour l'éducation de Monsieur de Sainte-Marie*, in *Supplément à la collection complète des oeuvres de J.-J. Rousseau*, volume 2 edited by Moultoy and Du Peyrou (Geneva: Du Peyrou, 1782), pp. 1-24; republished as *Mémoire présenté à M. Dupin sur l'éducation de M. son fils*, in *Le Portefeuille de Madame Dupin* (Paris: Gaston de Villeneuve-Guibert, 1884), pp. 361-414.
 - *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne et sur sa réforme projetée. Du Contrat social. Deux Ponts* (1782) and *Considérations sur le gouvernement de la Pologne et sur sa réforme projetée et Lettres sur la législation de la Corse dans lesquelles tous les souverains trouveront des choses utiles . . . suivies de son Jugement sur la paix perpétuelle de l'Abbé de Saint-Pierre, de la Polysynodie du même auteur, du jugement de cet ouvrage et d'une Réponse à une lettre anonyme dont le contenu se trouve en caractères italiques dans cette réponse* (La Hague: P. F. Gosse / Lausanne: François Grasset, 1783); translated and edited by Frederick Watkins as *Rousseau. Political Writings. Containing the Social Contract, Considerations on the Government of Poland, and Part I of the Constitutional Project for Corsica* (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1953).
 - *Seconde partie des Confessions de J.-J. Rousseau*, volume 3 (Geneva, 1789); translated as *The Confessions of J. J.*

Rousseau . . . Part the Second. To Which Is Added a New Collection of Letters from the Author (Dublin, 1791).

- *Le Nouveau Dédale, ouvrage inédit de J.-J. Rousseau et copié sur son manuscrit original daté de l'année 1742* (Paris: Mme Masson, [1801]); translated as *Le Nouveau Dédale. A Reproduction of the First edition. With an Introduction by Members of the Staff of the Aeronautics Division, Library of Congress* (Pasadena: Institute of Aeronautical History, 1950).
- *La Botanique de J.-J. Rousseau, contenant tout ce qu'il a écrit sur cette science, l'exposition de la méthode botanique de M. de Jussieu; la manière de former les herbiers, par M. Haüy* (Paris: F. Louis, 1802); translated by Thomas Martyn as *Letters on the Elements of Botany, Addressed to a Lady by the Celebrated J.-J. Rousseau. Translated with Notes and Twenty-Four Additional Letters, Fully Explaining the System of Linnaeus* (London: B. White, 1785).
- *Lettre sur la musique française* (1753), in *Oeuvres complètes de J. J. Rousseau par V. D. Musset-Pathay* (Paris: Dupont, 1824).
- *Pensées d'un esprit droit, et sentiment d'un coeur vertueux, par J.-J. Rousseau. Ouvrage inédit, imprimé sur le manuscrit autographe de l'auteur, suivi d'un autre opuscule de Rousseau intitulé: "Moeurs et caractère"* (Paris: Fournier Favreux, 1826).
- *Notes sur l'arrêt du Parlement de Paris du 9 juin 1762 concernant le traité "de l'Education" écrites de la main de J.-J. Rousseau avec une note inédite. Communication lue à la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève, le 3 avril 1885, par Emile Duval* (Geneva: G. J. Fick, 1885).
- "Quatre Lettres à M. le Président de Malesherbes contenant le vrai tableau de mon caractère et les vrais motifs de toute ma conduite [janvier, 1762]," in *Rousseau, Oeuvres complètes, publiées sous la direction de Bernard Gagnebin et Marcel Raymond, volume 1* (Paris: Gallimard, 1959).

Collections

- *Collection complète des oeuvres de J.-J. Rousseau*, 33 volumes, edited by Moultoy and Du Peyrou (Geneva, 1782).
- *Oeuvres complètes. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade*, 5 volumes, edited by Bernard Gagnebin and Marcel Raymond (Paris: Gallimard, 1959-1995).
- Jean Roussel, *Oeuvres politiques de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Paris: Bordas, 1989).

Editions in English

- *Political Writings*, translated and edited by Frederick Watkins (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986).
- *Basic Political Writings*, translated and edited by Donald A. Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987).
- *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, edited by Roger D. Masters and Christopher Kelly, 7 volumes (Hanover, N.H.: Published for Dartmouth College by University Press of New England, 1990).
- *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings [of] Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, edited by Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

PLAY PRODUCTIONS

- *Les Fêtes de Ramire*, ballet, Versailles, 22 December 1745.
- *Les Muses galantes*, ballet performed for Louis-François-Armand de Vignerot du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, Paris, 1745.
- *Le Devin du village*, intermède, Fontainebleau, 18 October 1752.
- *Narcisse, ou l'amant de lui-même*, Paris, Les Comédiens du Roi, 18 December 1752.
- *Le Pygmalion*, Paris, Comédie française, 1 November 1775.

OTHER

- "Economie politique," in *L'Encyclopédie*, edited by Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, volume 5 (Paris: Fol, 1755).
- *Iphis et Anaxarète. Tragédie pour l'Académie Royale de Musique*, in *Oeuvres mêlées*, volume 5 (London: de Boubers, 1776), pp. 297-309.
- *La Découverte du Nouveau Monde. Tragédie*, in *Oeuvres mêlées*, volume 8, edited by de Boubers (London, 1776), pp. 267-296.
- *L'Engagement téméraire*, in *Oeuvres posthumes* (Geneva, 1781), pp. 203-289.
- *Les Amours de Milord Edouard Bomston*, in *Oeuvres de J.-J. Rousseau*, volume 3, edited by Moultoy and Du Peyrou (Geneva, 1782), pp. 513-530.
- *Les Prisonniers de Guerre*, in *Supplément à la Collection des Oeuvres complètes de J.-J. Rousseau* (Geneva, 1782), pp. 27, 69-116.
- "Courts fragments de Lucrèce," in *Oeuvres complètes de J.-J. Rousseau*, volume 18, edited by Poinçot (Paris, 1792), pp. 367-384; complete text published by T. Dufour in *Annales J.-J. Rousseau*, 2 (1906): 218-244.
- "Lettres à Sara," in *Oeuvres complètes de J. J. Rousseau par V. D. Musset-Pathay*, volume 10 (Paris: Dupont, 1824), pp. 227-237.
- *Pauvre Jacques, romance, chant et piano* (Paris: E. Heu, 1860).
- *Mélodie arabe: que le jour me dure, paroles et musique de J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris: L. Labbé, 1889).
- "Arlequin amoureux malgré lui," *Annales J.-J. Rousseau*, 2 (1906): 200-217.
- *Daphnis et Chloë*, in *Oeuvres complètes*, edited by Bernard Gagnebin and Marcel Raymond (Paris: Gallimard, 1964), II: 1165-1166.
- *Duo de Rousseau, arrangé à 4 mains pour le forte piano, par Desormerie et Piccini* (Paris: Leduc, n.d.).

SELECTED PERIODICAL PUBLICATION-- UNCOLLECTED

- *Le Pygmalion, par J.-J. Rousseau* [Précédé d'une "Lettre sur le Pygmalion de J.-J.

Rousseau," signée Coignet, 26 novembre 1770], *Le Mercure de France*, January 1771, pp. 200-209.

Selected Collections of Letters

- *Matériaux pour la correspondance de J.-J. Rousseau, publiés par Alexis François* (Paris: Hachette, 1923);
- *Correspondance générale de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 20 volumes, edited by Théophile Dufour and Pierre P. Plan (Paris: Colin, 1924-1934);
- Charles William Hendel, *Citizen of Geneva. Selections from the Letters of Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937);
- *Correspondance complète de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 16 volumes, edited by Ralph Alexander Leigh (Geneva: Publications de l'Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1965-).

A bilingual colloquium commemorating the bicentennial of the death of Jean-Jacques Rousseau was held at Trinity College, Cambridge, in July 1978. The dozen papers by specialists and an abridged account of the discussion among about one hundred scholars were published in 1982 as *Two Hundred Years of Rousseau: A Balance-Sheet of His Life and Work*. The editor, Ralph Alexander Leigh, wrote in the introduction: "As was only to be expected, the papers did not in fact achieve the desired synthesis. Rousseau is too vast and too elusive a subject for convenient encapsulation. Indeed, it is unlikely that a completely satisfactory account of him and his work will ever be given."

The closest to consensus achieved by more than two hundred years of scholarship on Rousseau is that his work must be analyzed as a whole in order to begin to understand him, and even then synthesis is virtually impossible. That his work spans an incredibly wide range of subjects--ethics, religion, sociology, language, fiction, political theory, music, drama, biology, botany, and anthropology--is only part of the problem. His

influence is vast and uneven, and has never been definitively studied. Moreover, many scholars interpret Rousseau in the light of later events instead of assessing his meaning at the time of composition. Too often the subtleties and shadows cast by the complexities of his ideas and style require, as Leigh aptly stated, "a degree of insight, sensibility and sophistication which is too often inhibited by the polemical animus his work and personality so frequently arouse." Although Rousseau always insisted on the fundamental unity of his thought, he was frequently ambiguous and deliberately cultivated paradox in his writing.

