

Studies on Voltaire
and the eighteenth century

201

THE VOLTAIRE FOUNDATION
AT THE TAYLOR INSTITUTION, OXFORD

1982

The problem of the Kehl additions to the *Dictionnaire philosophique*: sources, dating and authenticity

BERTRAM EUGENE SCHWARZBACH

Immature artists imitate. Mature artists steal.

Lionel Trilling

When you steal from one author it is plagiarism; if you steal from many it is research.

Wilson Mizener

Il semble que la perfection soit atteinte non quand il n'y a plus rien à ajouter, mais quand il n'y a plus rien à retrancher.

Saint-Exupéry, *Terre des hommes* III

Introduction

IN the autumn of 1972, just after I had completed a cursory reading of the articles on religion that first appeared in the Kehl edition, professor Jeanne Monty very graciously made available to me and to the other collaborators in the edition of Voltaire's alphabetical articles, a preprint of her essay, 'Voltaire's debt to the *Encyclopédie* in the *Opinion en alphabet*'.¹ She put us all in her debt – one which, unlike Voltaire's debt to the *Encyclopédie*, is gratefully acknowledged – because her essay demonstrated a kind of analysis, a sort of higher criticism, that could be applied to a certain class of Voltaire's articles. She showed beyond dispute that seventeen of the very erudite and heavily annotated articles which appeared for the first time in Kehl contained extensive copying and/or editing from the *Encyclopédie*, that most of 'Zèle' was copied from Isaac de Beausobre's history of Manichæanism, 'Inquisition 1' from André Morellet's 1762 *Manuel des inquisiteurs* (BV2514), and 'Prétensions de l'empire' from the table of contents of *Les Intérêts présents (et les prétensions) des puissances de l'Europe* (1733-1736) by Jean Rousset de Missy. Because the bulk of the articles in question show editing and abridgement of the original sources as well as faithful copying, professor Monty argued that the 'Opinion en alphabet', a manuscript collection from which the Kehl editors claimed to have taken most of the previously unpublished articles, ought to be related to a project that Voltaire had proposed to undertake for the publisher Joseph Panckoucke in 1768-1769, an abridged and more pointed edition of the *Encyclopédie*, and especially of Jaucourt's verbose contributions. (Professor Monty excerpts from this class of articles 'Prétensions de l'empire' and 'Inquisition 1' which she regards as reading notes.) This is an ingenious hypothesis which accounts adequately for the borrowings that professor Monty had detected.

I began to check her work on the articles assigned to me for *The Complete works* and I found additional borrowings from Beausobre and from other sources. That changed the perspective immediately. The *Encyclopédie* could no longer figure as a semi-exclusive source for the articles that first appeared in the Kehl edition (henceforth, 'Kehl articles' or 'Kehl material'), which now seemed to correspond still less than before to the descriptions of the Panckoucke project that are recorded in the correspondence. My work also required a modification of her judgement that the copied 'Opinion en alphabet' articles belong among the works that Voltaire edited, since he integrated copied and rewritten passages with original material to create essays quite different in intent and form from their sources.

In the body of this essay I shall gratefully incorporate professor Monty's discoveries with mine and draw my conclusions from this larger body of material.

Certain explanations will be needed regarding the various collections of alphabetical articles which the Kehl editors integrated into their *Dictionnaire philosophique*.² The Kehl 'alphabetical jungle'³ of a *Dictionnaire* merged the five distinct collections that we shall now enumerate plus at least sixty previously published works (including such a major text as the *Lettres philosophiques*).⁴ Voltaire himself, as will be shown here, had used his two major alphabetical collections, the *Dictionnaire* and especially the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, as receptacles for many assorted writings, both his own and those of others. In the circumstances it was not entirely unreasonable for the Kehl editors to have expanded the commodious alphabetical format to contain everything and anything for which they could find no more appropriate rubric. That did not in itself render any of the texts inauthentic, but it destroyed both the periodisation of Voltaire's work and the proportions of the *Portatif* and the *Questions*.

1. Professor Trapnell has worked out the prehistory of the *Dictionnaire*. He shows that Voltaire began work on a philosophical dictionary while in Potsdam. He argues convincingly that Voltaire frequently urged Frederick to support an ambitious collaboration of *philosophes* to produce a dictionary which might be more outspoken than Diderot's, which was subject to the constraints of official and self-censorship.⁵ Voltaire offered Frederick certain sample articles for his examination and criticism, an 'Abraham' (October/November 1752, Best. D5057), a 'Moïse' (November 1752, Best. D5073), and he discussed an 'Athéisme' (October/November 1752, Best. D5053). These cryptically described articles are not necessarily those that were subsequently published in the *Dictionnaire*. The Kehl 'Abraham' rather than the *Dictionnaire* 'Abraham' may be the draft submitted to Frederick as Trapnell suggests, but the Kehl 'Moïse' seems to us too advanced for what would have been Voltaire's first step in Bible criticism and, besides, it has strong affinities with material published much later. Trapnell speculates that the 1752 'Athéisme' may be the Kehl article of that title. This is particularly plausible because 'Athéisme' appears to be a refutation of Maupertuis's *Essai de cosmologie* (1752). However, the article demonstrably draws upon Jean-Baptiste Bullet's *L'Existence de Dieu démontrée par les merveilles de la nature* (1768, BV575). This shows that caution is necessary in identifying published alphabetical articles with Voltaire's descriptions of articles written or about to be written. Trapnell associates the composition of 'Salomon' with 1752, and

'Ezéchiel' and 'Moïse' with 1760/1761. More generally, he argues that Voltaire's *Dictionnaire* is intimately associated with his plan to direct a collaborative alphabetical project outside French jurisdiction (eventually in Clèves). The interest in such an outspoken and 'reduced' *Encyclopédie* was revived each time Diderot's *Encyclopédie* endured a crisis, and each revival reanimated Voltaire's own alphabetical efforts.⁶

Voltaire published five editions of his *Dictionnaire* between 1764 and 1769, each an expansion of its predecessor. He added respectively 7, 16, 18 and 4 articles and several new sections and carried out numerous textual emendations. (The Varberg 1765 edition is particularly interesting because of its variants, which are frequently outspoken and are suppressed in the two succeeding editions.) Professor Vercruyse has identified 15 different editions of the *Dictionnaire* between 1764 and Kehl, and professor Pomeau has traced the history of the five significant editions.⁷

2. Voltaire contributed 43 (according to Naves) or 44 (according to professor Lough) articles to Diderot's *Encyclopédie*. During the interruption of publication in 1757, after the appearance of volume 7, until its resumption in 1765 when the *Dictionnaire* had already been launched, Voltaire chose to publish several of his *Encyclopédie* articles in the *Troisième suite des mélanges [...] de littérature* (1761), and all of them in the *Nouveaux mélanges* (1765), ii.265-380, except for 'Généreux, générosité', 'Idole, idolâtre, idolâtrie' and 'Messie'. According to Naves, 'Généreux, générosité' is not by Voltaire.⁸ 'Idole, idolâtre, idolâtrie' and 'Messie' had already appeared in the 1764 *Dictionnaire*. The *Nouveaux mélanges* texts are particularly interesting because the five articles which appear there for the first time were not restyled to conform to the *Encyclopédie*'s format and punctuation and should be presumed to be more authentic than the form that appeared in the *Encyclopédie*.

3. In 1760 Voltaire prepared 115 articles, the Ts, for the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* (Paris 1762), most of which appeared there in some form. Thirty-two of these articles, the longer ones, appeared in the Kehl *Dictionnaire*, inaccurately transcribed. Professor Vercruyse has published the complete text of all the articles on the basis of a manuscript draft which he believes was used by the Kehl editors (Bn n.a.fr. 24344, ff.14-36).⁹

4. In 1770 Voltaire brought out the first volume of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie par des amateurs*, the articles of which he had begun to draft by September 1769 and which he was organising and revising in December of that year.¹⁰ The ninth volume appeared in 1772 with fifty-five additional articles out of sequence and supplements to others. Professor Wade shows that the additional material was written at the last moment to fill out the ninth volume which would have been too slender (pp.85-86). There were two almost simultaneous re-editions whose texts incorporated the errata of the first edition and the last of them also integrated the supplementary articles, from 'Ozée' on, into the alphabetical order. When the 1768 Genevan edition of Voltaire's complete works reached its *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* volumes (21-24) in 1774, it added several articles and included additions to the earlier ones. This edition was reprinted without further expansion in the *encadrée*, volumes 25-30, but with the addition of a 'Rétraction nécessaire' which modified 'Colimaçons' and 'Justice'. Professor Taylor remarks

that not only were the *Questions* a collection distinct from the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, they were its replacement in the *Œuvres* of 1768 and 1775.¹¹ In his frugality, Voltaire did not discard the *Dictionnaire* articles which he had not incorporated into the *Questions* – according to professor William Archie they were rejected precisely because Voltaire replaced them with fuller developments in *Questions* articles of the same or different titles (p.322) – but rather salvaged these essays as ‘Fragments sur divers sujets par ordre alphabétique’ in volume 28 of the Geneva 1768 edition and volume 38 of the *encadrée* under the title of ‘Pièces détachées attribuées à divers hommes célèbres’, with pieces by other authors.

The *Questions* themselves were something of an authorised ‘ragbag’, including chapters and fragments of thirty-five other works in forty-eight different articles! In many cases, the previously published pieces that Voltaire salvaged are short essays quite like those which he was composing for the *Questions*.

5. There remain many scattered essays published in the *Nouveaux mélanges* and earlier publications which could just as well have been added to the *Questions*. This material, too, turns up in the Kehl *Dictionnaire*, sometimes with a change of name. Two examples will show the confusion which Kehl brought to Voltaire’s anthology of his own works in the *Questions*. The *Fragment des instructions pour le prince royal de **** first appeared in the *Nouveaux mélanges*, volume 9 (1770), accompanied by a short dialogue, ‘Liberté de conscience’. The same dialogue became, in a slightly more polite text, ‘Conscience iv’ in the *Questions* (1771). Kehl eliminated ‘Conscience iv’ but printed ‘Liberté de conscience’ as a separate article. An essay, ‘Du gouvernement et de la divinité d’Auguste’ appeared together with the play, *Le Triumvirat*, in the fourth volume of the *Nouveaux mélanges* (1767); Voltaire included it in the *Questions*, with a different introductory sentence, as ‘Auguste’, but in Kehl it appears as ‘Velletri’, Augustus’s natal city.

6. The ‘Opinion en alphabet’: Condorcet and Decroix admitted in their ‘Avertissement des éditeurs’ (Kehl gov. edition, K.xlvii.2):

Nous avons réuni sous le titre de *Dictionnaire philosophique* les *Questions* sur l’Encyclopédie, le *Dictionnaire philosophique* réimprimé sous le titre de la *Raison par alphabet*, un dictionnaire manuscrit intitulé l’*Opinion en alphabet* [...] On trouvera nécessairement ici quelques répétitions; ce qui ne doit surprendre, puisque nous réunissons des morceaux destinés à faire partie d’ouvrages différens. Cependant on les a évitées, autant qu’il a été possible de le faire sans altérer ou mutiler le texte.

This passage suggests that, whatever the nature and length of the *Opinion en alphabet* manuscript¹² and whatever the date and circumstances of its composition, the editors of Kehl did not publish it in its entirety, and in fact their apology for publishing ‘Conciles’ despite its redundancies supports the suspicion that they suppressed other seemingly redundant articles.

The hypothesis which will be advanced here is that the Kehl editors found a batch of articles, drafts and fragments with one-word titles which Voltaire chose not to publish but which looked to them like yet another alphabetical collection, and that, since the packet bore the provisional title of ‘Opinion en alphabet’ or merely contained the ‘Avertissement’ referring to it, they construed it to be a separate collection. They acknowledged its existence like the scrupulous editors

they were, and then integrated it into their *Dictionnaire*, together with so much other miscellaneous material that its identity was completely lost.

In principle it should be possible to extract the 'Opinion en alphabet' from the Kehl *Dictionnaire* by segregating the material that had been previously published. Once the obvious drafts and preparatory material related to the other alphabetical collections and published short essays have also been set aside, what is left should include the core of an 'Opinion en alphabet' distinguishable from any accompanying alphabetical chaff by certain common qualities. We shall argue that most of the remaining Kehl texts, despite certain unifying strands, are actually preliminary drafts and reading notes for published alphabetic articles and for other works – what Roger Lauffer calls 'antetextual documents'¹³ – spanning a period from Potsdam to the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, but mostly concentrated in the years 1767 to 1770, precisely when the *Dictionnaire* underwent its greatest expansion, so there is nearly nothing left that could belong to the core of an 'Opinion en alphabet'.

Of course it completes the Voltairean corpus to publish every scrap that he ever wrote, but Voltaire, like other authors, should have some privacy in the creation of his literary canon. He should not be charged with responsibility for every line, footnote, sentiment and borrowing that he tried on for size or jotted down as an *aide-mémoire*. In particular he need not be taxed with having plagiarised the *Encyclopédie* and other sources – professor Monty uses the more delicate term, debt – in these unauthorised publications, especially since there is enough borrowing in the authorised *Dictionnaire* and *Questions* to satisfy any depreciator. But, since these pieces have survived, it should be noted that in no case do their opinions require apology; they are as consistent with what Voltaire did publish as one would expect. Several of the articles, notably 'Bien', 'Foi' and 'Théologie' are interesting and/or do credit to Voltaire's liberalism, while 'Juifs III' shows him copying the generous sentiments of the *Lettres persanes* LX through Jaucourt's expansion in an *Encyclopédie* article, hardly what one would expect of the reputed father of scientific, racist antisemitism, but quite in line with the *Lettres à s. a. mgr le prince de *** IX* and the *Sermon du rabbin Akib*.¹⁴

1. The problem of the Kehl additions

Professor Samuel Taylor has treated the problems of the Kehl edition in considerable detail and with much precision in his study, 'The definitive text of Voltaire's works: the Leningrad *encadrée*'. He shows that in principle, there are several authorised and authentic sources for the Kehl departures from the last *œuvres complètes* to be published in Voltaire's lifetime, the Geneva 1775 *encadrée*. For those works which Voltaire published between the *encadrée* and his death there is some reason to believe that Kehl had access to his corrections. Thus for all Kehl's faults, many of its deviations from the last texts that Voltaire is known to have authorised are in fact verifiable, and some of the others are almost surely authoritative (though which are and are not may be difficult to ascertain). Taylor's approach to the problem of the authenticity of the Kehl text is direct. He works with all the surviving documentation relating to the material made

available to the Kehl editors, and with Voltaire's own annotated copies of the *encadrée*.

Since it will be necessary to refer to professor Taylor's findings in detail and since the question is somewhat complicated, it will be convenient to summarise them in schematic form with some amplification as they apply to the alphabetical articles.

1. Voltaire corrected several copies of the *encadrée* edition for a new edition of his works. Some of these corrections became available to the Kehl editors, via Panckoucke and Wagnière.

2. Voltaire had the writer's habit of scanning editions of his work, correcting typographical errors and making small changes so that, professor Taylor argues, he always had at hand material for a new and corrected edition of individual or collected works, even when he did not have the time to prepare a major revision. Such pages, were they made available to the Kehl printers, would probably have been destroyed during the typesetting and proof-reading processes (pp.27-28).

3. It is clear in some cases that the Kehl editors had access to preliminary drafts of published articles. They then inadvertently corrected authorised texts on the basis of preliminary drafts which, in some instances being longer than the final text, they took for late additions. Regressions from Voltaire's last printed texts or manuscripts can be demonstrated in 'Directeur' of the *Questions*,¹⁵ and in the addition to 'Ame' as well as in the articles 'Idole, idolâtre, idolâtrie' and 'Eclipse'.

Thus 1 and 2 represent authorised corrections and additions. In general we can tell when corrections of class 1 entered Kehl, and, when they did not, the material in the Leningrad *encadrée* can often serve to produce a more correct and authorised text than Kehl, Beuchot or Moland. As for class 2, the problem is to know which corrections belong to that class, since the evidence has usually disappeared. Corrections and additions of type 3, when they can be distinguished, are authentic but invalid.

4. After Voltaire's death mme Denis sold a considerable quantity of his manuscripts, twenty packets in two packing cases, to Panckoucke. Wagnière's inventory of those packets, signed, sealed and dated 27 July 1778, has been preserved at the Institut et musée Voltaire, ms 40.37. According to Andrew Brown's uncorrected transcript, there was a 'N^o.9 Mss: de Mad^e. Du Chatelet, matériaux pour les questions et pour le dictionnaire de l'académie'. It would be reasonable to assume that some if not most of the alphabetical articles first published by Kehl came in that packet. It is significant that Wagnière does not refer to any of the material in the inventory as 'Opinion en alphabet'.

5. Wagnière transcribed corrections and additions that were in the Leningrad *encadrée* and, one must assume, other sources, before and after Voltaire's death. He even served as Voltaire's research assistant, adding references and cross-references at his direction. But not all his work under Voltaire's supervision is trustworthy. Professor Taylor shows that in some cases he misunderstood Voltaire's cryptic directions (pp.31, 36). His notions of what should have been included in the Kehl edition and what should have been omitted from it need not be construed as reflections of Voltaire's literary testament in all cases. For example, professor Wade has published a letter from Polier de Bottens to

Voltaire explaining the various meanings of the Hebrew root *znh*. This letter seems to be connected with the *Plaidoyer de Ramponeau* (1760), which does speak about the Hebrew root describing the Biblical Rahav's profession, rather than with anything in the *Questions*, yet Wagnière wrote on the manuscript: 'no. 7. A placer dans les questions article fornication, au tome 38^e de Kehl, p.343'.¹⁶ Evidently there were at least six other texts that he would have inserted somewhere or another in the Kehl edition sometime after its completion. While he may have expressed Voltaire's intention in their regard, he does not inspire confidence. Here he should have written 'au tome 40^e' rather than '38^e' which would interpolate Polier's letter between 'Bouffon' and 'Boulevard ou Boulevard' or between the latter and 'Bourges'. While Polier's letter has some connection with 'Fornication', that is not its real context and Wagnière would have added a spurious piece to the *Questions*.

By this analysis, the materials described in 4 and 5 must be considered authentic but not authorised, and the material under 4 not generally intended for publication, or composed too close to Voltaire's death for him to have seen them through publication (Taylor, p.26).

We now turn to material published after the appearance of the Kehl edition.

6. Decroix who, with Condorcet, was responsible for the literary side of the Kehl enterprise, communicated to Beuchot his corrections of the Kehl edition and some additional material which was excluded from it.¹⁷

7. Some manuscripts became available to the editors of the Lefèvre-Détermville (1818) and veuve Perronneau (1819) editions, which they attributed to Voltaire and which became annexed to the *Dictionnaire philosophique*. Beuchot reprinted them, apparently from manuscript, with slight variants, particularly in styling. Unfortunately not all these manuscripts can be traced, so their claim to authenticity depends upon Beuchot's authority and must be supported by such deductive considerations as can be adduced. Since Voltaire borrowed from several clandestine sources, and since at least some of the tracts (those coming out of d'Holbach's group) were written after Voltaire began to publish his anti-Christian polemics, it would be gratuitous in principle to assume that these pieces are necessarily Voltaire's work, much less that they are connected with either the *Dictionnaire* or the *Questions*.

8. Various fragments have turned up since Beuchot's edition. One in particular, 'La Sibylle', first published in *Le Dernier volume des œuvres de Voltaire* (Paris 1861), bears some resemblance to an alphabetical article. Other prose pieces have been published in volume 32 of the Moland edition, in Besterman's edition of the notebooks,¹⁸ in its supplement,¹⁹ and at the end of Andrew Brown's 'Calendar of Voltaire manuscripts'.²⁰

9. Wagnière's 'Notes' for Catherine are now available,²¹ and Tronchin's copy contains some independent information.

Even though the Kehl editors did their worst in the *Dictionnaire*, Wagnière, who should have been adequately informed about this and who had no interest in protecting the Kehl editors (who had treated him shabbily), did not offer corrections for these volumes. He probably had not seen them.

Taylor calls these post-Kehl corrections 'apocryphal' (p.37), an ambiguous term. The implication seems to be that the material is of the right period and of

acceptable provenance. Even authentic material, if it could be distinguished from the corrupt and spurious texts, still should not be admitted into the canon because it was not authorised by Voltaire. The Kehl material is in principle equally suspect with regard to Voltaire's authorisation to publish.

Since the annotated *encadrée* and the posthumous materials provide almost no direct evidence regarding the Kehl additions to the *Dictionnaire*, we must exploit professor Monty's method to the limit. We must work backwards and deduce what we can.

II. The evidence of the 'Avertissement'

The Kehl editors prefaced their *Dictionnaire philosophique* with a hitherto unpublished 'Avertissement de la collection intitulée: l'Opinion en alphabet' (K.xlvii.10) which, on the face of it, would seem to belong to that collection even if they themselves supplied the title. It remarks that 'cet alphabet est extrait des ouvrages les plus estimés qui ne sont pas communément à la portée du grand nombre: ainsi l'auteur ne cite pas toujours les sources où il a puisé, comme étant assez connues des doctes, il ne doit pas être soupçonné de vouloir se faire honneur du travail d'autrui, puisqu'il garde lui-même l'anonyme'. (In the Lefevre-Déterville edition, xxiii.8, the 'Avertissement' acquired a prefatory paragraph, a Latin and French quotation of *Ep. to Titus* i.11 which does not appear to be *à propos*.)

This 'Avertissement' would indeed be appropriate for an 'Opinion en alphabet' that edits and abridges, without acknowledgement, Diderot's *Encyclopédie* (professor Monty's suggestion) and may indeed represent Voltaire's intention of publishing such a work. However, by 1768, when Voltaire would have begun work on his abridgements, the *Encyclopédie* was hardly a rarity. The first edition was widely disseminated and re-editions were already in progress that would make it accessible to a public willing to wade through its bulk. If there was to be an *Encyclopédie* according to Voltaire, it would have had to perform a function distinct from those of the *Encyclopédie*, the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions*. It would have to say something new, or find some new way of proposing Voltaire's usual polemics. The 'Avertissement' does not suggest what that might be and the Kehl material which is supposed to be the bulk of the 'Opinion en alphabet' does not meet either of these tests. That gives reason to doubt, despite the 'Avertissement', that such an 'Opinion' ever existed.

There are cogent reasons, and no inconveniences, in relating the 'Avertissement' that speaks about extracts 'des ouvrages les plus estimés' to the *Dictionnaire* of 1764 rather than to the Kehl material. As a matter of fact and perception, the *Dictionnaire* was regarded by Voltaire – and he evidently expected his friends to notice it – as a tissue of borrowed texts. His 'Mémoire' regarding the *Dictionnaire* (Best.D.App.253 and Bn n.a.fr. 24341, ff.164 and 186, and Wade, p.18) complains about the attribution of a certain *Dictionnaire* 'aux personnes connues auxquelles la calomnie l'impute', and goes on to reveal that 'Apocalypse' is copied from Firmin Abauzit, that 'Baptême' is 'traduit des œuvres du docteur Middleton', that 'Messie' comes from Polier de Bottens, and that 'plusieurs morceaux étaient imités de Bayle, de Le Clerc, du marquis d'Argens et de

plusieurs autres auteurs'. Professor Trapnell regards the 'Mémoire' as a ruse, one of the last steps in Voltaire's elaborate campaign to escape the consequences of having written the daring *Dictionnaire* (pp.44-47). The ruse is not incompatible with a good measure of truth. It will be shown that most of Voltaire's attributions are verifiable to some extent, and that the *Dictionnaire* is somewhat of an anthology. Indirect demonstration is available from the *encadrée* edition where Voltaire reprinted under his own name those *Dictionnaire* articles omitted from the *Questions* as 'Pièces détachées attribuées à divers hommes célèbres', and at least five letters of October-November 1764 (Best.D12137, D12138, D12159, D12164, D12192) make the same point though with slightly different attributions, evidently to disarm the criticism of those friends who might have been expected to recognise at least several of the borrowed texts. These letters add that 'Christianisme' is copied from Abauzit, 'Miracles' from Middleton, that 'Christianisme' and 'Enfer' are translated 'mot à mot' from William Warburton's *Divine legation of Moses*, and that other articles are drawn from Locke. A detailed account of the borrowings, sources and false attributions of the *Dictionnaire* of 1764 will surely be incorporated into the introduction and notes of the *Complete works of Voltaire*, so a few remarks will suffice to show that the 'Avertissement' which appeared in Kehl could have applied to the *Dictionnaire*, and will provide the basis of comparison with the copying that has been detected in the Kehl articles.

