

# Effects of the *Agrégation de Philosophie* on Twentieth-Century French Philosophy

ALAN D. SCHRIFT

MUCH ATTENTION HAS BEEN PAID to developments in French philosophy over the past half century, and it has been frequently noted that the recent history of French philosophy differs significantly from its counterparts in England, Germany, and the United States. While many reasons for these differences have been suggested, in what follows I would like to suggest that there is an important and unique French institution—one with no equivalent in the English-speaking or German academic systems—that has had a significant impact on developments in French philosophy throughout the twentieth century. This institution is the *Agrégation de Philosophie*, and its effects are virtually unknown among philosophers outside France. Even within France—while knowledge of and experience with the *agrégation* is part of the intellectual formation and career of virtually every academic educated in France, including every philosopher teaching in a university and the majority of philosophers teaching the *classe de philosophie* in French *lycées*—French philosophers themselves seem relatively unaware and uninterested in the history of the *agrégation* and the effects that this history has had on philosophical practices in France. What I hope to do in the following pages is explain how the *agrégation de philosophie* works, and suggest that its impact on the education of French philosophy students and the teaching corps in both the university and *lycée* helps explain a number of developments in French philosophy over the past century. I will also explain why the French philosophical tradition differs from its American counterpart in some very significant ways. As will become clear, in referring to the differences between the American and French philosophical traditions, I do not mean to invoke the overworked distinction between “analytic” and “continental” philosophy, and what I will discuss cuts across the analytic-continental split that has so profoundly impacted American and, to a lesser extent, British and Australian philosophy in the past half-century. What I will suggest instead is that the failure to acknowledge the role of the *agrégation de philosophie* leads to a failure to understand what, at a profound level, distinguishes *all* French philosophers—whether

---

Alan D. Schrift is F. Wendell Miller Professor of Philosophy at Grinnell College.

*Journal of the History of Philosophy*, vol. 46, no. 3 (2008) 449–74

Derrida or Deleuze or Bouveresse or Descombes—from their German, British, and American counterparts, namely, the thorough grounding in the history of philosophy, especially the history of philosophy prior to 1800, that has been throughout the twentieth century a necessary condition for employment as an instructor of philosophy in France.

## I

To begin, a bit of history. The *agrégation* was established in 1766 under Louis XV as a competitive examination to certify secondary school teachers. The original *agrégation* sought to credential teachers in three areas: philosophy, letters, and grammar.<sup>1</sup> Its creation had important political implications, however, especially for the teaching of philosophy, insofar as it took the power to credential these teachers out of the hands of an examining jury selected by the Sorbonne's Faculty of Theology<sup>2</sup> and gave that power to a jury under the exclusive control of the Faculty of Arts. The Faculty of Arts housed the humanities and science faculty, and, since the founding of the University of Paris in the twelfth century, the Arts Faculty had been considered an "inferior" Faculty in contrast to the other three "superior" Faculties—Theology, Law, and Medicine. It would not be inappropriate to regard the withdrawal of this power in 1766 from the Theology Faculty to be in fact the first step in the secularization of French education that came to completion in the 1905 law formally separating Church and State in France.

In 1821, three distinct competitive examinations were organized: one for sciences, one for letters (including philosophy), and one for grammar. Although the jury for this first *agrégation de lettres* was presided over by a layman, two of its five members were abbés from the Faculty of Theology, and the important place philosophy held in the examination in letters can be seen in that first examination's written question: *Philosophia, omnium mater artrium, quid est aliud nisi donum aut inventum Dei?* (Philosophy, mother of all the arts—what else is it if not a gift or discovery of God?).<sup>3</sup> Four years later, in the Arrêté du 12 juillet 1825, the *agrégation de lettres* was split into two—an *agrégation de lettres* and an *agrégation de philosophie*—with the latter created specifically for the certification of teachers of classes in philosophy. Presided over by the Abbé Burnier-Fontanel of the Faculty of Theology at the Sorbonne, this new philosophy examination, with the written part still conducted in Latin, was little more than a revision of the earlier examination in letters that, now independent, could be placed again under the control of the clergy, thus reflecting the Restoration's desire to re-establish the power of the Roman Catholic Church in France. The forces of the Restoration were largely successful in this desire, and by the end of the Restoration (1830), more than half the philosophy teachers in France were members of the clergy.<sup>4</sup> Under the July Monarchy, however, the *agrégation de philosophie* became in 1830 a truly

<sup>1</sup>André Chervel, *Histoire de l'agrégation: Contribution à l'histoire de la culture scolaire* [*Histoire de l'agrégation*] (Paris: Éditions Kimé, 1993), 18. Most of the following details concerning the early history of the *agrégation* come from this work.

<sup>2</sup>One might recall here Descartes's *Meditations on First Philosophy*, which opens with a plea "To those most learned and distinguished men, the Dean and Doctors of the sacred Faculty of Theology at Paris," that they take his work under their protection.

<sup>3</sup>Chervel, *Histoire de l'agrégation*, 69.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 79.

independent philosophy examination with the appointment of the philosopher Victor Cousin (1792–1867) as president of the *jury d'agrégation* and the change of language for the written essays from Latin to French.<sup>5</sup> In subsequent years, many other specific competitive examinations have also been created, including examinations in history and geography (1831), mathematics (1841), German (1849), and English (1849).

In its modern form, the philosophy *agrégation* is a competitive exam (called the *Concours*) that licenses students for teaching philosophy in secondary and post-secondary schools. The content of the exam is chosen by a *jury d'agrégation*, acting under the auspices of the Ministry of Public Instruction (now the Ministry of National Education), on the basis of the philosophy syllabus or *Programme* determined for the preceding year. The structure and content of the philosophy *agrégation* has been a subject of almost constant review and debate throughout the twentieth century.<sup>6</sup> In the early years of the twentieth century, the exam consisted of two parts: a preliminary written examination and a final oral examination.<sup>7</sup> The written part consisted of three essays, each allotted seven hours, often scheduled for a single week, with two questions on general philosophy and one on the history of philosophy. Following the written examination, of which only one in four candidates typically passed, several oral examinations were required. While the purpose of the written examination was to ascertain the candidate's philosophical knowledge and abilities, the goal of the oral examination was to discern the candidate's pedagogic talents. In the first oral examination, candidates were given three philosophical texts with one hour each to prepare a thirty minute explication. The second oral examination required candidates to provide a "lesson" on an assigned topic, given six hours access to the Sorbonne library to prepare. The number of candidates who ultimately were admitted into the *agrégation* was determined by the state in accordance with the number of teaching posts available. The *agrégation* results of 1913 are typical of these early years: of 66 students who registered for the exam, seventeen passed the written examination and were "admittable" to the oral examination; of these, ultimately seven were admitted as *agrégés*.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup>In the Arrêté du 11 septembre 1830.

<sup>6</sup>For a fascinating discussion of the philosophy *agrégation*, see the proceedings of the May 7, 1938 meeting of the Société Française de Philosophie, which was devoted to this topic: "L'Agrégation de philosophie," *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie*, 38 (1938): 117–58. In this discussion, one sees many of the perennial problems raised: questions concerning the stress of such a rigorous examination, the problem of a "generation gap" between examiners and students, the relative importance of demonstrating technical knowledge versus pedagogic ability, the importance of knowledge of the philosophical canon, etc. Another issue that emerges in this discussion points directly to tensions between the Sorbonne and the École Normale Supérieure. This concerns whether the *agrégation*, whose purpose is to identify good teachers who know the material they will be required to instruct, discriminates against more creative philosophizing. While the Sorbonne establishment (Léon Brunschvicg, Désiré Roustan, Dominique Parodi) question whether the École Normale is concentrating enough on making sure its students know the material, the representatives from the ENS, Célestin Bouglé, the Director, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the *agrégé-répétiteur*, suggest that insofar as the ENS encourages independence of thought, their students may be discriminated against by the more conservative Sorbonne jurors. Bouglé in particular is quite defensive, suggesting at one point that the session be subtitled "How to explain the failure of the *normaliens* at the *agrégation*" (138).

<sup>7</sup>This was basically the structure the examination took when it was first created in 1825.

