

THE CONTROVERSY WITH RAMEAU AND THE GENESIS
OF THE ESSAI SUR L'ORIGINE DES LANGUES

Rousseau believed that mankind was by nature good and that his own character was proof of this. But while his belief came to be quite widely shared, his proof was often thought to be less certain, and in his own lifetime he did not command the universal admiration which he felt a man of his great virtue could expect. He professed to have a great love for humanity and a deep respect for friendship, and yet among the major intellectual figures of his day there were few who could tolerate his company for long.

J'étois fait pour être le meilleur ami qui fut
jamais, mais celui qui devoit me répondre est
encore à venir.¹

For while his literary attacks upon polite society were sometimes held to be ingenious even by individuals who found his ideas to be mistaken,² the contempt for civility which he displayed in his conduct was generally regarded as offensive. He was either too sullen or too earnest and conspicuously out of place in the salon,

1. 'Mon Portrait', O.C.I., p. 1124. Cf. the Confessions, O.C.I., p. 426: "Comment se pouvoit-il qu'avec une ame naturellement expansive, pour qui vivre c'étoit aimer, je n'eusse pas trouvé jusqu'alors un ami tout à moi, un véritable ami, moi qui me sentoie si bien fait pour l'être?"

2. See, for example, the following note which appears in d'Alembert's Discours préliminaire to the Encyclopédie, I, p. xxxiii: "M. Rousseau de Genève, auteur de la partie de l'Encyclopédie qui concerne la Musique, & dont nous espérons que le Public sera très-satisfait, a composé un Discours fort éloquent, pour prouver que le rétablissement des Sciences & des Arts a corrompu les moeurs. Ce discours a été couronné en 1750 par l'Académie de Dijon avec les plus grands éloges; il a été imprimé à Paris au commencement de cette année 1751, & a fait beaucoup d'honneur à son Auteur."

he always showed an unacceptable mistrust of the eloquence of others, and in an age when men of good taste were devoted to the pursuit of cosmopolitan sophistication he both chose and was driven to become a solitary figure.

La protestation de Rousseau, dirigée contre l'essence même de la société contemporaine, est d'une telle envergure qu'elle ne peut soutenir sa validité que si elle est l'expression d'un homme qui s'est exclu lui-même de la société.³

In many respects, to be sure, it was the style of life, more than the ideas, of his contemporaries which excited his sharpest condemnation. The attacks that in the 1760s he made against Voltaire, for example, or against Diderot, Grimm, d'Holbach, and Helvétius - not to mention the charges which he levelled against Hume - were more generally concerned with their personal misconduct than their philosophical mistakes. These men, in his view, were irresolute in their beliefs and unreliable in their affections. They paid no respect either to God or to Nature, and if they formed a 'party of humanity' that was for no other reason than to conspire against the reputations of honest and pious men like himself.

It would be incorrect, however, to suggest that Rousseau was critical only of those writers in his day who possessed the social graces which he lacked. For the one figure whose ideas he discussed at greatest length - that is, Rameau - was also manifestly disinclined to seek the pleasures of polite society.⁴ Rameau, like Rousseau,

3. Starobinski, La transparence et l'obstacle, p. 44.

4. It must have been in the autumn of 1734, about one year after the first performance of Rameau's Hippolyte et Aricie, that Rousseau became interested in his work. For in a passage of his Confessions (O.C.I, p. 184) that recalls an event which occurred in September of that year, Rousseau remarks that "les Opera de Rameau commençoient à faire du bruit et relevèrent ses ouvrages theoriques que leur obscurité laissoit à la portée de peu de gens. Par hazard, j'entendis parler de son traité de

preferred to live alone, and like Rousseau, too, he had neither talent for conversation nor any great respect for men of wit. Indeed he was so disdainful of human company, it was said, that when he shut his

l'harmonie, et je n'eus point de repos que je n'eusse acquis ce livre". (Rameau's Traité de l'harmonie réduite à ses principes naturels was first published in 1722.) There is no record, however, of any meeting between the two figures until shortly after Rousseau presented his Projet concernant de nouveaux signes pour la musique to the French Académie des sciences in 1742. In its learned report the investigating panel of the Académie found that Rousseau's system was neither new nor useful for the study of instrumental music (see the Correspondance complète, I, appendice 45, pp. 317-322), but Rousseau, dissatisfied with these objections, turned to Rameau for a second opinion. Rameau replied, quite sympathetically, that it was cumbersome in technical detail, and Rousseau, for reasons which are not entirely clear, seemed much more satisfied with this criticism than the first. Thus, he wrote (Confessions, O.C.I, pp. 285-286), "La seule objection solide qu'il y eut à faire à mon Système y fut faite par Rameau....L'objection me parut sans réplique, et j'en convins à l'instant: quoiqu'elle soit simple et frappante, il n'y a qu'une grande pratique de l'art qui puisse la suggérer, et il n'est pas étonnant qu'elle ne soit venue à aucun Académicien". (Rousseau allowed his Projet to be published under the title Dissertation sur la musique moderne in 1743, but in his Dictionnaire de musique [see the article 'Caractères de musique'] he later admitted that his ideas in this work were empty speculations, rightly ignored by the public. Near the end of his life, nevertheless, in his Lettre à M. Burney sur la musique, he attempted yet again to vindicate his notational scheme.) His most celebrated meeting with Rameau occurred in 1745 and was far less cordial than the first. Some time between 9 July and 14 September he was invited to present his operatic ballet, Les Muses galantes, at the home of a distinguished patron of the arts, Alexandre-Jean-Joseph Le Riche de La Pouplinière, and Rameau, who was then the music master of Mme de La Pouplinière, reluctantly agreed to attend the performance. The music was so uneven in quality, however, that Rameau (see the Confessions, O.C.I, pp. 333-334) was soon enraged by what he heard: "[Il] commença dès l'ouverture à faire entendre par ses éloges outrés qu'elle ne pouvoit être de moi....Il m'apostropha avec une brutalité qui scandalisa tout le monde, soutenant qu'une partie de ce qu'il venoit d'entendre étoit d'un homme consommé dans l'art et le reste d'un ignorant qui ne savoit pas même la musique." Cf. Rousseau's 'Fragment biographique', *ibid.*, p. 1119. Ten years later, Rameau, in a work (Erreurs sur la musique dans l'Encyclopédie, CTWR, V, pp. 217-218) devoted to an attack upon the musical ideas of Rousseau, recalled his assessment of Les Muses galantes, and for good measure he then added that its best features could not have been composed by Rousseau at all: "Il y a dix ou douze ans qu'un Particulier fit exécuter chez M.*** un Ballet de sa composition, qui depuis fut présenté à l'Opéra, & refusé: je fus frappé d'y trouver de très-beaux airs de Violon dans un gout absolument Italien, & en même tems tout ce qu'il y a de plus mauvais en Musique Française tant vocale

harpsichord there was no one at home.⁵ He was, again like Rousseau, suspicious of the motives of his critics, and he was equally exasperated when the meaning of his ideas was not immediately perceived by others. Yet unlike Rousseau, Rameau readily attracted a great following among French men of letters to make up for the absence of any intimate friends. His ideas were not always interpreted correctly, but they were nonetheless received with much acclaim. And while Rousseau lived apart from other men and too often managed to incur just their contempt or pity, Rameau was eminently successful in exciting the admiration of most of his contemporaries.

In 1748 and 1749 six of his opera-ballets were performed in Paris, an accomplishment which no other composer had ever achieved before.⁶ The

qu'instrumentale....Ce contraste me surprit, & je fis à l'Auteur quelques questions, auxquelles il répondit si mal, que je vis bien, comme je l'avois déjà congu, qu'il n'avoit fait que la Musique Française, & avoit pillé l'Italienne." See also O.C.I, pp. 1408-1409 and 1839; CTWR, IV, pp. 15-18; Correspondance complète, II, appendix 95, pp. 338-340; and Georges Cucuel, La Pouplinière et la musique de chambre au XVIII^e siècle (Paris 1913) pp. 118-125. According to Rousseau (see O.C.I, p. 334) Les Muses galantes received a favourable reception on its first public performance, but it was seldom staged thereafter, and most of the score was eventually lost. In the foreword to the libretto (O.C.II, p. 1051), however, Rousseau shows that he came to share at least some of Rameau's misgivings about the work: "Cet ouvrage est si médiocre en son genre, et le genre en est si mauvais, que pour comprendre comment il m'a pu plaire, il faut sentir toute la force de l'habitude et des préjugés.... Ce fut...sur l'exécution de quelques morceaux...que M. Rameau qui les entendit conçut contre moi cette violente haine dont il n'a cessé de donner des marques jusqu'à sa mort."

5. See Alexis Piron to Hughes Maret, 18 May 1765, in the Lettres d'Alexis Piron à M. Maret (Lyon 1860), p. 6, cited in Cuthbert Girdlestone, Jean-Philippe Rameau: His Life and Work, second edition (New York 1969), p. 514. Charles Collé once remarked (Journal et mémoires [Paris 1868 edition], II, p. 375) that Rameau was "le mortel le plus impoli, le plus grossier et le plus insociable de son temps".

6. These were Les Fêtes d'Hébé, Zaïs, Les Fêtes de l'Hymen, Pygmalion, Platée, and Nais (see Girdlestone, Rameau, p. 492).

predominance of his works on the stage of the Opéra came, in fact, to be so much envied that Mme de Pompadour, who objected to his manner at least as much as to his music, was able to secure that there should be no public appearance of more than two of his operas in any single year.⁷ But while the pretext for this prohibition was that younger composers ought to be encouraged at Rameau's expense, the fact that there was a felt need for it at all indicates the true strength of his popular esteem rather than any loss of it.

The theoretical works of Rameau, moreover, were almost as widely known by his contemporaries as his operas were attended by them.⁸ It

7. See *ibid.*, p. 483.

8. Both his Traité de l'harmonie of 1722 and his Génération harmonique of 1737 had attracted much attention even before the philosophes began to endorse his ideas in the late 1740s. The Jesuit Father Louis-Bertrand Castel, for instance, expressed the deepest admiration for Rameau in a long review of the Traité which was published in two issues of the Journal de Trévoux in 1722, and in the following year an equally favourable reception was accorded to the same work in the Neue Zeitungen von Gelehrten Sachen printed in Leipzig (see CTWR, I, pp. xxviii-xlix, and CTWR, VI, pp. 3-7). In the mid-1730s Castel was to take issue with at least some of Rameau's theoretical ideas and entered into public dispute with him in the pages of the Journal de Trévoux (see CTWR, III, pp. xv-xviii, and CTWR, VI, pp. 67-102). This dispute in some ways foreshadowed the later controversy between Rameau and d'Alembert (see especially pp. 278-282 below), and it already displayed his capacity to treat the occasional objections of admirers with a riposte of incredulity and contempt. But the strength of his standing as the leading theorist of his day is shown most clearly by the widespread praise with which his Génération harmonique was greeted in a report of the Académie des sciences and in many of the contemporary journals (see CTWR, III, pp. xviii-xxix, and CTWR, VI, pp. 105-137 and 148-179). In CTWR, VI, Erwin Jacobi incorporates an excellent collection of documents, originally printed between 1723 and 1762, pertaining to the reception of Rameau's theoretical ideas on music. Jacobi himself also provides a very useful account (see *ibid.*, epilogue, pp. xlviiii-lxviii) of the influence exercised by the thought of Rameau in the period immediately after his death. Against all this evidence, however, Rousseau reminds us ('Musique', Encyclopédie, X (1765), p. 902) that the theoretical writings of Rameau "ont fait une grande fortune sans avoir été lûs de personne".

is true that in the 1730s and 1740s some supporters of Lully had complained that Rameau was too much of a 'musicien cérébral',⁹ and his belief that music should always express sound philosophical ideas¹⁰ was held by a few critics to be both mistaken in logic and, when practised, distasteful to the ear. But despite intermittent opposition, by the turn of the mid-century Rameau's reputation both as a theorist and composer towered over that of any other man in France.¹¹ The period from 1750, it has been said, "marks the climax in his fame".¹² Diderot,

9. See, for example, the remarks attributed to François Cartaud de la Villatte in Girdlestone, Rameau, p. 483, and to an anonymous critic of Rameau's opera Dardanus in Alfred Oliver, The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music (New York 1947), p.20, note 79.

10. See the following passages in his Génération harmonique, CTWR, III, pp. 29 and 53: "La Musique est une Science Phisicomathématique, le Son en est l'objet Phisique, & les rapports trouvés entre différens Sons en font l'objet Mathématique; sa fin est de plaire, & d'exciter en nous diverses passions....Le jugement de l'Oreille est toujours fondé, & tout obscur qu'il est sans le secours de la raison, il ajoute cependant aux lumieres de celle-ci, quand une fois elle nous a développé les causes de ce jugement: c'est pour nous une double confirmation de voir ainsi la Raison & l'Oreille s'accorder ensemble."

11. Oliver (The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music, p. 19), however, suggests that while Rameau was, by 1750, "the outstanding composer of the opera in France, he never enjoyed the popularity of Lulli". Insofar as no figure in the history of French opera was ever so dominant as Lully had been in the late seventeenth century, the truth of this claim must be allowed. Nonetheless, Rameau, like Lully, also enjoyed the patronage of the Court, and in his own lifetime his works (especially Castor et Pollux and Les Fêtes d'Hébé) were performed more frequently than the revived operas of Lully. In this context it should perhaps be noted that whereas the 1752-54 season of 'Les Bouffons' began at the Paris Opéra with a production of Pergolesi's La Serva padrona on the same programme as Lully's Acis et Galatée, it was effectively brought to an end when Rameau's Platée replaced Leo's I Viaggiatori on the same stage. After the disappearance from the capital of 'Les Bouffons' Rameau's dramatic works were again performed frequently at the Opéra, and while his stature as a theorist came progressively to be undermined in the late 1750s, his operas continued to command the highest respect until the mid-1770s when, together with the works of Lully still performed then, they succumbed to the interest excited by the operas of Gluck.

12. Girdlestone, Rameau, p. 493.

in that year, helped him to draft one of his works on harmony,¹³ d'Alembert, in the following year, proclaimed that he was one of the greatest men of the Enlightenment,¹⁴ and in a work which was printed in 1752 Grimm proved so unctuous in his praise that an anonymous reviewer, who clearly stood among Rameau's supporters too, felt obliged to remark that not everyone had come to share Grimm's adoration of the master.¹⁵ But apart, perhaps, from d'Alembert's Elémens de musique of 1752,¹⁶

13. The Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie (see Girdlestone, Rameau, pp. 495 and 522). See also Diderot's remarks on Rameau in his 'Principes généraux d'acoustique' of 1748 and the commentary by Raynal reprinted in CTWR, III, pp. xl-xli.

14. See the following passage in the Discours préliminaire, Encyclopédie, I, pp. xxxii-xxxiii: "Les François paroissent enfin persuadés que Lulli avoit laissé dans [la Musique] beaucoup à faire. M. RAMEAU, en poussant la pratique de son Art à un si haut degré de perfection, est devenu tout ensemble le modele & l'objet de la jalousie d'un grand nombre d'Artistes.... Mais ce qui le distingue plus particulièrement, c'est d'avoir réfléchi avec beaucoup de succès sur la théorie de ce même Art; d'avoir sù trouver dans la Basse fondamentale le principe de l'harmonie & de la mélodie; d'avoir réduit par ce moyen à des lois plus certaines & plus simples, une science livrée avant lui à des regles arbitraires ou dictées par une expérience aveugle. Je saisis avec empressement l'occasion de célébrer cet Artiste philosophe, dans un discours destiné principalement à l'éloge des grands Hommes."

15. See Grimm's Lettre sur 'Omphale', in Denise Launay, ed., La Querelle des Bouffons, 3 vols. (Genève 1973), I, pp. 1-54. This work appeared several months before the arrival in Paris, in August 1752, of the Italian company of 'Les Bouffons', but it nonetheless raised some of the questions, particularly about the nature of Italian music, which were to figure in the controversy that ensued. In his Lettre Grimm regarded the opera Omphale by André-Cardinal Destouches most unfavourably in the light of several operas by Rameau. The review appears in the Mercure de France of March 1752, p. 139, and it may have been composed by Raynal, the putative author (though not for all scholars) of the Remarques au sujet de la Lettre de M. Grimm sur 'Omphale' (see La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 55-80).

16. D'Alembert's work (see Girdlestone, Rameau, p. 493) was in fact designed to do Rameau "the honour of presenting his theories in an easily intelligible form", since Rameau's turgid prose often made his ideas appear dull and obscure, even to his most ardent admirers. The text was

the highest tribute which was paid to Rameau came, in my view, from the pen of Rousseau. For in a number of publications about music, and particularly in his contributions on the subject to the Encyclopédie, Rousseau displayed a great familiarity with Rameau's works and a generally deep respect for his authority as a theorist.

Now the fact that he should have examined the ideas of Rameau at some length is not at all surprising, since throughout his life Rousseau was more devoted to the study of music and its theory than to any other subject.

J.J. étoit né pour la Musique; non pour y payer de sa personne dans l'exécution, mais pour en hâter les progrès et y faire des découvertes. Ses idées dans l'art et sur l'art sont féconds, intarissables.¹⁷

Before he came to Paris in 1742 he had decided that he would make music his career,¹⁸ and the first work which he produced in order to secure

therefore entitled Elémens de musique, théorique et pratique, suivant les principes de M. Rameau, éclaircis, développés et simplifiés par M. d'Alembert, and it was generously praised by most of its reviewers, though d'Alembert did engage in a protracted dispute with one, Jean-Laurent de Béthizy (see CTWR, III, pp. li-lvii, and CTWR, VI, pp. 227-293). Rameau was flattered by this tribute to his ideas (see his letter in the Mercure de France of May 1752, reprinted in CTWR, VI, pp. 237-238), and he later charged d'Alembert with inconsistency when the editor of the Encyclopédie began to challenge certain features of his theory (see pp. 280-281 below and especially the exchanges between Rameau and d'Alembert in CTWR, V, pp. 346-349 and 367-368). D'Alembert also made some editorial changes to Rousseau's articles for the Encyclopédie about which Rousseau was at first quite content, though toward the end of his life he accused his former colleague of plagiarism (see note 117 below).

17. Rousseau juge de Jean Jaques, O.C.I., p. 872. See also the following passage in the Confessions, *ibid.*, pp. 180-181: "Je parle de la musique. Il faut assurément que je sois né pour cet art, puisque j'ai commencé de l'aimer dès mon enfance, et qu'il est le seul que j'aye aimé constamment dans tous les tems."

18. See *ibid.*, p. 207: "Je m'obstinois à chercher follement ma fortune dans la musique, et sentant naître des idées et des chants dans ma tête, je crus qu'aussitôt que je serois en état d'en tirer parti j'allois devenir un homme célèbre, un Orphée moderne dont les sons devoient attirer tout l'argent du Perou." See also ch. II, note 38.

his reputation was the Projet concernant de nouveaux signes pour la musique.¹⁹ His Lettre sur la musique française of 1753 formed the most remarkable contribution to the Querelle des Bouffons and was, according to d'Alembert, "tant combattue et si peu réfutée",²⁰ while his compositions Le Devin du village and Pygmalion were almost as successful as those of Rameau himself.²¹ His articles for the Encyclopédie, moreover, when

19. See note 4 above.

20. See d'Alembert's De la liberté de la musique in La Querelle des Bouffons, III, p. 2203. Some eighteenth-century scholars have suggested that Grimm's Petit prophète de Boehmischbroda was the first important work devoted to the Querelle des Bouffons. But while it is true that the Petit prophète appeared almost one year before the Lettre, it is, in my view, equally clear that Rousseau's more polemical and less satirical work attracted both greater support, on the one hand, and most of the refutations, on the other. Louissette Richebourg [Reichenburg], in her Contribution à l'histoire de la 'Querelle des Bouffons' (Paris and Philadelphia 1937), pp. 38-84, counts twenty-five replies to Grimm and thirty-two to Rousseau. See also Dufour, I, pp. 36-42, Servando Sacaluga, 'Diderot, Rousseau, et la querelle musicale de 1752', Diderot Studies, X (1968), pp. 133-173, and the list from the second (Paris 1757) edition of the Histoire du Théâtre de l'Académie royale de musique en France by Louis Travenol and Jacques Bernard Durey de Noinville, reprinted in La Querelle des Bouffons, III, pp. 2285-2293.

21. Le Devin du village was first performed at Fontainebleau on 18 October, 1752, in the presence of the King. The work is quite clearly of a mediocre standard, but the King, nonetheless, was so impressed by its pastoral melodies that he insisted upon a second performance which took place the following week. It was again produced for his benefit in March 1753, at which time Mme de Pompadour herself played one of the leading rôles. When it opened at the Paris Opéra in the same month it was an immediate success, and it remained popular, and was staged frequently, until the 1830s with periodic revivals since then (see O.C.II, pp. 1884-1885). The first public performance of Pygmalion, in March 1772, was also at the Opéra, though it was initially staged before a private audience in Lyon in 1770. Rousseau had entrusted the composition of its score to Horace Coignet, but some of its musical passages, and of course the whole of its libretto, were his own work (see *ibid.*, pp. 1926-1928). The best general study of Rousseau's music is Albert Jansen's Jean-Jacques Rousseau als Musiker (Berlin 1884). See also Adolphe Adam, 'Rousseau musicien', in Adam, Souvenirs d'un musicien (Paris 1857), pp. 177-215;

they were later revised and reissued as his Dictionnaire de musique, were to form one of the longest of his writings, and, indeed, he produced a number of other works on musical topics as well.²² Already by 1748 Diderot must have been sufficiently impressed by Rousseau's knowledge of the subject, for it was toward the end of this year that, as editor of the Encyclopédie, he entrusted his friend with the task of preparing the articles on music.²³

Jules Carlez, Grimm et la musique de son temps (Caen 1882); Arthur Pougin, Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Musicien (Paris 1901); Julien Tiersot, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Paris 1912); Samuel Baud-Bovy, 'Rousseau musicien', in Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Neuchâtel 1962), pp. 51-66; and O.C.I., pp. 1316-1318.

22. In this chapter I shall be considering only two of Rousseau's manuscripts and five of his published writings on music in any detail: the Neuchâtel Ms R 60 and Ms R 69, the Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale', the Lettre sur la musique française, the Examen de deux principes, the Essai sur l'origine des langues, and the Dictionnaire de musique. Apart from the Projet concernant de nouveaux signes pour la musique, the Dissertation sur la musique moderne, the Lettre d'un symphoniste, the Observations sur l'Alceste de Gluck, and the Lettre à M. Burney sur la musique, all of which I mention only in passing, Rousseau also wrote a substantial number of other essays about music to which I make no reference here. So far as I am aware, however, none of Rousseau's finished works on this subject, apart from the Essai sur l'origine des langues and an English translation of most of the Lettre sur la musique française (see Oliver Strunk, ed., Source Readings in Music History [New York 1950], pp. 636-654), has ever been produced in an annotated edition. Since the forthcoming fifth volume of O.C. should include most of them I suspect that Rousseau scholarship will be profoundly affected by its publication. In the past few years the Essai has attracted much attention as a work in philosophical anthropology, and I believe that in the next decade or so the Dictionnaire de musique may become as much a focus of Rousseau studies as are the Contrat social and Emile today.

23. See the Confessions, O.C.I., 347-348. Rameau, however, later claimed that he had declined the undertaking and thus implied quite clearly that it had been offered to him first. Rousseau's errors might still have been avoided, he remarked, if only the editors had sent him the manuscripts before releasing them to their printers (see the Réponse de M. Rameau à MM. les éditeurs de l'Encyclopédie, CTWR, V, pp. 360-361). In any case Rousseau was not solely responsible for the

Rousseau fulfilled his undertaking zealously. By the spring of 1749 he had completed more than two hundred essays of various lengths, most of which were faithful to the teaching of Rameau. Thus in his article 'Basse fondamentale', for instance, he provided a full account of the most important of Rameau's conceptual discoveries.

BASSE FONDAMENTALE, est celle qui n'est formée que des sons fondamentaux de l'harmonie; de-sorte qu'au-dessous de chaque accord, elle fait entendre le vrai son fondamental de cet accord; par où l'on voit qu'elle ne peut avoir d'autre contexture que celle de la succession fondamentale de l'harmonie. Pour bien entendre ceci, il faut savoir que tout accord, quoique composé de plusieurs sons, n'en a qu'un qui soit fondamental: savoir celui qui a produit cet accord, & qui lui sert de base....M. Rameau a fait voir dans son traité de l'Harmonie, que plusieurs de ces prétendus accords n'étoient que des renversemens d'un seul.²⁴

His observations on the phenomenon of dissonance, moreover, were

contributions on music in the Encyclopédie. Cahusac, Diderot, Jaucourt, and d'Alembert each produced numerous or substantial essays on this subject for the first seventeen volumes, while the most frequent contributor to the supplement was Frédéric de Castillon. A comprehensive list of the articles on music and their authors in the Encyclopédie can be found in Oliver, The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music, pp. 171-188.

24. Encyclopédie, II (1751), p. 119. In the Dictionnaire de musique (Paris 1768), pp. 43-44, the second part of this passage was changed so as to make Rousseau's debt to Rameau even more explicit: "Pour bien entendre ceci, il faut savoir que, selon le système de M. Rameau que j'ai suivi dans cet Ouvrage, tout Accord, quoique formé de plusieurs Sons, n'en a qu'un qui lui soit fondamental; savoir, celui qui a produit cet Accord & qui lui sert de Basse dans l'ordre direct & naturel." Rameau believed that if one took the sound produced by the total length of a vibrating string to be the fundamental root of a chord, then the second and third harmonics, together with this root, would provide the chord's major triad. Vibrating strings of lengths which form perfect

conceived, he wrote, "sans s'écarter pour le fond des principes de M. Rameau",²⁵ and he also acknowledged his debt to Rameau's description of the proper techniques of musical accompaniment.

C'est à M. Rameau, qui par l'invention de nouveaux signes & la perfection du doigter, nous a aussi indiqué les moyens de faciliter l'accompagnement; c'est à lui, dis-je, que nous sommes redevables d'une méthode nouvelle, qui garantit des inconvéniens de toutes celles qu'on avoit suivies jusqu'à présent. C'est lui qui le premier a fait connoître la basse fondamentale, & qui par-là nous a découvert les véritables fondemens d'un art où tout paroissoit arbitraire.²⁶

Now despite these and many other favourable references to his works, Rameau was dismayed by the articles on music in the Encyclopédie. In 1755, several months after the publication of the fourth volume, the

arithmetical multiples or divisions of the first would also yield the chord's minor triads, and if one conjoined the upper and lower harmonics all the chordal relations of the 'basse fondamentale' - tonic, dominant, subdominant, and their derivatives - could be expressed. This, in essence, was his theory of the fundamental tone (see, for instance, his Génération harmonique, CTWR, III, pp. 52-66). See also Matthew Shirlaw, The Theory of Harmony, second edition (DeKalb 1955), pp. 98-130, and Jacques Chailley, 'Rameau et la théorie musicale', Revue musicale, CCLX (1965), pp. 87-90.

25. 'Dissonance', Encyclopédie, IV (1754), p. 1050.

26. 'Accompagnement', Encyclopédie, I, pp. 75-76. Rousseau's assessment of Rameau as a composer, however, was somewhat less flattering. See especially the following passage in his Lettre à M. Grimm au sujet des remarques ajoutées à sa lettre sur 'Omphale', La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 111-115: "Il faut reconnoître dans M. Rameau un très-grand talent, beaucoup de feu, une tête bien sonnante, une grande connoissance des renversemens harmoniques & de toutes les choses d'effet; beaucoup d'art pour s'approprier, dénaturer, orner, embellir les idées d'autrui, & retourner les siennes; assez peu de facilité pour en inventer de nouvelles; plus d'habileté que de fécondité, plus de sçavoir que de génie: ou du moins un génie étouffé par trop de sçavoir; mais toujours de la force & de l'élégance, & très-souvent du beau chant. Son récitatif est moins naturel, mais beaucoup plus varié que celui de Lulli... Il est le premier qui ait fait des symphonies & des accompagnemens travaillés, & il en a abusé.... Je dis que M. Rameau a abusé de cet Orchestre tel quel. Il a rendu ses accompagnemens si confus, si chargés, si fréquens, que la tête a peine à tenir au tintamarre continuel des divers instrumens, pendant

ageing composer assembled what remained of his always doubtful literary talents in a virulent attack upon Rousseau's contributions which he entitled the Erreurs sur la musique dans l'Encyclopédie. In the next year there appeared his Suite des 'Erreurs', and when the editors of the Encyclopédie replied on Rousseau's behalf he retorted almost immediately with a Réponse à MM. les éditeurs. These exchanges about the articles of Rousseau were, in fact, to continue into the 1760s when the disheartened Rameau began to lose favour generally among the philosophes,²⁷ and in 1764 he died. The reason for his attacks, to be sure, was not immediately understood, and in their foreword to volume VI of the Encyclopédie Diderot and d'Alembert, whose patience with Rousseau was already under strain by 1756, nonetheless came to his assistance and argued that Rameau had unwisely maligned a writer who had always praised his works. We are unable to believe, they remarked, that the celebrated artist to whom the Erreurs sur la musique has been attributed could really be its author - a pretence made possible only by the fact that Rameau had elected to leave his text unsigned.

l'exécution de ses Opera....je pense que personne n'a mieux que lui saisi l'esprit des détails, personne n'a mieux sçu l'art des contrastes; mais en même tems personne n'a moins sçu donner à ses Opera cette unité si sçavante & si désirée, & il est peut-être le seul au monde qui n'ait pu venir à bout de faire un bon ouvrage de plusieurs beaux morceaux fort bien arrangés." Grimm's Lettre sur 'Omphale' (see note 15 above) appeared in February 1752, and Rousseau's Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale' was first published, anonymously, in April of the same year. See also Jansen, Rousseau als Musiker, pp. 128-157; Paul-Marie Masson, 'Les idées de Rousseau sur la musique', Revue musicale, S.I.M., VIII.vi (1912), p. 8; Masson, 'La Lettre sur Omphale (1752)', Revue de musicologie, XXIV (1945), pp. 1-19; and Oliver, The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music, pp. 106-108.

27. All the works in which Rameau attacked the Encyclopédie are included in CTWR, IV (see pp. 265-280 and 313-324), and CTWR, V (see pp. 195-261, 309-361, and 369-385). For accounts of the controversy between Rameau and the philosophes, see Oliver, The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music, especially pp. 101-112, and Eve Kisch, 'Rameau and Rousseau', Music and Letters, XXII (1941), pp. 106-114. See also note 16 above and pp. 277-282 below.

Tout nous empêche de le croire...la maniere peu mesurée dont on traite dans cette brochure M. Rousseau, qui a souvent nommé avec éloges le musicien dont nous parlons, & qui ne lui a jamais manqué d'égards, même dans le petit nombre d'endroits où il a cru pouvoir le combattre.²⁸

Yet the central reason for Rameau's complaints is, I think, quite clear. For while Rousseau had adopted the technical innovations of his theory with enthusiasm, he had not accepted the philosophical principles from which they were derived. He had expressed doubts about the scope and application of Rameau's ideas, and he had disagreed with Rameau's supposition that there must be fixed and constant rules for every form of musical expression.

In his article 'Accompagnement', for instance, Rousseau added a number of critical observations to his account of Rameau's theory. He acknowledged the importance of most of the harmonic rules which Rameau had developed, but he denied that they could prescribe which kinds of musical accompaniment must be appropriate in every case. The manner of providing an intelligent accompaniment, he wrote, depends more upon custom and taste than upon any technical precepts which might be ascribed to it.

Quoique suivant les principes de M. Rameau il faille toucher tous les sons de chaque accord, il ne faut pas toujours prendre cette regle à la lettre. Il y a des accords qui seroient insupportables avec tout ce remplissage...En général on doit penser en accompagnant, que quand M. Rameau veut qu'on remplisse tous les accords, il a bien plus d'égard à la facilité du doigter & à son système particulier d'accompagnement, qu'à la pureté de l'harmonie.²⁹

28. CTWR, V, p. 290. See also the passage from Neuchâtel Ms R 16 cited in note 234 below. Rameau's authorship of the Erreurs sur la musique was never really in doubt; it had already been confirmed at least as early as January 1756 in the Mercure de France (see CTWR, V, p. xxxix). In his 'Fragment biographique' - which was probably composed around this period as well - Rousseau turned the anonymity of Rameau to his own advantage with prickly sarcasm, reflecting (O.C.I, p. 1119) about the author of the Erreurs that in the work, "pour le tourner en ridicule on affecte de le faire incessamment louer par lui meme".

29. Encyclopédie, I, p. 76.

One must always adapt the sound of the accompaniment to the character of the music,³⁰ and since the music of different nations was distinct in character, it therefore followed that French and Italian music, for example, ought to be provided with quite separate forms of harmonic arrangement. For French music, Rousseau remarked, all the notes must be sustained and graceful arpeggios constructed round the melodic theme so that the harmony may be filled out. But for Italian music the bass line of each chord should be played simply, and there must be no addition of either trills or embellishments to obscure the sober and steady flow of the tune.³¹

According to Rameau, however, these objections to his theory were entirely misconceived, since the harmonic structures of our music must be universally the same. In answer, therefore, to Rousseau's contention that "il y a des accords qui seroient insupportables avec tout ce remplissage", he replied that

un accord n'est tel qu'avec tout son remplissage, il doit être complet selon la définition....s'il est Accord il est donc supportable.³²

Whereas Rousseau claimed that the forms of accompaniment must vary in accordance with the prevailing differences in musical style, Rameau, on the other hand, insisted that there could be only one harmonic rule which applied to each example. For even if we must in all cases permit some discretion as to the manner in which the harmony of an accompaniment is rendered, it was still perfectly clear, he argued,

30. See *ibid.*: "Il faut toujours proportionner le bruit au caractère de la Musique, & à celui des instrumens ou des voix qu'on a à accompagner ...en un mot, on a toujours attention que l'accompagnement, qui n'est fait que pour soutenir & embellir le chant, ne le gêne & ne le couvre pas."

31. See *ibid.*, p. 77.

32. Erreurs sur la musique, CTWR, V, p. 203.

that the 'corps sonore' of every accompaniment was unique and was in turn marked by its own appropriate 'son fondamental'.

Le son fondamental de ce corps sonore domine tellement sur ses harmoniques, qu'à peine ceux-ci se distinguent avec lui: donc on ne sçauroit trop multiplier les sons de la Basse.³³

And while untrained and uncritical "Accompagnateurs sans Méthode" might suppose themselves entirely free to choose their chords, such a choice becomes not only useless, but pernicious, when it is made at the expense of the "complément de l'harmonie ordonnée par la Nature même".³⁴ All the varieties of musical expression must incorporate the same harmonic intervals, and in his view it was this fact, more than any other, which Rousseau had failed to grasp. Thus, in his critique of the article 'Dissonance', he exclaimed,

On sçait bien que chaque Art, chaque Science a ses propriétés particulières. Mais ne pourroient-elles pas dépendre, toutes, d'un même principe? Y a-t il deux principes dans la Nature?³⁵

Rousseau, for his part, had argued at length in the Lettre sur la musique françoise that a clear melodic line was musically more important than the harmonic structures built around it, and so far from there being a unique and universal principle of harmony in Nature, there was always, he proclaimed in that work, an inescapably artificial quality produced by the intonation of more than one note, or the expression of more than one vocal line, at a time. For whatever harmony might be produced by an

33. Ibid., p. 208.

34. Ibid., p. 206.

35. Ibid., p. 257. Rameau referred to this passage again in his Réponse à MM. les éditeurs de l'Encyclopédie, though there (see ibid., p. 356) he changed the terms slightly. See also ibid., pp. 359-360: "Je ne dois mes découvertes en Musique qu'aux loix de la Nature, dont le corps sonore nous présente un modèle, & dont l'observation est en même tems si simple & si lumineuse qu'aujourd'hui le Musicien, d'accord avec le Géomètre, m'écoute, m'entend & m'imite."

ensemble of voices each singing a fine tune,

l'effet de ces beaux chants s'évanouit aussitôt qu'ils se font entendre à la fois, & il ne reste que celui d'une suite d'accord, qui, quoiqu'on puisse dire, est toujours froide quand la mélodie ne l'anime pas...il est impossible à l'oreille de se prêter au même instant à plusieurs mélodies, & que l'une effaçant l'impression de l'autre, il ne résulte du tout que de la confusion & du bruit.³⁶

In place of Rameau's conception of a uniform harmonic structure which underlay all forms of music, Rousseau therefore put forward his own rule of the unity or singularity of melody which he thought approximated natural song most closely. For a work of music to become interesting, he remarked, for it to arouse the sentiments which it was intended to excite in the hearts of those who hear it, all its parts together must fortify the expression of its central theme. The harmony should only serve to make that theme more lively; the accompaniment should embellish it, but not leave it suffocated or disfigured; and the bass, by a uniform and simple though imperceptible progression, should guide both the performer and the listener to a full appreciation of the melody.