The *Dictionnaire* of 1767 finally attributes 'Messie' to Polier de Bottens. By that time the tenth volume of the *Encyclopédie* had already appeared (1765) with Polier's complete, signed article, so the borrowing that had become too transparent to be hidden (if that, rather than concern for a friend's reputation, had indeed been the objective of withholding the Swiss minister's name from the earlier editions of the *Dictionnaire*) would have compelled identifying the author. Actually, as professors Torrey and Wade have proved, Voltaire not only commissioned 'Messie' from Polier but also suggested the general lines of its discussion and many of its specifics;²² while the completion of the *Encyclopédie* was still in doubt Voltaire published parts of the article himself. Dr Mina Waterman has shown that 'Apocalypse' was in fact edited from manuscript material of Abauzit,²³ so these two attributions are confirmed.

Despite Bn n.a.fr. 24342, f.164, 'Baptême' does not seem to have come from Middleton at all – the subject does not seem to have interested him particularly – and it is clear from the Kehl 'Baptême' that the *Dictionnaire* article's introductory definition comes from Augustin Calmet, and all the information contained within it which Voltaire might not have known was available in Calmet.²⁴ Parts of 'Circoncision' do come from Middleton as do portions of 'Christianisme', notably the paragraph beginning, 'Les disciples de Jean-Baptiste'. The four paragraphs beginning with 'La sagesse des apôtres' are very close to his *Cursory reflections on the dispute [...] between st Peter and st Paul*, and the paragraph, 'Le zèle inconsidéré' comes from his *A free enquiry into the miraculous powers* (1749),²⁵ two paragraphs of which are discernible in 'Miracles'.²⁶

No borrowing from Abauzit has yet been detected in 'Christianisme' but it is a long article and Voltaire's attribution may refer to a still unpublished manuscript to which he had access. This is a real possibility. The opening of the Kehl

'Reliques' bears enough resemblance to Abauzit's 'Lettre à une dame'²⁷ to suggest that Voltaire had seen a more detailed version of that essay than was eventually published. 'Miracle III' refers to certain 'notes' of Abauzit, and 'Trinité' quotes a long passage from him which had not yet been published.

Warburton contributed no more than the paragraph 'Il faut voir' to 'Christianisme'. It deals with the pagan mystery rites and is the material that Voltaire habitually borrowed from him: see for example *La Philosophie de l'histoire*, ch.23, 25, and the Kehl 'Théologie'. 'Enfer' is compounded out of themes drawn from various parts of Warburton's *Divine legation*: that statesmen always established religion to restrain men and frequently regarded it as a useful deceit, that the Hebrew word for soul did not have the spiritual connotations which Christian theology subsequently lent it, that the descent into Hades in the sixth book of the *Aeneid* must be understood in a special way. Even the style of 'Enfer' is very much like Warburton in his more polemical pages where he puts words in the mouths of his philosophical opponents. Yet there are very few lines in this article that are actually copied, and proportionally little in 'Christianisme' and 'Baptême'.

The 'imitations' of Leclerc, d'Argens and Bayle are still more problematical. 'Genèse' (DP65V) is only vaguely in the genre of Leclerc's *Sentiments de quelques théologiens de Hollande* (1685). The resemblance is limited by the absence of Leclerc's most characteristic contribution to Bible criticism, the theory of a northern redaction of the *Pentateuch*. Even the form of 'Genèse' is all wrong for a Leclerc imitation because it is much closer to the *Bible enfin expliquée* (which is a burlesque of Calmet's *Commentaire littéral* with its anthologies of traditional legend and interpretation) than to the *Sentiments* or to Leclerc's series of Latin commentaries, *Veteris testamenti [...] cum commentario philologico* (1696-1731, titles vary), which is not represented in Voltaire's library and with which he shows no sign of familiarity. A more likely candidate for the Leclerc imitation is 'Moïse' with its coherent exposition of the reasons why the *Pentateuch* could not be attributed to Moses. 'Moïse' has the additional advantage of appearing in the *Dictionnaire* of 1764 so, even if again there is not too much that can be associated exclusively with Leclerc, it at least does not require a date after the autumn of 1764 for Bn n.a.fr. 24342, f.164, when the other letters discussing copying in the *Dictionnaire* were written.

The imitation of d'Argens may be no more than an adaptation, in 'Tolérance', of one of the themes of the 'Discours' introducing his translation of the emperor Julian's *Contra Galilaeos*, the uniqueness of the persecution of Christians by Christians which began during the reign of Constantine,²⁸ a theme which Voltaire had developed at much greater length in the *Traité sur la tolérance* of the previous year.

The Bayle imitations may be the character assassinations of Biblical worthies which appeared in the *Dictionnaire* of 1764: 'Abraham', 'Ezéchiel', 'Jephté', 'Joseph' and possibly 'Moïse' although the latter is a more serious article dealing with matters of lower Biblical criticism which are foreign to the comparable Bayle articles and to his sympathies.²⁹ The second critique of the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, by Nicolas Sylvestre Bergier, of whom more later, regards 'Bêtes' as an 'abrége' of Bayle's 'Rorarius'.³⁰ Yet none of these proposed Bayle imita-

tions, not even the 'David' and 'Job' which first appeared in the *Dictionnaire* in 1767, is copied from the *Dictionnaire historique et critique* which, as a matter of fact, lacks articles for Ezekiel, Jephthah, Joseph and Moses.

As for Locke, 'Bornes de l'esprit humain', 'Folie' and 'Sensation' are very Lockean, not because of intentional imitation, as Voltaire would have had his friends believe, but because he was a devoted and convinced disciple.³¹ Professor Pomeau has discovered that the text in 'Enthousiasme' which relates to the Yogi of India is the same one which Voltaire copied from François Bernier in the *Essai sur les mœurs*.³² In Best.D12137 Voltaire admitted to self-copying, 'des pages entières copiées mot à mot des mélanges de littérature qu'on imprime sous [son] nom.' One would like to confirm this by endorsing professor Wade's identification of 'Fanatisme', 'Théisme', 'Contradictions' and 'Bulle' of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* of 1764 with articles in the fifth volume of the *Œuvres mêlés* (42G) and in the *Mélanges* of 1756 (*The Search for a new Voltaire*, p.82), and by professor Pomeau's identification of 'Gloire' with a 1742 article of that title ('Histoire d'une œuvre', p.45). Unfortunately we have not been able to discover significant similarities in the two 'Gloire' articles. None of the articles which professor Wade mentions ever appeared in the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, although 'Contradictions' and 'Bulle' do appear in the *Questions*; he claims that 'Contradictions' reproduces four paragraphs of the earlier article, but we have not been able to confirm this either. The volume which he cites for 'Bulle' does not contain such an article although there is a chapter by the title of 'De la bulle *In coena domini*' in *Le Cri des nations*, in volume 8 of the *Nouveaux mélanges*, but its text is entirely different from that of the article in the *Questions*. The 'Théisme' and 'Fanatisme' which he discusses were only added to the *Dictionnaire philosophique* in Kehl, and will be shown to be posterior to May 1756 and February 1766 respectively. Professors Pomeau and Wade both agree, however, that Voltaire wrote short philosophical essays long before he undertook the *Dictionnaire* at Potsdam. Professor Pomeau derives the genre from the *Lettres philosophiques* while professor Wade likens it to certain 'petits chapitres' (see note 6). Curiously enough, the only self-copying we have detected went in the opposite direction, from 'Ame' of the 1764 *Dictionnaire*, 'Si Moïse avait annoncé', to 'De l'antiquité du dogme de l'immortalité de l'âme' of the *Nouveaux mélanges* (1765).

Thus, as Voltaire represented it, and with considerable justification, the *Dictionnaire* of 1764 and the subsequent editions could just as well have been introduced by the 'Avertissement' associated by Kehl with the 'Opinion en alphabet' as by the 'Préface' which eventually preceded the Varberg 1765 edition. Actually, both prefaces exaggerate the importance of Voltaire's copying which, except for 'Apocalypse', is not comparable in extent or degree of fidelity to that which will be encountered in the Kehl articles. The 'Avertissement' could have been a draft preface to the *Dictionnaire* of 1764 at some early stage in its gestation when Voltaire may have thought of calling it – or may have called it as a working title – 'Opinion en alphabet', a title that he eventually used, in a modified form, when the *Dictionnaire* of 1769 appeared as *La Raison par alphabet*. This is, of course, hypothetical, but it accounts for the two prefaces well enough to call into question the Kehl editors' assumption on the basis of the 'Avertis-

sement' that they had in their possession yet another of Voltaire's alphabetical collections.

iii. Which Kehl additions could not have been written for an 'Opinion en alphabet'?

Before trying to deduce the nature of the manuscript which the Kehl editors took (or, according to the suggestion to be developed here, mistook) for an 'Opinion en alphabet', it would be useful to clear the deck, so to speak. Certain articles and fragments which appear in the Kehl *Dictionnaire* and are said by Bengesco to have appeared there for the first time (i.425-26) are incorrectly identified. We shall first exclude, without enumeration, the articles under 'T', including 'Terre', that Voltaire wrote for the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. Professor Vercruyse has already treated them definitively. The following articles and additions were either published by Voltaire elsewhere or are so obviously drafts of publications that they can be discussed briefly and then excluded from further consideration. Of course, if there had been an 'Opinion en alphabet', Voltaire might have decided to include them, but these texts certainly were not written for such a collection.

1. 'Ame' (K.xlvii.239-43; M.xvii.130-32) – Two manuscripts representing early stages of 'Ame I' and 'Ame IV' of the 1770 *Questions* have survived, one in the Institut et musée Voltaire in Geneva (ms 43.7), and another, which has been published by professor Wade,³³ 'Autres considérations sur l'Ame' (Bn n.a.fr. 24342, ff.30-33). This last manuscript represents three separate states, a primitive state, a corrected state of which ms 43.7 is a generally faithful copy, and a final state where many lines and paragraphs have been crossed out. Where 'Ame I' and 'Ame IV' diverge from the third state of n.a.fr. 24342 they are clearly developments of it, so the printed text is at least Voltaire's fourth draft. It seems that the Kehl editors had access to ms 43.7 or to another copy of the second state because they introduced their 'Ame I' with that text, contrary to any edition that Voltaire is known to have authorised, and then omitted from their 'Ame IV' a large part of the text of the *Questions* which had become redundant with regard to the manuscript draft which they had just printed. Beuchot and Moland follow the Kehl text in the addition and omission without comment.

2. 'Bekker' (K.xlviii.507-18; M.xvii.559-65) contains three small textual variants and an addition, all of which are found in the Leningrad copy of the *encadrée*. Evidently Kehl had access to a transcript of these corrections.

3. 'Enfer' (K.li.29-32; M.xviii.544-46) of the *Questions* has, according to Beuchot, a posthumous addition in the middle of the article, the paragraphs 'Dès que les hommes' to 'Plusieurs Pères [...] et qu'il est dans les champs Elysées'. This is, as Moland recognised, the text of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* 'Enfer' (1764) which Kehl inserted at this point. It is rather doubtful that Voltaire would have authorised this interpolation, first because he had already salvaged the article 'Enfer' in the *Fragments sur divers sujets par ordre alphabétique* (68G, t.28, pp.282-84), and second because it begins with an introductory discussion, and one introduction, at the head of an article, is usually enough.

4. 'Idole, idolâtre, idolâtrie' (K.lii.479-503; M.xix.402-15) contains several

variants and additions. For the most part, Kehl follows the *Encyclopédie* and DP69 texts. The additions are all *à propos*. Since it is hard to imagine Voltaire regressing from the *Questions* text to the DP69 text, it is reasonable to assume that Kehl had access to a DP69 text with the expansions but without the deletions that would transform it into the *Questions* text. Because this was a more ample text they published it in the place of Voltaire's authorised text.

5. 'Inquisition I' (K.liii.112-30; M.xix.476-85) became, with only slight changes, 'Aranda' of the 1770 *Questions* (the running head for the article in the 1770 and 1774 editions is 'Aranda. Inquisition'). It copies its opening paragraph and the beginning of its fifth from Jaucourt's 'Inquisition' (which admits to being based on Voltaire, evidently upon the *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.140) while the rest is almost entirely copied from Morellet's *Manuel de l'inquisiteur* (1761).

6. 'Inquisition II' (K.liii.131-36; M.xix.485-88) is numbered in the Kehl edition 'Inquisition III' in error, there being only two articles by that title. This is the 'Inquisition' of the 1769 *Dictionnaire philosophique* and is indebted to Morellet (probably through the 'Inquisition I' draft) for some details.

7. 'Pierre le Grand et Jean-Jacques Rousseau' (K.liv.208-11; M.xx.221-22) is a draft of the article of the same title which appeared in the *Nouveaux mélanges* (1765), iii.369-71, and was superseded by 'Russie'.

8. 'Poètes' (K.liv.226; M.xx.230) is a text of the *Nouveaux mélanges* (1765), iii.116-20, with only a short, anecdotal, introductory paragraph that is new. This paragraph refers to articles on 'avocats et médecins' which appear in the same volume of the *Nouveaux mélanges*, so it clearly belongs to that period of composition.

9. 'Prétensions de l'empire' (K.liv.287-91; M.xx.270-72) are clearly reading notes copied from a table of contents. Because they are found almost verbatim in the Piccini notebooks most of whose contents are dated by Besterman between 1750 and 1755,³⁴ this article probably antedates the 'Opinion en alphabet' by at least 13 years.

10. 'Somnambules IV' (K.lv.107-10; M.xx.435) too, has survived in a notebook fragment (Voltaire 82, p.709). While the fragments cannot generally be dated, there is no obvious reason to doubt the date of 25 October 1757 which the article itself bears. Since the history of this particular manuscript is unknown prior to a 1950 sale, it could well be the manuscript from which the Kehl editors prepared the article.

11. 'Suicide' (K.lv.138-42; M.xx.444-46). The last three paragraphs were part of *Suicide, ou homicide de soi-même* which appeared in volume iv (1743) of the Amsterdam 1739 edition of Voltaire's *Œuvres* (39A). The first two paragraphs appear in less detailed form in 'Caton' of the 1770 *Questions* while the fourth paragraph is further developed in 'Caton'. There are no new texts here at all, just drafts and an old essay. It is not clear whether Kehl found them copied out in the present order or organised these fragments on its own authority.

iv. Do the Kehl articles have enough in common to have been part of a distinct collection?

The fundamental fact about the Kehl articles is that many are very substantial. They fall into two types: rather general articles like 'Foi', 'Grâce' and 'Bien',

and prodigiously learned articles like 'Généalogie', 'Eclipse', 'Reliques' and 'Zèle'.

It must be noted at the outset that the learned articles are in a class by themselves among all the alphabetical articles. 'Ame' of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* and several of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* articles are quite impressively learned. That is only to be expected since wide learning, or the semblance thereof, was Voltaire's stock-in-trade. This is not to say that Voltaire had command of all the primary and secondary materials to which he referred in his histories and polemics. Professor Pomeau's discussion of the comprehensiveness of Voltaire's library and the breadth of his reading ('La documentation', pp.395-405) is surely sound but also somewhat exaggerated. Whatever the scholarly difficulties of a question and the conflicting evidence bearing upon it, Voltaire generally proposed interpretations with insouciant decisiveness, and then paid the price of his daring in disputes with conservative pedants like Larcher and Guénéée who exploited his errors of detail to discredit his opinions. It is clear from the several sketches that have been identified, and from a comparison of the Kehl footnotes to Voltaire's private library, that Voltaire's erudition had to be borrowed. The Ferney library lacked much of the primary documentation that Voltaire cited and, in many cases, he betrays his debt to scholarly or journalistic treatments of a subject by referring to works that he possessed – generally Patristics – in editions that he did not own. This has been determined by identifying the editions whose pagination or internal divisions correspond to Voltaire's footnotes.

There is also the direct evidence of inherited scholarly errors to show that Voltaire did not command all the sources necessary for articles dealing with ecclesiastical history and with theology. Torrey has shown that Voltaire frequently verified references when he could. Evidently in ecclesiastical questions he often could not. A pair of letters to Moulou, a Genevan pastor and friend (27 and 30 June 1770, Best.D16452 and D16460), request that he verify references to such relatively familiar and accessible authors as st Jerome and Richard Simon, and Voltaire writes to Christin on 11 December 1769 (Best.D16044) that he will send him articles on jurisprudence for checking, and years earlier (9 November 1764, Best.D12187) he requested Moulou to supply the references for an article already written!

Professor Monty calls a series of very learned Kehl articles 'core articles' for three reasons: their learning, their mutual interrelation by cross-referencing which testifies to a unity of literary purpose and method, and their dependence – actual copying – upon the *Encyclopédie*. Most of these articles are extensively annotated. 'Zèle', for instance, has as many as 26 notes, 'Reliques' 24, and 'Messe', 'Eclipse' and 'Prophétie' almost as many relative to their length. These are not the gossipy digressions of an 'Amour socratique' (*Dictionnaire philosophique*), nor the critical refutations of long passages quoted in the text as in 'Causes finales I' or 'Quisquis' (*Questions*) but rather precise references to Church Fathers and to extremely obscure primary and secondary sources in ecclesiastical history.

It could be argued that a long, detailed, footnoted Kehl article is really the scholarly development of a more succinct *Dictionnaire* or *Questions* article or episode, and that the more general Kehl articles which parallel *Dictionnaire* or

Questions articles were written to complement the learned articles destined for the 'Opinion en alphabet'. If the Kehl articles do not seem to be improvements over their less scholarly counterparts, that may be because, apart from normal variations of quality and the element of subjective judgement, Voltaire chose to write in a more pedantic vein; he may not have sought the succinctness and *élan* of the other two collections which have prejudiced critical judgement about what is first-drawer Voltaire and what is mediocre.

There are a few things to be said in rebuttal. First, were it necessary to publish a few general articles to balance out the learned ones in a scholarly 'Opinion en alphabet', then any of the *Dictionnaire* or *Questions* articles would have been available. Voltaire never hesitated to reuse earlier writings in the alphabetical collections so he should have had no scruples about lifting a few for a new collection. In fact, he had at his disposal the *Dictionnaire* articles which he omitted from the *Questions*, yet he still composed alternatives to them. Secondly, even if Voltaire had begun an 'Opinion en alphabet', there is still no reason to believe that he would have undertaken an entire collection as uncharacteristically learned and as heavily footnoted as are so many of the Kehl articles.

The closest competitors in footnoting to the Kehl core articles – a term that will be retained for convenience even though all its implications will not be accepted – among the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* articles are 'Apôtres', 'Confession' and 'Ecouelles'. 'Bouc', 'Dieu II' and 'Eglise' are learned enough but still less oppressively footnoted. The *Questions* articles tend to incorporate their references in the text or to suppress them altogether, while the Kehl core articles, except 'Abbaye' which is insufficiently footnoted with respect to the wide range of historical fact and legend invoked, are rather encumbered by them.

Table of cross-references

'Abbaye'	→ 'Quête'
'Eclipse'	→ 'Prophétie', 'Vision de Constantin'
'Hérésie III'	→ 'Conciles', 'Généalogie', 'Inquisition', 'Zèle'
'Livres'	→ 'Hérésie'
'Messe'	→ 'Kalendes', 'Reliques'
'Noël'	→ 'Eclipse'
'Prophétie'	→ 'Sibylles'
'Oracles'	→ 'Kalendes'
'Reliques'	→ 'Zèle'
'Xavier'	→ 'Reliques'
'Zèle'	→ 'Généalogie', 'Reliques'

The many cross-references within the Kehl core show that at one time Voltaire thought of publishing them together in one collection or another and, since he did not publish them, it is evident that he subsequently decided to suppress them. There is some direct evidence for this in Bn n.a.fr. 2778, ff.79-80, 96-97, a text of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* 'Bulle', less its concluding sections. Across the bottom of f.97r under a pasted-in sheet containing two paragraphs that would first appear in Kehl, a line was drawn followed by a 'C', and f.97v begins with a 'C' and then the Kehl 'Conciles', crossed out. These pages were evidently part of a notebook or larger manuscript in a bold and elegant hand whose pages

are numbered consecutively. They are certainly not a Kehl transcription, of which there are several in n.a.fr. 2778; they are in a different hand and in a different format. To judge from the only part of the manuscript which we have identified, it may be a clear copy of articles that Voltaire thought of adding to either the 1767 *Dictionnaire* or to the *Raison par alphabet* (DP69) rather than being a manuscript of the *Questions*, because 'Bulle' eventually did appear in the *Questions*, but many articles were interposed between it and 'Conciles'. In any event, whether written for the 1767 or 1769 *Dictionnaire* and held back or, contrary to appearances, for the *Questions*, 'Bulle' and the Kehl 'Conciles' were written about the same time for the same collection, yet the former was eventually authorised while Voltaire replaced the latter in the *Questions* with a different 'Conciles' which draws upon it. To judge from the slight variants in the manuscript page of 'Conciles' which survives, Kehl must have based its edition on a different text.

There is reason to believe that there were cross-references to Kehl articles from articles that appear in the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* but that Voltaire eliminated them once he decided not to publish the Kehl articles. This is suggested by a manuscript of 'Eclipse' corrected in Voltaire's hand (Fitzwilliam museum, Boissy d'Anglas dossier, ms 6-1961, ff.356-58) where he strikes out the cross-references to 'Vision de Constantin' and to 'Prophétie' which survive in the Kehl text. Evidently he had decided to suppress these articles while he still entertained the idea of publishing 'Eclipse'. By analogy it must be supposed that authorised articles originally had cross-references to articles that Voltaire eventually suppressed and that they were all removed. The many cross-references still existing in the Kehl core suggest that Voltaire decided to suppress the manuscript articles in a group. As a result they lacked final editorial touches evident in the Fitzwilliam manuscript. What is surprising is that there are no references in the Kehl material to Voltaire's published works, particularly to the *Questions*, apart from the one from 'Dieu' to 'Infini'. It would have been useless to excise from articles to be suppressed references to articles that had been or were about to be published while leaving references to articles that were to be suppressed. This absence of references to published articles is, however, an argument for the independence of the Kehl core from the authorised alphabetical collections, which is contrary to the hypothesis advanced here.

