

5 Rousseau's Political Philosophy: Stoic and Augustinian Origins

It is well established that the philosophical writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau were significantly shaped by his critical engagement with themes and arguments from the Stoic and the Augustinian traditions. Although Alasdair MacIntyre could write in 1983 that a "general blindness to the importance of the continuing influence of Augustinianism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries" had meant that "books of the highest importance about Rousseau tend with few exceptions to ignore the importance of *any* reference to Augustine,"¹ the situation is considerably changed today. MacIntyre's words served to introduce Ann Hartle's study of Rousseau's *Confessions*, in which she systematically compared the autobiographical techniques Rousseau used with those in Augustine's work of the same name; Patrick Riley's volume, *The General Will before Rousseau*, showed how the most important concept in Rousseau's political theory had first been elaborated for use in the theological arguments of the previous century by French Augustinian writers – including the Jansenist Antoine Arnauld (who may have coined the term), the Oratorian Nicolas Malebranche, and the Calvinist Pierre Bayle – as they sought to elucidate the Pauline claim that "God wills all men to be saved."² Owing to Rousseau's concerns to defend autonomy and to identify and attack relations of dependence, the Stoic strand in his thinking is much more readily apparent, and scholars have been alert to it for a lot longer: It is a theme in Jean Starobinski's classic study, for

For valuable conversation and helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter I am happily indebted to John Michael Parrish, Patrick Riley, Richard Tuck, Pratap Mehta, Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, and audiences at seminars held at the Center for Ethics and the Professions and the Department of Government at Harvard University and at the Department of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania.

example³; among the more recent important works on the subject are a pair of articles by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty.⁴

Given the tasks Rousseau set himself, an engagement with certain aspects of Stoic and Augustinian philosophy was inevitable. On the one hand, as part of his project to improve on the political science he had inherited from Grotius and Hobbes, Rousseau was taking part in a discourse partially shaped by Stoicism, for it was Stoic philosophy that provided the moderns with the richest accounts of the natural inclination to self-preservation, which they used as the basis for the natural-rights theories that held out the possibility of an authoritative and universal theory of political legitimacy and international law. On the other hand, as part of his project to describe the moral psychology of his contemporaries, Rousseau gave a prominent place to the pathologies produced through *amour-propre*, or self-love, a concept that had hitherto been given most prominence with an Augustinian tradition that offered a powerful account of humans' prideful self-love as the fundamental vice that was responsible for actually existing human misery.

Yet the attempt constructively to engage both traditions posed a particular problem of its own. Stoic and Augustinian ideologies pull in quite different directions over a range of questions, and, in particular, Augustinianism in seventeenth-century France had itself been articulated precisely as a form of anti-Stoicism in an attempt to create an exclusive binary and compel a choice between the two standpoints. One of the significant challenges Rousseau faced, therefore, was to structure his own political theory in such a way as to be able to refuse this choice while still being able to work creatively with his Stoic and Augustinian inheritances, and the contention of this chapter is that it is through the interplay of the Stoic and the Augustinian thematics in Rousseau's work, and above all in the *Second Discourse*, "On the Origins of Inequality," that we see most illuminatingly why he arranges his political philosophy in the way that he does.

The fundamental antagonism between Stoicism and Augustinianism was well described by William J. Bouwsma in an important article from the 1970s.⁵ He presented a distinctive interpretation of Renaissance humanism as, he wrote, a "singularly complex movement," but one with its own "underlying unity."⁶ It was a single movement "in much the sense that a battlefield is a definable piece

of ground," and he suggested that the "two ideological poles between which Renaissance humanism oscillated may be roughly labeled 'Stoicism' and 'Augustinianism.'" ⁷ Bouwsma was swift to concede that these were rather imprecise labels, but he emphasised that they did usefully serve to "designate antithetical visions of human existence" ⁸ that were peculiarly relevant to the understanding of humanism. For too long, he contended, scholars had thought of Renaissance humanism as an attempt to recover an authentic classicism embodied in the works of Plato or Aristotle, whereas it was the philosophy of the Stoics and of Augustine that represented "genuine alternatives for the Renaissance humanists to ponder." ⁹

This opposition between "Stoicism" and "Augustinianism" had many dimensions. ¹⁰ A Stoic, for example, would emphasise that the human being partook of the substance rather than of the image of God, whereas for an Augustinian it is the other way around. A Stoic would insist that careful study of the natural world would render it intelligible to us, and help us discover how we should live, and would be optimistic about the possibilities of a natural theology. However, for the Augustinian the truths of religion are revealed in Scripture, not discovered in Nature. A Stoic would hold to the Socratic teaching that it is impossible to know the good and not to do it, that virtue is a kind of knowledge, that we come to virtue through reason; but an Augustinian would stress the frailty of human reason and its capacity to be led astray in the absence of divine illumination. Not only the weakness but also the corruption of the will makes it straightforward for an Augustinian that one can know what the right thing to do is, and why one ought to do it, and yet still be wholly unable to perform the required action. The Stoics teach that it is wholly in our power to determine whether we lead a just and virtuous life, to achieve a state *apatheia*, or of philosophical detachment, passionless existence and – therefore – of constant happiness. From an Augustinian perspective this is absurd, for such a view denies our almost total dependence on God, and the only tranquillity we will ever enjoy will be in a world to come.

Stoicism and Augustinianism did present rival and incompatible visions of human existence and human excellence, and yet what Bouwsma shows in his survey of Renaissance writings is the extent to which the humanists rarely put themselves in a position in which they felt forced to choose one set of ideals and commitments and

to abandon the other. Owing to the unsystematic nature of much humanist reflection and the limited availability of the more technical Greek Stoic sources, the polarity between Stoic and Augustinian philosophies was not as clearly perceived as it would later become. As Bouwsma noted of the Renaissance, "Its Augustinianism consisted of a bundle of personal insights that had, indeed, legitimate affinities with Augustine himself . . . ; but its Stoicism was singularly confused."¹¹ Yet even as the humanists did come to understand some of the distinctive complexities of Stoic philosophy and of how it differed on the one hand from its rival systems of ancient philosophy and on the other from the claims of mainstream Christian theology, many writers continued to draw selectively on Stoic doctrines in pursuit of some kind of syncretism.¹²

Even the most extensively Stoic project of the late Renaissance shared in the syncretist ambition. Bouwsma notes that the Belgian humanist Justus Lipsius, who offered "the first fully systematic presentation of Stoicism" and was the first to recognise clearly that "the heart of Stoicism is not its ethics but its philosophy of nature," "recognised a number of Christian objections to Stoicism."¹³ It might also be added that in his textbook presentations of Stoic doctrine, he also suppressed the elements he considered least compatible with Christian orthodoxy. Thus Lipsius argued that the Stoics' "divine fire," which they thought permeated the cosmos, in some sense existed above and beyond ordinary nature, whereas the Stoics themselves were straightforward materialists. For the Stoics, God was physically coextensive with nature, yet Lipsius tells us that this doctrine must be false and that instead we should merely understand that when the Stoics *say* nature, they sometimes *mean* God – "*naturam dixi, intellego Deum*" – which is a little different. Although the Stoics were determinists who denied anything we would recognise as a free-will doctrine, Lipsius nevertheless manages to find a free-will teaching in the Stoics' account of human action.¹⁴

If writers like Lipsius or Guillaume Du Vair had tried to defend a set of Stoic positions, Hugo Grotius by contrast was chiefly interested in one particular Stoic argument.¹⁵ This was the rather simple thought that all creatures have a natural instinct towards self-preservation, that their behaviour is naturally guided towards the appropriate kinds of goods that will help them to secure their continuing existence.