<sup>8</sup>While a rate of approximately ten percent of the candidates passing the *agrégation* is not unusual in the early years, the odds do not increase as the century unfolds. To cite two other years: in

Prior to the educational re-organization in 1968, the *agrégation* typically was taken immediately upon completion of one's formal schooling (usually at the Sorbonne or the *École Normale Supérieure*), and the instructors assigned to prepare students for this exam, called the *agrégé-répétiteur* (or "*caïman*" in ENS slang<sup>9</sup>), often had profound influences on the students who come to depend on them. Over the years, some of the most influential philosophy professors at the *École Normale Supérieure*<sup>10</sup> have served as *agrégé-répétiteur* or "*caïman*," including Jean Cavaillès (1931–35), Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1935–39), Georges Gusdorff (1939–48), Louis Althusser (1948–80), and Jacques Derrida (1965–67). As Derrida has noted, however, the role of the *agrégé-répétiteur* is not unproblematic, as it must reflect the sort of knowledge that the *agrégation* seeks to ascertain:

A repeater, the *agrégé-répétiteur* should produce nothing, at least if to produce means to innovate, to transform, to bring about the new. He is destined to repeat and make others repeat, to reproduce and make others reproduce: forms, norms, and a content. He must assist students in the reading and comprehension of texts, help them interpret and understand what is expected of them, what they must respond to at the different stages of testing and selection, from the point of view of the contents or logico-rhetorical organization of their exercises (*explication de texte*, essays, or *leçons*). With his students he must therefore make himself the representative of a system of reproduction. . . . Or, rather, he must make himself the expert who, passing for

---

1951, only 21 candidates passed out of the 343 who registered for the examination (6.1%), and in 1996, 88 of the 1,842 candidates who registered were admitted into the *agrégation* (4.8%). Among the distinguished philosophers who have failed on their first attempt at the *agrégation* one finds Jean-Paul Sartre, Jean Beaufret, and Michel Foucault. In Sartre's case, which created a scandal insofar as he was widely regarded as the *École Normale's* top philosophy student, one can see some of the problems with how this exam is graded. Sartre received in 1928 the lowest score among the fifty who took the exam, but his friend at the time, Raymond Aron, who received the highest score, claimed that Sartre was failed because he took the opportunity to present some of his own ideas on the nature of existence (Raymond Aron, *Memoirs: Fifty Years of Political Reflection*, trans. George Holloch [New York: Holmes and Meier, 1990], 25). Sartre himself was asked years later about his failure on the *agrégation* and responded: "I had tried to be original in my philo. compositions. That displeased. I had very bad marks. For the following year I understood: one must produce a banal copy presented in an original way." (Jean-Paul Sartre, *Œuvres romanesques* [Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1981], xlv.) Sartre passed his *agrégation* the following year, this time receiving the highest score, with Simone de Beauvoir finishing second and Jean Hyppolite third.

<sup>9</sup>The precise origin of the term '*caïman*' is contested. It might be related to the Cayman Islands (*Îles caïman*), or to a species of alligator that, because of its reputed cruelty, came to be the ironic nickname attributed to a former ENS *agrégé-répétiteur*. Alain Peyrefitte (*Rue d'Ulm: Chroniques de la vie normalienne* [Paris: Fayard, 1994, 4th ed.], 615) suggests its usage dates from 1852.

<sup>10</sup>As an institution initially created in 1794 to prepare *lycée* instructors, the *École Normale Supérieure* has always occupied a special place with respect to all the *agrégations* and especially the *agrégation de philosophie*. This explains both the expectation that *normaliens* will do well on the *agrégation*, and why attending the *École Normale* was by far the norm for almost all university professors of philosophy for most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Of the major French philosophers of the past half century, Paul Ricoeur, Gilles Deleuze, and Jean-François Lyotard are perhaps the only three to have had successful academic careers in France and *not* to have studied at the *École Normale Supérieure*. Another sense of the philosophical importance of the *École Normale* can be seen by looking at the famous entering class of 1924: among the 29 students admitted into the Lettres section that year, one finds Raymond Aron, Georges Canguilhem, Daniel Lagache, Paul Nizan, and Jean-Paul Sartre; Jean Hyppolite and Maurice Patronnier de Gandillac entered the following year, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty entered the year after that. For a discussion of the *École Normale Supérieure* and its relationship to the Sorbonne and the history of philosophy in France, see my *Twentieth-Century French Philosophy: Key Themes and Thinkers* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006, esp. Appendix 1).

knowing better the demand to which he first had to submit, explains it, translates it, repeats and re-presents it, therefore, to the young candidates.<sup>11</sup>

Today, one can take the *agrégation* examination with a *maîtrise*, although it is no longer necessary to pass the *agrégation* in order to teach in a secondary school. Students can, instead, take an examination for a secondary school teaching diploma called the *Certificat d'Aptitude au Professorat de l'Enseignement Secondaire* (CAPES), created in 1950 to meet the need for more secondary education teachers without diminishing the prestige of the *agrégation*. In contrast to the CAPES, holders of the *agrégation* (known as *agrégés*; feminine *agrégées*) enjoy certain privileges like higher salaries and shorter working hours, and they tend to take up positions in the more prestigious *lycées*.<sup>12</sup>

## 2

I have gone into such detail concerning the *agrégation* because I think it has had an enormous impact on developments within French philosophy. For one thing, the figures who appear on the *Programme* have been for the most part canonical figures from the history of philosophy, with relatively few figures from the nineteenth century and even fewer from the twentieth.<sup>13</sup> When a philosophical text appears on the *Programme* for the *agrégation's* oral examination, this means that all students that year who hope for a career in philosophy will spend the year reading that text intensively. Even more significantly, when a philosopher is named on the *Programme* for the written examination, this means that candidates preparing for the exam will be expected to know the entirety of that philosopher's corpus. Not surprisingly, spending a year, and sometimes two, concentrating on a figure often results not just in subsequent publications on that figure, but equally often in that figure becoming a constant intellectual resource for one's subsequent career.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Jacques Derrida, "When a Teaching Body Begins," in *Whose Afraid of Philosophy? Right to Philosophy I*, trans. Jan Plug (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), 75. Derrida's text first appeared in *Politiques de la philosophie*, ed. Dominique-Antoine Grisoni (Paris: Grasset, 1976).

<sup>12</sup>The first teaching jobs following the *agrégation* are typically in provincial *lycées*, with the best students returning soon thereafter to Paris to teach in the more prestigious *lycées*, including the Lycées Louis-le-Grand, Henri-IV, and Condorcet. Among the philosophers who spent a significant part of their careers teaching philosophy in these *lycées* are Alain (1903–33, including 21 years at the Lycée Henri-IV), Henri Bergson (1881–97), Simone de Beauvoir (1929–43), Jean Hyppolite (1929–45), Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1931–45), and Jean Beaufret (1946–52, 1955–72).

<sup>13</sup>Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Comte are the most frequent nineteenth-century thinkers on the written *Programme*. Among twentieth-century philosophers whose *oeuvre* has been required for the written examination, only Bergson appears prior to 1965 (four times in the 1950s); Bachelard appears in 1974 and 1975, and Husserl in 1994 and 1995.

<sup>14</sup>In this discussion, I have chosen to restrict the focus of the effects of the content of the *agrégation* examination on developments in French philosophy in terms of which figures enter and leave the philosophical canon. An equally important topic for analysis, and one suggested by Derrida's comment above on the role of the *agrégé-répétiteur*, would be to examine the form the candidates' answers were required to take and the effect this form of answer would play as a model of the "proper" style of philosophizing in France. That is to say, not only can one trace the copious citation of relevant primary and secondary literature that mark the work of the great French historians of philosophy like Gilson, Guéroult, or Bréhier back to the performance required for a successful answer to the *agrégation's* written composition on the history of philosophy. In addition, one can also see the connection between the oral examination, during which candidates were required to demonstrate their pedagogic skills by producing a close and careful *explication de texte* that is also creative and engaging, and the meticulous,

Beyond its impact on students, however, there is another effect which may be even more significant, namely, the effect that the annual *Programme* has on the teaching activities of the professoriate. That is to say, in an effort to ease the burden on students preparing for the *agrégation* examination, there has been not only a tendency for university professors to “teach to the exam,” but also an expectation that the topics of many university courses will be chosen in terms of topics announced or anticipated on future exams. As an example, consider the following: the *Programme* for the *agrégation de philosophie* in 1939 listed Plato, Descartes, Malebranche, and Kant as authors for the written composition on the history of philosophy, and listed for explication in the oral examination Greek texts by Plato (*Phédon* [*Phaedo*]) and Aristotle (*Physique*), Latin texts by Spinoza (*Ethica*, IV) and Leibniz (*Méditationes de cognitione, veritate et ideis*, *De rerum originatione radicali*, and *De primae philosophiae emendatione et de notione substantiae*), French texts by Berkeley (*Dialogues entre Hylas et Philonous*) and Ravaisson (*De l'habitude*), and for candidates who could waive the Greek explication, English texts by Mill (*An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*, chs. 2–7) and James (*A Pluralistic Universe*) or German texts by Kant (*Kritik der Urtheilskraft*, *Deuxième Partie: Critique du jugement téléologique*) and Schelling (*Bruno*). When we compare this with what was taught by the philosophy faculty at the Sorbonne during the 1938–39 academic year, we find an astonishing correlation. That year, the faculty in philosophy was comprised of nine philosophers (two of whom held chairs in sociology), and three professors of psychology. The typical teaching responsibilities of a Sorbonne professor included teaching one course and offering one weekly *Conférence* or smaller discussion session. Of the eight philosophy courses taught, four directly address figures that appear on the written *Programme*: Albert Rivaud's “La Philosophie de Descartes,” Émile Bréhier's “La Monde intelligible dans le néoplatonisme” and “Questions d'histoire de la philosophie grecque,” and Jean Laporte's “Le Rationalisme de Malebranche.”<sup>15</sup> And of the ten *conférences*, eight relate directly to the *agrégation*: Rivaud's “Textes de Spinoza (*Ethique*, livre IV) et de Leibniz,” Jean Wahl's “Explication de la *Physique* d'Aristote,” Léon Brunschvicg's “Préparation à l'*Agrégation*,” Charles Lalo's “Auteurs du programme,” Laporte's first semester *conférence*, “Philosophie générale” and second semester “Histoire de la philosophie,” Maurice Halbwachs's *Agrégation*, along with the Psychology Chair René Poirier's “La Perception de l'espace.” Of the philosophy faculty, only Abel Rey, who held the Chair in the History and Philosophy of Science, does not list activities that can be seen to relate directly to the content of that year's *agrégation*, and almost three-quarters of the teaching activities of the philosophy faculty at the Sorbonne clearly relate directly to preparing their students for the coming examination.