Table of Encyclopédie borrowing

- 'Abbaye' ← 'Ab' by Mallet
- 'Décrétales' ← 'Décrétales (fausses)' by Bouchaud
- 'Fanatisme I' ← 'Fanatisme' by Deleyre
- 'Hérésie III' ← 'Hérétique' by Jaucourt
- 'Inquisition I' ← 'Inquisition' by Jaucourt
- 'Généalogie' ← 'Césarienne'
- 'Juifs III' ← 'Juif' by Jaucourt
- 'Kalendes' ← 'Fête des ânes' by Mallet, 'Fêtes des fous' by Jaucourt
- 'Livres III' ← 'Livre' by Diderot
- 'Messe' ← 'Danse sacrée' by Cahusac, 'Messe' by Jaucourt, 'Agape' by Mallet
- 'Oracles II' ← 'Oracles' by Jaucourt, 'Eloge de Dumarsais', by d'Alembert
- 'Reliques' ← 'Relique' by Jaucourt
- 'Sibylle' ← 'Sibylle', 'Sibyllins (livres)' by Jaucourt
- 'Université' ← 'Université' by Jaucourt

'Vision de Constantin' ← 'Vision de Constantin' by Jaucourt
 'Xavier' ← 'Xavier' by Jaucourt
 'Yvetot' ← 'Yvetot' by Jaucourt
 'Zèle' ← 'Zèle' by Jaucourt

The cross-referencing, the weighty erudition which Voltaire disguises as a rule in the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions*, the similar and complementary subject matter, and what contemporaries should not have failed to recognise as flagrant and transparent copying from the *Encyclopédie* – actually the only copying that Kehl acknowledges is 'Fanatisme' – all suggested to professor Monty that the core articles were indeed designed for an alphabetical collection of abridgements of *Encyclopédie* articles, the 'Opinion en alphabet' described in the 'Avertissement' and submerged among all the extraneous material that Kehl published in their edition of the *Dictionnaire philosophique*. In addition, there was an occasion for a series of *Encyclopédie* abridgements for a project contemplated by Panckoucke.³⁵ Panckoucke's letters to Voltaire have not survived so it is necessary to reconstruct the events from Voltaire's replies. As early as October/November 1768 (Best. D15280), Voltaire suggests tactful abridgement of the *Encyclopédie*, the project which he had pursued for years, ever since he had become disillusioned with Diderot's compromises. On 29 September 1769 (Best. D15929) he acknowledges Panckoucke's invitation to participate in the 'partie littéraire' (cf. Best. D15976, to d'Alembert, 28 October 1769) of the project which had already been reduced to a reprint of Diderot's *Encyclopédie* with supplementary volumes. Either misjudging Panckoucke's intentions or trying to reshape the project according to his own designs, Voltaire offers gratis, 'dans deux ou trois mois commencer à vous faire les articles suivants'. Of the eighteen titles that Voltaire lists ('des matériaux assez curieux' is his description in the letter to d'Alembert), two had already appeared in the *Dictionnaire*, 'Fanatisme' appears among the Kehl titles, and the description of 'Juifs' is fairly close to the Kehl 'Juifs III'. The remaining titles – and presumably the articles they described – can be found in the 1770 edition of the *Questions*.³⁶ Thirteen of the articles are actually described in some detail so they must have been drafted already. To judge from the titles, these were rather general literary and philosophical articles of the sort that had appeared in the *Dictionnaire*. In effect, Voltaire was offering his Parisian publisher the project of the *Questions* for which the Genevans would have paid generously. As late as 6 October (Best. D15942) Voltaire writes to mme Denis of his enthusiasm for the Panckoucke project and of the ease with which he expects to turn out the articles.

By 6 December (Best. D16025) he must have been informed that Panckoucke's project had encountered official obstacles and had been scaled down, or Panckoucke may have realised that the proposed 'contributions' were not quite suitable for an *Encyclopédie* which pretended to bring Diderot's up to date and to make it more rigorous. In any event, Voltaire sends Panckoucke general advice on the shape of the new encyclopedia, suggests abridging Jaucourt's prolix articles but does not offer to do it himself; however he does reiterate his tempting offer, 'J'ai actuellement plus de cent articles de prêts. Je les crois sages; mais, s'ils paraissent un peu hardis, sans être téméraires [...]' While assuring Panckoucke that the articles are sufficiently 'sages' to escape censorship, he also suggests the strategy

of a foreign sale – his old idea of the foreign publication of a more truly philosophical *Encyclopédie* – just in case. This could hardly have reassured the publisher who sought to exploit the unsatisfied French market with a cheaper edition of a best seller.³⁷ Going still further, Voltaire apparently tried to take advantage of Panckoucke's embarrassment with the *Supplément* and induce him to publish the *Questions*: 'Puis que vous avez été assez hardi pour vous charger de mes sottises en 4^o, il faut que cette sottise-ci soit de la même parure.' Panckoucke evidently refused again and Cramer published the first edition of the *Questions* which, by January 1770, had found their form and literary gravity relative to Diderot's *Encyclopédie* (Best.D16123, to d'Alembert, 31 January). A month later Voltaire can write to d'Alembert: 'On fait, par ordre alphabétique, un ouvrage qui n'a rien de commun avec le *Dictionnaire encyclopédique*, et dans lequel on rend à cet ouvrage immense la justice qui lui est due' (Best.D16186, 22 February). Voltaire now realised, even if it had not been the original intention, that he had embarked upon a critique of the *Encyclopédie*. (From this point of view it is not at all surprising that so many of the Kehl articles have a close relationship to the *Encyclopédie*!)

There was a second, still less promising occasion for a Voltaire-Panckoucke alphabetical collection. When Panckoucke was about to launch his *Encyclopédie méthodique* he again invited Voltaire to participate. On 23 August 1777 (Best.D20770) Voltaire offers encouragement but no participation, and in Best.D20910 of 20 November he undertakes articles but his reply is rather vague and he cannot have made much progress with the project, if he had begun to work upon it, because he was occupied with a revision of the *encadrée* for Panckoucke, and because on 5 February of the following year he left Ferney and his library for Paris. Aside from the brief interval between 20 November and 5 February when he might have been able to write the Kehl articles, there is not much cogency in associating them with this period. It will be shown that in fact, many of the Kehl articles antedated the *Questions* of 1770 so one would require better reason than opportunity to assign the remaining undatable articles to the second Panckoucke project.³⁸

Panckoucke, thus, can not be accorded the credit for having inspired the Kehl articles. Voltaire's *esprit alphabétique* had already intensified at the time of the major expansion of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* into the *Questions* which begins with the 1767 edition. Many of the articles that entered the *Questions* were already contemplated if not drafted before Voltaire received Panckoucke's invitation to participate in his encyclopedia. The *esprit alphabétique* persisted, in somewhat attenuated form, after Voltaire's participation in the Panckoucke project fell through. He added supplementary articles to the ninth volume of the *Questions*, in violation of the only convention of his loose genre, to fill out the volume which otherwise would have been too slender (Wade, *The Search for a new Voltaire*, pp.85-86), and added a few more articles and sections to the 1774 edition, but by then the alphabetical urge had evidently spent itself.

It could be argued, contrary to the thesis of this paper, that the Kehl articles are the debris of the hundred articles which Voltaire wrote to Panckoucke that he had prepared. Since most of the articles that he enumerated in Best.D15929 were incorporated into the *Questions*, it would be natural to assume that most of

the others were, too. In that case it would be most reasonable to treat the Kehl articles as the debris of the *Questions* since the relevant question is what made the relatively few Kehl articles – in relation to the *Questions* which is a very large collection – unsuitable while so many articles of the same provenience were published.

v. Sources – the *Encyclopédie*

The strongest argument against a core of *Encyclopédie*-related articles preserved in Kehl is that the articles of that assumed core derive from such a variety of other sources that they can not be construed as a collection of abridgements from any predominant source.

While, in general, the detection of literary influence is a delicate and even perilous occupation, the detection of borrowed texts is, at least in theory, not at all problematic. The object is to determine whether sufficiently long sequences of words had previously been published in some instrument which is likely to have come to an author's attention. In practice, denying that a text has any copied elements is risky, and the range of Voltaire's reading makes discovering copied elements often quite hard. In 'Kalendes' and 'Messe', for example, it is clear that Voltaire copied both from the *Encyclopédie* and from its sources. It is not clear, however, where Voltaire's copying from the *Encyclopédie* leaves off and his copying from its sources picks up. When copied passages are sufficiently long one can be sure that an exact or nearly exact correspondence of texts guarantees the identification of a source. Voltaire's *Marginalia*, the first volume of which has recently appeared, confirm, in the case of Beausobre, that most of the borrowing which we had detected in the Kehl articles is in fact indicated in Voltaire's exemplar in some fashion. We expect further confirmation from the marginalia in Calmet and the *Encyclopédie* when the next volume appears.

When passages are relatively short and the information they contain not terribly obscure (for example, that the Jews took the names of their angels from Babylonia, or that Gruter published an inscription refuting Justin Martyr's contention that Simon the Magician had been worshipped in Rome), one must exercise caution. Scholars quoted one another freely and paraphrased the same sources, so elements of information could be (and, in the examples mentioned, in fact were) discussed in much the same terms in various books that Voltaire knew quite well. This is the case, for example, in the article 'Sibylle' which apparently copies from the *Encyclopédie* which itself copies and/or edits almost its entire text from Nicolas Fréret's 'Observations sur les oracles', *Mémoires de l'Académie royale des inscriptions* (1749).

One is often tempted to identify small units of text with particular sources if the material seems to be rare, if Voltaire drew other related information from the same source, or if the source is betrayed by a characteristic typographical error or faulty reference. In 'Abbaye', for one example, Voltaire describes the special privileges of the abbaye-cardinale de la Ste Trinité in Vendôme. This information, in the same terms, was available in the *Encyclopédie* 'Ab' so, since 'Abbaye' clearly takes its point of departure from that article, it is probable that the Ste Trinité material comes from there too, even though the common text is

short and Voltaire's article has other sources of information. 'Généalogie' contains the same list of eminent men born by Cæsarian section as does the *Encyclopédie* 'Césarienne'. Even though the two articles have no other evident connection, this small unit may be tentatively assigned to the *Encyclopédie* until another source containing the same list is identified.

Another question that must be raised regarding small units of copying is whether there are cases where Voltaire remembered elements of information in almost the terms in which he read them, long after he forgot his source – Wagnière testified to Voltaire's excellent memory – or whether he looked them up for articles he was writing. There may not be a general answer; some points of information may have been verified in the precise language of the source while others were recalled quite accurately and still others recalled quite inaccurately.

The extent of copying from the *Encyclopédie*, and thus its importance to the Kehl articles relative to its contributions to articles of the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions*, varies considerably. Certain articles such as 'Décrétales', 'Fanatisme', 'Hérésie', 'Juifs III', 'Kalendes', 'Oracles', 'Sibylle', 'Vision de Constantin', 'Yvetot' and 'Université' copy extensively. Other articles merely borrow a point of departure – 'Abbaye', 'Inquisition I', 'Livres', 'Reliques', 'Xavier' (where the borrowing is not quite initial) and 'Zèle' – or cite a commonplace from the *Encyclopédie* in order to refute it as in 'Théologie'. There are analogous cases in the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*³⁹ and in the articles that Voltaire contributed to the *Encyclopédie* (Naves, pp. 122ff.). Quite typically Voltaire would begin an alphabetical article with a rather ordinary definition which could be either original, as in 'Grâce' and 'Foi' of Kehl, or drawn from such respectable sources as Moréri's *Dictionnaire* ('Conciles', Kehl), or Calmet's *Dictionnaire historique* ('Baptême', both the Kehl and the *Dictionnaire* articles).⁴⁰ The sources of the definitions need not influence the direction of the article – none of those just cited do – although they may furnish other material for it as did Calmet for 'Baptême' and the *Encyclopédie* 'Ab' for 'Abbaye'.

Voltaire's 'debt' to the *Encyclopédie* must not, therefore, be exaggerated and construed as the unifying factor of the Kehl articles, much less of an 'Opinion en alphabet'. In the first place there are other sources and one in particular, Isaac de Beausobre, lent almost as many pages of text as the *Encyclopédie*, and can be said to have had some intellectual influence on Voltaire. In the second place, the *Encyclopédie* often transmitted the research of seventeenth-century ecclesiastical scholars in a nearly pellucid fashion. Several of the articles upon which Voltaire drew, such as those which contributed to 'Messe', were singularly uncritical and unencyclopédique. Even when Voltaire copied from congenial articles – generally Jaucourt's – it was not the ideas that he borrowed, much less the prose which, as professor Monty has shown, he tightened up in transcription, but the anthologies of primary and secondary materials. In any event, a debt to the *Encyclopédie* is hardly an exclusive trait of the core articles any more than extensive borrowing is peculiar to them. 'Inquisition' of the 1769 *Dictionnaire* and 'Antipodes' of the *Questions* copy from the *Encyclopédie*; 'Certitude', 'Infini' and 'Bêtes' openly take issue with it; 'Adam' and 'Foi' of the 1767 *Dictionnaire* (this is demonstrable from parallel Kehl articles) are so opposed to the *Encyclopédie* that a connection is inescapable. *Dictionnaire* and *Questions* articles can be

as dependent upon their sources as any of the Kehl articles. 'Inquisition' (1769 *Dictionnaire*), 'Inquisition II' (Kehl), 'Aranda' (*Questions*) copy extensively from Morellet, 'Bulle' of the *Questions* depends upon Du Marsais's *Exposition de la doctrine de l'église gallicane* (1757),⁴¹ and 'Vampires' upon Calmet. 'Ecrouelles' depends in part upon the *Encyclopédie*, in part on Le Brun, and in part on at least one still unidentified source which mentions a work by sir John Fortescue (1394?-1476) which remained unpublished until the twentieth century! As a group, however, the learned Kehl articles are closer to their sources and more dependent upon them than the relatively large and varied sampling of *Questions* and *Dictionnaire* articles which we recently had occasion to edit.

As has been remarked, the learned Kehl articles are formidably scholarly and range over such ecclesiastically related subjects as Chinese astronomy, early heresies, ancient practices regarding the holy relics, and the liturgies in which the Feast of Fools was celebrated in fifteenth-century French churches. Voltaire's general articles could have been written with no more than his sharp wit and a Bible and Lucretius at hand for verification, but the learned articles, with their cryptic references to primary sources and scholarly treatises, are impregnated with library dust. They had either to be copied from specialists or had to be the work of a scholar to be ranked with Mabillon for the depth and breadth of his knowledge. Since Voltaire was not so learned as Mabillon the first alternative is more cogent and, in fact, almost all the learned passages in the Kehl articles are demonstrably copied.

It will be convenient to make a somewhat arbitrary distinction at this point between original articles and copied ones. This does not refer entirely to the sequence of words but to the article's general composition and marshalling. An entirely original work of historical exposition may be largely composed of quotations and citations from primary and secondary sources, but all juxtaposed and organised to make the author's point, and he is to be held responsible for their accuracy and historicity. Such articles may be decently objective or entirely polemical. 'Abraham', 'Baptême' and 'Moïse' are, for example, entirely original compilations of Biblical and historical materials without, in the first two cases, any discernibly new ideas. ('Moïse', however, without introducing extra-biblical material, can still propose some significant innovations to the entirely traditional lower criticism in which it is grounded.) In copied articles, by contrast, Voltaire reproduces long extracts from secondary sources and is at their mercy for the accuracy of the quotations and references – several of his errors in footnoting can be traced to his sources or to a misunderstanding of their footnoting conventions⁴² – as well as for the balance, choice and exclusion of material.

In those articles where many sources contribute relatively small units of information or phrases, Voltaire has begun to synthesise 'original' articles. When the synthesis is still incomplete or imperfect, as in the case of many of the Kehl articles, the seams and stitches which bind together the various fragments culled for the article remain detectable. (This is the difference between these articles and the *Dictionnaire philosophique* articles which Voltaire admitted were copied where, except for 'Apocalypse', 'Messie' and 'Inquisition' of the 1769 *Dictionnaire*, the copying is nearly invisible and thoroughly amalgamated into Voltaire's articles.) In the Kehl material we can in some instances 'unwrite' an

article – the late Moses Hadas’s expression – decompose it into its component sources and determine what material Voltaire rejected as well as what he collected and shaped to suit his needs.⁴³ The two articles where this method can be applied with the best results are ‘Généalogie’ and ‘Messe’, and even there the dissection of Voltaire’s memory must still be far from complete. There seems to be no way to account completely for the most interesting aspect of Voltaire’s literary creation, the rejection of all the unsuitable or unharmonious elements of his personal and literary experience which were surely called up from memory during the composition of an article – imagine the wealth of associations the mass must have had for him, or the idea of genealogy! Professor Monty and dr Waterman were able to perform an analysis of eliminations in the restricted area of style, and demonstrated how Voltaire abridged *Encyclopédie* and Abauzit texts until all the inessentials had been discarded and the pithy and effective remained, according to his sense of those qualities, which is ultimately what literary scholarship would like to determine. Outside the alphabetical articles, in *La Sainte bible enfin expliquée*, professor Arnold Ages has been able to produce bi-columnar comparisons of Voltaire’s prose with the passages in Calmet which he adapted. Certain of the Kehl articles permit us to perform the same operation on Voltaire’s copying from Beausobre, Claude Fleury and the *Examen critique*. But now a broader perspective is possible. When one knows that Voltaire researched an article, or at least refreshed his memory, in certain chapters of several sources, one can assume that he chose to omit those details and anecdotes which do not appear in his article. Obvious examples are the distortion of apologists and historical sources in order to extract material contrary to their views,⁴⁴ but more subtle examples can now be adduced which have a bearing on what was suitable material for a polemic. Since, as will be demonstrated, several Kehl articles were absorbed into articles for the *Questions*, one can even observe Voltaire editing himself, eliminating what, on reflection, must have appeared to be extraneous in his own prose and documentation. These articles are, in such cases, the analogues to manuscript drafts and show Voltaire in his workshop.

vi. Other sources

At least eight articles copy extensively from Isaac de Beausobre’s *Histoire critique de Manichéisme et du manichéisme* (Amsterdam 1734-1739; BV310): ‘Conciles’, ‘Généalogie’, ‘Messe’, ‘Noël’, ‘Prophétie’, ‘Reliques’, ‘Xavier’ and ‘Zèle’. ‘Zèle’ is the only one that acknowledges its borrowing. A detail and reference in ‘Livres’ that regard the authority of the books excluded from the canon probably come from Beausobre, too, but they are too short for one to be certain. From the selectivity with which Voltaire copies from Claude Fleury’s *Histoire ecclésiastique* (1691-1734) in ‘Conciles’ one can suppose that Fleury was the source of much of Voltaire’s information regarding Church history, especially since Voltaire admired Fleury’s preliminary *discours*.⁴⁵ Fleury was not a critical historian like Beausobre,⁴⁶ so the material available in his history was not ready made for a Voltairean polemic, but he was thorough, encyclopedic and exploitable. A comparison of Voltaire’s ecclesiastical history outside the Kehl additions and articles will probably reveal other debts to him.⁴⁷ ‘Kalendes’ copies from Jean-

Baptiste Lucette Du Tilliot's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la fête des fous* (1741), and 'Messe' from Jacques Bonnet's *Histoire générale de la danse sacrée et profane* (Paris 1724; BV469). Although Calmet does not lend much text to any of the Kehl articles, he figures directly and prominently in 'Adam', 'Ange', 'Baptême', 'Généalogie' and probably also in 'Eclipse' and 'Prophéties'.

Two of the clandestine tracts figure in these articles. The *Analyse de la religion chrétienne* (of which more later) supplied a strange anecdote relating to a supposed establishment of the canon of the gospels at the first council of Nicea. The identification of this source is not only assured by the anecdote's obscurity – it is neither in Fleury nor in Tillemont – but by an incorrect footnote. The sequence of allegedly christological verses upon which 'Prophéties' comments seems to come out of the *Analyse*, too, but that is not equally sure despite the fact that Voltaire draws on that work elsewhere, notably in 'Contradictions' of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*. A large part of 'Livres' – with a distinctive typographical error – comes from the *Examen critique des apologistes de la religion chrétienne*, and there is reason to believe that it inspired 'Xavier' as well as 'Evangile' of the 1767 *Dictionnaire*.

'Eclipse' and 'Abbaye' are two cases where it is clear that Voltaire is drawing upon secondary sources, almost surely a single one for 'Eclipse' and possibly several for 'Abbaye', which have so far eluded identification. 'Eclipse' is based on the controversy that was provoked in England (1732-1733) when Arthur Ashley Sykes attacked the credibility of the testimony that st Denis the Areopagite attributed to Phlegon regarding an eclipse seen in Rome at the moment of the crucifixion. Sykes relied upon astronomical calculations initiated by Kepler to show that such an eclipse was impossible, and upon Denis Petau's analysis of Patristic texts (*De doctrina temporum* XII.xxi [1627]), to argue that they merely repeated st Denis's assertion without adding independent corroboration. Voltaire's article draws upon his familiar in Biblical questions, Calmet, upon three separate pamphlets by Sykes, and upon William Whiston's reply to Sykes. None of this material, except of course Calmet, figures in Voltaire's library and he refers to an astronomer who is 'unnamed' in Sykes, and 'G. M.' in Whiston, as an unidentifiable 'Gale Morris'. (In 'Denis' of the *Questions* Voltaire refers to him as 'Gale et Maurice', confusing the identification even further.) There had to be an intermediary between the English disputants, Sykes and Whiston – one sufficiently familiar with the English scientific community to risk an identification of Whiston's 'G. M.' with a figure so obscure that he is not listed in the J. C. Pogendorff, *Biographisch-literarischen Handwörterbuch zum Geschichte der exacten Wissenschaften*⁴⁸ – and Voltaire, Jaucourt ('Ténèbres de la passion' and 'Tralles') and the author of the *Analyse de la religion chrétienne*⁴⁹ and *La Religion chrétienne analysée*.⁵⁰ (Since Jaucourt's articles and the *Analyse* appeared in print in 1765/1766, the hypothetical intermediate source must have been in circulation in France before that date. If it could be identified it could narrow the possible time span for the *Analyse* which, according to the most recent study, was written after 1739.)⁵¹ The Fitzwilliam manuscript of 'Eclipse', though incomplete at the point where 'Gale Morris' would be mentioned – there is a mark in the margin indicating that an insertion was to be made at that point – supports the hypothesis of an intermediate source. It bears the title, 'dissertation sur leclipse arrivee / lan

32 de notre ere vulgaire / par M^r Freret secretaire perpetuel / [continued in the margin] de lacademie / des inscriptions / et belles lettres'. Now it is clear from the cross-references to other Kehl articles that 'Eclipse', in the form represented in the manuscript and in Kehl, was written by Voltaire for an alphabetical collection. He may have thought of attributing 'Eclipse' to the learned Fréret who had died in 1749 and was thus beyond suffering for an audacious article, but it seems that Voltaire was drawing upon an as yet unidentified clandestine tract which may have proposed itself as Fréret's work – other clandestine manuscripts were, perhaps plausibly but still incorrectly, attributed to him – and Voltaire innocently took the attribution at face value.

'Abbaye' is extremely knowledgeable about Benedictine history and especially about the lore of Monte-Cassino. 'Quête' of Kehl, 'Abbé, abbaye' and 'Biens de l'église r' of the *Questions* are evidently related to it by subject matter. Dom Anselmo Lentini, titular historian of Monte-Cassino, suggested in a letter of February 1974 that Voltaire could have absorbed the arcane Benedictine lore reproduced in such detail in those articles (and, although he did not discuss it, also at a few points of the *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.45, where professor Pomeau in his fine edition admits that he has not identified the sources) from Calmet and his brothers of the abbey of Sénones,⁵² in whose company he spent three weeks in the summer of 1754. This is plausible because the abbey of Sénones had been reorganised after the model of Monte-Cassino during the great Benedictine reform of the first half of the seventeenth century. 'Abbaye' and the three related articles are heavily but not accurately documented so one would have to suppose that Voltaire brought back very detailed but not too correct notes from Sénones, and that he was not able to verify his notes and recollections in the Ferney library.