Il faut, en un mot, que le tout ensemble ne porte à la fois qu'une mélodie à l'oreille & qu'une idée à l'esprit. Cette unité de mélodie me paroît une règle indispensable & non moins importante en Musique, que l'unité d'action dans une Tragédie; car elle est fondée sur le même principe, & dirigée vers le même objet.³⁷

Now it is true that by 1753, when Rousseau composed his Lettre sur la musique française, he had not yet entirely abandoned Rameau's central thesis that the principle of harmony was a fixed and constant rule of

36. Lettre sur la musique française, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 707.

37. Ibid., p. 708. See also ibid., pp. 712, 719, and 729-730 and the passage from the article 'Unité de mélodie' in the Dictionnaire de musique cited on p. 259 below. Fréron, in a critique of the Lettre published anonymously in Geneva in 1754, charged (see his Lettres sur la musique française, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 786) that the notion of the unity of melody was a commonplace derived initially from Horace, while Rameau, in his Erreurs sur la musique (see p. 269 below), decried the idea as "une chimère".

Nature. In his Essai sur l'origine des langues and Examen de deux principes - texts which were both initially drafted only in the following two years³⁸ - he was to argue that just certain kinds of melodic vocal music could be described as truly natural and that all harmonic schemes were artificial corruptions of these kinds;³⁹ but while this view is in some respects already foreshadowed in the Lettre,⁴⁰ there it figures in the context of a theory which still allows that the systematic rules that govern harmony are drawn from Nature. Nonetheless, in the Lettre Rousseau did put forward a claim about the connection between melodic and harmonic music which he was to elaborate in his subsequent works - a claim to the effect that insofar as the patterns of harmony differed between nations, this difference was attributable to the influence of melody, which in turn expressed the national variations between forms of language.

L'harmonie ayant son principe dans la nature, est la même pour toutes les Nations, ou si elle a quelques différences, elles sont introduites par celles de la mélodie; ainsi, c'est de la mélodie seulement qu'il faut tirer le caractère particulier d'une Musique Nationale; d'autant plus que ce caractère étant principalement donné par la langue, le chant proprement dit doit ressentir sa plus grande influence.⁴¹

38. See pp. 289 and 294-326 below.

39. See pp. 289-293 and 326-342 below.

40. See especially the following passage (La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 677-678) in which Rousseau remarks upon the way that a musical language which was deficient in melodic inflexions must have become transformed into a harmonic system lacking all sense: "Comme une telle Musique seroit dénuée de toute mélodie agréable, on tâcheroit d'y suppléer par des beautés factices & peu naturelles; on la chargeroit de modulations fréquentes & régulières, mais froides, sans graces & sans expression.... La Musique avec toute cette maussade parure resteroit languissante & sans expression, & ses images, dénuées de force & d'énergie, peindroient peu d'objets en beaucoup de notes, comme ces écritures gothiques, dont les lignes remplies de traits & de lettres figurées, ne contiennent que deux ou trois mots, & qui renferment très-peu de sens en un grand espace." Cf. the passages from the Essai sur l'origine des langues discussed on pp. 339-342 below.

41. Lettre sur la musique françoise, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 676. See also the passage from p. 681 cited in note 267 below.

Some languages, Rousseau contended in the Lettre, were more appropriate to music than were others, while certain tongues did not have any musical attributes at all. Those languages which were marked, for instance, by a lack of sonorous vowels, on the one hand, or, on the other, by an excess of consonants, or mute and nasal syllables, or imprecisely measured figures of speech, could only be joined to an insipid and monotonous form of musical expression which must be dull when sung slowly and coarse at full speed.⁴² Since it would be impossible to construct agreeable tunes which might be sung in languages of this kind, composers in nations which were characterized by such defective speech would be obliged to turn their attention to harmonic arrangements instead, and even then they would often be unable to extract a melodic theme from the strident noise of their accompaniment.

L'impossibilité d'inventer des chants agréables obligeroit les Compositeurs à tourner tous leurs soins du côté de l'harmonie, & faüte de beautés réelles, ils y introduiroient des beautés de convention, qui n'auroient presque d'autre mérite que la difficulté vaincue; au lieu d'une bonne Musique, ils imagineroient une Musique sçavante; pour suppléer au chant, ils multiplieroient les accompagn[ne]mens...Pour ôter l'insipidité, ils augmenteroient la confusion; ils croiroient faire de la Musique & ils ne feroient que du bruit....Partout où ils verroient des notes ils trouveroient du chant, attendu qu'en effet leur chant ne seroit que des notes. Voces, praetereaque nihil.⁴³

In the Lettre Rousseau's principal claim was that the French language in particular suffered from just these faults and was therefore insusceptible to a properly musical exposition. The continual bark and bray which was characteristic of French songs could not be suffered by

42. See *ibid.*, pp. 676-677.

43. *Ibid.*, pp. 678-680.

anyone who was unprepared for the ordeal, while the brusque and heavy harmonies of French accompaniment fell upon the ears of listeners as a deluge of tedious notes. The airs of French opera, moreover, were not proper airs at all, and its recitative was misconceived as well.⁴⁴

Thus, Rousseau concluded,

les François n'ont point de Musique & n'en peuvent avoir; ou que si jamais ils en ont une, ce sera tant pis pour eux.⁴⁵

Against all the calamities which made French prose so intractable as music Rousseau juxtaposed the virtues of Italian. For the inflexions of the Italian language were more soft and gentle, he argued, its modulations more precise and sonorous, and the tempo of its speech more constant, than their equivalents in French.

S'il y a en Europe une langue propre à la Musique, c'est certainement l'Italienne; car cette langue est douce, sonore, harmonieuse, & accentuée plus qu'aucune autre, & ces quatre qualités sont précisément les plus convenables au chant.⁴⁶

These, then, were the reasons Rousseau cited in support of his contention that the Italian language was musically superior to French.

44. It was one of Rousseau's central postulates in this work (see *ibid.*, pp. 743-749) that French composers of opera since Lully had come to develop a theatrical technique of declamatory recitative and a drawling and monotonous form of aria, both of which were inappropriate to any kind of musical performance.

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 763-764.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 689. In the Essai sur l'origine des langues (see the passage from the seventh chapter cited on p. 338 below), however, Rousseau later drew a somewhat different dichotomy between the musical attributes of the two languages. For there he asserted that Italian was just like French and all other modern European languages in the sense that it lacked determinate musical accents which would give its words an exact and constant tone and character when sung. And while Italian speech might lend itself to music more readily than other tongues, it was not in fact, he maintained, a musical language. Even in the Lettre, moreover, Rousseau acknowledged that Italian composers still sometimes employed the gothic harmonies which had been the most characteristic style of the baroque idiom in both France and Italy before the period beginning around the turn of the eighteenth century when Corelli, Bononcini, Vinci, and Pergolesi (see La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 717, note) had introduced compositions of a

Now the technical elaboration of this argument in the Lettre, and in particular those features of the work that are expressly joined to the Querelle des Bouffons which had occasioned its composition by Rousseau, need not detain us here.⁴⁷ It is true that the text forms

truly musical kind. These cumbersome harmonies, according to Rousseau, remained prevalent in French music, and (*ibid.*, p. 718) "depuis même que les Italiens ont rendu l'harmonie plus pure, plus simple, & donné tous leurs soins à la perfection de la mélodie, je ne nie pas qu'il ne soit encore demeuré parmi eux quelques légères traces des fugues & desseins gothiques, & quelques fois de doubles & triples mélodies" (in this connection see also the passage from the eighteenth chapter of the Essai cited on p. 340 below). It would be a mistake, however, Rousseau concluded in the Lettre (La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 764, note), for French composers to imitate their Italian colleagues: "J'aimerois mieux que nous gardassions notre maussade & ridicule chant, que d'associer encore plus ridiculement la mélodie Italienne à la langue Française." See also note 54 below.

47. In his Lettre (see especially La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 722) Rousseau refers directly to La Serva padrona by Pergolesi, an excellent example of opera buffa first produced in Naples in 1733 and already staged in Paris at the Comédie Italienne in 1746, whose renewed performance at the Opéra by the company of Eustachio Bambini was much acclaimed and in fact constituted the musical inauguration of the Querelle. Rousseau also calls attention in the text to Grimm's Petit prophète de Boehmischbroda (see *ibid.*, p. 749 and note 20 above), which was the most important literary contribution to the Querelle before his own. But in addition to these citations the Lettre contains many other passages which deal specifically with the music around which the controversy was shaped. It includes comments upon at least four more operas (Il Maestro di musica and Il Tracollo which were principally by Pergolesi, and La Bohémienne [La Zingara] and La Femme orgueilleuse [La Donna superba] by Rinaldo di Capua) which were staged by 'Les Bouffons'; it mentions three further composers (Leo, Niccolò Jommelli, and Gioacchino Cocchi) and one librettist (Metastasio) whose intermezzi were performed during their season in Paris; and it refers to a whole host of still other composers (e.g. Nicola Antonio Porpora, Baldassare Galuppi, Davide Pérez, and Domenico Terradellas) whose music had been made to serve as overtures or pasticci or who, more indirectly still, had just helped to inspire the contemporary style of opera buffa (see *ibid.*, pp. 699-705 and 710-711). Rousseau's profound knowledge of this quite generally slight form of opera stemmed from the fascination which he had felt for it during his stay in Venice in 1743-44 (see note 56 below). While the 'Bouffon' season was in progress he prepared a collection of Italian songs under the title 'Canzoni di batello' as well as an edition of La Serva padrona (see Dufour, I, pp. 42 and 269-270), and his own opera, Le Devin du village, moreover, itself first staged during that season, was described by some of his critics (notably Fréron) as substantially plagiarized from the music which he had heard in Italy before. This charge, it should be noted here, was first made with regard to Le Devin in 1753 (see the Correspondance complète, II, pp. 329 and 333), that is, two years before Rameau made the same claim (see note 4 above) about Les Muses galantes. For an account of the operas performed

Rousseau's principal contribution to that dispute,⁴⁸ and many of its most striking features cannot be understood properly in any other way. Indeed, since it has been my central thesis in this study that the only way which we have to establish the exact meaning of his ideas is that of locating their place in the specific polemical controversies which gave rise to them, I should be both inconsistent and incorrect in my interpretation if I were now to depart from that position. But the views expressed by Rousseau in the Lettre were not concerned exclusively with the Querelle des Bouffons, and an attempt to determine the sense of each of them in that context alone will in certain cases lead us to make superfluous and even false assumptions about their intended meaning. Some of his ideas in the Lettre about the lamentable state of French music, on the one hand, and the irresistible charms of Italian song, on the other, were to be further developed in works which he produced later and which have no direct connection with the Querelle des Bouffons,⁴⁹ and these ideas need not prove unintelligible just because the setting which surrounds them has been changed. Other ideas which appear in the Lettre, moreover, should be examined not only in the light of the various arguments of 1752-54 about the merits of Italian opera buffa but also in conjunction with writings that Rousseau had produced even before, and in

by 'Les Bouffons' in 1752-54, see especially Travenol and Durey de Noinville, Histoire du Théâtre de l'Académie royale de musique, part one, pp. 273-320, and the list appended to part two, reprinted in La Querelle des Bouffons, III, pp. 2294-2300; Lionel de La Laurencie, 'La Grande saison italienne de 1752: Les Bouffons', Revue musicale, S.I.M., VIII.vi and vii (1912), pp. 18-33 and 13-22; and the commentaries of Donald Grout and Eugène Borrel in Roland-Manuel, ed., Histoire de la musique (Paris 1960-63), II, pp. 5-13 and 26-39.

48. It is not Rousseau's only contribution, however. See also his bitterly satirical Lettre d'un symphoniste (La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 648-664) in which he suggests that the poor performance of some of the operas was due to a conspiracy on the part of the orchestra of the Académie de musique.

49. See, for example, the letter of Saint-Preux to Julie in La Nouvelle Héloïse, O.C.II, pp. 131-135.

order to establish the significance of these ideas we must first have a grasp of the manner in which they were elaborated, extended, or alternatively, conceived as departures, from claims which he had propounded in earlier works. The dominant themes of the Lettre which I have discussed here must, it seems to me, be considered in this fashion, and both help to make clear the sense in which that essay sets forth an account of music that is still more critical of Rameau's theory than had been the point of view adopted by Rousseau in his articles for the Encyclopédie.

The first of these themes, that is, Rousseau's contention that in music the melodic subject should always take precedence over its harmonic accompaniment, does not figure in any of the articles printed in the initial four volumes of the Encyclopédie which Rameau decried in his Erreurs sur la musique. In these articles Rousseau had in fact taken no account of the problem of the relation between melody and harmony, and on the very few occasions that he had considered the matter in 1748 and 1749 when he was engaged in preparing his musical contributions to the Encyclopédie he had actually maintained a position quite contrary to that which he was to uphold in his Lettre sur la musique française. Thus, for instance, in his article 'Mélodie', which eventually appeared in 1765 in the tenth volume of the Encyclopédie, he had argued that

comme la constitution de nos chants dépend entièrement de l'harmonie, la mélodie ne fait pas une partie considérable de notre musique.⁵⁰

Rousseau predictably left out this remark about the relative insignificance of melody as compared to harmony in the article on the same subject

50. Encyclopédie, X, p. 320. There is no evidence at all to suggest that Rousseau had only French music in mind here, even though, if this were the case, his contention would then be in closer accord with his later perspective.

which he later composed for the Dictionnaire de musique, and in his final text he reiterated, in still stronger terms, the opposite contention he had first proposed in the Lettre. For "si la Musique ne peint que par la mélodie, & tire d'elle toute sa force", he proclaimed in the Dictionnaire,

il s'ensuit que toute Musique qui ne chante pas, quelque harmonieuse qu'elle puisse être, n'est point une Musique imitative, & ne pouvant ni toucher ni peindre avec ses beaux Accords, lasse bientôt les oreilles, & laisse toujours le coeur froid.⁵¹

Of course since Rousseau's statements about this matter are so scanty in the Encyclopédie, we should be careful to avoid exaggerating the importance of the distinction in his perspective between 1749 and 1753. The problem is indeed made more obscure by the fact that in his original article on 'Harmonie' he had already provided a hint of what was to be his later position,⁵² while in a passage of the Lettre sur la musique françoise, on the other hand, he still asserted that music was derived essentially from harmony,⁵³ a contention which he generally denied in that work. But despite these and still other complexities,⁵⁴

51. 'Mélodie', Dictionnaire de musique, p. 275.

52. See the following remark in the Encyclopédie, VIII, p. 50: "Un dictionnaire de mots élégans n'est pas une harangue, ni un recueil d'accords harmonieux une piece de musique. Il faut un sens, il faut de la liaison dans la Musique, comme dans le langage; mais où prendra-t-on tout cela, si ce n'est dans les idées mêmes que le sujet doit fournir?" The text of this statement was later modified slightly by Rousseau in his Dictionnaire de musique (see p. 237). Cf. also the passage from the Essai sur l'origine langues, ch. xiiii, cited on p. 342 below.

53. Hence, he wrote (La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 675), "Le chant... naît immédiatement de l'harmonie".

54. Of particular significance in this context is Rousseau's account of measure in the Lettre. For in his view the fundamental components of every kind of music included not only harmony and melody but measure as well, and it was in fact the case, he claimed (*ibid.*), that "le chant tire son principal caractère de la mesure". Measure provided the structure of song, he continued (see *ibid.*, p. 680), bearing the same relation to melody as syntax does to speech, while earlier, in his article 'Mesure' for the tenth volume of the Encyclopédie he had even suggested that harmony and melody stood

it remains perfectly clear that Rousseau's stance with regard to the primacy of melody over harmony was to be consistently upheld in the Dictionnaire de musique which, since it contains his final and most comprehensive reflections on this subject, we must regard as his definitive position.

In the Dictionnaire, to be sure, Rousseau devoted a whole article, entitled 'Unité de mélodie', to a treatment of the relation between these two facets of musical expression, and it is in this article that we find the fullest statement of his later view. There are two kinds of unity in music, he remarks here, one of which pertains to harmony, the other to melody. The first proceeds in sequence and, joining all the parts of a composition together, displays the relations between them in the form of an integral whole. The second is more pure and more immediately perceptible, and from it stems the energy of the music and the force of its terms and phrases. This difference, Rousseau continues, is attributable to the fact that the first kind of unity is only a succession of chords while the second is a procession of song, and there can be no doubt but that in his view the latter is more creative and vital.

Le plaisir de l'Harmonie n'est qu'un plaisir de pure sensation, & la jouissance des sens est toujours courte, la satiété & l'ennui la suivent de près: mais le plaisir de la Mélodie & du Chant, est un plaisir d'intérêt & de sentiment qui parle au coeur, & que l'Artiste peut toujours soutenir & renouveler à force de génie.⁵⁵

together as the intoned substance of music, whereas measure constituted its form. Thus he remarked (p. 410), "Le chant ne consiste pas seulement dans l'intonation, mais aussi dans la mesure, &...l'un [n'est] pas moins naturel que l'autre". This perspective was to have some bearing upon his argument in the Essai sur l'origine des langues (see pp. 328 and 335 below), and of course it figures clearly in his proposition of the Lettre (see pp. 253-254 above) that the measured speech of the Italian language made it more suitable to musical expression than was French. My account here of the primacy of melody over harmony in Rousseau's theory after 1753 must thus be taken in connection with his claims about the importance of measure too. See also the appendix, note s. 55. 'Unité de mélodie', Dictionnaire de musique, pp. 536-537. Cf. also the passages from the Lettre sur la musique française cited on p. 251

In the same article, moreover, Rousseau explained that his appreciation of the predominance of melody over harmony in music had actually been inspired by the operas which he had heard in Venice⁵⁶ while he had been stationed there in 1743-44, so that the principle could not have been established but only confirmed for him by the Paris performances of 'Les Bouffons' some ten years later. The Lettre sur la musique françoise, he added, had been designed to elaborate the foundations of that principle, just as Le Devin du village, composed a short while earlier, had formed his attempt to realize it in practice, and it was now, he concluded, for the 'Maîtres de l'Art' to judge whether the rule was correct and his application of it proper.⁵⁷ But in its theoretical formulation, which is of central importance here, he maintained that it had been put forward as a direct challenge to the views of Rameau.

above, and from the Examen de deux principes, the article 'Harmonie', and the Observations sur l''Alceste' de Gluck cited on pp. 292-293 below.

56. See 'Unité de mélodie', Dictionnaire de musique, p. 536. In the Lettre (see La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 699-701) Rousseau had already recalled an experience in Venice which confirmed the superiority of French over Italian song, at least to his own satisfaction. In his Confessions, moreover, he later devoted a few pages to the delights of Venetian song, for which, he claimed (O.C.I, p. 314), "j'eus bientôt...la passion qu'elle inspire à ceux qui sont faits pour en juger", despite his having come to Venice with a characteristically French prejudice against Italian music. Madeleine Ellis, in her Rousseau's Venetian Story (Baltimore 1966), p. 125, rightly notes that he was apparently unimpressed by the sculpture and painting which were then flourishing in the city and which so many of its other distinguished visitors at the time, such as Charles de Brosses, commended at length. But during his stay there as secretary to the Ambassador he was, nevertheless, deeply moved by at least one further feature of the city, i.e., the despotic nature of its ostensibly republican institutions (see ch. V, pp. 423-424). If it is true, therefore, as I mean to show (see pp. 346-378 below), that Rousseau's musical and social thought are conceptually conjoined, it is also the case that both are historically connected as two aspects of his first-hand reflections about Venetian life.

57. See the Dictionnaire de musique, p. 539.

M. Rameau, pour prouver que l'énergie de la Musique vient toute de l'Harmonie... n'a pas vû qu'il prouvoit tout le contraire de ce qu'il vouloit prouver; car dans tous les exemples qu'il donne, l'Accompagnement de la Basse ne sert qu'à déterminer le Chant... l'Harmonie n'agit... qu'en déterminant la Mélodie à être telle ou telle, & c'est purement comme Mélodie que l'intervalle a différentes expressions selon le lieu du Mode où il est employé.⁵⁸

It is perhaps odd that the article 'Unité de mélodie' was not incorporated in the supplement to the Encyclopédie which otherwise included the great bulk of Rousseau's emendations to his original essays that he compiled for the Dictionnaire de musique.⁵⁹ Rameau, however, who was never to know anything at all about the article, and who in 1753 could not even adduce from the Lettre that Rousseau's concept of melody had been designed specifically to challenge him, nonetheless immediately perceived the sense in which the idea elaborated in this work was actually opposed

58. Ibid., p. 538. See also the Lettre à M. Burney sur la musique, Moulton-Du Peyrou, VIII, p. 551. Marie-Elisabeth Duchez, in her important essay, 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', Revue de musicologie, LX (1974), argues (see p. 58) that Rousseau's technical principle of the 'unité de mélodie' was the counterpart in his theory to the principle of the 'basse fondamentale' in the work of Rameau. Duchez's article, which complements much of the material treated in this chapter, is further considered below (see especially pp. 298-299 and 312, and notes 133 and 221). In an excellent discussion, moreover, of 'Taste, Style, and Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Music', published in Earl Wasserman, ed., Aspects of the Eighteenth Century (Baltimore and London 1965), Edward Lowinsky (see pp. 190-192) concentrates upon the article 'Unité de mélodie' as the most striking essay in the Dictionnaire de musique. Lowinsky's study is a learned piece of musicological research, and where it deals with Rousseau's ideas it is, for the most part, highly illuminating. There is no evidence, however, to support its claim (p. 194) that Rousseau composed Le Devin du village shortly after the performance of La Serva padrona - at the Opéra in August 1752 - which initiated the Querelle des Bouffons. In his Confessions (see O.C.I., pp. 374-375) Rousseau remarks that while his work drew much inspiration from Italian opere buffe (which he had heard during his stay in Italy), he was anxious about the reception it would have in Paris since there no one would be accustomed to that genre and it would appear to be in an entirely new style. On the evidence which we do have (see the Correspondance complète, II, pp. 185-186), Le Devin du village was probably composed in the spring, most likely in April, of 1752.

59. A list of Rousseau's additions appears in Oliver, The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music (see note 23 above).

to his own theory. He promptly embarked upon the task of overturning the thesis about the relation between melody and harmony which Rousseau had set forth, and in April 1754, just slightly more than four months after the Lettre appeared, his reply was published under the title Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique. Here, in the text which forms his own main contribution to the Querelle des Bouffons,⁶⁰ Rameau argued that melody was in fact dependant upon rather than superior to harmony and that the natural sentiments of musical expression were essentially derived from, and not just adorned by, a harmonic base.

On fait sonner...l'Harmonie avant la Mélodie qui en est produite, pour qu'elle inspire au Chanteur le sentiment dont il doit être affecté indépendamment des paroles: sentiment qui frappera tout homme sans prévention, qui voudra bien se livrer aux purs effets de la Nature.⁶¹

In his Erreurs sur la musique of the following year, moreover, he turned again to Rousseau's confusion of priorities, exclaiming that

pour un Partisan de la Mélodie c'est bien mal prendre sa bisque que de s'inscrire contre la plénitude de l'harmonie en général.⁶²

And in both works, as I shall try to show,⁶³ Rameau set out to rebut the

60. There is, to be sure, no direct reference to the Querelle in the Observations. Thus one reviewer of Rameau's work observed (in the journal Annonces, affiches et avis divers, reprinted in CTWR, VI, p. 307) that while all the defenders of French music had waited impatiently for Rameau to produce a decisive reply to Rousseau's Lettre, and while his energetic rejoinder did in fact ensure that "notre Musique...est vengée", it was still the case, however, that "il s'explique...indirectement, dans ses Observations". Yet despite this lacuna the second half of the text (which appears in CTWR, III, pp. 257-330) is devoted almost entirely to a critique of the mistakes that Rousseau had committed in the Lettre. For accounts of the reception of the Observations in 1754-55, see CWTR, III, pp. lxxviii-lxxiv, and CTWR, VI, pp. 305-326.

61. CTWR, III, p. 316.

62. CTWR, V, p. 213.

63. See pp. 267-271 below.

principle which he associated with the Lettre at the same time that he contended with the articles Rousseau had composed for the Encyclopédie.

The second main theme of the Lettre sur la musique françoise, that is, the claim that the music of Italy is much superior to that of France, was also set forth at length by Rousseau for the first time in this work. It is true that in the Encyclopédie Rousseau had earlier remarked upon the discrepancies between the styles of music which prevailed in different nations, and especially in the passage of the article 'Accompagnement' which I have noted above⁶⁴ he drew a distinction between the modes of accompaniment that best suited the Italian and French styles in particular. But while the dichotomy which was to figure in the Lettre may have already received a sketchy treatment in that text, there remains, in my view, a quite crucial divide between his thesis in the Encyclopédie and his remarks in the later work. For while in 1749 Rousseau had only maintained that there was an essential contrast between the music appropriate to the languages of these two nations, by 1753 he had placed that contrast upon the same scale and had declared his preference.

This change in Rousseau's view seems to me attested by the fact that in an unfinished essay which he probably drafted in 1750 or 1751⁶⁵ and in which he treated the relative musical merits of the two

64. See note 31 above.

65. Neuchâtel Ms R 69 (ancienne cote 7881d). The text of this fragment, which includes many excisions and additions that are difficult to decipher, appears as an appendix in Jansen (see pp. 455-463), though in a version that contains mistakes, is in modern orthography, and leaves out the variants. Jansen (see p. 146) remarks that it was probably drafted by Rousseau on the suggestion of Grimm in the winter of 1750, and he therefore provides it with the title 'Schreiben an Grimm über das Französische und Italienische Musik-Drama'. Dufour (see II, p. 183) accepts that the work is addressed to Grimm, while Tiersot (Rousseau, p. 112) and Courtois ('Chronologie critique de Rousseau', pp. 60-61) accept Jansen's approximate date as well, but no arguments are put forward by any of these figures to establish the date or addressee. The

languages in some detail, he argued that each had its separate virtues. There was a sense, he declared, in which the appeal of Italian music was more universal than that of French, since the connection between speech and song was in the first case not so exact and limited as in the second,

d'où il suit que quand on admettroit ce caractère particulier dans la musique [Italienne]⁶⁶ elle seroit toujours préférable à [la nôtre]⁶⁷ comme plaisant plus universellement.⁶⁸

But though the music of Italy might bring greater pleasure to more hearts than that of France, this was not the only criterion by which

work was certainly not intended by Rousseau to be a missive letter to Grimm, for while at first he speaks of it as 'ma lettre' (p. 1r) he concludes with a reference to 'cet article' (p. 7v), and there is, to be sure, no specific mention of Grimm in the text. But despite the absence of any convincing internal clues I am inclined to accept Jansen's suppositions about it, and this for two reasons. Firstly, it contains a passage that appears to be directed at least partly to Grimm. Rousseau remarks (p. 1r) that "je vais...vous parler des spectacles d'italie à vous qui avez [déjà]...si bien jugés...ceux de france". Now it is quite likely that this sentence pertains, *inter alia*, to some remarks about the French operatic stage which Grimm made in an article he contributed to the Stuttgart *Beiträge zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters* around 1750 (see Jansen, p. 138). We know from the *Lettre sur 'Omphale'* (see *La Querelle des Bouffons*, I, p. 7) that Grimm was much inspired by French opera, and particularly that of Rameau, upon his arrival in Paris in the winter of 1748-49, and his praise, in the same work, of one of Rousseau's still unpublished articles for the *Encyclopédie* (see *ibid.*, p. 12, note) suggests that both writers were in close accord about their views on music in this period. Secondly, the text is substantially consistent with Rousseau's articles in the *Encyclopédie* but it does not constitute a draft for any one of them; on the other hand, its argument pertaining to the relative merits of French and Italian music is quite unlike the view expressed in his *Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale'* and *Lettre sur la musique françoise*, insofar as he here contrasts French *tragédie lyrique* quite favourably with Italian *opera seria* whereas in those works he states his preference for *opera buffa*. It is therefore more probable that the fragment was written in the period between 1749 and 1752 than at any other time before or after.

66. <françoise et dans>

67. <la françoise>

68. Neuchâtel Ms R 69, p. 5v. Cf. Jansen, p. 460.

the two styles should be judged. For since French music and especially French opera, Rousseau continued, were more successful in stirring our emotions, we must allow that each genre was best suited to produce a different effect.

La musique Italienne me plaît souverainement mais elle ne me touche point, la françoise ne me plaît que parce qu'elle me touche. Les fredons, les passages, les traits, les roulemens de la première, font briller l'organe et [charmer]⁶⁹ l'oreille mais les sons seduisans de la seconde vont droit au coeur, si la musique est faite pour plaire [seulement], donons la palme a l'italie, mais si elle doit encore émouvoir tenons en à la nôtre, et⁷⁰ sur tout quand il est question de l'opera ou l'on se propose [d'exciter]⁷¹ les passions et ⁷²[e toucher]⁷² le spectateur.⁷³

Now in this text Rousseau is somewhat inconsistent with both his article 'Accompagnement' and the Lettre sur la musique françoise, since in each of those two works he draws attention to the apt conformity between the Italian language and its music whereas here he remarks upon the advantages of a loose bond.⁷⁴ But the point which I wish to

69. <enchantent>

70. <combien>

71. <toujours d'émouvoir>

72. d'agiter>

73. Neuchâtel Ms R 69, pp. 5v-6r. Cf. Jansen, p. 461. See also the passage from Rousseau's article 'Choeur' in the Encyclopédie discussed in note 100 below.

74. Jansen (p. 151) sees the fragment in terms of an inner conflict in the views Rousseau held about Rameau around 1750, and he argues that Rousseau's musical theory became progressively more critical of Rameau's claims between 1749 and 1752: "Im Jahre 1750, wo das vorhin besprochene Manuscript entstand, sehen wir Rousseau in einer inneren Gährung, wie sie mangelhafte Kenntniss und noch weit mehr unklare und widerspruchsvolle Gedanken verursachen. Der Conflict mit den Theorien Rameau's, den er bereits in den Artikeln für die Encyclopédie Ausdruck verlieh, steigerte sich aber von 1750 bis 1752 mehr und mehr, und in Folge dessen musste auch sein Urtheil über die Art und Kunst der Composition bis 1752 grosse und rasche Wandelungen erfahren."

emphasise in the present context is that Rousseau did not decry the faults of French music in any general way until he had first established the deficiencies of the French language, so that the attack of 1753 which he levelled against the music of his adopted nation was in fact made possible only by the development, from 1749 onwards, of his ideas about the central place which language occupies in musical expression.⁷⁵ Rousseau's remarks in the Encyclopédie about the relative merits of Italian accompaniment provide merely a hint of the thesis on the connection between music and language which he was to set out later. A much closer approximation to his fully developed view can be found in those passages of the Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale' in which he develops a contention made by the author of a reply to Grimm that Italian recitative is superior to French because it clarifies rather than obscures the many distinctions between the sentiments enunciated by the performers.⁷⁶ By 1752 Rousseau had adopted the position that the French style of recitative was no more than "une espece de chant mêlé de cris"⁷⁷ which so confused the lyrics and their accompaniment that it could not even be distinguished from aria. But the first work in which Rousseau treated the relation between music and language in detail was in fact the Lettre sur la musique françoise of the following year, and it was here that his observations in the Encyclopédie about the difference between French

75. For Jansen (see p. 148) this change may be explained partly just as a consequence of Rousseau's abandonment of his earlier prejudice in favour of French music.

76. See the Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale', La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 92. Cf. the Remarques au sujet de Grimm sur 'Omphale', in *ibid.*, pp. 61-62. The author of the Remarques may have been Raynal (see note 15 above), but not all scholars are agreed about this.

77. Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale', *ibid.*, p. 104.

and Italian music came to be transformed into an argument that the French language was far less suitably adapted to musical expression. In the concluding section of the Lettre, Rousseau indeed commented particularly upon a passage of Lully's opera Armide which by repute was "le modèle le plus parfait du vrai récitatif François"⁷⁸ but which, in his view, was marked only by insipid cadences that suited neither the lyrics nor the sense of the theatrical plot. His thesis in the Lettre about the relation between music and language, moreover, was subsequently to be put in its most mature form in his Essai sur l'origine des langues, a work which deals at still greater length and in more abstract terms, not so much with the connection between the linguistic and musical nature of opera, but with the general relation between speech and song.

I shall be turning to the Essai later in this chapter. For the moment I should like to suggest only that in 1753 Rameau could not but have been incensed by the views expressed in the Lettre sur la musique française, since the two main contentions of that work were directed either against his own conception of harmony, on the one hand, or against the national style of opera of which he was then the leading exponent, on the other. The man who was both the foremost composer and theorist of France at the time, as well as the most dedicated and outspoken champion of these undeniable facts, must have seen himself as the intended victim of the first charge and equally as the successor

78. Lettre sur la musique française, *ibid.*, p. 751. Rousseau's remarks upon the celebrated monologue 'Enfin il est en ma puissance' of the heroine in Act II of Armide appear on pp. 751-753. In his Nouveau système de musique théorique of 1726 (see CTWR, II, pp. 51 and 90-100) Rameau himself had dealt at length with this passage, claiming that it illustrated "la plus parfaite distribution qu'on puisse imaginer" of his own rules of harmonic modulation. Rousseau's critique of the monologue in the Lettre was thus prefaced with the charge that the acclamation by Rameau "devient une véritable satire", while Rameau, for his part, retorted (in 1760 in his Code de musique pratique, CTWR, IV, p. 193, note) that "il faut être bien peu sensible aux effets de l'harmonie...pour avoir osé critiquer ce Monologue". See also notes 94 and 104 below.

to the culprit named in the second. In any event, over the next twenty months that followed the publication of the Lettre, Rameau produced two works, the Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique and the Erreurs sur la musique, in which he attempted to refute the claims Rousseau had made, both about the relation between melody and harmony and about the distinction between French and Italian music.

The first of these claims was quite clearly treated by Rameau with greater severity than the second, probably because Rousseau's notion of the primacy of a melodic theme over its harmonic accompaniment was, in his view, nothing less than a sheer inversion of the truth. Melody was not the source but the product of harmony, he retorted, for it was the harmonic structure of a song which gave rise to its melodic line and which inspired the singer to portray the sentiment that the composer had intended to convey, even without reference to the lyrical text - even, that is, "indépendamment des paroles".⁷⁹ In his Observations Rameau placed great stress upon this argument by repeating it in several ways,⁸⁰ and he put forward the same case again in his Erreurs sur la musique of the following year.⁸¹ In the Erreurs, moreover, he charged that anyone who supposed the opposite could not pretend to have a sure grasp of the principles of music, since

79. Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique, CTWR, III, p. 316. See also p. 262 above.

80. See for instance, *ibid.*, pp. 260, 271-272, and 317.

81. See the Erreurs sur la musique, CTWR, V, especially pp. 220 and 229.

tant qu'on ne considérera que la Mélodie comme principal moteur des effets de Musique, on ne fera pas de grands progrès dans cet Art.⁸²

And the concept of the 'unité de mélodie' which Rousseau in the Lettre had suggested was more central to musical expression than any harmonic rule was now decried by Rameau as "une chimère"

dont l'effet n'a que de foibles attraits en Musique sans le secours de l'harmonie.⁸³

Already in his earlier works, for instance the Traité de l'harmonie of 1722 and the Génération harmonique of 1737,⁸⁴ Rameau had insisted that the melodic phrases of our music were derived invariably from a harmonic base,⁸⁵ and as he developed his theory of the 'basse fondamentale' in the

82. Ibid., p. 219.

83. Ibid., p. 214. Cf. the passages from the Lettre cited for note 37 above. In his highly partisan defense of Rousseau against the charges levelled by Rameau, Jansen (pp. 234-235) suggests that these principles of harmony were conceived by a man who had no philosophical understanding: "Von dem Unterschiede zwischen Harmonie und Musik hat Rameau niemals eine Ahnung gehabt, und wenn er in seinem sehr schlechten Genre gelegentlich schöne Einzelheiten hervorbrachte, so geschah es, ohne dass er sich seines Verdienstes bewusst war. Nach seinen Principien braucht der Componist gar kein Genie und nur die Wissenschaft der Accorde. Rameau gleicht einem Maurer oder Zimmermann, der über die Bearbeitung von Steinen und Brettern philosophierend, uns für die Beurtheilung der Schönheit eines Bauwerkes zu befähigen glaubt."

84. With regard to the Traité de l'harmonie, see especially the following passage in CTWR, I, p. 31: "On divise ordinairement la Musique en Harmonie & en Melodie, quoique celle-cy ne soit qu'une partie de l'autre, & qu'il suffise de connoître l'Harmonie, pour être parfaitement instruit de toutes les proprietéz de la Musique." Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 168-169. With regard to the Génération harmonique, see, for example, CTWR, III, p. 45.

85. The principle that harmony gives rise to melody is, in my view, central to all of Rameau's writings about music. It should be noted, however, that his conception of harmonic structure was established from his account of the resonance of one note alone, and not, as some commentators have supposed, from the divisions of the octave (see, for instance, the Traité de l'harmonie, CTWR, I, p. 40). See also Girlestone, Rameau, pp. 520-523. The best account of Rameau's theory of harmony in its application to his own music is provided by Masson in his splendid L'Opéra de Rameau (Paris 1930), pp. 464-498. According to Masson (p. 466), Rameau believed that "l'expression de la mélodie ne vient pas de la simple succession de notes plus ou moins élevées, mais bien de l'harmonie originale que la mélodie implique et qui, inconsciemment, lui a donné naissance".

years leading to the publication of the Encyclopédie he in fact came to believe that other mathematical sciences were also governed by the principles of harmony which he had discovered. By 1750, at the age of 66, he felt sufficiently confident about the truth of his belief to proclaim, in his Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie, that the laws of every science were drawn, in the first instance, from the rules which applied to the resonance of a 'corps sonore'.