Leigh contends that Rousseau has been preyed upon "to an unusual extent" by "sociologists, journalists and polygraphs" and has suffered more than anyone from a "critical fixation on the 'paternity' approach." Rousseau has been labeled the "father" of the French Revolution, romanticism, socialism, anarchism, totalitarianism, and even movements for environmental protection. Despite the many difficulties inherent in the study of disparate genius, Rousseau has had no dearth of interpreters.

The literature on Rousseau is enormous and has grown with scarcely a break for more than two centuries. Much of what has been written is negative. As the "father" of the French Revolution, he is considered responsible for its fanaticism and rarely for its achievements. As the "father" of democracy or socialism, he slips from grace into the pitfall of totalitarianism. He fomented ambiguity in his own time: he was worshiped for his genius and sensitivity, and despised for his obstinacy and neuroses. He longed for social compatibility but alienated his intellectual colleagues and fled from their city and society. He gave his five infants to a foundling hospital, was accused of mistreating his mistress's mother, indulged in many affairs of passion, suffered intensely from real and imagined insults, and ended his life in paranoid alienation.

Rousseau was the most original, profound, and creative writer of the eighteenth century. He was also the most controversial--and perhaps the most obscure. Leigh contends that Rousseau "raised the fundamental question of where modern civilization was leading mankind." His view that civilization took a wrong turn and lost the essence of what really mattered in life was dissonant in an age noted for its optimism. When others spoke of wondrous advancements in material wealth, learning, and science, Rousseau argued that freedom comes from divesting oneself of such encumbrances. People work for what they do not really need, and the desire for more turns them into slaves. On the other hand, "Rousseau . . . was impelled by his genius towards the extremes of human experience," writes Jean Gu  henno, one of his many biographers. Rousseau was satisfied "only with absolute justice and absolute truth; . . . he never gave up, and always held to his opinions; . . . he was very much afraid of being thought ordinary."

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was born in Geneva on 28 June 1712 to parents of French Huguenot origin. He was the second son of Isaac Rousseau, a rakish and irascible watchmaker, and Suzanne Bernard, a minister's daughter who died shortly after giving birth. Ailing and weak, the infant was cared for rather freely--even haphazardly--by his father, his aunt Suzon, and a young servant, Jacqueline. In his *Confessions* (*Les Confessions de J.-J. Rousseau* [1782; translated as *The Confessions of J. J. Rousseau*, 1783] and *Seconde partie des Confessions de J.-J. Rousseau* [1789; translated as *The Confessions of J. J. Rousseau . . . Part the Second*, 1791]), written much later in a state of depression, he speaks of a happy existence "before he began to think." Jean-Jacques neither attended school nor remembered learning to read, but he and his father read all kinds of books together and often discussed them through the night. Plutarch was the boy's favorite author, and he learned to love Rome and its free republican spirit.

Isaac Rousseau left Geneva abruptly in 1722 when an altercation with a fellow citizen threatened him

with imprisonment. Isaac left ten-year-old Jean-Jacques and his older brother, François, in the care of his brother-in-law, Gabriel Bernard, and settled in Nyon. In his *Confessions*, Rousseau scarcely mentions his brother, who was soon apprenticed elsewhere and disappeared. Meanwhile, Jean-Jacques and his cousin Abraham Bernard were placed under the tutelage of Jean-Jacques Lambercier, a minister at Bossey, a few miles from Geneva. Rousseau describes two spankings that he considers critical in his development. One was administered by Lambercier's young daughter and sparked a lasting sexual preference. The other, from the minister, was more brutal and for a misdemeanor he supposedly did not commit; thus, it was his first glimpse of man's injustice and violence. Otherwise, Rousseau's freedom was scarcely diminished from the time with his father. He was left to roam and commune with nature or study as he wished.

This rather idyllic existence ended abruptly in September 1724 when the cousins were sent back to Geneva. Jean-Jacques was apprenticed to a lawyer for a short time, and on 26 April 1725 he was sent to live with a twenty-four-year-old engraver, Abel Du Commun, with a five-year contract for food, shelter, and professional and moral instruction. What he received was three years of agonizing constraint and tyranny. On 14 March 1728, a Sunday, and the third time the gates of Geneva closed before he returned from an outing--which meant a thrashing--Rousseau chose to flee. He was not quite sixteen when he strode away from Geneva with his possessions on his back, some food, and a small sword from his cousin to begin what he dreamily hoped would be a life of great adventure. Virtually the only source for Rousseau's wanderings and encounters for the next fourteen years is his *Confessions*.

The adventure began with conversion. Rousseau made his way by chance or design to Confignon in Savoy and the village priest, who sent him to Annecy with a letter of introduction for Françoise-Louise de La Tour de Warens, herself a convert to Catholicism. In April 1728 Rousseau was baptized

in Turin, where he lived for a year before returning to Annecy in the spring of 1729. Warens included him as one of several protégés, and he became her seventeen-year-old "petit" (young one) and she his thirty-year-old "*maman*" (mama).

Warens decided that this rather strange and dreamy young man should become a priest. He was sent to a Lazarist seminary, where he lasted only a few months, and then to a choir school, where he stayed for six quite happy months until the choirmaster deserted. Rousseau spent the next year wandering and making a living however he could. His travels took him as far as Paris, but his first sojourn there was brief. He left the city and walked back to Savoy via Lyon to join Warens in Chambéry. For the third time in three years, he found a home with *maman*--a threesome, in fact, with the addition of Warens's steward and lover, Claude Anet, until Anet's death on 13 March 1734. Rousseau worked a few months in a land survey office at Chambéry before trying his hand as a music teacher. His most notable accomplishment during this period (1732-1738), however, was to progress from "*petit*" to "*chéri*" (darling) for his generous benefactress. Although the degree of true passion for both parties is conjectural, this period was the time of Rousseau's greatest happiness, or so he recorded in his *Confessions*.

Before intimacy, Rousseau wanted only to be with *maman*. Afterward and despite their shared "idyll" at Les Charmettes near Chambéry, he made many excuses for journeys, including other romantic interests. In 1737, at age twenty-five, Rousseau traveled to Geneva to claim a small inheritance, returned briefly to Chambéry, and left again for Montpellier, where he stayed for four months engaged in an affair with a woman twenty years his senior. When he finally returned to *maman* early in 1738, he found that a handsome twenty-year-old, Jean-Samuel-Rodolphe Wintzenried, had usurped his place. Rousseau spent the next two years, from June 1738 to April 1740, at Les Charmettes, where his frame of mind vacillated between regarding it as a hell of

sickness and despair, and a haven of solitude for study.

Rousseau was searching for self-expression and trying his hand at virtually every genre, especially music. He composed an opera that he later abandoned, as well as poems and songs--one of which was published in the *Mercure de France* in 1737. Hoping for a pension from the court of Savoy, Rousseau wrote a poem, *The Orchard of the Baroness de Warens*, with a telling foreword aimed at dissuading gossip about his indolence and relationship with *maman*. Guéhenno concedes that the poem was not good, although it provides glimpses of the "essential Rousseau," a man with "a mania for self-revelation, . . . a Narcissus, . . . a solitary man, solitary because he was good, because he was just, and knew the secret of things eternal." Rousseau probably wrote his play *Narcisse* (Narcissus, produced 1752; published 1753), at this time, although he later claimed he wrote it when he was eighteen and planned to publish it when he no longer cared what the world thought of him as a writer.

Rousseau was twenty-eight in 1740 when Warens found a position for him as tutor to the children of the provost marshal of Lyon. Ludicrous as it was for a man with no formal education to undertake the instruction of children, his initial enthusiasm quickly disintegrated when he could not control his charges or his own temper. Rousseau, who later wrote the most famous treatise on education of his time, was a failure as a teacher--a failing that he honestly admitted in *Emile* (1762; translated as *Emilius and Sophia; or, A New System of Education*, 1762-1763). But this failure did not prevent him from developing a theory of education radically different from the prevailing pedagogy, *Projet pour l'éducation de Monsieur de Sainte-Marie* (1782, Project for the Education of Monsieur de Sainte-Marie), and sending it with an apology to the family he had failed. In brief, he theorized that because young children are governed by senses rather than by reason, the proper order for learning is first the heart (self-esteem, love), then judgment and intellect. Early

instruction should be fun and emphasize sociability, with maximum hands-on experience and minimum traditional study. Most telling in light of his later writings was his insistence that children must learn compliance and submissiveness early through a system of deceptions and rewards. Both parents and tutors should use the virtues and weaknesses of children for the ultimate goal of molding them to suit the adults' purposes.

From 1740 to 1742 Rousseau divided his time between Chambéry and Lyon. He profited from the literary and intellectual milieu in Lyon and possibly refined his opera *La Découverte du nouveau monde* (1740-1742, The Discovery of the New World), with its theme of confrontation between "the noble savage" and decadent civilization. Rousseau also developed a system of musical notation based on numbers, which he believed would ensure his fame when he presented it to the Académie des sciences (Academy of Science) in Paris. He wanted to make his fortune and repay *maman*, and he believed that music was his portal, since he was convinced that he lacked the wit to shine in the glittering Parisian literary world. He left for Paris in the summer of 1742 by stagecoach with a ticket paid for by a friend.