In the "Preliminary Discourse" to *The Rights of War and Peace*, Grotius confronts a hypothetical objection posed by a Carneadean sceptic, that there is no such thing as justice and that individuals seek only their private advantage, and he invokes a Stoic argument in response:

But what is here said by the Philosopher [Carneades], and by the Poet after him [Horace] must by no Means be admitted. For Man is indeed an Animal, but one of a very high Order, and that excells all the other Species of Animals much more than they differ from one another; as the many Actions proper only to Mankind sufficiently demonstrate. Now amongst the Things peculiar to Man is his Desire of Society, that is, a certain Inclination to live with those of his own Kind, not in any Manner whatever, but peaceably, and in a Community regulated according to the best of his Understanding, which Disposition the Stoicks termed *Οικειωσις* [*Oikeiosis*]. Therefore the Saying, that every Creature is led by Nature to seek its own private Advantage, expressed thus universally, must not be granted.¹⁶

Here his focus is on Stoic *oikeiosis* as the basis of a natural sociability among men; but later in the same work, he returns to the same concept, this time putting the emphasis on self-preservation:

Marcus Tullius Cicero, both in the third book of his treatise *On Ends* and in other places, following Stoic writings, learnedly argues that there are certain first principles of nature – "first according to nature," as the Greeks phrased it – and certain other principles which are later manifest but which are to have the preference over those first principles. He calls first principles of nature those in accordance with which every animal from the moment of its birth has regard for itself and is impelled to preserve itself, to have zealous consideration for its own condition and for those things which tend to preserve it, and also shrinks from destruction and things which appear likely to cause destruction. . . .¹⁷

Grotius thus follows the Stoics in arguing that both the natural inclination to self-preservation and the the natural disposition to a social existence have a common source in the concept of *oikeiosis*. *Oikeiosis* can be translated into English as something like appropriateness, a word that is doubly suitable – or, indeed, appropriate – as it suggests both the *appropriate* goods that we need in order to flourish and our *appropriation* of them to do so.¹⁸ The impulse to self-preservation is shared by all animals ("impulse," or *horme*, is what distinguishes animals from plants in Stoic philosophy¹⁹) and

the same impulse is at the root of a parent's natural affection for its offspring. This impulse, furthermore, according to Cicero and emphasised by Grotius, is "the starting-point of the universal community of the human race" and of our being naturally suited "to form unions, societies and states."²⁰

Grotius was more than a generation younger than Lipsius, writing at a time when the restatement of arguments drawn from ancient Scepticism was becoming extremely popular, and these arguments were being formulated with great skill and devastating results.²¹ In particular, the exploration of much of the non-European world was nurturing the varieties of moral relativism that often accompany the serious contemplation of cultural difference. Grotius's distinctive contribution to modern moral philosophy – hailed by the eighteenth-century scholar Jean Barbeyrac as his "breaking the ice" of medieval moral philosophy²² – was to claim that the natural *instinct* towards self-preservation served to ground a natural *right* of self-preservation, and that this natural right could be used as the foundation of a universally valid, nonrelativistic moral code. It might not be surprising that he used a Stoic idea to ground a post-Sceptical philosophy, for the Stoics had been the most sustained opponents of the ancient Sceptics and had fashioned their conceptual tools in opposition to Scepticism. (René Descartes would follow suit, using the "clear and distinct idea" – a variant of the Stoics' *phantasia kataleptike* – as his chief epistemological weapon against Sceptical doubt). Although Grotius drew carefully on Stoic arguments in fashioning this ethical theory, he stressed that none of the ancient schools would have objected to his emphasis on the right of self-preservation: "For on this point, the Stoics, the Epicureans and the Peripatetics are in complete agreement, and apparently even the Academics have entertained no doubt."²³

Grotius was keen to emphasise that his moral theory could stand independently of the truth of revealed religion, becoming notorious for his claim that the argument would remain valid "[T]hough we should even grant [*etiam daremus*], what without the greatest Wickedness cannot be granted, that there is no God, or that he takes no Care of human Affairs."²⁴ The theory presented itself as self-sufficient, fully compatible with Christian religion but not necessarily dependent on it for its validity; and in presenting his theory in such a way, Grotius contributed to both the secularisation of moral theory

and the differentiation and mutual insulation of the spheres of ethics and theology. However, the self-image of the modern theory of natural rights might be thrown into question when we ask how such a theory might appear from an Augustinian perspective?

In contrast to the tenor of the natural-rights theorists, whose arguments sought to provide criteria for the recognition of legitimate political authority, the tenor of Augustinianism was always to accept that rulers are sent by God and that we should for that reason obey them. If those who rule over us are brutal, then perhaps they are sent to chastise us for our sins, or perhaps their violence is inflicted on us in order to test our Christian commitment to not resisting evil:

But the power of lordship is given even to such men as this [Nero] only by the providence of the supreme God, when He judges that the condition of human affairs is deserving of such lords. . . .²⁵

Earthly kingdoms, however, He gives to the godly and the ungodly alike, as it may please Him, Whose good pleasure is never unjust. . . . He Who gave it to Augustus also gave it to Nero. . . . He Who gave it to the Christian Constantine also gave it to the apostate Julian.²⁶

"Though the causes be hidden," Augustine asks, "are they unjust?"²⁷ Indeed, the most resolute Augustinians of the seventeenth century still tended towards absolutism in politics even when, as in the cases of Pierre Bayle and the Jansenists, they themselves were being persecuted by the King of France: Bayle, in particular, considered it contemptible that one should abandon one's principled absolutism merely because one's own people were suffering.²⁸

We get closest to Augustine's views on the question of self-preservation in the opening book of his early dialogue, *On the Free Choice of the Will*, during a discussion of the possibility of a defensible killing.²⁹ Augustine and his interlocutor Evodius have established that "inordinate desire" or "cupidity" lies behind an instance of evildoing, and a distinction has been drawn between cupidity and "fear": The one desires its object, the other flees from it.³⁰ The way seems to be open for one of the pair to make a natural-rights-style argument – that killing someone because you fear that otherwise you will lose your own life could be an example of legitimate killing. Instead, the dialogue takes a different turn. Augustine asks whether a man would be a murderer who "kills someone, not out of cupidity for something that he desires to gain, but because he fears that some

harm will come to himself . . . ?"³¹ Evodius insists that this man *does* desire something, namely, to live without fear, and Augustine responds that this is not a *blameworthy* desire and that it is therefore outside the domain of cupidity. In what way, then, does this man do wrong? The question is still open.

Augustine takes a different example. "So consider someone who kills his master because he fears severe torture. Do you think that he should be classed among those who kill a human being but do not deserve to be called murderers?" Evodius first replies that "No law approves of the deed in your example," but Augustine denies that an appeal to authority will suffice, as they are trying to find out how it is that the law can be said to be just.³² Both initially agree that the killing is unjust, and it is in order to establish why it is unjust that Augustine makes his key move:

Augustine: It follows that, since the master is killed by the slave as a result of this desire [to be free from fear], he is not killed as a result of a blameworthy desire. And so we have not yet figured out why this deed is evil. For we are agreed that all wrongdoing is evil only because it results from inordinate desire, that is, from blameworthy cupidity.

Evodius: At this point it seems to me that the slave is unjustly condemned, which I would not dream of saying if I could think of some other response.

Augustine: You have let yourself be persuaded that this great crime should go unpunished, without considering whether the slave wanted to be free of the fear of his master in order to satisfy his own inordinate desires. *All wicked people, just like good people, desire to live without fear. The difference is that the good, in desiring this, turn their love away from things that cannot be possessed without the fear of losing them.* The wicked, on the other hand, try to get rid of anything that prevents them from enjoying such things securely. Thus they lead a wicked and criminal life, which would better be called death.³³

Instead of appealing to a Stoic principle of a natural inclination to self-preservation as the grounds of a lawful killing, Augustine appeals to another principle, familiar above all from the philosophy of the Stoic Epictetus: the distinction between things that are and are not "under our control," here presented as the distinction between things that can and cannot "be possessed without the fear of losing them."³⁴ This then is the distinction that provides Augustine with his basic criterion for distinguishing rightful from wrongful killing.

Evodius likes this distinction very much and seems to embrace it more strongly than Augustine himself. For the newly enlightened Evodius, killing in order to preserve “the things that one can lose against one’s will” – one’s life, for example – cannot now be justified in any circumstances. He is unfazed by Augustine’s objection that if this is so then the law is unjust that allows a traveller to kill a highwayman, for he confidently asserts that the law

permits lesser evils among the people that it governs in order to prevent greater evils. . . . The law does not force them to kill; it merely leaves that in their power. They are free not to kill anyone for those things which can be lost against their will, and which they should therefore not love . . . , I don’t blame the law that allows such people to be killed; but I can’t think of any way to defend those who do the killing.³⁵

Augustine’s reply is weak, given his previous comment about the appeal to legal authority: “And I can’t think why you are searching for a defense for people whom no law condemns.”³⁶ Both agree that there may be a hidden divine law that punishes those who act wrongly but who go unpunished by human law. The dialogue then takes another turn, to investigate the relationship between this eternal law and the temporal law, and then to the nature of the good will, which occupies the rest of the dialogue.

Although it is hard to say precisely where Augustine settles on the question of a wrongful killing, it is clear that he rejects considerations regarding self-preservation as being the right kind of criteria to use. Instead, the distinctively Augustinian question about the object of one’s love occupies the centre of his attention. This is, of course, the question that underpins the political theory of *The City of God*, which also, in its most succinct formulation, asserts that “Two cities . . . have been created by two loves: the earthly city by love of self extending even to contempt of God, and the heavenly by love of God, extending to contempt of self.”³⁷ From an Augustinian perspective, once shaped by an appreciation of the divergent paths of the two cities, a natural-rights theory could indeed form a part of the earthly city’s self-understanding. Those who aspire to membership of the City of God should accept natural rights and the law that rests on them as the law of the earthly city to which they submit in accordance with God’s decree. However, they submit to that law because it is the temporal, positive law that they must put up with

during their pilgrimage on earth, and not because it is thought to have any special, rational, universally valid authority of its own.

Stoic ideas had flourished in France in the early decades of the seventeenth century. In addition to the works of Lipsius, which were widely read across western Europe, the *Essais* of Montaigne did much to interest French authors in the ideas of the Stoics, and the works of Seneca remained extraordinarily popular throughout the period. Stoic philosophy fertilised discussions of moral psychology, shaped the curriculum of the Jesuit academies, and influenced both the drama and the political thought of the age.³⁸ However, as we might expect in light of Bouwsma's analysis of the "two faces of humanism," the backlash against this Neostoic current in French culture came as a part of the revival of militant Augustinianism in the middle of the century. Cornelius Jansenius's *Augustinus*, posthumously published in Louvain in 1640 and in Paris in 1641, provoked the most explosive debate among French theologians in the seventeenth century, but it was this book that also inaugurated a new round of anti-Stoic polemic.³⁹

Convinced that much Catholic teaching on the key questions of grace and free will was insufficiently Augustinian, and in particular that the free-will teaching espoused by the Jesuits, who followed the doctrine of the Spanish theologian Luis Molina, was both false and dangerous, Jansenius presented in his *Augustinus*, a three-volume Latin treatise, what he asserted to be the authentic and authoritative teaching of Augustine on these questions. Predestination was reasserted; the role that divine grace played as a necessary cause of right action was emphasised,⁴⁰ as was the seemingly arbitrary distribution of this divine grace across the human species. Stoicism entered his account because of the argument, made in the opening part of the fifth chapter of the first volume of *Augustinus*, that Stoic philosophy is one stage in the historical development of the Pelagian heresy.

The fifth-century British monk Pelagius had taught that sin was in its essence voluntary. He argued that we could always choose not to sin, and – relatedly – that Adam's disobedience in the garden of Eden could not have issued in inherited original sin that would afflict all his descendants. In the last great theological controversy of his life, which began in 411 and continued until his death in 430, Augustine had engaged Pelagius and his followers in vigorous

polemic. Augustine defended the reality and the heritability of original sin, arguing that the church's practice of infant baptism would otherwise be unintelligible. He worried that the Pelagian teaching raised the possibility of a sinless life or of a human being for whom Christ's redeeming sacrifice on the Cross was in vain – and therefore of someone who could not with justice be damned to hell or someone to whom God would owe eternal life in paradise – yet it was axiomatic for Augustine that God could owe His creation nothing. The Church agreed with Augustine, and declared Pelagius's doctrine heretical in two condemnations in 416 and 417.

Jansenius argued in *Augustinus* that Stoic philosophy was a version of this Pelagian teaching. The Stoic account of the will that stressed the distinction between the things that were and that were not in our power and the ability that we always had to withhold our assent from any proposition was, he suggested, the precursor of the Pelagian will that could always choose to avoid sin. The mistake the Stoics made had been to assume that human nature was still that of Unfallen Man, whose sin had indeed been voluntary, and Pelagius's mistake had been to repeat this error.⁴¹ This was not altogether new. Augustine himself never tried to pin the Stoic label on his Pelagian opponents – for example, in his unfinished polemic *Against Julian* – but it is clear from the fourteenth book of *The City of God* that Augustine understood the vocabulary and emphases of Stoic philosophy as a relevant guide to understanding what life must have been like for Adam and Eve before the Fall. There, for example, we find the following succession of chapters:

8: Of the three dispositions which the Stoics wish to find in the mind of the wise man, pain or grief being excluded because the virtuous mind ought not to feel it.

9: Of the things which disturb the mind, which become right feelings in the lives of righteous men.

10: Whether we are to believe that the first human beings were subject to emotions of any kind when they were placed in Paradise and before they sinned.

11: Of the fall of the first man, whose nature, created good and vitiated by sin, can be restored.

One of the stock Christian objections to Stoicism through the ages had always been that the Stoics attributed too much power to the

unaided human will and seemed to deny human beings' dependence on God. Jansenius was in essence restating this traditional objection, but he articulated it in a new way. The connection between Stoicism and Pelagianism was made quite explicit. Pelagianism was not just any old deviation from Catholic orthodoxy, but the most dangerous heresy that the greatest of the Church Fathers had so strenuously opposed. And Augustine's (and Jansenius's) relentless concern to focus attention on the Fall was a powerful reminder that Adam's original sin was one of disobedience rooted in pride and that pride had always been taken to be the besetting sin of the Stoics.

Although Jansenism was condemned by the Pope in the 1653 encyclical *Cum Occasione* (which condemned five propositions defended by the book) and later again in the 1713 bull *Unigenitus*, the argument about Stoicism was never a part of the theological controversy between the party of Jansenius and their more orthodox Catholic opponents. Indeed, the anti-Stoic argument was taken up and restated by other Augustinian writers who were themselves opponents of the Jansenists. The best example of Augustinian Christianity being articulated precisely as anti-Stoicism is perhaps to be found in two prefaces written by the prominent Oratorian father Jean-François Senault.

Senault published a treatise, *De l'usage des passions*, in 1641, and an anti-Pelagian theological treatise on original sin, *L'homme criminel*, in 1644, each of which was accompanied by a preface that was more forthright than anything in the main text of the books themselves, and both took a hard line against Stoicism. The preface to the treatise on the passions, for example, stressed that the opinions of the Stoics

do infinitely differ from the beliefs of the Christians... [for] the Stoics thought virtue the only happiness; and Christians allow of no felicity but grace... [The Stoics] fill the soul with arrogance, and in the misery of their condition, they imitate the pride of devils; [whereas the Christians] acknowledge their weakness, and finding by experience that nature and reason cannot deliver them, they implore aid from grace...⁴²

Elsewhere in the same text, the sharp distinction between Stoic nature and Christian grace is emphasised, and Senault also invokes Augustine's famous distinction between the two loves that created two cities: it is corrupt self-love that lies behind the Stoic philosophy,

which therefore stands in direct contradiction to true Christian charity. Although the main text of his later treatise, *L'homme criminel*, barely touches on Stoicism at all, it is clear from its preface that an attack on Stoicism was a significant part of its purpose:

Pride has made so powerful an impression in the soul of man, as that all the pains he suffers are not able to efface it. . . . This error being the outmost of all our evils, religion labours only how to disabuse us therein. . . . Only the Stoics, whose whole philosophy is enlivened with vainglory, did believe that if man were irregular, it was only because he would be so. . . . Pelagianism may be said to have had it originally with this proud sect, and that diverse ages before Pelagius's birth, Zeno and Seneca had taken upon them the defence of corrupted nature; for they allotted all her disorders to man's constitution and education, nor knowing any other sins save such as be merely voluntary. . . . Not knowing that reason was blind and liberty a captive, they impudently affirmed that . . . their felicity depended upon their own proper power. . . .⁴³

Considered as ideology, this aggressive anti-Stoicism proved quite flexible. It was not only directed against the Neostoics, the Jesuits, and the Molinists, but it could also be turned against François La Mothe Le Vayer and the *libertins erudits*.⁴⁴ Augustinian anti-Stoicism would continue to be developed in the second half of the seventeenth century, in particular in the hands of Blaise Pascal and Nicolas Malebranche.⁴⁵ However, the main outline of the Augustinian anti-Stoic argument was clearly discernible by the mid-1640s, and it is this argument that constituted an important criticism of the modern natural-rights project. It is not so much the case that the French Augustinians were setting out to discredit the natural-rights philosophy of Hugo Grotius and his followers. Writers in Catholic France were considerably less interested in modern natural-rights theory than those in Protestant countries. The French Augustinians' targets were who they said they were: libertines, Neostoics, Molinists, Jesuits, and Cardinal Richelieu. However, their argument did have a straightforward application to natural-rights theory.

The key claim of the natural-rights theorists, as we have seen, was something like this: that in the face of serious moral disagreement among peoples, and of widespread philosophical scepticism, one should look for a moral principle that all peoples must be assumed to share – to serve as a point of overlapping consensus, to use a contemporary idiom. If this were to be found, a moral code that

could be developed from that principle might be minimal, but would be universal, and could then be used to regulate the otherwise lawless sphere of international relations and to ground a moral theory that could withstand sceptical objections. Grotius had suggested that a right of self-preservation was precisely a principle of this kind, and he had presented his arguments in distinctively Stoic terms, building on the idea of the natural instinct towards self-preservation, which was derived from the Stoics' concept of *oikeiosis*, or appropriateness.

If, however, the Stoics' impulse to self-preservation was to be theorised not as a universally shared foundation for a new moral science, but as a consequence of sinful self-love, the fruit of pride, an echo of original sin, or a symptom of the corruption of human nature – as the French Augustinians seemed to suggest – then it is not at all clear that the principle of self-preservation can be the starting point for a universal moral code. Instead, it seems to serve an opposite function, as the fountainhead of vice. In restating the Augustinian doctrine of two antithetical loves in uncompromising terms and deliberately locating Stoic philosophy on the prideful, self-loving, anti-God side of the stark binaries, the Augustinians assembled all the elements that were needed for a powerful attack on the Grotian enterprise, even if they did not make it themselves. Of all the Augustinian writers, it was Blaise Pascal who drew the connection between Augustinian self-love and Stoic *oikeiosis* most explicitly in a fragment that simply runs, "Thus we are born unjust, for each inclines towards himself."⁴⁶ If Grotius became notorious for his claim that his theory would be valid even if we were to grant (*etiam daremus*) that there is no God, it would seem to be the case in light of this objection that his theory most obviously loses all of its force if there is in fact a God and if He should turn out to be a French Augustinian.

The seventeenth-century French Augustinians were not themselves especially concerned with the question of the feasibility of a natural-rights theory. However, in seeking to establish a set of sound "principles of political right," Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the eighteenth century certainly was. For although Rousseau denounced the principles of Grotius and his followers as false (*Émile*, p. 467), declared Grotius to be a "child in bad faith" in the field of "the science of political right" and denounced Hobbes for "bas[ing] himself on sophisms" (*ibid.*, p. 458), he showed himself to be a careful student of the natural rights and related social contract traditions, and

his own political theory presents a radical and sophisticated development of these traditions rather than a fundamental alternative.⁴⁷ Given his reputation as the most effective Enlightenment critic of the classical Augustinian doctrine of original sin, we might therefore expect to find Rousseau fully embracing the dichotomies proposed by the seventeenth-century Augustinians and to take sides against them alongside the Stoics and the Pelagians and the modern natural-rights theorists. Yet this would be much too simple. For although Rousseau does indeed reject the central planks of Augustine's theology of grace and original sin, his own arguments retain deeply Augustinian elements with respect to both content and structure, and it is in the way in which he synthesizes the Stoic and the Augustinian traditions that his philosophy is at its most creative and original.

On matters concerning grace, Rousseau opposed the Augustinian claims of the Jansenists. Whereas Augustine had argued that divine grace was not and could never be merited by human action but was instead distributed across the human species in a way that could seem only arbitrary and mysterious to human intelligence, Rousseau presented a radically different doctrine. It is most strikingly expressed in a letter in the sixth part of the epistolary novel *Julie, or the New Heloise*, in which Julie's lover St. Preux repudiates, piece by piece, Augustine's teachings on grace and free will:

In creating man he [= God] endowed him with all the faculties needed for the accomplishment of what he required of him, and when we ask him for the power to do good, we ask him for nothing he has not already given us. He has given us reason to discern what is good, conscience to love it, and freedom to choose it. It is in these sublime gifts that divine grace consists, and since we all have received them, we are all accountable for them. . . . I do not therefore believe that after having provided in every way for man's needs, God grants to the one and not to the other exceptional assistance, of which he who abuses the assistance common to all is unworthy, and of which he who makes good use of it has no need. This respect of persons is prejudicial to divine justice.

The arguments between the Jansenists and their opponents always turned on the precise interpretation of a small number of verses in the letters of St. Paul and St. Preux breaks with this method of conducting theological dispute by rejecting the authority of Scripture:

Were this harsh and discouraging doctrine deduced from Scripture itself, is not my first duty to honor God? Whatever deference I owe to the sacred text, I owe even more to its Author, and I would sooner believe the Bible falsified or unintelligible than God unjust or evil. St. Paul does not allow the vessel to say to the potter, why hast thou made me thus? That is all very well if the potter demands nothing more of the vessel than services he has made it capable of rendering; but if he rebuked the vessel for not being suited to a use for which he had not made it, would the vessel be wrong to say to him, why didst thou make me thus? [*Julie*, Dartmouth edition, pp. 561–2]

It was these passages that led Rousseau to his celebrated exchange with the official French censor Malesherbes, who rightly declared this to be “A most daring doctrine on grace, a revolt against the authority of holy scripture, an *ad hominem* argument against St. Paul” and, therefore, “more than is needed to require . . . excision.” Rousseau’s response, that “If St. Preux wants to be a heretic concerning grace, that is his business . . .,” was disingenuous insofar as there are no strong reasons for thinking that the opinions put into the mouth of St. Preux were not his own. When it came to the privileged position of Biblical texts in theological argument, Rousseau dropped this insistence on the separation of author and his fictitious character:

As for what M. de Malesherbes calls revolt against the authority of Scripture, I call it submission to the authority of God and of reason, which must take precedence over the Bible’s, and serves as its foundation: and as for St. Paul, if he does not admit of counter-argumentation, he ought not to argue himself, or at least he should do it better.⁴⁸

Yet even as he asserted this heterodox theology Rousseau was not wholly abandoning Augustine, but rather marking a retreat from the older Augustine’s obsession with grace to the younger Augustine’s account of the nature of the free will presented especially in the dialogue *On the Free Choice of the Will*, a section of which was examined earlier in this chapter. For where this “young” Augustine, Stoicism (especially in its presentation by Epictetus), and Rousseau most strikingly converge – with intimations, furthermore, of the Kantian philosophy to come – is in their shared belief that a rightly-directed will is the only genuinely unqualified human good [Riley fns DLA 1.12]. Augustine’s *bona voluntas*, directed to the proper love of God; the Epictetan *hegemonikon*, which learns to distinguish

between that which is and that which is not truly under our control, and Rousseau's *volonté générale*, whereby the individual citizen enjoys freedom by living in accordance with the shared civic will of the political community: In each case the right kind of will is the one that transcends the narrow horizons of the self-centred agent to find fulfilment through aligning itself with something of universal, infinite, or general value.

Augustine ascribed such significant enough powers to the rightly directed freely choosing will in *On the Free Choice of the Will* that his Pelagian opponents quoted his own words back at him during their long-running polemic many years later. In the *Retractationes*, compiled at the end of his life, Augustine insisted not that the early account was wrong, but that it was incomplete⁴⁹:

In these and similar statements of mine, because there was no mention of the grace of God which was not the subject under discussion at the time, the Pelagians think or may think that we held their opinion. But they are mistaken in thinking this. For it is precisely the will by which one sins and lives rightly, a subject we discussed here. Unless this will, then, is freed by the grace of God from the servitude by which it has been made – 'a servant of sin' – and unless it is aided to overcome its vices, mortal men cannot live rightly and devoutly.

One of Augustine's main worries in his dispute with the Pelagians was that they seemed to deny the Fallen state of humankind, making nonsense of the Church's claims about the postlapsarian need for redemption through Christ. And if the early Augustine's account of the will is not coupled with his much later account of grace, he suggests, we may be very close indeed to Pelagianism.

As we have seen, Rousseau does indeed combine a strong account of the freedom of the will with a denial of Augustinian grace, but he joins to this Pelagian combination a secular narrative of Fall that provides a functional equivalent for the Augustinian account of original sin that is lacking in the Pelagian schema. Like its Augustinian alternative, Rousseau's conjectural history of the emergence and the entrenchment of inequality in human society, presented in the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, seeks to explain how humankind passed from an original state of contentment to one of degradation, corruption, and misery. To use Ernst Cassirer's phrase, Rousseau sought to transpose the traditional problem of theodicy onto the

terrain of politics, locating the origins of evil not in any original sin by the First Couple but in the consequences of the organisation of human societies.⁵⁰ Yet with unmeritable grace denied and the problem transposed into a new register, Rousseau's account retains unmistakably Augustinian elements. First, in its form, the *Discourse*, like the fourteenth book of the *City of God*, presents an account of human life in its prelapsarian state, tells a story of how that state came to be abandoned, and in so doing teaches something about the contours of any possible redemption. Second, the story it presents is one in which self-reinforcing patterns of behaviour are attendant on the original corruption that serves to mire humankind ever deeper in its problems, foreclosing any nonradical solution to the problem presented by the Fall. Third, Rousseau's narrative agrees with Augustine's in having as its pivot a distinctive account of the nature and malign consequences of self-love, or, to use the word extensively discussed by the seventeenth-century French Augustinians, of *amour-propre*.

In Rousseau's account, primitive humans originally lived in a pre-political, presocial state of nature in which "the produce of the earth furnished him with all he needed, and instinct told him how to use it." However, as these primitives began to encounter difficulties – whether they took the form of other animals, variable "soils climates and seasons" – and opportunities – such as the chance discovery of fire, for example – then

the way these different beings and phenomena impinged on him and on each other must naturally have engendered in man's mind the awareness of certain relationships . . . which we denote by the terms great, small, strong, weak, swift, slow, fearful, bold, and the like . . ." (p. 85).

They begin to understand the ways in which they are superior to animals – they know how to catch them, for example – and they begin to feel a certain pride.⁵¹ As early societies form and humans interact one with another and do things together, they learn how to make comparisons, to form judgements about what is better and worse, and to acquire preferences. This is very bad, for as "each one began to consider the rest, and to wish to be considered in turn, . . . thus a value became attached to public esteem." A reflexive characteristic enters human thinking for the first time: They came to think more highly of themselves if they thought themselves to be highly

thought of by others, and this, says Rousseau, was “the first step towards inequality, and at the same time towards vice.”⁵² Comparative judgements, a sense of superiority, the desire for the approval of others: All are aspects of *amour-propre*, the self-love that comes to poison the simplicity of the primitive life and that leads to hierarchy, poverty, slavery, misery, property, and to the social division of labour.

This is all quite Augustinian, in its way, but Rousseau does not want to embrace all of the Augustinian argument, even in this radically secularised form. The implication of the Augustinian critique, especially in its strict Jansenist interpretation, as we have seen, is that self-love is always and everywhere bad, that the principle of self-love or of the natural instinct towards self-preservation could not serve as an adequate foundation of a natural-rights theory. It is this thought that brings us to the famous distinction between self-love as *amour-propre* and self-love as *amour de soi* in Rousseau’s thought, and it also brings us back to Stoicism.

In the Preface to the *Second Discourse*, Rousseau writes:

[C]ontemplating the first and most simple operations of the human soul, I think I can perceive in it two principles, prior to reason, one of them [self-love as *amour de soi*] deeply interesting us in our own welfare and preservation, and the other [pity, *pitié*] exciting a natural repugnance at seeing any other sensible being, and particularly any of our own species, suffer pain or death.⁵³

The famous distinction between self-love as *amour de soi* and as *amour-propre* appears in other books by Rousseau, notably *Émile*, and in important respects Rousseau’s *amour de soi* closely resembles Stoic *oikeiosis*. For the Stoics as well as for Rousseau, for example, this principle had more content than merely being a mechanical instinct towards bodily self-preservation. Stoic *oikeiosis* helps to explain the care that parents have for children and the affection that the children have for them; in Rousseau’s *Emile*, also, we are told that “we have to love ourselves in order to preserve ourselves” and that it therefore “follows from the same sentiment that we love what preserves us. Every child is attached to his nurse” (p. 213). *Amour de soi* is presented as “the source of all our passions” (p. 212), but Rousseau quickly qualifies this to note that the “gentle and affectionate passions are born of *amour de soi*, and . . . the hateful and irascible passions are born of *amour-propre*,” reminding us of the

distinction the Stoics drew between the harmful passions and the benign *eupatheiai* that would come to replace them. (Rousseau will often use the word sentiment to refer to the affectionate and desirable passions). The fit is not perfect: The Stoics would not, for example, have considered *oikeiosis* a principle "prior to reason," but rather one involving judgement or mental assent, however instinctive it might seem to be.

If Rousseau's *amour de soi* does serve as a version of Stoic *oikeiosis*, then what he is doing becomes clear. He accepts the full force of the Augustinian argument about the centrality of self-love – *amour-propre* – in accounting for the corruption of human society; but he denies what was implicit in the seventeenth-century Augustinian argument, that the baneful effects of self-love can serve as an indictment of a natural-rights theory resting on a principle of self-preservation. What the French Augustinians found to condemn in self-love speaks only to the domain of *amour-propre*, and this *amour-propre*, we might say, does not go all the way down. It is not the most fundamental principle of postlapsarian human nature, in the way that the Augustinians alleged. *Oikeiosis* – or, here, *amour de soi* – can still serve perfectly well as the foundation of a natural-rights philosophy as well as serve as the ground for Rousseau's belief in the natural goodness of humankind.

There is an obvious objection to this line of argument. In the passage immediately following the one cited above from the Preface to the *Discourse on Inequality*, Rousseau remarks that

It is from the agreement and combination which the understanding is in a position to establish between these two principles [*amour de soi* and *pitié*] without it being necessary to introduce that of sociability, that all the rules of natural right appear to me to be derived.⁵⁴

At first glance, it looks as if Rousseau is here repudiating the Stoic foundation of natural-rights theory altogether. Grotius's approving discussion of Cicero on "sociableness" (*sociabilitas*) formed a part of the demonstration that there was a significant appeal to Stoic philosophy in the argument for natural rights. Yet what is going on in this passage is that Rousseau is denying a principle of the natural sociability of human beings that could be used to defend the naturalness of *political* society. Here, Rousseau follows Hobbes, whose contract theory is premised on the artificiality of political

community, which has to be a radical construction of human will. In denying the principle of human sociability in the way that he does, Rousseau is not abandoning Stoic principles: His account of *amour de soi* might generate certain kinds of other-regarding activity, as it does in *Emile*, but it cannot generate the thicker account of human sociability that Hobbes's natural lawyer critics, including Pufendorf, were keen to defend.⁵⁵

In positively valuing some form of self-love, is Rousseau abandoning the Augustinian tradition decisively? It is not clear that he is, for the French Augustinians of the seventeenth century often deployed more rigid distinctions than those that Augustine himself had used. Although Augustine taught that "two loves created two cities" and says much to condemn self-love, we should remember that, for Augustine, nothing in created nature is ever inherently bad and that the self-love he deplored was the prideful love of self that – crucially – leads one to despise God. Oliver O'Donovan's extensive discussions in his book, *The Problem of Self-Love in Augustine*, make it clear how nuanced – and how complex – Augustine's treatment of self-love was and how implausible it is to reduce his analysis to a single, negatively valued concept of *amour-propre*. Rousseau's whole argument is basically secular, and it is this feature of his argument that most clearly marks a break with the Augustinian tradition, not his positive valorisation of self-love as *amour de soi*.

It seems also that Rousseau developed this theory in opposition to an alternative Augustinian social theory, which was presented by the Jansenist Pierre Nicole. A natural question to pose to strict Augustinians is to ask how human society is able to function in any tolerably well-ordered way if humanity is as Fallen as they assert. Nicole had famously argued that although self-love – *amour-propre* – was indeed depraved, the ties of self-interest that bound one person to another worked to produce a kind of social cohesion.⁵⁶ These ties were generated by a disreputable cupidity, not by a worthy charity, to be sure, but the resulting society could *look* very similar to what a society might look like if all its inhabitants were to have been motivated by true charitable love of God and neighbour. On this account, it is when we begin interacting with other people, generating ties of interdependency through the exchange of goods and services, adjusting our behaviour to fit the expectations of others, that the depraved effects of self-love begin to be redeemed, in an earthly

register, at least. Human action remains motivated by a sinful self-love and is to that extent deplorable, but a trick of divine providence brings about a certain kind of social harmony.⁵⁷ Rousseau's account in the *Discourse on Inequality* thus reverses Nicole's at a crucial moment. Although humans are substantially independent of one another, living in the state of nature, with their *amour de soi* guarding over their self-preservation, *amour-propre* is barely existent and poses no particular problem. However, when early societies begin to develop, the interactions among people provoke and inflame *amour-propre*, and it is these repeated social interactions that quickly are translated into relations of dependency, inequality, and oppression. For Nicole it is social existence that corrects some of the bad effects of self-love; for Rousseau it is the social existence that produces these bad effects in the first place, perverting natural *amour de soi* into awful *amour-propre*.

The problem facing Rousseau's political philosophy, then, is that of discovering a way in which *amour de soi* can be preserved and nurtured, minimising the influence of *amour-propre* as much as is possible, disciplining it, channelling it into productive outlets and generally preventing its growth. This problem is structurally analogous to the problem facing Stoic philosophy, too. The task of Stoicism is to find a way of living in accordance with nature, an important part of which involves extirpating the (harmful) passions, and especially anger; in Rousseau's vocabulary, *amour de soi* is presented as entirely natural, *amour-propre* as the origin of all the "hateful and irascible passions." Whereas the Stoics present their philosophical training and their programme of spiritual exercises as the most suitable means of attaining their goal, Rousseau turns to democratic politics instead.

The democratic citizen republic of the *Social Contract* describes the institutions within which a people may live together without inflaming their *amour-propre*. The rough economic equality of citizens prevents the development of hierarchies and of certain forms of dependence and oppression; so does the transparency of the majoritarian political process, which insists on the equal status of all citizens. Rousseau attacks oratory or partial associations – interest groups, factions, and parties – both of which are ways for individuals and groups to acquire more significance in the common life than they deserve to possess. A citizen's life under the general will is a

disciplined life, as is the life of the Stoics' sage, lived in accordance with the universal law of the cosmos, but in both cases the discipline provides, paradoxically enough, the best chance of being able to live in accordance with nature or of living in freedom. Stoicism brings about the moral transformation of an individual; Rousseau's politics deals with the collective moral transformation of an entire people.⁵⁸ Just as Augustine himself once found Stoic philosophical vocabulary helpful for describing the condition of Unfallen Man, Rousseau's Stoic democracy aims to preserve an entire people in an Unfallen condition, safe from the miseries induced by too much *amour-propre*. It is not too much, perhaps, to call Rousseau's political theory a strikingly original piece of secular Augustinian Stoicism.