C'est dans la Musique que la nature semble nous assigner le principe Physique de ces premières notions purement Mathématiques sur lesquelles roulent toutes les Sciences, je veux dire, les proportions, Harmonique, Arithmétique & Géométrique, d'où suivent les progressions de même genre, & qui se manifestent au premier instant que résonne un corps sonore.⁸⁶

Using arguments which owed much to Pythagorean metaphysics,⁸⁷

Rameau in his later years put forward the claim that musical intervals served as a model for all the relations which prevailed in the world of Nature. Music, he contended, was at once a science and an art, so that acoustics and aesthetics - that is to say, the studies of its physical and artistic material - must ultimately be reduced to the same principles. And by the time he produced his Observations in 1754 Rameau was quite fixed in his view that the harmonic proportions and progressions of music which he had explained showed that this subject

86. CTWR, III, pp. 157-158. Rameau might have drawn some inspiration for this passage from the first proposition, entitled 'Il n'y a quasi nul art, nulle science, ou profession, à qui l'harmonie...ne puisse servir', in the eighth book of the third volume of Marin Mersenne's Harmonie universelle (first published in Paris in 1636). That work and - even more - Gioseffo Zarlino's Istitutioni harmoniche of 1558 comprise the principal modern sources from which Rameau developed his theory of harmony. See also Lionel Gossman, 'Time and history in Rousseau', pp. 320-322.

87. In his Génération harmonique of 1737 and again in his Nouvelles Réflexions sur le principe sonore of 1760, for instance (see CTWR, III, p. 38, and CTWR, IV, pp. 213 and 255-258), Rameau commented favourably upon the application of the laws of harmony, by Pythagoras, both to music, on the one hand, and to planetary motion, on the other. It is true, however, that in his Observations (see CTWR, III, pp. 274-277) he also objected to a number of ideas pertaining to the divisions of the octave which had been attributed to Pythagoras. Chailley ends his interesting but for the most part technical article on 'Rameau et la théorie musicale' with the remark (p. 95) that Rameau was the only real musical theorist after "le fabuleux Pythagore". See also note 121 below.

was the mother of all the arts and sciences. "Ne l'abandonnons...

plus", he exclaimed,

cette mere des Sciences & des Arts, examinons-la bien, & tâchons désormais de ne plus nous lais[ser] conduire que par elle. Le Principe dont il s'agit, est non-seulement celui de tous les Arts de goût... il l'est encore de toutes les Sciences soumises au calcul: ce qu'on ne peut nier, sans nier en même tems que ces Sciences ne soient fondées sur les proportions & progressions, dont la Nature nous fait part dans le Phénomène du Corps sonore, avec des circonstances si marquées, qu'il est impossible de se refuser à l'évidence: & comment le nier! puisque point de proportions, point de Géométrie.⁸⁸

The rules which applied to music, therefore, must be identical throughout the world, and, equally, they must be fundamental to all other subjects. For the harmonic laws of Nature were at once musical and cosmic, and to define their principles in a systematic fashion was, according to Rameau, the most important enterprise to which man could devote his talents.⁸⁹

The second of Rousseau's principal claims in the Lettre was answered by Rameau in a much more indirect and elusive fashion that almost entirely overlooked the crucial points Rousseau had made about the relative musical merits of the French and Italian languages. For though as an operatic composer Rameau was often ingenious in his use of intervals and variations of tempo to express or to add emphasis to the texts of his libretti,⁹⁰ as a theorist he never paid much attention to the tonal qualities of speech and in fact often appeared to have little

88. CTWR, III, pp. 264-265. These remarks may have been inspired, in part, by the following passage from Jean Adam Serre's Essais sur les principes de l'harmonie (Paris 1753), p. 28: "Dans l'ordre réel des choses, l'Harmonie, Fille de la Nature même, est la Mere de tous les Sons que peut employer la Mélodie." On the connection between the musical doctrines of Rameau and Serre, see the appendix, note aa. See also the passage from Rameau's Génération harmonique cited in note 10 above.

89. See note 138 below.

90. See, for instance, the illustrations of Rameau's employment of major sixths in the recitative of Hippolyte et Aricie and Les Indes galantes, his use of minor sevenths in Castor et Pollux and Zoroastre, and his rhythmic variations in Hippolyte, Dardanus, and Castor, cited by Masson (L'Opéra de Rameau, pp. 136-142 and 146-148). Masson, however, also comments at length

patience for the suggestion that the sentiments expressed in music might be mediated in some respects by the words to which the notes were attached.⁹¹ No perspective of songs conceived as poems had any real bearing upon his view of musical form and structure, so that Rousseau's distinction between national styles of music in terms of linguistic differences seems to have stirred him very little, if at all. But in his own fashion Rameau did object to Rousseau's thesis that Italian music was superior to French, and he set down his reply in two ways.

Firstly, in the Observations, he pointed in detail to several apparent contradictions in Rousseau's study of Armide,⁹² noting, too, that a particular chordal shift to the subdominant mode about which Rousseau had complained was in fact perfectly justified in virtue of its 'basse fondamentale',⁹³ and commenting that, on the whole, Lully "pensoit en Grand"⁹⁴ and did not commit the petty technical faults which had been ascribed to him. Secondly, he charged, in the Erreurs sur la musique, that Rousseau had been unable to appreciate French music in general, and the French style of recitative in particular, largely because of his naïve view of the place occupied by measure in musical expression. In the Lettre Rousseau had decried French recitative as an "extravagante criailerie"⁹⁵ because the lyrics were too often swollen up and drawn out so as to suit the artificial pace of the accompaniment; Italian recitative, on

(*ibid.*, pp. 106-116) upon "cette indéniable faiblesse des poèmes [que Rameau] a mis en musique".

91. See, for instance, the passage from the Observations cited on p. 268 above.

92. See the remarks, for example, in CTWR, III, p. 324.

93. See *ibid.*, pp. 305-307. Cf. the Lettre sur la musique française, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 754-755.

94. Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique, CTWR, III, p. 305. Much of this text, Rameau himself admitted (*ibid.*, p. 301), was conceived to "rendre à Lulli la justice qui lui est due" after Rousseau's unwarranted attack.

95. Lettre sur la musique française, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 744-745.

the other hand, he had depicted as sung in clearly measured tones which were more appropriate to the tempo of speech and which helped to place due emphasis upon the meaning of the plot.⁹⁶ But Rameau maintained that, in this distinction, Rousseau had allowed himself to be seduced by a crude notion of measure which took no account of the subtle progressions of harmonic accompaniment, claiming that he really ought to have commended French recitative instead for its greater variety of pace and tempo.⁹⁷ In any event it was most odd, Rameau observed, that Rousseau should have admired a certain style of accompaniment on the grounds that it does not attract the attention of the listener at all,⁹⁸ while the praise which he had lavished upon the Italian style was inconsistent since, for no good reason, he sometimes preferred a lighter, sometimes a heavier, touch.⁹⁹

Now Rameau's treatment of this second theme of the Lettre is less clear than his reply to the first, not only because it pays little heed to the distinction Rousseau had drawn between the musical qualities of different languages, or again because it deals at length and in an obscure way only with some matters of technical detail, but also because it changes from one work to the next. In the Observations, that is, Rameau argued that the views which Rousseau had expressed in the Lettre about national styles of accompaniment contradicted some remarks he had made earlier in the Encyclopedie,¹⁰⁰

96. See *ibid.*, pp. 746-748.

97. See the Erreurs sur la musique, CTWR, V, p. 210. For a brief discussion of Rousseau's idea of measure in the Lettre see note 54 above.

98. See the Erreurs sur la musique, CTWR, V, p. 212.

99. See *ibid.*, pp. 210-211. Rameau's treatment of the Lettre in the Erreurs appears on pp. 205-219.

100. See the Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique, CTWR, III, pp. 328-329. Rameau noticed a discrepancy between Rousseau's complaint in the Lettre (see La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 715) that French choirs

while in the Erreurs sur la musique - perhaps because his hostility to Rousseau had by then taken a more violent turn - he charged him with having made the same mistake in both places.¹⁰¹

Of course Rameau had always reacted sharply to even the mildest criticisms of his theory, but in his later years his impatience with other thinkers assumed the form of a most fierce exasperation whenever he felt that his views had been challenged or opposed. I think it is largely because of this habit of mind that Rameau exaggerated the extent to which the Lettre sur la musique française had been designed to challenge his own works. In the Lettre Rousseau had, after all, objected specifically to some features of Lully's opera Armide and not at all to any composition by Rameau. And even if he had mentioned Rameau as an exponent of the French style of tragédie lyrique that he deplored, he would in any case have had to take note of the fact that Rameau was the composer of a successful opéra bouffon too.¹⁰² Rousseau

only made noise and his previous contention ('Choeur', Encyclopédie, III (1753), p. 362) that "un beau choeur est le chef-d'oeuvre d'un habile compositeur. Les François passent pour réussir mieux dans cette partie qu'aucune autre nation de l'Europe". By pointing to this contrast Rameau showed his own awareness of the fact that Rousseau's hostility to French music is absent from his initial contribution to the Encyclopédie. In connection with Neuchâtel Ms R 69 (see especially the passage cited for note 73 above) I have tried to show that Rousseau maintained a substantially favourable impression of French music until at least 1750 or 1751. Rameau's attention to the article 'Choeur' might have been drawn at first not so much by the observations of Rousseau as by the following remark of Cahusac which was added to Rousseau's text: "M. Rameau a poussé cette partie aussi loin qu'il semble qu'elle puisse l'être: presque tous ses choeurs sont beaux, & il en a beaucoup qui sont sublimes."

101. In the Erreurs sur la musique, see, for instance, his comments in CTWR, V, pp. 205 and 210.

102. This opera, Platée, first staged at Versailles in 1745, became particularly popular after a performance at the Paris Opéra on 21 February 1754 which effectively marked the end of the season of 'Les Bouffons' (see note 11 above). In 1745 Rameau had also produced a comic operatic ballet, La Princesse de Navarre, and around 1760 he was later to compose another lyrical comic opera, Les Paladins.

was certainly clear in the Lettre that the superiority of Italian over French music was due to a difference between the languages rather than the talents of composers, and in that sense at least no French musician was personally at fault for the defects of his work.¹⁰³ With regard to Rousseau's remarks in the Lettre about musical theory, moreover, it must be stressed here that he refers directly to Rameau only three times in that text, twice in order to object merely to his appraisal of Lully¹⁰⁴ and once actually to agree with his claim that certain chords evoke particular human sentiments.¹⁰⁵ Despite the widening gulf which had developed between their ideas from 1749 to 1753, Rousseau did not, in the Lettre, propound any general critique of Rameau's theory. Indeed, even after Rousseau replied to Rameau's attacks in 1755, he still often acclaimed the genius of the master and acknowledged the immense debt which his own ideas on music owed to those that Rameau had advanced before.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, whether or not there is sufficient justification for the severity of the replies which Rameau made

103. See the passage in La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 764 cited in note 46 above.

104. See *ibid.*, pp. 751-752 and notes 78 and 94 above.

105. See *ibid.*, pp. 726-731.

106. See, for instance, the following passage from Rousseau's article 'Système' in the Dictionnaire de musique, p. 474: "Jusqu'à notre siècle l'Harmonie, née successivement & comme par hasard, n'a eu que des règles éparses, établies par l'oreille, confirmées par l'usage, & qui paroissent absolument arbitraires. M. Rameau est le premier qui, par le Système de la Basse-fondamentale, a donné des principes à ces règles.... ce Dictionnaire a été composé...[sur son Système]." It should be noted here that this tribute to Rameau appears in roughly the same form in the fourth supplementary volume to the Encyclopédie already published in 1767, though there had been no mention of Rameau in Rousseau's initial article 'Système' for the fifteenth volume of the Encyclopédie printed in 1765. Most of Rousseau's essay in the Dictionnaire - the longest in the entire work - is nevertheless devoted to the musical theory of Tartini rather than to that of Rameau. Tartini's Trattato di musica secondo la vera scienza dell'armonia, first published in Padua in 1754, was much admired by Rousseau, and in his preface to the Dictionnaire (see p. ix) he even claimed that, between the two, the system of Tartini was the better. But since Rousseau seldom referred to Tartini before

to Rousseau's work in 1754 and 1755, I hope that I have shown how the two main themes of the Lettre sur la musique française were connected by Rameau to the philosophical perspective of the articles in the Encyclopédie which had already troubled him. For in his Observations and Erreurs sur la musique the only serious objection of Rameau which applies directly to the Encyclopédie alone is the critique of Rousseau's claim, which I have considered earlier in this chapter,¹⁰⁷ that different rules of harmonic accompaniment are appropriate to the music of different nations. The other charges made by Rameau actually pertain to the Lettre sur la musique française.

It may be argued that the divergencies between the musical ideas of the two thinkers is attributable more to their having raised some different problems than to their having treated the same problems in a different way. How, indeed, from Rameau's point of view, could the constant principles that explained the physical resonance of a vibrating string be derived from any one of an infinite number of songs born of fancy and imagination? And how, from the perspective of Rousseau, could the pattern of just a single scale that was appropriate to the tuning of some instruments alone be regarded as more fundamental to musical expression than the impulsive sounds produced by the human voice? Neither figure really addressed himself to the main concern of the other, and both Rameau's failure to discuss the musical place of language, as well as Rousseau's belief that harmonic progressions formed only a secondary part of the subject, left each thinker with a general

the 1760s, and since his remarks about Tartini's theory are all of a technical rather than philosophical nature, I shall treat them only in passing here (see note 200 below and the appendix, note gg).

107. See the passage from the article 'Accompagnement' cited in note 31 above.

theory of music which more or less excluded the features that the other regarded as central.¹⁰⁸

By 1755 the confrontation which had arisen between the views of Rameau and Rousseau was in any case matched by the estrangement of the composer from several of the other figures, especially Diderot, Grimm, and d'Alembert, who only three years earlier had been in general agreement about both the profundity of his theory and the magnificence of his music. This break between Rameau and his followers was partly due, of course, to their having espoused the cause of the Italians in the Querelle des Bouffons. Thus, for instance, when Diderot later reflected upon the preference of the Encyclopédistes for Italian over French opera he remarked that their earlier prejudice in favour of Rameau's music had been overcome by 'Les Bouffons',¹⁰⁹ claiming, too, in his Neveu de Rameau, that in the operas of the master there was little else but

l'harmonie, des bouts de chants, des idées decousues,
du fracas, des vols, des triomphes, des lances, des
gloires, des murmures, des victoires a perte
d'haleine.¹¹⁰

The break after the publication of the Observations and Erreurs sur la musique was no doubt also due in part to the annoyance felt by Diderot

108. Colm Kiernan, in an otherwise very thin essay on 'Rousseau and Music in the French Enlightenment', French Studies, XXVI (1972), makes the interesting suggestion (see p. 156) that while Rameau may have regarded music as a physical science, Rousseau seems to have believed that it was linked to the life sciences.

109. See Diderot's 'Pantomime dramatique' of 1769 in Assézat-Tourneux, VIII, p. 458. In 1753 Diderot also contributed three anonymous pamphlets to the Querelle itself, entitled Arret rendu à l'amphithéâtre de l'Opéra (this work is sometimes ascribed to d'Holbach), Au petit Prophète de Boesmischbroda, and Les Trois chapitres, ou la vision de la nuit du mardi-gras, respectively (see La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 277-289, 413-427, and 491-511).

110. Le Neveu de Rameau, p. 6. Diderot drafted most of the Neveu in 1761-62.

and his friends at Rameau's lack of gratitude for their generous assistance and praise, a complaint made not only on behalf of Rousseau alone by the editors of the Encyclopédie,¹¹¹ but equally on behalf of Rousseau, d'Alembert, and Diderot together by Grimm.¹¹²

Particularly in the case of d'Alembert, moreover, the clash with Rameau after 1755 was forged on theoretical grounds as well. In his articles 'Fondamental' and 'Gamme' which appeared in 1757 in the seventh volume of the Encyclopédie, d'Alembert levelled two main charges against the musical system of Rameau which had not figured in his Elémens de musique of 1752. The first is that Rameau had exaggerated the importance of harmony at the expense of melody and had not understood that it was the thematic lines rather than the form of their accompaniment which for most men constituted the most striking feature of any musical work.¹¹³ The second is that Rameau had attempted to endow his speculations with "un faux air scientifique"¹¹⁴ as if they were geometrical proofs, despite the fact that the numerically complex relations which he had perceived in the resonance of a 'corps sonore' could never be established with the certainty that applied to the propositions of geometry. "Je crois qu'en qualité de géometre", objected d'Alembert, "on me pardonnera de protester... contre cet abus ridicule de la Géométrie dans la Musique".¹¹⁵

111. See note 28 above.

112. See the Correspondance littéraire of 15 November 1755, II(3), p. 129, and 15 January 1762, IV(5), p. 20.

113. See especially 'Fondamental', Encyclopédie, VII, p. 61.

114. Ibid., p. 62. In his Suite de la 'Reponse' à M. d'Alembert of 1761 Rameau took great objection to these words, retorting (CTWR, V, p. 384) that "je suis le seul qui ait écrit scientifiquement, bien ou mal, de la Musique, excepté quelques Sectateurs de mes Principes". See also d'Alembert's 'Discours préliminaire' to his second edition of the Elémens de musique, CTWR, VI, p. 474, and the anonymous letter - probably Rameau's - in the Mercure de France of April 1762, ibid., p. 453.

115. 'Fondamental', Encyclopédie, VII, p. 62. See also 'Gamme', ibid., p. 465.

Each of these two contentions was in some sense connected to Rousseau's own views, the first because it could be shown to stem, as d'Alembert himself remarked, from the account of the melodic virtues of Italian music which had already figured both in the article 'Accompagnement' and in the Lettre sur la musique française,¹¹⁶ the second because it was to be more or less renewed in a postscript to the article 'Musique' which Rousseau prepared for the tenth volume of the Encyclopédie.¹¹⁷ In any case after 1757, Rameau, with a new

116. See 'Fondamental', *ibid.*, p. 61. Even before Rousseau several other eighteenth-century critics of Rameau had also decried his emphasis upon harmony over melody, and on this point d'Alembert might have turned elsewhere for inspiration. Perhaps the earliest figure of distinction to have made the charge is Johann Mattheson, whose influence upon musicology in Germany almost equalled that of Rameau in France in the same period (see his Critica musica, 2 vols. [Hamburg 1722-25], II, pp. 7-11). The most important of the early French critics of Rameau in this context is probably Castel in the Journal de Trévoux (see note 8 above and CTWR, VI, pp. 78-79). With regard to d'Alembert's own preference for Italian over French music, which was never so categorical in substance nor so vehement in tone as that of Rousseau, see especially his De la liberté de la musique, La Querelle des Bouffons, III, pp. 2201-2282, and Pappas, 'D'Alembert et la querelle des bouffons', RHLF, LXV (1965), pp. 479-484. In the light principally of some unpublished sources Pappas even claims that d'Alembert really disliked Italian music, but he overstates his case, and a few of his contentions, for instance his remark that d'Alembert is the author of the Réflexions sur la musique en général of 1754, have little or no evidence to support them.

117. After a somewhat deprecatory mention of the works of Rameau (see note 8 above) the text reads as follows (Encyclopédie, X, p. 902): "Nous avons encore plus récemment des principes d'acoustique d'un géometre, qui nous montrent jusqu'à quel point pourroit aller la Géométrie dans de bonnes mains, pour l'invention & la solution des plus difficiles théorèmes de la musique spéculative." I take this passage to refer to the first edition of d'Alembert's Elémens de musique, with the emphasis upon "de bonnes mains" to contrast his geometrical talents with those of Rameau, since at the same point in the text of the Dictionnaire de musique Rousseau remarks (pp. 316-317) that it is no longer necessary to read the works of Rameau "depuis que M. d'Alembert a pris la peine d'expliquer au Public le système de la Basse-fondamentale, la seule chose utile & intelligible qu'on trouve dans les écrits de ce Musicien". It is of course possible that the addition to the article 'Musique', which must have been made some years after the rest of the work was completed, is by d'Alembert himself, since in a letter of 26 June 1751 Rousseau admitted that d'Alembert had already proposed a few, apparently only very minor, editorial changes to his essays for the Encyclopédie which he had

grievance against the Encyclopédie, remonstrated bitterly with d'Alembert for his adoption of the hostile stance of Rousseau.¹¹⁸

In a number of essays which appeared between 1760 and 1762 he replied to d'Alembert's objections in still fiercer terms than he had employed in 1754-55 against Rousseau's less direct attack.

D'Alembert had both betrayed and misrepresented him, he lamented, and, to be sure, the two main points made by the renegade disciple, that is,

been happy to accept (see the Correspondance complète, II, pp. 159-162). By the 1770s, however, after Rousseau had come to be convinced that his erstwhile friend was a frequent and leading conspirator against him, he saw d'Alembert's connection with his musical writings in a very different light. In a note to the first dialogue of Rousseau juge de Jean Jaques (possibly added around 1774 rather than in 1772 when this part of the work was first drafted), he hinted that the 1768 edition of d'Alembert's Elémens de musique had incorporated a number of "augmentations" following the publication of his Dictionnaire de musique (see O.C.I., p. 680). In notes to the twelfth book of the Confessions and to his copy of a letter originally dated 23 November 1770 (both, however, probably appended even after the addition to Rousseau juge de Jean Jaques) he went on to suggest that the Elémens de musique had always included "beaucoup de choses" (O.C.I., p. 608) or even "beaucoup d'articles tout entiers de ceux que j'avois faits en 1749 pour l'Encyclopédie" (Correspondance générale, XX, p. 17), implying, moreover, that d'Alembert might also have played a part in the plagiarisms which he had detected in Jacques Lacombe's Dictionnaire des beaux-arts, published in the same year (1752) as the first edition of the Elémens de musique. In a letter printed in the Mecure de France in October 1780 d'Alembert, who then knew only of the remark in Rousseau juge de Jean Jaques, protested that the 1768 edition of his work was identical with the revised version of 1762 that had appeared some years before the publication of the Dictionnaire de musique, in which, to be sure, his own text is actually mentioned. And in the final issue of L'Année littéraire of the same year, Madame de La Tour de Franqueville, one of Rousseau's most ardent and indefatigable admirers, replied on his behalf - quite wrongly as it turned out - that d'Alembert had misinterpreted the remarks which he had found offensive (for this exchange see Moulton-Du Peyrou, XV, pp. 544-554). The whole episode bears a striking similarity in its development to the progressive intensification of Rousseau's charges, also produced in a series of notes which he added to his writings in the 1770s, against the influence of Diderot in connection with the composition of the Discours sur l'inégalité (see ch. III, note 6).

118. See especially Rameau's Lettre à M. d'Alembert of 1760, CTWR, IV, p. 268. This text was produced at the same time as, and partly in connection with, the Code de musique pratique (see *ibid.*, pp. xlii-xliii).

about melody on the one hand and geometry on the other, were each wrong.¹¹⁹ Indeed everything about d'Alembert's critique, he concluded, was hopelessly mistaken, since it was founded upon nothing at all except

futilités, subtilités, faux fuyans, subterfuges, contre vérités, citations falsifiées. Depuis quand le Philosophe ne sacrifie-t-il plus ses opinions à la vérité? Ne doit-il pas se taire quand la Nature parle?¹²⁰

For his part d'Alembert elaborated his critique of Rameau's claims in three essays published in the Mercure de France in 1761-62, two of which he incorporated in a new edition of his Elémens de musique in 1762.¹²¹ Some years after Rameau's death, moreover, he even allowed

119. Rameau produced at least nine (and, if one counts two anonymous essays which were almost certainly by him, eleven) replies to the articles 'Fondamental' and 'Gamme' and the three main additional texts in which d'Alembert developed his critique (see CTWR, IV, pp. 265-280 and 313-324; CTWR, V, pp. 369-385; CTWR, VI, pp. 440-455 and 507-514; and note 121 below). The majority of these works first appeared as essays in the Mercure de France, and some were no more than a few paragraphs long. The most important, apart from the Lettre à M. d'Alembert, is the Controverse sur le même sujet published in 1762 in conjunction with the Origine des sciences. For Rameau's accusation of betrayal see especially the Lettre à M. d'Alembert, CTWR, IV, p. 270, and the Suite de la 'Réponse' à M. d'Alembert, CTWR, V, p. 385; for his charge of misrepresentation see the Controverse sur le même sujet, CTWR, IV, p. 322 and the even sharper but earlier rebuke in the Réponse à MM. les éditeurs de l'Encyclopédie, CTWR, V, pp. 345-346; for his reminder of "la supériorité de l'harmonie" over melody in music see the Lettre à M. d'Alembert, CTWR, IV, pp. 277-280; for his renewed claim about the connection between music and geometry see ibid., pp. 270-271, the Suite de la 'Réponse' à M. d'Alembert, CTWR, V, pp. 382-383, and again the Réponse à MM. les éditeurs, ibid., pp. 359-360.

120. Observations sur l'Origine des Sciences, CTWR, IV, p. 326. In this text, which Rameau intended to serve as an appendix to the Controverse sur le même sujet and the Origine des sciences (the lot then to be joined to the Code de musique pratique), he does not mention d'Alembert by name, but his reference to "le Géomètre" leaves no room for doubt.

121. The 'Discours préliminaire' and the Réponse à M. Rameau (see CTWR, VI, pp. 460-488). The third and shortest of these works, the Lettre à M. Rameau (see CTWR, V, pp. 367-368), appeared first. D'Alembert's central aim in all three was not so much to discredit

himself to engage in some gentle mockery of the ideas of the man whom he had earlier regarded as one of the leading figures of the Enlightenment.

De cette résonance du corps sonore...Rameau a tâché de déduire toute la théorie de la musique. Il expliqua assez bien quelques-uns des faits connus; il réussit moins à quelques autres; il voulut même en expliquer qui se refusoient entièrement à son principe; il finit par vouloir trouver dans les proportions musicales toute la géométrie, dans les modes majeur et mineur les deux sexes des animaux, enfin la Trinité dans la triple résonance du corps sonore.¹²²

The most extensive reply to Rameau's Observations and Erreurs sur la musique, however, was put forward by Rousseau himself.¹²³ By

Rameau's theory further, but rather to simplify it and to distil from it that part which was both true and cogent. "Le langage des sciences", he remarked (Réponse à M. Rameau, CTWR, VI, p. 482), "doit être plus simple, plus clair & plus précis". There was no need or justification for one of Rameau's demonstrations of the origin of the minor mode, and d'Alembert accordingly proposed to delete it from his new edition of the Elémens de musique (see the 'Discours préliminaire', *ibid.*, pp. 464-465). There was no evidence, too, for Rameau's supposition that harmony was a feature of ancient music, though melody must certainly have been a feature of every musical form (see *ibid.*, p. 461). Above all, Rameau's complicated account of the 'proportions géométriques' which he believed to be derived from the resonance of a 'corps sonore' was, for d'Alembert (*ibid.*, p. 465), "tout-à-fait inutile, &...tout-à-fait illusoire dans la théorie de la Musique". In his attacks d'Alembert nevertheless continued to acknowledge Rameau's stature as the first great musical theorist. "La gloire du savant Artiste", he wrote (*ibid.*, p. 468), "n'a rien à craindre; il aura toujours l'avantage d'avoir le premier rendu la Musique une science digne d'occuper les Philosophes". A decade earlier, in one of his exchanges with Béthizy (see CTWR, VI, p. 257 and note 16 above), he had even admitted that the first edition of his Elémens de musique had won the approval of Rameau and had benefited from his help, a point which Rameau turned to his own advantage (see the Réponse à MM. les éditeurs, CTWR, V, pp. 346-347).

122. 'Réflexions sur la théorie de la musique', in Charles Henry, ed., Oeuvres et correspondances inédites de d'Alembert (Paris 1887), p. 138 (the passage also appears in CTWR, VI, p. xxxiv). The work was originally prepared for a meeting of the Académie des sciences in May 1777 and was subsequently revised and expanded by d'Alembert, who may have had in mind here this remark about the resonance of a 'corps sonore' in Rameau's Lettre aux philosophes published in the Journal de Trévoux in August 1762 (CTWR, VI, p. 510): "Ne croiroit-on pas reconnoître ici une image vivante de quelques attributs de la Divinité?"

123. The fact that d'Alembert's objections to Rameau in the period from 1757 to 1762 were conceived largely as replies to both of these works, or

1755 Rousseau was already at the height of both his powers and his fame. His Discours sur les sciences et les arts had won for him not only the prize of the Académie de Dijon in 1750 but also the interest of established and aspiring men of letters throughout Europe. His opera Le Devin du Village of 1752 had been an immediate theatrical and commercial success which, but for his own misgivings, would have occasioned an offer of a pension from the King of France.¹²⁴ His Lettre sur la musique française of the following year had elicited more replies in the space of four months than any of his other works were to do throughout the whole of his lifetime,¹²⁵ and notwithstanding all that would later be said about the seditious effects of his

at least to the Erreurs sur la musique, seems clear from their preoccupation with Rameau's account in that text (see CTWR, V, pp. 254-260) of the affinity between geometry and music. This aspect of Rameau's theory had already been decried in the foreword to the sixth volume of the Encyclopédie where the Erreurs is specifically mentioned as the appropriate reference (see *ibid.*, p. 290, note b), and Rameau's attempt to show that he had held the same view as early as 1737 in his Génération harmonique was somewhat disingenuous, since in that text he had treated harmonic intervals as 'proportions Arithmétiques' but not as 'proportions géométriques' (see, for instance, CTWR, III, pp. 33 and 71, and CTWR, V, p. 384, note g). It is true, however, that d'Alembert did not focus his critique of Rameau exclusively upon the Erreurs sur la musique and the writings which followed it, for he also addressed himself to the Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie of 1750 and especially to the title of that work which, he complained, had been added after the book had won the approval of the Académie des sciences in 1749. "Cette compagnie", he remarked ('Gamme', Encyclopédie, VII, p. 465), "n'a jamais prétendu approuver le système de Musique de M. Rameau, comme renfermant une science démontrée" (see also the 'Discours préliminaire' to his 1762 edition of the Elémens de musique, CTWR, VI, p. 467, note).

124. See the Confessions, O.C.I, pp. 379-381, and Leigh, 'Rousseau's English Pension', in Studies in Eighteenth-Century French Literature presented to Robert Niklaus (Exeter 1975), pp. 110-112.

125. See La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. xxvii-xxviii, and the other works cited in note 20 above. Rameau's Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique appeared just over four months after the Lettre and was nearly the last of the replies printed during the Querelle des Bouffons itself, but in fact the controversy about Rousseau's book continued for much longer. D'Alembert produced his De la liberté de la musique in 1760; John Gregory came to Rousseau's defence in his Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man with those of the Animal World in 1765 (published in London - see pp. 93-94 and especially 107), promptly sending

writings or the revolutionary intentions underlying them the appearance of this book during a politically dangerous crisis for the King in fact stimulated so much public interest that, according to Rousseau, the thoughts of men were immediately turned away from politics to music, and the French Revolution of 1753 which would have occurred but for his intervention was thus averted.

C'étoit le tems de la grande querelle du Parlement et du Clergé. Le Parlement venoit d'être exilé; la fermentation étoit au comble; tout menaçoit d'un prochain soulèvement. La Brochure parut; à l'instant toutes les autres querelles furent oubliées; on ne songea qu'au péril de la musique françoise, et il n'y eut plus de soulèvement que contre moi. Il fut tel que la Nation n'en est jamais bien revenue....Quand on lira que cette brochure a peut-être empêché une revolution dans l'Etat, on croira rêver. C'est pourtant une vérité bien réelle.¹²⁶

Rousseau a copy accompanied by an effusive declaration of his love (see the Correspondance générale, XV, pp. 43-44); and in 1780 Mme de la Tour de Franqueville (perhaps in collaboration with the violinist Pierre Gaviniés) assailed Jean-Benjamin de La Borde's critical account, not only of the Lettre in particular but also of Rousseau's ideas on music generally (in his Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne, 4 vols. [Paris 1780]), with a whole series of charges and invectives whose sense of urgency and strength of tone might have surprised Rousseau himself (for this attack, and Du Peyrou's own sympathetic acknowledgments, see especially Moultoy-Du Peyrou, XV, pp. 487-543 and 560-609). See also note 131 below.

126. Confessions, O.C.I, p. 384. See too note 127 below. In this passage Rousseau also remarks that the Lettre caused such outrage at the Court that "on ne balançoit qu'entre la Bastille et l'exil, et la lettre de cachet alloit être expédiée, si M. de Voyer [probably the nephew of the Marquis d'Argenson - see the Correspondance complète, II, p. 237] n'en eut fait sentir le ridicule". D'Argenson confirms this statement in his Journal et mémoires, VIII, p. 180, adding, rather mysteriously, that the lettre de cachet was circumvented by "de tristes artistes". Actually, Rousseau's text continues (see O.C.I, p. 385), the orchestra of the Paris Opéra plotted to murder him, while the free pass which had been his perquisite for Le Devin du village was revoked. Other commentators (see especially the passages from Palissot, d'Argenson, Grimm, and an anonymous correspondent of Joseph d'Hémery cited in the Correspondance complète, II, pp. 234, 324, 325, and 330) note only that Rousseau was badly treated when he next attended a performance at the Opéra and that he was hanged in effigy by the orchestra, while Grimm reflected (*ibid.*, p. 325) that "il aurait été singulier de voir...Rousseau exilé pour avoir

Rousseau no doubt exaggerated the importance of the fuss which had been stirred by the appearance of the Lettre sur la musique française,¹²⁷ but it was the only one of his works upon which nearly

dit du mal de la musique française, après avoir traité impunément les matières de politique les plus délicates". In any case the fact that the Court may have reacted sharply to the Lettre sur la musique française suggests that we should attach at least some very mild reservations to the thesis of Sacaluga (see 'Diderot, Rousseau, et la querelle musicale de 1752', p. 163) that the appearance of this work provided just the kind of diversion which had been sought by the politically beleaguered French monarchy of 1753. Sacaluga's generally commendable essay, however, remains, so far as I know, the only study in which this important passage of the Confessions is treated as a subject worthy of historical research (but see note 127 below). The events to which Rousseau refers in his assertion that "le Parlement venoit d'être exilé...tout menaçoit d'un prochain soulèvement" are not really those which directly followed the exile and dispersion of the magistrates of the Paris Parlement, for that prolonged state of affairs, dating from 9 May 1753 to 1 September 1754, caused no particular crisis around 22 November 1753 when the Lettre sur la musique française was published (see the Correspondance complète, II, p. 233). In fact the survival in Paris of the Grand'Chambre or Central Court of the Parlement after May 1753 provided the King with the pretence that the Parlement had suffered no dissolution at all, and it was only on 8 November 1753, when the Crown issued lettres de cachet to the councillors of the Grand'Chambre itself, that the "fermentation" of which Rousseau speaks began in earnest. For several months after the exile of the Parlement the King had encountered increasing resistance to his will on the part of the Grand'Chambre (and also several lower courts then still in session) but his dissolution of this assembly was immediately understood as an attempt to suppress the Parlement itself and was thus regarded as a critical escalation of the dispute. On 11 November a new court of justice, the Chambre royale, was established to replace the Parlement, but the Châtelet - that is, the tribunal of the prévôt de Paris - promptly refused to recognise its authority, and the King replied by suspending this body as well. Other tribunals (for instance the Cour des aides) quickly followed suit in resisting the Chambre royale, so that by the time the Lettre sur la musique française appeared the capital of France was on the verge of anarchy and, wrote d'Argenson (Journal et mémoires, VIII, p. 184), "On a à craindre...un soulèvement dans Paris". For an account of these developments see, in addition to vol. VIII of d'Argenson's Journal et mémoires, Edmond-Jean-François Barbier's Chronique de la régence et du règne de Louis XV, 8 vols. (Paris 1857), V, pp. 431-455, and Ernest Glasson's Le parlement de Paris, 2 vols. (Paris 1901), II, pp. 195-205. Of course Rousseau flattered himself in supposing that his work brought an end to the crisis, since it continued in much the same fashion - and in 1754, indeed, affected many provincial parlements which had not been in conflict with the Crown during the previous year - until the return of Paris magistrates in September.