Rousseau's arrival in Paris marks the beginning of a decade christened by Jack Howard Broome as "The Years of Ambition." The beginning was not auspicious, despite letters of introduction from Lyon dignitaries to influential persons. The pretty young wife of one of these persons distracted Rousseau in a way long familiar. More ominous for his pursuit of fame, the Academy of Science rejected his system of musical notation. Rousseau used much of his money to publish it anyway as *Dissertation sur la musique moderne* (1743, Essay on Modern Music) but found himself at a dead end and out of funds when this and several short pieces were noticed, but did not sell.

Then a Swiss friend, Daniel Roguin, introduced Rousseau to Denis Diderot at the Café de la

Régence. Rousseau and Diderot were immediate soul mates in their poverty, sensitivity, and impulsiveness, although deep temperamental and attitudinal differences later caused trouble. They were the closest of friends for fifteen years before they became the bitterest of enemies. Meanwhile, Rousseau also met fashionable aristocratic ladies, including extraordinarily beautiful Louise-Marie-Madeleine Dupin, doyenne of one of the most celebrated Parisian salons. He was immediately infatuated and naively told her so, a declaration that led to a rebuff and humiliating pleas for forgiveness. Groveling did nothing to improve Rousseau's deeply neurotic and resentful nature, although he had the capacity to turn his own dishonor against humanity as a whole. He could certainly blame part of his discomfiture in Parisian society on its domination by women, a feature he found odious and unnatural, despite--or because of--his own weaknesses for women.

Rousseau had begun to write a ballet, *Les Muses galantes* (1745, *The Gallant Muses*), when he was appointed embassy secretary to the French ambassador in Venice, Louis-Gabriel Christophe, chevalier de Montaigu. Rousseau was delighted, but he evidently exaggerated the importance of his new post and himself. After only one year, he quarreled with his employer and was dismissed in August 1743 with a string of accusations.

The departure from Venice was bitter; Montaigu withheld Rousseau's salary, and the quarrel was news in Paris. When Rousseau returned on 10 October 1744, he shared quarters with a friend until the latter moved to Spain in March 1745. In utter poverty, Rousseau went back to his old depressing lodgings and vowed to stay closed up in his room until he finished his ballet. He evidently ventured out for food, because he met a young laundress who ate with the boarders. She was not pretty, although her soft eyes and modest bearing appealed to Rousseau.

Thérèse Levasseur became Rousseau's lifelong companion, and eventually his wife. She was born on 21 September 1721 in Orléans, one of six

children of an unemployed mint worker. In March 1745 she was twenty-three and supported herself and her family on a meager salary. The true nature of Levasseur's relationship with Rousseau was controversial even during their lifetime. She was never described as attractive in person or temperament, and many of Rousseau's intellectual companions, particularly the philosophes of the *Encyclopédie* (1751-1780), were vicious in their criticism. Those who defended her seemed moved by pity for an illiterate and possibly mentally defective girl in love with a neurotic genius who denied her children--their five children were all sent to a foundling hospital at birth--as well as his rich intellectuality. Evidently, Rousseau needed Levasseur for any number of reasons--nurse, maid, respect, and the simple warmth of human contact. He never liked polite society, although he was ambitious enough to put on a mask. With Levasseur he could be himself without the dreaded timidity and awkwardness (even embarrassing incontinence) that he so often felt in the presence of other women. He was plagued with urinary problems, and Levasseur performed the rather unpleasant task of catheterization necessary for treatment. Rousseau never claimed to love her, and he detested her mother, but he became increasingly dependent on Levasseur for the rest of his life.

In 1745, their mistresses and money problems were two more things that Rousseau and Diderot had in common, and they met at least weekly to dine and talk. Rousseau had high hopes for his ballet, *Les Muses galantes*, which he completed in July, and it was performed several times with mixed reviews. It made little money, but Rousseau gained important contacts, including his first correspondence with Voltaire, whom he had long admired. When Louis-François-Armand de Vignerot du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, asked Rousseau to revise *Les Fêtes de Ramire* (produced 22 December 1745), an entertainment piece from a book by Voltaire with music by Jean-Philippe Rameau, Rousseau sent Voltaire an ingratiating letter in December and received a cordial reply telling him to make whatever changes he wanted.

Rousseau also submitted his old comedy *Narcisse* to the Théâtre italien, where it was accepted, but never performed. At last, Dupin and her stepson, Charles-Louis Dupin de Francueil, who had studied chemistry with Rousseau, hired him as their joint secretary. Although the salary did not compensate for dependents, the position provided pleasures such as spending time at the great château de Chenonceaux, owned by Mme Dupin's financier husband.

In 1746, 1748, 1751, and twice more thereafter, Levasseur gave birth to children who were promptly taken to the foundling hospital, a solution supposedly suggested by Rousseau's young male table companions. Some scholars think that Rousseau's oblique reference to these children in the *Confessions* is a distortion or outright fiction, since no absolute proof of their existence has ever been found. One theory is that Rousseau contrived the story because of his poor health and awkwardness with women, thinking it better to be remembered as immorally virile than virtuously impotent. Others speculate that a jealous Levasseur somehow made up the births to hold Rousseau's affections. Yet another theory is that she had five children, but Rousseau could not possibly have been the father and knew it. Whatever the truth, abandonment of children was a common occurrence in the eighteenth century.

Guéhenno believes that the fundamental dynamic that ruled Rousseau was freedom to be himself: "He could not bear to be under any sort of restraint for any length of time. He instinctively avoided obligations and duties." Although his vanity and ambition placed him in many restrictive social situations, his sensitivity and pride eventually extracted him from them. For a man who spent so much of his life feeling bitter, disillusioned, and disappointed, he had an amazing capacity for self-justification and faith in his own virtue. In the 1740s, the real Rousseau was often hidden behind a social persona that persuaded his philosophe friends that he was one of them. When he later became their enemy, they accused him of hypocrisy when he was simply

finally becoming himself. Guéhenno postulates that for a man such as Rousseau, children were, like illness, "mere physical accidents . . . ; 'the work of nature'; whereas his ideas were his and his alone."

By 1748, Rousseau was living three different and chaotic lives: with his few intellectual friends, with his mistress's rabble of a family, and with the snobbery and deceit of high society. Often in the luxurious and leisurely life of the Dupins at Chenonceaux, he wrote plays performed by the château guests. One of his plays was performed in September at La Chevrette, the country estate of Louise d'Epinau. A writer and friend of the philosophes, Epinau was among the brilliant and influential *salonnières* that Rousseau assiduously courted at the time and later blamed for the decadence of Parisian society. Her partly fictionalized memoirs, *Histoire de Madame de Montbrillant* (1951, *The Story of Madame de Montbrillant*), portray the milieu of her class, in which true feelings are hidden behind ritualized games of adultery and deceit. She found Rousseau strangely appealing--an impolite flatterer, intelligent without social graces, and attractive though homely. Part of Rousseau's lack of social grace was likely caused by increasing health--specifically bladder--problems that added pain and embarrassment to his social engagements.

Poverty was also a constant companion. Diderot entrusted Rousseau with the articles on music for his great collaborative project with Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, the *Encyclopédie*, but no monetary compensation was forthcoming until the first volume appeared on 28 June 1751. On 27 January 1749, Rousseau wrote to Warens complaining about how hard Diderot was making him work on his great project, but Rousseau always admitted he was lazy. Meanwhile, Louis XV's government responded to increasing criticism and unrest by a barrage of *lettres de cachet* (arrest warrants) aimed particularly at the intelligentsia--writers and scientists of the Republic of Letters. The philosophes working on the *Encyclopédie* were suspect, and Diderot was arrested on 24 July 1749

and incarcerated at Vincennes. Rousseau's life changed when he visited Diderot, as was his habit every other day.

Rousseau claims that he "became another man" in October 1749 when he read the subject of an essay contest sponsored by the Academy of Dijon and advertised in the *Mercur de France*. The question, "Has the revival of the arts and sciences done more to corrupt or to purify morals?" unleashed "a thousand lights . . . a host of exciting ideas" swimming in his head so that he felt drunk, unable to breathe. Rousseau, as Gu  henno quotes, spoke of how in a quarter hour the "great truths" that are "inadequately distributed throughout my three main works" flashed through his mind. The rest are lost, but those that underpin his first two discourses and the treatise on education "are inseparable and form a single whole. . . . And that is how I became a writer almost against my will. . . . The remainder of my life and all my subsequent misfortunes were the inevitable result of this moment of aberration."

With Diderot's encouragement, Rousseau began work immediately on his *Discours qui a remport   le prix    l'Acad  mie de Dijon, en l'ann  e 1750, sur cette question propos  e par la m  me Acad  mie: "Si le r  tablissement des Sciences et des Arts a contribu        purer les moeurs,"* known as the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* (1750; translated as *A Discourse on the Arts and Science*, 1751). The Academy of Dijon awarded him the prize in July 1750, and the essay was published toward the end of the year. The success of the first discourse inaugurated the period of Rousseau's greatest productivity and the rewards and frustrations of fame. It also set the direction of his thoughts and the themes of his future works, although Rousseau later contended that it was the most weakly reasoned of any of his writings.

In the first part of the discourse, Rousseau postulates that "our souls have gradually become corrupt as our sciences and arts have advanced toward perfection." In the second part, he argues that "the sciences and the arts owe their origin to

our vices." Lester G. Crocker contends that Rousseau set out to prove that while primitive human nature was more rustic and natural, it was no better or worse as such; feelings were simply transparent. Man had not yet learned the great sin of civilization--"the duality of the face and the heart, of outer form and inner being, of word or gesture and thought"--the same duality that brings suspicion, calumny, and treachery. Thus, civilization opposes virtue, and the arts and sciences, particularly, "have an inverse relation to morals." Rousseau explains in the second part of the discourse that the origin of the arts and sciences ensures their harmful effect because they are spawned from ambition, lies, superstition, greed, curiosity, and pride. The function of truly great men, however, is "to erect monuments to the glory of the human mind." These men, such as the gentlemen of the Academy of Dijon, should be admitted into the courts and councils of the king, whereas ordinary men, similar to himself, should be content to remain obscure. Gu  henno comments, "no one could have expressed more eloquent contempt for the very thing he was asking for, or put forward his claim to fame with greater humility. Contradictions such as these were part and parcel of his nature."

The first discourse severely shook the Republic of Letters when it appeared in November 1750. Writers rushed to defend the arts and sciences, and to refute the attack on the progress of civilization that the enlightened century held most dear. The essay was discussed all over Europe and sparked nothing but refutations, albeit respectful in tone. No one could know that the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* included kernels of Rousseau's entire philosophical system--or what he recalled of those "thousand lights" on the road to Vincennes--which were developed in later works. With fame, Rousseau also began divesting himself of the superficiality--the multiple masks--that had heretofore governed his life. He was almost forty and had finally found the confidence to be himself. In the *Confessions* he speaks of inaugurating his "reform" by rejecting adornment--his gold braid, white stockings,

sword, and watch. "Thank Heaven, I shall never again need to know what time it is," he wrote with great delight.

A true reform meant breaking with the philosophes and the society he had courted for a decade, but Rousseau was not quite ready for that change. Although his relationship with his intellectual peers was changing with his fame and success, Diderot and the others did not yet realize the philosophical and psychological chasm that separated them. They all craved and strove for success, but, unlike the others, Rousseau could never live easily with it. Furthermore, he tended to become more detached as his painful illness grew worse, and he was certain he would soon die. Still, the intent of Rousseau's reform in 1750 was to transform himself into a paragon of virtue who no longer toadied to those whose beneficence he desired.

Rousseau's reform was tested when a minor tempest raged among Parisian music buffs about the virtues of French versus Italian opera. As the music specialist of the *Encyclopédie*, Rousseau both entered the debate and composed an opera, *Le Devin du village* (The Soothsayer of the Village, produced 1752; published 1753). It was a grand moment when his opera was successfully staged at Fontainebleau on 18 October 1752 in front of the king, Madame de Pompadour, and the court. Yet, the reformed Rousseau turned down a pension offered by the king and fled back to copying music (his main source of income) and his freedom.

The contradictions in Rousseau's nature beg the question of how a "paragon of virtue" can write comedies and operas for the same arts he condemns. Guéhenno suggests that perhaps Rousseau believed that he alone cultivated the arts and sciences for truth and virtue, not for fame or self-interest. Success is also addictive, and Rousseau brought out his old comedy *Narcisse* to be performed anonymously (ostensibly to avoid compliments) at the Théâtre français on 18 December 1752. Yet, when the play failed, he

seemed to gain more pleasure from failure than success. He wrote a new preface, which he considered one of his best creations, and published the play. This action inspired one critic to comment on the strangeness of the Citizen of Geneva, whose manner of waging war with his century was to perform a play of poor quality just for the "pleasure of hearing it booed."

The new preface for *Narcisse* was part autobiography, part summary of the major themes of the first discourse, and a preview of Rousseau's next major work. Although he claims to care little what people think of him, he cares deeply about being unjustly accused. Thus, he explains his ambivalence by insisting that it does not violate his principles to write comedies and operas for the people of Paris, because a corrupted people can never recover its morals. Rousseau heralds Karl Marx by condemning competitiveness and self-interest in society. Instead of individuals working for the happiness of others in order to ensure their own, a competitive society makes living together impossible without aiming to deceive, betray, and destroy each other. Competition brings out evil by forcing people to hurt each other while pretending to care, a characteristic that Rousseau insists was not the case with primitive societies with no private property; he sees ownership as the origin of crime. Competition is most vicious in the economic sphere, where those with wealth become wealthier and more revered while those who are poor are looked down upon and remain poor forever. In a key statement, Rousseau maintains that the evil in man is more the fault of poor government than an inherent characteristic of his nature.

The public generally disliked the arrogant tone of the preface. Crocker says that Louis XV was so angry at Rousseau's "republican maxims" and his arrogant refusal to make suggested changes in his opera that he threatened to throw Rousseau into the insane asylum. Nevertheless, *Le Devin du village* was presented at the Paris Opera on 1 March 1753 and was a grand success. According

to Crocker, it became a kind of symbol of the ancien régime in the early nineteenth century and was performed more than four hundred times. Yet, in November 1753, Rousseau scathingly criticized French music in a long brochure, *Lettre sur la musique française* (1753, Letter on French Music). The public reaction was violent: he was kicked in person and burned in effigy at the Opera where he courageously kept appearing, and some thirty brochures were written in indignant response. Rousseau was momentarily diverted from these persecutions, however, by the announcement of a new essay contest sponsored by the Academy of Dijon. The subject, "What is the origin of inequality among men, and is it authorized by natural law?" did not spark another "thousand lights," but it fit exactly with the development of insights left dangling from his 1749 epiphany. Rousseau completed his second discourse in May 1754 and then left Paris for Geneva.

Voltaire called Rousseau's *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (1755; translated as *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of the Inequality among Mankind*, 1762) his "second book against the human race." For Rousseau, it was a logical extension of his "system" revealed on the road to Vincennes. Since he had come to believe that human affairs center on politics and that the government determines the happiness of a nation, he had been considering a major work titled "Political Institutions" that would articulate basic principles for the best possible government and thus form the essence of his system and his crowning achievement. Whereas the first discourse, in part, attacked the Enlightenment creed of inevitable progress and the moral laxity that can accompany that belief, the second discourse, among other things, addressed the complacency generated by religious doctrine. The question of the origin of inequality led Rousseau back to the question of whether social ills are the result of society, man's sinful nature, or ordained by God.

Rousseau believed that he had firsthand experience with inequality through his apprenticeship and adult dependence on benefactors. According to Jean Starobinski, Rousseau decided that inequality "is a consequence of a deluded and vain concern for appearances." A wicked society abused him, but he could still live a "dignified and morally justified existence" by living in poverty. In this way, he challenged the society that spawned inequality by using his literary fame to make an "ostentatious display of poverty and independence" and became an example to the rest of the world. Thus, Rousseau wanted to remain a victim of a wicked society. Accepting gifts or pensions, he believed, is to admit inferiority and forces a show of gratitude and submission, whereas rejection signifies living free and according to virtuous ideals.

Starobinski calls *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* "a remarkable intellectual effort, . . . more than just a recasting of rebellious emotions in a systematic analytical form. Rousseau transcended personal experience to create a universal model." In this work, he became the spokesman for the oppressed, the impoverished, and the expatriated. In Starobinski's opinion, Rousseau also "hit upon his grand style, . . . his earnest genius . . . found the tone that suited it-- . . . one of proud eloquence grappling with lofty issues." Even if Rousseau borrowed heavily from others, "the work itself is a source to which one could trace, . . . all modern thought about the nature of society."

Starobinski claims that Rousseau believed that man became evil without willing evil (just as he believed that his heart could remain pure although he performed an evil act) because he struggled with nature and attempted to "overcome adversity through labor." Evil was not Christian sin but "alienation: loss of identity, living for the opinion of others, wanting more than simple recognition. Its source is external and its essence is passion for the external." Man, amoral by nature and in a natural state, must

ultimately struggle with his fellows over division of property, and, hence, a government is created to keep order. However, the social contract thus formed is evil, because it is based on inequality. The rich man, with advantages gained by deception, convinces others to accept a contract that consolidates his advantages. It institutionalizes inequality by establishing dominant property rights for the rich, and it is unjust because it springs from deception and not the spontaneous will of the entire society.