Voltaire knew the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great which he cites for the biography of st Benedict, but, unaided, could he have known the *Gesta Dagoberti* in Duchesne's *Historiae Francorum scriptores* (1636-1649), or the *Chronica sacri Casinensis* by Leo Marsicanus (c.1045-c.1115), or its continuation by Peter, deacon of Monte-Cassino, the primary sources of his information? While he evidently knew Paolo Sarpi's *Traité des bénéfices* and Claude Pithoys's *Apocalypse de Méilton* – they figure (with page references) in 'Biens de l'église' and 'Apocalypse' of the *Questions* as well as in 'Abbaye' and 'Quête' of Kehl, though Pithoys is no longer to be found in Voltaire's library – is he likely to have been able to quote primary sources from Sirmond's *Concilia antiqua Galliae* (1629), or from Mabillon's *Acta sanctorum ordinis s. Benedicti*? And if Voltaire had done the research himself, why should his footnotes to Mézeray's *Histoire de France* (which was well known and which he did not possess) not correspond to any edition ever published, and why should he unnecessarily attribute to Mézeray much more than he wrote? Voltaire evidently knew that relic of seventeenth-century anti-monastic polemics, bishop Jean-Pierre Camus's *Eclaircissements de Méilton* (1635) through Pithoys's abridgement and Jean Meslier's extracts (*Testament* VI.47), but such defences of the religious orders as Domenico Gravina's *Vox turturis* (1625) and Yves de Paris's *Les Heureux succès de la piété ou les triomphes que la vie religieuse a remportés sur le monde et l'hérésie* (1634), and such self-aggrandising tracts as Constantin Cajetan's *De religiosa s. Ignatii sive s. Enneconis, fundatoris societatis*

Iesu, per patres benedictinos institutione (1641) were ancient history by Voltaire's time, despite the contention they provoked when they were published. Evidently Voltaire only knew them at second hand⁵³ or by half-forgotten reputations because he knows of the *Vox turturis* as *La Tourterelle de l'âme*, and confuses Constantin Cajetan with an Ambrosius Cajetan who either never existed or never wrote. While most of the material in 'Quête' is within Voltaire's range – Claude Fleury on canonisations, Henri Sauval, Matthieu Pâris and Pierre L'Estoile – there is a reference to René Choppin in 'Abbé, abbaye' of the *Questions* which is not because Choppin was long out of date. If dom Lentini's suggestion is wrong, then the articles are related to one or two extremely knowledgeable secondary sources whose identification has so far defeated intensive efforts.

The specifically French material may derive from the visits to Ferney in the spring of 1768 and of 1769⁵⁴ of the freethinking lawyer, Charles-Gabriel-Frédéric Christin (1744-1799) who collaborated with Voltaire on a defence of the serfs of the monastic lands of Saint-Claude and assisted Voltaire with various jurisprudential writings, particularly the *Commentaire sur le livre des délits et des peines par un avocat de province* (1766). Christin's *Dissertation sur l'établissement de l'abbaye de s. Claude, ses chroniques, ses légendes, ses chartes* ([Neufchâtel] 1772) suggests that he had a sufficient command of the specialised bibliography of 'Abbaye' to have provided Voltaire with the necessary scholarship. Since Voltaire intended to annotate the *Dissertation* (see Best.D15972, 26 October 1769, to Christin), it would beg the question to assume that it was Christin rather than Voltaire who supplied the ecclesiastical expertise if the initial perception were not that such scholarship was beyond Voltaire's means. Besides, Voltaire attributed to Christin both 'Biens de l'église I' and 'Biens de l'église II' which seem to be partially derived from the Kehl 'Abbaye' so it is easy to implicate Christin in that article, too, even if his contribution cannot be identified.

The authors of the books which Voltaire conscripted into the service of the Kehl articles were all professional scholars except possibly for the authors of the two clandestine tracts, and even they have an impressive command of apocrypha and other ecclesiastical subjects. The *Encyclopédie* material is usually on a tertiary level, syntheses of various specialised studies of ecclesiastical history. Thus the actual range of scholarship which contributed indirectly to the Kehl articles is enormous. 'Abbaye' depends upon Mabillon's researches in Benedictine hagiography, upon his purge of dubiously attested saints, as well as upon Sarpi's studies of ecclesiastical revenues. 'Messe' depends upon Du Cange, Louis Thomassin, *Anciennes et nouvelles disciplines de l'église touchant les bénéfices et les bénéficiers* (1678-1679), Pierre Hélyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques* (1714-1719), Giovanni Cardinal Bona, *Rerum liturgicarum* (1677), Jean-Baptiste Thiers, *Traité des superstitions qui regardent les sacrements selon l'écriture sainte* (1697), Joseph Bingham, *Origines ecclesiasticae* (1710), and upon several editions of the Church Fathers and Councils. 'Kalendes' depends upon Du Cange, 'Eclipse' upon Petau, Kepler and the Newtonian celestial mechanics, and 'Noël' upon Joseph Scaliger. 'Décrétales' depends, by way of the *Encyclopédie*, upon Pierre de Marca, a Gallican bishop and Richelieu's spokesman in his disputes with Rome, and upon the pastor, David Blondel, de Marca's contemporary. Again through the intermediary of the *Encyclopédie* (Jaucourt), 'Sibylle' depends upon Fréret and

Johann Albert Fabricius's *Bibliotheca graeca*. Voltaire was surely not always aware of the genealogy of his articles – the list could be extended much further – because his interest was largely polemical. It would not be an exaggeration to say, however, that the lineage of the Kehl articles entails almost all the significant contributors to the ecclesiastical sciences up to his time.

While 'Décrétales', 'Reliques', 'Sibylle' and 'Zèle' are almost entirely copied from one or two secondary sources with little that is Voltairean in them except for stylistic editing and abridging, other articles such as 'Conciles', 'Généalogie', 'Messe', 'Prophéties', 'Xavier' and even 'Abbaye' and 'Quête', although the immediate source of the latter two has not yet been identified, are original concatenations of found materials rather than editions of others' works. Certain contemporary novels and musical compositions have been described as collages because they are built out of blocks of ready made texts. That is not the case, or rather the effect, here because Voltaire's borrowings do not seem designed to carry their literary identity and resonance with them. When he exploits a pious author or sacred text for polemical purposes he will identify them as a rule because otherwise few readers would appreciate the jest.⁵⁵ Compare, for example, 'Genèse' and 'Vampires' of the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions* with the Kehl 'Baptême'. All three draw upon Calmet for information but the former two impugn the subject under discussion by Calmet's credulity regarding his sources, while the Kehl 'Baptême' does not even mention him. Yet the Kehl 'Baptême' contains passages sufficiently long and idiosyncratic to be identified as Calmet's. The *Dictionnaire* refines and abridges these passages still further, in fact to the point where the borrowing from Calmet would not have been detectable had the Kehl sketch, an intermediate stage, not been preserved. Thus, far from a collage effect, Calmet's conscription into the service of the erudition and polemic of 'Baptême' would have passed unnoticed but for the betrayal of the Kehl sketch.

There is also a certain tongue-in-cheek play with sources in the Kehl articles. In 'Noël' Voltaire cites apocryphal and relatively late Patristic sources for the date of Jesus's birth, and in 'Généalogie' he uses similar material to guarantee the physical procedure by which Jesus was conceived and to document the manner of his birth and his childhood miracles. In 'Prophéties' he cites Martino Martini (1659) and Gottlieb Spitzel (1666) on Chinese history and letters as though they were primary or authoritative sources. Actually, Martini knew some Chinese, but by the time Voltaire was writing there were much better sources, as he must have known, and the material cited from Martini is quite incredible. As a final example, 'Généalogie' identifies the grave theological and judicial opinions that described how incorporeal demons effect sexual intercourse with mortal women, and even beget children upon them, despite their 'cold' nature which precludes procreation.

In some cases Voltaire may not have realised the limited historical value of the sources he quoted through Beausobre who wittingly commanded and implicitly or explicitly criticised an impressively wide repertoire of dubious testimonies and naïvely ignorant historians. Beausobre's *Histoire critique* is not only a study of the legendary adumbration and ritual elaboration of apostolic Christianity, but also a history of the 'Réformation dont on trouve des Essais dans quelques vues de ces Sociétés Chrétiennes, qui se séparèrent du Gros de

l'Eglise Grecque et de l'Eglise Latine, ou que la violence des Evêques en arracha' (i.iii). To penetrate beneath the authorised history of the two Churches, Beausobre was obliged to perform a highly critical, revisionistic reading of Patristic sources – for which, incidentally, he still retained some reverence – and to rely on rare and dubious accounts of ancient heresies and heretics. He was probably aware that the Eutychius whom he cited regarding the suppression of the Arians at the first council of Nicea (325) was a tenth-century patriarch of Alexandria (*Histoire critique*, i.531), and he may have expected fellow scholars in ecclesiastical history to realise it and to judge the weight of his testimony accordingly, but by the time Voltaire cites Eutychius in 'Conciles' and other works he was either unaware of the quality of the source or did not scruple to leave his innocent readers unalerted.

There is something rather ahistorical about Voltaire's borrowing from Beausobre, quite apart from his unwitting misevaluation of sources. Writing Reformation ecclesiastical history, Beausobre imposed a certain perspective upon it. He implied when he did not state outright that apostolic Christianity endured profound (and deleterious) changes, while Voltaire's polemical adaptation of Beausobre tends to regard all the rites, customs and opinions he treats as contemporaneous phenomena. It is as though the Christianity of any one era, even the apostolic era, stands characterised (and damned) by Christian practices and beliefs of all others. Thus it is significant that, while copying a passage from Beausobre regarding the ancient bishops' frequent exploitation of apocryphal and falsified documents in the interest of the faith ('Zèle'), Voltaire neglects to transcribe Beausobre's exception of the apostolic period from the 'comédie pieuse' that he had described (*Histoire critique*, ii.756). By ignoring Beausobre's Reformation historicising of the Christian tradition in these articles which, with the exception of 'Conciles', do not yet represent Voltaire's most nuanced opinions nor his most sophisticated historiography, he produced an almost Catholic historical scheme. By polemical intention or by the inadvertance of unpolished drafts, these articles give the impression of rattling the skeletons of what Bossuet and apologists of the period had insisted was the 'constant and uniform tradition' of the Church, and damning it in all its aspects because Voltaire could present many of its excesses and aberrations in a damnable light.

vii. Dating

It is consistent with the hypothesis of this paper that the Kehl materials are too diverse in their origins for there to be a method of dating them collectively. A careful study of individual articles' sources, references and footnotes sometimes yields *termini a quo*. In the cases where articles seem to be drafts of published material *termini ad quem* can be established, but distinguishing a draft from an independent work is less certain than the identification of references and, in most cases, sources. When a Kehl article and a published work deal, in the whole or in part, with the same subject and exploit the same or related documentation, and when the published form is more brilliant – admittedly, a subjective judgement – it is more reasonable to conclude in most cases that the Kehl article is the draft of the published work than to argue that the Kehl corpus

is one where Voltaire repeated himself so frequently and so ineffectively.⁵⁶ It is easier to imagine him applying Saint-Exupéry's dictum *avant la lettre* and eliminating pedantic and scholarly dross from the Kehl articles, or rather from those of their parts that seemed potentially useful so that the few arguments and anecdotes retained in a revised article or published in another context might be seen to better advantage. Professor Pomeau has found evidence for just such a 'méthode constante' outside the Kehl corpus: 'Il applique ici la règle d'efficacité qui veut qu'on retranche tout ce qui est oiseux pour ne retenir que les idées qui portent' ('La documentation', p.398).

It will be most convenient for the reader if the Kehl articles – those about whose dates something can be said – are treated alphabetically rather than chronologically. It will be assumed that the cross-references contained in the articles are contemporaneous with their composition rather than subsequent additions because this hypothesis yields dates that are consistent with the *termini a quo* given by the sources. In practice we have accepted the date of publication of a *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* article as the limiting date for the Kehl articles which appear to precede it. Actually, one can assume more cogently that the limiting date is the composition of the articles for the *Questions*, mostly in 1769-70, rather than the moment that the article appeared whether in 1770 or 1771. (The exceptions would be the articles which appeared in the ninth volume of the *Questions*, out of sequence.) The effect of this simplification is to narrow the timespan even further for many of the articles. In effect, those that are related to the *Questions* might as well be considered contemporary with the composition of the bulk of the *Questions* articles.

12. 'Abbaye' (K.xlvii.30-39; M.xvii.18-22) draws on the *Encyclopédie* 'Ab', so it was written after 28 June 1751, when that volume reached Voltaire. Because it lent material to 'Abbé', 'Apparition' and 'Biens de l'Eglise' – or at least they develop material sketched here – it must be no later than the first two volumes of the *Questions*, or 1770. Should a secondary source dealing with the Benedictine material of 'Abbaye' be identified, it may be possible to produce a later *terminus a quo*, but very likely not much later. In the *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.45, addition of 1761, Voltaire already has information about Didier, abbot of Monte-Cassino, which professor Pomeau cannot trace to Muratori or any of Voltaire's other usual sources for Italian ecclesiastical history. If that material and the really obscure Benedictine material of 'Abbaye' come from the visit to Sénones in 1754 – and if that is the case, why did the Benedictine material of the *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.45, not appear in the 1756 edition? – or a literary source encountered before 1761, one would not be able to narrow the interval for the composition of 'Abbaye' by very much. If some of the documentation does come from Christin, as we have speculated, then the article was written after the spring of 1769.

13. 'Abraham' (K.xlvii.71-80; M.xvii.40-44) is a detailed and repetitive article, actually two very similar articles strung together. Since it adds little to the *Dictionnaire* 'Abraham' (1764) and is less effective, one can conjecture that it is its draft, or one of them, possibly even the 'Abraham' submitted to Frederick.⁵⁷

14. 'Adam' (K.xlvii.105-108; M.xvii.58-60) speaks of 'Hanscrit' and of the *Veidam*. While this may be the fraudulent Indian sacred scripture which duped Voltaire in 1759, the text seems rather to be related to John Zephaniah Holwell's

Interesting historical events relative to the provinces of Bengal (1767), BV1666, because of the spelling, 'Hanscrit', and other resemblances.

15. 'Ange' (K.xlvii.453-57; M.xvii.252-54) could be a draft of the *Dictionnaire* 'Ange' (1764), but the resemblances are not compelling.

16. 'Athée 1' (K.xlviii.305-12; M.xvii.453-57) is clearly inspired by Jean-Baptiste Bullet's *L'Existence de Dieu [...]* (1768), and seems to follow, in a logical sequence of development, the second *Homélie prêchée à Londres* (1767), while preceding both the 'Athéisme' of the *Questions* (1770) and the *Lettres de Memmius à Cicéron* III (1771) which are more sophisticated examples of the probability arguments adapted from Bullet in 'Athée 1'. There is an indirect confirmation of the role that Bullet plays in this article from the Leningrad *encadrée*. At two points in the marginal notes to 'Athéisme' Voltaire identified the arguments which he was confuting with an 'objection de Maupertuis' whom Bullet explicitly sought to refute.

17. 'Baptême' (K.xlviii.479-83; M.xvii.544-46) does not figure in Bengesco's list. It probably precedes the *Dictionnaire* 'Baptême' (1764) because various themes it develops in detail appear as passing references in the 1764 article. In particular, Voltaire's casual suggestion, 'Voyez sur cela [la régénération par immersion] Epiphane, Maimonide et la Gemara', is justified by his source for the Kehl 'Baptême', Calmet, who cites those texts, directly in the first case, and through John Selden in the latter two, with precise references. This is indirect evidence that the *Dictionnaire* article does depend upon the draft preserved in Kehl.

18. 'Bien' (K.xlix.10-20; M.xvii.576-81) is an uncertain case. It may have served as a draft for parts of 'Bien (tout est)' and 'Fin (cause finale)' of the 1764 *Dictionnaire* but there are no texts in common. The article has a decidedly Spinozistic cast that is precocious relative to the chronology that professor Vernière has established for Voltaire's receptiveness to the *Ethics*, and it would suggest that Voltaire adulterated his pantheistic sympathies to produce the more conventional (and even Aristotelian) 'Bien (tout est)' and 'Fin (cause finale)'. The resemblances between the Kehl article and the two *Dictionnaire* articles are not so compelling, and professor Vernière's chronology of Voltaire's Spinozism is so convincing⁵⁸ that the priority of 'Bien' over the 1764 articles is not asserted. In any event the Spinozan approach towards good and evil of 'Bien' was already formulated in the *Traité de métaphysique*, ch.2.

19. 'Conciles' (K.xlix.379-96; M.xviii.205-13) existed in the same notebook as 'Bulle' of the *Questions*. It is a rather Gallican article in its emphasis on the first eight Church councils called and dominated by the temporal powers, but still draws on Beausobre who dealt with the Church councils from a different point of view. Voltaire read and admired Beausobre in 1750 (see Best.D4756, 2 January 1751, to Formey) and evidently reread and exploited him after 1765 because in 'Reliques', 'Xavier' and 'Zèle' he used him in connection with *Encyclopédie* texts that did not reach Ferney till February 1765 (see Best.D12965, note 6), and before 1770 because Kehl articles drawing on Beausobre were adapted into 'Adorer', 'Almanach' and 'Conciles' of the *Questions*. Voltaire also reproduces a very obscure anecdote, with its distinctively inaccurate footnote, from the *Analyse de la religion chrétienne par Du Marsais*, a clandestine tract to which

he did not have access before early December 1765 (see below). Much of 'Conciles' went into 'Arius' and 'Conciles' of the 1767 edition of the *Dictionnaire*, and into 'Arianisme' of the *Questions*.

20. 'Décrétales' (K.I.126-36; M.xviii.319-23) was entirely copied and adapted from André Bouchaud's 'Décrétales (fausses)' of the fourth volume of the *Encyclopédie* which appeared 14 October 1754. Incidentally, Bouchaud was a particularly estimable contributor to judge from Gibbon's praise of his 'Conciles'.⁵⁹

21. 'Dieu' (K.I.196-200; M.xviii.357-59) represents itself as part of 'ce dictionnaire' which Beuchot construed as a reference to the 'Opinion en alphabet' because the article was manifestly not contained in any edition of either the *Dictionnaire philosophique* or the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*. Unfortunately, the Kehl text is not reliable here. Because they consolidated the *Questions* with the *Dictionnaire*, the Kehl editors systematically changed Voltaire's references to the *Questions* into references to the *Dictionnaire* (see 'Quisquis' and Taylor, p.32). Thus the article was not necessarily drafted for either the *Dictionnaire* or the 'Opinion en alphabet'. The article cross-references to 'Infini' of the *Questions* which criticises the *Encyclopédie*'s 'Infini' (volume 8) which reached Voltaire in February 1766. While 'Dieu' may be posterior to the publication of the *Questions* 'Infini' (volume 7, 1771), it is more likely that it is contemporaneous with its composition, that is, certainly after 1766 and almost surely in 1767-1770. The interest of 'Dieu' in probability seems to correspond to the probability arguments in 'Athée' (Kehl) / 'Athéisme' (*Questions*), and the eternity and divisibility of matter and their theological implications that it discusses resemble texts in 'Matière' of the *Dictionnaire*. Voltaire would have had reason to suppress the article on the grounds that he had developed its themes in other articles that were to appear in the *Questions*.

22. 'Eclipse' (K.I.366-75; M.xviii.449-53) is the object of a cross-reference from 'Noël' which precedes 1770, and it refers to 'Prophéties' and to the 'Vision de Constantin' of volume 17 of the *Encyclopédie* or to the Kehl article copied from it. Voltaire wrote to Damilaville, 4 February 1766 (Best.D13156) that he had just received the last volumes of the *Encyclopédie* from Briasson and that he was reading them with excitement, so 'Eclipse' could not have preceded that date. It was abridged into 'Denis (Saint) l'Aréopagite, *De la grande éclipse observée par Denis*' of volume 4 of the *Questions* (1771). The same material reappears, further abridged, in the *Sommaire historique des quatre évangiles* XVIII (1776) and in the *Histoire de l'établissement du christianisme*, ch.6, vi note (1778), but not in earlier texts. As has been remarked, the immediate source of the article has not yet been identified. The manuscript in the Fitzwilliam Museum poses certain problems. It is clearly a more advanced copy than the one which Kehl reproduces, or rather Kehl does not reproduce Voltaire's manuscript deletions and corrections which are preserved in the Fitzwilliam copy. However, the Fitzwilliam text lacks the paragraph beginning, 'Enfin les calculs de MM. Hodgson', having an asterisk at the end of the preceding paragraph. Evidently Voltaire had the intention of adding the English astronomic material drawn ultimately from Sykes and Whiston but his addition became detached from the rest of the Fitzwilliam manuscript. But if Kehl represents this text prior to Voltaire's

corrections, how could they have the missing paragraph, 'Enfin les calculs', or rather, if it was extant in the earlier draft available to the Kehl editors, why was it not incorporated into the Fitzwilliam text?

23. 'Euphémie' (K.l.215-16; M.xix.40) is a fragment related to the examples of scabrous Latin epigrams quoted in 'Auguste Octave' of the *Questions*. It criticises 'Euphémisme' of the *Encyclopédie* so it must be posterior to volume 6 which appeared after 1 May 1756.

24. 'Fanatisme' (K.l.265-72; M.xix.73-77) draws text from the *Encyclopédie* 'Fanatisme' so it too is posterior to volume 6, 1 May 1756. If this is the 'Fanatisme' which Voltaire mentioned in his letter to Panckoucke, it was at least drafted before 29 September 1769, and Kehl identifies it as part of the 'Opinion en alphabet' text and identifies its source in the *Encyclopédie*.

25. 'Foi' (K.li.413-15; M.xix.456-58) is so contrary to Morellet's 'Foi' in volume 7 of the *Encyclopédie* (appeared after 24 November 1757) that it would seem to be Voltaire's criticism of that article, or rather an opposing definition of faith which Voltaire preferred as a conception, whether or not he could accept propositions on faith. Morellet leaves very little to faith; almost all the articles of Catholicism are represented as being entirely credible when they are not demonstrable; the element of mystery or irrationality is absent from his ever so rational system. Voltaire paraphrases and summarises Locke's *Essay* iv.xvi.8, 14, xviii.2, 5, 10, and restricts faith to areas that are either necessarily beyond human experience (that is, entail 'ideas' hitherto unreceived or naturally unreceivable), or propositions of fact that cannot be otherwise known and which are not allowed to conflict with what is considered to be rationally possible. In particular, and quite contrary to their rationalist reputation, Voltaire and Locke stress that revelation is an overwhelming and irrefutable experience to whomever receives it directly, quite on a plane with the quotidian experience which otherwise delimits man's credulity,⁶⁰ but that whoever has not received such a revelation directly is obliged to verify scrupulously the instruments by which it has been transmitted since he can only believe on their credit. 'Foi' of the 1767 *Dictionnaire* is a burlesque dialogue between Pico della Mirandola and pope Alexander VI where Pico cites the various propositions that he believes by faith because they are too absurd to believe on rational grounds. This 'Foi' seems to be the exemplary version of the formal and relatively abstract discussion of the Kehl 'Foi'. The sequence of these two articles is a matter of conjecture but the precedence of the Kehl article is more persuasive. While one can imagine Voltaire disguising the abstract principles of any possible faith in a brilliant little scene where particular (and, incidentally, mostly ridiculous) propositions represent the doctrines which can, cannot, or can only be accepted on faith, it is hard to imagine Voltaire redoing the 1767 'Foi' in such a prosaic and obviously derivative fashion as the Kehl article. If the sequence has been correctly deduced it not only dates the Kehl article before 1767 but has implications for Voltaire's other philosophical writings. They are notable for their exploitation of piquant exemplary propositions (for example, 'Mais si, après bien des siècles, nous nous sommes avisés d'inventer des ciseaux et des broches, de tondre avec les uns la laine des moutons et de les faire cuire avec les autres pour les manger, que peut-on en inférer autre chose, sinon que Dieu nous a faits de façon qu'un jour

nous deviendrions nécessairement industriels et carnassiers?’ ‘Fin. Cause finale’) and for generalisations from them. This is closer to Montaigne than to the tradition of abstract discussion that one attributes to the great philosophers. One would like to know whether Voltaire conceived of the philosophical questions which piqued him in abstract terms, or whether his examples provoked the abstract formulation that accompanies them. The inquiry into Voltaire’s method of composition and expression is not inane. One would want to know whether a piece like the 1767 ‘Foi’ should be subjected to philosophical exegesis or whether it should be regarded as merely a superficial satire impaling Catholicism on legendary baggage peripheral to theology and piety. On the basis of the sequence proposed here, the 1767 ‘Foi’ should be read as implying the abstract propositions that had been enunciated in the Kehl ‘Foi’. Obviously this principle of philosophical exegesis or exemplary propositions can be extended to all of Voltaire’s philosophical writings, but it should first be carefully verified and controlled.