127. "Il y a grand bruit contre...Rousseau", wrote d'Argenson (Journal et mémoires, VIII, p. 179) just after the Lettre was printed, and the work created "une foule d'ennemis" for its author, added Palissot (Correspondance complète, II, p. 234). But while none of Rousseau's

all the leading figures of the Enlightenment at the time were agreed in their enthusiasm, and against which most of the critics of the 'party of humanity' - the defenders of tradition, authority, and religion, as well as of French music - concentrated their attack. No work of the Enlightenment before Helvétius's De l'esprit of 1758 so quickly aroused such passionate convictions immediately upon its publication, and no other work at all proved quite so controversial. In an age when disputes about culture and taste divided men as much, and often in the same way, as did quarrels about justice and law,¹²⁸

contemporaries disputed these facts, only Grimm shared his view that the occasion was so momentous as to distract men from the immediate political crisis of the day. "Il est difficile de prévoir comment cette querelle finira", he observed in a passage of the Correspondance littéraire (I [2], pp. 313-314), "et le public en est bien plus intrigué que de la Chambre royale et de ses procédures... Il faut attendre que les esprits soient calmés, et qu'on soit revenu de la chaleur et de l'emportement que M. Rousseau a excités par sa Lettre". This judgment most probably stemmed in part from his general conviction (ibid., pp. 258-259) that the whole of the Querelle des Bouffons was far more captivating for Parisians than the exile and "les brouilleries du Parlement... avec la cour", a subject in which the public took only a fleeting interest and which "n'a jamais pu obtenir la trentième partie de l'attention qu'on a donnée à la révolution arrivée dans la musique". Sacaluga, moreover (see 'Diderot, Rousseau, et la querelle musicale de 1752', p. 164), even attributes to Grimm the following statement about the publication of the Lettre, remarking, though without providing a precise reference, that it appears in the Correspondance littéraire of 1753: "Sans cet événement, les esprits oisifs et tranquilles se seraient sans doute occupés des différends du Parlement et du clergé, et... le fanatisme, qui échauffe si aisément les têtes, aurait pu avoir des suites funestes." Neither this statement nor another which, on the same page, he claims to have discovered in the Correspondance littéraire of 1753 is to be found there (the second appears in 1754), and I have searched at length but in vain through all the passages of that journal in which I thought it might conceivably be found. Clearly if Grimm did make the statement before the late 1760s, when Rousseau's passage about the Lettre in his Confessions must have been drafted, then that passage would most likely have been drawn from Grimm. The best detailed accounts of the reactions to the Lettre sur la musique françoise are those of Jansen, pp. 207-231, and Richebourg, Contribution à l'histoire de la 'Querelle des Bouffons'.

128. Thus, remarks Mercier (in his Tableau de Paris, 12 vols. [Amsterdam 1783-88 edition], VII, p. 269), echoing the sentiments of Grimm (in the passage from the Correspondance littéraire, I, pp. 258-259 cited in note 127 above), "Ah, combien le gouvernement doit chérir l'opéra! Les factions théâtrales font disparaître toutes les autres factions". See also note 131 below. For the benefit of the many contemporary scholars who have been too much impressed by the evidence for Mornet's claims (see ch. I, note 93) that Rousseau's writings,

the Lettre sur la musique française was promptly recognised as a political tract,¹²⁹ its reception as a political event,¹³⁰ and its author as the leader of a party.¹³¹

particularly the Contrat social, received only scant attention in France in the years leading to the Revolution, it should perhaps be noted here that his works were in fact to be found in twenty-five of twenty-nine documented libraries owned by magistrates of the pre-revolutionary Paris Parlement (see François Bluche, Les magistrats du parlement de Paris au XVIII^e siècle [Besançon 1960], p. 356). Eighteen libraries contained collections of his writings (presumably including the Contrat social) - a larger proportion than that in which could be found Montesquieu's L'Esprit des loix - and five (see *ibid.*, p. 293) possessed separate editions of the Dictionnaire de musique.

129. See, for instance, the following passage from Jacques Cazotte's Observations sur la Lettre de Rousseau (probably published in December 1753), La Querelle des Bouffons, II, pp. 844-845: "On veut aujourd'hui violer nos sentimens & nos goûts actuels. Une cabale de gens ignorés la plûpart pour le talent, ou ruinés de réputation littéraire, d'enthousiastes, de factieux, de furieux, (en musique) l'ont entrepris. C'est une conjuration en forme: J'y vois Catilina. Faut-il que j'aye le chagrin d'y rencontrer César!" Even before the publication of the Lettre Cazotte had described the Querelle des Bouffons as constituted by (La Guerre de l'opéra, *ibid.*, I, 321) "des intrigues, des brigues, des factions, des cabales, des hauts, des bas, des révolutions étonnantes", while Jean-Baptiste Jourdan had complained (see Le Correcteur des bouffons, *ibid.*, p. 196) of the dispute's fanaticism, and the most verbose of Rousseau's critics (a M. de Rochemont) insisted upon calling his work the Réflexions d'un patriote (see *ibid.*, III, pp. 2025-2174). There is an interesting - albeit brief - account of the political character of four works which were opposed to Rousseau's Lettre in Charles Paul, 'Music and Ideology: Rameau, Rousseau, and 1789', Journal of the History of Ideas, XXXII (1971), pp. 397-398.

130. Rousseau himself makes this claim in the Confessions, O.C.I., p. 384. In a slightly embellished paraphrase of the same passage Lady Sydney Morgan later made the following observation (France [London 1817], II.vii, pp. 127-128): "Paris soon divided into two formidable musical factions, which...were not without their political colour. The privileged class cried out against innovation, even in crotchets and quavers; and the noble and the rich, the women and the court, clung to the monotonous discords of Lulli, Rameau, and Mondonville, as belonging to the ancient and established order of things; while the musical connoisseurs and amateurs, the men of talent, genius, and letters, were enthusiastic for nature, taste, and Italian music."

131. This perspective of the Lettre has in fact dominated much of the historiography of the Querelle des Bouffons since the eighteenth century and - what is not at all strange - it has come to the fore most often in periods of political turmoil. Thus at roughly the same time during the Second World War that Nisbet discovered Rousseau's totalitarianism (see ch. I, note 4), Noël Boyer, in La guerre des bouffons et la musique française (Paris 1945), denounced his musical ideas as alien and decadent anarchic barbarism (see especially the dedication and pp. 11 and 164), while Jean Gaudefroy-Demombynes, in his Jugemens allemands sur la musique française au XVIII^e siècle (Paris 1940), hailed these same ideas (p. 202) as heralding "un communisme idéal" and "la libération de l'égoïsme capitaliste". Boyer's political interest in his diatribe

By 1755, moreover, Rousseau had already completed the most substantial and profound of all his early works, that is, his Discours sur l'inégalité, an essay which, as he declared later,¹³² had at first contained a long fragment or section on the development of music in the context of a general study of the origins of social institutions. That this should have been the case is hardly surprising, since apart from the Discours sur les sciences et les arts nearly every one of Rousseau's major writings before 1755 fell within or turned around the subject of music, and I shall presently discuss this fragment and its fate in the corpus of Rousseau's writings as a whole. But for the moment I only wish to emphasise that by 1755 Rousseau's talents as a writer had come to their full fruition. He had already by then begun to describe his views on music, art, language, culture, and society as forming a coherent system of ideas,¹³³ and in his later writings he set himself the task of elaborating that system at length and in detail.¹³⁴ Above all, by the autumn of 1755 when the Erreurs sur la musique was published, Rousseau had become one of the leading and most renowned of the contributors to the Encyclopédie, and it was inconceivable that a man who had always found it difficult to refrain from defending his ideas in print,¹³⁵ and who had managed to reply to a

against Rousseau is particularly clear from his concluding remark (p. 166) that "la restauration musicale française accomplie peut bien préfigurer d'autres restaurations". A splendid account of the parallels between the historical interpretations of Rousseau's influence on the musical revolution of 1752-54, on the one hand, and the political revolution of 1789, on the other, is supplied by Paul in his 'Music and Ideology'.

132. See pp. 303-305 below.

133. See especially the 'Préface d'une seconde lettre à Bordes', O.C.III, p. 105, the 'Fragment biographique', O.C.I, p. 1115, and ch. V, pp. 430-431. As Duchez has rightly noted (see her 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', p. 49), Rousseau's reference in his 'Fragment biographique' to "le vrai Système" - which had been attached to his ideas and which he ascribed to Nature - is particularly important, on the one hand because it shows that he regarded that system as having been formulated in his early polemical writings, and on the other because it appears in an incomplete opusculé that deals principally with Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique.

134. See, for instance, the passage from Rousseau juge de Jean Jaques, O.C.I, pp. 934-935 cited in ch. V, pp. 431-432.

135. In April 1752, for instance, in connection with the controversy about the Discours sur les sciences et les arts, Rousseau had remarked ('Dernière réponse', O.C.III, p. 96), "Je pose la plume pour ne la plus

mathematician, a surgeon, a king, an old friend, and a stranger¹³⁶ - when they had attacked him on a subject of which he had at first but slight command - should not at least attempt to rebut the charges that the greatest composer and musical theorist of France had hurled against his views on the very matter which he knew best.

According to Rousseau himself, it was still in 1755, and thus only a short while after the appearance of Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique, that he composed the first draft of his rejoinder.¹³⁷ In this work, which he eventually entitled the Examen de deux principes avancés par M. Rameau, he argued that the philosophical presuppositions of Rameau's theory were mistaken, largely because the set of rules which figured in that theory could not, as their author imagined, have universal application. In reply to the thesis that the general

reprandre dans cette trop longue dispute". In May, however, he returned to the same subject in his 'Lettre à Lecat', and more than a year later he came back to it again in his 'Préface d'une seconde lettre à Bordes'.

136. See ch. V, pp. 404-428.

137. See the following passage from the foreword of the Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, p. 266: "Je jettai cet Ecrit sur le papier en 1755, lorsque parut la Brochure de M. Rameau, & après avoir déclaré publiquement, sur la grande querelle que j'avois eue à soutenir, que je ne répondrois plus à mes adversaires." The first edition of the published text appeared in 1781 in three distinct versions: Moulton-Du Peyrou, VIII (in the 4to edition which I have consulted - 8vo and 12mo formats of the collection were printed at the same time); a separate issue of Moulton-Du Peyrou, XVI in the 8vo edition, produced with the half-title Traité sur la musique; and vol. III of the Oeuvres posthumes de Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 12 vols. (Genève 1781-83). All three editions share the same publishers, printers, and presses, and the difficulty of ascertaining exactly which one appeared first is as great as that which surrounds the identification and ordering of three similar editions of the first six books of the Confessions (see Dufour, II, pp. 21 and 24-27, and O.C.I., pp. 1889-1894). The Examen de deux principes has not yet been published in O.C., and I have therefore consulted that version of the first edition which is reproduced in CTWR, V. Perhaps it should be noted here that the Examen figures in this collection of the works of Rameau for much the same reason that Diderot's article 'Droit naturel' is incorporated by Vaughan in an edition of the writings of Rousseau (see ch. II, note 40). The meaning of most works in the history of ideas could be made more clear if they were printed in editions which included the writings that their authors intended to challenge or refute. See also note 144 below.

laws of harmonic progression must be identical throughout the world,¹³⁸ Rousseau maintained that the particular scheme which had been adduced by Rameau was only limited in scope. He allowed that the principles of the 'basse fondamentale', and of the chordal structures to which the 'basse' gave rise, were, for the most part, technically correct, but that was just with regard to a number of musical forms and not all. These principles elucidate the features which mark the scales of certain modern and Western nations, but they do not explain the music of the ancient Greeks, for instance,¹³⁹ whose scales, divided into tetrachords instead of octaves, formed harmonic patterns which were different

138. This idea, already foreshadowed in many of Rameau's earlier writings (see, for instance, the passage from his Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie cited on p. 270 above), had begun to figure with special prominence in his thought following his attempt in the Erreurs sur la musique to join his rules of harmonic progression together with the principles of geometry (see especially note 123 above). Its most extreme formulations were to come later, however, as in this passage from his Réponse à MM. les éditeurs de l'Encyclopédie, CTWR, V, pp. 355-356: "Tel est le pouvoir prédominant de la proportion géométrique dans la Musique, tel il est, dit-on, dans l'Architecture, & tel il doit être, si je ne me trompe, dans bien d'autres Sciences."

139. In his Dictionnaire de musique (see the passage from the article 'Harmonie' cited in note 257 below) Rousseau later remarked that "de tous les peuples de la terre...les Européens sont les seuls qui aient une harmonie, des Accords, & qui trouvent ce mélange agréable". In the appendix to this work, moreover, he incorporated some examples of ancient musical notation as evidence of the variety of tonal systems which had been devised by men in different cultures. Drawing upon a number of authorities (see the article 'Musique', Dictionnaire de musique, p. 314) he also provided illustrations of Persian and American Indian tunes, and the few bars of the 'Air Chinois' which he drew from Father Jean-Baptiste Du Halde's Description de la Chine (4 vols. [Paris 1735] - see III, p. 267) were eventually to figure in the scores of Weber's overture to Turandot and Hindemith's Symphonic Metamorphoses of Themes by Weber. (Rousseau must have drawn this musical fragment directly from Du Halde rather than from the transcription in the Histoire générale des voyages, VI (1748), pp. 280-281, since his copy, though transposed up a third, is more faithful to the original.) According to Rameau, on the other hand, Greek and Chinese music were in some sense unnatural and defective. See especially the following passage in his Nouvelles Réflexions sur le principe sonore (published in 1760 in conjunction with the Code de musique pratique), CTWR, IV, pp. 216-217: "On ne croira jamais qu'on ait donné à la Musique toutes les grandes prérogatives dont les Grecs & les Chinois l'enrichissent, sans en avoir auparavant goûté les charmes; mais...comment ont-ils pu les goûter ces charmes, avec tant de faux rapports pour des consonances & pour les degrés naturels qui servent

from our own. The 'basse fondamentale' as it had been conceived in Rameau's system, he proclaimed, was truly fundamental only to those varieties of music which had come to be adopted by convention, and the convention could only be appreciated by persons who had been trained in the appropriate way. Thus even in our own society most men were quite unable to fathom and enjoy the harmonic configurations which the theory described, and, in any case, Rameau's ideas account neither for the origin of the minor mode nor for the phenomenon of dissonance.¹⁴⁰ In the light of these facts it followed for Rousseau that the 'basse fondamentale' could not have been derived from Nature.

Si la longue routine de nos successions harmoniques guide l'homme exercé & le Compositeur de profession; quel fut le guide de ces ignorans, qui n'avoient jamais entendu d'harmonie, dans ces chants que la nature a dictés long-tems avant l'invention de l'Art? Avoient-ils donc un sentiment d'harmonie antérieur à l'expérience; & si quelqu'un leur eût fait entendre la Basse-fondamentale de l'air qu'ils avoient composé, pense-t-on qu'aucun d'eux eût reconnu-là son guide, & qu'il eût trouvé le moindre rapport entre cette Basse & cet air?...Les Grecs n'ont reconnu pour consonances que celles que nous appellons consonances parfaites; ils ont rejeté de ce nombre les tierces & les sixtes....Qu'on pense maintenant quelles notions d'harmonie on peut avoir, & quels modes harmoniques on peut établir, en bannissant les tierces & les sixtes du nombre des consonances!¹⁴¹

à passer de l'un des termes de ces consonances à l'autre?...Il faut...que la Musique ait été entendue dans une certaine perfection...& qu'apparemment on ne se soit jamais avisé de l'éprouver dans l'ordre de faux rapports dont tous les systèmes anciens sont composés." At the same time Rameau, unlike Rousseau, still believed that the scales of Greek and Chinese music resembled our own in principle, and while the abbé Pierre-Joseph Roussier later took issue with his perspective of the Chinese scale in particular, Charles Burney, in his *General History of Music* (first published in 4 vols. between 1776 and 1789) disagreed and reverted to Rameau's stance (see the 2 vol. London 1935 edition, I, pp. 45-46).

140. See the *Examen de deux principes*, CTWR, V, p. 279.

141. *Ibid.*, pp. 271-272. With two very minor modifications the second part of this passage was later incorporated by Rousseau in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. xviii, p. 183 (see the appendix, note 238).

In the Examen de deux principes Rousseau also claimed that Rameau was mistaken to suppose that the melodic line in every form of music was constructed upon a harmonic base. Melody, he argued, both expressed and excited our natural passions in a tonal language and stood in much the same relation to its accompaniment as did design to colours in painting, so that the conventions of our harmony should serve only to embellish rather than determine the intonations of the human voice.

M. Rameau, pour comparer la mélodie à l'harmonie, commence par dépouiller la première de tout ce qui lui étant propre, ne peut convenir à l'autre: il ne considère pas la mélodie comme un chant, mais comme un remplissage; il dit que ce remplissage naît de l'harmonie, & il a raison...les accens de la voix passent jusqu'à l'ame; car ils sont l'expression naturelle des passions, & en les peignant, ils les excitent. C'est par eux que la Musique devient oratoire, éloquente, imitative, ils en forment le langage...La mélodie est dans la Musique ce qu'est le dessein dans la Peinture, l'harmonie n'y fait que l'effet des couleurs. C'est par le chant, non par les accords que les sons ont de l'expression, du feu, de la vie; c'est le chant seul qui leur donne les effets moraux qui font toute l'énergie de la Musique.¹⁴²

See also the Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, pp. 272-273; the appendix, notes g and q; and the passage from both the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xiiii and the article 'Harmonie' in the Dictionnaire de musique cited on pp. 345-346 below.

142. Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, pp. 275 and 277. The claim that harmony is secondary to melody had already appeared as a central theme of Rousseau's Lettre sur la musique française (see pp. 250-252 above), and it was to be reiterated often in his later works as well. It also occupies an important place in the section of the Neuchâtel Ms R 60 which he incorporated in ch. xviii of the Essai sur l'origine des langues (see the passages cited on pp. 339-340 below and the appendix, pp. 458 and 460-461), including the fragment which originally formed a part of the Discours sur l'inégalité (see note 257 below and the appendix, notes 369-398). For the most important elaborations of this point in his writings after the Essai sur l'origine des langues see especially the passages from the articles 'Mélodie' and 'Harmonie' in the Dictionnaire de musique cited on p. 258 above and in note 257 below), together with the following statement drawn from the article 'Harmonie' (Dictionnaire de musique,

For Rousseau, then, the theory of Rameau was fundamentally misconceived. In his reply to the criticisms of his articles for the Encyclopédie he once again paid tribute to the many subtleties of technical detail which were contained in that theory, but he did not agree that the laws of music which Rameau had adduced were either fixed, or constant, or universal in their application. On the contrary those laws, in his view, were manifold, complex, and, above all, different from one

p. 242) as well: "M. Rameau prétend...que l'Harmonie est la source des plus grandes beautés de la Musique; mais ce sentiment est contredit par les faits & par la raison...tous les grands effets de la Musique ont cessé...depuis l'invention du Contre-point." Note too the following remarks from the Observations sur l'Alceste de Gluck (probably drafted around the beginning of 1775), Moutou-Du Peyrou, VIII, pp. 565-566: "Il importe ici de remarquer...que l'harmonie par elle-même, ne pouvant parler qu'à l'oreille & n'imitant rien, ne peut avoir que de très-foibles effets. Quand elle entre avec succès dans la Musique imitative, ce n'est jamais qu'en...renforçant les accens mélodieux...C'est par les accens de la mélodie, c'est par la cadence du rythme que la Musique, imitant les inflexions que donnent les passions à la voix humaine, peut pénétrer jusqu'au coeur & l'émouvoir par des sentimens; au lieu que la seule harmonie n'imitant rien, ne peut donner qu'un plaisir de sensation...le dessin par lui-même peut, sans coloris, nous représenter des objets attendrissans, & la mélodie imitative peut de même nous émouvoir seule, sans le secours des accords." On the extent of Gluck's admiration for Rousseau, and especially for his views about the place of melody in music, see his letter to the Mercure de France of February 1773, as transcribed and annotated, with supporting documents, in the Collected Correspondence and Papers of Gluck (London 1962), pp. 30-44. (The editors of this remarkable collection, which was prepared over a period of forty-eight years, overcame the difficulty of presenting Gluck's letters, which were originally composed in French, German, and Italian, by having them all translated into English.) Among the most noteworthy commentaries upon Rousseau's conception of the primacy of melody over harmony in music, see Masson, 'Les idées de Rousseau sur la musique', vi, pp. 3-8, and vii, pp. 24-26; Oliver, The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music, pp. 42-44 and 66; Eric Taylor, 'Rousseau's Conception of Music', Music and Letters, XXX (1949), pp. 236-241; Georges Snyders, Le goût musical en France aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles (Paris 1968), pp. 122-124; and Duchez, 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', pp. 56-60. With respect to Rousseau's remarks on the connection between melody in music and design in painting, see the appendix, note w, and the following statement in the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xiii, p. 149, which closely follows the text of the Examen de deux principes provided above: "La melodie fait précisément dans la musique ce que fait le dessein dans la peinture; c'est elle qui marque les traits et les figures dont les accords et les sons ne sont que les couleurs."

culture and one period to the next. Together with d'Alembert he believed that Rameau had mistaken music for geometry and metaphysics and, as a consequence, had failed to provide an accurate account of what, in fact, were incompatible systems of music which had been devised by men.

Toute sa génération harmonique se borne à des progressions d'accords parfaits majeurs; on n'y comprend plus rien, si-tôt qu'il s'agit du mode mineur & de la dissonance; & les vertus des nombres de Pythagore ne sont pas plus ténébreuses que les propriétés physiques qu'il prétend donner à de simples rapports....J'avois à montrer que son système harmonique est insuffisant, mal prouvé, fondé sur une fausse expérience....J'ai dit mes raisons, M. Rameau a dit ou dira les siennes; le Public nous jugera.¹⁴³

The rules of harmony which Rameau had defined, in short, formed a theory about chords but not about musical expression.

While Rousseau formulated his reply to the Erreurs sur la musique within a few months of the publication of that work, his Examen de deux principes did not appear in print, however, until some years after his death, when it was published with a foreword which he must have added in the early 1760s, at roughly the same time that he compiled his manuscript of the Dictionnaire de musique.¹⁴⁴ Rousseau had thus put aside the essay for a period of perhaps six years, and when in the 1760s he

143. Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, pp. 283 and 285.

144. Already in his 'Fragment biographique', probably drafted around 1755-56, Rousseau announced (see O.C.I., p. 1119) that he would treat the questions raised in the Erreurs sur la musique in his own Dictionnaire de musique. And the foreword of the Examen (CTWR, V, p. 266) includes this remark immediately following the passage cited in note 137 above: "Content...d'avoir fait note de mes observations sur l'Ecrit de M. Rameau, je ne les publiai point; & je ne les joins maintenant ici¹⁴⁵, que parce qu'elles servent à l'éclaircissement de quelques Articles de mon Dictionnaire, où la forme de l'Ouvrage ne me permettoit pas d'entrer dans de plus longues discussions." With regard to Rousseau's work on the Dictionnaire de musique during the early 1760s see especially the Confessions, O.C.I., pp. 607, 622, and 1589, and his letters of 5 June 1763 and 30 December 1764

returned to it he in fact made a number of important changes to the critique of Rameau which he had originally prepared. He modified the style and sometimes the substance of several passages that he had too hastily constructed, and he withdrew a number of fragments and two long sections¹⁴⁶ from the definitive arrangement of his work.

Rousseau, indeed, produced three notebook versions of the Examen de deux principes, which are all now to be found in the collection of his papers lodged in the municipal library of Neuchâtel.¹⁴⁷

to his publisher, Nicolas-Bonaventure Duchesne (Correspondance complète, XVI, p. 284, and XXII, pp. 326-327). The manuscript of the Dictionnaire de musique was finished by about the beginning of 1765, but its publication was delayed until the end of 1767. It is even probable that Rousseau had completed his revision of the Examen de deux principes, including its new foreword, by the autumn of 1761, in which case it would have figured with the Essai sur l'origine des langues among his manuscripts that were then, he reflected later (Confessions, O.C.I, p. 560), "tous en état de paroître". By January 1765, in any case, he prepared a list of all his writings which he wished to incorporate in a collected edition (see the Correspondance complète, XXIII, pp. 181-182), and the Examen de deux principes (under the title Réponse à M. Rameau) is specifically mentioned in that list, again in connection with the Essai sur l'origine des langues. I believe that all the musical works which in 1765 Rousseau proposed should be bound together, had in fact been ready for publication in the autumn of 1761. It is most unlikely that Rousseau made any alteration to the Examen de deux principes after 1765, and indeed by the end of that year all three manuscript versions of the text were probably in the hands of Du Peyrou (but see note 216 below).

145. Neuchâtel Ms R 58 (ancienne cote 7877a), p. 1v: <à ce Dictionnaire>.

146. Apart from the section discussed in this chapter the first draft of the Examen de deux principes contains a passage of four folio sides (see the appendix, fragment C) which Rousseau apparently did not incorporate in any of his later writings. The shorter passages that he deleted are provided in the appendix as note 1 (this covers many extracts of varying lengths) and fragments A-B and D-G.

147. In 1765 Rousseau entrusted some of his papers to Du Peyrou, and in 1778 he gave much of the rest to Moulto. Most of these manuscripts, together with others which he retained until his death, were donated to the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Neuchâtel. Several were published in 1781 and 1782 in Moulto-Du Peyrou, others (principally the second part of the Confessions) appeared in the supplement of 1789, and still more were printed in various nineteenth- and twentieth-century collections of his works, among which the most important are those of Streckeisen-Moulto, Jansen, and Vaughan. Many of these manuscripts - and particularly those concerned with music - have never been published at all.

The last of these manuscripts¹⁴⁸ is written in his finest hand and is identical with the published text that was, most likely, taken from it. The second version¹⁴⁹ is very similar to the third, though it includes a quite substantial number of corrections and at least one draft of a paragraph which was deleted from the publication copy.¹⁵⁰ It also includes the foreword, however, and must therefore have been written at a time which is closer to the date of composition of the final work than of the initial draft,¹⁵¹ so that the reply to Rameau which Rousseau conceived in 1755 can be properly identified as the first version.¹⁵²

Now among his surviving manuscripts that have not yet appeared in any edition of his works the original text of the Examen de deux principes is certainly one of the most important. For while it contains the bulk of the material which was to figure in the later draft and published version it also includes some passages that were subsequently deleted, of which one in particular provides some striking testimony about the genesis of his ideas. This section comprises

148. Neuchâtel Ms R 59 (ancienne cote 7877b). See Dufour, II, p. 179.

149. Neuchâtel Ms R 58. See Dufour, II, p. 179.

150. This crossed out passage appears in the manuscript on p. 14v, a page which is in a generally disorganized state, since it is appended to the concluding sheet as an intercalation to an earlier page and itself contains deletions and intercalations plus a marginal note indicating that the text should in fact be transferred to the beginning of the essay.

151. Because the handwriting of the foreword appears in a style and ink which are indistinguishable from those of the rest of the text I presume that it is not a later addition. And because, in any case, it seems to me unlikely that Rousseau would have returned to this work on three separate occasions over a period of about six years, and then only to produce two principal variants, my guess is that the second version was written at approximately the same time as the third.

152. Neuchâtel Ms R 60 (ancienne cote 7877c). See Dufour, II, pp. 179-180.

ten folio sheets altogether¹⁵³ - indeed, nearly half the total manuscript - in the form of a long and elaborate commentary about the origins of melody which Rousseau added to a paragraph that he was later to include in the final text.¹⁵⁴ It constitutes, in fact, the central passage of the manuscript, not only because it is the middle and longest and, to be sure, the most profound, part of the work, but also because Rousseau himself acknowledged its significance in the title which he initially selected for his reply to the Erreurs sur la musique. In 1755, that is, he called it Du Principe de la Melodie,¹⁵⁵ and it was only when he later withdrew these pages about melody that he also changed the title of his work to the Examen de deux principes.¹⁵⁶ The text which he prepared for publication was thus a

153. Pp. 8r-17r, recto sides only, apart from two short intercalations on pp. 10v and 14v. The section is marked off in the appendix by notes 181 and 430.

154. Cf., in the appendix, p. 447, the paragraph of the Ms R 60 which concludes with note 176, and the final version of the same paragraph in the Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, p. 273. Together with most of the sections which Rousseau incorporated in his later drafts of this essay, the passage in the Ms R 60 is crossed out. See also pp. 320-322 below.

155. Its full title, in fact, is Du Principe de la Melodie ou Réponse aux erreurs sur la Musique.

156. It is not entirely clear why Rousseau did make this change, since he retained several passages about the principle of melody in the Examen de deux principes (see especially p. 292 above). My impression, however, is that he had intended the title to refer primarily to the section which he later deleted, so that when he transposed part of that section and incorporated it in the Essai sur l'origine des langues he also transposed the original title of the Examen and adopted it as the subtitle of the later work. Du Principe de la Melodie, that is, became the Essai sur l'origine des Langues, où il est parlé de la mélodie et de l'imitation musicale. I suspect that the central section of Du Principe de la Melodie would have been uncovered long ago if Rousseau had retained his original title in the final version of his reply to Rameau, though scholars have only themselves to blame for missing the clue about the genesis of the Essai sur l'origine des langues which is provided by Rousseau himself in the first edition of Emile. For in the fourth book of this work, in connection with a point about the moral quality of imitation and the moral aspect of matters of taste, Rousseau reminds his readers (O.C.IV, p. 672, note) that "cela est prouvé dans un essai sur le principe de la mélodie qu'on trouvera dans le recueil de mes écrits".

much abbreviated version of the work he had originally conceived, and it is, I think, because Rousseau deleted the most prominent passage of his earliest draft that his reply to Rameau has only just begun to attract the attention it deserves from his interpreters.¹⁵⁷

The full text of Du Principe de la Melodie, or the Neuchâtel Ms R 60, is here transcribed for the first time, though the central section of the work has recently been printed twice - indeed twice in

The earliest draft of Emile does not contain this reference in any form, the second draft contains the crossed out remark "j'explique cela dans un autre écrit" in the main body of the text, while two later manuscripts contain a note which refers instead to the "essai sur l'origine des langues" (for these comparisons see especially O.C.IV, pp. 1288, 1618, and 1853-1863). No doubt the manuscript references to the Essai have led scholars to regard the note in Emile as a citation of the subtitle of that text, but the fact that the precise words which are employed more closely fit the title of the first draft of the Examen de deux principes ought to have received attention. The same clue, moreover, appears in Courtois's 'Chronologie critique de Rousseau' (cf. pp. 77, note 1 and p. 84). Jansen (see p. 246) lost the scent (though he was to pick it up again in another context only to lose it once more - see note 232 below) by focusing his attention, not on the transposed title of the first draft, but rather on its subtitle, that is, the Réponse aux Erreurs sur la musique, which Rousseau retained with only slight modification, in the final version of the Examen de deux principes Avancés par M. Rameau, dans sa Brochure intitulée: Erreurs sur la musique, dans l'Encyclopédie. In both the first and published versions of this work Rousseau is at least quite explicit (cf. the appendix, p. 441 and CTWR, V, p. 268) as to why the Examen de deux principes serves as a suitable title: "Je remarque, dans les erreurs sur la Musique, deux de ces principes importants. Le premier qui a guidé M. Rameau dans tous ses écrits, & qui pis est, dans toute sa Musique, est que l'harmonie est l'unique fondement de l'Art, que la mélodie en dérive, & que tous les grands effets de la Musique naissent de la seule harmonie. L'autre principe, nouvellement avancé par M. Rameau, & qu'il me reproche de n'avoir pas ajouté à ma définition de l'accompagnement, est que cet accompagnement représente le corps sonore. J'examinerai séparément ces deux principes." See also note 225 below.

157. Apart from the already published studies of Duchez and my own, Charles Porset has now prepared another essay which deals with the text of Du principe de la Melodie in some detail; this work is due to appear in SVEC in 1976 under the title 'L''inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai sur l'origine des langues. Rousseau et ses exégètes'. I am most grateful to M. Porset for providing me with an advance copy of this important contribution to our understanding of both the Essai itself and the historiography of the interpretations placed upon it.

the same year (1974) - first in my own 'Rameau, Rousseau, and the Essai sur l'origine des langues' of which this chapter is an adaptation, and then in Marie-Elisabeth Duchez's 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues'.¹⁵⁸ In these two studies, each of which was produced without the author's knowledge of the work in progress on the other, it has been shown that five¹⁵⁹ of the ten pages in the central fragment which Rousseau deleted from the Examen de deux principes recur with only minor changes, as part of ch. xviii and the whole of ch. xviii of the Essai sur l'origine des langues. In my own essay, moreover, I argued that, with only two remotely possible

158. See note 58 above and the appendix, note 1. Before the appearance of these two studies only Jansen and Dufour, so far as I know, had ever cited any passages from the Neuchâtel Ms R 60. The two fragments which Jansen provides (see the appendix, notes 2 and 954), however, are drawn only from the first and last pages of the manuscript, and he gives no indication that he was ever aware of the connection between the Ms R 60 and the Essai sur l'origine des langues. Dufour, for his part, points to the location of Jansen's two fragments in the text of the Ms R 60 and adds the following general remark (II; p. 180) about the relation between the manuscript and the Examen de deux principes: "Nombreux passages développés demeurés inédits. Par conséquent Rousseau ne les a pas pris dans sa rédaction définitive." He establishes, moreover (see II, p. 184), that ten of the thirteen passages rendered by Jansen in connection with the Ms R 60 are actually fragments which figure in another manuscript (Neuchâtel Ms R 72: ancienne cote 7881g), though this is hardly a remarkable discovery since Dufour himself was responsible for separating the two sets of papers, which he did in order to join the Ms R 60 together with the later drafts of the Examen de deux principes (that is, the Mss R 58 and 59 - for the location of the thirteenth fragment see note 234 below). Dufour's attempt to place the Neuchâtel manuscripts of Rousseau in better order sometimes suffered from the defects of its virtues, insofar as it led him to attach a number of first-draft fragments to their later transcriptions at the cost of their dislocation from other fragments of the same kind which he overlooked (in this context see especially the appendix, notes 295 and 369). It has also led to some minor difficulties about establishing the proper sequence of the last two pages of the Ms R 60, which Dufour joined together with sealing wax and appended to the rest of the text. In her study Duchez adopts one pagination sequence while I have preferred another (which now appears to be in force at Neuchâtel), so that the folio sheet which she renders as 26r is cited here as 25r.

159. Neuchâtel Ms R 60, pp. 11r-15r.

exceptions,¹⁶⁰ those pages were, in my judgment, the first in any of Rousseau's writings to have been incorporated in the text of the Essai, and I maintained that in view of the prominent position which they occupy in both texts they suggested that the Essai sur l'origine des langues was first conceived by Rousseau largely as a refutation of Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique.¹⁶¹

160. See SVEC, CXVII (1974), p. 200, and SVEC, CXXXII (1975), p. 112. The two passages which I cited appear in the articles 'Harmonie' and 'Opéra' in the Dictionnaire de musique, and they also figure in both the Essai sur l'origine des langues and the third and fourth supplementary volumes of the Encyclopédie. Since, however, these supplements were first printed in 1777, that is, a decade after the publication of the Dictionnaire de musique, and since there is no evidence that the passages which are transposed between the Essai and the Dictionnaire were drafted at any time before the early 1760s when Rousseau was engaged in preparing both texts (see note 144 above and note 196 below), it seemed to me unlikely that their composition would have predated Rousseau's work on the Ms R 60 in 1755. In fact a comparison of the nineteen variants between the passages (most of them in the article 'Harmonie') now suggests to me that they were probably written for the Essai first and then incorporated in the Dictionnaire. The fragment from 'Harmonie' is specified in note 266 below. The passage from 'Opéra', Dictionnaire de musique, pp. 349-350 (cf. the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xvi, pp. 175-177), reads as follows: "C'est un des grands avantages du Musicien de pouvoir peindre les choses qu'on ne sauroit entendre, tandis qu'il est impossible au Peintre de peindre celles qu'on ne sauroit voir; & le plus grand prodige d'un Art qui n'a d'activité que par ses mouvemens, est d'en pouvoir former jusqu'à l'image du repos. Le sommeil, le calme de la nuit, la solitude & le silence même entrent dans le nombre des tableaux de la musique. Quelquefois le bruit produit l'effet du silence, & le silence l'effet du bruit; comme quand un homme s'endort à une lecture égale & monotone, & s'éveille à l'instant qu'on se tait; & il en est de même pour d'autres effets. Mais l'art a des substitutions plus fertiles & bien plus fines que celles-ci; il sait exciter par un sens des émotions semblables à celles qu'on peut exciter par un autre; & comme le rapport ne peut être sensible que l'impression ne soit forte, la peinture, dénuée de cette force, rend difficilement à la Musique les imitations que celle-ci tire d'elle. Que toute la Nature soit endormie, celui qui la contemple ne dort pas, & l'art du musicien consiste à substituer à l'image insensible de l'objet, celle des mouvemens que sa présence excite dans l'esprit du Spectateur... Non-seulement il agitera la mer à son gré, excitera les flammes d'un incendie, fera couler les ruisseaux, tomber la pluie & grossir les torrens; mais il augmentera l'horreur d'un désert affreux, rembrunira les murs d'une prison souterraine, calmera l'orage, rendra l'air tranquille, le Ciel serein, & répandra, de l'Orchestre, une fraîcheur nouvelle sur les bocages." With regard to the substance of this passage on the relation between music and painting, see the appendix, note w.