Herein lie the seeds of Rousseau's well-known *Du Contrat social* (1762; translated as *A Treatise on the Social Compact*, 1764); but the *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* also challenges certain tenets held dear by the Enlightenment philosophes. For example, Rousseau viewed history as a process of decay, not progress; moreover, he thought that salvation was possible only by opposing the destructiveness of history. Yet, he suggested that both he and Geneva were possible exceptions that had avoided corruption by remaining true to principles and/or withdrawing from civilization. Rousseau neither denied the natural inequality of talent nor advocated the leveling of society, and he offered no viable alternative to man's search for happiness. He believed that the man who understands clearly the evil of present society and that happiness lies in a past to which he cannot return "can no longer accept the status quo" and "is condemned to solitude."

Rousseau left Paris on 1 June 1754 with Levasseur and an old friend, Victor de Gauffecourt, to visit his birthplace for the first time in five years. At Chambéry, en route, he was horrified to find Warens in dire straits from debt and lawsuits at age fifty-four. Although he was not willing to stay with her and thus expunge his old debt for his upkeep, he invited her to live with him and Levasseur. When she refused, he gave her a little money and spoke of his everlasting remorse for leaving her, but he continued on his way to Geneva.

Rousseau dedicated his second discourse to Geneva and planned to publish it as soon as the contest winner was announced. He and his companions arrived at the end of June 1754, before anyone in the city knew of the dedication, but Rousseau was the object of enough honor and curiosity to feel welcome. Relishing the attention and feeling a surge of republican patriotism, he renewed his citizenship by reconverting to the Calvinist faith. He returned to Paris in October with plans to move to Geneva permanently in the spring.

Rousseau's reason is not clear--he gave different reasons to different people--but he did not move back to Geneva in 1755. Although the Council of Geneva thanked him for the second discourse, many town leaders were offended by the insolent tone of the dedication, as though Rousseau were condescendingly giving advice, and he was disappointed by their unenthusiastic reception. Voltaire, who moved to Geneva in 1755, was also a problem. Rousseau sent Voltaire a copy of his new work, for which Voltaire thanked him in his politely malicious and satirical style, thus leading to the first polemical exchange of a long battle. Sparring between these two men was probably inevitable, but perhaps a jealous Rousseau believed that Geneva was not large enough for the two of them. The most important reason may have been that Epinay made it possible--he said she insisted--for Rousseau to move to L'Ermitage (the Hermitage), a house in the park of her estate of La Chevrette.

Before Rousseau, Levasseur, and her mother moved to L'Ermitage in April 1756, Rousseau's article "Economie politique" appeared in the fifth volume (published in November 1755) of the *Encyclopédie*. Crocker describes it as the "complement and the crown" of the second discourse because Rousseau was able to articulate basic principles for the reconstruction of society that had eluded him before. These tenets were part of a "vast scheme for an ideal society . . . so vast, so daring, so completely new and revolutionary that he could as yet perceive only

its dim outlines." Therefore, the time was propitious for Rousseau to take up the life of a hermit, although doing so meant being beholden to Epinay for both the house and a stipend to live there.

Several events, in fact, delayed Rousseau's great political work. In June 1756, Voltaire sent two new poems, one on natural law and the other about the disastrous Lisbon earthquake of November 1755, to Rousseau, d'Alembert, and Diderot. Rousseau was flattered by the attention but determined to have his say. Crocker claims that Rousseau's third letter to Voltaire was an intellectual outpouring defending the existence of God. Rousseau agreed that all in life was not good, but he courteously accused Voltaire of causing needless despair by questioning the goodness of Providence. Insisting that a perfect God exists, Rousseau wrote, "I have suffered too much in this life not to await another one. . . . All the subtleties of metaphysics will not make me doubt a moment the immortality of the soul and a beneficent Providence. I feel it, I believe in it, I want it, I hope for it, I will defend it till my last breath." Voltaire responded briefly and civilly, but Rousseau believed that Voltaire's satire *Candide* (1759) was his real reply. Voltaire was, indeed, offended, especially when Rousseau's letter was published in Berlin in 1759.

For Rousseau, another distraction from his writing was his continuing search for love. He is quoted by Crocker as "consumed by the desire of loving, without ever having been able to satisfy it completely." This yearning developed into a novel in which Rousseau, as protagonist, was finally loved as well as lover. During the harsh winter of 1756-1757, his life (as it should have been) unfolded in the story of Julie d'Etange and Saint-Preux, the lovers of *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* (1761; translated as *Eloisa; or, A Series of Original Letters*, 1761). Meanwhile, in reality, Rousseau's life was that of a hermit punctuated by periods of rather intense activity--several trips to Paris and a visit on 10 January 1757 from Elisabeth-Sophie d'Houdetot.

Rousseau had known Houdetot for more than a decade and was also friendly toward her lover, Jean-François, marquis de Saint-Lambert. However, when she visited him again in May, dressed in mannish riding attire with whip in hand, Rousseau saw her as the woman of his dreams--his "Julie." He was all the more entranced as she spoke of her passion for Saint-Lambert; he could vicariously engage in lovemaking without actually having to perform. His passion was overwhelming, and the liaison intensified through the summer. Rousseau's affection was reciprocated until it turned into a sort of frenzy replete with suspicions and neuroses wild enough for Houdetot to fear she was dealing with a dangerous and deranged man. When Rousseau's guilt turned to moralizing, Houdetot became bored. She severed their relationship in May 1758, but not before it became entangled with the notorious quarrel between Rousseau and Diderot.

Guéhenno describes dealing with this period of Rousseau's life as "plumbing the depths of the hell that can exist inside a human being. Jean-Jacques was not two-faced. He was not trying to be peculiar; he *was* peculiar. He was not pretending to love solitude, he did love it," and his physical affliction made it necessary. Rousseau's reform initiated the intellectual alienation from the clique of the philosophes, and his discourses and the third letter to Voltaire proved how far he had moved away from them ideologically. Still, Rousseau maintained a close relationship with Diderot, though he was disappointed and hurt that Diderot did not pay him more attention. Rousseau was always prone to read his own neuroses into situations, and the perfect opportunity came in February 1757 when Diderot sent him his new play, *Le Fils naturel* (1757, *The Natural Son*). When one of the characters utters the phrase "Only the bad man lives in solitude," Rousseau was shocked and considered it a gross insult. The two men had reconciled by April 1757, however, and Diderot was the first to hear Rousseau confess his passion for Houdetot.

Both Epinay's *Memoirs* (1818) and Rousseau's *Confessions* describe the drama of love and lost friendship with equal inaccuracy and bias, according to Guéhenno. It seemed to reach a crisis in August 1757 when Houdetot told Rousseau that her lover, Saint-Lambert, "knew everything." Rousseau suspected everyone of perfidy, especially Diderot. The romance deteriorated from there, carrying with it Rousseau's friendships with Frédéric Melchior Grimm, Epinay, and Diderot, and became what he called a "great revolution in my destiny."

Controversy surrounds this "great revolution" as it does many events of Rousseau's life. Crocker quotes Diderot's charge that Rousseau "is a monster [who] hates all those who put him under obligation." On the other hand, Diderot's defenders believed him incapable of such treachery and tended to blame Rousseau's considerable paranoia for allowing a small misunderstanding to grow out of proportion. What is certain is that the narratives of the events leading to the alienation of Rousseau from his benefactress, mistress, and best friend are complicated and contradictory. The literary cause célèbre resulted in the deepening of Rousseau's psychoses and his permanent alienation from the philosophes.

In December 1757 Rousseau and Levasseur moved to Montmorency (Montlouis) and forced Levasseur's mother, aged eighty, to return to Paris under great protest. She sought and received solace and funding from Rousseau's former friends, who used his treatment of a hapless old woman against him. These philosophes also became embroiled in a battle with conservative factions when the seventh volume of the *Encyclopédie* came out in October 1758. It included contributions from Rousseau, but the entries were anonymous and the onslaught against it was mostly centered in Paris. Rousseau, removed from the capital and no longer a philosophe (if, indeed, he had ever been one), nonetheless became involved in the fracas after reading a piece by d'Alembert promoting Voltaire's project of a

theater for Geneva. Rousseau again believed that he was near death when he wrote *Lettre sur les spectacles* (1758; translated as *Letter to d'Alembert on the Theater*, 1960) a work Guéhenno describes as closest to his "essential self; . . . almost a self-portrait, in which he . . . [displayed] all the strangeness of his mind."

Rousseau obviously aimed at Voltaire when he wrote, "no foreigner ever entered Geneva without doing more harm than good there." He considered himself the defender of his birthplace from the destructive ideas of outsiders. That these ideas were propagated by his old friends only widened the chasm between them. In a note, Rousseau added what became his motto: "*Vitam impendere vero*" (to submit one's life to the truth). When, in a revised preface to the *Lettre sur les spectacles*, he condemned Diderot after Houdetot broke off their relationship permanently because of Diderot's supposed indiscretions, to restore their friendship became impossible. Thus, the events of 1757 and 1758 provided a major turning point in Rousseau's life: "the catastrophe," he calls it, "which divided my life into two different parts, [and began] the time of my adversity." Crocker contends that from this point on, Rousseau was alone against the world.