---

yet “transgressive,” explications of the work of canonical figures in the history of philosophy by thinkers who are themselves largely critical of the traditional model of philosophical instruction in the French university, e.g., Deleuze's work on Spinoza and Leibniz, Lyotard's work on Kant's third *Critique*, and Derrida's work on a wide range of thinkers (Husserl, Hegel, Kant, Rousseau, etc.). I thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting I mention this aspect of the *agrégation*'s influence.

<sup>15</sup>Information concerning the Sorbonne faculty is drawn from the Université de Paris *Livret de l'Étudiant*, which was published annually. I wish to thank the director of the Archives of the Rectorat de Paris, Stéphanie Méchine, and her assistant, Carole Pena, for allowing me free access to these documents.

Later in the twentieth century, addressing the *agrégation* became part of the “required” teaching obligations of the philosophy faculty, in particular the faculty with chairs in the history of philosophy, as we can see by looking at the 1963–64 academic year. That year, the philosophy faculty included two chairs in General Philosophy (Ricoeur and Polin), one in General Philosophy and Logic (Poirier), two in History and Philosophy of Science (Canguilhem and Suzanne Bachelard), one in Comparative Philosophy (Lacombe), one in Aesthetics (Grenier), one in Moral Philosophy (Jankélévitch), and five in the History of Philosophy (Schuhl, Gandillac, Gouhier, Alquié, and Guittou), in addition to two Chairs in Sociology and eight in Psychology. The *Programme* for the 1964 *agrégation* listed the Stoics, Epicureans, and Kant as subjects for the history composition, along with the following texts for the oral examinations: Malebranche’s *Recherche de la Vérité* (livre III), Diderot’s *Lettre sur les aveugles*, Kant’s *Critique de la raison pure* (Dialectique transcendentale, livre II, chapitre II: Antinomie de la raison pure), Bergson’s *La Pensée et la mouvance* (Introduction, première et deuxième parties and VI: Introduction à la Métaphysique), Séneca’s *Lettres à Lucilius* (lettres 71, 72, 73, 74, 82, et 88), Descartes’s *Regulae*, Plato’s *Théétète*, Aristotle’s *Des parties des Animaux*, (livre I [entire] et II [selections]), Fichte’s *Die Bestimmung des Menschen*, Kant’s *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (Vorrede, Einleitung, Erster Teil), Berkeley’s *A New Theory of Vision*, and Ruskin’s *The Crown of Wild Olive*. When one compares this with the teaching offerings of the Chairs in the History of Philosophy, the point is clear: four of them teach courses specifically labeled “*Agrégation*.” Schuhl offers “La Matière chez les premiers penseurs grecs” and “Textes latins. Textes grecs,” Gandillac offers “Explication d’Aristote: *Des parties des Animaux*” and “Explication de Sénèque, *Lettres à Lucilius*,” Gouhier teaches a course on “Diderot, *Lettre sur les aveugles*,” and Alquié teaches “La Philosophie de Kant.”<sup>16</sup>

What these sorts of comparisons indicate is that not only the work of advanced students but also much of the work of the professoriate is determined in response to the *Programme* of the *agrégation*.<sup>17</sup> And this is particularly true of those professors at the École Normale who occupy the position of *agrégé-répétiteur*, whose primary responsibility is precisely to prepare students for this examination. Thus, when Derrida’s *La Vérité en peinture* (*The Truth in Painting*)<sup>18</sup> first appeared in 1978, his former *agrégation* students from 1967 were not surprised, as the thematic topic on the *Programme* for the second composition that year had been “L’art. Le création artistique. La contemplation esthétique. Le beau. La nature et l’art. Les beaux arts.”<sup>19</sup> Given the impact one’s appearance on the *Programme* has on the entire aca-

<sup>16</sup>Guittou’s courses are not listed for that year; he, too, might have taught a course in preparation for the *agrégation*.

<sup>17</sup>One finds a similar phenomenon in the relationship between the entrance examination to the École Normale Supérieure and the *classe de philosophie* (the *lycée*’s terminal year), *hypokhâgne* and *khâgne* (the first and second years of the preparatory course for entry into the École Normale Supérieure), with the content of these courses anticipating the questions of the ENS entrance exam.

<sup>18</sup>Jacques Derrida, *La Vérité en peinture* (Paris: Flammarion, 1978); *The Truth in Painting*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

<sup>19</sup>Jean-Luis Fabiani, Professor of Sociology and directeur d’études at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, who had been “prepared” by Derrida for the 1967 *agrégation*, recalls (personal conversation) comparing Derrida’s text, when it appeared, with his own lecture notes from Derrida’s seminar that year and finding them to be substantially the same.

ademic field of philosophy—in terms of teaching, scholarship, and publication—it is thus important who serves on the jury that selects the figures to appear on the *Programme*, and equally important which figures appear frequently or regularly on the *Programme*, and which other figures do not. Analyzing the content of the annual *Programmes* thus reflects, I would argue, the foundational historical knowledge that philosophers educated in France will draw upon, and frequently write upon, early and sometimes throughout their careers.

## 3

Before looking at the content, however, a few words are in order on the format of that annual *Programme*, which has itself evolved over the twentieth century in response to the structure of the *agrégation* examination. From 1900 to 1910, two groupings of philosophers were provided for the historical question on the written exam, one each for ancient philosophy and modern philosophy. As we have already noted, being named for the written exam meant *de facto* that students would be responsible for knowing the entirety of these philosophers' oeuvres. For the oral examination, the annual *Programme* in these years typically listed two or three Greek philosophical works, two Latin philosophical works, and three or four modern works in French or French translation. In 1911, the *Programme* was changed to reflect the fact that candidates with a diploma or other certification in science (*licence-ès-sciences* or *certificat d'études supérieures* from the Faculty of Sciences)<sup>20</sup> could be exempted from the Greek explication by replacing it with an explication "in the original language, of a passage, either from Kant's *Kritik der Urteilskraft* or Stuart Mill's [sic] *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*." After World War I, the *Programme* changed again: beginning in 1921, the number of ancient or modern figures provided for the written exam could vary from as little as one (Leibniz was the only modern philosopher listed on the *Programme* for 1921) to as many as four, and beginning in 1922, the texts for the English or German options for those exempted from the Greek explication also began to vary. In 1922, selections from Locke and Schopenhauer replaced Mill and Kant, and beginning in 1923 two English and two German philosophers' works were listed: the choices that first year were Hobbes's *Of a True Citizen* (part II, "Of Dominion"), the third of Berkeley's *Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, Fichte's *Die Bestimmung des Menschen*, and Schopenhauer's *Ueber die vierfache Wurzel des Satzes vom zureichenden Grunde*, respectively.

<sup>20</sup>The role of scientific training in the education of French philosophers has been a vastly underappreciated phenomenon outside France. Beginning in 1904, in addition to a *licence-ès-lettres* or *licence-ès-sciences* and a *Diplôme d'études supérieures en philosophie*, students who registered for the *agrégation de philosophie* were also required either to have completed the *baccalauréat Lettres-mathématiques*, or to have taken at least one of a series of courses in either physics, chemistry, or biology, passed the appropriate examination and thus received a *certificat* in that science. While other possible sciences in which a candidate could be certified were added later (including psychology and ethnology), the requirement for certification in a science remained a prerequisite for registering to take the *agrégation* until it was removed in the Arrêté du 26 mai 1964. Knowing this may help explain why, for example, so many French philosophers draw upon advanced mathematical theory (Deleuze, Serres, Badiou) or wrote books early in their career on topics in psychology (Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Foucault), while their American, British, or German counterparts have tended, unless they become philosophers of science or mathematics, to stay relatively far away from scientific topics.



A more significant change appeared in the *Programme* in 1926, as the topic for the second written composition was specified (in 1926, candidates were informed that the second composition would deal specifically with the “psychology of activity and affectivity”), and the scope of possible questions for the historical composition was also narrowed (“Plato and Aristotle’s Moral and Political Doctrines” and “The Theory of Method in Descartes, Pascal, Malebranche, and the Port-Royal *Logique*”). The *Programme*’s format remained unchanged until 1936, when it returned to listing only names for the historical composition. And in 1937, the description of the question for the second composition was withdrawn. Beginning in 1952, a new pattern appears, as now both philosophers named for the written examination and texts listed for the oral explications tend to appear on the *Programme* for two consecutive years. In 1965 the topic of the second composition is again listed, but more significant changes begin in 1968.