26. ‘Généalogie’ (K.lii.3-12; M.xix.217-22) draws upon many sources, Calmet’s ‘Dissertation sur Mélchisedech’, Fabricius’s collection of apocryphal gospels, Origen’s *Contra Celsum*, Wagenselius’s collection of Jewish polemics, d’Argens’s *Reflexions de l’empereur Julien* (1764) for material on demonology (with a characteristic typographical error, Gualterius for Gualtiparius, to guarantee the source identification) and borrows texts from Beausobre. There is a clear connection with the ‘Avant Propos’ of the *Collection des anciens évangiles* (1769) but it is not clear which was the earlier. Apparently they both resulted from Voltaire’s study of the New Testament apocrypha which is already in evidence in the 1765 Varberg additions to the *Dictionnaire* ‘Christianisme’ and in the 1767 ‘Evangile’. Among many other issues, the article confutes Nicolas Sylvestre Bergier’s *La Certitude des preuves du christianisme* (1767) and may even be an unpublished riposte to Bergier’s *Réponse aux Conseils raisonnables* (1769).

27. ‘Hérésie’ (K.lii.230-38; M.xix.217) draws text from Jaucourt’s ‘Hérétique’, therefore it must be later than volume 8 of the *Encyclopédie* which reached Voltaire in February 1766. ‘Hérésie’ cross-references to ‘Conciles’ (after 1767), ‘Généalogie’ (after 1767 or 1769) and ‘Zèle’ (after February 1766) so it must be later than 1767 or 1769.

28. ‘Juifs III’ (K.lii.386-91; M.xix.523-26) draws text from Jaucourt’s ‘Juifs’, volume 9, after February 1766.

29. ‘Kalendes’ (K.liii.147-51; M.xix.550-52) draws text from ‘Fête des ânes’ by Mallet, and ‘Fête des fous’ by Jaucourt, *Encyclopédie*, volume 6, after October 1756. ‘Messe’ (before 1770) cross-references to ‘Kalendes’ so the latter must have been written before 1770. The epigram at the end of ‘Ane de Vérone’ (‘Nous avons des livres sur la fête de l’âne et sur celle des fous; ils peuvent servir à l’histoire universelle de l’esprit humain’) in the 1770 *Questions* may be a substitute for this article.

30. ‘Livres’ (K.liii.235-39; M.xix.598-600) draws on the *Encyclopédie* ‘Livre’ by Diderot, volume 9, after February 1766, and from the *Examen critique des apologistes de la religion chrétienne* which Voltaire read around June 1766.

31. ‘Locke’ (K.liii.245-51; M.xix.600-603) is still another defence of Voltaire’s patron philosopher against the dual calumnies that he asserted that matter was

capable of thought, and that he denied the immortality of the soul. It also treats the infinite divisibility of matter as a purely theoretic ('géométrique') concept that need not correspond to physical realities. The defence of Locke is taken up on the same grounds in 'Ame II', and in 'Filosofe II' in a more polemical fashion, and the divisibility of matter is discussed less technically in 'Infini' (all three of the *Questions*). It would seem that 'Locke' was developed in two different directions in those articles so it probably dates from the period of the composition of the *Questions* articles, 1769/70.

32. 'Messe' (K.liii.400-408; M.xx.58-62) draws text from 'Agape' by Mallet (volume 1), 'Danse sacrée' by Cahusac (volume 4), and 'Messe' by Jaucourt (volume 10, February 1766). It cross-references to 'Généalogie' so it must be later than 1767 or 1769, and lends material to the 1770 *Questions* 'Adorer' so it must be before 1770.

33. 'Moïse' (K.liii.483-95; M.xx.102-108) bears some resemblance to the 1764 *Dictionnaire* article and might have been a draft for it, except that it is much less conventional. In fact, the article seems to be composed of two sketches joined together since it contains repetitions and a change in direction. Although it bears some resemblance to the descriptions of the 'Moïse' prepared for Frederick (and thus would be the contemporary of the *Défense de Milord Bolinbroke* which also deals with post-Mosaic elements in the Pentateuch),⁶¹ its series of seven 'vraisemblances' suggests the 'Moïse' of the *Questions* even more, and it shows affinities with *Dieu et les hommes* (1771) and *La Sainte bible enfin expliquée* (1776) which are more advanced in their hypotheses regarding the composition of the Pentateuch. The Kehl 'Moïse' is identified by the editors as having come from the 'Opinion en alphabet' manuscript.

34. 'Noël' (K.liv.22-30; M.xx.123-27) refers to 'Eclipse' and possibly to 'Reliques', both of which were certainly finished after February 1766. 'Noël' is largely drawn from Beausobre who supplied material to other articles composed between 1765 and 1770, and it lent material to 'Almanach' of the *Questions* so it is certainly before 1770.

35. 'Oracles' (K.liv.57-66; M.xx.141-46) draws text from Jaucourt's 'Oracles' so it is later than volume 11 of the *Encyclopédie* and thus after February 1766.

36. 'Philosophe I' (K.liv.163-71; M.xx.195-99) has some relation to the 1770 *Questions* 'Philosophe I' (1771), though not enough to assume precedence. It mentions Abraham Chaumeix (*Préjugés légitimes contre l'Encyclopédie* [1758]) and Jean-Hubert Hayer whose critique of the *Encyclopédie*, *La Religion vengée* (1757-1761), offended Voltaire in early 1757 (16 January 1757 to d'Alembert, Best. D7122), so it may even be an early essay related to the 1764 *Dictionnaire* or *Nouveaux mélanges* (1765) rather than the *Questions*.

37. 'Prophéties' (K.liv.342-49; M.xx.282-86) draws upon Calmet and Beausobre, extensively. There is a cross-reference to 'Sibylles' which is later than February 1766. The order of christological verses discussed – in themselves entirely familiar – seems to come from the *Analyse de la religion chrétienne par Du Marsais*, a work to which Voltaire did not have access before early December 1765.

38. 'Quête' (K.liv.425-33; M.xx.314-18) is mentioned by 'Abbaye' so it is prior to or contemporaneous with that article, that is, between 1754 and 1770.

39. 'Reliques' (K.liv.501-13; M.xx.357-64) draws on Beausobre and on Jaucourt's 'Relique' in volume 14 of the *Encyclopédie* so it is posterior to February 1766. There is a cross-reference from 'Zèle' which is posterior to 'Généalogie', that is, after 1767 or 1769, and another from 'Messe' which is prior to 1770, so this article was written between 1766 and 1770.

40. 'Sibylle' (K.lv.76-82; M.xx.423-26) draws its text from Jaucourt's 'Sibylle' and 'Sibyllins (livres)', and therefore was written after volume 15 of the *Encyclopédie*, that is, after February 1766.

41. 'Théologie' (K.lv.266-69; M.xx.513-15) contradicts 'Théologie' of the *Encyclopédie* so pointedly that it must have been suggested by that article, thus it would have been written after volume 16, February 1766.

42. 'Université' (K.lv.322-25; M.xx.513-15) draws text from Jaucourt's 'Université', volume 17, after February 1766.

43. 'Vision de Constantin' (K.lv.392-404; M.xx.582-88) copies the text of Jaucourt's article of that name (volume 17, after 1766) without any modification.

44. 'Xavier' (K.lv.420-23; M.xx.596-98) draws text from Jaucourt's 'Xavier', volume 17, after 1766, from Beausobre, and it seems to have been inspired by the *Examen critique des apologistes de la religion chrétienne*, ch.10, which Voltaire read around June 1766. The article cross-references to 'Reliques' which was written between February 1766 and 1769.

45. 'Yvetot' (K.lv.436-43; M.xx.605-608) draws text from Jaucourt's article, 'Yvetot', volume 17, after February 1766.

46. 'Zèle' (K.lv.443-58; M.xx.608-16) draws text from Jaucourt's 'Zèle' (volume 17, after February 1766), and refers to 'Reliques' (between 1766 and 1769) and to 'Généalogie' written after 1767 or 1769. The article contains an anecdote about a Jesuit missionary in Canada which Jean Louis Dupan reports that Voltaire heard from d'Alembert at a dinner, 18 August 1765,⁶² so that is not inconsistent with the other dates adduced. While it is likely that 'Zèle' is not later than the other Kehl articles which are connected with the *Questions* of 1770, we can supply a probable *terminus ad quem* of 1775. The article quotes a letter of the emperor Julian as reported by Ammianus Marcellinus. In the *Eclaircissements historiques*, 'Sottise vii', Voltaire quotes the same letter in 'la traduction très-estimée faite à Berlin, imprimée cette année [1775]'. Were 'Zèle' later than 1775 he would probably have used the new translation since he seems to have been so taken with it.

The remaining articles – several are fragmentary – are general rather than learned so the method employed in the previous cases is not applicable. These articles are: 47. 'Athée II' (K.xlviii.312-19; M.xvii.457-61); 48. 'Banque' (K.xlviii.460-66; M.xvii.533-37); 49. 'Conquête' (K.xlix.437-38; M.xviii.234); 50. 'Juifs II' (K.liii.383-85; M.xx.522-23).

VIII. Kehl additions to *Questions* articles

The general problems regarding the authenticity of the Kehl articles and the purposes for which they were written, are still more difficult for the Kehl

additions to authorised articles. These are small fragments that could be related to any number of nonalphabetical works. Assuming that the fragments are authentic and have a connection with the alphabetical articles, the question remains whether the Kehl editors inserted them at the points that Voltaire authorised. Professor Wade's discovery of two of three paragraphs added to 'Bulle' pasted to a manuscript copy of the *Questions* article suggests that the Kehl editors found similar scraps among the longer manuscripts – Voltaire would write on backs of envelopes, on any piece of paper – and inserted them where they thought them relevant. The obvious question is whether the scraps are not private notes that should be published in the notebooks rather than be intercalated into the text of the *Dictionnaire/Questions* with which some of the additions may never have had any connection at all. There is very little evidence regarding any of the additions and they are too short to betray the circumstances and context of their composition. It would still be useful to go through Bengesco's list of additions and discuss each briefly in order to correct certain inaccuracies.

51. 'Augustin' (K.xlviii.373-74; M.xvii.490) of the *Questions* contains two additional paragraphs, 'Quant à cette puberté prématurée d'Augustin' and, one paragraph later, 'Ces avantages précieux d'Augustin', which seem to interrupt the article, the second particularly. The first addition contains a reference, '(Épître *ad Vitalem*, tome III)', within the text which is inconsistent with the styling of the *Questions*. (In manuscripts and in the notebooks one finds references within the text; evidently it was the responsibility of Voltaire's editors to extract the parenthetical references from the text and to print them as marginal notes or footnotes. Kehl apparently did this with the longer manuscript texts that they published but Beuchot was more scrupulous in the *inédits* he published and did not extract the references.) Both additions to 'Augustin' may be authentic because they have been suggested to Voltaire by his text at the point where Kehl inserted them, although he would subsequently have had reason to suppress them as discursive. We suspect that Kehl found them, or even a complete draft that still contained the two paragraphs, and restored what Voltaire had ultimately suppressed.

52. 'Bœuf Apis. (Prêtres du)' (K.xlix.75-76; M.xviii.17) is a short anecdote. Beuchot indicates that the 1770 edition of the *Questions* interpolates this paragraph into the *Dictionnaire* article 'Apis'. This is not correct because the *Questions* do not contain an 'Apis'. It has an anecdotal rapport with the *Dictionnaire* article 'Apis' which begins with a different story about Cambyses and the bull Apis, but even if it had been attached to an early draft on the strength of the association, Voltaire could finally have suppressed it as irrelevant to the argument that he was developing regarding the inferiority of ancient Egypt in all regards.

53. 'Bulle' (K.xlix.126-27; M.xviii.45-46) has, as was indicated above, three additional paragraphs, two of which have been found pasted onto Bn n.a.fr. 2778, f.97. They and the paragraph which precedes them are *à propos*. However the situation is strange. If Voltaire had wanted to add the three successive paragraphs to the *Questions* text, he would have added them to the printed page or indicated on a manuscript of those additions that they should be inserted in such and such a place in the printed text. This is what he did on the manuscript

which adapted a chapter of the *Eléments de la philosophie de Newton* into 'Distance' of the *Questions*. It is rather strange to attach the additions to a preliminary manuscript of 'Bulle' (ff.79-80, 96-97). The manuscript has the first five lines of the paragraph, 'Philippe le Bel de son côté', which eventually appeared in the *Questions*, crossed out. A slip of paper was attached, covering the suppressed lines, upon which the two paragraphs, 'Avant Boniface' and 'Le roi d'Angleterre' were written in. Since the manuscript of 'Bulle' does not contain the sections dealing with the bull *Unigenitus* and those of the crusades, it would seem to be a preliminary stage of the article where Voltaire thought of replacing the indelicate paragraph, 'Philippe le Bel de son côté' with the paragraphs 'Avant Boniface' and 'Le roi d'Angleterre'. Evidently Voltaire restored the somewhat scabrous paragraph and suppressed the two with which he thought to replace it. Kehl retained the latter, purely alternative material, plus an additional paragraph, 'Clément v' whose manuscript has not been found.

54. 'Confession' (K.xlix.425-26; M.xviii.228-30) is a fragment copied entirely from Charles Matthias Chardon, *Histoire des sacrements* (Paris 1745), BV713, ii.549-51. Chardon abridges Edmond Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritualibus* (1700-1702), i.vi.ix, regarding the practice of certain abbesses to hear the confessions of their nuns. The fragment can be dated with some cogency if not much certainty after 1775. In the *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.21, Voltaire had remarked that laymen had heard confessions during the Middle Ages (citing Joinville's *Mémoires*, ch.70, which he surely knew at first hand), and that the custom had been recognised by the Church. Claude Nonnotte, in *Les Erreurs de Voltaire* (Avignon 1762), i.79, dared Voltaire to produce a decision of a Church council authorising laymen to hear confessions (which implies the right of granting absolution). Voltaire produced a refutation of Nonnotte's criticism in the first edition of the *Eclaircissements historiques* (1763) and added documentation and invective through the *Fragment sur l'histoire générale* (1773). One would like to situate the Kehl fragment in this sequence of texts to which it belongs. In the 'Sottise xii^e' of the *Eclaircissements* he has some information about the institution of private confessions, an anecdote about Nectarius (which should have been well known since it figured in Protestant controversialist literature), and a quotation from Chrysostome. In the 'Sottise xxii^e' (1769) he supports his contention regarding confessions to laymen during the medieval period by references to st Basil and dom Martène which he found in the *Encyclopédie* 'Abbesse', and by a letter of Innocent III cited through Fleury's *Histoire ecclésiastique*, xvi.264. (Voltaire writes 'p.246', an inversion of the last two digits which was probably inadvertent rather than an error inherited from an intermediary source, first because it is an error that is easily committed, and second because Fleury's index is quite detailed and contains a reference to this passage so, were Voltaire researching the history of the confession in order to answer Nonnotte, he would have looked in Fleury's index immediately and found the discussion of Spanish abbesses and would not have needed another author to direct him to it. He probably copied from his own text when adapting this material for the 1770 *Questions* 'Conciles' because he retained the inverted digits.) 'Confession' repeats the information and references of the 'Sottise xxii^e', while adding research about Jewish confessional customs, some of it (confession with flagel-

lation on the day preceding Yom Kippur) evidently from Calmet, either his *Dictionnaire historique* (Paris 1730), s.v. 'Confession', i.456 BV616, with its full page illustration, or the *Dissertations qui peuvent servir* (Paris 1720), iii.328, BV617, which refers to Johann Buxtorf's *Synagoga judaica* (Leipsig 1641), chap.35, that Voltaire did not possess. Voltaire added information on the institution of the confession in the Church which was not available in either Calmet or Chardon, and he even went so far as to consult the index of his Hebrew-Latin *Mischna, sive totius Hebraeorum juris, rituum* (Amsterdam 1693-1703), BV2469, from which he turned up *Megilah* 2.5 and *Sanhedrin* 6.2 (his reference should have been p.234 rather than p.134), the latter of which deals with the confessions of condemned criminals who protest their innocence. The *Fragment sur l'histoire générale* v adds nothing at all to the previous documentation except another Jewish confessional custom that Calmet had cited from the *Synagoga*, chap.18, evidently a remnant of the research for the 1770 'Confession' which is printed without change in the 1774 *Questions* and in the 1775 *encadrée*. Kehl omits the paragraph drawn from Fleury regarding Innocent III and substitutes for it the fragment copied from Chardon. The dating of the Chardon fragment depends upon the opinion one holds of Voltaire's scholarly integrity. Fleury's text is not wrong. He merely cited Innocent III to show that women used to hear confessions in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, really all that Voltaire needed to demonstrate for his controversy with Nonnotte:

or je trouve dans le même temps en Espagne des abbeses qui donnaient la bénédiction à leurs religieuses, entendaient leurs confessions, et prêchaient en public lisant l'évangile. C'est ce qui paraît par la lettre du pape du dixième de Décembre de la même année 1210, adressée aux évêques de Valencia et de Burgos, dans les diocèses desquels étaient ces abbeses.

The 'Sottise xxii^e' is content to paraphrase Fleury but the 1770 'Confession' extrapolates: 'Innocent III n'attaque point cet usage dans sa lettre du 10 Décembre 1210.' The fragment copied from Chardon, while generally supporting Voltaire, describes Innocent III's letter more completely: 'nous avons dans le droit canonique un décret du pape Innocent III qui enjoint aux évêques de Valence et de Burgos en Espagne d'empêcher certaines abbeses de bénir leurs religieuses, de les confesser et de prêcher publiquement' and it quotes the pope's letter. It is hard to imagine Voltaire writing that Innocent III did not attack the practice in the face of the Chardon text, nor omitting to cite its supporting evidence. It is most reasonable to assume that the Chardon text came to his attention after the 1770 'Confession' was in print. If one regards Voltaire as having been decently scrupulous, it must be assumed that he only became aware of the Chardon text after the 1774 *Questions* were issued (or even after the 1775 *encadrée* if it can be shown that Voltaire modified any of its *Questions* texts for that edition). On the other hand, since there is no sign of new research regarding confessions after the 1770 article, it is possible that Voltaire discovered the Chardon text just too late to correct his error, and did not bother to correct himself, either in the *Fragment sur l'histoire générale* VIII that he was about to write ('Innocent III, dans ses lettres, n'attaque point cet usage' where he has the gall to add, 'Quelques jésuites, et surtout un Nonnotte, qui n'avaient lu ni Basile, ni

Martène, ni les *Lettres d'Innocent III*, que nous avons lues dans l'abbaye de Sénones, où nous séjournâmes quelque temps dans nos voyages entrepris pour nous instruire, s'élevèrent contre ces vérités. Nous nous moquâmes un peu d'eux. Il faut l'avouer: notre amour extrême de la vérité n'exclut pas les faiblesses humaines'), nor in the 1774 *Questions*. The advantage of this hypothesis is that it does not require the assumption of renewed research on the confessions to laymen after 1774, for which there is no other evidence.

55. 'Goût' (K.lii.122-23; M.xix.283-84) of the *Questions* added a final paragraph in Kehl, 'Ce sont les gens de goût [...] dans les arts.' It is rather more hopeful than the article that precedes it but it makes a satisfying ending so this may represent Voltaire's intentions despite the apparent change of direction.

56. 'Guerre' (K.lii.196-99; M.xix.320-21) of the 1764 *Dictionnaire* contains six interpolated paragraphs beginning 'La religion naturelle' which deal with sermonisers who lend the authority of religion to wars, and with others, like Massillon, who do not condemn them. The interpolation seems to weaken the article so one can doubt that Voltaire authorised it.

57. 'Pourquoi' (K.liv.287-91; M.xx.258-61) of the *Questions* is a long series of political and spiritual anomalies which Voltaire queries 'Pourquoi [...]', to which Kehl adds a long introduction in exactly the same idiom. It goes on at Rabelaisian length, especially in its list of twenty-four useless dignities like 'Inspecteurs d'eaux-de-vie' and 'Inspecteurs des perruques' which had been sold. The additional material is drôle enough but Kehl may have restored a passage that Voltaire had cut.

ix. Post-Kehl additions and articles

A certain number of articles and additions to articles were added to the Kehl *Dictionnaire/Questions* canon by Beuchot in the various editions which he handled. He claimed to have received them from Decroix or to have identified Wagnière's hand. None of these manuscripts has been identified so Beuchot's assurance is the sole authority for these materials. They seem Voltairean enough but if they were available to the editors of Kehl, why did they refuse to publish them? If they had been found in a different source from the rest of the posthumous material that they published, one could understand that the Kehl editors entertained doubts about their authority. Had they become available to Decroix only after the *Dictionnaire philosophique* volumes were in print, they would certainly have come from a different source than the papers transmitted to Panckoucke and finally to the Kehl editors by Wagnière. In either case there is little likelihood that Voltaire had intended their publication.

58. 'Ana, anecdote' (M.xvii.205-208) of the *Questions* acquired an 'Addition de l'éditeur' commenting upon Voltaire's remarks on *masque de fer*, and a note – identified by Beuchot/Moland with a 'K' – explaining its provenience. The note claims that the 'Addition de l'éditeur' appeared in the 1771 edition of the *Questions* (Beng.1410) and that Voltaire never denied responsibility for it, therefore it is an authentic and authorised text (cf. edition of Beuchot, xxvi.221). Actually, there is no such addition in Beng.1410 (Bn Z. 2476), in the 1774 *Questions*, in the *encadrée*, or in Kehl. The note and 'Addition' do not enter the

canon of the complete works until the Lefèvre-Déterville edition (1818), xxiii.230-33, from which it was reproduced in the editions of veuve Perronneau (1819), xxix.289-91, and Renouard, xxxiii.289-90. The Armand-Aubrée edition (Paris 1829), xx.261ff. reproduces the 'Addition' and note to which it adds an anecdote not found in other editions whose purpose is to lend credence to the theory proposed in the 'Addition'.

59. 'Lois, esprit des' (M.xix.3) contains one paragraph interpolated into its critique of Montesquieu, 'Auguste, lorsqu'il', which first appeared in the Lefèvre-Déterville edition, xxv.665. The paragraph criticises a particular text of the *Esprit des lois*, but out of sequence. The other texts criticised are presented in the order in which they appear in Montesquieu. The Lefèvre-Déterville interpolation could have been intended for any of several of Voltaire's refutations of the *Esprit des lois*, such as A. B. C.