Guéhenno, who spent ten years writing an almost daily account of Rousseau's life, believes that Rousseau spent his first forty years searching for himself. Rousseau began to attain his goal with the first discourse, in which he "pledged himself to virtue through that profession of his own uniqueness . . . and he kept his pledge. From then onward he wrote against the general trend of the century." Guéhenno also believes that much of Rousseau's work was musings of remorse or attempts to atone for the sins he committed lightheartedly enough at the time, when abandoning his five children: "He was only able to explain what was right because he knew what it was to have done wrong," explains Guéhenno. "He set out to refashion everything--man, love, society, even God himself." Alone in his "tower" at

Montmorency, he never "pursued a more grandiose dream."

When that tower was literally in danger of collapsing, he and Levasseur accepted an invitation from Charles-François and Madeleine-Angélique, duc and duchesse de Luxembourg, to stay at their château during repairs, provided they honor Rousseau's demands for solitude. He refused a lucrative offer to write for the *Journal des Savants* (Journal of the Learned), claiming that he could write only from passion; and Guéhenno contends that Rousseau's passion then was to remake man in his own image. Rousseau had become a "man of nature," whereas others were slaves and liars because they were trapped in a debased society. Yet, before addressing the central query of how to restore freedom and happiness to man, he first turned to the critical problem of education.

Rousseau worked simultaneously on *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse*, *Emile*, and *Du Contrat social* until the former was published by Marc Michel Rey in Amsterdam. It went on sale in London at the end of 1760 and in Paris early in 1761, and caused a sensation. *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* became the most popular novel of the time and went through seventy-two editions before 1800. Although the modern reader tends to find it tedious and uneven, Rousseau's generation and the Romantics after him fought over copies. The novel "was both the wish fulfillment of [Rousseau's] dream of love and the catharsis of guilt for his treacherous liaison with Mme d'Houdetot." Crocker believes that "Rousseau did not love women, but the tender, voluptuous, and false memories of them." Rousseau's characters came from memories or self-projections, and the experiences were often those he had been denied. While Saint-Preux is the lover that Rousseau might have been, *Emile* describes the "splendid father he failed to become."

Not everyone liked *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse*; literary critics and theologians disparaged it, and its distribution was forbidden in Geneva in

January 1761. Voltaire, disguised as the marquis de Ximenez, wrote four *Lettres à M. de Voltaire sur "La Nouvelle Héloïse"* (Letters to M. de Voltaire on *La Nouvelle Héloïse*), heaping calumny and insults on Rousseau's work. Yet, the public adored the work because it concerned problems of marriage, love, family, and education. "It was a book for women, and they loved it," writes Crocker. "Through Saint-Preux, they fell in love with Jean-Jacques."

Rousseau published *Extrait du projet de paix perpétuelle de M. l'abbé de Saint-Pierre* (1761; translated as *A Project for Perpetual Peace*, 1761)--a condensation of Charles-Irénée Castel, abbé de Saint-Pierre's work--but his chronic illness took a turn for the worse in June, and he was again certain he was near death. He confessed his sins toward his children to Mme de Luxembourg, and even asked her to search for his first child, who was the only one left with identification. The search was unsuccessful, and his painful illness became more severe. Yet, he somehow continued to work on *Emile* and *Du Contrat social*, and in September 1761 sent to Lamoignon de Malesherbes, the chief censor, his *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (1781; translated as *Essay on the Origin of Languages*, 1966). In response to his publisher's request for an autobiographical sketch to accompany his works, Rousseau wrote four autobiographical letters to Malesherbes while in a state of deep depression in January 1762. *Emile* was published in April 1762, followed by the *Contrat social* in May. The Parlement of Paris condemned *Emile* on 9 June, and Rousseau had to flee to Switzerland to avoid arrest in France.

Rousseau's *Essai sur l'origine des langues* is another version of the same theme he presented in the *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*. Though sometimes dissonant, the two texts are complementary and form the basis of a theory of language that undergirds Rousseau's philosophical works. Starobinsky explains that whereas the second discourse "places a history of language within the larger context of a history of society, . . . the *Essai* . . .

introduces a history of society into the theory of language and of music." The *Essai sur l'origine des langues* also develops Rousseau's notion that time and civilization have tended to corrupt both man and language. Whereas helpless primitive man used language to ask for assistance, modern man uses language to deceive others.

If mankind is to regain true freedom, governance must change, and man must be properly educated to function within the new society. Rousseau's two most famous works, *Du Contrat social* and *Emile*, concern these issues, although the threads of his reasoning are not always easy to follow. *Emile* has been called Rousseau's atonement for abandoning his children, but it more likely resulted from a fascination with education from the perspective of an outsider whose own upbringing was anything but orthodox. Although discussions of education abounded in the eighteenth century, Rousseau's original approach is credited with initiating a revolution in educational theory. *Emile* is long, dense, and easily misunderstood; but it may be Rousseau's best book and is assuredly a landmark work in educational literature.

Part of the problem with *Emile* is that it is both a treatise on education and a novel about Emile and Sophie. Sophie provides an opportunity to explore the education of girls and courtship. It fuels the debate between those who see Rousseau as simply a man of his age (possibly of all ages), in contending that woman's role is primarily domestic, and those who insist that he is hopelessly, perhaps psychotically, antifeminist. Broome contends, however, that to conclude that Rousseau is staunchly antifeminist is as irrelevant as applying totalitarian bias to his politics. His views faithfully follow his fundamental doctrine concerning what is natural and what is imposed by civilization: "What he desires primarily is to reestablish the ideal of marriage as a partnership, and as the creation of a new 'moral person' analogous to the Public Person of his political society."

The education of Emile is divided into stages according to age, and he is ready to encounter religion for the first time at sixteen. This stage takes the form of a discourse within the text, titled *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard* (Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar), and can be taken as the author's own statement of belief. Again Rousseau departs from the philosophes by abandoning reason when it no longer serves his purpose. He views reason as a fine human attribute that has been misused in civilization. Crocker explains that reason cannot replace Rousseau's "inner light," which "is infallible because it is an immediate intuition, preverbal in form, unfiltered by reason." Thus, without becoming an ally of the church, Rousseau opposed atheism, determinism, and materialism. God exists and science cannot explain everything; yet, man has the power to judge in such a way as to make freedom possible. Rousseau's paradoxical conclusion "the less we judge, the closer we shall be to the truth" leads to his statement: "Thus my rule, to be led by feeling rather than reason, is confirmed by reason itself." The apparent contradictions in the *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard* seem incredible when viewed out of the context of his other works. Even then, says Crocker, it is "feeble" as a philosophical treatise, and "represents Rousseau's need for subjective certainty, his tendency to perceive reality in accordance with his wishes, interests, and fantasies."

Rousseau's amazing productivity while in the throes of intense physical pain and emotional anguish was capped by his best-known work. He had labored for years on drafts of his never-published "Institutions politiques" (Political Institutions), but abandoned the larger project to complete a fragment that became *Du Contrat social*. He wanted to end his literary career with a final positive vision from the cascade of revelations on the road to Vincennes. Whereas the *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* exposed society and its evils, he intended his final work to show how man can restore his natural dignity and change society.

Twenty-eight years before the French Revolution that so often claimed Rousseau as its philosophical father, his version of the utopian state went on sale in France in February 1761 (there is some discrepancy about this date, which might be April or May). The famous opening, "Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains," poses the questions of "why?" and "what can be done?" Rousseau's lawgiver warns that whoever dares to draw up the institutions of a nation must feel able to change human nature, which means changing each individual from "a perfect and separate whole, into a part of a greater whole from which, in a sense, this individual receives both his life and his being." Rousseau, as Guéhenno quotes him, states, "if each citizen is nothing, and can do nothing except through others, and if the strength acquired by the whole becomes equal or superior to the sum of the strength of all individuals, we can say that legislation has reached the highest degree of perfection to which it can attain."

Rousseau was just the exceptional man to guide mankind back to the "ideal contract" that ensured the justice, dignity, order, and harmony in society that must have existed before man became corrupt. Man included the God-given source of law within himself, but his corruption caused many infringements of the contract that tainted the subsequent history of nations and governments. Since the ideal contract is freely entered into and is "the common demand of all consciences," it is absolute. It is the General Will, and it is only in surrendering to this Will that man recovers true freedom. This statement is essentially Rousseau's answer to the perennial question of legality and legitimate political authority, since he believes that no man has natural authority over another. To actually implement such a revolutionary change, however, requires an extraordinary statesman--Rousseau's lawgiver--who is not sovereign or magisterial, but can fashion institutions and laws for the orderly functioning of the state. After establishing the theoretical basis of the state and the lawgiver who helps to give it form, Broome argues that

Rousseau becomes more empirical and realistic in discussing who will actually run the government. He is concerned with the tendency of government to "degenerate and abuse its power at the expense of the Sovereign [People]" (totalitarianism), and believes that all governments will perish eventually. The point is to keep them functioning properly, or "to maintain the sense of the authority of the Sovereign People," for as long as possible. As for the actual form of government, Rousseau contends that different states will likely need different governments.