161. See pp. 200-201.

My reason for advancing this hypothesis was, in part, to challenge the contention, put forward by a number of Rousseau's interpreters, that the Essai sur l'origine des langues must originally have been drafted by him around 1749-50, either at the time that he was also preparing his articles on music for the Encyclopédie,¹⁶² or, alternatively, "entre la rédaction et le succès"¹⁶³ of his Discours sur les sciences et les arts. Such claims were, in my judgment, based upon some false assessments of a number of putative inconsistencies between the Essai and the Discours sur l'inégalité, and upon an unwarranted 'chronologie logique', inferred from these assessments, which required that the composition of the Essai predate the second Discours in Rousseau's intellectual development.¹⁶⁴ The sequence

162. See Hendel, Rousseau: Moraliste, I, p. 66.

163. Lanson, 'L'Unité de la pensée de Rousseau', p. 5. This essay was published in 1912, but Lanson had already adopted his stance in 1900 in his article on Rousseau for La Grande Encyclopédie (see vol. XXVIII, p. 1062). In the light, however, of Pierre-Maurice Masson's criticisms of his supposition (see 'Questions de chronologie rousseauiste', pp. 45-49), and particularly after taking note of Masson's transcription of the rough draft preface to the Essai cited below, Lanson changed his mind (see his review of the two major works on Rousseau by Masson, i.e., La 'Profession de foi du Vicaire savoyard' and La religion de Rousseau, in RHLF, XXIV (1917), p. 325). Even earlier Henri Beaudouin had maintained that Rousseau must have composed the Essai after the first Discours but before the second (see La Vie et les oeuvres de Rousseau [Paris 1891], I, p. 323), while Vaughan later contended (I, p. 10, note 2) that the Essai "may have preceded the second, if not also the first, Discourse".

164. The controversy about the date of composition of the Essai was inaugurated by Alfred Espinas in a collection of three articles (of which the last was a reply to a critique of the first two by Edmond Dreyfus-Brisac) entitled 'Le "Système" de J.-J. Rousseau' and published in the Revue internationale de l'enseignement, XXX-XXXI (1895-96) (see XXX, pp. 344-352 and 435 - Espinas's work was preceded by that of Beaudouin cited in note 163 above, but the earlier text remained, on this matter, largely ignored until the 1960s). According to Espinas the Essai must have been drafted by Rousseau after he had completed the Discours sur l'inégalité, since though it incorporates a number of features which are drawn from that work it also contains some which are quite new (such as the proposition that society is natural to man) and still others (including, paradoxically, the thesis that the state of nature is one of conflict and brutality) which he had delineated only in

which was stipulated by this conjectural ordering of his early works seemed to me without foundation, and on that point I am still of the same opinion. But my trust in the evidence which established that the Ms R 60 could not have been drafted before 1755 also led me to

a brief and rudimentary way before. Without disputing Espinas's claim that the Essai was in some aspects incompatible with the Discours sur l'inégalité, Lanson retorted (see 'L'Unité de la pensée de Rousseau', pp. 4-5) that it was in fact the Essai which had been produced first, since in tone and substance it was rather like Condillac's Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines of 1746 and Diderot's Lettre sur les sourds et muets of 1751, while its original title, which Lanson rendered as the Essai sur le principe de la mélodie, established that it was a reply to Rameau's Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie of 1750. (It is interesting to note that even if the elements of this presumptive rebuttal of Espinas had been correct - for nearly all of them which pertain exclusively to Rousseau are actually false - they would have been perfectly consistent with the thesis they were intended to refute. For my part, in 'Rameau, Rousseau, and the Essai sur l'origine des langues' [see p. 202, note 51], I drew attention to the fact that the chronological perspective of the genesis of the Essai which I had adopted involved a kind of reversion to the view of Espinas. My position has now changed somewhat, but at no time did I adopt any part of the approach outlined by Espinas, and the fact that we held similar views about the temporal connection between the Essai and the second Discours is quite fortuitous.) The dispute about the chronology of the Essai in terms of its consistency with the Discours sur l'inégalité continues without respite to this day. According to Launay (Rousseau: Ecrivain politique, pp. 207-208), Duchet's attempt (on which he had earlier collaborated - see note 289 below) to "harmoniser la chronologie des premiers temps proposée par le Discours...avec celle que nous offre l'Essai...nous paraissent très ingénieux...mais non...convaincants. Nous conservons l'impression que l'Essai, dans sa conception générale, est antérieur au Discours". Duchet replies that she is unconvinced by this challenge and still holds the view (Anthropologie et histoire, p. 324) that "l'Essai comble les lacunes du Second Discours" and that the Essai is also clearly the later work. Polin's gentle intimations, moreover, that the Essai may have been produced before the Discours (see La politique de la solitude, pp. 263-264, 270, and 274) receive short shrift from Porset (in his forthcoming 'L'inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai'). And Starobinski's now self-avowed "hypothèse imprudente" that a certain passage in the Essai might justify our supposition that this work is the earlier of the two texts (see note 242 below) has been pilloried by nearly every commentator on the subject since it first appeared in print more than ten years ago. Is it not now time, I wonder, for scholars to spare that particular mistaken conjecture any further ignominious attention and to let it rest henceforth quietly in peace? At least I am confident that all the living scholars I have mentioned in this note would agree that a philosophical case about the coherence of two works is an insufficient and unreliable base upon which to construct an argument about the temporal order of their composition. Several have already joined their claims about the meaning of the Essai sur l'origine des langues to historical

believe that the central section of that work was initially conceived by Rousseau after the publication of Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique, and with regard to this matter I am now very much in doubt.

Rousseau himself, to be sure, in a well-known and often-quoted passage from his papers,¹⁶⁵ had already given me some reason to be hesitant in my suggestion. For in this passage - a rough draft of a preface designed to introduce a collection of three works in one volume¹⁶⁶ - he states that the Essai sur l'origine des langues

accounts of its genesis and place in Rousseau's writings; I am indebted to their research and hope only that this contribution may be added to their own. For other reviews of the debate about the chronology of the Essai see Derrida, De la grammatologie, pp. 272-278; Antonio Verri, Origine delle lingue e civiltà in Rousseau, second edition (Ravenna 1972), pp. 13-23; and especially Porset, 'L''inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai'. Later in this chapter (see pp. 349-372 below) I shall consider some propositions put forward by Espinas, Léon, Derrida, Grange, Duchet, Launay, Polin, and Goldschmidt about the conceptual ties between the second Discours and those parts of the Essai which must have been composed afterwards.

165. Neuchâtel Ms R 91 (ancienne cote 7887), pp. 103v-105v. The passage was first transcribed, incorrectly and with elisions, by Jansen (see pp. 472-473). It then appeared in Pierre-Maurice Masson's 'Questions de chronologie rousseauiste', pp. 48-49; Porset's foreword to his edition of the Essai sur l'origine des langues, pp. 11-12; my 'Rameau, Rousseau, and the Essai sur l'origine des langues', p. 201, note 51; and Duchez's 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', p. 50. Many commentaries have been devoted to this text, and it will be reprinted again in Porset's 'L''inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai sur l'origine des langues'.

166. Apart from the Essai the two works which Rousseau planned to have published together are the Imitation théâtrale and the Lévite d'Ephraïm. His project was not realized, however, and only the Imitation théâtrale, including a slightly revised version of the relevant part of the manuscript preface, was published in his lifetime (1764). The section which pertains to the Lévite d'Ephraïm, moreover, was first published in O.C.II, pp. 1205-1206. Masson ('Questions de chronologie rousseauiste', p. 48 and note 2) regarded the preface as dating very probably "aux environs de 1763", since in the Ms R 91 it is sandwiched between copies of letters which Rousseau drafted on 19 (not 16) February and 7 July 1763. It is in fact possible to date the composition of this preface somewhat more exactly, for in a letter to Duchesne of 5 June 1763 Rousseau undertook to send his publisher the text of the Imitation théâtrale as soon as it was finished, proposing (Correspondance complète, XVI, p. 284) that it should be printed "soit tout seul, soit avec d'autres morceaux pour en faire un volume". After Duchesne's partner Pierre Guy reminded him of

was at first a fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité to which he returned when he later composed his reply to the Erreurs sur la musique, so that the Essai was apparently not commenced but only revised just after the appearance of the attack levelled against him by Rameau:

Le second morceau¹⁶⁷ ¹⁶⁸[ne fut] aussi [d'abord] qu'un¹⁶⁸ fragment du discours sur l'inégalité que¹⁶⁹ j'en retranchai comme trop long et hors de place. J[e]¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹[le repris]¹⁷¹ à l'occasion des¹⁷² Erreurs ¹⁷³[de M. Rameau]¹⁷³ sur la musique ¹⁷⁴titre [aux deux mots près que j'ai retranchés] parfaitement rempli par l'ouvrage qui le porte^{175,174}. cependant¹⁷⁶ retenu par le ridicule de dissenter sur les langues quand on en sait à peine une et d'ailleurs peu content de ¹⁷⁷ce [morceau]¹⁷⁷ j'avois résolu de le supprimer comme¹⁷⁸ indigne de l'attention du

this suggestion on 20 June and 12 July, he replied, in both July and August, that he would very shortly be submitting the Imitation théâtrale alone, and we know that by September he had in fact accomplished that task (see *ibid.*, p. 320; XVII, pp. 41, 67, 167, 175, 245, and 276; and Dufour, I, pp. 193-194). It is likely that Rousseau's intimation of 5 June that the text might be published in conjunction with "d'autres morceaux" predates the composition of his preface, and as he did not refer to this idea again when Guy drew his attention to it I think it is also likely that he had abandoned it before he drafted the next entry in his notebook on 7 July. On this interpretation the preface was written in June or July 1763 and, indeed, probably quite early in June. By January 1765 (see the Correspondance complète, XXIII, pp. 181-182, and note 144 above) Rousseau had clearly decided that the Imitation théâtrale and Lévite d'Ephraïm should be published with the Discours sur les sciences et les arts in a volume of his collected works incorporating most of his writings about art as well as his operas and plays, and he then envisaged that the Essai sur l'origine des langues, on the other hand, should appear together with his studies on music.

167. The Essai sur l'origine des langues.

168. P. 104r: <n'est> aussi <qu'un>.

169. <et>

170. J<'a>

171. <l'achevai>

172. <du>

173. <de M. Rameau>

174. Variant added to p. 103v: <C'est le> titre [en ôtant les deux mots qui le suivent est le] titre <d'un ouvrage de> [qui(?)] [parfaitement] rempli par l'ouvrage qui le porte.

175. porte <[en ôtant les]> <aux deux mots près dans l'Encyclopedie qu'il <[en]> faut ôter> <[qu'il faut retrancher]>

176. cependant <peu content de cet écrit, je>

177. ce<t écrit>

178. comme <peu>

public. ¹⁷⁹Mais¹⁸⁰ ¹⁸¹un magistrat [illustre¹⁸²] ^{183,181}
 qui cultive et protège les lettres¹⁸⁴ [en¹⁸⁵] a pensé plus
 favorablement que moi, ¹⁸⁶[je] soumetts [donc]¹⁸⁶ avec
 plaisir, comme on peut bien croire mon jugement au sien,
 [et] j'essaye¹⁸⁷ a la faveur des deux autres [écrits]¹⁸⁸
 de faire passer celui-ci que je n'eusse¹⁸⁹ peut être
 osé¹⁹⁰ risquer seul.

Now the remark here about the tie between the Essai and the second Discours is not utterly irreconcilable with the contention that the Essai was first drafted by Rousseau in 1755, since we know that he was still amending the Discours - as well as correcting the proofs - in that year,¹⁹¹ and it would only have been at a relatively late stage in his composition of this work that he could be sure the Essai was there "trop long et hors de place". On the other hand we have no evidence to suggest that he made any substantial alterations to the main body of the text of the Discours after he submitted it to the Académie de Dijon in the early spring of 1754, and since his projected preface refers to a fragment rather than a note or supplement,¹⁹² and since a section which

179. <Cep>

180. Mais <l'ayant montré à>

181. Malesherbes - see note 196 below.

182. illustre <et>

183. <éclairé>

184. lettres <il en>

185. en <ayant désiré de le voir>

186. <et> soumet<tant> <[donc]>

187. j'essaye <de faire passer ici>

188. <écrits> <ecrits>

189. n'eusse <ose>

190. <ose>

191. Thus, for instance, through a letter to Rey of about 5 February 1755 (see the Correspondance complète, III, pp. 97-98), Rousseau made a number of additions to the text of the Discours which we are now no longer able to identify. His letter of 23 February (see *ibid.*, p. 102), moreover, includes a change to two lines of note i. See also ch. III, note 1.

192. This is a point which Rousseau scholars, including several who were and are familiar with the text of the projected preface, have frequently forgotten. Thus Masson himself, for instance, after providing a transcription of the passage, remarks ('Questions de chronologie rousseauiste', p. 49) that the "Essai sur les langues a donc été primitivement en 1754 une longue note du second Discours". Courtois assents to this suggestion in his 'Chronologie critique de Rousseau', p. 77, note 1, while Hendel adds (Rousseau: Moralist, I, p. 67) that "the essay seems to have been intended as a Note to be put into an Appendix for the Discourse". Despite the doubts raised by Leigh about this point of view (see his 'Manuscripts disparus', p. 63, note 1), moreover, both Derrida (see De la grammatologie, p. 274) and Angèle Kremer-Marietti (see the introduction - entitled 'Rousseau ou la double origine et son rapport au système langue-musique-politique' - to her own edition of the Essai [Paris 1974], p. 25) have recently adopted it once again.

he regarded as too long for the Discours must itself have taken him some time to prepare, it would seem far more likely from his remark that the Essai, or rather some fairly extensive passage which was to become a part of the Essai, was initially composed by him in 1754. At any rate that is the position adopted by most of Rousseau's interpreters¹⁹³ aside from those who have held that the text was first conceived in 1749-50, and though these scholars had the authority of the preface to support them I admit that my earlier observations were intended to unsettle their thesis too.

It was not my aim, of course, to challenge the accuracy of Rousseau's recollection in his 'Projet de préface', but I believed that we did not yet have any evidence to corroborate his statement there about the place of the Essai in the Discours, whereas the Ms R 60 very clearly establishes the tie between the Essai and the Examen de deux principes, a work whose original version Rousseau almost certainly prepared in the late autumn of 1755.¹⁹⁴ The close historical connection between these two texts seemed, and indeed still seems, to me beyond dispute, not only because the Ms R 60 contains drafts of each of them, or again because a note in Emile refers to them interchangeably,¹⁹⁵ but also because the two essays appear to have been revised and put in something like their final form by Rousseau at about the same time,¹⁹⁶ and because they were both first

193. The most comprehensive (though not quite complete) list prepared thus far of the adherents to this claim, including a summary of the argument in each case, appears in Porset's 'L'inquiétante étrangeté de l'Essai'.

194. See note 137 above.

195. See note 156 above.

196. That is, in the autumn of 1761, since it is then, as Rousseau later reflected in his Confessions (O.C.I, p. 560) in a passage about the Dictionnaire de musique, that "j'avois quelques autres écrits de moindre

published together - precisely as he wished¹⁹⁷ - in a volume of his works devoted to his writings on music.¹⁹⁸ In my article I did not deny that there might be an historical link between the Essai and the

importance, tous en état de paroître et que je me proposois de donner encore, soit séparément, soit avec mon recueil général si je l'entreprendois jamais. Le principal de ces écrits dont la plupart sont encore en manuscrit dans les mains de Du Peyrou, étoit un Essai sur l'origine des langues que je fis lire à M. de Malesherbes et au Chevalier de Lorenzy, qui m'en dit du bien". See also notes 144 and 181 above. Most of Rousseau's letters to Orlando de Lorenzy have been lost, and the surviving letters which Lorenzy sent to Rousseau during this period do not mention the Essai. The relevant exchange with Malesherbes, on the other hand, is intact. On 25 September 1761 Rousseau asked him for his opinion of the work - a copy of which had been brought to him by the Duchesse de Luxembourg - noting (Correspondance complète, IX, p. 131) that while "ce barbouillage" really ought not to be published separately, "toutefois je souhaiterois qu'il pût être donné à part à cause de ce Rameau qui continue à me tarabuster vilainement et qui cherche l'honneur d'une réponse directe qu'assurément je ne lui ferai pas". On 25 October Malesherbes replied that he had not yet had an opportunity to read the essay with the care which it required, but he still observed politely (*ibid.*, p. 205) that it should be printed separately since the collection of Rousseau's works in which it would otherwise appear was not due for some time, and "il n'est pas juste de faire attendre si longtems au public un morceau utile et interessant". On 18 November Malesherbes returned the manuscript, reiterating (*ibid.*, p. 251) that "je crois que vous feriez grand tort au public de l'en priver ou d'attendre l'Edition entiere de vos oeuvres pour le donner". On this occasion, moreover, he excused his failure to provide any detailed comments with the reflection that the work was "par mille raisons...au dessus de ma portée". Nevertheless, he continued, he admired the essay just as much as he did all of Rousseau's other writings: "Je me contente de vous assurer que l'ouvrage entier m'a fait le meme plaisir que tout ce qui sort de votre plume." On 20 November Rousseau, then preoccupied with several problems in connection with the publication of Emile, concluded about the Essai (*ibid.*, p. 253) that "dans le profond sentiment de mon étourderie, je ne puis m'occuper que du Soins de la réparer". For some speculations about Rousseau's purpose in addressing his text to Malesherbes, see Porset, 'L'inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai'. See too note 200 below.

197. See note 144 above. Rousseau's letter to Malesherbes of 25 September 1761 (see note 196 above) makes it quite clear that he then still regarded the Essai principally in terms of his dispute with Rameau, and, indeed, largely as a reply to the Erreurs sur la musique and the other attacks which Rameau had later directed against him.

198. The first edition of the Essai sur l'origine des langues was produced in 1781 in three different versions which have precisely the same format - and were incorporated in the same tomes - as the three versions of the original edition of the Examen de deux principes (see note 137 above).

Discours, while some of my remarks, moreover, were devoted, as they will again be here, to an account of the conceptual relations between them. But I believed that most of Rousseau's interpreters had placed too much weight upon a single passage in a short preface to an abandoned project and at the same time had neglected the much more substantial evidence of the connection between the Essai and the Examen de deux principes. Thus whereas Rousseau had finished most of the Discours by the spring of 1754, I suggested that one year later he had only just begun to write the Essai.¹⁹⁹ And I imagined that at least some additional support for this view might be drawn from the facts that in both the Ms R 60 and the Essai he alludes to a work by Tartini, while in the Essai alone he cites two other works - one by Duclos from which he claims to have drawn much inspiration, the second by the abbé Jean Terrasson that he mentions in passing - all of which were published in 1754 after he had completed the bulk of the Discours.²⁰⁰

199. See p. 202, note 51.

200. In a paragraph of the Ms R 60 that Rousseau deleted from the Examen de deux principes he mentions Tartini's account of the origins of the minor mode and of the phenomenon of dissonance in music, and he later developed the theme of this paragraph in a note which he appended to ch. xviii of the Essai (see the appendix, p. 480 and notes 360 and gg). The text he must have had in mind is clearly the Trattato di musica, first published in 1754 (see note 106 above), though the 'approvazione' is dated 1 February 1753. The text by Duclos is his Remarques sur la grammaire générale et raisonnée, which appeared in Paris in 1754. In ch. xx, in his concluding paragraphs of the Essai (see p. 377 and note 344 below), Rousseau refers to a passage in this work which had inspired, he maintains, his own "réflexions superficielles", by which he may have meant either his observations in ch. xx alone or, more probably, the whole of the Essai. I shall return to the question of the influence of Duclos's ideas later in this chapter, but for the moment I should like to note only that this reference, and three others in chs. v and vii of the Essai (see pp. 65, 77, and 83), suggest that at least these passages were drafted by Rousseau after he had completed most of the Discours sur l'inégalité. If the Essai was itself generally inspired by Duclos's Remarques, moreover, it is hard to see how Rousseau could have got very far with his text by February 1754, when much the greater part of the Discours would already have been finished. Thus the citations of the Remarques in the Essai, states Derrida (De la grammatologie, p. 243), "n'ont...pas pu être antérieures à la publication du second Discours", a point which I would still regard as correct, but only with regard to the composition, and not the publication, of the Discours. The work by Terrasson is La philosophie applicable à tous les objets de l'esprit et de la raison, which appeared posthumously, also in Paris, in December

I was convinced, too, that the central section of the Ms R 60 could not be the fragment to which Rousseau draws attention in his projected preface because such a hypothesis would require that this fragment must originally have been intended to refute the views of Rameau (whose ideas are specifically discredited in at least five passages of that portion of the manuscript²⁰¹) even before Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique had been conceived. Since most of the

1754, though the 'approbation' is dated 31 March. In a note to ch. xii (p. 143) of the Essai Rousseau quotes a passage of several lines about Greek music from pp. 179-180 of La philosophie. (I am grateful to Professor Starobinski for bringing this passage to my attention, particularly since, as he explained to me in the same letter, he did not share the view which I held then that Rousseau had only just begun to draft the Essai in 1755.) It would of course be quite incorrect - and it was never in fact my intention - to attempt to fix the dates of composition of the Essai in the light of these references alone, a point which has been wisely made by Porset with regard to the Duclos passages in particular (see his 'Note à l'usage des grammairiens. Rousseau dans Duclos', Colloque Duclos, Université de Haute Bretagne 1973, forthcoming). In any case whether the Essai was first drafted in 1754 or 1755, we have good reason to believe that at least some sections of the work - for instance, ch. xx, in which there appears an elliptical reference to d'Alembert's De la liberté de la musique - must have been composed by Rousseau after 1760, probably, again, in the autumn of 1761. Masson, finally (see 'Questions de chronologie rousseauiste', pp. 47-49), has noticed that several additions and revisions to the final manuscript of the Essai (Neuchâtel Ms R 11: ancienne cote 7835) are in a different ink and style of handwriting from the rest of the text, and he speculates that while the work would, for the most part, have been completed around the time of Rousseau's exchange of letters with Malesherbes, these alterations, as well as the division of the work into chapters which Rousseau indicates in the margins, were most probably added in 1763 when he turned to his projected preface of the Essai (see note 166 above).

201. Two of these passages - one about Greek harmony, the other about the general relation between harmonic and melodic music - were incorporated by Rousseau in the Examen de deux principes (see the appendix, notes 238 and 265), and I still believe that they were drafted for the first time after the appearance of Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique. The three other passages read as follows (see the appendix, pp. 448-449. and 462): (1) "Recherchons, s'il y a moi en, la véritable origine de la mélodie, et voyons si l'idée que M. Rameau en a conçue s'accorde à celle que nous fournit l'exacte observation des faits"; (2) "C'est une observation très judicieuse de M. Rameau que le son diffère du bruit, en ce que le premier est appreciable et que le second ne l'est pas: ce qui n'empêche point que le bruit ne soit que du son modifié comme on peut s'en convaincre avec un peu de réflexion"; (3) "Tout cet historique est appuyé sur des faits et fournit... des conclusions directement contraires au Système de M. Rameau". See also pp. 320-322 below and the appendix, note j.

Ms R 60 is undoubtedly a reply to the Erreurs sur la musique it did not seem possible to me that in 1754 Rousseau could have drafted a rejoinder to an attack which had not yet been made. I allowed that it was possible that he had at first planned to challenge the ideas of Rameau in the Discours, even in advance of the publication of Rameau's own critique, but I remarked that I thought this unlikely, and I added that insofar as the central part of the manuscript deals with a subject - that is, the origins of melody in music - which Rousseau does not consider in the Discours, it was hard to see where its initial place there might have been, for it could only have figured in that work as an appendix to the section on the origins of language which is itself, according to Rousseau, a digression from the text.²⁰² I intimated that the fragment to which Rousseau refers in his projected preface could have formed a draft of ch. ix of the Essai, which describes the origins of society in general,²⁰³ rather than of ch. xviii, which is concerned with music, and I concluded my long note on this matter with the observation that whatever fragment of the Discours may have been incorporated by Rousseau in the Essai, it did not form the section of the Ms R 60 that I had uncovered and transcribed.

I no longer hold these views for three main reasons. Firstly, the publication twice in the past twenty years of two drafts of another important fragment which Rousseau deleted from the Discours²⁰⁴ now persuades me much more clearly than before that he

202. See the Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 146, and ch. III, p. 168. The brief remark in the Discours (O.C.III, p. 171) about "quelques grossiers instrumens de Musique" of primitive men could hardly have served as a suitable introduction to the passage.

203. This is a thesis which has occasionally been advanced by Rousseau scholars, perhaps most notably by Derrida and Duchet (see pp. 356-359 below), who have attempted to locate in the Discours the original place of certain features of ch. ix (and ch. x) of the Essai. Much the same contention - but based particularly upon a mistaken reading of the 'Projet de préface' - has been put forward recently by Goldschmidt (see note 218 below).

204. See ch. III, pp. 221-224.

originally conceived his work to be a treatment of a far wider range of subjects than is actually considered in the published text. That fragment deals at length with the place of arbitrary spiritual laws and the rôle of hypocritical idolatrous priests in the development of inequality among men, and according to Ralph Leigh its treatment of religion in Rousseau's account of the formation of society fills "une des grandes lacunes" or "un trou béant"²⁰⁵ in the Discours. But if Rousseau initially planned to examine the significance of religious superstition in the context of an argument about the genesis of morality, and property, metallurgy, agriculture, war, government, and language, is it not conceivable that in the same work he intended to discuss the origins of music too? Does not a chapter of an essay which deals with the songs of enslaved or subjugated peoples²⁰⁶ and which is entitled 'Comment la musique a dégénéré'²⁰⁷ also have a proper place in a text about the general causes of the deterioration, decrepitude, and corruption²⁰⁸ of the human race? There can be no doubt about the striking similarity between the form and substance of the Discours and that part of the Ms R 60 which Rousseau later incorporated in his Essai sur l'origine des langues,²⁰⁹ and I now believe that we should accept his testimony about the historical connection between the two works, so long as this is not contradicted by

205. 'Manuscripts disparus', p. 63. "Nous savons...que le texte primitif de l'Inégalité a dû être beaucoup plus étendu que la version définitive", writes Leigh on the same page, adding that the two fragments which he transcribed (the second is considered here in ch. III, pp. 193-194) might have been removed from the published version of the Discours partly for the same reasons that Rousseau withdrew his draft of the Essai, that is, because - as he states in the preface - it would have been too long and out of place there.

206. See the appendix, pp. 457-458, the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, pp. 189-191, and pp. 334-336 below.

207. This is the title of ch. xviii of the Essai. In the Ms R 11 these titles are intercalated in the margins together with the Roman numerals which mark the divisions into chapters. All the headings were very likely added to the manuscript in 1763 (see note 200 above).

208. In the Discours sur l'inégalité Rousseau recounts the course of the misfortunes of mankind which must have produced our 'détérioration' (O.C.III, p. 162); "décrépitude" (ibid., p. 171), and "corruption" (ibid., p. 191).

209. See also p. 347 below.

any new information which might arise.

Secondly, I am now persuaded, too, by the arguments of both Duchez and Porset²¹⁰ that the fragment to which Rousseau refers in his projected preface must be the central section of the Ms R 60, since his remark pertains to an extract which was "repris" and even "achev[é]"²¹¹ at the time that he formulated his reply to the Erreurs sur la musique. If we proceed from Rousseau's recollection we should in fact be able to identify a passage in the Ms R 60 which is distinct from the rest of that work insofar as it constitutes a more finished draft of a discussion whose original version he had already composed as part of the Discours sur l'inégalité. "On imagine mal ce que pourrait être une 'reprise' qui ne reprendrait rien!",²¹² observes Porset wisely, and I should certainly feel ill at ease if my interpretation required that such a statement must be false. Now aside from the central section of the Ms R 60 there is no passage anywhere at all in the manuscript to which Rousseau's later reflection might apply, and this for several reasons. For one thing that part of the text which comes both before and after the digression, and which constitutes a draft of the published version of the Examen de deux principes, could only have been commenced by Rousseau after he had read the Erreurs sur la musique.²¹³ The citations of Rameau's work, and the detailed objections to its theory which encompass them, occupy so crucial and conspicuous a place there that it would be utterly

210. See Duchez's 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', pp. 50-51, and Porset's 'L'inquiétante étrangeté de l'Essai'.

211. See note 171 above.

212. 'L'inquiétante étrangeté de l'Essai'.

213. This was of course my earlier view in connection with the central section too (see p. 309 and note 201 above), but I think the same claim with respect to the first draft of the Examen alone is not contentious.

implausible to suppose that they were merely added to remarks which had been drafted earlier. In any case we have no evidence at all which might suggest that Rameau devised his Erreurs sur la musique before 1755, or that Rousseau had access to any draft of that essay prior to its publication. The section of the Ms R 60 which was to figure in the Examen de deux principes could not, in short, be regarded as the fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité which is noted in the projected preface. Both this section and the long passage which is transcribed in the appendix as fragment C, moreover, may also be excluded on the grounds that neither could conceivably have figured at any point in that work, the first because it contains no account and scarcely any trace of an historical development of music²¹⁴ which in the Discours might have paralleled Rousseau's speculations on so many of our other social practices and institutions, the second because it contains nothing but some technical remarks about the vibrations of a 'corps sonore'.²¹⁵ In fact whatever might

214. Perhaps the paragraphs about untrained and uncorrupted musicians that figure in the appendix on pp. 444-445 and 477 (and which constitute rough drafts of the Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, pp. 271 and 283, respectively) might be held to raise some doubts about this statement. But both of those passages really pertain only to the distinction between our enjoyment of a natural melodic line, on the one hand, and an artificial harmonic accompaniment, on the other, and neither offers any sketch of the transfiguration of primitive melody into modern harmony. It is worth noting here that the two paragraphs about the difference between Greek and modern music which immediately follow the first of these passages in the Examen de deux principes have no place in the analogous part of the Ms R 60. The first paragraph (see the appendix, note 136) is actually missing altogether from the manuscript, while the second (see note 141 above and the appendix note 238) is a transposition from the central section which does provide a history of music.

215. Since there is no direct reference to the Erreurs sur la musique, nor even any mention of Rameau, in fragment C, it is difficult to imagine where Rousseau had intended the passage to fit in his text. It is indeed possible that the fragment forms a draft of a quite separate essay that he abandoned, for while there are a number of remarks in a few articles in the Dictionnaire de musique which might have drawn some inspiration from it I believe that it does not constitute the original version of any extended piece in that work, and I have been unable to

have been the initial place of fragment C in the context of the Ms R 60, Rousseau must eventually have formed the view that it was actually inappropriate there, for like the central section, too, he deleted it from his later versions of the Examen de deux principes. The connection between the first draft of the Examen and the published text of the Discours, on the other hand, can only be established clearly in the light of Rousseau's commentary upon the degeneration of music which comprises the theme of the digression from the Ms R 60, so that once again our attention is drawn to that passage alone. Most decisively, however, it is obvious, from the number of deletions and amendments, and also from the often cramped and hurried handwriting - which mark the other portion and all the major fragments of the Ms R 60 except the central section - that in the manuscript these passages appear only in their original form. Indeed the manuscript is for the most part in such a chaotic state that it is "totalement indéchiffrable",²¹⁶ Rousseau remarked in a letter to Du Peyrou in 1765, and Du Peyrou, who then returned it to Rousseau so that he might redraft it himself, concurred in this opinion. Yet the digression contains far fewer alterations per page than does any other part, and its resemblance to the published text of the Essai sur l'origine des langues is more precise than is the conformity between the first and final

find a later draft elsewhere in Rousseau's papers. Its arguments about the resonance of a 'corps sonore' - though they are not strictly relevant to this discussion - do apply at least indirectly to several of Rameau's theoretical writings, among which the Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie may well have been the main composition Rousseau had in mind.

216. Rousseau to Du Peyrou, 25 November 1765, Correspondance générale, XIV, p. 296. In his letter to Rousseau of 7 January 1766 (*ibid.*, XV, p.11) Du Peyrou describes the manuscript as "presque indéchiffrable". Both letters refer to the text as the 'Réponse à Rameau', the title

versions of the Examen de deux principes. Only this segment is written in the hand which Rousseau employed to transcribe intermediate and later drafts of his works, and whereas the remaining elements of the essay are patently in their earliest construction it alone can be described as a re-prise of a commentary which he had already penned before. As both Duchez and Porset remark, finally, the fragment of which Rousseau speaks in his projected preface could not have been a draft of chs. ix and x of the Essai quite simply because no versions at all of these chapters are to be found anywhere in the Ms R 60. Thus despite the similarities between their subject matter and the central theme of the Discours

which had already been attached to the Examen de deux principes (see note 144 above). Toward the end of 1765 Rousseau - who had been forced to flee from his home at Môtiers in September and then remained uprooted and in almost constant agitation until his arrival in England in January 1766 - was in frequent contact with Du Peyrou about the books and papers which he had earlier entrusted to him. He was at the time trying to gather together the evidence for his Confessions (see *ibid.*, XIV, p. 350) and also had it in mind then to prepare a catalogue for a collected edition of his works (see *ibid.*, p. 224), two tasks which he could hardly undertake without access to his papers. In his letter of 25 November, moreover (*ibid.*, pp. 295-296), he states that "il y a des manuscrits...que personne ne pourroit débrouiller que moi. Il faudra me les envoyer aussi afin que je les mette au net et que je vous les renvoye lisibles". Since these words are followed by the reference to the Ms R 60 cited above, and since we know that Rousseau had already completed the two works of which the manuscript forms a draft (see notes 144 and 196 above), the passage suggests that in 1765 he might have wished to prepare a new version - and not just a clean copy - of his text. But it points more clearly still to the general agitation of a writer, literally unsettled by attacks from all quarters, who had been separated from his papers and was determined to put them in order and ensure that they survive intact "de peur d'en perdre la trace" (*ibid.*, XV, p.2). In any case Du Peyrou sent his friend the books and packets of manuscripts which had been requested, adding his hopes that they "peut-être vous feroient plaisir dans l'occasion" (*ibid.*, XIV, p. 355). On 27 January 1766 Rousseau, now more safely ensconced in London, replied that "je mettrai au net tout ce qui aura besoin de l'être pour vous être envoyé quand j'en trouverai l'occasion" (*ibid.*, XV, p. 31). Yet there is no evidence that he ever turned to the Ms R 60 again, even though it probably remained in his hands for the next twelve years. See also *ibid.*, XIV, pp. 278-279 and 356, and XV, pp. 12-13 and 58.

- similarities which have led one distinguished Rousseau scholar²¹⁷ to remark that the Essai incorporates a history of society within a history of language, while the Discours includes a history of language inside a history of society - no link between their origin and the composition of the Discours is established by the 'Projet de préface'.²¹⁸ In fact these two chapters were almost certainly written by Rousseau after he had finished the Ms R 60, and my guess is that they were composed in 1760 or 1761.²¹⁹

I have, then, adopted a different position about the genesis of the Essai sur l'origine des langues from that which I put forward

217. Starobinski - see p. 349 below.

218. This mistake underlies several accounts of the connection between the Essai and the Discours. It figures most recently in Goldschmidt's Anthropologie et politique in which he makes the following claim (pp. 434-435): "L'antériorité du chapitre IX par rapport au Discours ne saurait être mise en question, à partir du Projet de préface....Ce Projet...ne donne pour postérieurs au Discours que les textes ajoutés plus tard pour répondre à Rameau (ce qui, assurément, ne peut s'entendre du chapitre IX) et décrit globalement l'Essai comme n'étant 'd'abord qu'un fragment du Discours sur l'inégalité que j'en retranchai comme trop long et hors de place' (ce qui doit s'entendre, pour l'essentiel, du chapitre IX, et en affirme l'antériorité, au moins par rapport à la version définitive du Discours)." Goldschmidt's error here has already been corrected by Porset in his 'L'inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai'. See also note 164 above and pp. 349-372 below.

219. I confess that this is almost sheer conjecture - based principally upon Rousseau's remark in his Confessions to the effect that the work was finished by the autumn of 1761 (see notes 144 and 196 above), from which I surmise that most of the text was written around that period or shortly before, apart, of course, from those passages which we know he drafted in 1754 and 1755. A similar conclusion follows from the dating of the fragment about the art of writing, which contains a reference to the Essai, in Neuchâtel Ms R 19 (see notes 264 and 341 below). There are also some observations on the concept of pity in ch. ix of the Essai that appear in much the same terms in the fourth book of Emile (see note 242 below), but while the passage in question there was most likely composed in 1760 when Rousseau was engaged in preparing his final version of Emile (for it does not figure in the earlier manuscripts) we have no reliable information that would establish in which of the two works it figured first (see too note 238 below). I know of no evidence at all to suggest that Rousseau drafted any part of the Essai in the years between 1755 and 1760, and there is at least one reference (to an idea of d'Alembert in ch. xx) which probably dates from 1760 (see note 200 above).

in my article, firstly on the grounds that the fragment of the second Discours which Rousseau describes in his preface might conceivably have been a draft of the central section of the Ms R 60, and secondly because I now believe that it was so of necessity. Now it is regrettable that the fragment has not survived intact, since if it had our speculations about its rightful place in Rousseau's writings could be superseded by our certain knowledge of its real location. Nevertheless, all is not lost. For provided that the justifications for my second reason are correct, then I think it follows that if there are any earlier rough draft versions of passages in that section these must once have formed a part of the Discours sur l'inégalité itself. Of course it is possible that Rousseau actually formulated his ideas about the corruption of music on three or even more occasions in the mid-1750s, once when he prepared his fragment of the Discours early in 1754, once when he drafted his reply to Rameau in the autumn of 1755, and once or several times again on some unspecified dates in medio. If that were the case then any surviving drafts of the digression in the Ms R 60 might just be additions to the original text of the Discours. Yet I believe this to be a quite unnecessary hypothesis for which there is no supporting evidence at all, and it seems to me improbable that Rousseau would have turned to the same reflections three times in a period of less than two years, only to produce his final version some six years later. In any event, judging from the style of handwriting and the number of corrections which mark the central passage of Du Principe de la Melodie, and comparing that passage both with the rest of the Ms R 60 and with the final manuscript version of the Essai, I am convinced that the digression comprises the second draft of a work - or rather the second draft of two chapters of

a work - which Rousseau formulated on three occasions only. In my view, therefore, any sketch or brouillon of that section of the Ms R 60 which may still be uncovered is very likely to have figured initially in the fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité to which he refers in his projected preface.²²⁰ And my third main reason for departing from my previous stance is that at least three such drafts from the Discours have in fact survived after all. It is my thesis here that these drafts of the digression in the Ms R 60 constitute portions of the original version of both the Essai and Discours, and in the appendix I have for the first time supplied a transcription of all the variants which distinguish them from the passages in which they recur in Rousseau's later manuscript.²²¹ They provide, in my judgment, substantive confirmation of his claim that he initially conceived the Essai as a part of the Discours which he then extended and revised to form the central section of the first draft of the Examen de deux principes, and they thus show that the Essai passed through two other works before he reconstituted it as the foundation of a separate study.