60. 'Prières' (M.xx.276-77) of the *Questions* has two final paragraphs, a short anecdote, attached to it since the Lefèvre-Déterville edition, xxvi.252-53. Beuchot writes: 'Ce qui suit n'est pas dans les éditions de Kehl, mais avait déjà été publié dans l'édition en quarante-deux volumes, lorsqu'en 1821 je l'imprimai après l'avoir copié sur un écrit de la main de Wagnière.' This addition announces itself as a continuation of 'Prières': 'Voici sur la prière une anecdote assez curieuse, et qui ne paraîtra pas déplacée à la suite de ce qu'on vient de rapporter dans cet article.' The anecdote, a testament whose author does not wish prayers to be said for him after his death, is dated 1773. It is a fine tract against prayer on grounds that Voltaire would have appreciated and might have integrated into the article, but it seems out of place appended to it, and the introductory sentence might have been Voltaire's or Wagnière's note regarding the anecdote, but hardly the way that Voltaire would have introduced it at the point where it does appear.

61. 'Quisquis' (M.xx.332-34) 'Errata et supplément à l'article 'Langleviel' des *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* was added by Beuchot to an article which settled old scores with several of Voltaire's enemies: 'Cette addition m'a été communiquée par feu Decrois, l'un des éditeurs de l'édition de Kehl. Elle paraît ici [l'édition veuve Perronneau, xxix.81-84] pour la première fois. Ce 4 juin 1829. B.' It does not seem that this biographical material relating to La Beaumelle even pretends to have been written by Voltaire.

The following articles have been added to the *Dictionnaire/Questions*:

62. 'Littérature' (M.xix.590-92) first appeared in the veuve Perronneau edition, xxix.848-51. The article is incomplete and seems to be a draft of an *Encyclopédie*-style article. Its substance resembles 'Gens de lettres' that Voltaire contributed to the *Encyclopédie*. The text, until 'dès qu'ils', survives in a manuscript copy, Bn n.a.fr. 2778, f.81. Evidently Beuchot had a more complete text or a page of this manuscript which has since become separated from it.

63. 'Prépuce' (M.xx.267-68) first appeared in the Lefèvre-Déterville edition, xxvi.239-40. In Beuchot's later edition of the *Œuvres complètes*, xxxix.504, he writes: 'J'ai publié cet article en 1821, d'après l'original écrit de la main de Wagnière, secrétaire de Voltaire; mais cet article avait déjà été imprimé trois ans auparavant, dans le tome xxvi de l'édition en quarante-deux volumes.' The

text borrows material from Calmet's *Commentaire littéral* [...] *Maccabées* and from his *Dictionnaire* so it is consistent with what one would expect of an authentic text. The end of the last paragraph, from 'S' Paul et ses compagnons', exists in an authentic manuscript in part holograph and in part in Wagnière's hand (Voltaire 82, p.674). The text quotes the Bible in Latin twice which is a bit strange for the *Questions* if there is no point of philology under discussion, and has its references in parentheses rather than in marginal notes or footnotes.

64. 'Tolérance' (M.xx.517-18) first appeared in the veuve Perronneau edition, xxxii.712-13. Beuchot declares: 'J'ai, le premier, publié, en 1821, ce qui forme cette section, d'après une copie que je tenais de feu M. Decrois, l'un des éditeurs de Kehl.' This article might be a sketch for almost any of Voltaire's essays on tolerance and adds nothing unfamiliar, so one can imagine the Kehl editors suppressing it.

x. Excursus regarding Voltaire's contact with the *Analyse* and the *Examen critique*

Since the *Analyse de la religion chrétienne* and the *Examen critique des apologistes de la religion chrétienne* were cited to date certain articles, a discussion of the date of Voltaire's contact with them is incumbent. Unfortunately any discussion of the clandestine tracts tends to become complicated and discursive. We shall argue that any of Voltaire's articles which shows a dependence upon either of those tracts was written after its publication, even though both certainly were widely diffused in manuscript form for an indeterminate period prior to their appearance in print. The same is also true for Voltaire's dependence, in other works, upon at least two other clandestine tracts dating to the 1760s, although his first contact with them was in one instance with a manuscript, and in the other with a second edition which was in fact the first to achieve relatively wide diffusion.

Professor Wade regards all the clandestine tracts, the *Analyse* and the *Examen critique* included, as products of the first half of the century.⁶³ The principal reasons for Wade's early dating of the tracts are their internal references to books and events of the first half of the century – professor J. S. Spink assigns *termini a quo* of 1739 and 1733 for the *Analyse* and the *Examen critique* on the basis of those references⁶⁴ – and their extensive manuscript dissemination which would normally have preceded rather than followed their diffusion in print which occurred in the 1760s. Wade and his student, professor E. Judson Humeston, jr, assert that Voltaire knew the *Analyse*, the *Examen de la religion*, and several similar works during his Cirey period because certain elements of the Bible criticism exploited in those tracts also appear in the 'Examens de la Bible'⁶⁵ attributed to mme Du Châtelet, and in the Bible criticism that Voltaire began to publish in 1761 with the *Sermon des cinquante*⁶⁶ most of which, they claim, was actually written, or at least drafted, at Cirey.⁶⁷ In addition, certain 'Notes et Preuves' associated with the *Analyse* in certain manuscripts are appended to the Troyes manuscript of mme Du Châtelet's *Examens de la bible*. Their presence there ties them, and therefore the *Analyse*, to her; the documentation at her disposition must have been familiar to Voltaire. In support of this argument Andrew Brown has pointed out to me in a letter that Caussy's inventory of volume 9 of Voltaire's

collection of manuscripts, now in Leningrad, includes (p.44), 'f.449. *Religion*, par Dumarsais', probably the *Analyse* which Voltaire and almost everyone else attributed to Du Marsais (although other tracts, notably the *Examen de la religion*, were also attributed to him), and that it is contained in the same volume as manuscripts which Caussy attributed to mme Du Châtelet. 'One might conclude that Voltaire's ownership of the *Analyse* dated back to the Cirey period.' Until a definitive catalogue of the manuscripts in Voltaire's possession is issued this will remain conjectural. There are, however, counterarguments.

Professor Pomeau has re-examined the evidence adduced by Wade for the influence of the clandestines on mme Du Châtelet and Voltaire at Cirey and can only find one element of information in the *Examens de la bible* which might have come from the *Examen de la religion* rather than from a common source, Calmet's *Commentaire littéral*, and that element should have been obvious to any careful reader of the Gospels. He does not identify any material from the *Analyse*, the work that interests us here, in the *Examens de la bible*, but detects a single reference to st Gracilian which could have come from Jean Meslier (*La Religion*, pp.167, 196-97). With regard to Voltaire himself, he finds that both the *Traité de métaphysique* (1734) and the *Eléments de la métaphysique de Newton* (1740) clearly imply an acquaintance with Meslier who is the representative of Cartesian atheism whom Voltaire refutes in these works. This identification may be overly specific.⁶⁸

There are other difficulties with Wade's syllogisms. While the attribution of the *Examens de la bible* to mme Du Châtelet is traditional and cogent – at several points one detects a feminist's or mathematician's hand at work – it was never supported by Voltaire's testimony⁶⁹ and he should have known better than anyone! The association of the *Analyse* with mme Du Châtelet on the basis of the Troyes manuscript, which is not an autograph, or on the basis of any other manuscript which cannot be shown to have remained unaltered since it left her possession, is circumstantial and dubious because of the common practice of copying and/or binding together unrelated tracts of a generally similar nature. There are many such collections, both manuscript and published, not the least conspicuous of which are Voltaire's own *Evangile de la raison*, *Evangile du jour* and *Recueil nécessaire*, while the 1792 edition of the *Œuvres de Fréret* is a veritable anthology of clandestine classics. There is no reason to hold mme Du Châtelet responsible for, and Voltaire aware of, the appendices attached to an individual copy of her *Examen* at an undetermined moment in its peregrinations to the Bibliothèque municipale de Troyes. The case must be proved better than that.

As for the reputed influence of the *Analyse* and the 'Notes et Preuves' on Cirey Bible criticism, it rests on the assumption that Voltaire actually produced in Cirey the Bible criticism that he published in the 1760s and 1770s, and that the material common to the *Analyse*, the *Examens de la bible* and Voltaire's Bible criticism published before 1766 did not derive from their common sources, several of the English deists and, most prominently, Calmet's *Commentaire littéral*. While not yet impossible, the case for the influence of the *Analyse* on Voltaire prior to 1766 has not yet been demonstrated with sufficient rigour.

Whenever and by whomever the *Examen critique des apologistes* and the *Analyse* were written,⁷⁰ and however long they circulated in manuscript, it is fairly sure

from the correspondence that Voltaire had not read them until they were published (by Marc-Michel Rey, in Amsterdam, apparently upon the recommendation of d'Holbach, but Voltaire may not have known that).

In three letters to Damilaville, 16 October, November and 19 November 1765 (Best.D12938, D12984 and D12989), he writes that he is impatiently waiting for a delivery of the works of Fréret, and then, in a letter to Damilaville, 4 December 1765, Best.D13026, and in a later letter to d'Alembert, Best.D13345, he discusses what seems to be the *Analyse*. Very shortly thereafter, the *Analyse* appears in one of the editions of the *Évangile de la raison* (Beng.1897B, Bn No.5230) and in the *Recueil nécessaire*. While these dates do not provide an absolute *terminus a quo* for Voltaire's acquaintance with the piece, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that he had read it earlier while there is indirect evidence, besides his impatience to obtain a copy in late 1765, that he had not.

The Kehl 'Conciles' reports an anecdote regarding the Fathers of the first Nicene council who, being in doubt which of the gospels in their possession were authoritative, piled them all upon an altar and retired to pray. In the morning they found all the gospels on the ground but four which they then accepted as canonical. This anecdote, deriving from a late and dubious source, together with its inaccurate reference to the first rather than the second volume of Philippe Labbe's *Sacrosancta concilia*, (1671) is to be found in the *Analyse*. The anecdote appears for the first time in Voltaire's published works in the *Examen important* xxxi (issued in the *Recueil nécessaire* together with the *Analyse*), then in 'Conciles' of the 1767 edition of the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, then in the 'Avant propos' of the *Collection des anciens évangiles* and *Dieu et les hommes*, ch.40, both of 1769, 'Athéisme' of the 1770 *Questions*, and finally in the *Histoire de l'établissement du christianisme*, ch.18. Evidently, but not rigorously demonstrably, Voltaire simply did not know the useful anecdote before December 1765, after which time it makes its appearance in the Kehl 'Conciles'⁷¹ and subsequently in the several works just indicated.

According to a letter to Damilaville, 26 June 1766 (Best.D13375), Voltaire has just read the *Examen critique* and seems to suggest that Morellet wrote it, a reasonable hypothesis because of its ecclesiastical expertise. 'Évangile' of the 1767 *Dictionnaire* refers to the *Examen critique*⁷² and attributes it to Nicolas Fréret, as do Voltaire in his notes on his copy of the 1766 edition, BV2546, and Bergier who tried to refute it. It can be adduced in support of the dating just proposed that Voltaire was particularly interested in the clandestine literature, and not just the two tracts we have discussed, between 1761 and 1766, just when they were being published for the first time or, in the case of the *Examen de la religion*, reissued after a lapse of sixteen years. The *Examen de la religion* is attested since 1734 and was published in 1745 – an edition which apparently had very limited diffusion outside Germany⁷³ – but Voltaire does not seem to have read it until after it was reissued in 1761. This edition came to Voltaire's notice at the very end of December 1761, to judge from a letter to Gabriel Cramer (Best.D10239) and by 6 December 1763 (to Damilaville, Best.D11535) he is already contemplating publishing the *Examen de la religion* together with various of his own works and with his *Extrait des sentiments de Jean Meslier* in the collection which he would name *Évangile de la raison* (1764 or 1765, Bn No.5227).

The case of Voltaire's contact with Meslier – if the correspondence is a more reliable indication than the hypothetical identification of him as the philosopher refuted in the 1734 *Traité de métaphysique* – is analogous. The first allusion to him is in a letter to Damilaville, 4 February 1762, Best.D10305, and it is followed by another, very enthusiastic reference (Best.D10315, 8 February, cf. also D10494, etc.) and, within the year, by Voltaire's *Extrait des sentiments de Jean Meslier* (Geneva 1762), Bn No.5375, which is in fact Meslier's *editio princeps*. Shortly after this contact with Meslier one can see a trace of his bombastic language and categorical pronouncements in the *Examen important de Milord Bolingbroke* (in particular the characteristic expression, 'Christicoles'). The emphasis on the economic effects of religion which distinguishes the *Dîner du comte de Boulainvilliers* (1767) may also be attributable to Voltaire's reading of Meslier in 1762.

Still another analogous case is that of the *Militaire philosophe* which is clearly a work of the early part of the century and has been cogently attributed to Robert Challe.⁷⁴ Nevertheless Voltaire does not mention it until 18 November 1767, in a letter to Damilaville (Best.D14536), two months after the appearance of its first edition in September 1767. Shortly thereafter the *Dîner du comte de Boulainvilliers* and the *Pyrrhonisme de l'histoire* (1769) show its influence.

The case of the *Lettre de Thrasybule à Leucippe* (London 1768) is different only in so far as we have not found any trace of its arguments or information in Voltaire's *œuvre*. It is one of the Fréret manuscripts that he had requested from Damilaville (Best.D12938). (We should add here that because we are only concerned to show that Voltaire's interest in the clandestines does not predate the 1760s, we are satisfied to follow Besterman's identifications of the clandestine works to which Voltaire refers, even though they are quite conjectural. Very few of the letters describe the works in question with sufficient precision for a positive identification. In particular, the manuscripts of Fréret to which Voltaire refers here could be any of the clandestines except Meslier because they were all attributed to him at one time or another and because Voltaire was particularly confused in this regard.) He continues to request *Thrasybule* from Damilaville and from Cramer in five more letters (Best.D12959, D12965, D12984, D12989, and D13003) until finally, 30 November 1765 (Best.D13014), he has read it.

Evidently, therefore, Voltaire was disposed to search for the clandestine tracts in the 1760s (that is, ask Damilaville to procure them for him) and made use of them almost as soon as he read them. Either he had not been interested in them earlier despite their availability in manuscript or the extent of their diffusion in philosophical and literary circles has been exaggerated despite the number of manuscripts that Lanson and Wade have identified. In any event, the evidence adduced here suggests that Voltaire had not read these tracts before their publication (Meslier and Fréret are exceptions because Voltaire read them in manuscript, as is the *Examen de la religion* which was so rare in its first edition that one can consider its second edition (1761) as the moment of its earliest printed diffusion in France), therefore the Kehl articles which borrow text from any of these tracts (actually only from the *Analyse* and the *Examen critique*) can be dated with confidence.

XI. General conclusions

The learned Kehl articles give insight into Voltaire's compositional techniques. For a learned article or chapter he would copy out relatively detailed anecdotes and histories with their professionally abridged and not always too clear footnotes. Some of the manuscript scraps preserved in the notebooks show how he also researched his *Dictionnaire/Questions* articles. Bn n.a.fr. 24342, ff.127-28 (Voltaire 82, pp.62-63) contains a sketch of his *Dictionnaire philosophique* 'Ame' with its references to Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hilarion, Augustine and Ambrosius. It would seem to be the synthesis of research (or possibly a précis of somebody's learned chapter) on the Patristic conceptions of the soul. There are less precise examples: Bn n.a.fr. 24343, ff.191 and 305 (Voltaire 82, pp.623-24, 629) have learned notes of the same sort dealing with baptism and the Jews. Voltaire was evidently collecting primary material on both subjects for use in articles and polemics. The fact that neither of these fragments is discernible in a finished essay shows the extent to which Voltaire ruthlessly excluded even material which cost him some pains to research.

Not all the learned articles were specially researched. As Naves and professor Pomeau have shown, the research for the *Essai sur les mœurs* 'did coldly furnish' certain of the learned articles of the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions*. When the new edition of the *Works* appears it will probably demonstrate that many of the *Questions* articles are in an intimate relationship with the broad research undertaken for the *Essai*. For example, it is already clear that 'Ecrouelles' is built around an anecdote concerning Louis IX and the Calabrian hermit François Martorillo (saint François de Paule). According to the *Essai*, ch.94, the superstitious king sent for the hermit to cure him of a mortal illness. 'Ecrouelles' adds that when he arrived in court the hermit was suffering from scrofula (the king's evil) and promptly asked the king to cure him by his thaumaturgic touch and that neither one cured the other. This anecdote is orchestrated with other material regarding the thaumaturgic pretensions of various kings, most of it available in Pierre Le Brun's *Histoire critique des superstitions* (1733-1736), and already epitomised in the *Essai*, ch.42.

Symmetrically, some of the material which first appears in the *Questions*, and was presumably researched for them, appears in subsequent works. 'Adorer' with its citations from Augustine on the canticles which Jesus and his disciples sang, comes from the Kehl 'Messe' whose complementary material on Jesus's leading the dance (from an apocryphal *Acts of st Andrew*) appears in a 1775 addition to the *Essai*, ch.114.

After research comes drafting, and it is clear from the drafts surviving in the Kehl articles that Voltaire did not toss off all of his short articles. Four of them, and thus presumably more, required drafts, while 'Ame I' and 'Ame IV', which are far from being the most learned or complex articles, are fourth drafts.

Sometimes a draft would be dominated by a single source-author and in places Voltaire would even follow the order of his argument to the point of retaining his internal cross-referencing. In 'Zèle'-'Reliques', 'Zèle'-'Généalogie' and 'Messe'-'Reliques', for example, Voltaire follows Beausobre scrupulously. These would be, in the whole or in part, his 'unoriginal' articles, and even there

he skips around, omitting phrases and sentences while rearranging paragraphs. At a second stage of drafting Voltaire would synthesise the secondary materials which he had collected, although they may still remain discernible, as they do in 'Abbaye', 'Généalogie' and 'Messe'. At a third stage of composition he breaks off the most interesting elements of a draft – this surely takes into account the general balance of the collection for which the articles are being prepared as well as the intrinsic interest of the material – and adapts them into other articles or works which, while often developing the material taken from the draft, tend to disguise the considerable erudition upon which they were based. Unfortunately, there are not too many verifiable examples of this last stage and none that offers the complete progression of an article through all three stages. 'Eclipse' and 'Noël' demonstrate the first and third stages, while 'Abbaye', 'Messe', 'Conciles' and 'Généalogie' illustrate the second and the third. Of course a third stage would be lacking for articles that Voltaire abandoned in gestation. Besterman has remarked that drafts of Voltaire's published works are rare.⁷⁵ That may be because the draft of a published work contained little material that Voltaire had not already used, while a draft of an abandoned article could still contain useful information. Voltaire would have had reason to save such drafts. This would account for the preponderance of learned drafts over general ones among the material that came into the possession of the Kehl editors and which they published precisely because it was new to them, that is, because it was incompletely or not at all absorbed in other works. Since the post-Kehl articles and additions came to Beuchot through Decroix they may be drafts that the Kehl editors decided not to print because they contained nothing new or significant, a reasonable judgement because this editorial scheme did not provide for notebooks to accommodate drafts and miscellany. In any event, the scheme of a typical drafting progression accounts for the three kinds of learned article found in Kehl and in the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, but it is not claimed that Voltaire had to follow it for each learned article.⁷⁶

The study of the sources of the Kehl articles, precisely because it was possible to identify almost all of them – 'Abbaye', 'Eclipse' and 'Quête' are the only ones whose immediate sources are in doubt, and a very few bits of information in the other articles have eluded attribution – suggests, on the assumption that they are a random sampling of articles on religion in its broad sense, certain qualifications to professor Pomeau's observations. He remarked that many of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* articles (and by extension this should apply to the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*) derive from the intensive research undertaken for the *Essai sur les mœurs* and for its successive editions which, together with the *Philosophie de l'histoire* are the exact contemporaries of the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions* ('La documentation', p.401). While certain of the Kehl articles which are more than abridgements of the *Encyclopédie* and Beausobre, like 'Kalendes' and 'Conciles', may derive from Voltaire's historical research, others, despite as many affinities as one would expect with various pieces in the *œuvres*, seem rather special to the alphabetical collections. While reading provocative material in the *Encyclopédie* and Beausobre during the years 1765 to 1770, Voltaire evidently assembled extracts which, at first glance, he thought would make interesting articles. If a given extract could not provide the core of an article, Voltaire

salvaged what he could and used it to amplify more interesting or significant material.

The question of Voltaire's erudition and the fidelity with which he reported his sources is also at issue. It can easily be shown that many, but still a minority, of the learned footnotes are quite wrong. A closer look at the Beausobre texts for 'Reliques' and 'Zèle' in particular shows that Voltaire misinterpreted Beausobre's references in a few cases, and in some others it could be that he transcribed poorly or that the Kehl text has typographic errors. Therefore any discussion of Voltaire's erudition and scholarly scruples must segregate the borrowed material, for whose accuracy and errors Voltaire deserves neither credit nor blame, from the material where he himself supplied the documentation, and there he has been severely criticised by his contemporaries whose repertoires of *Erreurs de Voltaire* were not exclusively doctrinal, and by modern critics seeking to demonstrate his conscious distortion of sources for polemical effect.⁷⁷

It would be easy enough to claim, on the basis of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* articles, that Voltaire's knowledge was superficial. If the cases of 'Denis (Saint) l'Aréopagite', 'Adorer' and 'Apparition' are typical, then that claim requires drastic revision. The Kehl articles from which those *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* articles are extracted are extremely learned, and their sources, which Voltaire demonstrably read though he can hardly be presumed to have mastered them, are even more detailed and erudite. Thus obscure points of general or ecclesiastical history mentioned in passing in the *Questions* probably represent, in most cases, just a small portion of Voltaire's reading on the subject though, in many cases, not necessarily less than he remembered at the time he was writing. Since Voltaire had read Beausobre around 1/2 January 1752 and then returned to the *Histoire critique* between 1765 and 1770 according to the datings just adduced, it is clear that even his fine memory had to be refreshed in his marked and annotated library.

Professor Pomeau has suggested that the influence of liberal Protestants, particularly certain of the pastors of Geneva and Lausanne, was highly significant in Voltaire's religious thought and writings ('La documentation', p.397). This is a bit stronger than his description in *La Religion de Voltaire* of an agreement on essentials of religious philosophy which was limited by the ministers' refusal to renounce their Christianity and by Voltaire's unvanquishable hatred for the faith of his ancestors (pp.293, 285-303 *passim*), but this is still consistent with Pomeau's emphasis on Voltaire's deism, his formation in the relatively liberal school of the Jesuits in Paris, and his receptiveness to their hypothesis which claimed that a nonparticularised primitive religion ubiquitously preceded polytheistic and superstitious developments. That is not at issue here. What is not clear is whether Voltaire was able to conscript articles by Abauzit and Polier de Bottens because the general proximity of their religious outlook to his deism allied them to his cause (Naves, pp.145-48, and Trapnell, p.16), or whether the exploitation of their learning was essentially fortuitous. This is a question that should be answered relative to the bulk of Voltaire's religious polemics and their sources. The sample studied, the Kehl articles, their progeny and several of the related *Dictionnaire* articles, precisely because of its concentration on ecclesiastical

subjects – religion, strictly speaking, is more frequently discussed in Voltaire's general philosophical articles – does suggest an answer. It is here that one would expect to find traces of liberal Protestant sources if they are especially significant to the alphabetical collections which should be, in that regard, representative of the entire output of the Ferney years during which Voltaire was in contact with his liberal Swiss ministers. As a matter of fact, Voltaire quarrelled with Vernet and Polier in 1757 and 1759, before any of these articles were drafted, and with Vernes in 1772; his relations with the Genevan clergy were to remain frigid as a result of d'Alembert's 'Genève' which they thought he had inspired, and because of his own comments on Calvin's 'âme atroce' (Florida, chapters 7 and 8).