The debates sparked by *Du Contrat social* are legion, but two problems have especially intrigued commentators. The first is the notion of the "General Will" that determines social control and justice, and notoriously invoked by Maximilian Robespierre during the revolutionary Terror. It is more than a simple majority vote because it tolerates no permanent dissent. Rousseau understood that men will fight for their own interests, but he also believed in a unanimous rationalism that prevails if individual passions are quieted. This underlying rational unity is the General Will; and it is through the participation of everyone in the voting process and then instituting the General Will over Individual Will that man becomes truly free. Crocker further explains, "thus, when we suppress the individual's protest, even the protest of his conscience, we merely 'force him to be free,' force him to do what he *really* wants to do."

A second problem is the essential nature of Rousseau's political thought and the relationship of the individual to the state. The question of whether it is totalitarian or liberal (democratic) is usually the main thrust of discussion, but Rousseau was unlikely to be thinking in those terms. He wanted to ensure mankind's happiness through a just and legitimate political structure. That to do this demanded some sacrifice of individual will to a greater entity for the greater good of everyone, he deemed a small price. Rousseau's insistence on absolute subjection is troubling today, but justified to him by the

absolute freedom and justice imparted by the General Will.

These problems touch only a critical fraction of Rousseau's philosophy, and they must be studied within the context of his entire oeuvre before any cohesive schema becomes apparent. Rousseau has always been accused of inconsistency although he insisted on the essential unity of his work. For example, the *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* seems to contradict *Du Contrat social* by espousing individualism and a spirit of rebellion as opposed to the submissiveness condoned in the latter. Rousseau, however, is speaking of two different things. The *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* refers to existing societies that are corrupt and unjust whereas *Du Contrat social* is a dream for the future. In both works, the core value of "happiness" can only come from a good society in which men are virtuous. Since Rousseau believed that mankind can never return to his precivilized past where he lived in natural virtue, *Du Contrat social* is his blueprint for molding a virtuous society after a history of corruption.

The final and most troubling stage of Rousseau's life began with the condemnation of *Emile* in France and his flight to Switzerland. He arrived in Bern on 14 June 1762 only to be expelled when the authorities of Geneva burned *Emile* and *Du Contrat social* and issued a warrant for his arrest. He went to Motiers in the Prussian principality of Neuchâtel on 10 July and was given shelter by Julie-Anne-Marie Boy de La Tour, a niece of his old-time friend Daniel Roguin who had introduced him to Diderot. Levasseur, to whom he gave the choice of joining him or staying in France, arrived on 20 July. A new friend and protector, George Keith, tenth Earl of Marischal, a Scotsman in the service of Frederick the Great, made certain that he was naturalized in the territory of Neuchâtel, although he had many invitations, including one from [David Hume](#) in England.

Rousseau grieved when he heard in October 1762 that his once beloved *maman* had died in July. Meanwhile, in August the archbishop of Paris condemned *Emile* in a pastoral letter that cut into Rousseau's heart. His response was the masterful *Lettre à M. Christophe de Beaumont* (1763, Letter to M. Christophe de Beaumont), in which Rousseau not only defended his work but also attacked the theologians and governors of Geneva who had condemned him. The man who was once proud to call himself a "Citizen of Geneva" renounced his citizenship in May in the midst of a civil conflict that divided the republic into two parties: those who supported oligarchical rule and condemned Rousseau (*Négatifs*), and those who supported both him and a wider democracy (*Représentants*). Jean-Robert Tronchin, an old enemy of Rousseau who was reelected Procureur-général (Attorney General) in 1762, published a clever defense of the oligarchy in 1763, *Lettres de la campagne* (Letters from the Countryside). Rousseau worked through the winter and spring to compose his response--not only to Tronchin, but to all authorities and ministers who had refuted him, and not only to Geneva, but to all of Europe.

At Motiers, secretly composing his *Lettres écrites de la montagne* (1764; translated as *Letter to Beaumont, Letters Written from the Mountain, and Related Writings*, 2002), Rousseau, dressed eccentrically in a loose Armenian costume that hid the catheters and other signs of his chronic problem, held court to friends and strangers. He maintained a huge correspondence with many people, including his admiring women (Comtesse Marie-Madeleine de Boufflers, La Tour-Franqueville [his Julie], and a mysterious Henriette, to name only a few). This period was also when he acquired a deep fascination for botany. Rousseau was even asked to draw up a constitution for recently independent Corsica in September 1764. He responded with his "Project for the Constitution of Corsica," which he later abandoned when the French annexed the island.

Lettres écrites de la montagne was published in October 1764 and reached Geneva and Paris in

December. Although modern readers tend to find the *Lettres écrites de la montagne* rather boring, Rousseau attached the greatest importance to them as a vindication of the religious and political ideas expressed in his other books. He knew they could be explosive in Geneva, but he was not prepared for the anonymous eight-page pamphlet he received on 27 December, *Le Sentiment des citoyens* (1764, The Feeling of Citizens). Rousseau believed it was the work of an old friend, Jacob Vernes, when it was, in fact, the clever poisonous pen of Voltaire who painted Rousseau as the blackest of villains. The author appeared to be a priest and a Geneva native, and claimed to express the "opinions of the town" by accusing Rousseau of insulting "Jesus Christ and the ministers of the Gospel." The pamphlet, quoted by Guéhenno, begins, "We are sorry for a madman: but when he becomes a raving lunatic we tie him up." It questions how an honorable man born in Geneva can offer such affronts to its ministers, but the passage that stopped Rousseau cold was:

Is he an honorable man deceived by misplaced zeal and leveling rash accusations at virtuous men? We confess with shame and sorrow that he is a man bearing the dreadful taint of his debauchery, who dresses up like a circus clown and drags with him from village to village, and from mountain to mountain an unfortunate creature whose mother died because of him and whose children he abandoned on the doorstep of a poorhouse, after refusing to allow a kind-hearted person to take care of them, and spurning all natural feelings as he renounces those of honor and religion.

Now all Europe knew Rousseau's secret, although he had "condemned" himself to a life of virtue for fifteen years.

Rousseau was thunderstruck, but he brazenly sent the pamphlet to his Paris publisher with instructions to reprint it with additional notes. The additions set the record straight about Levasseur's mother, who was still alive; but they were a sad display of Rousseau's own duplicity. Although his reputation was scarcely tarnished in

France, Rousseau was haunted by the words of his enemies and decided to write an autobiography as a grand vindication (his publisher had promoted this idea for a long time). He began work on *Les Confessions de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* in January 1765, a date that also marks the beginning of the worst period of his life. He went through alternating phases of abject despondency and frenetic excitement.

Rousseau left Motiers for Paris when he clashed with the town leaders and his house was stoned. On 4 January 1766, he departed from Paris for London with Hume and an old Geneva friend, Jean-Jacques de Luze. Rousseau later recalled that during a night when the three slept in the same room, he lay awake listening to Hume say, "I have got hold of Jean-Jacques Rousseau." Thus began what Henri Guillemin called "*cette affaire infernale*" (this infernal affair). Everything went well at first, and Rousseau was enthusiastically welcomed in London. Levasseur joined him on 13 February (escorted by James Boswell, a frequent visitor at Motiers, with whom she supposedly had an affair on the way), but trouble soon followed.

Rousseau was initially grateful and overwhelmed by the attention but soon became suspicious that Hume was part of a plot incited by old enemies in Paris and Geneva. After complaining that he was denied the solitude he craved, Rousseau gained more than he anticipated when he was offered lodging at Wootton Hall in Derbyshire in March 1766. The winter had been extremely cold; the snow was still deep, and the countryside silent. Rousseau's vow to speak only French meant that few visitors disturbed them.

By the end of 1766, Rousseau suspected virtually everyone of deception. He broke his reform by accepting a pension for £100 per year from George III in March 1767, but the phobias continued unabated. Levasseur despised England and nagged him to leave, and Rousseau was evidently obsessed with fear that his papers and the completed parts of the *Confessions* would fall into the wrong hands. Although he had offers of

hospitality from many people and places (including economist and physiocrat Victor Riquetti, marquis de Mirabeau; and Grigory Grigoryevich, Count Orlov, lover and favorite of Catherine the Great), he distrusted almost everyone. He and Levasseur left Wooton Hall on 1 May 1767 and made their way to Dover. They landed at Calais on 22 May with no passports, a warrant still out for his arrest, and nowhere to go. But Rousseau, more churlish and distrustful than ever, still had well-placed friends.

Louis-François de Bourbon, prince de Conti, arranged for Rousseau to go to his Château de Trye near Gisors. The prince insisted that Rousseau change his name, but nothing altered his suspicious attitude toward everyone, especially servants. In May 1768, Rousseau began two years of wanderings that took him to Lyon, Chambéry, Grenoble, and elsewhere. When Levasseur joined him in Bourgoin in August 1768, he surprised her by arranging their marriage after twenty-three years of cohabitation. Marriage, however, brought neither bliss nor serenity. The two, in fact, came close to separation in the summer of the following year when Rousseau found Levasseur possibly amusing herself with a monk. In a pathetic letter on 12 August, he told her that she was his one resource, that he would be completely alone--indeed, he would die--without her. Nothing more came of the quarrel, but his emotions were obviously close to the breaking point.