For those of us who want to be the friends of the Stoics, there is something exhilarating about this line of thought. Although the historical record itself is mixed on this point, the Roman Stoics acquired for themselves a reputation for being pillars of republican virtue and enemies to those who sought or occupied the Imperial throne. This Stoic pantheon includes Cato of Utica, Marcus Brutus, and Helvidius Priscus, who steadfastly refused to submit to the dictators or tyrants they opposed.⁵⁹ Lipsius and the early modern Neostoics, by contrast, had been theorists of a centralised, absolute monarchy; they opposed representative assemblies, and they denied popular sovereignty. Not the least part of Rousseau's Stoic achievement is to have articulated, at long last, the theory of a participatory republican politics, which many people through the ages have often believed was somehow implicit in the Stoics' philosophy of freedom.

I have introduced two alternative Augustinian social theories into this chapter. On the one hand, there was Pierre Nicole's argument about the unintended consequences of self-love, which is more familiar to us in Adam Smith's later version, in which it is known as the Invisible Hand argument. If everyone's behaviour is motivated by narrow self-interest – the secular version of Augustinian self-love – then the aggregate outcomes can still tend to the benefit of all, including the poorest members of the society.⁶⁰ As Smith secularises the Augustinian argument, interestingly enough, he also Stoicises it, too, for Smith was extremely interested in Stoic moral philosophy, and much of it finds its way into the pages of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*.⁶¹ Smith's other great book, *The Wealth of Nations*, inaugurated the tradition of the Classical Political Economy, which

later included David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill. Although a revolution in value theory took place in the 1870s, beginning what we now call Neo-Classical Economics, which is still taught in universities today and is the basis of the rational-choice theory that is popular among political scientists, the Nicole–Smith argument was still retained right at the heart of the new economic science.

On the other hand, there was Rousseau's argument – also a form of secular Augustinian Stoicism, as I have suggested – that human society is corrupted and divided most severely by the results of precisely the kind of social and economic interactions that are valued in the Nicole–Smith approach. In unequal societies in which *amour-propre* runs rampant, people are alienated from their authentic or natural selves: Appearance and reality diverge. As Rousseau writes, "it . . . became the interest of men to appear what they really were not. To be and to seem became two totally different things."⁶² On his account, furthermore, human society is divided into brutal and entrenched class hierarchies: The poor are exploited by the rich, and the rich own great property, but their title to this property is despicable, for it rests ultimately on crime, on the seizure and private appropriation of the common land.⁶³ In Rousseau's political theory, only a rather severe form of democratic action can bring an end to this alienation and exploitation, holding open the possibility of the free, collective, moral development of the entire people.

I have just redescribed Rousseau, of course, in the language of alienation and exploitation, terms made familiar to us above all from the writings of Karl Marx, Rousseau's great successor in the tradition of European radical democracy. The occasional references to Rousseau in Marx's writings exhibit a variety of attitudes. There is the famous sneer of the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*: "In short, one could just as well have copied the whole of Rousseau." There is the approving quotation from the *Discourse on Political Economy* in the first volume of *Capital*:

"I will allow you," says the capitalist [Marx's replacement for Rousseau's "rich man"], "to have the honour of serving me, on condition that, in return for the pains I take in commanding you, you give me the little that remains to you."

There is his most persistent note, sounded both in the essay *On the Jewish Question* and in *The Grundrisse*, in which Marx links

Rousseau's "abstract notion of political man" to the radical individualism found in the later theorists of "civil society" and describes his theory as the political analogy of the "Robinsonades" of the eighteenth-century political economists. Nowhere, however, is Marx's debt to the spirit and substance of the *Second Discourse* properly acknowledged, though it remained both deep and lifelong.⁶⁴

If this is a plausible sketch of the succession from Rousseau to Marx, then the question of whether one is an apologist for liberal capitalism on the one hand or sympathetic to the claims of radical socialism on the other comes to turn in part on which secularising and Stoicising transformation of the Augustinian problem of original sin one comes to prefer. If that is the case, to conclude, then the legacies of the Stoic and Augustinian traditions are of crucial importance, not just for the political philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the eighteenth century, but for us all in the twenty-first.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Alasdair MacIntyre, writing in the Preface to Ann Hartle, *The Modern Self in Rousseau's Confessions* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame Press, 1983), p. x. An important exception would be Nannerl O. Keohane's *Philosophy and the State in France* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980).
- 2 Patrick Riley, *The General Will before Rousseau* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986): *New Testament*, 1 Timothy 2:4.
- 3 Jean Starobinski, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Transparency and Obstruction* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1971).
- 4 Rorty, A. O., "Rousseau's Therapeutic Experiments." *Philosophy* (1991): 1–22. "The Two Faces of Stoicism in Rousseau and Freud." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 34(1996): 335–56.
- 5 William J. Bouwsma, "The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought," in *A Usable Past: Essays in European Cultural History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990), pp. 9–73.
- 6 *Ibid.* 19.
- 7 *Ibid.* 20.
- 8 *Ibid.* 20.
- 9 *Ibid.* 22.
- 10 *Ibid.* 24–27.
- 11 *Ibid.* 58.
- 12 *Ibid.* 60.

- 13 *Ibid.* 63–4.
- 14 A. A. Long, *The Stoic Legacy on Naturalism, Rationality and the Common Good* (unpublished MS), (Harvard University Archives) pp. 15–17.
- 15 J. B. Schneewind has a useful summary of the ways in which Grotius is not a Stoic in *The Invention of Autonomy* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 175.
- 16 Grotius, "Preliminary Discourse," in *The Rights of War and Peace*, (1738 London edition), Vol. VI, pp. xv–xvi.
- 17 From the excerpts from Grotius in J. B. Schneewind, *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant: An Anthology* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1990). The relevant part of Cicero's *De Finibus* follows. The speaker is Cato. "He said, 'it is the view of those whose system I adopt, that immediately upon birth, for that is the proper point to start from, a living creature (*animal*) feels an attachment for itself and an impulse to preserve itself and to feel affection for its own constitution and for those things which tend to preserve that constitution (*ipsum sibi conciliari et commendari ad se conservandum et ad suum statum eaque quae conserventia sunt eius status diligenda*); while on the other hand it conceives an antipathy to destruction and to those things which appear to threaten destruction. In proof of this opinion they urge that infants desire things conducive to their health and reject things that are the opposite before they have ever felt pleasure or pain; this would not be the case, unless they felt an affection for their own constitution and were afraid of destruction. But it would be impossible that they should feel desire at all unless they possessed self-consciousness, and consequently felt affection for themselves. This leads to the conclusion that it is love of self (*se diligendo*) which supplies the primary impulse to action.' " Cicero, *De Finibus*, BK 3, Ch. V. Secs. 16–17; Loeb translation, Harvard University Press, pp. 232–4.
- 18 For the most significant surviving original Stoic passages on *oikeiosis* and a useful philosophical commentary, see A. A. Long and David Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1987), Vol. 1, Section 57, pp. 346–354.
- 19 See Long and Sedley, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 350.
- 20 *Coetus, concilia civitates*. Cicero, *De finibus*, 3.XIX.62–3. Loeb translation, pp. 281–5.
- 21 See, especially, Richard Popkin, *The History of Skepticism from Erasmus to Spinoza* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979) for details of the nature and the extent of sceptical arguments in Europe in the early seventeenth century.
- 22 See Tuck, R., *Natural Rights Theories: Their Origin and Development*. Cambridge, 1979: 174–5.

- 23 Grotius, *Prolegomena to De Indis*, quoted by Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 173.
- 24 Grotius, "Preliminary Discourse" in *The Rights of War and Peace* (1738 London edition), Vol. XI, p. xix.
- 25 Augustine, *City of God*, Vol. 19.
- 26 *Ibid.* Vol. 21.
- 27 "Et si occultis causis, numquid iniustis!" *Ibid.* Vol. 21.
- 28 See the classic chapter on Bayle's dictionary article on "David" in Walter Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965). Nannerl Keohane presents a good English summary of the main themes in Jansenist political thought in the ninth chapter of her *Philosophy and the State in France* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980).
- 29 The same passage is also discussed by Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 55–56.
- 30 Augustine, *On the Free Choice of the Will* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1993), p. 6.
- 31 *Ibid.* 6.
- 32 *Ibid.* 7.
- 33 *Ibid.* 7–8 (emphasis added).
- 34 See Epictetus, *Enchiridion 1* or *Discourses 1.1* for this distinction and its importance.
- 35 Augustine, *op. cit.*, 8.
- 36 *Ibid.* 9.
- 37 Augustine, *City of God*, Vol. XIV, p. 28: "de qualitate duarum ciuitatum, terrenae atque caelestis. fecerunt itaque ciuitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad contemptum dei, caelestem uero amor dei usque ad contemptum sui."
- 38 For the neo-stoic current in moral psychology, see, especially, Anthony Levi, *French Moralists: the Theory of the Passions, 1585 to 1649* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon, 1964). For an important neo-stoic French political text, see the *Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu*, trans. Henry Bertram Hill (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961). The major neo-stoic dramatist was Pierre Corneille. For an enormous amount of detailed research on Stoicism in France in the first half of the seventeenth century, see père Julien-Eymard D'Angers, *Recherches sur le stoicisme aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (New York: Georg Olms Verlag Hildesheim, 1976), whose first chapter provides a useful summary of his main claims about the period.
- 39 The most detailed account of the theology of Jansenius's book in English is Nigel Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford, U.K.:

- Clarendon, 1936). More sympathetic to the Jansenists, and also extremely useful, is Leszek Kolakowski, *God Owes Us Nothing* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995), which provides an excellent and spirited account of the theological debate.
- 40 A good account of the structure of the metaphysical underpinnings of Jansenius's doctrine of the will is in the *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, Vol. 2, pp. 1205–6.
- 41 Anthony Levi, *French Moralists*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1964, op. cit., p. 207.
- 42 Senault, Preface to *De l'usage des passions* (Paris, 1641; reissued Paris: Fayard, 1987). The passage quoted is from the English translation by Henry, Earl of Monmouth, *The Use of Passions* (London: printed by W. G. for John Sims, 1671).
- 43 Senault, Preface to *L'homme criminel* (Paris, 1644). The passage quoted is from the English translation, again by Henry, Earl of Monmouth, *Man Made Guilty, or the Corruption of Nature by Sinne According to Saint Augustine's Sense* (London: William Leake, 1650), which I have slightly modernised. Note the word "vainglory": Hobbes's *Leviathan* would be published the following year.
- 44 François La Mothe Le Vayer had published his *De la vertu des payens* in 1642, against which Antoine Arnauld wrote his long treatise *De la nécessité de la foi en Jesus-Christ pour-êre sauvé*, which restated parts of the new anti-Stoic argument, and which is reprinted in the 1775 *Oeuvres de messire Arnauld*, Vol. X.
- 45 For Pascal, see especially the "Conversation with M. de Sacy" in Levi and Levi, eds, *The Pensées and Other Writings* and the scattered remarks on the Stoics in the *Pensées*. For a discussion that emphasises the significance of anti-Stoicism to the *Pensées*, see Anthony R. Pugh, *The Composition of Pascal's Apologia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984). For Malebranche, see his attack on Seneca in Book Two, Part Three, Chapter Four of *The Search After Truth*, trans. Thomas M. Lennon and Paul J. Olscamp (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1980) and the chapter by Lennon in Tom Sorrell, ed., *The Rise of Modern Philosophy: The Tension between the New and Traditional Philosophies from Machiavelli to Leibniz* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon, 1993).
- 46 Brunschvig, ed. *Oeuvres de Blaise Pascal*. Paris: 1914. Quoted in Riley, P., *The General Will Before Rousseau*: 19n47.
- 47 Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace*: sections on "The Hobbesianism of Rousseau." (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- 48 Émile too ran into trouble for similar reasons, the Cardinal Archbishop

- of Paris Charles de Beaumont complaining that Rousseau's language was "at complete variance with the doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Church concerning the revolution which has come about in our nature." Christophe de Beaumont, *Mandement, portant condamnation d'un livre qui a pour titre EMILE, OU DE L'EDUCATION...*, quoted in Timothy O'Hagan, *Rousseau* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 241–2.
- 49 St. Augustine, *Retractationes* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1968), Book I, Chap. 8, p. 32.
- 50 Ernst Cassirer, *Das Problem J.-J. Rousseau*, translated by Peter Gay as *The Question of Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954).
- 51 Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, Cambridge University Press ed. v. Gourevitch, pp. 85–86.
- 52 *Ibid.* 90.
- 53 *Ibid.* 47.
- 54 *Ibid.* 47.
- 55 See Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace*, pp. 151–152, pp. 197–200 (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- 56 See especially his essays "De la grandeur" and "De la charité et de l'amour-propre" in his *Essais de morale*. There is an English translation, *Moral Essayes: Contain'd in Several Treatises on Many Important Duties* (London: printed for Samuel, Manship, 1696).
- 57 E. D. James, *Pierre Nicole: Jansenist and Humanist* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1972), pp. 148–161.
- 58 In the *Discourse on Political Economy*, Everyman edition p. 143, Rousseau compares the achievement of Socrates with that of Cato, to the latter's advantage. See also the unpublished *Discourse on Heroic Virtue*, Cambridge edition, pp. 305–6 for similar sentiments.
- 59 Cato of Utica killed himself rather than submit to Caesar; Brutus was one of Caesar's assassins; Helvidius Priscus was an imperial Senator and Stoic whose defiance of the Emperor Vespasian is marvellously recounted by Epictetus, *Discourses*, 1.2. 19–24. Loeb translation, pp. 19–21.
- 60 Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, IV.ii.9; *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Glasgow edition, (Nelson 1938) pp. 184–5. This edition reports H. B. Acton's judgement that the passage from *TMS* immediately preceding the invocation of the invisible hand was written deliberately to oppose Rousseau's account of inequality in the *Second Discourse*.
- 61 There is a considerable literature by now on Adam Smith's use of Stoicism, with recent contributions in books by Vivienne Brown, *Adam Smith's Discourse: Canonicity, Commerce and Conscience* (London: Routledge, 1994), Stewart Justman, *The Autonomous Male of Adam*

Smith (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), Charles L. Griswold, Jr., *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Athol Fitzgibbons, *Adam Smith's System of Liberty, Wealth and Virtue* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon, 1995).

62 Rousseau, *ibid.* 95.

63 Rousseau, *ibid.* 84, 97–8. For Marx on the expropriation of the commons, see Chaps. 27 and 28 of the first volume of *Capital*.

64 In his article on "The Marxist Critique of Rousseau," *New Left Review* 59 1970, Galvano Della Volpe finds a striking congruence between Rousseau's discussion of the ideal of equality in the *Second Discourse* and Marx's arguments for the inherent inegalitarianism of an ideology of "equal right" in the second half of the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (pp. 101–109).