In January 1968 (Arrêté du 30 janvier 1968) the three oral explications were reformulated: beginning with the *agrégation* in 1969, candidates would be required, with the texts supplied in the previous year’s *Programme*, to provide an explication of a French philosophical text, a Greek or Latin philosophical text of the candidate’s choice, and an explication of a philosophical text in German, English, classical Arabic, or the ancient language not selected for the second explication. Following the disruptions within the university in 1968, this decree never went into effect, having been replaced by the Arrêté du 21 novembre 1968, which changed significantly the entire *agrégation*: in part in response to claims that the examination was too difficult, and in part in response to the need for more individuals to fill the available posts, the written compositions were decreased from three to two, with the first related to a part of the program of philosophy of the *classe de philosophie* (Terminale A) given in advance, and the second an essay on the history of philosophy relating to the annual *Programme*. The scope of material required to prepare for the oral examinations was also substantially reduced: one forty-minute lesson after three hours of preparation on a subject drawn from the Terminale *classe de philosophie* with the works needed for this preparation and requested by the candidate put at their disposal; a thirty-minute explication of a French philosophical text or of a philosophical text translated into French; and a thirty-minute translation of a Greek, Latin, German, English or Arabic text that was a part of the *Programme* (in a subsequent decree of 28 January 1969, this was changed to a “translation and explication” of one of the foreign language texts). This new format was in effect for only one year, however, as a new format began in 1970 that, with little change, continued through the end of the century. In this new format, the oral examination remained the same, but the written examination changed considerably as a third question was once again included. Now, the first question addressed a general philosophical topic, the second question involved an explication of a short selection that related to a general theme announced in the *Programme* (themes were, for example, “Society” or “Religion and Philosophy” or “Law”), and the third question—which since the nineteenth century had always been a composition on some topic in the history of philosophy—now involved a commentary on a short text (typically one or two paragraphs) by one of the historical figures announced in the *Programme*.

To summarize this history of changes in the structure of the annual *Programme* for the *agrégation de philosophie* in the twentieth century, we observe that the general structure of the examination has remained relatively constant, with a privileging of canonical ancient and early modern philosophers on the written part of the examination, and with one of the three written examinations focused specifically on a topic in the history of philosophy. At the same time, the amount of material the candidate would have had to prepare in anticipation of the examination has been becoming progressively smaller, as the questions for the written examination have come increasingly to be tied to the syllabus for the *classe de philosophie* or have asked candidates to explicate in some detail a given passage rather than respond to a more general and open-ended question (e.g., the 1952 historical composition simply stated: “The Stoic conception of freedom”). With respect to the oral part of the examination, the primary change concerns the waiver of a necessary competence in both Greek and Latin: while candidates in 1900 would have been required to read and explicate passages in both Greek and Latin, after 1911, candidates with certification of advanced work in a science could substitute linguistic competence in English or German for Greek, and after 1968 a candidate could pass the *agrégation* without competence in either Greek or Latin by opting to provide an explication of a passage in German, English or Arabic instead of a Greek or Latin selection.<sup>21</sup>

## 4

Moving from a discussion of the structure of the examination to an analysis of its content, the first important feature to observe is that the figures who appear on the *Programme* for the written exam have a special importance, since this means, effectively, that anyone planning to take the *agrégation* will be required to familiarize themselves with the entirety of this philosopher’s work. Who, then, appears most frequently on the *Programme* for the written examination? There are few surprises here: in the ninety-five *Programmes* published from 1900 to 2000 (because of the wars, no *Programme* appeared in 1915–18, 1941, or 1945), Plato appears on the written *Programme* 36 times, Aristotle 31 times, Kant 31 times, and Descartes 28 times. The only others to appear more than twenty times are the Stoics<sup>22</sup> (25 times), Spinoza (22), and Leibniz (22). The only eighteenth-century<sup>23</sup> figure to appear more than ten times is Rousseau (11); the only nineteenth-century figures to appear more than five times are Nietzsche (8, first appearance in 1970) and Hegel (7, first appearance in 1968); and the only twentieth-century figure to appear more than two times is Bergson (6, first appearance in 1951).

<sup>21</sup>Beginning in 2003, Italian texts were added to the list from which candidates could choose in order to demonstrate their foreign language competence.

<sup>22</sup>In addition to the general group “Les Stoïciens” appearing for the written examination, the *Programme* frequently names selections or texts by Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, or Epictetus individually for the oral explications.

<sup>23</sup>For the purposes of this analysis, I am making a distinction reflected in the *agrégation* groupings between “eighteenth-century philosophers” like Rousseau or Diderot and those philosophers who are part of the early modern canon (Descartes to Kant), but who also could, from a strictly historical perspective, be considered eighteenth-century philosophers (e.g., Hume or Kant).

When one examines total appearances on the *Programme*, both on the written examination and as a possible author for an oral explication, the four major philosophical presences remain the same: Plato appears 88 times, Aristotle 77 times, Kant 83 times, and Descartes 69 times. When one considers, however, that Plato's and Aristotle's appearances on the oral examination are always in Greek, one sees that the order of priority reverses somewhat insofar as 32 of Kant's 52 appearances on the oral *Programme* are in French translation and 32 of Descartes's 41 appearances are also in French (the others are in Latin). So, privileging the French explication over an explication that required competence in a foreign language,<sup>24</sup> Kant now appears as the philosophical author who appears most frequently, appearing 63 times on the written or French oral *Programme*, with Descartes's 60 appearances a close second.<sup>25</sup>

Looking at total appearances brings other figures to the fore as well: the Stoics remain at the top, appearing on 55 *Programmes*, but they are joined at the top by Leibniz (54; 22 written, 26 French), Spinoza (54; 22 written, 6 French), Hume (53; 19 written, 7 French), and Berkeley (50; 16 written, 9 French). Among eighteenth-century philosophers, Rousseau appears 34 times; among nineteenth-century philosophers, Schopenhauer appears 42 times, Comte 29 times, Hegel 26 times, Mill 22 times, and Fichte 20 times; and among the most frequent twentieth-century philosophers, Bergson stands out with 28 appearances, followed by Edmund Husserl (15), Bertrand Russell (11), William James (9), and Émile Boutroux (6).<sup>26</sup>

## 5

On the basis of examining the data concerning the annual *Programme* for the *agrégation de philosophie*, I think there are a number of things that can be learned, some of which might interest a French philosopher, but more of which should be of interest to non-French philosophers trying to understand the French philosophical scene and how it differs, say, from the American scene. The most obvious feature to highlight is that it is simply impossible to become a philosopher in France without

<sup>24</sup>Such privileging is justified for several reasons. First, because French would of course be the native language of the vast majority of candidates, the amount of text assigned for the French explication would far exceed that for a Greek explication. So, for example, in 1902, candidates could choose to provide an explication of book 2 of Aristotle's *Physics* or an explication of the entirety of Kant's *Critique de la raison pratique* or Comte's *Discours sur l'esprit positif*. And second, once the Greek explication became optional in 1911, the number of students who actually chose the Greek explication was quite small in comparison with those who chose a French explication. To cite two years when this information was made public, in 1983, 13 candidates chose to offer a Greek explication of Plato's *Parmenides*, while 101 candidates opted for one of the French explications: Descartes's *Les Passions de l'âme* (30), Rousseau's *Emile* (47), or Comte's *Discours sur l'esprit positif* (24). And in 1997, 12 candidates opted for the Greek explication of either Plato's *Gorgias* (7) or Plotinus's *Enneads*, V, 8 (5), while 162 opted for a French explication of either Leibniz's *Discours de métaphysique* (42), book 4 of Rousseau's *Emile* (35), Maine de Biran's *Mémoires sur la décomposition de la pensée* (43), or Bergson's *Matière et mémoire* (42).

<sup>25</sup>This should already raise a problem for those who seek to insert a wedge between the French and German philosophical traditions in terms of the former's commitment to Descartes and relative "lack of familiarity" with Kant.

<sup>26</sup>See Appendix 1 for a list of all the philosophers who have appeared on the written *Programme*, noting their total number of appearances, appearances on the written *Programme*, and appearances on the oral *Programme* in French or French translation.

a thorough familiarity with the canonical figures in the history of philosophy. As should be clear from the figures mentioned above, the *Programme* and *agrégation* have always been heavily weighted toward the canonical Greek and early modern philosophers. In fact, of the 355 philosophers named (individually or collectively) to the written *Programme* in the twentieth century, 301 of these are ancient (133) or early modern (168) philosophers.<sup>27</sup> This extends beyond the four most frequently represented on the *Programme*—Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Descartes—as Berkeley, Hume, Leibniz, Spinoza, and representatives of Stoicism all appear on more than half the *Programmes* in the twentieth century. And one consequence of this fact is immediately evident when one compares the work of “analytic” philosophers in France with their American counterparts, as the former often teach and publish on “historical” figures as well as analytic “problems.”<sup>28</sup>

Examining the *Programmes* in more detail, a number of differences emerge in terms of the intellectual formation of French vs. American philosophers. Again, most obviously, while it is impossible for a French philosopher to be unfamiliar with the canonical figures in the history of philosophy, it is quite possible for an American philosopher to be largely unfamiliar with this history.<sup>29</sup> But equally obvious from the other side, while it is difficult to imagine an American philosopher, even one “continentally” trained, who would be thoroughly unfamiliar with the canonical figures in twentieth-century analytic philosophy (Frege, Russell, Carnap, Quine, Davidson, Searle, et al.), it seems quite possible for a French philosopher, especially a philosopher whose university education concluded prior to 1990, to be totally unaware of the work of these thinkers. While noting this, it is important to acknowledge that these analytic philosophers are not absent from the *Programme*: in addition to Russell—whose eleven appearances almost triple Heidegger’s four, and exceed the appearances of Hobbes, Diderot, and Maine de Biran (all appear ten times)—Wittgenstein, Whitehead, Frege, Rawls, Quine, and Strawson all have appeared since 1991.