On 27 April 1769, Rousseau informed his publisher that he did not intend to finish his memoirs. By November, however, he changed his mind and secretly resumed work on the story of his life that would prove his innocence for all posterity.

Guéhenno contends that the more one studies Rousseau's life, the less meaningful the question of the truth of the *Confessions* becomes. "It is not the mistakes he makes in the detailed narration of events which matter most," says Guéhenno, "the most serious thing is that the whole of his account

is proof . . . that he did not know himself. . . . What is missing from his account is his passion and his genius."

Rousseau and Levasseur headed toward Paris in April 1770 and settled in his old lodgings, the Hôtel du Saint-Esprit on rue Platrière, on 24 June. The police left them alone as long as Rousseau abided by certain restrictions. He could not publish anything nor wear the Armenian outfit that he had given up, and he was later asked to stay away from public places because he drew such curious crowds. He completed the *Confessions* in December but did not intend to publish them in his lifetime. Yet, when his return to Paris did not draw his enemies into open confrontation as he had hoped, Rousseau decided to hold readings of the *Confessions* at the homes of selected people. These readings lasted into the spring of 1771 when the police forbade them at Epinay's request.

Rousseau also worked on a Polish constitution, a project presented to him in 1770. He completed the *Considérations sur le gouvernement de la Pologne* (1783; translated as *Considerations on the Government of Poland*, 1953) in April 1771, but it remained unpublished through a vow of secrecy between the author and Count Michel Wielhorski, his liaison with the Polish Diet. Secrecy failed when a publisher somehow got copies and circulated them in April 1772. Rousseau was furious, but he had readily accepted the challenge despite vows to forgo both writing and politics. Perhaps the chance to be the "Lawgiver" had more appeal than he could deny. Since the government and society of Poland were much older, less primitive, and more corrupt than Corsica's, Rousseau faced a different challenge in this last of his political writings. He was conservative regarding existing institutions and never believed in the usefulness of reform. Nor was he a social revolutionary; he was not interested in redistributing wealth or abolishing hierarchy. But his ideas were nonetheless revolutionary and coincided with his earlier writings. With order and stability as goals, and human nature the

perverse matter that prevented them, Poland needed a different type of revolution from simply changing laws and institutions. Rousseau's Polish revolution was designed to mold men so that they would freely consent to be controlled, by instilling an intense patriotism for the country and its laws through games, rituals, even the arts, and competition.

Crocker declares, "in the great choice between collectivism and individualism, between the closed and the open society, there is no doubt which is Rousseau's way." Certainly, the differences between him and the liberal philosophes, who relied on enlightened laws and education to change society, were clarified, and he added his passionate voice to the new force of nationalism. Rousseau hoped that this work would enhance his reputation and fame after his death, but it met the same fate as the plan for Corsica. Poland was soon caught up in the partitions that wiped out her national existence for well over a century.

When Rousseau moved back to Paris in 1770, he lived by his old craft of copying music and indulged his passion for botany when the weather permitted. After completing his work on Poland and breaking with most of his friends, he could have finished the *Confessions* but claimed he did not have the heart for it. Instead, in 1772, he began *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques. Dialogues* (1780; translated as *Rousseau, Judge of Jean-Jacques*, 1990), an extraordinary testimonial that occupied him intermittently for the next three years. The *Dialogues* portray Rousseau's broodings and show a distinct touch of madness. He decided to give the manuscript to God by placing it on the high altar of Notre Dame, where, perhaps, the king might also notice it. He carefully prepared to carry out this task, but when he arrived at the church on 24 December 1776, a railing with locked gates that he had never seen before surrounded the chancel. Stunned, Rousseau wandered aimlessly all day, now certain that God had joined men against him.

The fading years of Rousseau's life were not altogether unpleasant. Although he was still manic on the subject of his enemies, botany and music soothed him and he continued to compose. His *Pygmalion* (1770) was performed at the Comédie française on 1 November 1775, but he took little interest and refused any payment. Visitors still came to see him, and one final friendship developed--with young writer Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, who was as poor, virtuous, and antisocial as Rousseau. Rousseau's health actually improved until 24 October 1776, when a large dog running beside a speeding carriage knocked him unconscious on the street in Ménilmontant. He awoke in a euphoric state with no pain, although he was bleeding. Ronald Grimsley believes that when rumors of Rousseau's death circulated and he saw an indication of his obituaries, he decided to write *Des Rêveries du promeneur solitaire* (1782; translated as *The Reveries of the Solitary Walker*, 1783). Never finished, it consists of a series of "walks" or essays on the "secret history of his soul," a more restrained continuation of his pursuit of self-knowledge begun in the *Confessions*.

Rousseau began the *Des Rêveries du promeneur solitaire* in the autumn of 1776 and continued to write them through 1777 and into 1778. In May 1778, he accepted the hospitality of the marquis de Girardin to live with Levasseur in a pavilion on Girardin's property at Ermenonville. In early June, when the marquis was surprised by the deep effect of Voltaire's death on Rousseau, the latter responded that their existence was linked, and he would not be long in following. Rousseau died a month later, 2 July, with only Levasseur as a witness. On 4 July 1778, he was buried on the Ile des Peupliers at Ermenonville.

From 9 to 11 October during the Reign of Terror in 1794, Rousseau's remains were ceremoniously transported to the Pantheon in Paris. This man who so loved solitude and functioned so poorly in the Parisian society that he claimed to deplore was put to rest in a marble mausoleum in the

heart of Paris surrounded by the tombs of the great men of France, including Voltaire.

FURTHER READINGS ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Bibliographies:

- Jean S nelier, *Bibliographie g n rale des oeuvres de J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950).
- Tanguy L'Aminot, *Bibliographie mondiale des  crits relatifs   Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Montmorency: Mus e Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1989-).

Selected Biographies:

- John Morley, *Rousseau*, 2 volumes (London: Macmillan, 1896).
- H. F. Amiel, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, translated by Van Wyck Brooks (New York: Viking, 1922).
- F. C. Green, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau. A Study of His Life and Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955).
- Frances Winwar, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Conscience of an Era* (New York: Random House, 1961).
- Bernard F y, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: ou le r ve de la vie* (Paris: Librairie acad mique Perrin, 1974).
- Bernard Gagnebin, *Album Rousseau* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976).
- George R. Havens, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Boston: Twayne, 1978).
- Susan K. Jackson, *Rousseau's Occasional Autobiographies* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992).

References:

- Louis Althusser, *Montesquieu, Rousseau, Marx. Politics and History*, translated by Ben Brewster (London: Verso, 1982).
- Jack Howard Broome, *Rousseau. A Study of His Thought* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963).

- David Cameron, *The Social Thought of Rousseau and Burke. A Comparative Study* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973).
- Ernst Cassirer, *The Question of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, second edition, translated by Peter Gay (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Alfred B. Cobban, *Rousseau and the Modern State*, revised edition (London: Allen & Unwin, 1964).
- Maurice Cranston, *Jean-Jacques. The Early Life and Work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau 1712-1754* (New York: Norton, 1983).
- Cranston, *The Noble Savage. Jean-Jacques Rousseau 1754-1762* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).
- Cranston, *The Solitary Self. Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Exile and Adversity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
- Lester G. Crocker, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 2 volumes (New York: Macmillan, 1968).
- Havelock Ellis, *From Rousseau to Proust* (London: Constable, 1935).
- Ronald Grimsley, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1983).
- Jean Gu henno, *Jean-Jacques* (Paris: Grasset, 1948-1952); translated by John and Doreen Weightman, 2 volumes (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967).
- Charles William Hendels, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Moraliste*, 2 volumes (London: Oxford University Press, 1934).
- Ralph Alexander Leigh, ed., *Two Hundred Years of Rousseau. Proceedings of the Cambridge Bicentennial Colloquium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- Jim MacAdam, Michael Neumann, and Guy LaFrance, eds., *Trent Rousseau Papers: Proceedings of the Bicentennial Congress, Trent University, June 1978*, Collection Philosophica, no. 15 (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1980)--includes translations of "Narcisse".
- Gita May, *De Jean-Jacques Rousseau   Madame Roland: essai sur la sensibilit *

préromantique et révolutionnaire (Geneva: Droz, 1964).

- Louis Proal, *La Psychologie de J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris: Alcan, 1923).
- Daniel Roche, *France in the Enlightenment*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).
- Jean Starobinski, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Transparency and Obstruction*, translated by Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
- Starobinski and others, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: quatre études* (Neuchâtel: La Baconnière, 1978).
- Tzvetan Todorov, *Frail Happiness: An Essay on Rousseau*, translated by John T. Scott and Robert D. Zaretsky (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001).
- Mary Seidman Trouille, *Sexual Politics in the Enlightenment. Women Writers Read Rousseau* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).

About this Essay: Joy H. Hall, Colorado College.

Source: *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 314: Writers of the French Enlightenment, II.* A Brucoli Clark Layman Book. Edited by Samia I. Spencer, Auburn University. Gale, 2005. pp. 116-136.

Source: Dictionary of Literary Biography