The evidence which corroborates Rousseau's remark in his projected preface goes a long way to establishing the dates and early

220. It is possible that in addition to the three portions of this fragment which I have incorporated in the appendix there are others among the manuscripts at Neuchâtel that I have overlooked. There may even be some more substantial portions - or perhaps related passages from a different source - in the lost collection of Rousseau's notebooks (dating from 1754) which once belonged to the abbé Gabriel Brizard, or among the missing papers of Joseph Lakanal which are known to have included several adjuncts to Rousseau's writings about music (see Leigh, 'Manuscrits disparus', pp. 47-57).

221. See the appendix, notes 188, 295, and 369. A short selection of the variants from the first draft, and one of the twenty-eight from the third, have already been transcribed in the notes (on pp. 62 and 75) of Duchez's 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', though she nowhere suggests that these drafts might have formed part of the fragment from Rousseau's Discours sur l'inégalité. The fact that they are now to be found in different manuscripts in the Neuchâtel archives is due to some oversights of Dufour in his efforts to place the Rousseau papers there in a more coherent order (see note 158 above).

course of composition of the Essai, but it does a great deal more than this as well. For these facts about the genesis of that text are also facts about its meaning; they indicate as much about the nature of his arguments as they do about the time of their conception, and they demonstrate that we can have a sure grasp of the sense of his ideas - in this case about the degeneration of music and language - only if we take note of his reasons for formulating them precisely as he did on certain appropriate occasions. In order to fathom the philosophical substance of his views in the Essai we must understand the points which they were historically intended to express and convey, and while I have so far attempted merely to make clear that he originally set forth two chapters of that work in drafts of both the second Discours and the Examen de deux principes I shall next try to interpret these chapters - naturally in connection also with the rest of the Essai - in a manner that draws upon this perspective of their origin.

I think it would first be appropriate, however, to include a brief word here about the bearing which this material might have upon our understanding of the genesis and meaning of the Discours sur l'inégalité, to supplement my remarks on that subject in the preceding chapter. For the same evidence which shows that the Essai was once a fragment of the Discours equally confirms that Rousseau first devised the earlier work to embrace a section about music. Indeed - though I previously regarded this as quite improbable²²² - I now see that the manuscript testimony establishes that the Discours initially contained some comments about Rameau's theory too. By the spring of 1754, that is, more than a year prior to the publication of the Erreurs sur la musique, Rousseau had already drafted an account of the manner in which

222. See pp. 309-310 above.

the natural melodies of primitive men must have degenerated into the corrupt harmonies of modern culture, and it is clear from the explicit reference to Rameau which appears in one of the surviving passages of this account²²³ that Rousseau had planned his own attack of at least a few features of the master's musical doctrines even before Rameau had challenged him. The critique in that passage of Rameau's distinction between euphonic sound and atonal noise in fact pertains directly to some observations in his Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie of 1750,²²⁴ and we are therefore able to ascertain that the Discours sur l'inégalité was originally intended to incorporate a refutation of this text, whose very title, to be sure, Rousseau must certainly have had in mind when he termed the Ms R 60 Du Principe de la Melodie.²²⁵

If we suppose, moreover, that in its first draft version the passage was prefixed by much the same material which comes before it in the Ms R 60,²²⁶ then it would appear that Rousseau's initial aim in his section on music in the Discours was to oppose the general thesis that Rameau had advanced in the Démonstration about the origin of melody. In that work Rameau had rehearsed a proposition, which he had already upheld on many occasions before,²²⁷ that melody, together with every

223. See the appendix, note 188.

224. See the appendix, note j.

225. The resemblance between the titles of Rameau's printed work and Rousseau's manuscript was first noticed in 1912 by Lanson in his 'L'Unité de la pensée de Rousseau' (see notes 163 and 164 above), though Lanson later abandoned his view that the Essai sur l'origine des langues might initially have been conceived as a reply to the Démonstration following the publication of Masson's evidence that at first the Essai had actually been a part of the second Discours. It is a curious fact that Rousseau's remark in his projected preface (see p. 304 above) about the similarity ("aux deux mots près que j'ai retranchés") between the titles of Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique dans l'Encyclopédie and his own Erreurs de M. Rameau sur la musique applies equally to the relation between these other titles.

226. See the appendix, pp. 447-448 from note 177.

227. See pp. 269-270 above.

one of our harmonic modes and intervals, was engendered by the resonance of a 'corps sonore' or 'son fondamental'. "Ce principe unique, générateur & ordonnateur de toute la Musique", he wrote,

ne résonne pas plutôt qu'il engendre en même tems toutes les proportions continues, d'où naissent l'harmonie, la Mélodie, les Modes, les Genres, & jusqu'aux moindres regles nécessaires à la pratique.²²⁸

Thus in the Démonstration he yet again presented a canon of music which he regarded as universally true and which, he continued, gives rise everywhere to both the proportions of harmony and the progressions of melody, with these "premiers principes Mathématiques", in turn, having their own physical principles grounded "dans la nature".²²⁹ Rousseau, for his part, introduced the central section of the Ms R 60 with the remark that

la Mélodie...pur ouvrage de la nature ne doit...son origine à l'harmonie, ouvrage et production de l'art.²³⁰

It was therefore necessary to disentangle the relation between melodic and harmonic music which Rameau had confused and to locate the natural source of melody, not in the light of the composer's speculations, but rather with reference to the facts themselves.

Recherchons, s'il y a moiën, la véritable origine de la mélodie, et voyons si l'idée que M. Rameau en a conçüe s'accorde à celle que nous fournit l'exacte observation des faits.²³¹

228. Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie, CTWR, III, p. 176. See also pp. 184 and 196.

229. Ibid., p. 197.

230. See the appendix, p. 447.

231. See note 201 above and the appendix, p. 448.

This is the task which Rousseau undertook, and these the words which begin his passage on the degeneration of music, in the Ms R 60. And if my suppositions about the genesis of that text are correct, then the same words, or others like them, must also have begun the fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité to which he refers in his projected preface.

The composition of the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of the Essai seems, then, to have been a fairly complex affair. For if all the postulates I have put forward here are actually warranted by the surviving manuscript evidence, then it follows that Rousseau's discussion of the origin of music there comprises the third version of a critique of Rameau which was first formulated in 1754 as a section of the Discours sur l'inégalité that dealt with the Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie. That section was promptly struck out of the Discours, and in an adapted form it was in 1755 made part of the earliest draft of a reply to the Erreurs sur la musique, which Rousseau later entitled the Examen de deux principes. In 1761, or perhaps just before, finally, it was withdrawn from the definitive version of the Examen, only to be incorporated again at about the same time in a more comprehensive essay on the origins of both music and language.²³²

232. It is perhaps appropriate at this point to contrast these speculations about the genesis of the Essai with those put forward by Jansen more than ninety years ago. For until the 1970s Jansen was undoubtedly the best-informed of all scholars about the contents of Rousseau's musical manuscripts, and he may still be granted pride of place insofar as the discovery and initial publication of the projected preface to the Essai, as well as the first transcription of any passage in the Ms R 60, were all achieved by him (see notes 158 and 165 above). In his study Jansen took account of Rousseau's remark that the Essai had originally been a fragment of the second Discours (though for no good reason he described it as a set of chapters which Rousseau had written in 1753), and he observed, too, that the later work was conceived as a critique of Rameau which, in the light of the correspondence with Malesherbes (see note 196 above), must have been completed around 1760-61. But because he imagined that the fragment was devoted to a discussion of the origin of language alone it never occurred to him that it might also be concerned with music, and he therefore took no notice of the fact that when Rousseau speaks of the original version of the Essai in his projected preface he

The main point which I wish to stress here, however, is that the surviving first-draft fragments of the central section of the Ms R 60 show that Rousseau originally planned the second Discours to include a lengthy passage on the genesis of melody in music which was designed to challenge certain features of the theory of Rameau. We know from his Confessions that Rousseau often struggled hard to put his views in proper order and that he refashioned and reconstituted his ideas in many ways, sometimes through several works, before submitting them to print.

Mes idées s'arrangent dans ma tête avec la plus incroyable difficulté. Elles y circulent sourdement; elles y fermentent jusqu'à m'émouvoir, m'échauffer, me donner des palpitations, et au milieu de toute cette émotion je ne vois rien nettement; je ne saurois écrire un seul mot, il faut que j'attende. Insensiblement ce grand mouvement s'appaise, ce cahos se débrouille; chaque chose vient se mettre à sa place, mais lentement et après une longue et confuse agitation....Mes manuscrits raturés, barbouillés, mêlés, indéchiffrables attestent la peine qu'ils m'ont coûtée. Il n'y en a pas un qu'il ne m'ait fallu transcrire quatre ou cinq fois avant de le donner à la presse.²³³

points to the same fragment which he reformulated in his first draft of the Examen de deux principes. The account of the development of the Essai that Jansen offers, then, is rather odd, and this for three reasons: firstly, because he overlooks the intermediate draft of the fragment which shows the connection of the Essai to Rameau's ideas most clearly; secondly, because he stipulates that since the work was largely written around 1760 it must have been devised as a reply to the Code de musique pratique which appeared in that year; and thirdly, because he supposes that when Rousseau prepared his final version he was reminded of his earlier reflections about language, and - perceiving that these would now be relevant to a critique of Rameau - he then added to the fragment some new sections about music, in this way completing his essay on both subjects. Thus, writes Jansen (p. 255), the "ganze Reihe von Capiteln" of Rousseau's second Discours or, alternatively, his "Aufzeichnungen von 1753" - pertaining to the "Ursprung der Sprachen" - had been "zu ausgedehnt" for that work, and Rousseau therefore left it "unbenutzt". When Rameau "auskramte" his ideas about harmony in the Code de musique pratique of 1760, Rousseau was "erinnert" of his fragment: "Er überarbeitete sie, fügte einige Abschnitte über die Tonkunst hinzu und betitelte das Ganze: 'Essai sur le principe de la mélodie', oder sich nachher genauer fassend: 'Essai sur l'origine des langues où il est parlé de la mélodie et de l'imitation musicale'."

233. Confessions, O.C.I, pp. 113-114. Rousseau also comments here that the order which stems from the confusion of his thoughts and papers resembles the course followed by an Italian opera, in which, from a general "desordre desagréable....peu à peu tout s'arrange".

The passage about melody - conceived initially as part of a thesis on morals, developed as part of a study of music, and completed as part of an essay on language - must surely have figured among the manuscripts he had in mind when making these reflections. But if that passage proved in the end to be too long and out of place in the Discours, it had clearly filled an appropriate and assigned place there in the beginning. For even in its final version it encompasses an illustration of Rousseau's general argument about the origins of the practices, pleasures, customs, and values that all together mark the illusory progress of society and the real decadence of man, of which the fullest exposition in his writings can be found in the Discours sur l'inégalité. The birth and development of music, that is, comprised a crucial element in the evolution of art and culture, which in turn form a counterpart to the world of social institutions, so that, in Rousseau's theory, the rigidly artificial standards of taste which we must have come to accept in the one sphere constitute a parallel system to that of the fixed and binding duties which we have come to adopt in the other. If in society men are bound by hierarchical relations that are maintained through once-verbal and now-silent undertakings whose true purpose they do not comprehend, with regard to music, on the other hand, the same men are captivated by harmonic relations which have never had any meaning at all because they lack all vocal content. The abstract intervals that set apart the speechless tones of the modern scale provide a particularly striking example among human artifacts of the cleavages in both society and culture which, according to Rousseau, divide persons senselessly into artificial groups.

In the previous chapter I tried to show how the printed text of the second Discours was formed largely as a confutation of the anthropological views of Buffon, the linguistic ideas of Condillac, and the speculations

about war and property set forth by Hobbes and Locke, respectively. I hope I have now established that the work was also conceived at first to challenge the philosophy of Rameau, who was the foremost exponent of the most advanced musical doctrines of Rousseau's day. The central section of the Ms R 60 ties together three of the published writings of Rousseau - the Discours sur l'inégalité, the Examen de deux principes, and the Essai sur l'origine des langues - all of which were designed initially to include a critique of Rameau's theory.²³⁴ That critique survived as a dominant feature of the

234. The thirteenth fragment connected by Jansen (see pp. 466-467 and note 158 above) to the Ms R 60 also contains a rebuttal of Rameau's claims, but it could not have formed a part of the Discours since it includes a reference to the Erreurs sur la musique which was composed and published later. I believe, however, that Jansen was right in his guess that Rousseau conceived the passage at the time he was engaged in drafting the Ms R 60 (though it is not incorporated anywhere in the text), and it is a curious fact, which indirectly supports my argument here about the place of Rousseau's musical ideas in the context of his social theory, that the notebook in which it appears is filled principally with first-draft sections of his political writings, in particular, of the Lettres de la montagne and the article 'Economie politique'. The passage (Neuchâtel Ms R 16, p. 69.ii) reads as follows: "j'ai par tout fait usage du système de M. Rameau, je l'ai partout nommé avec éloge / J'ai fait des objections, sans doute, <M. Rameau <[et]> faloit-il sacrifier le bien de l'art a > [le bien de l'art l'exigeoit, M. Rameau <se croit> [veut-il] qu'on le croye infaillible ou <et> faut-il] adopter jusqu'à ses erreurs. <Mais> [si] je les ai <faites> [relevées c'est] avec tous les égards qu'on pourroit avoir pour le plus grand h:²³⁵ et sur lesquels M. Rameau m'a rendu plus de justice qu'à lui même s'il les attendoit de ma part. / Quelles sont donc les étranges prétentions de M. Rameau <prétend> [et] quels honneurs peuvent <donc> le satisfaire s'il n'est pas content de ceux qu<e>[i] <M. d'Alembert et moi lui rendons à l'envi> <[les editeurs (?)]> [lui sont rendus comme à l'envi] dans l'Encyclopedie <où son art n'occu> <ne d> <n'occupe qu'un des derniers> <il> ignore-t-il que son art n'y tient qu'un des derniers rangs, et qu'il <n'a> [n'y tient lui même] le premier <n'> dans son art que par <ce que> [la défiance ou] ses procedés envers moi m'ont mis <en garde> contre mon propre avis, par l'extrême déference de M. d'Alembert et la mienne pour le goût de la nation, enfin parce que l'Encyclopedie est faite en france: <q>[Que M. Rameau [sache] que par tout ailleurs <il n'est pas> [son nom] même <nommé> <[n'y seroit pas] <[n'y paroitroit pas]> [seroit oublié] et que l'ouvrage n'en vaudroit <pas moins> <que mieux> pas moins." See also the passage from the foreword to vol. VI of the Encyclopédie (reprinted in CTWR, V, p. 290) discussed on pp. 247-248 above.

235. Abbreviation for 'homme'.

Examen and the Essai, and this fact partly explains why Rousseau planned to have the two studies appear together in the same volume of his collected works. Indeed his account of the development of language was actually constructed round his earlier arguments about the origins of music, and both the text and the title which he withdrew from his rough draft of the Examen were to serve as the foundation of the Essai.²³⁶ What I have tried to emphasise here is that these works, which once formed part of the same rejoinder to Rameau's Erreurs sur la musique of 1755, and which came subsequently to comprise two distinct sets of objections to his views, are themselves only later versions of a reply, to the Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie of 1750, that initially figured in the Discours sur l'inégalité. I shall now turn to a closer study of the substance of the argument as it appears in the Essai sur l'origine des langues.

The account of music that Rousseau develops in the Essai is concerned, above all, with its properties as a language. It is speech which underlies the fundamental difference between human and animal behaviour, and the enunciation of our thoughts in the form of linguistic signs, he maintains, constitutes the first of the institutions which drew men together.

La parole distingue l'homme entre les animaux: le langage distingue les nations entre elles; on ne connoit d'où est un homme qu'après qu'il a parléSitot qu'un homme fut reconnu par un autre pour un Être sentant pensant et semblable a lui, le desir ou le besoin de lui communiquer ses sentimens et ses pensées lui en fit chercher les

236. See note 156 above.

moyens. Ces moyens ne peuvent se tirer que des sens, les seuls instrumens par lesquels un homme puisse agir sur un autre. Voilà donc l'institution des signes sensibles pour exprimer la pensée.²³⁷

Yet the expression of our sentiments must have depended initially upon the intonations of our speech, for only music could supply those phrases, tones, and accents which would have been required to bestow some sense or purpose upon the vocal sounds that were produced by men. Each person's snarling threats or cries of rage were vociferated in a way that depended mainly upon his use of the tongue and palate, while his more tender sentiments were softened by the glottis. In general all the first articulations of the human race were shaped from the cadences through which men voiced their passions, so that the syllabic figures of both speech and song have a common origin.

Avec les premières voix se formèrent les premières articulations ou les premiers sons, selon le genre de la passion qui dictoit les uns ou les autres. La colère arrache des cris menaçans que la langue et le palais articulent; mais la voix de la tendresse est plus douce, c'est la glote qui la modifie, et cette voix devient un son. Seulement les accens en sont plus fréquens ou plus rares, les inflexions plus ou moins aiguës selon le sentiment qui s'y joint. Ainsi la cadence et les sons naissent avec les sillabes, la passion fait parler tous les organes, et pare la voix de tout leur éclat: ainsi les vers les chants la parole ont une origine commune.²³⁸

237. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. i, p. 27. The suggestion in this passage that speech must have initially consisted of verbal signs through which the thoughts of men might be expressed seems to be a departure from Rousseau's stand against the views of Condillac in the Discours sur l'inégalité to the effect that speech must also have been necessary for the very formation of our thoughts (see ch. III, pp. 169-175 and especially the passage from the Discours, O.C.III, p. 147 cited on p. 172). Derrida (see De la grammatologie, pp. 327-328) has argued forcefully that in this passage speech, which is universally natural to man, is set apart from language, which is specific to nations, but the apparent - albeit minor - inconsistency with the Discours remains, insofar as it is speech to which Rousseau refers there too.

238. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xii, p. 139. The distinction between verse, song, and speech to which Rousseau alludes in the concluding line of this passage bears a striking similarity to his tripartite division

According to Rousseau, therefore, the first languages must have had a rhythmic and melodic character. They must have been poetic rather than prose, sung rather than spoken, and the significance that came to be attached to their terms must have depended upon the musical forms in which these were constructed.

Les premières histoires, les premières harangues, les premières loix furent en vers; la poesie fut trouvée avant la prose....Il en fut de même de la musique; il n'y eut point d'abord d'autre musique que la melodie, ni d'autre mélodie que le son varié de la parole, les accens formoient le chant, les quantités formoient la mesure, et l'on parloit autant par les sons et par le rythme que par les articulations et les voix. Dire et chanter... eurent la même source.²³⁹

Primitive expressions, that is, must have derived their meaning from

between types of utterance in the following remarks in *Emile*, Livre II, O.C.IV, p. 404: "L'homme a trois sortes de voix; savoir, la voix parlante ou articulée, la voix chantante ou mélodieuse, et la voix pathétique ou accentuée, qui sert de langage aux passions et qui anime le chant et la parole." Since these reflections already figure in the first extensive draft, that is, the *Manuscrit Favre*, of *Emile* (see *ibid.*, p. 149), and since that text was for the most part compiled in the early months of 1759 (see *ibid.*, p. lxxv, and Jimack, *La Genèse et la rédaction de l'Emile*, pp. 38-39), and since, finally, it appears that most of the *Essai*, apart from chs. xviii and xviii, were composed after 1760 (see notes 196 and 219 above), I rather suspect that the passage in *Emile* antedates that of the *Essai*. But Rousseau's quadruplex distinction - in his article 'Voix' for the *Dictionnaire de musique* (see pp. 539-540) - was almost certainly formulated later. For that account of the differences between 'un simple Son', 'un son articulé', 'le Chant', and 'la déclamation', does not figure in any of his contributions to the *Encyclopédie*. In fact the terms are taken directly, as Rousseau acknowledges, from Duclos's article 'Déclamation des anciens' (see the *Encyclopédie*, IV (1754), p. 687), where they figure in the context of a commentary upon Denis Dodart's *Mémoire sur les causes de la voix de l'homme et de ses différens tons* (see the *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences. Année 1700* [Paris 1703], pp. 238-287).

239. *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. xii, p. 141. Commenting upon a passage from the first book of Strabo's *Geographica* (for which his immediate source was almost certainly Father Bernard Lamy's *La Rhétorique ou l'art de parler* - see the fourth edition [Paris 1701], I.xix, p. 108), Rousseau adds here that "Dire et chanter....ne furent d'abord que la même chose". The propositions that music and language have a common source, and that poetic speech was developed before prose, can both be found in several classical writings. They also figure prominently in the linguistic theories of the three perhaps best-known authorities on this subject

the chants which made utterances out of noise.²⁴⁰

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

n'est point dûe aux premiers besoins des hommes; il seroit absurde que de la cause qui les écarte vint le moyen qui les unit. D'où peut donc venir cette origine? Des besoins moraux, des passions. Toutes les passions rapprochent les hommes que la nécessité de chercher à vivre force à se fuir. Ce n'est ni la faim ni la soif, mais l'amour la haine la pitié la colère qui leur ont arraché les premières voix.²⁴¹

Thus before men came to communicate ideas, and before they began to harangue their neighbours in order to secure a personal advantage, they could only have expressed, in an impulsive manner, those sentiments and dispositions which they all shared. The vocal gestures which they made must have been exuberant and benign,²⁴² and since, in their earliest

in the eighteenth century, that is, Vico, Monboddo, and Herder. (See especially the third (1744) edition of Vico's Scienza nuova, paragraphs 459-463; Monboddo's Of the Origin and Progress of Language, VI (1792), II.iv, pp. 136-137, and II.v, pp. 154-169; and Herder's 1767 fragment 'Von den Lebensaltern einer Sprache' and his 1772 Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache, in Herders sämtliche Werke, I, pp. 151-155, and V, pp. 57-59.) But there is no evidence that Rousseau ever saw the work of Vico - despite a fulsome academic controversy about this matter - and though Monboddo and Herder were both well-acquainted with the Discours sur l'inégalité (see ch. III, pp. 151-153 and notes 151, 172, and 214) neither made any reference at all to the Essai sur l'origine des langues. As my concern here is not with conceptual parallels but rather with the affinities between arguments in writings which are historically related, I shall have little to say in connection with the Essai about the otherwise extremely important ideas of Vico, Monboddo, and Herder.

240. See the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xiii, p. 161, and the appendix, p. 448 and note j.

241. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ii, p. 43.

242. It is true, however, that according to Rousseau in the Essai men are not naturally inclined to show compassion to other creatures like themselves. Our sentiment of pity, he argues there, is displayed in the ways that we identify with the suffering of others, and he describes it as

societies, they had not yet come to recognise their separate interests

they must, in short, have been enchanting.

a feeling of empathy for which, even at first, we required a socially formed and well-developed sense of judgment and imagination. Thus he reflects, in a well-known passage of the text (ch. ix, p. 93), "Les affections sociales ne se développent en nous qu'avec nos lumières. La pitié, bien que naturelle au coeur de l'homme resteroit éternellement inactive sans l'imagination qui la met en jeu. Comment nous laissons nous émouvoir à la pitié? En nous transportant hors de nous-mêmes; en nous identifiant avec l'être souffrant. Nous ne souffrons qu'autant que nous jugeons qu'il souffre; ce n'est pas dans nous c'est dans lui que nous souffrons. Qu'on songe combien ce transport suppose de connaissances acquises! Comment imaginerois-je des maux dont je n'ai nulle idée? Comment souffrirois-je en voyant souffrir un autre si je ne sais pas même qu'il souffre, si j'ignore ce qu'il y a de commun entre lui et moi? Celui qui n'a jamais réfléchi ne peut être ni clement ni juste ni pitoyable: il ne peut pas non plus être méchant et vindicatif. Celui qui n'imagine rien ne sent que lui-même; il est seul au milieu du genre humain". As Starobinski has observed (see O.C.III, pp. 1330-1331) this passage does seem somewhat inconsistent with the account of pity which is set forth in the Discours sur l'inégalité (see ch. III, pp. 196-200). But Rousseau does not claim, in the Essai, that the compassion which men feel for one another is due only to the social relations that they form, since the sentiment of pity, he remarks, is "naturelle au coeur de l'homme". His argument, rather, is that this sentiment cannot be manifested and developed until men recognise the similarities between themselves and other creatures, and for this reason I think that Starobinski is mistaken to suggest that in the Essai "Rousseau...paraît...enclin à soutenir l'idée hobbenne de la guerre de tous contre tous". It is, says Rousseau, "la crainte et la foiblesse" (ch. ix, p. 93) which bring men into conflict, and not, as Hobbes had maintained (see ch. III, p. 185), competition, diffidence, and glory. In view of the inconsistency between the Essai and the Discours with regard to the concept of pity Starobinski also speculates that the chapter of the Essai in which the passage appears - if not the whole text - might have been drafted before the other work. But since Rousseau later incorporated almost exactly the same terms in the fourth book of Emile (see O.C.IV, pp. 505-506 and 1467) the passage - if it implies anything at all about the order in which he produced his works - suggests that the Discours is the earlier composition (see Derrida, De la grammatologie, pp. 243-272; Porset, Essai sur l'origine des langues, 'Remarque', pp. 16-24; and Goldschmidt, Anthropologie et politique, pp. 331-356). In a review of the second Porset edition of the Essai sur l'origine des langues (see the Annales, XXXVIII (1969-71), p. 397) Starobinski has quite recently acknowledged that his earlier statement was an "hypothèse imprudente". And in any case, whether pity is a natural or social sentiment according to Rousseau, it seems quite clear that, in his view, an individual could only have expressed this sentiment after he had come to recognise that all other men possessed traits which were very much like his own.

Dans cet âge heureux où rien ne marquoit les heures, rien n'obligeoit à les compter; le tems n'avoit d'autre mesure que l'amusement et l'ennui... Là se firent les premières fêtes, les pieds bondissoient de joye, le geste empressé ne suffisoit plus, la voix l'accompagnoit d'accens passionnés, le plaisir et le desir confondus ensemble se faisoient sentir à la fois. Là fut enfin le vrai berceau des peuples, et du pur cristal des fontaines sortirent les premiers feux de l'amour.²⁴³

It was also Rousseau's view, however, that while our first languages were formed from a variety of intonated gestures they could not all have remained musical for long. In the southern regions of the world, where the climate was mild and the land fertile, the needs of men and women were largely satisfied by Nature, and it was only in order to convey their inclinations and desires that they began to sing to one another. Those persons, on the other hand, who were later driven by fortuitous events²⁴⁴

243. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 123. If the fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité from which the Essai was developed had formed a draft of ch. ix (see pp. 315-316 above and 349-372 below) one might be tempted to connect this passage to the paragraph in the Discours (O.C.III, pp. 170-171) where Rousseau describes the state of primitive society that must have been "le meilleur à l'homme" and in which "le Genre-humain étoit fait pour...rester toujours". It should in any case be noted here that in his article 'Chant' for the Dictionnaire de musique (pp. 83-84) Rousseau later remarked that men do not chant by nature, since true savages, mutes, and infants are all marked by their lack of song: "Le Chant ne semble pas naturel à l'homme. Quoique les Sauvages de l'Amérique chantent, parce qu'ils parlent, le vrai Sauvage ne chanta jamais. Les Muets ne chantent point; ils ne forment que des voix sans permanence, des mugissemens sourds que le besoin leur arrache...Les enfans crient, pleurent, & ne chantent point. Les premières expressions de la nature n'ont rien en eux de mélodieux ni de sonore." The same point with regard to the cries of children also appears in Emile, Livre II, O.C.IV, p. 404. Rousseau's concession to the chants of American Indians is based upon Mersenne's account - which is in turn drawn from the work of Jean de Léry - of 'Trois Chansons des Américains' in his Harmonie universelle (see II.ii, p. 148 of the 1963 Paris reprint of the 1636 edition). In plate N of the Dictionnaire de musique a transcription of these three, allegedly Brazilian, tunes is misdescribed as a 'Chanson des Sauvages du Canada'. See also Derrida, De la grammatologie, pp. 281-284.

244. See the passage from the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 113, cited in ch. III, note 220. Rousseau suggests in the Essai that, aside from natural catastrophes such as floods, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, still more cosmic phenomena, including perhaps even divine intervention, may also have played some initial part in bringing men together. Hence, he writes (ch. ix, p. 109), "Celui qui voulut que l'homme fut sociable toucha du doigt l'axe du globe et l'inclina sur l'axe de l'univers. A ce léger mouvement je vois changer la face de la terre et

to live in northern areas had always to contend with Nature in order to survive and must, as a consequence, have begun to work even before they had learnt to sing. The effect upon their speech of a harsh climate and poor soil would certainly have been considerable,²⁴⁵ for according to Rousseau they were very soon obliged to construct a set of terms with which they could communicate their needs and had hardly any opportunity to devise a language for the expression of their pleasures. The linguistic rules of the first inhabitants of the north

décider la vocation du genre humain...je vois édifier les Palais et les Villes; je vois naitre les arts les loix le commerce; je vois les peuples se former, s'étendre, se dissoudre...je vois les hommes rassemblés sur quelques points de leur demeure pour s'y dévorer mutuellement et faire un affreux desert du reste du monde digne monument de l'union sociale et de l'utilité des arts". Grange (see 'L'Essai sur l'origine des langues dans ses rapports avec le Discours sur l'inégalité', pp. 301-303) has rightly observed that the first part of this passage must have been inspired by some remarks about "l'axe de la terre" which God "inclina quelque peu vers les étoiles du nord" that appear in the third volume of the abbé Antoine Pluche's Le Spectacle de la nature of 1735.

245. The influence of climate upon the nature of language constitutes the dominant theme of chs. viii-xi of the Essai sur l'origine des langues. The subject attracted the attention of many prominent Enlightenment thinkers, from whose writings Rousseau undoubtedly drew some of his own inspiration too (see especially the references cited in the appendix, note h). His principal sources may well have been that section of the abbé Jean-Baptiste Dubos's Réflexions critiques sur la poesie et sur la peinture (first published in 1719) entitled 'Le pouvoir de l'air sur le corps humain prouvé par le caractere des Nations' (see the 1733 Paris edition, II.xv, pp. 251-276) and the following passage from Lamy's La Rhétorique ou l'art de parler, I.xv, pp. 81-82: "La difference du temperament & des climats fait qu'on ne prononce pas de la même maniere. Ainsi ceux mêmes qui avoient dans le commencement le même langage avant leur separation, pûrent dans la suite prononcer si differemment les mêmes mots, qu'ils ne parurent plus les mêmes....C'est ainsi qu'il y eut sur la terre autant de differentes langues que de contrées....Chaque peuple a ses manieres de prononcer, selon la qualité du climat. Ceux du Nort sont portez à se servir de mots composez de consones fortes, qui se prononcent du fond du gosier." Monboddo was later to make a point very similar to that of Rousseau about the distinction between the first southern and northern languages when he remarked (Of the Origin and Progress of Language, VI, II.iv, pp. 137-138) "that language and the race of men came from the south and east. Now, the people there are much more musical than in the north and west, where they appear to have almost quite lost those musical talents, which they brought with them from the south and east: And the further north they have gone, the more they have lost of those talents".

were thus established so as to make their joint undertakings and mutual aid possible, but the common ventures upon which they were enabled to embark through the articulation and use of signs were themselves in a sense forced upon them by the severity of the elements and by the features of an inhospitable terrain that allowed no person to survive without the assistance of his neighbours.

Forcés de s'approvisionner pour l'hiver voila les habitans dans le cas de s'entre aider, les voila contraints d'établir entre eux quelque sorte de convention. Quand les courses deviennent impossibles et que la rigueur du froid les arrête, l'ennui les lie autant que le besoin. Les Lapons ensevelis dans leurs glaces, les Esquimaux le plus sauvage de tous les peuples se rassemblent l'hiver dans leurs cavernes et l'été ne se connoissent plus. Augmentez d'un degré leur développement et leur lumières, les voila réunis pour toujours.²⁴⁶

Our original languages, then, were born of the musical ebullience of southern peoples whose speech and song expressed their own natural affections, but the languages which subsequently arose in the north were produced as a response to the constraints imposed by a Nature that was external to the character of men. In the one case, in bountiful surroundings, our needs were developed from our passions; in the other, in an inclement and ungenerous world, it was our needs which gave rise to our passions. While in the south, therefore, one might have heard - or rather, overheard - the dulcet melodies of love, in the north one would inevitably have been confronted by men who cried out for help. And languages which, in the one region, were formed of gentle modulations and were enlivened by sonorous tones, must, in the other region, have become either monotonous, or gruff, or shrill.

246. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 113-115.

Dans les climats méridionaux où la nature est prodigue les besoins naissent des passions, dans les pays froids où elle est avare les passions naissent des besoins, et les langues, tristes filles de la nécessité se sentent de leur dure origine....dans ces lieux où la terre ne donne rien qu'à force de travail et où la source de la vie semble être plus dans les bras que dans le coeur....le premier mot ne fut pas...aimez-moi, mais, aidez-moi.... Voilà selon mon opinion les causes physiques les plus générales de la différence caractéristique des primitives langues. Celles du midi durent être vives, sonores, accentuées, éloquentes, et souvent obscures à force d'énergie: celles du Nord durent être sourdes rudes, articulées, criardes, monotones, claires à force de mots plustot que par une bonne construction.²⁴⁷

Now this distinction between the northern and southern cultures of the world is central to Rousseau's theory. For the historical development of both our language and our music could be attributed directly, in his view, to the manner in which the peoples of the north must have attacked and, in due course, overrun, the settlements of the

247. Ibid., ch. x, pp. 129 and 131, and ch. xi, p. 135. For a discussion of these remarks see Derrida, De la grammatologie, pp. 318-322. In his Lettre sur la musique françoise (La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 735-736) Rousseau treats modern Italian as if it were the contemporary language of love, and he describes it in terms that are similar to those which he attaches here to the original southern tongues: "C'est le langage de l'amour...vif, bouillant, entrecoupé, & tel qu'il convient aux passions impétueuses." He was, in any case, not the only writer in the eighteenth century to draw a distinction between the industrious labourers of the north, on the one hand, and the frolicsome peoples of the south, on the other. Much the same point can be found, for instance, in Diderot's (or Saint-Lambert's) article 'Législateur' (see the Encyclopédie, IX, pp. 357-358, and ch. II, note 43). In his Esprit des loix, Livre XIV, ch. ii, moreover (Oeuvres complètes, I.i, p. 308), Montesquieu had also made a similar observation: "Dans les pays froids, on aura peu de sensibilité pour les plaisirs; elle sera plus grande dans les pays tempérés; dans les pays chauds, elle sera extrême." According to Montesquieu, however (Esprit des loix, XXIV.v, Oeuvres complètes, I.ii, p. 86), if the peoples of the north were less susceptible to pleasures they were at the same time less likely to be ruled by others: "C'est que les peuples du nord ont & auront toujours un esprit d'indépendance & de liberté, que n'ont pas les peuples du midi; & qu'une religion qui n'a point de chef visible, convient mieux à l'indépendance du climat, que celle qui en a un." See also the passage from the Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, pp. 143-144 cited on p. 358 below.

south. In a passage that already figures in the middle section of the Ms R 60 he remarks that it was the barbarian invasions, in particular of the Roman remnants of the ancient civilisations of the south, which destroyed those languages that had been born of passion and desire, since with the conquest of the Mediterranean world the guttural and staccato speech of northern men must eventually have taken precedence over the rhythmic and melodic intonations which had served for the expression of human sentiments before. These men with harsh, thundering, nasal voices could only employ protracted vowels to offset but not to soften the sharpness of their consonants, and the peoples whom they conquered were soon obliged to imitate their piercing chants. In order to make the tones of northern speech more distinct the captive interlocutors of the south must actually have slackened the pace of this language of shouts and cries, and as they progressively transformed it into dialects of drawling croaks and droning murmurs, all the sweetness, measure, and grace of their original vernacular songs came to be lost.