A couple of other observations are noteworthy. The first is the relative frequency of Spinoza’s appearance and the relative infrequency of Locke, especially when compared with Berkeley. While American philosophers frequently set Spinoza aside as the least important of the seven dominant modern philosophers, the French would appear to regard Spinoza as equal in importance to Leibniz and Descartes. This difference in American vs. French appreciation of Spinoza is reflected, on the one hand, by the American tendency not to know what to do with Spinoza in terms of the dominant narratives they appeal to when teaching the

<sup>27</sup>See Appendix 2 for a breakdown by period and nationality of those who have appeared on the written *Programme* in the twentieth century.

<sup>28</sup>A case in point would be Jules Vuillemin, who was a major figure in the development of analytic philosophy in France as well as a leading historian of philosophy. A professor at the Collège de France from 1962 to 1990 with a Chair in Philosophy of Consciousness, Vuillemin published important works on Kant, Aristotle, Descartes, and Russell in addition to his writings on logic, epistemology, and the philosophy of science and mathematics.

<sup>29</sup>As an aside, on more than one occasion have I heard a comment like the following when asking a graduate student to describe their dissertation research in analytic philosophy of language during an APA job interview: “Well, let me contextualize my thesis historically. Frege said . . .” and then they proceed to trace the “history” of philosophy as if it began around 1900!

moderns—as concerned with epistemological and methodological problems, as responding to the rise of modern science, or as focused on the knowing subject. In France, on the other hand, there has been a dominant Spinoza scholar at the Sorbonne throughout the twentieth century: Victor Delbos at the start of the century (1904–16), followed by Léon Brunschvicg (1909–39), Martial Guérout (1945–51), Ferdinand Alquié (1952–76), and Pierre Macherey (1966–92). In addition, of course, Gilles Deleuze taught Spinoza at the University of Paris VIII-Vincennes, and Louis Althusser did the same at the École Normale Supérieure. Turning to the empiricists, I will simply note that, while Locke is, in the American context, at least as canonical a figure as Hume, and while both are viewed as exceeding Berkeley in terms of philosophical importance, Hume and Berkeley more than double Locke’s appearances on the written exam (19 and 16 to 8), and they nearly double Locke’s total number of appearances (53 and 50 to 27), with the number of Locke’s appearances being less than the appearances of philosophers who would be considered much less significant in an American context like Malbranche (35 total, 15 written) or Plotinus (28 total, 11 written).<sup>30</sup>

## 6

Let me conclude by outlining three examples of the kind of analysis one could perform with this data from the history of the *agrégation*.

6.1 *The Case of Auguste Comte*

Comte’s works appeared on the reading list for the *Concours* in 1901, 1902, 1904, 1908, 1909, and 1910, and this directly reflects the influence of Émile Durkheim, who during this period was arguably the most powerful professor in the Sorbonne’s Department of Philosophy. Comte appears four more times between 1919 and 1928, and then is absent for most of the thirties and forties, appearing only in 1932 and 1938. When the sociologist Georges Davy became president of the jury in 1942, Comte’s fortunes changed considerably, as did the fortunes of the empiricist philosophers in general. Davy presided over the jury without a break from 1942 to 1956. In the thirteen years following the resumption of the *agrégation* after World War II, an empiricist’s work appears on the oral examination in French translation every year but three (and in two of these years, Hume appears on the written *Programme*), and on the *Programme* for the written examination in eight of these thirteen years. By contrast, in the thirteen years following Davy’s presidency, empiricists appear only three times on the written *Programme* and only twice in French translation. Looking specifically at Comte, he returned to the reading list in 1949 and remained throughout most of the fifties, appearing in 1950, 1951, and 1955–61, indicating in addition to Davy the influence of Georges Canguilhem, who wrote his thesis for the *Diplôme d’études supérieures* in 1926 on “La Notion d’ordre et de progrès chez Comte” (“The Theory of Order and Progress in Auguste Comte”),

<sup>30</sup>It is worth noting that Locke’s fortunes have recently changed considerably: since 1988, he has appeared on the *Programme* seven times (once on the written), compared with six appearances each by Berkeley (twice on the written) and Hume (once on the written). This perhaps reflects concretely what many have felt to be a turn toward the Anglo-American philosophical tradition in recent French philosophy.

served as *Inspecteur Général de philosophie* from 1948–55, and served on the jury in 1949, 1951–53 [as vice-president], and 1962–67 [as president from 1965–67].<sup>31</sup> Overall, Comte appears on the reading list 29 times in the twentieth century, more often than any other nineteenth-century philosopher except Schopenhauer. But it must be noted that 34 of Schopenhauer's 42 appearances come as a foreign language option, where the candidate could provide, usually as a substitute for a Greek text, an explication of a German or English text. In fact, in the majority of his appearances—including every year from 1946–59—it is the third book of *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* that is offered as one of the two German text options. Comte, on the other hand, appears more often than Schopenhauer on the written *Programme* (six compared to five), and, more importantly for the present point, that Comte appears on the reading list especially frequently when a sociologist occupies a position of influence on or upon the jury indicates the power that individual members,<sup>32</sup> and particularly the president and vice-president, have over the syllabus for any given year.

Davy's influence as president of the jury, insuring as it did the presence of Comte and empiricist philosophy more generally during these years—precisely those years when the human sciences began to challenge the hegemony of philosophy within the French universities—provides an opportunity to consider the president's power in more detail. The power of the jury president was clear from the very start of the *agrégation de philosophie* in the figure of Victor Cousin, who used his position as president from 1830–51 (excluding the years 1848 and 1849) to make eclecticism or eclectic spiritualism the *de facto* state philosophy by requiring knowledge of, and sympathy toward, spiritualism as a prerequisite for success on the examination and, thereby, as a prerequisite to a career as a teacher of philosophy. One of those who came up during Cousin's control over the jury was the important French philosopher Félix Ravaisson (1813–1900), who served on the jury, sometimes as its president, for most of the years between 1840 and 1890, thus insuring the influence of Cousin's commitment to spiritualism on French philosophy for most of the century.<sup>33</sup>

The jury president's power could also be used more perniciously, as we see in the notorious case of Charles Andler, whom Jules Lachelier prevented from passing the *agrégation de philosophie* in 1887 and 1888. Andler's failure is one of the "scandals" in the history of the *agrégation* that some would regard as the result of a clear abuse of the jury's power. In "Le Jury d'agrégation: Le cas de Charles Andler," André Canivez writes that the jury in the 1880s was particularly suspicious of Émile Boutroux's metaphysical views and his criticisms of some of the traditional doctrines, and Lachelier in particular was extremely hard on Boutroux's students

<sup>31</sup>After Canguilhem leaves the jury, Comte's appearance on the *Programme* becomes regularized. He appears twice a decade—every seventh and eighth year, in fact: in 1975–76, 1983–84, 1991–92, and 2000–2001.

<sup>32</sup>That Jean Wahl appears on the jury as a regular for the first time in 1929, two years before William James's *A Pluralistic Universe* first appears on the *Programme*, is another example. Wahl's principal thesis for his 1920 *doctorat* was *Les Philosophies pluralistes d'Angleterre et d'Amérique* ("Pluralist Philosophies in England and America"); he joined the faculty at the Sorbonne in 1927 and in 1929 published *Vers le concret* (Paris: Vrin, 1929), which included a chapter on and extensive discussion of James.

<sup>33</sup>For a discussion of Cousin's influence, see Chervel, *Histoire de l'agrégation*, 94–97.

from the *École Normale Supérieure*, who referred to Lachelier as “the tyrant of the examination.” Canivez reports that although Andler, who was studying with Boutroux at the *École Normale*, came through the written examination in 1887 very highly ranked, he either received a note of zero for the oral examination or “the jury decided, rather illegally, not to take account of this note.” The following year, Lachelier personally read Andler’s written compositions and Andler did not even pass the written examination. Canivez comments that Lachelier’s “opinion was expressed in terms so final that Andler understood that it was useless to present himself again.”<sup>34</sup>

What these examples reveal is the influence and control exercised by individual members of the jury, and in particular the jury’s president, over the *Programme* and the futures of those who are studying for the examination. As a result, what they suggest is that while the presence or popularity of a philosopher might on the surface appear to reflect that philosopher’s intellectual importance, it might also be the result of the particular philosophical commitments of particular individuals who are institutionally empowered to determine what and who should or should not be read.

## 6.2 *The Case of Plotinus*

Another example of the sort of analysis that could be performed in terms of documenting the concrete effects of the *agrégation* concerns noting when figures disappear from the *Programme* after having been frequently represented in previous years, and when new figures are introduced or reappear after a long absence, and how this appearance or disappearance correlates with publication trends in terms of monographs and journal articles. One gets a sense of this relationship between the *agrégation* and scholarship in terms of the correlation between publication trends and the appearance of an author on the written examination by considering the case of Plotinus, who appears on the written examination twelve times during the twentieth century. In the first five decades, Plotinus appears only twice on the written examination, in 1910 and 1922, and during these years, only four books and one doctoral thesis are published in France on his work (in 1903, 1921 [two books], 1928, and 1933).<sup>35</sup> Plotinus appears on the written *Programme* four times between 1951 and 1956, and from 1952–55, two books and two theses are published, along with Jean Guitton’s revised second edition of his 1933 thesis. Three books are published from 1961–65 and then, following a dearth in publications for the remainder of the decade, there begins a relatively steady stream of

<sup>34</sup>See André Canivez, “Le Jury d’agrégation: Le cas de Charles Andler,” *Corpus, revue de philosophie* 24/25 (1994), 199–200. In *Charles Andler, sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Les Belles-lettres, 1937), Ernst Tonnelat writes that Lachelier was not on the jury in Andler’s first try at the *agrégation*, but his replacement, Elie Rabier, was one of the philosophers most concerned with Boutroux’s “dangerous actions,” and although the other members of the jury gave Andler grades that, given his superior rank in the written examination, would have allowed him to pass, Rabier gave him a zero, which made it impossible to pass (31–32).

<sup>35</sup>In what follows, I will treat as a book on Plotinus any work (whether singly authored or a collection of essays) that treats Plotinus either exclusively (e.g., Émile Bréhier, *La Philosophie de Plotin* [Paris: Boivin, 1928]) or in conjunction with another philosopher or philosophical theme (e.g., Jean Guitton, *Le Temps et l’Éternité chez Plotin et Saint Augustin* [Paris: Boivin, 1933; Paris: Aubier, 1955, 2nd ed.]).

publications during the seventies, with one or two books published almost every year between 1970 and 1982. Plotinus returns to the written *Programme* in 1983 and 1984, and although only one book is published on his work during the 1980s, one finds a very different story in the 1990s. He appears again on the *Programme* in 1991 and 1992, and this is followed by a flurry of scholarship, with one book in 1991, four in 1992, one in 1993, three in 1994, one each in 1995 and 1996, and two in 1998. Plotinus returns to the *Programme* in 1999 and 2000, and again this is conjoined in the following six years with almost as many monographs (twenty) being published on Plotinus as had appeared in the first eight decades of the twentieth century, with six in 1999, six between 2000 and 2002, another six in 2003, and one each in 2004 and 2005. The picture that emerges, when one correlates Plotinus's appearance on the written *Programme* with the erratic publication of monographs on his work is this: he appears four times in the 1950s and immediately following the beginning of these appearances, the number of monographs on Plotinus doubles the production of the preceding fifty years. When he appears again four times in the 1990s, the number of books on his thought increases by almost 150% the number that had appeared in the preceding nine decades: 33 books appear between 1991 and 2005, while 23 books had appeared between 1900 and 1990.<sup>36</sup> To be sure, the number of books being published in the last decades of the twentieth century far exceeds the number published earlier in the century. But the increase in the number of books published alone fails to explain the large amount of scholarship on a figure who would be hard to reconcile with the other philosophical "trends" that came to the fore in France in the last decades of the twentieth century.

### 6.3 *The Case of Friedrich Nietzsche*

We can locate a similar relationship between the *agrégation* and scholarship, but on a much grander scale, when we look at the publication history of works on Nietzsche and correlate this with his appearances on the written *Programme*. Many have wondered what explains the explosion of interest in Nietzsche's work among philosophers in France during the 1960s and 1970s, as numerous texts and essays on his work appeared during these years. What has not been fully appreciated, especially outside France, is how little scholarship on Nietzsche was done by philosophers in France prior to 1962, when Gilles Deleuze's *Nietzsche et la philosophie* first appeared. Early in the twentieth century, there was considerable interest in France in Nietzsche's thought, but this was located primarily outside the university and, when in the university, outside philosophy.<sup>37</sup> Professor of German Literature Henri Lichtenberger taught the Sorbonne's one full-year course in German Lan-

<sup>36</sup>I am ignoring here the history of subsequent editions of works published earlier, as these do not reflect new scholarship. They do, however, also correlate with the appearance on the written *Programme* insofar as students preparing for the *agrégation* create a market for secondary literature that must often be re-issued.

<sup>37</sup>Laure Verbaere, in *La Réception française de Nietzsche 1890–1910* (thèse de doctorat d'histoire, Université de Nantes, 1999), notes that between 1890 and 1910, more than 1,100 references to Nietzsche appear in French, with 47 books and more than 600 articles or studies discussing his thought. (Cited in Jacques Le Rider, *Nietzsche en France de la fin du XIXe siècle au temps présent* [*Nietzsche en France*] [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999], 104.)



guage and Literature in 1902–03 on Nietzsche, and Lichtenberger's *La Philosophie de Nietzsche*,<sup>38</sup> first published in 1898, was already in its ninth edition by 1905. Charles Andler—who, as we noted above, was prevented from passing the *agrégation de philosophie* in 1887 and 1888 because of some jury members' animosity to Émile Boutroux—subsequently switched fields and successfully passed the *agrégation d'allemand*. Andler went on to a distinguished career in German literature, first at the École Normale Supérieure, then the Sorbonne, and finally the Collège de France (1926–33), and published a magisterial six-volume study of Nietzsche between 1920 and 1931.<sup>39</sup> Others who wrote on Nietzsche were more likely to be associated with the literary avant-garde (Gide, Valéry) than with philosophy and viewed Nietzsche as an atypical German thinker (e.g., Théodore de Wyzewa<sup>40</sup>) or more of a writer than a philosopher (e.g., Pierre Lasserre<sup>41</sup>).

In contrast to these generally positive reactions to Nietzsche's thought stands Alfred Fouillée's *Nietzsche et l'immoralisme*,<sup>42</sup> one of the few works written by a philosopher during this period. Fouillée's book, which appeared in 1902 in Félix Alcan's series, *Bibliothèque de philosophie contemporaine*, and went through four editions by 1920, was extremely critical of Nietzsche and questions why any serious philosopher would attend to his thought.<sup>43</sup>

After World War I, although Nietzsche remains a canonical figure within German studies who appears frequently on the *agrégation d'allemand*<sup>44</sup> and is very much a part of the cultural debate between the right and the left, there is almost no philosophical scholarship on his thought. Léon Brunschvicg, arguably the most dominant historian of philosophy at the time, was largely dismissive of Nietzsche as a philosopher. In fact, while a student at the École Normale, Jean-Paul Sartre presented a paper at Brunschvicg's 1927 seminar at the Sorbonne titled "Nietzsche: Is he a Philosopher?" and, as Jacques Le Rider comments, "like all the philosophers, [Sartre's] answer is no."<sup>45</sup> Although largely ignored by the university philosophers,

<sup>38</sup>Henri Lichtenberger, *La Philosophie de Nietzsche* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1898).

<sup>39</sup>Charles Andler, *Les Précurseurs de Nietzsche* (Paris: Bossard, 1920); *La Jeunesse de Nietzsche: Jusqu'à la rupture avec Bayreuth* (Paris: Bossard, 1921); *Le Pessimisme esthétique de Nietzsche: Sa philosophie à l'époque wagnérienne* (Paris: Bossard, 1921); *La Maturité de Nietzsche: Jusqu'à sa mort* (Paris: Bossard, 1928); *Nietzsche et le transformisme intellectualiste: La Philosophie de sa période française* (Paris: Bossard, 1922); *La Dernière philosophie de Nietzsche: Le Renouveau de toutes les valeurs* (Paris: Bossard, 1931). Andler's first two volumes were sent to Félix Alcan in 1913, but publication at that time was impossible because of the war (see Le Rider, *Nietzsche en France*, 84). The six works were published together in three volumes by Éditions Gallimard in 1958 as *Nietzsche, sa vie et sa pensée*.

<sup>40</sup>See Théodore de Wyzewa, "Le Dernier métaphysicien," in *Ecrivains étrangers* (Paris: Librairie académique Perrin, 1896), 5.

<sup>41</sup>See Pierre Lasserre, *La Morale de Nietzsche* (Paris: Société du "Mercure de France," 1902), 122, 127–28.

<sup>42</sup>Alfred Fouillée, *Nietzsche et l'immoralisme* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1902). Nietzsche was so closely identified by French philosophers with "immoralism" that the term was introduced and defined as "Nietzsche's doctrine" in the prestigious philosophical dictionary *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1926), compiled from 1902–23 by members of the Société Française de Philosophie, under the direction of their General Secretary André Lalande.

<sup>43</sup>Much of the following information is discussed in Le Rider, *Nietzsche en France*, and Louis Pinto, *Les Neveux de Zarathoustra* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1998).

<sup>44</sup>Beginning in 1903, Nietzsche appears roughly every four or five years on the *Programme* of the *agrégation d'allemand*, even through World War II, appearing on the *Programmes* in 1940 and 1942.

<sup>45</sup>Le Rider, *Nietzsche en France*, 136. See also Le Rider's "Léon Brunschvicg, critique de Nietzsche," in *Nietzsche. Cent Ans de Réception Française*, ed. Jacques Le Rider (Paris: Les Éditions Suger, 1999),

from the 1930s to the 1950s Nietzsche did begin to appear as an important reference for *avant-garde* theorists who would, in the 1960s, become associated with philosophers. The most important of these is undoubtedly Georges Bataille, for whom Nietzsche was a constant object of reflection from the foundation of the journal *Acéphale* in 1936 through his *Sur Nietzsche*, published in 1945.<sup>46</sup> Through Bataille, Pierre Klossowski, and others, including the philosopher Jean Wahl, Nietzsche was a constant presence in the activities of the *Collège de Sociologie*, and both Bataille and the sociologist Henri Lefebvre wrote important works challenging the association of Nietzsche's thought with fascism.<sup>47</sup>

It must be emphasized, however, that in the four decades preceding Deleuze's text in 1962, even as Nietzsche continues to be discussed in terms of the influence of his thought<sup>48</sup> on German culture and, more specifically, on German militarism, there are only three books on Nietzsche published in France by philosophers. Two of these were introductory texts written by philosophy teachers at the Lycée Condorcet: Félicien Challaye's *Nietzsche* (1933), whose preface concludes "One wishes, in any case, that this modest popularizing work helps to dissipate some of the prejudices, today still too widespread, about this noble philosophy, daring, heroic and lyric;"<sup>49</sup> and André Cresson's *Nietzsche, sa vie, son oeuvre, avec un exposé de sa philosophie et des extraits de ses oeuvres* (1942),<sup>50</sup> which was a rather superficial introduction written during the German occupation that appeared in the series published by Presses Universitaires de France also called "*Les Philosophes*."<sup>51</sup>

---

97–102. In an interview with John Gerassi, Raymond Aron recalls that it was in the context of this talk on Nietzsche that Sartre "presented for the first time his own ideas on contingency" (cited by Michel Contat and Michel Rybalka in their Chronology in the Pléiade edition of Sartre's *Œuvres romanesques*, xlv). Sartre echoes this comment about Nietzsche in his essay on the work of Brice Parain, "Aller et retour" (first published in *Les Cahiers du Sud* in 1944, repr. in *Situations I* [Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1947]), remarking that "We know that Nietzsche was not a philosopher" (217) (English translation: "Departure and Return," in Jean-Paul Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, trans. Annette Michelson [New York: Criterion Books, 1955], 171). Sartre follows this comment about Nietzsche not being a philosopher with the following: "But why does Parain, who is a professional philosopher, quote this crackbrained nonsense?"

<sup>46</sup>Georges Bataille, *Sur Nietzsche: Volonté de chance* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1945). Vincent Descombes regards Bataille as the central figure in what he calls Nietzsche's "second French moment," when Nietzsche became a focal point for certain "nonconformist" intellectuals" between the wars. See Vincent Descombes, "Nietzsche's French Moment," trans. Robert de Loaiza, in *Why We Are Not Nietzscheans*, ed. Luc Ferry and Alain Renaut (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 70–91. While I do not share Descombes's views of Nietzsche's third, "philosophical" moment, my chronology here basically agrees with his account of Nietzsche's reception first by writers, then by "nonconformist" intellectuals," and finally by philosophers.

<sup>47</sup>Henri Lefebvre, *Nietzsche* (Paris: Éditions Sociales Internationales, 1939).

<sup>48</sup>In 1946, the *Société Française d'Études Nietzscheennes* was founded by Armand Quinot and Geneviève Bianquis, and among its eight founding members all were Germanists with the exception of the philosopher Félicien Challaye. The society continued until 1965 and eventually included among its members the philosophers Jean Wahl, Angèle Kremer-Marietti, Gilles Deleuze, Richard Roos, Pierre Boudot, and Jacques Derrida.

<sup>49</sup>Félicien Challaye, *Nietzsche* (Paris: Mellottée, 1933), 9. Challaye's book was part of a series of introductory texts, *Les Philosophes*, to which he also contributed books on Jaurès, Bergson, and Freud.

<sup>50</sup>André Cresson, *Nietzsche, sa vie, son oeuvre, avec un exposé de sa philosophie et des extraits de ses oeuvres* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1942).

<sup>51</sup>Although Cresson's book made it through three editions (the third published in 1953), the limitations of this book might explain why Gilles Deleuze was asked by Presses Universitaires de France to create a completely new text with the same title in 1965 for the same series.

Another indication of Nietzsche's position within the academic philosophical world can be gleaned from Armand Cuvillier's *Manuel de Philosophie à l'usage des Classes de Philosophie et de Première Supérieure* (1944), a preparatory text for students studying for either the *baccalauréat* or the entrance examinations for the *Grandes Écoles*, including the *École Normale Supérieure*. Cuvillier's text, which mentions Nietzsche only four times in over 650 pages, concludes with a table listing "Some Important Works Published since 1870" in which, among the one hundred titles listed, none of Nietzsche's texts are to be found.<sup>52</sup> It is not until much later, in the third of the philosophical texts published before 1960, Angèle Kremer-Marietti's *Thèmes et structures dans l'œuvre de Nietzsche* (1957),<sup>53</sup> that Nietzsche's work receives a more philosophically sophisticated treatment.

The situation changed considerably in the 1960s, and this is where I wish to again locate the importance of the *agrégation*. Nietzsche's first appearance on the *Programme* for the *agrégation de philosophie* was in 1929, when *Die Genealogie der Moral* appeared as an option for German explication. Nietzsche's name does not appear again on the philosophy *Programme* until *La Généalogie de la Morale* appears on the reading list, this time in French translation, in 1958 and again in 1959. Nietzsche appears again, with *Also sprach Zarathustra* as a German option, in 1962 and 1963, and he appears on the written exam in 1970 and 1971, and again in 1976 and 1977. A standard story for explaining the massive proliferation of French philosophical scholarship on Nietzsche during the 1960s and 1970s, and one that I myself formerly accepted, was that this explosion, initiated by Deleuze's 1962 *Nietzsche et la philosophie*, was largely in response to the publication of Heidegger's two-volume *Nietzsche* in 1961.<sup>54</sup> But attending to the influence of the *agrégation* suggests a different account. In precisely those years when Nietzsche's *Genealogy* was one of the required texts (1958 and 1959), Deleuze was beginning his university career at the Sorbonne, where he taught as *Maître-assistant* in the history of philosophy from 1957–60, and one of his teaching responsibilities would almost certainly have been to teach courses related to the annual *Programme*.<sup>55</sup> In addition, Jean Wahl gave the first lecture courses on Nietzsche ever offered by a Professor of Philosophy at the Sorbonne in 1959 on *La Pensée philosophique de Nietzsche des années 1885–1888* and in 1961 on *L'Avant-dernière pensée de Nietzsche*.<sup>56</sup> And during precisely these years, 1958–62, the first articles on Nietzsche are published

<sup>52</sup> Armand Cuvillier, *Manuel de Philosophie à l'usage des Classes de Philosophie et de Première Supérieure* (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1944), 668. While French texts are, not surprisingly, privileged, one does find among the texts listed titles by William James, Freud, Höfding, Westermarck, and Wundt, among others.

<sup>53</sup> Angèle Kremer-Marietti, *Thèmes et structures dans l'œuvre de Nietzsche* (Paris: Lettres modernes, 1957).

<sup>54</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, 2 vols. (Pfullingen: Neske, 1961).

<sup>55</sup> Among the other philosophers who are on the *Programmes* for the written examination or French explication while Deleuze is at the Sorbonne are Bergson, Kant, and the Stoics (1957), Spinoza, Hume, and Kant (1958 and 1959). Deleuze published on all of these figures in the following decade, during the first four years of which (1960–64), he was freed from teaching while an *attaché de recherches* at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS).

<sup>56</sup> Jean Wahl, *La Pensée philosophique de Nietzsche des années 1885–1888* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1959) and *L'Avant-dernière pensée de Nietzsche* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1961).

in prestigious French philosophical journals.<sup>57</sup> Given the length (almost 1200 pages) and difficulty of Heidegger's text, and the lack of its French translation,<sup>58</sup> it now seems to me much more likely that there is an indigenous explanation for the staggering increase in publications on Nietzsche, namely, the interest in his work generated by his appearance on the *Programme* six times between 1958 and 1971. It is these appearances, and the university and *classe de philosophie* teaching that would be associated with them, that sets the context for the appearance of Deleuze's book.

Along with Deleuze's book, which treated Nietzsche as a serious philosopher, the conference on Nietzsche at Royaumont in 1964 also played a significant role in legitimating Nietzsche's philosophical reputation. Presided over by the distinguished historian of philosophy, Martial Guérout, in addition to papers by younger philosophers like Deleuze, Foucault, and Gianni Vattimo and literary or *avant-garde* writers like Klossowski, Edouard Gaède, and Boris de Schloezer, presentations were also made by distinguished senior academic philosophers like Jean Wahl, Jean Beaufret, Karl Löwith, Eugen Fink, and Henri Birault, as well as the prestigious non-academic philosopher, Gabriel Marcel.<sup>59</sup> Following Deleuze's book and the Royaumont conference, Nietzsche's philosophical reputation had been confirmed to the point where he could be situated in the canon as a figure whose work could be treated in the written examination of the *agrégation*, where he appears four times between 1970 and 1977.

In addition, there is most likely another factor at work in Nietzsche's placement among canonical philosophers who could appear on the *agrégation's* written *Programme*—this one having to do with the tensions in the 1960s between the faculty of philosophy and the faculty in the human sciences. While there was great interest in the works of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche at that time among both students and faculty, Marx and Freud were already firmly entrenched within the canon of the human sciences. For those in control of the processes of instruction and philosophical formation—perhaps first and foremost Georges Canguilhem, who occupied the central administrative position governing philosophical instruction—opting for Nietzsche over Marx or Freud might have been seen as a way to

<sup>57</sup>Before Deleuze's book appears, articles by Henri Birault (1962: "En quoi, nous aussi, nous sommes encore pieux"), Jean Wahl (1961: "Le problème du temps chez Nietzsche"), Angèle Kremer-Marietti (1959: "Nietzsche et quelques-uns de ses interprètes actuels"), Pierre Klossowski (1958: "Nietzsche, le polythéisme et la parodie"), and Hermann Wein (1958: "Métaphysique et anti-métaphysique: accompagné de quelques réflexions pour la défense de l'oeuvre de Nietzsche") appear in *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*. Prior to 1958, the last article on Nietzsche published in the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* was Marie-Anne Cochet's "Nietzsche d'après son plus récent interprète," a review published in two parts in 1931 (613–41) and 1932 (87–119) of Charles Andler's six-volume study (see note 39 above). Only one other article on Nietzsche appears in a philosophy journal between 1958 and 1962: Pierre Fruchon's "Note sur l'idée de création dans la dernière pensée de Nietzsche," which appears in *Études philosophiques* in 1962.