It is obvious that Locke, Middleton and Leclerc should be added to Abauzit and Polier de Bottens as liberal Protestants whose contributions, direct or indirect, to the *Dictionnaire/Questions/Kehl* alphabetical collections have been documented. Beyond that point the qualification 'liberal' becomes problematical. It does not fit Warburton despite his eccentric views regarding Biblical and classical exegesis, and he clearly had no sympathy for Voltaire or for his historical and theological writings. Whatever we might think of the 'liberalism' of Beausobre's *Remarques historiques, critiques et philologiques sur le nouveau testament* (La Haye 1742), they changed Voltaire's mind regarding the deism that he had detected in the *Histoire critique de Maniché* (Best.D4756): 'Beausobre ne réussit pas si bien avec Jésus qu'avec Manès' (February/March 1752, to Formey, Best.D4821). While it is hard to translate Voltaire's litotes into specific terms, in the light of the New Testament criticism that he was to produce ten years later and to continue until his death, it is not hard to find reason for his disappointment. Beausobre shows himself an apologist for the gospels and not their critic. He finds reasonable and moderate translations and explanations where he can, defends the New Testament at those points where Voltaire was to attack it, and was able to subdue his incredulity where he could not honestly tame his texts, as for instance in regard to possession by demons (*Remarques historiques*, i.14). If Voltaire was led to believe from the *Histoire critique de Maniché* that Beausobre was close to his own deism, it was wishful thinking. While showing considerable independence of the Patristic and generally accepted interpretations,⁷⁸ and an extraordinary tolerance for erroneous opinion so long as it still remained Christian, Beausobre never suggests any criticism of apostolic Christianity as described in the Bible. His opinion of the Fathers tended to be devastating but that did not prevent him from adopting their Biblical interpretations when they seemed reasonable and adequate to the problems posed by the texts. Thus he was exploitable when dealing with ecclesiastical history where his religious scruples left him unconstrained (and not too charitable), but not in matters of Biblical exegesis where he was too loyal to the fundamental texts and tenets to create scandal, and too reasonable – despite some of the points that he brought himself to believe – and too open-minded to become an object of Voltaire's satire like Calmet.

With the significant exception of Locke in so many of the philosophical articles, these liberal and less liberal figures do not seem to have exerted an 'influence' in a broad, intellectual sense of the word, though there are pronounced

affinities. Voltaire learnt much ecclesiastical science from them, especially if the identified copying and imitations are only a small portion of what he read and absorbed of their works, but he does not seem to have seen the Apocalypse or the messiah, to take the most obvious examples of borrowed articles, in a different light because of Abauzit and Polier, and his antireligious polemics such as the *Examen important* would be more radical than either article. There are also sources, and probably one profound but indirect influence, in the radical fringe: Nageon's 'Unitaires', Morellet, the two clandestine tracts, Du Marsais's extreme Gallicanism, possibly a marginal contribution by Jean Meslier to 'Abbaye' and 'Quête' as well as two anticlerical anecdotes from d'Alembert ('Zèle' and 'Reliques'). 'Moïse' is at least indirectly attributable to Spinoza because by 1764 his Bible criticism had been absorbed, restated and confuted by so many authors whom Voltaire had read, Richard Simon, Jean Leclerc, Abbadie and Calmet, not to speak of the clandestine tracts and famous apologists who drew on Spinoza or castigated him, that through them the Dutch philosopher dominated the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century study of the Bible. Thus, though Voltaire had read the *Tractatus*, its direct influence cannot be segregated from his general background in the Bible criticism and polemics which he synthesised in his own works.

Otherwise, the contributors unwittingly marshalled into the service of the Kehl articles were orthodox, respectable, and not notoriously liberal writers. 'Décrétales (fausses)' of the *Encyclopédie* (by Bouchaud) is Gallican rather than radical. Jaucourt's articles are not very daring. This can be seen from his 'Sibylle' and 'Livres sibyllins'. At first glance one might think that their denial that the sibylline prophecies regarding Jesus are authentic was audacious. In fact, the articles are almost entirely copied from Nicolas Fréret's 'Observations sur les recueils de prédictions écrites, qui portent le nom de Musée, de Bacis et de la Sibylle' which was so far from being clandestine radicalism that it could appear in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres* (1749-1751, xxiii.192-212); Fréret admits that he based his essay upon the *Bibliotheca graeca* (1705) of the impeccably orthodox Johann Albert Fabricius. Jaucourt's articles resemble Voltaire's respectable histories more than his polemics, and are still further from the hostility of Meslier or the d'Holbach group.⁷⁹ Voltaire copied the 'Confession' fragment from the abbé Chardon and drew information from Calmet and Fleury for the *Questions* article to which it was added. He copied and adapted Fleury for 'Conciles'⁸⁰ and Calmet for 'Adam', 'Baptême' and probably parts of 'Eclipse' (not to speak of 'Genèse', 'Vampires' and doubtless many more articles in the *Questions*). Du Tilliot is not a well known figure but his study of the *Fête des fous* is not impious, and the two books on the history of the sacred and profane dance which figure in 'Messe', by Bonnet and by the Jesuit Menestrier,⁸¹ are utterly respectable, while the Oratorians, Jean-Baptiste Thiers and Pierre Le Brun, in their treatises regarding superstitions ('Messe' and 'Enchantements'), are irreproachable.

When one goes back, beyond the immediate sources of the Kehl articles, to the scholars whose editions of chronicles and histories (Duchesne), whose dictionaries (Du Cange), *Concilia* (Sirmond and Labbe), *Vita sanctorum* (Mabilion, d'Achéry and the Bollandists), histories of Church discipline (Martène,

Joseph Bingham) and of the monastic orders (Mabillon and Hélyot), and collections of apocrypha (Fabricius) and Patristic documents (Cotellier and Grabe) provided the primary materials for Voltaire's borrowed polemics, the cast becomes still more respectable. Behind the *Encyclopédie* material on the false decretals were the minister David Blondel (1628) and the archbishop Pierre de Marca (1641). The famous Fra Paolo Sarpi who contributed to 'Abbaye', 'Quête' and the *Questions* 'Biens de l'église' was the theological counsellor of the Venetian Republic who was invoked in all attempts to reunite the Christian confessions, while bishop Jean-Pierre Camus, whose antimonastic writings found their way into the same articles, was a disciple of st François de Sales and, according to legend, lacked only a touch of charity for the monastic orders to have merited canonisation. All the points that 'Abbaye' raised against the Benedictines and, by implication, against the other orders, can be traced back to the antimonastic polemics of eminent Churchmen in the early seventeenth century, and to the tracts in which the attacks, parries and ripostes of the orders were executed. Cardinal st Robert Bellarmino attacked the orders in his *De gemitu colombae* (1617) and Yves de Paris and Domenicus Gravina parried with their *Heureux succès de la piété* and *Vox turturis*. Baronius denied that st Gregory was a Benedictine, was attacked in turn by one Constantin Bellot or Belot, and Baronius's spokesman, Antonio Gallonio (1604) riposted with the charge that the Benedictines had falsified their charters. Matthieu Lauret took up the defence of Monte-Cassino in 1607 against Gallonio, while the Oratorian, Charles Le Cointe, took up the anti-Benedictine cudgels in his *Annales ecclesiasticae Francorum* (1665-1683), by asserting that many of the saints claimed by the order had not actually belonged to monasteries which followed the rule of st Benedict.⁸² After Le Cointe's death, a fellow Oratorian, Gérard Du Bois, continued the *Annales* and their attacks on the presumptions of Benedictine history. Mabillon's demonstration that the monasteries founded in France by st Colomba did not follow the Benedictine rule and that therefore their saints could not be imputed to his order was reckoned an act of treachery by dom Philippe Bastide and dom Joseph Mège who brought him up with charges within the order where Mabillon defended himself – and the cause of scientific history – successfully.⁸³ To complete the pedigree of 'Abbaye' one must add Constantin Cajetan's *De religiosa s. Ignatii Institutiones*. Cajetan was refuted by the Jesuit Jean Rho with such vigour that both parties earned a place in the *Index librorum prohibitorum!* Behind 'Eclipse' and 'Noël' stand the astronomer Kepler and the great scholar-chronologists, Denis Petau and Joseph Scaliger.

When one extends the genealogy of Voltaire's other ecclesiastical articles in the same manner, one finds relatively few Protestants – Bingham, Blondel, Scaliger, Pithoys⁸⁴, Sykes and Whiston are the only ones in this sample – so it is exaggerating to speak of a special contribution from liberated Protestant thought. In a profound sense, however, all these figures, Protestant and Catholic, despite their often narrow and opposing polemical intentions, share a common ground in the Erasmian tradition of scholarship and technical criticism of texts which, in Catholic circles, survived the Council of Trent, and in Protestant circles, the censure of seventeenth-century rigorists and obscurantists,⁸⁵ it was in fact even

reinforced through the pressures of the Catholic-Protestant polemics of that century.⁸⁶ It is not claimed that all these scholars were Erasmians. From the descriptions of their contributions to the polemics among the religious orders, Cajetan, Rho, Gravina and Yves de Paris must have been the antithesis of Erasmian, and they – except for Rho of whom Voltaire may not have been aware – became the objects of Voltaire's irony rather than his willing or unwilling allies, but even they participated in the development of the histories of the religious orders as they would emerge toward the end of the century from Mabillon's circle of scholars at St Germain des Prés.⁸⁷ What is more to the point than any claim of common religious ground between Voltaire and his sources, whether immediate or remote – that could not be sustained in any event and in most cases would be absurd – is the fact that, despite their religious diversity and conflicting purposes, they produced works of historical research and chronology, editions of primary sources and enormously knowledgeable tracts. Ecclesiastical science, no less than natural science, absorbs its own history in its advances, and drawing upon that science at any point implies a debt to all antecedent research. Looking for points of spiritual kinship between Voltaire and his sources obscures the more significant point that they and he looked to the historical sciences for explanation and authority for contemporary practice and belief or for grounds for their reform or suppression. Many of those sources exploited their historical research as enthusiastically as Voltaire did his, if not necessarily so well nor even so scrupulously.

Historical and ecclesiastical science was exploited for many purposes. Religious polemics and apologies are the most familiar examples. By the early eighteenth century it became clear that they could also be exploited by libertines against the various religious establishments. Beausobre, for one, recognised that his study of the Manichæans could be abused by libertines (*Histoire critique*, i.xiv). In fact the discussion of the birth and death of Jesus in the *Analyse* (p.23) seems to be derived from him, and the *Recherches sur les miracles* cites him twice.⁸⁸ Sykes's Phlegonian controversy, into which none of the parties entered in an impious spirit, reappears in the *Analyse* and the *Religion chrétienne analysée*.⁸⁹ Warburton, too, was on guard against libertine exploitation since, in his later volumes, he already complains, with reason, of Voltaire's misappropriations of his earlier work. While exploitation of Calmet seems to have been a Voltairean speciality – the Benedictine knew all the 'dangerous' Biblical verses (a sign that Voltaire's repertoire was mostly unoriginal) and, like Beausobre two decades later, confuted the objections to scripture as best he could – particularly in 'Genèse' of the *Dictionnaire* and *La Sainte bible enfin expliquée*. The author of the *Examen critique* leaves Voltaire far behind as an exploiter of credulous clergymen (and some not so credulous). His mastery of Tillemont and a host of minor figures is impressive, and he appreciated the devastating implications of the Richard Simon–Jean Leclerc controversy (in *Œuvres de Fréret*, iii.373-75).

Finally, there is one rather unexpected religious affinity between Voltaire and several of his sources. Both 'Kalendes' and 'Messe' reveal a rather post-Tridentine desire for religious decorum and respectability. Of course he ought to have been disingenuous in those articles but that does not seem to be entirely the case. The extravagances of the *Fête des fous* now seem (and even then seemed so

to Du Tilliot) more droll than offensive, and familiarity, not to speak of a post-Herderian sympathy, with 'primitive' societies recalls that dance was frequently as much a medium of religious expression as music, the plastic arts and liturgy. But nonprofessional dance had disreputable implications, and these spontaneous expressions of religious sentiment carried with them 'l'ombre de licence'. Voltaire dredged up, with the help of Beausobre, Menestrier and Du Tilliot, inappropriate examples of mixed dancing in the Bible, among the 'thérapeutes d'Égypte', and even dance survivals in modern churches.⁹⁰ 'Kalendes' in particular has a strange genealogy. Du Tilliot quotes Jean Deslyons, Mathurin de Neuré and other figures going back to the severe Jean Gerson, the early fifteenth-century chancellor of the Sorbonne. Like them, Thiers and Le Brun were also reformers. Their targets were aberrant (in their language, superstitious) practices regarding the sacraments and indiscriminate belief in sorcery.

Of course, not all of Voltaire's scholarly sources belong in the movement that tried to bring reform and decorum to the Church; most of them were polemicists supporting various causes and representing diverse points of view. Even much of the material coming from scholars who enjoyed the reputation of relative impartiality and scientific scruple was prompted, directly or indirectly, by disputes among the confessions and among the religious orders. But P. J. S. Whitmore reminds us of the wide dimension of Church reform reflected in these scholarly sources, and of the scholarship among the reformers. He argues that 'during the seventeenth century, the counter-reformation in France brought about a reaction against the supposedly pagan aspects of the renaissance, yet at the same time held to its freely expressed humanism' (p.xxvi). He adds that 'there was an increasing tendency for members of the clergy to write against the influence of superstitious practices in the Church. This was due partially to a genuine enlightenment' (p.xiii; see also p.xxxi). Although Voltaire's connection with Pithoys was through the *Apocalypse de Métilon* which is reformist but hardly 'enlightened', Pithoys still belongs among the 'enlightened' reformers by virtue of his attacks on injudicious exorcisms and judicial astrology. Whitmore counts Bekker and even two of the demonologists of 'Généalogie', Martin Del Rio and Henri Boguet, among the reformers because the latter two mixed scepticism, good sense and even practical experience, in varying proportions, to determine which possessions, incubi and thaumaturgical acts were not fraudulent.

It might have been more convincing if Whitmore had spoken of the genuine, partial enlightenment of his reformers. By the standard of Voltaire, they were still very credulous. Nevertheless, it is primarily through the enlightened aspects of their work, and through the scholarly methods which they applied to their data that Voltaire established contact with them, while the credulous side of their reforming energies exposed them to his satire. By the middle of the eighteenth century the passionate engagement of Thiers, Le Brun, Deslyons and de Neuré in religious reform was vulgarised into a study of religious folklore and anthropology, to use modern terms. Banier's and Lemascrier's dissertations on the mass, on the superstitions which had insinuated themselves into the administration of the sacraments and on the various ordeals to which suspected sorcerers were subjected appeared in volume 7 part 2 of Jean-Frédéric Bernard's splendid, illustrated, folios, *Cérémonies et coutumes religieuses de tous les peuples du*

monde [...] avec une explication historique et quelques dissertations curieuses (Amsterdam 1743). What is significant here is that these are not works of original scholarship nor are they in any way *sub rosa* publications. They must have been the equivalent of the deluxe editions that publishers now issue to decorate the coffee tables of the affluent, and therefore they must have been every bit as uncontroversial. Thiers and Le Brun also served as sources for *Encyclopédie* articles. When Voltaire drew upon them for the Kehl articles they had long been in the public domain and were quite respectable. Ironically, in view of his own estrangement from the Church, and of his rather unexpected sympathy for the more immediate forms of religious experience,⁹¹ Voltaire does not exploit these reformers, Victorians *avant la lettre*, who tried to purge the last vestiges of paganism, bad taste and, inadvertently perhaps, popular spontaneity from Church rites, so much as he joins them! He seems to jump back a generation from Du Tilliot, Banier, Lemascrier and the *encyclopédistes* to the indignation of Deslyons, de Neuré, Thiers and Le Brun. There is poetic justice here. After exploiting liberal religious thinkers, and after despoiling pious scholars of all the discoveries which, with adroit polemical assistance, could be brought to shake the tradition that they had sought to sustain and deepen, Voltaire at last found common ground, admittedly a very narrow strip, with a line of conservative and even desiccated thinkers.

Voltaire, too, had entertained some idea of reforming the Churches after his fashion. His erstwhile friend, Jacob Vernet, urged him to take a good look at the 'liberal' reform and purification of Calvinism that Jean-Alphonse Turretini had achieved in Geneva.⁹² Voltaire was not convinced and, after testing the tolerance of its pastors and trying the patience of its syndics, he finally embarked on his campaign to crush *l'infâme*, but that did not prevent him from borrowing, copying and exploiting religious 'reformers'.

- 1 *Literature and history in the age of ideas: essays presented to George Havens*, ed. Charles S. Williams (Columbus, Ohio 1975).
- 2 See J. Vercruysse, 'Les œuvres alphabétiques de Voltaire', *Annales de l'Université de Bruxelles* (1969-1970), pp.89-98, for complete details.
- 3 William H. Trapnell, 'Voltaire and his portable dictionary', *Analecta romanica* 32 (1972), p.6.
- 4 Georges Bengesco, *Voltaire: bibliographie de ses œuvres* (Paris 1882-1890), i.423-24.
- 5 See Norman L. Torrey and Douglas H. Gordon, *The Censoring of Diderot's Encyclopédie* (New York 1947).
- 6 Trapnell, p.70; see Best.D13449 and D13469 to Damilaville, 25 July and 4 August 1766. This is contrary to professor Ira O. Wade's claim that Voltaire began preparing his 'petits chapitres' for the *Dictionnaire philosophique* as early as 1741-1742, 'before he had a *Dictionnaire philosophique* or even an idea of one, and long before that memorable discussion in Potsdam in 1752 which is said to have given the original impetus to that work' (*The Search for a new Voltaire, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* N.S.48, part 4 (1958), pp.111, 83). Paradox aside, the inconvenience of Wade's opinion is that it breaks Voltaire's self-borrowing into two categories, the short, isolated hypothetical 'petits chapitres' and the excerpts from long works (for example, a chapter from the *Eléments de la philosophie de Newton* for 'Distance' of the *Questions*)

- which could hardly have been written for an alphabetical collection *avant la lettre*. The distinction seems arbitrary. It should be recalled that Voltaire was not the only man in Potsdam/Berlin to entertain the idea of abridging the *Encyclopédie* according to his own lights. See Georges Roth, 'Samuel Formey et son projet d'*Encyclopédie* réduite', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 54 (1954), pp.371-74.
- 7 Vercruyse, 'Les œuvres alphabétiques', p.93; René Pomeau, 'Histoire d'une œuvre de Voltaire: le *Dictionnaire philosophique portatif*', *L'Information littéraire* 7 (1955), pp.43-51.
 - 8 Raymond Naves, *Voltaire et l'Encyclopédie* (Paris 1938), p.141; John Lough, *The Contributors to the Encyclopédie* (London 1973), p.9, follows R. N. Schwab's attribution of 'Généreux' to Voltaire and comes out with 44 articles, *Inventory of Diderot's Encyclopédie*, *Studies on Voltaire* 93 (1972). For a very elegant discussion of Voltaire's contribution to the *Encyclopédie*, see René Pintard, 'Voltaire et l'*Encyclopédie*', *Annales de l'Université de Paris* 22 (octobre 1952), pp.39-56, and for a biographical approach, see Marta Rezler, 'Voltaire and the *Encyclopédie*: a re-examination', *Studies on Voltaire* 30 (1964), pp.147-87. Also see M. L. Perkins, 'Theme and form in Voltaire's alphabetical works', *Studies on Voltaire* 120 (1974), pp.7-40.
 - 9 J. Vercruyse, 'Articles inédits de Voltaire pour le *Dictionnaire* de l'Académie française', *Studies on Voltaire* 37 (1965), pp.7-51.
 - 10 See Best.D15929, 29 September 1769, to Panckoucke, D16026, 6 December to Servan, requesting his *Spectacles* for the article, 'Dramatique', and referring to the *Questions* as a 'supplément de l'*Encyclopédie*, dont on va bientôt imprimer le premier volume', and D16035, 11 December, to Christin, which suggests that the letters 'A' to 'E' are almost ready. The bibliography of the *Questions* is rather slender: see William Archie, 'Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique*: les *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*', *Symposium* 5 (1951), pp.317-27; his unpublished dissertation, 'An introduction to Voltaire's *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*' (Princeton University 1949: not consulted); and Wade, 'Genesis of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*', *The Search for a new Voltaire*, pp.82-85.
 - 11 Samuel Taylor, 'The definitive text of Voltaire's works: the Leningrad *encadrée*', *Studies on Voltaire* 124 (1974), p.32.
 - 12 We count 40 new articles plus additions to 11 previously published articles; this tallies with professor Vercruyse's count of 52 articles and sections, and the possibility remains that some of the post-Kehl articles are refugees from that collection.
 - 13 Roger Lauffer, *Introduction à la textologie* (Paris 1972), p.25.
 - 14 Other texts balance sympathy with very sharp criticism, cf. *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.54, 102, 103. For a discussion of the alleged antisemitism of the *Dictionnaire* see Roland Desné, 'Voltaire et les juifs: antijudaïsme et antisémitisme: à propos du *Dictionnaire philosophique*', *Pour une histoire quantitative: études offertes à Sven Stelling-Michaud* (Genève 1975).
 - 15 Jerom Vercruyse and others (ed.), *Voltaire: exposition organisée à l'occasion du bicentenaire de sa mort: catalogue* (Bruxelles 1978), no 93, includes a photograph of an autograph manuscript of 'Directeur'. The 1771 and 1774 *Questions* reproduce the text with one variant, a description of the conscience as 'le chef de votre conseil', while the Kehl editors, and after them Beuchot and Moland, regress to the text of the manuscript, 'votre premier ami'. Evidently they had seen the Brussels manuscript, had it copied (Bn n.a.fr. 2778, f.25), and preferred the variant of their manuscript to Voltaire's printed and authorised text.
 - 16 *The Search for a new Voltaire*, p.41.
 - 17 See Jacqueline Marchand, 'Un voltairien passionné: Jacques-Joseph Marie Decroix (1746-1826)', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 77 (1977), pp.187-205.

- 18 *The Complete works of Voltaire*, ed. Besterman and others (Genève, Banbury, Oxford 1968-) [henceforth 'Voltaire'], 81-82.
- 19 *Studies on Voltaire* 148 (1976), pp.7-35.
- 20 *Studies on Voltaire* 77 (1970), pp.75-101.
- 21 *Studies on Voltaire* 77, pp.43-74.
- 22 Ira O. Wade and Norman L. Torrey, 'Voltaire and Polier de Bottens', *Romanic review* 31 (1940), pp.147-55.
- 23 Mina Waterman, 'Voltaire and Firmin Abauzit', *Romanic review* 33 (1942), pp.236-49. Marie-Hélène Cotoni has shown that Voltaire was not the only one to pirate Abauzit's manuscripts; see 'Les manuscrits clandestins du XVIII^e siècle: nouveaux éléments et questions nouvelles', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 77 (1977), pp.24-29.
- 24 See the notes to the Kehl 'Baptême' in the forthcoming edition of the alphabetical works. Details of his borrowed texts for all the Kehl articles will be found there.
- 25 Conyers Middleton, *Miscellaneous works* (London 1755), i.153, 157, note.
- 26 See Best.D12192, note 2, and Norman L. Torrey, *Voltaire and the English deists* (New Haven, Conn. 1930), pp.163-68, for other borrowings from Middleton in the *Questions*.
- 27 Firmin Abauzit, 'Lettre à une dame touchant le dogme de l'église romaine', *Œuvres diverses* (Londres [Amsterdam] 1770), pp.183, 201-204, but attacks on the veneration of Mary, the saints and their relics were commonplace in Protestant controversialist literature.
- 28 Jean-Baptiste d'Argens (ed.), *Deffense du paganisme par l'empereur Julien* (Berlin 1764), pp.lvi-lx.
- 29 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle* (La Haye 1963-1964), ii.324ff.
- 30 Nicolas Sylvestre Bergier, *Œuvres* (Paris 1769), ii.359.
- 31 See Charles Dédéyan, *Voltaire et la pensée anglaise* (Paris [1957]), pp.121ff., and the introduction to the philosophical articles in the forthcoming edition.
- 32 René Pomeau, 'La documentation de Voltaire dans le *Dictionnaire philosophique*', *Quaderni francesi* 1 (1970), p.399. Naves (p.120) has shown that Voltaire's articles for the *Encyclopédie* also drew on research undertaken for the *Essai*. A frugal exploitation of the last crumbs of research for an earlier work is not surprising; anything that one writes draws upon all that one has learnt and researched for previous projects. The implication is a bit more subtle: that Voltaire did not research the *Dictionnaire philosophique* and the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* at all and that they are a *pot-pourri* rather than a carefully constructed large scale work. While that analysis will be accepted here, evidence will be adduced to show that the *Essai* is far from being the only source or occasion for the research that went into the *Questions*.
- 33 Wade, *The Search for a new Voltaire*, pp.74-75, argues without demonstration that 'this little essay formed part of a cahier prepared by some early secretary, perhaps Linant or Longchamps. Voltaire having adopted it for his basic text [for 'Ame iv'], gave it a thorough revision for the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*.'
- 34 Voltaire 81, pp.30-39; 82, pp.542-44.
- 35 See John Lough, *Essays on the Encyclopédie of Diderot and d'Alembert* (London 1958), chapter 2, for a detailed account of Panckoucke's project. Perkins (pp.38-40) associates the 'Opinion en alphabet' with a different project, the *Œuvres complètes* which Voltaire began to prepare for Panckoucke by revising the *encadrée*.
- 36 except for 'Femme' which may have been omitted by mistake since there is a cross-reference to it, and which finally appeared in the *Questions* of 1774.

- 37 Robert Darnton, 'The *Encyclopédie* wars of prerevolutionary France', *Studies in eighteenth-century culture* 6 (1977), pp.3-34.
- 38 Alfred J. Bingham, 'Voltaire and the *Encyclopédie méthodique*', *Studies on Voltaire* 6 (1958), pp.9-31. George B. Watts has written extensively on the *Encyclopédie méthodique*. See note 1 of Monty's study for a complete bibliography of his articles. Also see Bingham's several studies of Bergier: 'The abbé Bergier: an eighteenth-century Catholic apologist', *Modern language review* 54 (1959), pp.337-56; 'Voltaire and the abbé Bergier: a polite controversy', *Modern language review* 59 (1964), pp.31-39; 'Voltaire anti-chrétien réfuté par l'abbé Bergier', *Revue de l'Université Laval* 20 (1966), pp.853-71; 'The earliest critic of Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique*', *Studies on Voltaire* 47 (1966), pp.15-37. Ironically, even if Voltaire did not write the Kehl articles for Panckoucke, his *post mortem* contribution to the *Encyclopédie méthodique* was not negligible. Professor Alfred Bingham has shown that much Voltairean material was appropriated in the interval between the first volume, issued almost a decade after Voltaire's death (1787) and its eventual completion, 192 volumes and 55 years later. The material that was adopted was mostly in the 'partie littéraire' in which Voltaire had been invited to participate, and outside the theological and ecclesiastical sciences which so dominate the Kehl articles, an area that was in the charge of Nicolas Sylvestre Bergier, an erstwhile critic, who exploited the *Encyclopédie méthodique* to continue his polemics against Voltaire.
- 39 The material in 'Confession' relative to abbesses who heard the confessions of their nuns is very close to the text of the *Encyclopédie* 'Abbesse' which is early enough to have supplied the same information to the *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.21. When that chapter was attacked by Nonnotte, Voltaire went back to the source of the *Encyclopédie* article, Fleury, in order to defend himself.
- 40 See Elisabeth Nichols, 'Dom Calmet "qui n'a pensé jamais"', *French review* 31 (1958), pp.296-99, for a discussion relative to the *Dictionnaire*. For a more general discussion of Voltaire's various debts to Calmet, see the two studies by Arnold Ages, *Voltaire, Calmet and the Old Testament*, *Studies on Voltaire* 41 (1966), pp.87-187; 'Voltaire's critical notes in the Old Testament portion of *La Bible enfin expliquée*' (Dissertation: Ohio State University 1963), *passim*; and B. E. Schwarzbach, *Voltaire's Old Testament criticism* (Geneva 1971), *passim*.
- 41 César Chesneau Du Marsais, *Œuvres* (Paris An VII), vii.274-81. Voltaire's library did not contain any edition of this work. Wade enumerates the last paragraphs of 'Bulle' as follows: 1. 'Philippe le bel de son côté'; 2. 'Clément v'; 3. 'Avant Boniface VIII'; 4. 'Le roi d'Angleterre'; 5. 'BULLE DE LA CROISADE'; 6. 'BULLE UNIGENITUS'. He asserts that 5 and 6 are to be found only in Moland although they are already in the 1770 *Questions* but remarks quite correctly that 2, 3 and 4 appear for the first time in Kehl.
- 42 In 'Reliques', for example, Voltaire offers a reference, 'Cité de Dieu liv XXII, chap. VIII' that is quite wrong, he misunderstood Beausobre; the reference to Theodoret's 'Question 51 sur l'Exode' was a misinterpretation of Beausobre's '*ub. sup.* p.605, 606'; Augustine 'Des mœurs de l'Eglise chap xxxix' should read 'chap xxxiv', though this may have been Kehl's faulty transcription just as easily as Voltaire's; Voltaire confuses Cyril of Jerusalem with Cyril of Alexandria where Beausobre took it for granted that his readers were sufficiently expert not to require precise identification, etc. There are more like these in 'Zèle'.
- 43 Jacques Proust has called attention to analagous copying in the *Encyclopédie*, 'Questions sur l'*Encyclopédie*', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 72 (1972), pp.40-41.
- 44 See Jeanne Monty, 'Voltaire's rhetoric: the use of written evidence in the alphabetical works', *Studies on Voltaire* 120 (1974), pp.41-78.
- 45 See *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, 'Histoire. de l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Fleuri'; also see

- Pomeau, 'La documentation', p.400, and Raymond E. Wanner, *Claude Fleury (1640-1723) as an educational historiographer and thinker* (The Hague 1975), pp.23-26.
- 46 For a brief discussion of Beausobre's historical method, particularly in relation to the historiography of the embattled Protestant refugees, see B. E. Schwarzbach, 'Voltaire et les huguenots de Berlin: Formey et Isaac de Beausobre', *Voltaire und Deutschland*, ed. Peter Brockmeyer, Roland Desné and Jürgen Voss (Stuttgart 1979), pp.103-18.
- 47 See for example, 'Eglise primitive' of the *Questions*.
- 48 (Leipzig 1863), nor does he figure in the *DNB*, nor among the graduates of Oxford or Cambridge.
- 49 In *Œuvres complètes de Du Marsais* (Paris An VII), vii.23-24.
- 50 In *Œuvres de Fréret* (Paris 1792), iv.213-16. As Wade has shown, these are the same work.
- 51 J. S. Spink, *La Libre pensée française de Gassendi à Voltaire*, translated by Paul Meier (Paris 1966), p.344.
- 52 Voltaire brags about his studies at Sénones in the *Fragment sur l'histoire générale*, ch.8, and mentions them in the notebooks (Voltaire 82, pp.536 and 602).
- 53 He may have known some of this material through Louis Elliés Dupin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Amsterdam 1711), xvii.133-34 (BV1159), which still does not give all the details which Voltaire mentions.
- 54 For spring 1768, see Best.D14789, Voltaire to mme Denis, March 1768; D14981, to Sébastien Dupont, 26 April, and D14996, 3 May, to mme Denis. For spring 1769, see D15568, 3 April 1769, to mme Denis.
- 55 Even though, as has been demonstrated, the 1764 *Dictionnaire* contains quite a bit of borrowed material, its early critics, [A. Du Bon?], *Remarques sur un livre intitulé Dictionnaire portatif* (Lausanne 1765), and Bergier, *Œuvres*, vol.iv, who demonstrated Voltaire's errors, were unaware of most of the borrowing and did not make allowance for the errors that Voltaire inherited. Since Voltaire presumed to teach ecclesiastical history, he was correctly held responsible for his errors, whatever their source.
- 56 This principle must be applied with prudence because not only do the *œuvres* abound in repetitious pieces, arguments and illustrations, but the *Dictionnaire* and the *Questions* contain redundancies, as Voltaire admits in 'Quaker' where he pleads for indulgence on that score because of his ill health. One can always find some difference in tone or treatment that might justify a redundancy – which is why the Kehl editors published their 'Conciles' – or which suggests that a draft is really an independent literary creation, all the more so if one follows Lauffer's analysis (1.4.1) that each level of author intervention in the preparation of his own text is an entirely independent literary moment.
- 57 See Côte Alexandre Collini, *Mon séjour auprès de Voltaire* (Paris 1807), p.32, and Trapnell, pp.10-11, who cites Best.D5057 to Frederick, October/November 1752.
- 58 Paul Vernière, *Spinoza et la pensée française avant la révolution* (Paris 1957), ii.521-27. 'Idée II' of the *Questions* is a clear example of Voltaire's muting of the Spinozistic elements of an earlier text, his *Tout en dieu: commentaire sur Malebranche*. If Patrick Henry's contention ('A different view of Voltaire's controversial *Tout en dieu*', *Studies on Voltaire* 135 (1975), pp.143-50), that it was an anti-Holbach *pièce d'occasion* whose Spinozistic argument and vocabulary did not represent a serious commitment to Spinozism, is correct, then the purging of those elements to form 'Idée II', which would be analogous to the adulteration of 'Bien' into the two *Dictionnaire* articles, was a return to Voltaire's convictions rather than their sacrifice to the level of intellectual respectability which he tried to maintain in the *Questions*. Were the dating of 'Bien' more certain on other grounds it might have served as a check on both Henry and Vernière.

- 59 See Edward Gibbon, *The History of the decline and fall of the Roman empire*, ch.47, ed. J. B. Bury (London 1911), v.97, note.
- 60 Much has been written about some eighteenth-century writers' (and painters') interest in the autonomous and involuntary activities of the mind: Diderot's *Rêve de d'Alembert*, the theme of 'absorbition' in various painters and Diderot's appreciation of it (see Michael Fried, 'Absorbition: a master theme in eighteenth-century French painting and criticism', *Eighteenth-century studies* 9 (1975-1976), pp.139-77, and his 'Absorbition and theatricality: painting and beholder in the age of Diderot', *Studies on Voltaire* 152 (1976), pp.753-77), not to speak of the Goya 'Caprichos' and Fuseli. It should not be surprising that Voltaire touches on this theme, however superficially; he takes sleep and madness very seriously as valid psychic states emblematic of all that is uncontrollable in the psyche. See 'Idée', 'Folie' and 'Songes' of the *Dictionnaire*, and 'Ame III' and 'Somnambules' of the *Questions*.
- 61 See Trapnell, p.12, and Best.D5073 (November 1752).
- 62 Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, Genève, Mss. suppl. 1538, f. 83v, cited by R. E. Florida, *Voltaire and the socinians*, *Studies on Voltaire* 122 (Banbury 1974), p.165.
- 63 Ira O. Wade, *The Clandestine organization and diffusion of philosophical ideas in France between 1700 and 1750* (Princeton 1938), *passim*.
- 64 Spink, pp.345, 344. Beuchot had held that Voltaire himself wrote the *Analyse*. Professor Pomeau denies this and two points can be added to his reasons: the author of the *Analyse* had command of the first edition of Labbe's *Sacrosancta concilia* (1671-1672), a work which was already superseded by the time that Voltaire can be shown to have taken an interest in learned anti-Christian polemics. Neither Labbe nor any of Hardouin's expanded editions of his *Concilia* appear in Voltaire's library. More telling is the observation that the only time that Voltaire cites Labbe – apart from the texts parallel to the *Analyse* – it is through the intermediary of Beausobre ('Messe'). The *Analyse* and another clandestine tract, *Le Philosophe*, have usually been attributed to Du Marsais. Professor Herbert Dieckmann argues that those attributions are unwarranted because, although Du Marsais enjoyed amicable relations with various members of the philosophical movement, any suspicion of impiety or radicalism on his part rests upon Voltaire's attribution of both tracts to him, and upon Nageon's testimony. Voltaire's attributions of clandestine texts are notoriously unreliable in part because he delighted in disguising impious works in order to confer upon them the prestige and authority of a respectable scholar's name, and in part because he was evidently as ignorant of the circumstances of the composition of the tracts as anyone else. Nageon's testimony cannot be relied upon because it is contradicted by d'Alembert's testimony to Du Marsais's sincere Christian faith, and d'Alembert was well acquainted with Du Marsais. See professor Dieckmann's edition of *Le Philosophe*, *Washington University studies in language and literature* N.S.18 (St Louis 1948), pp.9-26. However dr A. W. Fairbairn argues to the contrary in 'Dumarsais and *Le Philosophe*', *Studies on Voltaire* 87 (1972), pp.375-95, on the basis of additional evidence, and he suggests that Du Marsais's posthumous *Exposition de la doctrine de l'église gallicane* (1757), an uncompromising defence of secular authority and of the autonomy of the national clergy, which shows a decent respect for the fundamental tenets of Christianity as well as for their local adumbrations, need not represent Du Marsais's opinion because it was written for the maréchal de Noailles who employed him as his house *philosophe* and tutor of his children.
- 65 The Troyes manuscript, nos 2376 and 2377, bears no title. It is a *seriatim* discussion of the books of the Old and New Testaments, each section headed, 'Examen de...', so we find it more reasonable to refer to the manuscript as *Examens de la bible* rather than as *Examen de la Genèse*, its traditional title.

- 66 We have argued elsewhere (*Voltaire's Old Testament criticism*) that the evidence for a publication of the *Sermon des cinquante* before 1761 is inadequate. The bibliographic evidence that will appear in the *Complete works* should settle the question one way or another.
- 67 Wade, *The Clandestine organization*, pp.183, 312; Wade, *The Intellectual development of Voltaire* (Princeton 1969), pp.537-47; E. Judson Humeston, jr, 'Voltaire, the *Examen* and the *Analyse*' (Dissertation: Princeton University 1942), pp.30-39; see also Trapnell, pp.7-8 for a more up-to-date discussion of Bible studies at Cirey.
- 68 See the paper by Charles Porset, 'Voltaire et Meslier ou les fausses influences', read at the Table ronde on 'Le matérialisme du XVIII^e siècle et la littérature clandestine' of the Université de Paris 1, 6 and 7 June 1980, which supports the periodisation of Voltaire's interest in the clandestine tracts which we propose here.
- 69 In a letter to the marquise Du Deffand (17 September 1759, Best.D8484) which shows Voltaire already quite interested in the historical books of the Old Testament and in the 'pornographic' passages of Ezekiel about which he would eventually have much more to say, he remarks, 'mme Du Châtelet l'avait commenté d'un bout à l'autre'. The description fits the *Examens de la bible* well enough but that does not yet identify the Troyes manuscript as a copy of her commentary, much less as her autograph copy (professor Pomeau denies that it is in her handwriting (*Religion*, pp.466, 164-65, 175) as does professor Spink, p.345), nor even as her personal copy, and that is the point crucial to the argument that she knew the 'Notes et preuves'. Best.D17778, note, cites the correspondence of Condorcet and Turgot of 14 and 21 June 1772, where they each describe a commentary on the Bible written by mme Du Châtelet, but in very divergent terms, ten or two quarto volumes (which does not correspond to the Troyes manuscript which consists of five volumes in a small format), so their testimony does not advance the argument. The reasons for the discrepancies in their descriptions may be that there seem to be other manuscripts of the work. The M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library informs me (letter of 22 May 1979) that they possess manuscripts in the hand of a copyist but with mme Du Châtelet's autograph corrections, and m. Wirz, conservateur of the Institut et musée Voltaire, informs me that there is a manuscript in a private collection which also purports to be the *Examens de la bible*. When these manuscripts are identified with regard to their content and handwriting some of the mystery surrounding this work may be dispelled.
- 70 See Jeroom Vercruyse, *Bibliographie descriptive des écrits du baron d'Holbach* (Paris 1971), pp.18, 33-36, 39, who describes the tradition assigning the *Examen critique* to Jean Lévesque de Burigny and the *Analyse* to Du Marsais. Also see Renée Simon, *Nicolas Fréret, académicien*, Studies on Voltaire 17 (Genève 1961), pp.176-87, but the grounds of Simon's dating and attributions of clandestine works are not convincing. The abbé Jean-Vincent Genet (*Une famille rémoise au XVIII^e siècle*, Reims 1881) saw documents of the Lévesque de Pouilly family then in possession of a mme de Noiron. He first regards the *Examen critique* as the abridgement of a youthful peccadillo, a 1595-page manuscript in 4°, 'Sur la vérité de la religion', dated 11 September 1733 (p.218). Then, on p.310, he denies that Lévesque de Burigny could have been responsible for an *Examen* so inconsistent with his published *œuvre*. One can only conclude that Genet never saw the impious manuscript and that he relied upon Barbier's authority or upon the tradition of a respectable family (possibly itself based on Barbier) unwilling to renounce any of its ancestor's claims to distinction, but also anxious to disassociate him and themselves from a scandalous work. See Alain Niderst, 'L'*Examen critique des apologistes de la religion chrétienne*, les frères Lévesque et leur groupe', paper read at the Table ronde on 'Le matérialisme du XVIII^e siècle et la littérature clandestine', for a defence of Lévesque de Burigny's claim to this tract.

- 71 We claim that the Kehl 'Conciles' preceded the *Dictionnaire* 'Conciles' in part because while the latter also deals with the question of the number of bishops attending the council of Nicea, it does so more coherently than the Kehl article in which the testimony of Eutychius of Alexandria regarding the very large number of bishops and inferior prelates who attended the council is cited from John Selden's translation of a Syriac manuscript in Oxford. The material regarding the attendance at Nicea is copied from Beausobre who wished to show that the Arians and other dissenters were not permitted to vote in the council, whence its unanimous rejection of Arianism (Beausobre, i.543). Voltaire adds an anecdote – correctly footnoted for a transcriptional error, 'Peruginus' for 'Perusinus', that probably derives from a source which remains elusive – regarding two bishops who, having died during the council, still signed its final canons in order to demonstrate miraculously their authority. This anecdote or the one regarding the establishment of the canon, with their tell-tale errors, recur in all Voltaire's treatments of the council of Nicea. While these later works, including the *Dictionnaire* 'Conciles', are more coherent than the Kehl 'Conciles' which digresses with Beausobre every which way, their suppression of his scholarship entailed a casualty. It is no longer clear why the number of bishops mentioned in an Oxford manuscript is important, nor why an absurd legend of miraculous subscriptions was worth reporting. Historiographic motivation, which is clear in Kehl, and the impression that Voltaire makes as a historian, were sacrificed, everywhere but in the Kehl article that Voltaire suppressed, to the brevity essential to polemical effectiveness.
- 72 Audrey Bowyer asserts ('The gospel according to Voltaire', *French review* 31 (1958), pp.294-95) that Voltaire copied and condensed 24 pages of the 1766 edition of the *Examen critique* into 4 pages (2 in the Naves/Benda edition) of 'Evangile', filling out the material on the canonicity of the four gospels and on the apocrypha from Mallet's *Encyclopédie* article, 'Evangile'. This is somewhat exaggerated. Voltaire drew just four sentences from three different pages of the *Examen critique* (and managed to confuse Irenaeus with Justin) and augmented them with material drawn from other sources.
- 73 See our forthcoming article with A. W. Fairbairn, 'The *Examen de la religion*: a bibliographic note', and the paper by Alain Widerst read at the Colloque Jean Meslier, Reims 1974, which attributes the *Examen* to Du Marsais.
- 74 Francis-L. Mars, 'Avec Casanova à la poursuite du *Militaire philosophe*: une conjecture raisonnée: Robert Challe', *Casanova gleanings* (Nice 1974), p.21, and Frédéric Deloffre, 'Robert Challe, père du déisme français', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 79 (1979), pp.947-80.
- 75 Voltaire 81, p.42.
- 76 The question of the methods by which Voltaire composed his alphabetical articles is explored more completely in 'Un regard sur l'atelier voltairien', *Actes du colloque international de Nice des 28 mai-3 juin 1978* (Genève 1981).
- 77 See Monty, 'Voltaire's rhetoric'. Also see Gilbert Emory Mills, 'The fidelity of Voltaire to his biblical and patristic sources', *Dissertation abstracts* (1956), no.4, p.752, which surveys the *Dictionnaire* of 1764 and finds only four cases of distortion that can be presumed to have been intentional.
- 78 'Le sophisme de l'Authorité [est] invoqué pour défendre des Opinions évidemment fausses et des pratiques superstitieuses [...] J'estime et honore les Pères, mais je ne les crois point du tout infaillibles, ni du côté du témoignage, ni du côté du raisonnement', *Histoire critique*, i.xx1-xxiii.
- 79 Jaucourt's 'Religion naturelle (morale)' is a respectable statement of the position that Christian dogma can be extracted from neutral, rational and experiential

premisses. He could surely have preached his article from any pulpit without causing scandal.

- 80 Rather to our surprise, we have not found any traces of direct borrowing from Tillemont in the articles that we sampled. The extent of Voltaire's overall debt to Fleury should therefore be studied.
- 81 Claude-François Menestrier, *Les Ballets anciens et modernes selon les règles du théâtre* (Paris 1682).
- 82 See Richard Simon, *Lettres choisies* (Amsterdam 1734), iii, nos. 11 and 12; Du Pin, xvii.7-8, xviii.252-55.
- 83 See dom Denis, 'Dom Mabillon et sa méthode historique', *Revue Mabillon* 4 (1908), pp.47ff., 6 (1910), pp.5-64.
- 84 See P. J. S. Whitmore, *A seventeenth-century exposure of superstition: select texts of Claude Pithois (1587-1676)* (The Hague 1972), introduction.
- 85 See H. R. Trevor-Roper, 'The religious origins of the Enlightenment', *The European witch-craze of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and other essays* (New York 1969).
- 86 See Bernard Dompnier, 'L'histoire religieuse chez les controversistes réformés au début du xvii^e siècle: l'apport de Du Plessis Mornay et Rivet', *Historiographie de la réforme*, sous la direction de Philippe Joutard (Paris, Neuchâtel, Montréal 1977), pp.31-32.
- 87 Mabillon, Edmond Martène and Bernard de Montfaucon are the most famous of the St Germain des Prés Benedictines, but that abbey co-ordinated and edited the archival research of all the Maurists (the Congregation of French Benedictines established before the union of Lorraine to France which attached to the realm the Benedictine monasteries belonging to the congregation of St Vanne and St Hydulphe). See Emmanuel de Broglie, *Mabillon et la société de l'abbaye de Saint-Germain des Prés* (Paris 1888), and Joseph Urban Bergkamp, *Dom Mabillon and the benedictine historical school of Saint-Maur* (Washington, D.C. 1928).
- 88 *Recherches sur les miracles*, in *Œuvres de Fréret* (Paris 1792), iv.22, 6.
- 89 *La Religion chrétienne analysée*, iv.213-16; *Analyse*, pp.23-25.
- 90 See 'Messe' and *Essai sur les mœurs*, ch.94, 1775 addition.
- 91 See our essay 'Coincé entre Pluche et Lucrèce: Voltaire et la théologie naturelle', *Transactions of the Fifth International Congress on the Enlightenment*, Studies on Voltaire 190-94 (Oxford 1981), iii.1072-84.
- 92 See Best.D6146, 8 February 1755, and Voltaire's cautious response, Best.D6149, 9 February. Also see Florida, p.156.