Enfin arriva la catastrophe qui détruisit les progrès de l'esprit humain...L'Europe, inondée de barbares et asservie par des ignorans perdit...la langue harmonieuse perfectionnée. Ces hommes grossiers que le nord avoit engendrés accoutumèrent insensiblement toutes les oreilles à la rudesse de leur organe.... Toutes leurs articulations étant aussi âpres que leurs voix étoient nazales et sourdes, ils ne pouvoient donner qu'une sorte d'éclat à leur chant, qui étoit de renforcer le son des voyelles pour couvrir l'abondance et la dureté des consonnes. Ce chant bruyant...obligea...les peuples subjugués qui les imitèrent de ralentir tous les sons pour les faire entendre. L'articulation pénible et les sons renforcés concoururent également à chasser de la mélodie tout sentiment de mesure et de rythme....Le chant ne fut bientôt plus qu'une suite ennuyeuse et lente de sons traînans et criés, sans douceur, sans mesure, et sans grace.²⁴⁸

248. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, pp. 189-191. Cf. the appendix, pp. 457-458. In the paragraph which precedes this passage

The mellifluous languages of men must therefore have been crushed by the clamour of those who either could not sing or no longer had the facility to do so, and as a consequence our music and our speech were set apart. Men began to chatter while their songs lost all their meaning, and, as Rousseau observed in terms which probably once figured in the Discours sur l'inégalité itself, the semantic element of primitive expressions came in this way to be divorced from music.

La mélodie commençant à n'être plus si adhérente au discours prit insensiblement une existence à part, et la musique devint plus indépendante des paroles. Alors aussi cessèrent peu à peu ces prodiges qu'elle avoit produits lorsqu'elle n'étoit que l'accent et l'harmonie de la poésie, et qu'elle lui donnoit sur les passions cet empire que la parole n'exerça plus dans la suite que sur la raison.²⁴⁹

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

As the communities in which men lived grew larger and their

Rousseau makes clear that it is principally classical Latin, already less musical than ancient Greek, which suffered this fate. To be sure, several other Enlightenment thinkers had already advanced that claim before him. Condillac, for instance, in his Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines (II.i.5, §56, OPC, I, pp. 76-77), had stated that "le climat n'a pas permis aux peuples froids et flegmatiques du Nord de conserver les accents et la quantité que la nécessité avoit introduits dans la prosodie à la naissance des langues. Quand ces barbares eurent inondé l'empire romain et qu'ils en eurent conquis toute la partie occidentale, le latin, confondu avec leurs idiômes, perdit son caractère. Voilà d'où nous vient le défaut d'accent que nous regardons comme la principale beauté de notre prononciation: cette origine ne prévient pas en sa faveur".

249. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, p. 189. See also the appendix, pp. 456-457 and notes 295-307. My reasons for regarding this passage as originally a part of that fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité to which Rousseau refers in his 'Projet de préface' are offered on pp. 316-318 above.

cares and aspirations multiplied, individuals must have called upon each other to perform a constantly increasing number of specific tasks. A vocabulary of responsibilities and obligations must have been developed so that men could subjugate their neighbours by the force of verbs alone,²⁵⁰ and their vocal sounds came to be endowed with artificial meanings just insofar as they were deprived of their initial charm. Sentiments came to be supplanted by ideas, impulses of the heart were replaced by instructions of the mind, and men began to languish as they employed an idiom of discourse that was more exact but also more exacting, more clear and precise, yet at the same time more hollow and cold.

A mesure que les besoins croissent que les affaires s'embrouillent que les lumières s'étendent le langage change de caractère; il devient plus juste et moins passionné; il substitue aux sentimens les idées, il ne parle plus au coeur mais à la raison. Par-là-même l'accent s'éteint l'articulation s'étend, la langue devient plus exacte plus claire, mais plus traînante plus sourde et plus froide.²⁵¹

With the emergence of prose, in effect, languages became prosaic.

Men who followed the same moral rules were equally required to adopt

250. In ch. ix of the Essai (see the remarks from pp. 105 and 107 cited on p. 356 below) Rousseau argues that mankind must have passed through three main epochs, each of which was centred largely round a different occupation. Only in the third of these epochs, characterized by the agricultural labour of man in civil society, did it become possible to form a true vocabulary of moral terms, for our concepts of duty and obligation, in Rousseau's view, must originally have been developed in connection with the ownership of land (see the passage from the Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 164 cited in ch. III, p. 189). Agricultural peoples, then, could be subjugated by the verb, in the sense that all individuals in an agrarian society might be bound by the promises they had made to respect the property of others. They would therefore be tied to keep to their word and in bondage to the "illocutionary force", as J. L. Austin described it (see How to do things with Words [Oxford 1962], pp. 115-116 and 145), of their own utterances.

251. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. v, p. 55. Inspired largely by the physical and anatomical researches of Dodart (see note 238 above), Rousseau drew a fuller and more general distinction between 'la Voix de parole' and 'la Voix de Chant' in his article 'Voix' for the Dictionnaire de musique (see especially pp. 540-543).

the same conventions in their grammar, and as they grew accustomed to their social obligations their manner of speaking must also have become increasingly monotonous and dull. Rousseau, indeed, believed that the contemporary languages of central and northern Europe were still marked very clearly by the influence of barbaric prose.

Le François, l'Anglois, l'Allemand sont le langage privé des hommes qui s'entre aident, qui raisonnent entre eux de sang-froid, ou de gens emportés qui se fâchent.²⁵²

Even modern Italian, he claimed - though it remained more amenable to musical constructions than most of the European tongues - had suffered much the same fate.

Les langues modernes de l'Europe sont toutes du plus au moins dans le même cas: Je n'en excepte pas même l'italienne. La langue italienne non plus que la française n'est point par elle-même une langue musicale. La différence est seulement que l'une se prête à la musique, et que l'autre ne s'y prête pas.²⁵³

The speech of men was thus transformed until its passionate inflexions had been lost, and at the same time the vocal cadences through which our earliest enthusiasms and affections had been enunciated were deprived of their significance. The sentiments which had once given rise to song were stifled, repressed, and forgotten as the social relations of men changed under the bondage of barbarian rule and

252. Ibid., ch. xi, p. 135. The idea that such languages might nonetheless retain a musical character, each in its appropriate way, was treated with derision by Rousseau already in his 'Fragment biographique' (see O.C.I., p. 1117).

253. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. vii, p. 81. It should be noted that Rousseau here departs somewhat from the position about the Italian language which he had upheld in his Lettre sur la musique française (see p. 254 and note 46 above).

agricultural labour, and primitive melodies were turned into disjointed sounds which must have been as dull and drab to hear as the humdrum reverberations of our newly-acquired prose.²⁵⁴

It was Rousseau's view, moreover, that the invention of harmonic intervals could only have occurred when this corruption of the earliest form of music was complete. For it was only after men had ceased to give a melodic character to their natural propensities that they began to wonder whether satisfactions of a different kind could be obtained directly from the senseless intonations of the human voice. We must have begun, by chance alone, to focus our attention upon the consonance which marked at least a few of the pitches that we employed when emitting our cries and calls, and harmony came to be fabricated for the first time when some individuals discovered that the simultaneous execution of several sounds produced a noise which could be more agreeable than that which was made by the articulation of the same tones one after the other. Our first chords, that is, must have been devised by accident.

Le chant ainsi dépouillé de toute mélodie et consistant uniquement dans la force et la durée des sons dut suggerer enfin les moyens de le rendre plus sonore encore à l'aide des consonances. Plusieurs voix traînant sans cesse à l'unisson des sons d'une durée illimitée trouvèrent par hazard quelques accords qui renforçant le bruit le leur firent paroître agréable; et ainsi commença la pratique du discant et du contrepoint.²⁵⁵

254. In his article 'Musique' for the Encyclopédie, X, p. 901, Rousseau had already distinguished ancient from modern music largely in terms of the connection to poetry that had once been the central feature of musical expression but had now been lost: "Le grand vice de notre mesure, qui est peut-être un peu celui de la langue, est de n'avoir pas assez de rapport aux paroles....L'ancienne musique, toujours attachée à la Poésie, la suivait pas à pas, en exprimait exactement le nombre & la mesure, & ne s'appliquoit qu'à lui donner plus d'éclat & de majesté." A study by Duchez of 'Rousseau et "nos anciennes musiques"' which promises to be of great importance was due to appear at the end of 1975 in the Revue de musicologie; I have not yet had an opportunity to see this article.

255. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, p. 193. Cf. the appendix, p. 458.

Since these manufactured noises were divorced from human sentiment, however, it was clear for Rousseau that the harmonic intervals of Western music were a barbarous and gothic innovation which entirely emasculated all the melodic expressions that had served as our first language. "On sait que nôtre harmonie est une invention gothique",²⁵⁶ he laments. And just as the semantic substance of our earliest locutions was lost as poetry gave way to prose, so too - he adds in another passage which once figured in the Discours sur l'inégalité - our music came to be deprived of all its naturally vivid and spirited qualities when it was rendered speechless and supplanted by the lifeless modes and scales of harmony. For while our original melodies had been inspired by our own moral impetuosity, harmony, he maintains, was governed only by the physical principles of concordant vibrations.

La mélodie étant oubliée et l'attention du musicien s'étant tournée entièrement vers l'harmonie, tout se dirigea peu à peu sur ce nouvel objet; les genres, les modes, la gamme, tout reçut des faces nouvelles; ce furent les successions harmoniques qui réglèrent la marche des parties....l'accent oral en aït souffert, et...la musique aït perdu pour nous presque toute son énergie. Voila comment le chant devint par degrés un art entièrement séparé de la parole dont il tire son origine, comment les harmoniques des sons firent oublier les inflexions de la voix, et comment enfin, bornée à l'effet purement phisique du concours des vibrations, la musique se trouva privée des effets moraux qu'elle avoit produits quand elle étoit doublement la voix de la nature.²⁵⁷

256. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, p. 181. Cf. the following remarks from Neuchâtel Ms R 72, p. 27: "<L'> [notre] harmonie est une invention gothique et barbare." These very words were also incorporated by Rousseau in his article 'Harmonie' for the Dictionnaire de musique (see note 257 below). See also the Lettre sur la musique françoise, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, p. 716.

257. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, p. 195. Cf. the appendix, pp. 460-461. This passage concludes ch. xviii of the Essai;

It was impossible for men to comprehend the new and artificial patterns of their music, asserts Rousseau, unless they were first made acquainted with its rules, so that the laws of resonance which underlay the structure of gothic harmony had to be learnt before the chords that were derived from them could be appreciated in the proper way. Music which was divorced from the natural impulses that it had once expressed now came to occupy a place in the sphere of intellectual deliberations alone, and each person was obliged to consult a dictionary in order to be certain of the feelings that were supposed to be aroused in him by arrangements of harmonic chords.

in the rough draft of the Discours sur l'inégalité, however - the variants of which are provided in the appendix, notes 369-397 - it continues as in the Ms R 60 (at least up to note 417). See also the Essai, ch. xvii, p. 179, the passage from the Lettre sur la musique française cited in note 40 above, and the following passage from the article 'Harmonie' in Rousseau's Dictionnaire de musique (pp. 241-242): "Quand on songe que, de tous les peuples de la terre, qui tous ont une Musique & un Chant, les Européens sont les seuls qui aient une harmonie, des Accords, & qui trouvent ce mélange agréable; quand on songe que le monde a duré tant de siècles, sans que de toutes les Nations qui ont cultivé les Beaux-Arts, aucune ait connu cette harmonie; qu'aucun animal, qu'aucun oiseau, qu'aucun être dans la Nature ne produit d'autre Accord que l'Unisson, ni d'autre Musique que la Mélodie; que les langues orientales, si sonores, si musicales; que les oreilles Grecques, si délicates, si sensibles, exercées avec tant d'Art, n'ont jamais guidé ces peuples voluptueux & passionnés vers notre Harmonie; que, sans elle, leur Musique avoit des effets si prodigieux; qu'avec elle la nôtre en a de si foibles; qu'enfin il étoit réservé à des Peuples du Nord, dont les organes durs & grossiers sont plus touchés de l'éclat & du bruit des voix, que de la douceur des accens & de la Mélodie des inflexions, de faire cette grand découverte & de la donner pour principe à toutes les règles de l'Art; quand, dis-je, on fait attention à tout cela, il est bien difficile de ne pas soupçonner que toute notre Harmonie n'est qu'une invention gothique & barbare dont nous ne nous fussions jamais avisés, si nous eussions été plus sensibles aux véritables beautés de l'Art, & à la Musique vraiment naturelle." For slightly different interpretations of some of these (and a few other) passages in Rousseau's work about the corrupt character of harmony, see especially Derrida, De la grammatologie, pp. 301-304, and Verri, Origine delle lingue in Rousseau, pp. 126-131.

Les plus beaux chants à nôtre gré toucheront toujours médiocrement une oreille qui n'y sera point accoutumée; c'est une langue dont il faut avoir le Dictionnaire.²⁵⁸

Melody had lost its strength, Rousseau remarks, and "le calcul des intervalles fut substitué à la finesse des inflexions".²⁵⁹

With analytical dictionaries and the calculation of intervals the full corruption of both language from speech and music from song had in fact been accomplished. For a mode of discourse and a system of intonations that had each lost their original meaning and passion had also come to be completely abstracted from the human voice which had earlier been the sole medium of expression of language and music together. In the one case our chants had been transformed, through the contrivance of speechless harmonies, into a kind of music which was predominantly instrumental rather than vocal. Thus while ancient music had consisted of no pure instrumentation which stood apart from the inflexions of speech - insofar as in classical times melody and poetry were always conjoined²⁶⁰ - we in modern Europe are forced to tune our instruments by harmonic consonances which we have come to regard as the only constructions that are musically correct.

258. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xiiii, p. 155. Cf. the following passage from among the fragments about the history of morals in Neuchâtel Ms R 44 (ancienne cote 7868), p. 3, O.C.III, p. 558: "Chaque état, chaque profession a son dictionnaire particulier pour exprimer en termes décens les vices qui leur sont propres."

259. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, p. 187. Cf. the appendix, pp. 455-456. In the Essai the word 'inflexions' replaces the original 'intonations' of the Ms R 60. As Derrida has observed (see De la grammatologie, p. 354) Rousseau speaks in the Rêveries (O.C.I, p. 1047) of the necessity to conduct life itself at an even pace, without jumps or intervals: "Il n'y faut ni un repos absolu ni trop d'agitation, mais un mouvement uniforme et modéré qui n'ait ni secousses ni intervalles."

260. See the following passage from the Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, pp. 275-276: "La raison pourquoi les anciens n'avoient point de Musique purement instrumentale, c'est qu'ils n'avoient pas l'idée d'un chant sans mesure, ni d'une autre mesure que celle de la Poésie." This is one of the few passages of the Examen which do not appear in the Ms R 60.

Tous les peuples qui ont des instrumens à cordes sont forcés de les accorder par des consonances, mais ceux qui n'en ont pas ont dans leurs chants des inflexions que nous nommons fausses parce qu'elles n'entrent pas dans nôtre systême et que nous ne pouvons les noter.²⁶¹

In the second case our speech, reformulated through prose, had come to be delineated in script by alphabetical characters assembled from the decomposition into its elementary parts of an already spoiled language. For our own manner of writing, Rousseau observes,

est de décomposer la voix parlante en un certain nombre de parties élémentaires soit vocales, soit articulées, avec lesquelles on puisse former tous les mots et toutes les sillabes imaginables.²⁶²

Yet "l'art d'écrire ne tient point à celui de parler",²⁶³ he continues.

The art of writing does not truly represent what we say; on the contrary, writing destroys speech. It arose later and was from the start connected with needs which were different from those that gave rise to our earliest tonal utterances. As it developed it substituted its own exactitude for the expressive force of speech, and it came to be communicated through the medium of the prevailing definitions of words rather than in virtue of the inspired tones adopted by writers. Now it dominates our language to such a great extent that we no longer even speak but only read aloud to one another.

L'écriture, qui semble devoir fixer la langue est précisément ce qui l'altère; elle...substitue l'exactitude à l'expression. L'on rend ses sentimens quand on parle et ses idées quand on

261. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, p. 181. See also the Lettre sur la musique françoise, La Querelle des Bouffons, I, pp. 681 and 685-686.

262. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. v, p. 57.

263. Ibid., p. 61.

écrit. En écrivant on est forcé de prendre tous les mots dans l'acception commune; mais celui qui parle varie les acceptions par les tons, il les détermine comme il lui plait....On écrit les voix et non pas les sons: or dans une langue accentuée ce sont les sons, les accens, les inflexions de toute espèce qui font la plus grande énergie du langage, et rendent une phrase, d'ailleurs commune, propre seulement au lieu où elle est. Les moyens qu'on prend pour suppléer à celui-là étendent, allongent la langue écrite, et passant des livres dans le discours énervent la parole même. En disant tout comme on l'écrirait on ne fait plus que lire en parlant.²⁶⁴

Hence with the invention of writing and the fabrication of instrumental sounds we had removed the need for any human voice in the production of both language and music and had thereby made our natural means of self-expression almost utterly redundant.

264. Ibid., pp. 67-69. These remarks, foreshadowed to a large extent by some of the arguments in Plato's *Phaedrus*, are elaborated further in a fragment of Neuchâtel Ms R 19 (ancienne cote 7843), pp. 14r and 15r, which is printed in O.C.II, in connection with Rousseau's notes on 'Prononciation' that figure on pp. 13v and 14v of the same manuscript. See especially the following passages (O.C.II, pp. 1249-1251) which I have corrected slightly in accordance with the manuscript text, though without here noting the many variants: "Les langues sont faites pour être parlées, l'écriture ne sert que de supplément à la parole....Plus l'art d'écrire se perfectionne plus celui de parler est négligé....la langue en se perfectionnant dans les livres s'altère dans le discours. Elle est plus claire quand on écrit et plus sourde quand on parle, la syntaxe s'épure et l'harmonie se perd, la langue française devient de jour en jour plus philosophique et moins éloquente bientôt elle ne sera plus bonne qu'à lire et tout son prix sera dans les bibliothèques....Il est singulier qu'à mesure que les lettres se cultivent que les arts se multiplient que les liens de la société générale se resserrent, la langue se perfectionne tant par l'écriture et si peu par la parole, pourquoi les hommes en se rapprochant sont ils si soigneux de bien dire, de l'art de parler à distance, et si peu de l'art de parler de vive voix? C'est que le discours prononcé se noie au milieu de tant de parleurs et que la célébrité ne s'acquiert que par les livres." Much the same point of view, moreover, is expressed in the notes on 'Prononciation'. Thus, for instance, Rousseau states there (O.C.II, p. 1252) that "l'écriture n'est que la représentation de la parole, il est bizarre qu'on donne plus de soins à déterminer l'image que l'objet". The main fragment contains an imprecise reference to the final chapter of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (see note 341 below), and since it is preceded in the manuscript by copies of letters which Rousseau penned in February and March 1761 (see Dufour, II, pp. 139-140) it suggests that the text of the *Essai* may already have been finished by the spring of that year (see also note 219 above). The most comprehensive treatment of

It was in this fashion that Rousseau elaborated his objections to the theory of Rameau. The universal laws of harmony which Rameau had supposed to be prescribed by Nature were, in his view, established only through the degenerate conventions of a barbaric race. These rules of music were thus limited in scope, and they reflected nothing more than the insipid sensibilities of men who had constructed all their chords round artificial intervals which rather resembled the manufactured hierarchies that, in society, governed the relations between one person and the next. The Greeks, for instance, had absolutely no harmonic system of the kind which was now prevalent, and since their scales were formed from tetrachords instead of octaves they were quite unfamiliar with the sounds which we associate with minor thirds or major sixths.²⁶⁵ Indeed, only those persons who already shared the prejudices of Rameau could ever come to appreciate - or even to recognise - the harmonies which he believed were fixed and constant throughout the world.

M. Rameau prétend que les dessus d'une certaine simplicité suggèrent naturellement leurs basses et qu'un homme ayant l'oreille juste et non exercée entonnera naturellement cette basse. C'est là un préjugé de musicien, démenti par toute expérience. Non seulement celui qui

Rousseau's general distinction between spoken and written languages is provided by Derrida in his De la grammatologie (see especially pp. 321-326). This work also includes a useful chapter in which Rousseau's account of writing is distinguished from the theories of some of his most immediate precursors on the subject (in particular Warburton and Condillac - see pp. 384-388 and 398-407).

265. See the following reflections from the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xviii, pp. 181 and 183: "Le système des Grecs n'avoit absolument d'harmonique dans notre sens que ce qu'il falloit pour fixer l'accord des instrumens sur des consonances parfaites....Les Grecs divisoient leur Diagramme par tetracordes comme nous divisons nôtre clavier par octaves." See also the passage from the Examen de deux principes, CTWR, V, p. 271 cited on p. 291 above which is reiterated on p. 183 of the Essai, and the article 'Intervalle, en Musique' that Rousseau had earlier prepared for the Encyclopédie, VIII (1765), p. 839.

n'aura jamais entendu ni basse ni harmonie ne trouvera de lui-même ni cette harmonie ni cette basse, mais même elles lui déplairont si on les lui fait entendre, et il aimera beaucoup mieux le simple unisson.²⁶⁶

The laws of music, like the canons of language too, were established not by Nature but by men, and for Rousseau it was clear that they must differ quite as much as did the various communities in which they were produced.²⁶⁷

Rousseau's account of music in the Essai, to be sure, also forms a part of his more general social theory. For whereas on the one hand he believed that men had first devised languages of prose that were devoid of melody and cadence in order to communicate their needs and aspirations in society, on the other he regarded the principles of music that they had come to adopt as similarly fabricated in accordance with the patterns of their social life. Music had become instrumental partly for the reason that it could provide some satisfactions of a useful kind, and like the institutions which we recognised to be legitimate the contrived harmonies which we acknowledged to be proper were, in fact, entirely opposed to all our natural inclinations. We had bound ourselves to permanent relations

266. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xiiii, p. 157. These lines appear, with minor changes, in the article 'Harmonie' for the Dictionnaire de musique, p. 241 (see also note 160 above).

267. Already in his Lettre sur la musique française (La Querelle des Bouffons), p. 681), Rousseau had asserted that "toute Musique Nationale tire son principal caractère de la langue qui lui est propre, &...c'est principalement la prosodie de la langue qui constitue ce caractère". This was certainly not an uncommon belief among the major thinkers of the Enlightenment. Perhaps the most forthright statement of all with regard to the variations between languages in particular appears in Lamy's La Rhétorique ou l'art de parler, I.xvi, p. 89: "La nature agit de la même manière en tous les hommes; les peuples ayant donc differens langages, c'est une marque assurée que le langage n'est point l'ouvrage de leur nature, mais de leur liberté....Ce n'est donc point la nature que nous devons consulter pour apprendre d'elle quels termes on doit employer. L'usage est le maître & l'arbitre souverain des langues."

with our neighbours, but we had become equally encaptivated by the prescribed intervals of senseless tones, and the progressively more rigid application of both sets of rules could only have increased the moral degradation of mankind. It was Rousseau's view, then, that our faculties had been debased by our aesthetic and linguistic, as well as our political, conventions, so that the development of our music was to be linked directly to the history of our morals. The capacity to form artificial languages was a distinctively human trait, and the manner in which we had come to be tied to despotic terms and to dominant tones, respectively, set us off from all other creatures whose mode of life was prescribed by Nature alone.

La langue de convention n'appartient qu'à l'homme.
Voilà pourquoi l'homme fait des progrès soit en
bien soit en mal, et pourquoi les animaux n'en font
point.²⁶⁸

For Rousseau, therefore, men are at once the authors and the victims of the institutions which he describes in both the Discours sur l'inégalité and the Essai sur l'origine des langues. In the one work he argues that individuals had become willingly enslaved by a collection of "relations morales" while in the other he maintains that they had gradually become enthralled by a "calcul des intervalles", but in both cases the imposition of these rules must have produced a similar effect. Thus our exuberant and benevolent inclinations are described, in each of these two texts, as having come to be suppressed by the constraints of social life, and both the Discours and the Essai are to be understood as speculative reconstructions of the way in which men must have made themselves corrupt.

268. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. i, p. 39.

Now the conceptual relations between the Discours and the Essai have been subjected to critical scrutiny by Rousseau's interpreters on many occasions before. In a still-unpublished article which will bear the title 'L'inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai sur l'origine des langues',²⁶⁹ Charles Porset comments upon at least twenty-five authors who since the late-nineteenth century have produced over thirty works in which this matter is discussed either at length or in passing, and Porset's list - though remarkably full - is by no means exhaustive.²⁷⁰ Most of these scholars, moreover, have supplemented their accounts of the theoretical links between the two works with speculations about the chronological sequence in which they were produced, and it is a noteworthy feature of the controversy about the place of the Essai in Rousseau's writings that differences about the meaning of the text have so often been conjoined to disagreements about its dates of composition.²⁷¹ I do not propose, however, to examine that dispute in detail here, partly because I believe I have said enough about dates already, partly, too, because Porset has provided an excellent summary of the major contributions in his essay, and, above all, because - as I shall attempt to show in a moment - the whole of the controversy is built upon a fundamentally mistaken premise.

269. See note 157 above.

270. Perhaps the most important of the contributions which receive no mention in Porset's study are those of Léon (in his 'Rousseau et l'Etat moderne') and Starobinski (in his 'Rousseau et l'origine des langues') discussed below. It must be stressed here, however, that these works were not overlooked by Porset; they are left out of his account because it deals exclusively with writings which incorporate conjectures about the dates of composition of the Essai or about its temporal order with respect to the Discours. One rather curious feature about the matter of their substantive ties is the fact that Morel, who includes a section of eleven pages under the heading 'L'Essai sur l'origine des langues' in his 'Recherches sur les sources du Discours de l'inégalité', and who is cited by Léon as having considered the influence of Condillac upon the Essai, actually makes not the slightest reference or allusion to the work and apparently knew nothing at all about its contents.

271. See especially note 164 above.

In an essay on 'Rousseau et l'origine des langues' Jean Starobinski has remarked upon what is perhaps the most striking of all the similarities between the two texts. For they are, he writes,

Textes complémentaires, parfois légèrement dissonants, mais qui proposent au lecteur une même histoire sous une double version: le Discours de l'inégalité insère une histoire du langage à l'intérieur d'une histoire de la société; inversement, l'Essai sur l'origine des langues introduit une histoire de la société à l'intérieur d'une histoire du langage.²⁷²

These observations seem to me an eloquent statement of a fact which is absolutely clear and perfectly correct, as we might well expect from the scholar who has already produced much the finest edition of Discours that has ever appeared and who is now responsible for the forthcoming version of the Essai in the same collection of Rousseau's writings. It would certainly be foolish to treat Starobinski's claim here lightly, but I believe, nonetheless, that it is potentially rather misleading. For while it is true that the central subject of the Discours also forms an important secondary subject in the Essai it does not follow that the propositions about that subject in the two works are either conceptually or historically intertwined. There is a chapter in the Essai - indeed the longest in the work - in which Rousseau provides a kind of history of the development of mankind through different social stages, and many of the claims which he makes there bear an undeniable resemblance to the arguments that figure in his account of the genesis of society in the Discours. But an equal if not larger number of the ideas in that same chapter bear no resemblance

272. 'Rousseau et l'origine des langues', p. 281.

at all to his views in the Discours, and therein lies the difficulty of establishing any exact correlation between the two works. According to some commentators ch. ix of the Essai, entitled 'Formation des langues méridionales', is altogether compatible in substance with the main postulates of the Discours, and it actually provides a more rich and subtle portrait of the life and nature of primitive men than can be found in that text. According to different interpreters it is precisely the portrait of the savage state depicted in that chapter of the Essai which proves not only that the two works are opposed but even that one rebuts the other. The fact that in his 'Projet de préface' Rousseau refers to the Essai as at first comprising a fragment of the Discours, moreover, has been accommodated equally to both of these conflicting views. Thus Jacques Derrida, for instance, has on the one hand located two passages in the Discours that he believes might once have marked the point at which the fragment - consisting principally of ch. ix - had appeared in the original manuscript. Victor Goldschmidt, on the other hand, has no doubt but that the same chapter - so patently contradicted by the final version of the Discours - cannot be invoked to fill in the details of an argument from which it was deliberately expunged by its author.

The essential problem here is that both of these writers, and many others besides, have been too much impressed by the resemblance between the substance of the main theme of the Discours and the substance of the ninth chapter of the Essai. This chapter really does show that the Essai includes an account of the development of society in the context of an essay on language, just as the Discours contains a study of language within a treatment of the genesis of society. But it does not thereby demonstrate that the two works form different elements of the same theory or that one is a refutation of the other.

The chapter forms no part of the fragment of the Discours to which Rousseau refers, it neither improves upon, nor still less is superseded by, a quite separate work which he had already published several years before he turned to it, and I believe that nearly all the attempts to relate or contrast it to the Discours have been philosophically wide of the mark because they have lacked a proper historical foundation.

Most of the crucial terms in this dispute were actually fixed at the end of the nineteenth century by a scholar - Alfred Espinas - who knew nothing of Rousseau's projected preface but who nevertheless saw perfectly well that ch. ix of the Essai pertains to the same material as the Discours sur l'inégalité. In Espinas's judgment there could be no doubt but that the arguments about the natural state of man in the Discours and the Essai are inconsistent, and that for two main reasons. The first is that in ch. ix of the Essai Rousseau speaks of primitive man as "un animal féroce" and even regards his mode of life there as one of misery in an "état d'abrutissement",²⁷³ whereas in the Discours he describes the natural condition of man as innocent and happy. The second reason has to do with the fact that in this chapter of the Essai Rousseau portrays the original state as a kind of natural society inhabited by families, while in the Discours he depicts the earliest savages as having lived entirely apart from one another, with families being formed, as Espinas saw it, only through the intervention of contracts. In the light of these distinctions - and a few others of lesser importance too - it seemed to follow that the Discours and the Essai are incompatible works. Indeed since the Essai on this reading constitutes a critique of the thesis, put forward in the Discours, that the presocial state must have been the

273. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 93 and 103.

happiest of all for man, Espinas was convinced that it is the later of the two works, and he argued that it dates from the period 1754-56 when Rousseau was engaged in preparing other texts, notably the 'Economie politique' and the Manuscrit de Genève, which show a similar break with the Discours.²⁷⁴

Almost precisely the same features of the Essai and the Discours have recently been contrasted by Michel Launay in his Rousseau: Ecrivain politique, though for him the two points elaborated by Espinas actually show that it is the Discours which must have been produced later. "Sur deux points au moins", observes Launay,

l'Essai apparaît comme acceptant encore des idées reçues qui seront critiquées radicalement dans le Discours.

He claims, firstly, that in the Essai the terms "féroce" and "sanguinaire" as well as "pacifique" and "craintif" are all attached to our natural state, while in the Discours Rousseau has cleared away from his theory every vestige of the idea that there is some "méchanceté" in human nature, referring consistently instead to our original "bonté".²⁷⁵ His second claim, moreover, like that of Espinas, is based upon the discrepancy between the naturally sociable and familial life of man as recounted in the Essai, on the one hand, and the unnatural character of family relationships upon which Rousseau insists in the Discours, on the other. And the general perspective which Launay adopts about the connection between the two works amounts to the claim that the obscurities and contradictions which figure in the argument of the ninth chapter of the Essai are transcended by the

274. See 'Le "Système" de Rousseau', pp. 344-349. See also note 164 above.

275. See Rousseau: Ecrivain politique, pp. 209 and 210.

more coherent propositions of the Discours. For "le Discours sur l'inégalité", he concludes,

rend cohérentes, en les radicalisant, des positions encore confuses dans l'Essai.²⁷⁶

In 1971, in the same year that Launay's work was printed, Raymond Polin also produced a major study of the social theory of Rousseau in which again these points of distinction are described, though in this case the writer at least cautions us to be wary of comparisons, "parce que Rousseau ne se fixe pas le même but dans les deux oeuvres".²⁷⁷

Polin, nevertheless, shows little hesitation in finding the argument of the ninth chapter of the Essai "beaucoup plus sommaire" and "beaucoup moins novateur"²⁷⁸ than that of the Discours, and he envisages the text as resembling the first of Rousseau's two Discours more closely than it does the second and as containing elements which were to disappear from the philosophically more inventive Discours sur l'inégalité.²⁷⁹

The most recent of all these accounts of the discrepancies between the two works, finally, appears in Goldschmidt's massive Anthropologie et politique de Rousseau of 1974. Goldschmidt comments yet again upon the same two aspects of the ninth chapter of the Essai - that is the points about the natural ferocity and sociability of man which eighty years earlier Espinas had treated as contradictory with the ideas of the Discours - but like Launay and Polin he regards the Discours as

276. Ibid., p. 211. Lanson, too (see note 164 above), had earlier accepted most of Espinas's philosophical views about the contradictions between the two works, while reversing the temporal order proposed in the historical claims.

277. La politique de la solitude, p. 262.

278. Ibid., p. 264.

279. See *ibid.*, pp. 263, 264, and 270.

the later work. For Goldschmidt it must be the case either that the Essai is a refutation of the Discours or that the Discours supercedes the Essai.²⁸⁰ And a rather odd interpretation of the 'Projet de préface',²⁸¹ conjoined with an even stranger presumption that a work to which Rousseau "ne cesse de se référer" could only have been composed after another "qu'il hésite tant à publier", finally leave Goldschmidt in no doubt at all. "Le Discours expose une pensée plus élaborée, plus cohérente et plus mûre que l'Essai", he reflects. Since it would be absurd to suppose that the less elaborate, less coherent, and less mellow work could have been drafted later than the other, it is therefore certain that "l'antériorité du chapitre IX par rapport au Discours ne saurait être mise en question".²⁸²

Against this perspective of the tensions between the arguments of the Discours and the Essai stand an equal if not larger number of Rousseau's interpreters who regard the works as perfectly consistent. Here, too, we find some fairly wide variations and disagreements around a central theme. Paul Léon and Henri Grange, for instance, take up almost diametrically opposed positions while still sharing the view that the Discours and Essai incorporate coherent and complementary elements of a single theory. Léon, on the one hand, contends that the account of language which in the Essai Rousseau takes to be the first of all our social institutions provides a crucially important example of the genetic and evolutionary approach which marks his study of society and politics generally. On this interpretation the Essai furnishes "un enseignement pour la solution du problème social et

280. Anthropologie et politique, p. 434.

281. See note 218 above.

282. Anthropologie et politique, pp. 434-435.

politique dominé également par l'évolution d'autres institutions",²⁸³ and according to Léon it joins the Discours in providing a critique of other, more traditional, views of the development of speech and prose, including, especially, the religiously orthodox claims of Condillac. For Condillac's two sketches of the origin of language, first as a gift bestowed by God to Adam and Eve, and second as a skill slowly learnt by two children after the Deluge,²⁸⁴ were each intended, Léon believes, to be compatible with Scripture, and Rousseau's rejection of both of these views must therefore have been devised to challenge the authority of the Bible as well.²⁸⁵

Grange, on the other hand, regards the ideas of the Discours and the Essai as convergent precisely because they show that Rousseau's account of the development of both language and society was in each work intended to be reconciled with Scripture. He points to the passage in the ninth chapter of the Essai in which Rousseau remarks that "il est aisé de concilier l'autorité de l'Écriture avec les monumens antiques",²⁸⁶ and he maintains that Rousseau's objections to Condillac are not meant to challenge the authority of the Bible but rather to extend the view of a post-diluvian world from one populated only by two inarticulate children to one that constitutes a veritable state of nature.²⁸⁷ Focusing his attention mainly upon the numerous Biblical references in this chapter of the Essai - references which, it must be said, have been sadly neglected by most of Rousseau's modern interpreters - he thus concludes that the two works really comprise the

283. 'Rousseau et l'Etat moderne', p. 204.

284. See ch. III, p. 167.

285. See 'Rousseau et l'Etat moderne', p. 201.

286. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 103. This passage is noted by Grange in his 'L'Essai sur l'origine des langues dans ses rapports avec le Discours sur l'inégalité' on p. 293.

287. See *ibid.*

interconnected elements of a rational theodicy. "C'est en assimilant les descendants de Noé aux premiers hommes du second Discours", he writes,

que la trame du récit rousseauiste vient se raccorder à celle de la Genèse...Rousseau réintroduit dans l'histoire de l'humanité un déluge, voire un Paradis terrestre, et nous montre en filigrane, dans le déroulement des événements, l'accomplissement d'un plan prévu de toute éternité. La construction est ingénieuse, mais cette ingéniosité ne doit pas nous faire douter de la sincérité de son auteur.²⁸⁸

Michèle Duchet, moreover, pursues an altogether different path to a conclusion similar to that of Léon and Grange. In an article that was published in 1967 and on which Launay collaborated too - though he has now rejected while she has reaffirmed its central thesis²⁸⁹ - Duchet contends that the several epochs in our social development that Rousseau portrays in ch. ix of the Essai actually fill in the gaps between the periods which he describes in the Discours. She focuses her attention particularly upon the following remarks in the Essai where Rousseau speaks of the three most important epochs, based mainly upon different forms of livelihood, through which the human race has passed:

Des trois manières de vivre possible à l'homme, savoir la chasse, le soin des troupeaux et l'agriculture...se rapportent les trois états de l'homme considéré par rapport à la société. Le sauvage est chasseur, le barbare est berger, l'homme civil est laboureur.²⁹⁰

288. Ibid., pp. 294 and 307.

289. Launay's contribution to the article 'Synchronie et diachronie' consists mainly of a transcription of a fragment of the Discours sur l'inégalité which I have discussed already (see ch. III, notes 143, 237, and 238). His objections to Duchet's claims about the compatibility of the Discours with the Essai are incorporated in his Rousseau: Ecrivain politique, pp. 207-208, while her rejoinder appears in her Anthropologie et histoire, pp. 322-326. See also note 164 above.

290. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 105 and 107. See also note 250 above.

According to Duchet this passage, and the details of the exposition that accompany it, provide a fuller picture of the transitional phase between the establishment of families and the formation of societies which in the Discours is described only "très rapidement"²⁹¹ as delimited by two great revolutions.²⁹² Thus, Duchet observes,

La chronologie de l'Essai comble les vides de celle du Discours, elle ne la contredit pas: la préhistoire du langage se situe tout entière entre les deux "révolutions" dont parle le Discours. En retard sur la première, mais en avance sur la seconde, elle a son propre cycle de révolutions.²⁹³

In short, on this interpretation, the ninth chapter of the Essai develops a certain number of ideas which the Discours "avait négligé d'approfondir".²⁹⁴

Derrida goes even further along this path in his De la grammatologie, also published in 1967. For whereas Duchet only regards the Essai as supplying an account of the stages in our social development which enhances and refines the abbreviated version of the Discours, Derrida identifies two passages in the Discours with which he supposes the very text of the ninth chapter of the Essai might once have been merged. In the last lines of his eighth chapter, for one thing, Rousseau states that he will next proceed upon a long digression with regard to the influence of climate in the formation of societies, a subject which in fact occupies his attention throughout the following three chapters.

291. 'Synchronie et diachronie', p. 434.

292. In the Discours sur l'inégalité Rousseau is quite explicit in his reference to these two revolutions, of which the first is marked by the establishment of families and the second by the introduction of metallurgy and agriculture (see O.C.III; pp. 167 and 171, and ch. III, pp. 215-216).

293. 'Synchronie et diachronie', pp. 434-435.

294. Anthropologie et histoire, p. 324.

Le genre humain né dans les pays chauds s'étend de là dans les pays froids....Tâchons de suivre dans nos recherches l'ordre même de la nature. J'entre dans une longue digression sur un sujet si rebattu qu'il en est trivial, mais auquel il faut toujours revenir malgré qu'on en ait pour trouver l'origine des institutions humaines.²⁹⁵

We might well imagine, claims Derrida, that this passage was initially connected as a note to that point in the Discours at which Rousseau suggests that the peoples of the north are generally more industrious than those of the south,

comme si la Nature vouloit ainsi égaliser les choses, en donnant aux Esprits la fertilité qu'elle refuse à la Terre.²⁹⁶

Alternatively, there is another place in the Discours where Rousseau, after interrupting his argument to consider Condillac's account of the genesis of languages, and after dispensing with one false supposition about the parental teaching of our first figures of speech,²⁹⁷ invites his readers to consider a second problem.

Supposons cette première difficulté vaincue: Franchissons pour un moment l'espace immense qui dut se trouver entre le pur état de Nature et le besoin des Langues; et cherchons, en les supposant nécessaires, comment elles purent commencer à s'établir.²⁹⁸

The account of the genesis of our social attributes which Rousseau puts forward in the Essai might equally have been intended, in Derrida's

295. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. viii, p. 89.

296. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 144. See also note 247 above. Derrida's suggestion that the two passages form a conceivable "jointure précise" between the Essai and the Discours is developed in De la grammatologie, pp. 313-314.

297. The passage is cited in ch. III, pp. 163-164.

298. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 147.

view,²⁹⁹ to appear at this point of the Discours, its propositions filling in "l'espace immense" which is passed over in the published text. On such a reading the ninth chapter of the Essai, or at least some part of it, would originally have constituted an extended treatment of a point raised in a digression from the main body of Rousseau's work, forming a fragment which would thus clearly have been "trop long et hors de place" in the final version of the Discours. Derrida's general stance, then, is that the Essai provides a more comprehensive portrait of "la société naissante" than can be found in the Discours, where Rousseau's main concerns are to depict the pure state of nature and to consider, in detail, only the very beginning of its corruption.³⁰⁰ He makes abundantly clear in his study that he regards the two works as consistent,³⁰¹ and whereas scholars who take the opposite view - such as Polin - generally regard the Essai as "plus sommaire", Derrida joins the camp of those who hold the text to be "plus riche".³⁰²

With reference to these eight commentaries alone among a much larger corpus of interpretations we therefore find ourselves confronted by a most confusing array of views, with at least three major arguments in favour of the postulate that the Discours and the Essai are conceptually divergent, and three in support of the thesis that they are compatible. That is to say, according to Espinas the Essai constitutes a refutation of the Discours, in the verdict of Goldschmidt it is the Discours which contradicts the Essai, while for Launay and Polin the Discours puts forward a more coherent and profound exposition of some aspects of the theory outlined in the Essai's ninth chapter, while at

299. See De la grammatologie, pp. 329-330.

300. See *ibid.*, pp. 358 and 360.

301. See, for instance, *ibid.*, pp. 268, 329, and 360.

302. *Ibid.*, p. 356.

the same time rejecting others. On the opposite side Léon holds the two works to be an interconnected critique of Scripture, Grange sees them as correlative aspects of a rational theodicy, and Duchet and Derrida, in turn, understand the theory of the ninth chapter of the Essai as completing and enriching some ideas of which the Discours provides only a sketch. What, then, are we to make of this dispute? Do any of these accounts of Rousseau's two most striking works about the genesis of society actually provide us with a proper grasp of the connections between them?

My own opinion is that the clash revolves around dichotomies and parallels that are, for the most part, illusory rather than real. I believe that each of these approaches introduces specious comparisons and unwarranted contrasts which are then employed to solve some rather inconsequential problems, so that in the end the conundrums and ambiguities which they seek to explain are less those of the relation between the Discours and the Essai than those of the perspectives which his interpreters have fabricated for themselves. There are, to be sure, some very attractive features in all these accounts, and some of the juxtapositions of ideas - especially those of Duchet and Derrida - seem to me remarkable both for the meticulous scholarship which underlies them and for the illumination which they shed upon particular aspects of the social and linguistic thought of Rousseau. Yet most of the historical speculations in this controversy are simply false. Goldschmidt and Derrida, for instance, are mistaken to suppose that the fragment of the Discours upon which Rousseau comments in his projected preface to the Essai must have included a draft of the ninth chapter of the later work, since, as we have seen already,³⁰³ that fragment was to

303. See pp. 310-326 above.

form the central section of the Ms R 60 which came to be incorporated only in the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of the Essai.

Goldschmidt, Launay, and Polin, moreover, are in error when they maintain that the ninth chapter could only have been composed some time before the bulk of the Discours was ready, insofar as all the evidence which has survived on this point indicates that it was drafted later, possibly some six years later.³⁰⁴

The associations between the ideas in the two texts which have been made by these scholars appear to lack a solid conceptual foundation as well. Grange, for instance, is most perceptive in his account of the Biblical citations and allusions in the ninth chapter of the Essai, but his interpretation of the Discours is entirely unconvincing. There are practically no passages at all in that text which have any bearing upon Rousseau's faith in Scripture, apart, of course, from the observations at the beginning of the piece that his reconstruction of the past will be made without reference to the word and work of God.

Il est évident, par la lecture des Livres Sacrés, que le premier Homme ayant reçu immédiatement de Dieu des lumières et des Preceptes, n'étoit point lui-même dans...le pur état de Nature....La Religion nous ordonne de croire que Dieu lui-même ayant tiré les Hommes de l'état de Nature, ils sont inégaux parce qu'il a voulu qu'ils le fussent; mais elle ne nous défend pas de former des conjectures tirées de la seule nature de le homme.³⁰⁵

If Grange had taken stock of the manuscript passage of the Discours in which Rousseau reflects upon the idolatry of priests and the religious superstition of their followers³⁰⁶ would he still have

304. See pp. 315-316 and especially note 219 above.

305. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, pp. 132-133. See also ch. III, pp. 222-224.

306. See ch. III, note 237.

wished to claim that the tract, the construction of which he already admits is "ingénieuse" on his reading, was really designed to express Rousseau's belief in the Bible? Léon, on the other hand, is certainly right to view the Discours as incorporating a critique of Condillac's theory of language in the context of a study of society, but the social philosophy of the Essai, and the linguistic theory in which it is encased there, both consist of some quite different elements, and we find no refutation of Condillac at all in that work - no challenge to any of his ideas, nor even any mention of his name. And even if we do not dispute Léon's claims that the arguments of the Discours were conceived to criticise Scripture rather than just to disregard it, how are we to conjoin Rousseau's propositions in that text with his views in the Essai, where the authority of the Bible is invoked frequently to sustain his case? Does this distinction not at least suggest that the cases put forward in each work might be different?

For his part Derrida constructs his arguments largely upon the presumption that the ninth chapter of the Essai may be located within the actual corpus of the Discours. In fact, however, there is not the slightest evidence to support this either. If it were true it would mean that the Discours initially contained two very long and major fragments in addition to the minor ones that have survived,³⁰⁷ of which the first has had a history - through the Ms R 60 and the Essai - that can be investigated in detail, while the second has vanished, without manuscript trace or a supporting document or reference anywhere at all in Rousseau's papers, appearing only in its final form as the ninth chapter of the Essai. If a scholar ever manages to uncover a

307. See ch. III, pp. 193-194 and 221-224.

rough draft of this chapter that will be a most important discovery in Rousseau studies; but there is no reason to believe that such a manuscript would also prove to be a part of the original version of the Discours. In any event - since it is allowed in De la grammatologie that there is a "transition" between Rousseau's focus upon "la pure nature" in the Discours and his interest in "la société naissante" in ch. ix of the Essai³⁰⁸ - why is Derrida so determined to find a home for the second work in the confines of the first?

Duchet's proposal that the chapter fills the lacunae between some points which in the Discours Rousseau "avait négligé d'approfondir" should also be treated with the greatest circumspection, since, for much the same reasons that apply to the account of Derrida, it must be emphasised that the theoretical gaps which we suppose are evident in one work cannot be bridged by elements drawn from a quite different study. If it were possible to put forward a composite social theory of Rousseau so that all his writings could ultimately be weaved together as fragments of one monumental treatise, then why should we not regard ch. ix of the Essai as filling its proper place, for instance, in a preface to ch. vi of the first book of the Contrat social, where Rousseau makes the following remarks about the natural state of man?

Je suppose les hommes parvenus à ce point où les obstacles qui nuisent à leur conservation dans l'état de nature, l'emportent par leur résistance sur les forces que chaque individu peut employer pour se maintenir dans cet état. Alors cet état primitif ne peut plus subsister, et le genre humain périroit s'il ne changeoit sa maniere d'être.³⁰⁹

Would it not be conceivable, if we follow the approach of Derrida and Duchet, for us to regard the ninth chapter as explaining in detail what

308. See De la grammatologie, p. 360.

309. Contrat social, I.vi, O.C.III, p. 360.

Rousseau means by his cryptic "ce point" and "sa maniere d'être" in this passage? At least that intercalation would have one clear virtue in its favour, for it would diminish the interval between the dates of composition of works that - in the example - we suppose to be related, by joining the Essai to a text which Rousseau may have been preparing at about the same time rather than to one which he had completed a few years before. Of course this juxtaposition has very little to commend it in fact - as would be the case, too, if we were to refer to the Discours to elucidate the passage - quite simply because the Essai and the Contrat are distinct works, produced at different times, inspired by different problems, containing different theoretical perspectives. And that is precisely my point against Derrida and Duchet too.

Above all, the conceptual dichotomies initially proposed by Espinas, and later adopted by nearly every one of the scholars who regard the Discours and the Essai as theoretically inconsistent, seem to me either arbitrary or fallacious. It is true that in the ninth chapter of the Essai Rousseau describes the earliest men as "féroces", "violens", and "sanguinaires", and the condition in which they live he there portrays as an "état d'abrutissement" and even an "état de guerre".³¹⁰ But he attaches the term "féroce" to the original savage in the Discours sur l'inégalité as well, and in that work he also remarks upon the "férocité" and "grossièreté des premiers âges" when each man must have been surrounded by enemies and was "toujours voisin du danger".³¹¹ In the Discours he maintains that the

310. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 95, 97, and 103.

311. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, pp. 136, 137, 140, 160, and 168.

inhabitants of the natural state "ne pouvoient être ni bons ni méchants, et n'avoient ni vices ni vertus",³¹² and in the ninth chapter of the Essai he claims that at first a person ruled only by the laws of Nature "ne peut être ni clement ni juste ni pitoyable: il ne peut pas non plus être méchant et vindicatif".³¹³ Where is the contradiction between these passages? In both works it is perfectly clear that men in the beginning must, for Rousseau, have been "plûtôt farouches que méchants".³¹⁴ Yet Polin, for instance, suggests that the creatures depicted at the start of the ninth chapter of the Essai "sont décrits à la façon de Hobbes",³¹⁵ whereas the account of man's natural condition which Rousseau subsequently developed in the Discours is sharply critical of the Hobbesian perspective of a state of war of all against all. The justification for this supposed cleavage escapes me altogether. There is no mention of Hobbes or his political ideas at any point in the Essai, nor is there a parallel between the pursuit of gain, safety, and reputation which are held to make men quarrel in the one theory and "la crainte et la foiblesse" that are said to make them cruel in the other. While in the Discours Rousseau was actually mistaken in his assertion that "Hobbes prétend que l'homme est naturellement intrépide, et ne cherche qu'à attaquer, et combattre",³¹⁶ that thesis imputed to him, even on Polin's reading, is contradicted in both works. For in the Discours, that is, Rousseau

312. Ibid., p. 152.

313. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 93. It must be allowed that the terms "ni pitoyable" in this passage are somewhat difficult to reconcile with Rousseau's conception of pity in the Discours sur l'inégalité (see note 242 above).

314. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 157.

315. La politique de la solitude, p. 263.

316. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 136. See also ch. III, pp. 190-191 and note 195.

maintains that men are not naturally aggressive at all, and in the ninth chapter of the Essai he argues that such conflict as did prevail among the first members of our race must have been inspired by fear. Whereas Hobbes, moreover, speaks of the state of war as so "miserable" and "horrible" that no calamities in political society could be worse, for Rousseau, in both the Discours and the Essai together, it is the social life of man which constitutes "la véritable misère".³¹⁷ I cannot imagine, Rousseau remarks in the Essai, how men could ever have come to renounce their primitive liberty, "pour s'imposer sans nécessité l'esclavage, les travaux, les misères inséparables de l'état social".³¹⁸ Is there any inconsistency here between the Discours and the Essai? The original state of man, Rousseau reflects in the latter work, was "le siècle d'or". Though violence and bloodshed must be counted among its features it was populated by men who were also marked by "des coeurs...tendres" and by "tant d'amour pour leur famille".³¹⁹ And since savages there would have met each other only rarely it must have been a state of war in which, in reality, "toute la terre étoit en paix".³²⁰

It is equally misleading to place special emphasis upon the difference between the family relationships which Rousseau delineates in the ninth chapter of the Essai and the natural isolation of the savage described in the Discours. Espinas and his followers have all noticed that in the Discours Rousseau recounts that "l'établissement et la distinction des familles" must have transpired not in the state

317. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, p. 152.

318. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 109.

319. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

320. *Ibid.*, p. 97.

of nature itself but at the time of the first revolution which marked men's departure from that state and their entry into "ce nouvel état",³²¹ whereas in the Essai he identifies the family directly with "les premiers tems".³²² Even if we allow, however, that the terms "les premiers tems" in the one work were intended to refer precisely to the natural state depicted in the other - a presumption which I have been at pains to challenge here - the contrast that some of Rousseau's interpreters have drawn between these two texts is far too sharp. For in both cases Rousseau emphasises that men were originally dispersed and must have lived essentially apart from one another without fixed settlements at all. Thus while in the Discours the savage is described as fending for himself, "seul", "solitaire", and "sans liaisons",³²³ in the Essai the primordial representatives of our race are seen to have been "épars", "séparés", and "dispersés", with the individual at first "abandonné seul".³²⁴ The fact that Rousseau generally refers to 'l'homme' in the Discours and to 'les hommes' in the ninth chapter of the Essai might be thought to lend some weight to the distinctions drawn by Espinas, Launay, Polin, and Goldschmidt, but on the other hand we must not forget that the men portrayed in the Essai "ne se connoissoient pas eux-mêmes" in their "vaste desert du monde".³²⁵ It is quite erroneous, on the part of Launay, for example, to maintain that Rousseau's arguments in the Discours repudiate the thesis of the Essai that the original family ties of a man tend "à rendre 'naturelle' la sociabilité".³²⁶ For

321. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, pp. 167 and 168.

322. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 91.

323. Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, pp. 140, 160, and 168.

324. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 91, 93, 95, 101, 103, and 109.

325. *Ibid.*, pp. 95 and 103.

326. Rousseau: Ecrivain politique, p. 211.

Rousseau insists often enough in his ninth chapter that men could not in the beginning have been drawn together by any gregarious, or corporate, or communal inclinations. "Ils n'étoient liés par aucune idée de fraternité commune", he contends. Our ancestors showed no sign of any "affections sociales", and the needs of each person, "loin de le rapprocher de ses semblables l'en éloignoient".³²⁷ There must have been blood ties, says Rousseau, but no social bonds, and a family would have been perpetuated through the sexual activities of its own members rather than extended in associations with other families. Incest, that is, ensured the survival of our species before sociability brought about its ruin.

Il y avoit des familles, mais il n'y avoit point de Nations; il y avoit des langues domestiques, mais il n'y avoit point de langues populaires.... Chaque famille se suffisoit à elle-même et se perpetuoit par son seul sang. Les enfans nés des mêmes parens croissoient ensemble...le penchant naturel suffisoit pour les unir, l'instinct tenoit lieu de passion, l'habitude tenoit lieu de préférence, on devenoit maris et femmes sans avoir cessé d'être frère et sœur.³²⁸

This is not precisely the same argument that Rousseau employs in the Discours, to be sure, but neither is it a thesis which refutes or is contradicted by any propositions in that work.

The advocates on both sides of this controversy, then, have in my view misinterpreted the real connections between the Discours sur l'inégalité and the Essai sur l'origine des langues. Of course it would be foolish to deny the importance of all the similarities and contrasts which these scholars have drawn between the arguments put forward in each work. Indeed to the list I have thus far considered we might even add a few further analogies and differences between the

327. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 91, 93, and 95.

328. Ibid., p. 125.

Discours and the ninth chapter of the Essai which are worthy of note, for instance the fact that, on the one hand, Rousseau in both cases maintains that our earliest societies must have been established as a result of natural accidents,³²⁹ and, on the other, the fact that in the Discours he depicts the original savage as a herbivore whereas in the Essai he portrays the first men as carnivorous.³³⁰ But similarities and contrasts between ideas in different works are not equivalent to correlations and inconsistencies within one theory. In the first book of the Contrat social Rousseau speaks of the family as the only natural society in terms which are similar to those he employs at the beginning of the ninth chapter of the Essai,³³¹ but it does not thereby follow that the Essai and the Contrat social are on this point conceptually intertwined. In the second book of Emile he states that "le goût de la viande n'est pas naturel à l'homme"³³² whereas in the Essai "on trouve les premiers barbares voraces et carnaciers",³³³ but neither proposition is a refutation of the other. Ideas which resemble one another cannot be taken to hold together as elements of a coherent theory just because they are advanced by the same author, nor are contradictions formed by disparate elements of distinct theories which he propounds.

329. Cf. the passages from the Discours sur l'inégalité, O.C.III, pp. 168-169 and the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 113, cited in ch. III, pp. 210-211.

330. Cf. the Discours sur l'inégalité, note v, O.C.III, pp. 198-199, and the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, pp. 99 and 103.

331. Cf. the Contrat social, I.ii, O.C.III, p. 352, and the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 91.

332. Emile, Livre II, O.C.IV, p. 411.

333. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. ix, p. 99.

Each of the interpretations I have discussed here provides a more or less misleading account of the conceptual ties between the Discours and the Essai because in every case it has been assumed that sections from the Discours must be juxtaposed with selected passages from the ninth chapter of the Essai. But, as we have seen, that chapter was actually drafted some time after the Discours had been completed, and it does not at all refer to the earlier work. It constitutes a new and separate theory of the development of society, and it pertains to a set of problems which are different from those that Rousseau had treated before. It is neither an elaboration of the Discours nor a departure from that work, and any attempt to locate theoretical bonds or breaks between them can only be focused upon connections or the lack of connections which Rousseau simply never had it in mind to make. We can only establish conceptual ties and contradictions between arguments which were at least intended by their author to form parts of the same system of ideas, and in any instance we can only determine the relevant facts about this matter through a philosophical study of the meaning of his statements which, in turn, requires an historical investigation of their place in the corpus of his writings.

In fact we do have historical evidence about the connection between the Discours and the Essai, but that evidence points to a link formed, not by ch. ix, but by chs. xviii and xviii, of the later work. It is to the Ms R 60 that we must turn if we wish to see what became of the fragment of the Discours of which Rousseau speaks in his projected preface. The arguments in the Ms R 60 about our linguistic and musical decline bear a resemblance of substance and structure to the Discours that is in fact a historical relation as well, and the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of the Essai which

incorporate a reconstituted version of these arguments³³⁴ are thus to be understood as having been conceived not only at the same time as the Discours but even as a very part of that work. They recount the fate of our music and language in terms which are perfectly appropriate in the context of a general theory of the degeneration of morals, and they form a bond between the Discours and the Essai which is more clear and fitting than all the bridges that have been constructed by these commentators who have addressed themselves only to the ninth chapter of the later text. If there is one contribution to Rousseau studies which I might hope to make here it would be that of helping to turn the attention of scholars away from comparisons of two accounts of the formation of society which Rousseau produced at different times to some further research into the connections between a perspective of music and language, on the one hand, and a view of society and morals, on the other, which he propounded together when he drafted the Discours sur l'inégalité.³³⁵ For in Rousseau's formulation of what must at first have been a substantial section of the Discours, and of what became the

334. It should perhaps be noted here that aside from those passages in the central section of the Ms R 60 which came to figure in the Essai sur l'origine des langues there are a few others which are echoed elsewhere in Rousseau's writings. Thus, for instance, a number of phrases among the remarks about Hector, Andromache, and Astyanax that appear in the appendix on p. 463 are repeated in Emile, Livre I, O.C.IV, p. 283. But the resemblance between the passages is not generally so close as to prove that the text of the Ms R 60 constitutes a draft of Emile, and in cases of this kind, since it did not seem to me correct to describe the differences as variants, I have left them out of the appendix.

335. Some of the interpreters of the social philosophy of the Essai, most notably Derrida (see especially pp. 298-309 of De la grammatologie) and Verri (see his Origine delle lingue in Rousseau, pp. 123-132), have already addressed themselves to some important issues about the connection between the ninth chapter and those chapters which deal with the nature and origins of music. But the task of correlating Rousseau's reflections on that subject with his ideas in the Discours has been very seldom undertaken by any scholars.

crowning chapters of the largest single part of the Essai,³³⁶ his critique of the musical philosophy of Rameau occupies a central place.

There are, moreover, some striking features which associate the chapters on music in the Essai to the second chapter of the Manuscrit de Genève - features which I believe actually establish theoretical affinities between Rousseau's ideas that are more close than those that join the ninth chapter of the Essai to the Discours. For just as in the Essai he insists that our rules of harmony could not have been prescribed by Nature, so too in the Manuscrit his chief claim is that our principles of obligation could never be deduced from natural law.³³⁷ In the same way that men had come to adopt all their musical conventions they must also have established all their duties by consent, and the patterns of their speech and song, together with the standards of their conduct, were unavoidably as diverse in form as the disparate communities in which they must in fact have been produced. If there were some kind of natural society of men throughout the world then perhaps Rameau's scheme of harmony would truly apply to all individuals equally. We should then be able to communicate our thoughts in a universal language and at the same time appreciate tonal combinations to which each of us was accustomed already, so that the rules of speech and song together would be general in their scope. Yet such a society could never exist, Rousseau reflects in the Manuscrit, for its establishment and survival must depend upon

336. Of course most of the eight chapters on music in the Essai must have been drafted - like the rest of the work - after Rousseau had completed the Discours. As Porset notes in his 'L'inquiétante étrangeté' de l'Essai' these chapters constitute nearly a third of the entire text. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to that excellent essay of Monsieur Porset; my remarks here about the putative ties between the Discours and the Essai have profited much from his work.

337. See the passages from the Manuscrit de Genève cited in ch. II, pp. 93-94.

the willingness of every person to accept the paramount duty of caring for the human race as a whole even at the expense of meeting his own particular needs, and men in that condition would have no real interest in adopting either political or linguistic maxims which might not always serve to their best advantage.

Si la société générale existoit ailleurs que dans les systèmes des Philosophes, elle seroit...un Etre moral qui aurait des qualités propres et distinctes de celles des Etres particuliers qui la constituentIl y auroit une langue universelle que la nature apprendroit à tous les hommes, et qui seroit le premier instrument de leur mutuelle communication: Il y auroit une sorte de sensorium commun qui serviroit à la correspondance de toutes les partiesMais où est l'homme qui puisse ainsi se séparer de lui même et si le soin de sa propre conservation est le premier précepte de la nature, peut on le forcer de regarder ainsi l'espèce en général pour s'imposer, à lui, des devoirs dont il ne voit point la liaison avec sa constitution particulière? Les objections précédentes ne subsistent-elles pas toujours?³³⁸

Most of the arguments that constitute the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of the Essai were initially set forth by Rousseau in 1754 as a critique of some aspects of Rameau's musical theory and were then developed in the following year as a reply to an attack which Rameau had levelled against a number of the articles he had written for the first four volumes of the Encyclopédie. The second chapter of the Manuscrit de Genève, on the other hand, was probably completed by Rousseau in 1756, and it was certainly designed to contradict the article 'Droit naturel' that had appeared, again in the Encyclopédie, in volume five. Thus the earliest sections of the Essai and the Manuscrit that we can date were produced, at least in part, as refutations of other compositions by Rameau and Diderot, respectively, and

338. Manuscrit de Genève, O.C.III, pp. 284 and 286 See also Gossman, 'Time and history in Rousseau', pp. 323-325.

in order to understand the meaning of Rousseau's ideas in both works we must, as I have tried to show throughout this study, take some notice of these circumstances under which they were conceived.

The relation between our musical and political conventions is, indeed, discussed by Rousseau in the text of the Essai itself. For in the final chapter of his work, which he entitled 'Rapport des langues aux gouvernemens', he maintains that languages which have come to be separated from music are inimical to freedom.

Il y a des langues favorables à la liberté; ce sont les langues sonores, prosodiques, harmonieuses, dont on distingue le discours de fort loin. Les nôtres sont faites pour le bourdonnement des Divans....Or je dis que toute langue avec laquelle on ne peut pas se faire entendre au peuple assemblé est une langue servile; il est impossible qu'un peuple demeure libre et qu'il parle cette langue-là.³³⁹

A prosaic rhetoric thus inspired servile manners, and speech which was made hollow by its lack of tone and rhythm also made for hollow men. The languages of modern Europe have become suitable only for discourse at close quarters, in the guise of an ineffectual chatter

339. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xx, pp. 199 and 201. D'Alembert raised the question of the link between political liberty and music in the very title of his De la liberté de la musique, a work which Rousseau had almost certainly read when he prepared this chapter of the Essai (see p. 201 of the text and note 200 above). For the most important of d'Alembert's remarks about the subject see the following passage in La Querelle des Bouffons, III, pp. 2216-2217: "Je m'étonne...que dans un siècle où tant de plumes se sont exercées sur la liberté du commerce, sur la liberté des mariages, sur la liberté de la presse, sur la liberté des toiles peintes, personne n'ait encore écrit sur LA LIBERTÉ DE LA MUSIQUE. Être esclaves dans nos divertissemens, ce seroit, pour employer l'expression d'un Écrivain Philosophe, dégénérer non-seulement de la liberté, mais de la servitude même. 'Vous avez la vue bien courte, répondent nos grands Politiques; toutes les libertés se tiennent, & sont également dangereuses. La liberté de la Musique suppose celle de sentir, la liberté de sentir entraîne celle de penser, la liberté de penser celle d'agir, & la liberté d'agir est la ruine des États. Conservons donc l'Opéra tel qu'il est, si nous avons envie de conserver le Royaume; & mettons un frein à la licence de chanter, si nous ne voulons pas que celle de parler la suive bientôt'."

of persons who can now only murmur feebly to one another with voices which lack inflexion, and therefore spirit and passion too. Hence as our speech has come to be deprived of its musical traits it has lost all its expressive force and has been transformed into the protracted but faint mutterings of individuals who have no strength of character or purpose. For such men the most appropriate utterances are also the most quiet; their form of discourse - emptied of melody - is almost devoid of sounds altogether, and their unremitting and stifling hum is hardly distinguishable from silence.

But if this is the private aspect of our contemporary languages their public manifestation, according to Rousseau, is more oppressive still.³⁴⁰ For men who govern others but have nothing to say themselves can do little else when the people are assembled apart from shout and preach to them, and their pronouncements, delivered as unmeasured speeches, are at once intemperate and unintelligible. The proclamations of our rulers and the supplications of our priests continually abuse our sensibilities and make us numb, and tortuous harangues and sermons, delivered by both religious and secular charlatans, have become the sole form of popular oratory in the modern world.

Quels discours restent donc à faire au peuple
assemblé? Des sermons. Et qu'importe à
ceux qui les font de persuader le peuple,
puisque ce n'est pas lui qui nomme aux
bénéfices?...Nos prédicateurs se tourmentent
se mettent en sueur dans les Temples, sans
qu'on sache rien de ce qu'ils ont dit. Après
s'être épuisés à crier pendant une heure, ils
sortent de la chaire à demi-morts. Assurément
ce n'étoit pas la peine de prendre tant de
fatigue....Qu'on suppose un homme harangant en

340. The important distinction between private and public communication in ch. xx of the *Essai* has already been noted by Barbara Guetti in 'The Double Voice of Nature: Rousseau's *Essai sur l'origine des langues*', *Modern Language Notes*, LXXXIV (1969), p. 865.

françois le peuple de Paris dans la place de Vendosme. Qu'il crie à pleine tête, on entendra qu'il crie, on ne distinguera pas un mot... Si les charlatans des places abondent moins en France qu'en Italie, ce n'est pas qu'en France ils soient moins écoutés, c'est seulement qu'on ne les entend pas si bien.³⁴¹

The private and public faces of language thus provide an accurate portrait of the utterly degraded state into which our societies have fallen. Conversation has become covert, political discourse has become barren, and we have all succeeded in bringing our original manner of speaking up to date only by becoming the speechless auditors of those who rule by diatribes and recitations from the pulpit. In fact since even these perverted forms of rhetoric are no longer necessary to keep us in our allotted places, the rulers of modern states have correctly come to understand that they can maintain their authority without arranging any popular meetings or assemblies at all. They have only to direct the attention of their subjects to the many things which they might exchange with each other and away from the few thoughts that they might still wish to communicate, so that in their latest form the vocal intonations which once expressed our pleasures have been reconstituted as the terms that denote our trades. Whereas the words 'aimez-moi' must in the past have been superseded by 'aidez-moi',³⁴² now all that we say to each other is 'donnez de l'argent'.

341. Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. xx, pp. 197 and 199-201. Cf. the following passage from Neuchâtel Ms R 19 (O.C.II, p. 1250), which contains an elliptical reference to this chapter of the Essai: "La raison de cet abus est comme je l'ai dit ailleurs dans la forme qu'on[t] pris les gouvernemens et qui fait qu'on n'a plus rien à dire au peuple que les choses du monde qui le touchent le moins et qu'il se soucie le moins d'entendre. Des sermons des discours académiques. quand on n'a rien oui de tout cela le public n'a pas perdu grand chose et souvent l'orateur y a beaucoup gagné."

342. See the passage from the Essai sur l'origine des langues, ch. x, p. 131 cited on p. 334 above.

Les sociétés ont pris leur dernière formes; on n'y change plus rien qu'avec du canon et des écus, et comme on n'a plus rien à dire au peuple sinon, donnez de l'argent, on le dit avec des placards au coin des rues ou des soldats dans les maisons; il ne faut assembler personne pour cela: au contraire, il faut tenir les sujets épars; c'est la première maxime de la politique moderne.³⁴³

In his last two paragraphs Rousseau refers to a passage from the Remarques sur la grammaire générale of Duclos which, in my view, provides perhaps the most conclusive testimony of the sense in which the Essai was conceived as a work in social theory.

Je finirai ces réflexions superficielles, mais qui peuvent en faire naître de plus profondes, par le passage qui me les a suggérées. 'Ce seroit la matière d'un examen assés philosophique, que d'observer dans le fait et de montrer par des exemples combien le caractère les moeurs et les intérêts d'un peuple influent sur sa Langue.'³⁴⁴

343. Ibid., ch. xx, pp. 197-199.

344. Ibid., p. 201. In Duclos's Remarques sur la grammaire générale et raisonnée the passage appears on p. 9 of the edition incorporated in the ninth volume of his Oeuvres complètes, 10 vols. (Paris 1806). The work - itself a commentary, in this case upon the seventeenth-century Port-Royal Grammaire of Antoine Arnauld and Claude Lancelot - was first published in 1754 (see p. 308 and note 200 above). It was quite widely read in the eighteenth century (already in 1754, in fact, there appeared a reply by the abbé Guillaume-Marie Du Breil de Pontbriand, and by 1788 it had been reprinted in four further editions), and its attack upon any conception of universal linguistic rules was clearly recognised to be one of its central features. Thus in his text (p. 38) Duclos had stated, for instance, that "c'est un peuple en corps qui fait une langue; c'est par le concours d'une infinité de besoins, d'idées et de causes physiques et morales, variées et combinées durant une succession de siècles, sans qu'il soit possible de reconoître l'époque des changemens, des altérations ou des progrès. Souvent le caprice décide; quelquefois c'est la métaphisique la plus subtile qui échape à la réflexion et à la conoissance de ceus même qui en sont les auteurs. Un peuple est donc le maître absolu de la langue parlée, et c'est un empire qu'il exerce sans s'en apercevoir". It must be acknowledged that Rousseau might have drawn some inspiration for his remarks in the concluding paragraphs of the Essai from a number of other works as well, since several writers whose ideas were certainly familiar to him had argued, in a more or less similar fashion, that our languages expressed our needs and that these needs varied from one society to the next. The point is quite explicitly made in the Essai

For Rousseau, then, it was clear that our harmonic and grammatical conventions were developed in accordance with our acquired needs and inclinations, and both our political and musical vocabularies were designed to specify and make secure those values which we had come to favour in our various communities throughout the world. The languages through which men sought to please their neighbours, like the languages which they employed to make them docile and compliant, were all conceived in order to establish the supremacy of some individuals over the rest. Thus when speech and song were set apart so too men came to be divided from each other, and the divisions which arose between them in society also came to have their counterpoint in the divisions of their octaves. The artificial pleasures of men, on the one hand, and their specious duties, on the other, were now fixed by rules which together prescribed the standards of good taste and the precepts of right conduct, and by common consent our new virtues and new satisfactions came to occupy their proper place.

sur l'origine des connoissances humaines of Condillac (see II.i.15, §143, OPC, I, p. 98), for example, a text to which Rousseau devoted some space in his treatment of language in the Discours sur l'inégalité, and it is, in my view, rather curious that there is no mention of Condillac's name at all in the Essai. As for Rousseau's connections with Duclos it is clear that each had considerable admiration for the other which was maintained - surprisingly in the case of Rousseau - over a period of many years. Le Devin du village was dedicated to Duclos, the Nouvelle Héloïse was entrusted to his care, and the Confessions were produced with his encouragement (but see the note which Rousseau added after he had completed the manuscript, in O.C.I, p. 290). When, in the 1750s, Rousseau was disenchanted with many of his friends, "Duclos seul", he later reminisced (ibid., p. 387), "parut même augmenter d'amitié pour moi", and toward the end of the next decade he reflected (Correspondance générale, XIX, p. 141) that "ce n'est pas un ami chaud, mais c'est un homme droit qui ne vous trompera pas, et qui n'insultera pas ma mémoire, parcequ'il m'a bien connu et qu'il est juste". Cf. Duclos's letter to Rousseau of 17 December 1762 (Correspondance complète, XIV, p. 206): "Vous etes du tres petit nombre d'hommes que j'aime le mieux et avec qui je voudrois vivre pour la Sureté et pour l'agrément." See also O.C.I, pp. 1439-1440; Paul Dimoff, 'Les relations de J.-J. Rousseau et de Duclos à propos de quelques lettres inédites', Mercure de France, CLXXVIII (1925), pp. 5-19; Paul Meister, Charles Duclos (Genève 1956), pp. 34-47, 79-88, and 197-198; Derrida, De la grammatologie, pp. 239-243 and 324; and Jacques Brengues, Charles Duclos ou l'obsession de la vertu (Saint-Brieuc 1971), pp. 91-104, 130-138, and 150-155.