<sup>58</sup>Heidegger's *Nietzsche* was not translated into French until 1971, in two volumes, by Pierre Klossowski and published by Éditions Gallimard. Rather than Heidegger, Deleuze himself, in *Différence et répétition* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968), credits two essays by Klossowski for "renovating or reviving the interpretation of Nietzsche" (81–82). These essays are "Nietzsche, le polythéisme et la parodie," first published in 1958 and reprinted in *Un si funeste désir* (Paris: NRF, 1963), 185–228, and "Oubli et anamnèse dans l'expérience vécue de l'éternel retour du Même," presented at the Royaumont Conference on Nietzsche in 1964 and published in *Nietzsche: Cahiers du Royaumont*, Philosophie VIIe colloque, 4–8 Juillet 1964 (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967), 227–35.

<sup>59</sup>The proceedings were published as *Nietzsche, Cahiers de Royaumont*.

persuade the philosophical establishment to acknowledge the changing times and the interests of the younger generation of students while maintaining philosophy's independence from the human sciences. What then follows Nietzsche's first recognition by the *agrégation's* written *Programme* in 1970 is another major conference, at Cerisy-la-Salle in 1972,<sup>60</sup> along with the publication of books dealing exclusively or primarily with Nietzsche by, among others, Jean Granier, Maurice Blanchot, Pierre Klossowski, Jean-Michel Rey, Bernard Pautrat, Pierre Boudot, Sarah Kofman, and Paul Valadier;<sup>61</sup> and special issues on Nietzsche organized by some of France's leading journals.<sup>62</sup> When one compares the total publications following Nietzsche's appearances on the *agrégation*, the picture is clear, as can be seen in the *Nietzsche-Bibliographie*<sup>63</sup> at the Stiftung Weimarer Klassik und Kunstsammlungen: from 1970–80, this bibliography lists over 275 French books or articles (not including Nietzsche's own works or reviews of other works) primarily written by philosophers. In contrast, from 1920–57, 334 French works are listed, the overwhelming majority of which are either translations into French or written by Germanists or *avant-garde* essayists.

## 7

Nietzsche's example, like those of Plotinus and Comte, both shows the concrete effects that the *agrégation* has had on philosophical scholarship in France and exemplifies the sort of socio-historical and institutional analyses of developments within French philosophy that could be performed. Similar analyses might reveal interesting information about the fall from prominence of the nineteenth-century spiritualists (Lachelier, Ravaisson, Cournot, Renouvier), or the emergence of French Hegelianism, or the disappearance and subsequent reappearance of Bergson, etc. At the very least, I hope these examples have demonstrated that the *agrégation de philosophie*, and the individuals who exercise influence over the construction of its annual *Programme*, have played a profound role in the evolution of philosophy in France in the twentieth century. And I hope they show as well that more attention to the role of the *agrégation* in the intellectual formation of French philosophers and the French philosophical *habitus* is in order.

<sup>60</sup>Over 800 pages of presentations and subsequent discussions from this conference were published in two volumes as *Nietzsche aujourd'hui* (Paris: Union Générale d'Éditions, 1973). In addition to several of the presenters from the Royaumont colloquium (Deleuze, Klossowski, Löwith, and Fink), papers were presented at Cerisy by Eugen Biser, Eric Blondel, Pierre Boudot, Eric Clémens, Jean Delhomme, Jacques Derrida, Léopold Flam, Edouard Gaède, Danko Grlc, Sarah Kofman, Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe, Jean-François Lyotard, Jean Maurel, Jean-Luc Nancy, Norman Palma, Bernard Pautrat, Jean-Michel Rey, Richard Roos, Paul Valadier, Jean-Noël Vuarnet, and Heinz Wismann.

<sup>61</sup>Jean Granier, *Le Problème de la Vérité dans la philosophie de Nietzsche* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966); Maurice Blanchot, *L'Entretien infini* (Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1969); Pierre Klossowski, *Nietzsche et le Cercle VICIEUX* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1969); Jean-Michel Rey, *L'Enjeu des signes. Lecture de Nietzsche* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1971); Bernard Pautrat, *Versions du soleil. Figures et système de Nietzsche* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1971); Pierre Boudot, *Nietzsche et l'au-delà de la liberté: Nietzsche et les écrivains français de 1930 à 1960* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1970; republished in 1975 as *Nietzsche et les écrivains français de 1930 à 1960*), *L'Ontologie de Nietzsche* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971), and *Nietzsche en miettes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1973); Sarah Kofman, *Nietzsche et la métaphore* (Paris: Payot, 1972); Paul Valadier, *Nietzsche et la critique du christianisme* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974).

<sup>62</sup>See, for example, *Bulletin de la Société française de philosophie* 4 (Oct.–Dec. 1969) on "Nietzsche et ses interprètes," *Poétique* V (1971) on "Rhétorique et philosophie," *Revue Philosophique* 3 (1971) on "Nietzsche," and *Critique* 313 (1973) on "Lectures de Nietzsche."

*Appendix I:*Appearances on the 20th Century *Agrégation Programme*


---

	Total Appearances	Written Programme	French Explication
Plato	88	36	0
Kant	83	31	32
Aristotle	77	31	0
Descartes	69	28	32
Stoics (including Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and Epictetus)	55	25	0
Leibniz	54	22	26
Spinoza	54	22	6
Hume	53	19	7
Berkeley	50	16	9
Cicero	44	0	0
Schopenhauer	42	5	3
Malebranche	35	15	24
Rousseau	34	11	25
Lucretius	32	0	0
Plotinus	28	11	0
Comte	29	6	24
Bergson	28	6	23
Locke	27	8	2
Hegel	26	7	7
Mill	22	1	3
Epicurians	20	18	0
Fichte	20	1	2
Nietzsche	15	8	2
Husserl	15	2	2
Augustine	11	0	0
Russell	11	0	0
Hobbes	10	2	0
Diderot	10	1	9
Maine de Biran	10	1	9
James	9	0	0
Montesquieu	8	0	8
New Academy	7	7	0
Sceptics	7	4	0
Marx/Engels	7	0	4
Schelling	7	0	0
Boutroux	6	0	6
Spencer	6	0	1
Pascal	5	3	2
Ravaisson	5	0	5
Lachelier	5	0	5
Merleau-Ponty	5	0	5

Socrates	4	4	0
Bachelard	4	2	2
Bacon	4	1	0
Cournot	4	0	4
Sartre	4	0	4
Heidegger	4	0	0
Imperfect Socratics	3	3	0
Hamelin	3	0	3
Montaigne	3	0	3
Condillac	3	0	3
D'Alembert	3	0	3
Freud	3	0	1
More	3	0	0
Pre-Socratics	2	2	0
Reid	2	2	0
Port Royale Logic	3	1	2
Sophists	1	1	0
Holbach	1	1	0
Helvetius	1	1	0
Hamilton	1	1	0

N.B. Only figures with less than three appearances in total who appear at least once on the Written *Programme* are included.

*Appendix 2:*

Appearances on the 20th Century *Written Programme*

	Total Appearances on <i>Programme</i>	Appearances on Written Program	Total written
<b>Ancient</b>			133
Plato	88	36	
Aristotle	77	31	
Stoics: including Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and Epictetus	55	25	
Epicurians	20	18	
Plotinus	28	11	
New Academy	7	7	
Sceptics	7	4	
Socrates	4	4	
Imperfect Socratics	3	3	
Pre-Socratics	2	2	
Sophists	1	1	
<b>Latin</b>			0
Cicero	44	0	
Lucretius	32	0	
Augustine	11	0	
<b>Modern</b>			168

*Appendix 2, continued.*

	Total Appearances on <i>Programme</i>	Appearances on Written Program	Total written
Kant	83	31	
Descartes	69	28	
Leibniz	54	22	
Spinoza	54	22	
Hume	53	19	
Berkeley	50	16	
Malebranche	35	15	
Locke	27	8	
Pascal	5	3	
Hobbes	10	2	
Reid	2	2	
Bacon	4	1	
Port Royale Logic	3	1	
<b>18th C French</b>			14
Rousseau	34	11	
Diderot	10	1	
Holbach	1	1	
Helvetius	1	1	
Montesquieu	8	0	
<b>19th C French</b>			7
Comte	29	6	
Maine de Biran	10	1	
Ravaisson	5	0	
Lachelier	5	0	
Cournot	4	0	
<b>19th C British</b>			2
Mill	22	1	
Hamilton	1	1	
Spencer	6	0	
<b>19th C German</b>			21
Nietzsche	15	8	
Hegel	26	7	
Schopenhauer	42	5	
Fichte	20	1	
<i>Marx/Engels</i>	7	0	
Schelling	7	0	
<b>20th C French</b>			8
Bergson	28	6	
Bachelard	4	2	
Boutroux	6	0	
Merleau-Ponty	5	0	
Sartre	4	0	
<b>20th C German</b>			2
Husserl	15	2	
Heidegger	4	0	
Freud	3	0	



**20th C British/American**

Russell	II	○	
James	9	○	
		355	355

---