

contains other similar methodological and theoretical digressions, and the figure of *l'homme-clavecin* often gets lost in the mêlée. The development of a bee–honey metaphor to elucidate Diderot's development of the human–harpsichord analogy is distracting, as are the invocations of string theory and Lenin in the conclusion. However, Sarrasin Robichaud makes some evocative arguments, notably when using Jan Zwicky's concept of resonance to discuss Diderot's dedication of his Shaftesbury translation to his brother. Later, in the chapter on the *Leçons de clavecin et principes d'harmonie*, he argues persuasively that the 'participation dynamique d'une pluralité de voix' (p. 130) bears a resemblance to the harmonic resonance of vibrating chords, and observes: 'Il ne suffirait pas de lire pour l'assimiler; il s'agit d'entrer en conversation attentive avec ses éléments constitutifs' (p. 143). These kinds of dynamics will be familiar to Diderot scholars, and offer inspiring connections.

ROSALIND HOLMES DUFFY
PARIS

doi:10.1093/fs/knz096

Bibliographie mondiale des écrits sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau, XVIII^e–XXI^e siècles, II: Vie — Famille — Événements — Lieux — Relations. Par TANGUY L'AMINOT. (Slatkine Érudition.)
Genève: Slatkine, 2018. 390 pp.

Broadly speaking, bibliographies fall into two categories, and in both cases they should be comprehensive, reliable, and easy to consult. On the one hand are those which describe, in greater or lesser detail, all the editions of the works of a particular author (or, more precisely, as many editions as the bibliographer has been able to find). On the other are those which list the studies devoted to an author, theme, or specific subject, and which give basic publication details such as the name of the writer and the title of the book or periodical in which the study can be found. Over the last thirty years, Tanguy L'Aminot has published several notable volumes of Rousseau bibliography which fall into the latter category. The present work continues the series, being a catalogue of studies on Rousseau's life and relationships published in the last 250 years or so. It can fairly claim to satisfy the first two requirements set out above, with full details of some 4,500 titles, published not only in the main European languages, but in Japanese as well. They are divided into general sections such as 'Fantaisies et romans en relation avec Rousseau et son œuvre', as well as 'Lieux' and 'Événements', with the individual places and happenings comprising these two latter categories presented alphabetically; hence, anyone seeking to know what has been written on, for example, Rousseau and Lyon, or the transfer of his remains to the Panthéon, can readily find that information here. Again, the section on 'Relations', carefully details, in alphabetical order of person, the studies devoted to just about everyone with whom Rousseau had dealings at some point in his life. These are perhaps the most valuable parts of the bibliography. Elsewhere, however, for reasons not explained, this convenient and straightforward system is not used. The section on 'Famille' is divided by century, rather than by listing Rousseau's relatives under their own individual headings. As a result, finding what has been written about, say, his childhood and upbringing becomes rather a chore, requiring the perusal of numerous articles written over some two and a half centuries in the hope of coming across something relevant. L'Aminot seems almost to anticipate this problem when he writes in the short bilingual Introduction: 'nous invitons les utilisateurs à parcourir les index des diverses bibliographies et à ne pas se contenter d'aller au thème unique qui les préoccupe' (p. 8). Readers perusing the section 'Famille' might ruefully reflect that they have little choice, especially as there is in fact nothing which any objective observer would recognize

as an index, but merely a final, one-page 'Table des matières' giving the general headings of the sections. All in all, therefore, while this volume can justifiably be regarded as a very useful addition to the bibliography of writings on Jean-Jacques Rousseau, anyone who consults it needs to make due allowance for its idiosyncrasies.

doi:10.1093/fs/knz089

DAVID ADAMS
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

Connaissance et reconnaissance chez Hobbes et Rousseau: la transparence est l'obstacle. Par STÉPHANE VINOLO. (Ouverture philosophique.) Paris: L'Harmattan, 2017. 243 pp.

Stéphane Vinolo's book is an ingenious examination of social contract theory, illustrated principally by the political thought of Hobbes and Rousseau but supplemented by more recent discussions of game theory on the one hand, and the thought of René Girard, Jacques Lacan, and Jacques Derrida on the other. The aim of the book is to show how the concept of individual autonomy can be reconciled with the idea of a durable and stable political society when, at first sight, the firmly individualistic orientation of the first seems to rule out the durability and stability of the second. The problem, of course, is an old one and, in different guises, was central to the concerns of the many generations of German philosophers, from Kant to Heidegger, whose thought was so salient to Girard, Lacan, and Derrida. It was, in short, the problem which, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was associated with the concept of sociability. For Vinolo, the problem was formulated initially by Hobbes with his claim that humans have no natural ability to prioritize their desires. This means that there is no natural human capacity to identify a highest good, whether something divine or something as apparently fundamental as the desire for self-preservation. There are, instead, only sequences of desires with nothing apart from chronology to distinguish them. Nor can individuals impose their desires for any durable periods of time because, as both Hobbes and Rousseau emphasized, humans are sufficiently equal and organized to be able to neutralize any individual drive for domination. And, being roughly equal, no individual could prevent another from giving priority to the short term over the long term, as Rousseau showed with the example of a stag hunt. If all these considerations require no special human insight and are instead common knowledge, then, as Vinolo argues, this potentially infinite pool of knowledge of knowledge simply makes violence rational. This, as should be apparent, is the point of the pun in the title of his book. Instead, as with Jean Starobinski, of thinking about politics in terms of the obstacles to transparency, applying game theory to Hobbes and Rousseau seems to show that transparency itself is the obstacle and, according to Vinolo, the same type of reflective loop applies to the passions. The way out is, therefore, misrecognition rather than recognition, or something more like a Rawlsian veil of ignorance, supplied here, however, by the idea of a sovereign state. It is not clear, however, at least in terms of Vinolo's final description of the properties of a contractually based sovereign state, what gives the combination of sovereignty and the state the ability to block the spiral of competitive recognition. On his terms, it works because it is external, like a humanly created artificial god. Notwithstanding the rigour and clarity of Vinolo's argument, students of modern politics might be surprised.

doi:10.1093/fs/knz108

MICHAEL SONENSCHER
KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE