



A University of Sussex DPhil thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

**The Chevalier Andrew Michael Ramsay's
Essay de Politique: Fénelon and Jacobitism**

Andrew Mansfield

University of Sussex

DPhil Thesis

May 2011

WORK NOT SUBMITTED ELSEWHERE FOR EXAMINATION

I hereby declare that this thesis has not been and will not be, submitted in whole or in part to another University for the award of any other degree.

Signature:.....

University of Sussex

Submitted for a DPhil in Intellectual History and the History of Political Thought

The Chevalier Andrew Michael Ramsay's *Essay de Politique*: Fénelon and Jacobitism

Summary

Andrew Michael Ramsay's *Essay de Politique* (1719) and the revised second edition, the *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* (1721) claimed to promulgate the political principles of the Archbishop Fénelon author of *Télémaque* (1699). The assumed relationship between Fénelon and Ramsay augmented by Ramsay's *Vie de Fénelon* (1723) meant that subsequent biographers of both men have believed the *Essay* to be a faithful depiction of the prelate's political ideas. However this work, aided by the *Vie de Fénelon* was used by Ramsay to promote the Jacobite cause of James Stuart (the 'Pretender'). The *Essay* was used by Ramsay to set out a theoretical system of government that would prevent an 'excess of liberty' in the people and thereby prevent the possibility of Revolution against a king. Ramsay's second edition augmented this idea with a more focused attack on the contract theorists and apologists for the 1689 Revolution. Ramsay deliberately manipulated the political legacy of Fénelon and focused on a corrupted view of Fénelon's early (children's) educational works in his promotion of Jacobitism. In doing so, he disregarded the important later reform plans for the French state under the potential reign of (an adult) Duke of Burgundy which were later influential in Regency France. Moreover, Ramsay manipulated the name and reputation of Fénelon to disguise the real influence of his *Essay*, Fénelon's nemesis Bossuet. The reliance of the *Essay* upon the seventeenth century absolutist theory of Bossuet at a time when eighteenth century Britain and Regency France had rejected absolutism in favour of reform led to its failure. The aim of the Thesis is therefore to examine the extent of Ramsay's Jacobitism, his impact on the political legacy of Fénelon in his attempt to create a work of Jacobite propaganda, and the true influences on the *Essay de Politique*.

Acknowledgments

I would first and foremost like to thank my supervisor Richard Whatmore for his support and advice over what seems a very long time indeed. I owe you a great debt of gratitude for your patience with my harassment over the last few years and for the various opportunities you have provided for me.

I would like to thank Cesare Cuttica for our invaluable discussions on absolutism, monarchy and government; for his advice on numerous fields of investigation and his insightful feedback after reading a draft of my thesis. This thanks I would like to extend to Mark Somos for his perceptive advice on the thesis and its format, and Mia Saugman for her offer of checking the French within the Thesis at such short notice. I should like to thank both Knud Haakonssen and Jim Livesey for some interesting conversations on Jacobitism, France and Scotland. Lastly, I would also like to recognize the Sussex Centre for Intellectual History and the inspiration drawn from its members, its conferences and the fascinating Works in Progress meetings.

I would like to thank my family and friends, particularly my Mum for her support especially in earlier in the Thesis, as well as to Paddy for listening to me prattle on over the years about Ramsay. My daughters Charlotte and Lana also deserve a very special mention as a source of inspiration and a means of keeping my feet firmly on the ground.

My greatest thanks go to my beautiful wife Sam for all her love, patience, support, proof-reading, and motivation in good times and more stressful times; and basically for putting up with the early mornings, late nights, weekends, and holidays. I could not have done this without you!

Contents

Introduction	7
 I: Andrew Michael Ramsay	 17
Ramsay's Association with Fénelon	25
Ramsay and the Jacobites	31
 II: Jacobitism in England and fear of the French, 1701-1722	 38
1701	57
1711	65
1716	73
1722	81
French Notions of Political Reform, 1714-1721	88
 III: The Political Fénelon	 101
The Life of Fénelon	101
The Educational Works: (1689-1695)	108
Plans and Reforms: (1701-1712)	126
Ramsay's Editing of Fénelon's Political Works	144
 IV: The <i>Essay de Politique</i>	 151
Man, Civil Society and Sovereignty	152
An 'Excess of Liberty'	164
'Monarchy moderated by Aristocracy'	172

V: Ramsay's Jacobitism: The *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* and the *Vie de Fénelon*

	177
‘Lovers of Independency’	182
Promoting Jacobitism	192
The Influence of Bossuet on the <i>Essay</i>	200
 Conclusion	 218
 Bibliography	 222

Introduction

Andrew Michael Ramsay's *Essay de Politique* (1719) is an unusual work that attempted to achieve a number of objectives which appeared to fail in all but one of them. These objectives were: to shape and promulgate a view of Fénelon's political works for an eager public desirous for more political commentary from the author of *Télémaque*; to provide a work that promoted the Jacobite cause in England; to create a 'plan of government'¹ that assuaged the fears of 'an excess of liberty,'² and to promote the career of Andrew Michael Ramsay. All but the last of these objectives were to fail. What Ramsay actually achieved with the production of the *Essay* and its second edition (1721), was a political legacy for Fénelon that was inaccurate and a 'plan' of government that failed through its merger of two opposing systems of government: absolutism moderated by nobility. Consequently, the only objective that Ramsay achieved with the *Essay* was his own self-promotion as he rose among Jacobite circles to become a baronet and briefly acted as tutor to the young prince Charles in 1724. The *Essay de Politique* has subsequently become a neglected work, serving mainly as a footnote in Fénelon's *Oeuvres*, while Ramsay has become known either for his very successful *Travels of Cyrus* (1727) or through his association with the Freemasons.

This disregard of the *Essay de Politique* and its second edition, the *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* neglects a crucial period in the literary career of Ramsay. The work was written at a time when Ramsay had become the editor of the Archbishop Fénelon's papers and manuscripts. It was a time when Ramsay's association with the Jacobite movement became far more involved, and it was at the beginning of his literary career. The *Essay de Politique* therefore reveals the early political thought and influence of a man who

¹ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique* (H. Scheurleer, Le Haye, 1719), ii.

² *Ibid.* 1-2.

was to become a literary success in Europe, man of letters, tutor to a (deposed) prince, and active Jacobite. Ramsay claimed that work was based upon the political principles of Fénelon, a thinker whose political ideas of reform and attacks on the absolutist regime of Louis XIV's France were much in demand in Regency France at this time. Ramsay's earlier association with Fénelon and his role as the editor of his papers therefore seemed to have allowed access to a much deeper understanding of the unpublished political thought of the prelate. Yet, the *Essay* sits rather at odds with the political principles expounded in works such as *Télémaque* which attacked absolutism while the *Essay* promoted absolutism in an attempt to restrain the 'liberty' of the people and the possibility of rebellion. Ramsay's endeavours to utilize absolutist political theory for the Jacobite cause in an effort to reject the 1689 Revolution and legitimacy of popular revolt, employed arguments that did not belong to Fénelon.

This thesis therefore has three linked aims which I will examine in relation to Ramsay's *Essay de Politique*. The first aim is to examine the extent of Ramsay's Jacobitism and to place him within the Jacobite movement and to discuss how this shaped the *Essay*, in particular the second edition. The second aim is to delineate the actual influence of Fénelon's political principles upon the *Essay*, and how his apparent subterfuge was used to promote the Jacobite cause for the benefit of the movement and of Ramsay. The final aim is to reveal the real influence upon the *Essay*, thereby arguing against the previous beliefs that the work was either indebted to Locke, Filmer, Bodin or Hobbes,³ or the (historically) predominant view that the work simply reflected the principles of Fénelon.⁴ In examining these three aims it

³ For discussions of the influence of the *Essay* see, Albert Cherel, *Fénelon au xviii^e Siècle en France (1715-1820). Son Prestige – Son Influence* (Hachette, Paris, 1917), 94; G.D. Henderson, *Chevalier Ramsay* (Nelson & Sons, Edinburgh, 1952), 175, and Jean Molino, "L'‘Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil.’ Ramsay ou Fénelon?," in *La Régence*, ed. Henri Coulet (Paris, 1970), 282-85. Both Cherel (98) and Molino (282) saw a link between Ramsay's Jacobitism and the publication of the *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*.

⁴ Cardinal Bausset, *The Life of Fénelon*, Vol. I (Sherwood, Neeley & Jones, London, 1810) 325, and Paul Janet, *Fénelon: His Life and Works* (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd., London, 1914), Appendix I.

will be possible to place Ramsay's *Essay*, not only in the context of a Jacobite work but also as a work on political theory at this time of great change both in Britain and France.

The opening two chapters will enable me to provide the background and context for Ramsay and his *Essay de Politique*. In chapter one I will examine his life, his relationship with Fénelon, and his association with the Jacobite movement in order to establish the biographical events of what is a rather mysterious and vague life. While outlines of his life are known much has been lost or destroyed, and Ramsay appears to have kept his intentions and thoughts very much hidden. There is also a large degree of subterfuge involved in the work and activity of Ramsay, as he obfuscated and attempted to cover the tracks of his influences as is manifested by the *Essay de Politique*. As will be shown in this chapter, Ramsay in many ways appears to have taken pleasure from his association with leading figures while trying to covertly and poorly imitate them.

The following contextual chapter 'Jacobitism in England and fear of the French, 1701-1722' is essential to explain the theoretical environment in which Ramsay wished to place his *Essay*. Not only was Ramsay presenting a work on government aimed at the effects of the 1689 Revolution, he wrote it in French. It is therefore necessary to examine what currents of thought were expressed at the time of the publication of both editions of the work in Britain and France. Moreover, as a work that promoted the Jacobite cause and Jacobite theory the contextual account in Britain is extended to encompass the succession of James Stuart as heir to his father James II's crown (1701). Ramsay's need to protect James Stuart from this usurpation and the threat to his hereditary line reflects the primary aim of the thesis: the role played by Jacobitism in shaping the *Essay*. While the influence of Jacobitism is hard to ascertain in the first edition of the *Essay* as it was extremely subtle, Ramsay's attacks on

contract theorists ('*les Amateurs de l'indépendance*')⁵ and his attack on the removal of James II from the throne are the obvious manifestations that the work is Jacobite. When one compares the *Essay* to George Habin's *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted* (1713) or Charles Leslie's *The Finishing Stroke* (1716) there could be no doubt as to their loyalties or principle aim.⁶ Leslie for example, claimed that the 'Authority of a Father is Civil Government; and *Absolute* where there is no *Superior Authority* to Controul it,'⁷ an authority invested in the king that could not be taken by the people. Conversely, Ramsay's support for Jacobitism was muted in the first edition and this makes for a very singular work of Jacobite propaganda. While the use of the principles of the author of *Télémaque* on the title page would guarantee public interest and an assumption that the work opposed the absolutist principles of Louis XIV's regime. In the second edition the support for Jacobitism became much more overt. Its Dedication to James Stuart,⁸ the alteration in the work's structure, the removal of some chapters and the addition of two chapters on the perils of popular government at the end of the work set the *Essay* in direct opposition with the contract theorists.⁹ Contract theory was the basis for supporting the alteration of the succession to William III and Mary II from James II. From Locke's *Two Treatises* through to the work by Benjamin Hoadly and others at the beginning of the second decade of the eighteenth-century, contract theory proved to be a popular method of defending the 1689 Revolution. An examination of such works both in support of the Revolution and contract theory as well as of those against the Revolution and Jacobite supporters will show the peculiarity of Ramsay's *Essay*.

⁵ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique* and *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* (London, 1721). It is first used on page 10 of the first edition and p. 13 of the second edition, and then throughout both works.

⁶ For a discussion of the Jacobite work of Harbin and Leslie see Chapter Two of the Thesis, 73-75.

⁷ Charles Leslie, *The Finishing Stroke* (London, 1716), 11.

⁸ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, Dedication.

⁹ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, 2.

Ramsay's decision to take on contract theory and the 1689 Revolution is interesting for two reasons. The first is that it reveals that Ramsay's work was already an anachronism in 1719 and then again in 1721. As will be argued in Chapter Two, the Jacobite doctrines of divine right, patriarchy, and hereditary succession had been abandoned by the Jacobites by 1716 after their humiliation at the 1715 Uprising under Ramsay's friend the Duke of Mar. Ramsay was therefore promulgating theories that were already derelict as for many theorists in Britain as attention had moved elsewhere. The contract theory used by Hoadly for example, had been expedient ten years earlier as the Protestant succession was still under a potential threat due to Anne's poor health. This threat was ended by George I's accession (1714) and the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) which removed the threat and support of France. France is extremely significant to Jacobitism as its financial and military supporter and as England's feared enemy. It was also symbolic for Ramsay's *Essay* because even at the time of publication in France, the absolutist theory propounded by the work had been abandoned by the French in favour of (Fénelonian) reform.

Ramsay's *Essay* was anachronistic both in France and Britain as both had moved forward politically, France by partially using Fénelonian political principles on government. This leads to the second connection to Ramsay's attack on 1689, that in utilizing such arguments and attacking such enemies this work failed as a piece of Jacobite propaganda. While Ramsay had manipulated and used the legacy of Fénelon to try and claim that he supported the Jacobite movement, regardless of the theory's origin he claimed to use Ramsay promoted absolutism. While political theory in Britain and France had moved into an era of reform, Ramsay advocated a government that was from the seventeenth-century. Calls for the British to accept a return to seventeenth-century Stuart (Catholic) absolutism was bound to failure, and indeed the work was a failure which the Jacobite Court recognized. James Stuart wrote

after the second edition that, ‘Ramsay is not to be anyways concerned in writing or politics. I know him well enough and shall be able to employ him according to his talents.’¹⁰

In the ‘The Political Fénelon’ chapter Fénelon’s political principles will be expounded to obtain a clear idea of what exactly was the thought of Fénelon and how it differed from Ramsay’s *Essay*. The confusion over Fénelon’s political philosophy which is still extant today is found in the insistence on focusing on his early educational works for Duc de Bourgogne as a small child. Much of the responsibility for this lies with the huge success of *Télémaque*, an ostensible critique of Louis XIV’s absolutist regime that became hugely popular throughout Europe. The fame and multiple editions of the work ensured that Fénelon’s reputation was to an extent connected with *Télémaque*. However, the strength of this connection was not aided by Ramsay as the later editor of Fénelon’s papers. Beginning with the Fénelon family’s request to publish a more complete edition as ‘All the former editions being extream faulty, and published without the Author’s Approbation, ‘tis a Piece of Justice due to his Memory, to let his performance appear Abroad.’¹¹ After the publication of *Télémaque* Ramsay continued to focus on the educational works (*Fables* and *Dialogues des Morts*) when publishing Fénelon’s political works. He thereby publicly perpetuated the idea that the lessons for a young boy (Bourgogne) were the true political ideas of Fénelon, and then attempted to ensure this through the publication of the *Essay de Politique*.

Indubitably many of Fénelon’s principles can be found in these early works: his need for a king that serves the public good,¹² who serves the law,¹³ who avoids war,¹⁴ and engages in commerce without luxury¹⁵ were present in his later works. However, the later works such as

¹⁰ James to Murray (3rd April 1724), *The Jacobite Court in Rome*, Ed. Henrietta Tayler (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1938), 229. For an explanation of this work see footnote 78 in Chapter One (p. 31).

¹¹ Ramsay, *The Adventures of Telemachus, Son of Ulysses* (London, 1719), *Preface*, iv.

¹² Fénelon, *Dialogues of the Dead, Modern Dead*, Book XVIII (London, 1723), 372.

¹³ *Ibid. Ancient Dead*, XI, 154.

¹⁴ Fénelon, *Fables* IV (London, 1723), 126.

¹⁵ Fénelon, *Telemachus*, Translated & edited Patrick Riley (Cambridge UP, 1994), Book XVII, 297.

the *Tables de Chaulnes* and the *Examen de conscience sur le devoirs de royauté* are genuine plans to reform the government of France when Burgundy ascended to the throne. Within these reforms were the practicalities of government, the need to end war in Europe so that France could recover and be reformed,¹⁶ the need to utilize a nobility that was languishing in the decadence of Versailles,¹⁷ and the widening of government to move France away from the stagnation of absolutism.¹⁸ These plans created by Fénelon as the central figure of the Burgundy Circle were in part enacted in the Regency under the Duc de Orléans, an acolyte of Fénelon. Yet with Ramsay we do not see this adherence to extensive reform and we certainly do not see the decentralization of government and dismantling of absolutism. This is despite the discovery¹⁹ that Ramsay's access to all of Fénelon's papers would seem to have enabled him to steal the *Supplément* from the *Examen* and publish it under the title of *The Ballance of Europe* while including an accompanying essay by himself.²⁰

So why would Ramsay wish to surreptitiously promulgate ideas on a European peace union and not on the use of government councils in a decentralized government? Perhaps it was because the abbé de Saint-Pierre, a member of the Burgundy Circle, had recently made known Fénelon's idea of government councils in his *Discours sur la polysynodie*²¹ and a further work on peace would add to Saint-Pierre's association with Fénelon rather than his own?²² This may never be known. Yet what Ramsay did do was to create a work of government theory that claimed to be based upon the political principles of Fénelon that appeared to be something unpublished. What in fact the *Essay* delivered was a work that referenced Fénelon out of context on four occasions in what was essentially an absolutist

¹⁶ Fénelon, *Tables de Chaulnes, Oeuvres, Tome II*, Ed. Le Brun (Gallimard, Paris, 1997), 1085.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 1100.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 1090-91.

¹⁹ See Chapter Three's discussion of Ramsay's manipulation, theft, and alteration of the papers and works of Fénelon in section four's discussion of his role as editor, 146-49.

²⁰ See page 'The Political Fénelon' chapter.

²¹ Saint-Pierre, *Polysynodie*, (London, 1718), iv.

²² Saint-Pierre's *Projet pour paix perpétuelle* (Chez Antoine Schouten, Utrecht, 1713), a plan for potential a European peace 'Union' influenced by Fénelon which is discussed in Chapter Two, pages 94-97.

system that Fénelon rejected. A system in which the king would always act in the ‘*dernier resort*’ as sovereignty could not be divided. A sovereignty which Ramsay divided to accommodate the Fénelonian idea that a king must use the nobility, but which Ramsay only relied upon for advice rather than as a truly active component of government.²³ The *Essay* therefore had very little of Fénelon’s true principles. It was a manipulation by Ramsay in his attempt to prevent the possibility of revolution by the people and thereby protect the king from an altered succession. A deliberate alteration of the principles of Fénelon that changed the true political legacy of Fénelon, and a concentration on elements of his political work that masked the true focus and direction of Fénelon.

Ramsay’s reliance on absolutism in his attacks on contract theory in his creation of a ‘*plan de gouvernement*’ are discussed in the final two chapters: ‘*Essay de Politique*’ and ‘Ramsay’s Jacobitism: The *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* and the *Vie de Fénelon*.’ The discussion of the *Essay de Politique* is a straightforward delineation of Ramsay’s political theory and absolutism shorn of the context it lacks and offering a comparison to other Jacobite works by virtue of this. The following chapter focuses on the second edition with its alterations, re-structuring, new *Preface* and Dedication to James Stuart, and it is here that the true influences on the *Essay* become apparent. While in the twentieth-century it became recognized that the work was promoting Jacobitism, the supposed influence for the work has been credited to Locke, but also Filmer, Hobbes, and Bodin.²⁴ Yet Ramsay’s use of absolutism to defend his government against contract theory and revolution actually reveals the influence of Hoadly and Bossuet. While Ramsay may well have been responding to Locke and a number of other contract theorists, his repeated use of the term ‘Lovers of Independency’ was a direct retort to Hoadly who used the term

²³ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, pp. 165-66

²⁴ Albert Cherel, *Fénelon au XVIII^e Siècle en France (1715-1820). Son Prestige – Son Influence*, 94; G.D. Henderson, *Chevalier Ramsay*, 175, and Jean Molino, “L’*Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*.’ *Ramsay ou Fénelon?*”, 282-85.

‘Independency’ in his delineation of popular power and contract.²⁵ Ramsay set himself in opposition to Hoadly in his attack on the notions of liberty and independence, which are an attack on Hoadly’s support for the 1689 Revolution. In attacking the alteration of the succession to the detriment of James Stuart, Ramsay employed a system of government that did not allow rebellion,²⁶ in which the public are controlled,²⁷ or the involvement of the people in government:²⁸ absolutism. The absolutism that Ramsay employed was that of Bossuet the nemesis of Fénelon he attacked in the *Vie de Fénelon* (1723).²⁹ Yet as he was prone to do, Ramsay hid the influence and targets of his work under the name of Fénelon in a manner that could not be sustained. Ramsay’s system has the same use of providence, divine right, patriarchy, subordination of the people, and rejection of rebellion as Bossuet.³⁰ Even Ramsay’s use of a ‘monarchy moderated by aristocracy’³¹ could in fact be taken from Bossuet’s desire for the king to have good counsel and rely upon trusted advisers. This absolutist system was the apotheosis of the theory behind Louis XIV’s France at a time during the seventeenth-century when Louis was at his height, and it is this system that formed the basis of Ramsay’s ‘plan’ in his defence of Jacobitism.

Ramsay’s *Essay de Politique* is an interesting example of Jacobite propaganda, as not only did it attempt to consolidate absolutism with mixed government, its theory was anachronistic by the time of publication. Ramsay’s promotion of the work as the political thought of Fénelon not only manipulated the ideas of Fénelon but attempted to mesh them with the opposed hidden theory of his nemesis Bossuet. The *Essay de Politique* and the subsequent second edition therefore offer a unique insight into the Jacobitism of Ramsay, his relationship

²⁵ Benjamin Hoadly, *The Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed*, p. 266 in *The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D.D., Volume II*, Ed. John Hoadly (London, 1773), 266.

²⁶ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique*, 78.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 31.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 141.

²⁹ Ramsay, *Life of Fénelon* (London, 1723) 60.

³⁰ See the ‘Ramsay’s Jacobitism’ chapter of the Thesis for a discussion of how Ramsay used Bossuet’s absolutism, pages 200-18.

³¹ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique*, 185.

with Fénelon and the impact on his political legacy, as well as his creation of a system of absolutism at a time when absolutism had been shunned in both Britain and France. Both countries had headed toward some of the reforms advocated by Fénelon such as the increase in power of government. Ramsay however, used his apparent 'mentor' to advocate his opponent Bossuet's political system in a country that rejected the Stuarts in part for their absolutism. Ramsay's *Essay* is therefore an unusual work of Jacobite propaganda.

I: Andrew Michael Ramsay

Andrew Michael Ramsay was born in 1686 to an Anglican mother (Susanna) and a Calvinist father (Andrew).³² While his birthplace is traditionally given as Ayr in Scotland, Ramsay's parents left due to the religious and political troubles of 1684, in which his father was involved. These troubles in Ayr at this time related to the Scottish Covenanters. The Covenanters were a group who had signed a National Covenant in 1638 against the interference of the Stuart monarchs with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. They had supported Charles I in return for a potential abolishment of the Episcopacy but Cromwell's victory ended these hopes. The restoration of Charles II (1660) saw the restoration of Anglicanism in Scotland, and this led to prolonged unrest which culminated in the Covenanters' defeat of government troops under Lord Claverhouse (1679). In 1684 there was a great deal of disorder as a number of Covenanters were summoned to court in Ayr for their political activities, and at the accession of James II (1685) Covenanting was declared treason and the Covenanters were persecuted. Ramsay's family subsequently returned to Ayr and this was the place of his upbringing. Ramsay's background was modest and his father was a baker. It should be pointed out that Ramsay (the younger) added the Michael to his name to mask his humble origins, as Scots very rarely had middle names unless they were of noble birth. Early on Ramsay began to claim descent from the Earls of Dalhousie on his father's side of the family and the Lairds of Dun on his mother's, although no clear

³² A detailed account of the life of Ramsay can be found in G.D. Henderson's *Chevalier Ramsay*. Henderson's work provides the most comprehensive background to Ramsay's life in what is an incredibly small market. It must be stated that the difficulty in providing a biography of Ramsay is that material is so sparse. There is very little written on Ramsay, there are few papers, letters, no portrait even. Some information was provided by Ramsay in his *Anecdotes* (below), but much of this is on his theoretical ideas. Outside of his works this problem extends to primary material on Ramsay. There is some primary material in a collection of letters between the Garden Circle by Henderson *The Mystics of the North-East* (Third Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1934), and occasional discussions amongst the Jacobites but he is largely a hidden figure. For criticism of Ramsay's work see Albert Cherel's *Un Aventurier Religieux au XVIIIe siècle: André-Michel Ramsay* (Librarie Académique, Paris, 1926).

connection can be found. Ramsay used the claim of noble ancestry to allay fears particularly in France, that he was an adventurer or a chancer. He also used this alleged ancestry to open up doors and connections for him on his travels.

Ramsay attended the local grammar school in Ayr before entering Edinburgh University. While Ramsay's autobiography, *Anecdotes de la vie de Messire André Michel de Ramsay ...dictés par lui meme peu de jours avant sa mort par le instances reiterées de son Epouze*³³ described his early interest in mathematics and the sciences, he claimed to have always been drawn toward religion. The environment in which Ramsay grew up was riven by religious unrest - both intellectual and physical - augmented by the growth of deism. Ramsay stated in the *Anecdotes* that he had earlier adhered to deism following the advice of his mother to eschew the Calvinistic dogma of predestination.³⁴ The deism present in the universities of Scotland took Ramsay to Edinburgh,³⁵ and while deism proved unsatisfying for Ramsay, he was introduced to the mysticism of St. Francis de Sales (1567-1622) and Archbishop Fénelon (1651-1715), and a range of other Catholic contemplative writers.³⁶ Ramsay began to avoid the prevailing forms of organized Christianity by 1708 and sought truth in the idea of a mystical union with a loving God.³⁷ He formed an attachment with the Garden Circle led by George and James Garden who encouraged him to be critical of religion and to espouse toleration.³⁸ It contained George Garden (1649-1733), Scottish Episcopal clergyman and controversialist; James Garden (1645-1726), minister and author of *Comparative Theology* (1700); George Cheyne (1671/2-1743), physician and natural philosopher; Robert Keith (1681-1757) Scottish Episcopalian Bishop and historian; Alexander Forbes, Lord Pitsligo

³³ Andrew Michael Ramsay, *Anecdotes de la vie de Messire André Michel de Ramsay ...dictés par lui meme peu de jours avant sa mort par le instances reiterées de son Epouze* (Méjanes Bibliothèque, Aix-en-Provence, MS. No. 1188), 2.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 4.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 5.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 7-8.

³⁷ *Ibid.* 6-7.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 6.

(1678-1762), philosopher and Jacobite army officer; and James Ogilvy, Lord Deskford (1663-1730). These men aided Ramsay in his spiritual journey and importantly they were the means of introduction to a wider world of contacts in London and the Continent.³⁹ Many of these men Ramsay corresponded with for many years connected through an interest in natural philosophy, religion and toleration, as well as their dedication to Fénelon and Madame Guyon.⁴⁰

After moving to London at the end of 1708 as the tutor of the Earl of Wemyss' children, he became involved with the Philadelphian Society, a Protestant sect that rejected the idea of being constrained by a church. Ramsay's involvement with the Philadelphians brought him into contact with Jacobite nobility and this allowed him to explore his attraction to Mysticism. With the aid of George Garden, Ramsay left London and travelled to the Rhynsburg, Holland in the Spring of 1710 to stay with Pierre Poiret (1646-1719).⁴¹ Poiret was a French mystic and philosopher who exerted a strong influence on the Garden Circle and was a frequent correspondent of theirs. In his work *La Paix des âmes dans tous les partis du Christianisme* (1687) Poiret disregarded religious creeds and asked Christians to move beyond restriction of church membership to an inner communion between like-minded souls. Poiret's theological views had led him to seek out a correspondence with the Catholic mystic Archbishop Fénelon, who he believed may be sympathetic to his own Protestant form of mysticism.⁴² The two men discussed whether Catholics could be contemplatives and not actively part of the Church. Fénelon, who was also in correspondence with the Garden Circle, argued that Protestantism was a damaging schism to Christianity, while Poiret countered by claiming that the true message a Christianity can be found in parts of Catholicism, Calvinism, Lutheranism, etc. The key to religious understanding was to float

³⁹ *Ibid.* 9-10.

⁴⁰ See Below.

⁴¹ *Anecdotes*, 10.

⁴² Aberdeen University Library, (Document MS2236).

objectively above organized religion which has lost its way through its use of priests and ceremony. The view espoused by Poiret had drawn him toward the Catholic mystics Madame Bourignon and Madame Guyon (1648-1717). The latter Poiret corresponded closely with over a number of years due to her greater openness (than Fénelon) towards other religions. Their similarity lay in their lack of requirement for their followers to join an established Church to pursue their personal path to pure love and God.

Poiret proved to be a strong influence on Ramsay and his spiritual quest, and it was through Poiret that Ramsay travelled to Cambrai in August 1710.⁴³ During his time with Fénelon, Ramsay was converted to Catholicism by him through a combination of spiritual discourse and confession over a period of about six months. His time with Fénelon and its duration is of some debate, but he appears to have lived in Fénelon's household for a period of about three years, leaving in 1714. A letter dated 20th March 1714 shows that he was already established in Blois and living with Madame Guyon, another of Poiret's correspondents.⁴⁴ The problem of Ramsay's stay at Cambrai arises from the uncertainty of his departure which may indeed be before 1714. It was assumed by many biographers of Fénelon that he lived with the Archbishop until shortly before his death on 7th January 1715, an assumption Ramsay appears to have cultivated in his *Historie de la Vie de Fénelon* (chez les Freres Vaillant, Le Haye, 1723) with his description of Fénelon's death as if he were present. While at Blois, Ramsay acted as Madame Guyon's secretary, translating her correspondence from English into French and vice versa. At this point Ramsay still maintained a healthy correspondence of his own with the Garden Circle, who were devotees of their "NM" (*Notre mère*), as they referred to Guyon.⁴⁵ Ramsay appears to have left Guyon's service towards the end of 1716 to become the governor to the son of the comte

⁴³ I can find no record in Fénelon's extensive correspondence of any introduction of Ramsay by Poiret or the Garden Circle. Indeed, Fénelon does not mention Ramsay at all in any of his correspondence.

⁴⁴ *Mystics of the North-East*, Ed. G.D. Henderson (The Third Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1934), 53.

⁴⁵ Ramsay to Lord Deskford, (13 de Mars 1715), in *Mystics of the North-East*, 96.

Ismidon-René de Sassenage (1670-1730), a soldier,⁴⁶ although he did return to be by her side at her death on June 9th 1717.

At some point between the deaths of Fénelon and Madame Guyon in 1716 Ramsay wrote *A Discourse upon Epick Poetry, and the Excellence of the Poem Telemachus*. The work was well liked by the Marquis de Fénelon (1688-1746), the Archbishop's great-nephew, who employed Ramsay in the task as editor of his uncle's papers. With a younger nephew of Fénelon's the abbé de Fénelon, Ramsay began to edit *Télémaque* and by 1717 an extended and corrected two volume edition was published containing Ramsay's *Discourse* and the *Preface* by him. In the following year Ramsay and the abbé de Fénelon went on to publish a further six works including the *Dialogues des Morts*. Ramsay then wrote the *Essay de Politique* (1719) which was expanded into a second edition *Essay philosophique sur les gouvernement civil* (1721). The latter edition was translated in 1722 into English by Nathaniel Hooke (1664-1738), a member of the Garden Circle who translated a number of works including Ramsay's *Vie de Fénelon* with a view to publish ideas associated with Mysticism and a number of Mystics.⁴⁷ Hooke was a member of the Garden Circle and associate of Ramsay's who translated several of Ramsay's works into English. The *Essay* which claimed to be based on the political principles of Fénelon⁴⁸ was accepted unquestionably by a public that were starved of any political works from Fénelon other than *Télémaque*. Ramsay's association with Fénelon strengthened the belief that the work was either Fénelon's or based on his political principles, especially as Ramsay had stayed with the prelate. This belief was augmented and guaranteed by the publication of his *Vie de Fénelon*

⁴⁶ Ramsay, *Anecdotes*, 14-16.

⁴⁷ Patrick Campbell of Monzie to Lord Deskford, (15th May 1722), *Mystics of the North-East*, (ed. Henderson), 177-78. For a discussion of Hooke as the translator of Ramsay's work – and nephew of the Maréchal Nathaniel Hooke, a Jacobite who served with distinction in the French army - see Thomas O'Connor, *An Irish Theologian in Enlightenment France: Luke Joseph Hooke 1714-96* (Four Courts Press, Dublin, 1995).

⁴⁸ Ramsay, *Anecdotes*, 17.

in 1723,⁴⁹ in which Ramsay depicted a strong bond between the two men. As will be discussed below the work is rather curious, and Fénelon features rather oddly as an almost peripheral figure. It focuses on Ramsay's own conversion by Fénelon, the plight of Madame Guyon, the Quietism Affair and promoted the cause of James Francis Edward Stuart (the 'Old Pretender') rather than Fénelon's life. The *Vie* was effectively a life of Fénelon that contained little of his life. An important point of interest was Ramsay's inclusion of James Stuart in the *Vie* as Ramsay used the biography to link Fénelon and James with the *Essay* and thereby the legacy of Fénelon to promote James' claim to the English throne.

Ramsay's involvement in the Jacobite cause provided him with his next opportunity of employment when his work with the comte de Sassenage ended in September 1722.⁵⁰ The following year his role as editor was terminated when the Marquis de Fénelon dismissed him, apparently incensed by the lack the of the dead archbishop's real character in the *Vie*. Ramsay's Jacobite friends arranged a pension from the abbé de Signy, and he was appointed a chevalier of the *ordre de Saint-Lazare* on 20th May 1723. The Order of Saint Lazarus of Jerusalem was a Catholic award for chivalry created in the twelfth century Crusades in defence of the faith. Ramsay's title was elevated to that of baronet in 1735 through his marriage to the undersecretary to James Stuart, Sir David Nairne's daughter Marie. The award of this title was partly made possible by the Duke of Mar (1675-1732), who allowed Ramsay to claim descent from his family. This acquaintance and that with George Granville, Lord Lansdowne and Jacobite Duke of Albermarle (1666-1735), politician and writer, proved to be again beneficial when in December 1723 Ramsay was awarded the role of tutor to the young prince Charles Edward Stuart (1720-88) in Rome. As will be shown below, this

⁴⁹ The *Vie de Fénelon* was also translated by Nathaniel Hooke into English (*The Life of Fénelon*) in the same year and published in London.

⁵⁰ Ramsay, *Anecdotes*, 16.

proved to be an extremely unhappy period for Ramsay and he left the court in early 1724, never to return to the royal household.

Ramsay followed his Jacobite disappointments by embarking upon a literary career and he became a member of the *Club de l'Entresol* in Paris. The *Entresol* contained members such as Montesquieu (1689-1755), the abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743), Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751), and was committed to the idea of reforming France from absolutism at times taking its inspiration from Fénelon.⁵¹ While a member of the *Entresol* Ramsay published *Les voyages de Cyrus* (1727), which was dedicated to his new patron the Duc de Sully and translated into English by Hooke. The work proved to be hugely successful across Europe. The work however, had to be quickly republished with amendments in 1728 due to accusations of plagiarism made in *A Supplement to the New Cyropaedia*.⁵² This work made a series of allegations about Ramsay and his *Cyrus*, ranging from the more serious allegations of plagiarism and his poor knowledge of the classics and Latin, to a disgust at his poor writing style. As had been noted by a number of biographers, *Cyrus* bore a resemblance in style, method, content, and tone of Fénelon. The art historian and man of letters Horace Walpole wrote in *Walpoliana*, '[t]he Travels of Cyrus had their vogue, though a feeble imitation of Telemaque; and nothing can be more insipid or foreign to such a book, than the distilled nonsense concerning the trinity.'⁵³ Yet for the author of the *Supplement* it was more than emulation: 'While we were at Tyre, a Book fell into my Hands, intituled, *The Adventures*

⁵¹ Nick Childs, *A Political academy in Paris, 1724-1731* (Voltaire Foundation, Oxford, 2000), 147-48.

⁵² This English edition published in London in 1729, translates the *Suite de la Nouvelle Ciropédie* and *Entretiens sur les voyages de Cyrus*, and the second part has a separate title page: *The second criticism upon Mr. Ramsay's Cyropaedia*, and separate pagination and register; the running title is: *Conversations upon the Travels of Cyrus*. The manuscript (found in the British Library) was anonymous, but in *La France Littéraire, ou Dictionnaire Bibliographique*, J-M Quérard attributed the work to P. F. Guyot Desfontaines and F. Granet, (page 449, Volume 7).

⁵³ Horace Walpole, *Walpoliana* (London, 1799), Volume 1, 136. The criticism of the work as a pale imitation of Fénelon's *Télémaque* started with contemporaries such as Francis Atterbury, and was continued by Horace Walpole and later biographers such as Cardinal Bausset, *The Life of Fénelon* (Volume I, page 326), and G.D. Henderson, *Chevalier Ramsay*, (page 114).

of *Telemachus*, where I met with that fine Discourse almost Word for Word.’⁵⁴ Ramsay was also accused of using passages from Ralph Cudworth’s *Intellectual System of the Universe* (1678). However, more surprisingly to contemporaries he was shown to have used over a dozen entire pages of Bossuet’s *L’Histoire Universelle* (1681)⁵⁵ verbatim: ‘he has such a veneration, that he has thought fit to fill fourteen pages of his Book with one of the finest passages in that History, almost without Variation.’⁵⁶ While the accusations meant that the offending pages were excised from the work, they did little to diminish from its success or the fame of its author. In 1729 Ramsay was elected a fellow of the Royal Society in London, and in the following year he became a member of the Gentleman’s Society at Spalding (which had Newton and Alexander Pope as members), and on the 10th April he went to Oxford to receive a degree of Doctor of Civil Law from William King, largely through the success of *Cyrus*.

In Ramsay’s later years he became the tutor to the Duke of Sully’s family and lived with them at Andresy and then Pontoise.⁵⁷ He corresponded widely with figures such as Montesquieu, Swift and Hume and continued to publish, writing the *Histoire du vicomte de Turenne* in 1735, a history of an illustrious member of his employer’s family.⁵⁸ Like other Jacobites in France he became an active freemason in the Lodge of St Thomas and wrote *A Discourse Pronounced at the Reception of Freemasons* (1737). After his marriage to Marie Nairne in 1735 he moved to St Germain-en-Laye where he died on 6th May 1743 and was buried in its parish church. On his deathbed he dictated his *Anecdotes* to his wife, but left his

⁵⁴ Anonymous, *A Supplement to the New Cyropaedia* (London, 1729), 111.

⁵⁵ See appendix of the above *Supplement*. As will be discussed in the ‘Political Fénelon’ chapter Bossuet, the Bishop of Meaux, was the nemesis of Fénelon. Fénelon began as Bossuet’s protégé and became his friend but they were estranged due to Fénelon’s involvement in mysticism. Bossuet’s friendship turned to enmity and he appears to have focused his energies on ruining Fénelon and his position in the Church in what was called the Quietism Affair. The result was Fénelon’s effective banishment to Cambrai which was a less severe punishment than Bossuet had hoped for.

⁵⁶ *A Supplement to the New Cyropaedia*, Part II, 82.

⁵⁷ Ramsay, *Anecdotes*, 19.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 20.

great work unpublished, *The Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion*. The work which reflected Ramsay's primary interest in Natural Philosophy, was published by the Foulis Brothers of Glasgow (1748-9). It expressed many of the ideas within *Cyrus* while attempting to reconcile Newton's ideas with his own philosophy, and revealed his deep interest held in the nature of religion.

Ramsay's Association with Fénelon

While Ramsay's association with Fénelon began in August 1710 at Cambrai it is perhaps more accurate to place it on June 9th 1717 in Blois at the death of Madame Guyon. For it was the death of Guyon and Ramsay's subsequent feud with Pierre Poiret over the right to write a biography of her that propelled Ramsay's energies toward the memory of Fénelon. Ramsay had written his *Discourse on Epic Poetry* at some point in 1716, and had been presented with the role of editor of *Télémaque* by June of that year. Ramsay's role as editor is revealed in a letter to Lord Deskford from the Marquis de Fénelon, in which he writes, '*R[amsay] y a fait une preface qui est un chef d'oeuvre de l'esprit, et du Coeur, et qui sera un grand ornement pour Telemaque.*'⁵⁹ Moreover, in the latter part of 1716 Ramsay sent Lord Deskford some of Fénelon's manuscripts (on the Church), yet by July of 1717 he had still not sent the Garden Circle the promised manuscripts of *Télémaque* via (the Jacobite) James Forbes. In his struggle with Poiret to write the biography of Guyon Ramsay was zealously and jealously guarding the very fresh legacy of Madame Guyon while apparently working on Fénelon's. A number of letters to the Garden Circle from Ramsay inform them of her death as a witness to

⁵⁹ Marquis de Fénelon to Lord Deskford, (June 3rd 1716), *Mystics of the North-East*, 126. Ramsay personally wrote to Lord Deskford on January 1st 1717 to inform him of this honour, and that he will also write the *Preface* to the work, (*Mystics*, pp. 136-7).

her passing, likening it to ‘*Jesus crucifié*.’⁶⁰ From the time of her death Ramsay went to extraordinary lengths to prevent Poiret from being successful in the publication of his work. Ramsay’s attempts were discussed by the Garden Circle, and Dr James Keith made known in a letter to Lord Deskford his discomfort:

This last period brings to my mind what perhaps your Lop has not yet heard of, namely the very strong opposition that is made by A.R. [Ramsay] with all the other friends in Fr[ance] against Mr P’s [Poiret] printing and publishing that most valuable Life at this time, and in order to hinder him from doing it, they have represented the copy wch he has as defective and imperfect, and therefore have desir’d him to return it to them to be corrected by one wch they call more perfect. R[amsay] has written several letters (by their order as he says) to Mr P[oiret] himself, to D.G. [George Garden] and to us here, to this purpose, wch is highly suprising to us all, and the more that he himself transcrib’d that very copy wch Mr P. Has, and sent it to him by N.M.’s [Madame Guyon] express order (having first carefully revis’d and corrected it herself) to be published after her death. But the good old man refuses to give it up and resolves to be faithful to the trust reposed in him. They on the other hand have they say strong reasons for delaying it, but do not say what they are.⁶¹

Despite Ramsay’s vigorous attempts to stall and disrupt Poiret he proved to be unsuccessful, and Poiret published his biography of her life with some of her unpublished works in that year. Yet despite his disappointment Ramsay appears to have rapidly turned his focus away from Madame Guyon and back to Fénelon. By 1718 he and the abbé de Fénelon had worked on the publication of six works, and there had been an announcement of his intention to publish the *Essay de Politique* in the *Nouvelles Littéraires*, viii.⁶²

Ramsay’s editing of the work of Fénelon could be described as hagiographical. The adoring tone towards Fénelon was set in the *Discourse on Epic Poetry* and within his eulogy to Lord Deskford:

⁶⁰ Dr James Keith in a letter to Lord Deskford (July 2nd 1717), *Mystics of the North-East*, 145. Keith quoting Ramsay.

⁶¹ Dr. James Keith to Lord Deskford, (September 10th 1717), *Mystics of the North-East*, 149. In a letter from Keith to Deskford in May 1723 Keith discloses his displeasure at Ramsay’s desire to include a letter in the *Vie de Fénelon* attacking Poiret as a false biographer of Guyon, pp. 189-90 (*Mystics*).

⁶² See Albert Chérel, *Fénelon au XVIII^e Siècle*, 631. I have been unable to find this notification elsewhere.

*C'étoit le plus grand et le plus petit des hommes. Tout ce que le monde admiroit en luy n'étoit qu'un voile pour le cacher des yeux des hommes. Tout ce que les âmes pieuses condamnoient en luy étoit l'effet de la plus pure abnegation. De manière qu'il étoit également caché et des profanes et des dévots, et encore plus de luy-même. Je sens à present que pour un père que j'ay perdu sur terre j'ay gagné un protecteur dans le ciel. Les sens et l'imagination ont perdu leur objet, mais mon coeur le trouve dans notre centre commun.*⁶³

While these sentiments may well have been genuinely felt by Ramsay, they also appear to have impacted on his role as editor for his objectivity appears to have been clouded by having the opportunity to have known a great man. Chancellor D'Aguesseau said of Fénelon's character that: "He was a man who always appeared to have just as much mind as the persons he might be conversing with; he stooped to their level, but without appearing to do it; this put them at their ease, and excited in them a lively sentiment of delight, so that they could neither quit him, nor, when absent, help returning to his company."⁶⁴ Over the period of time he spent at Cambrai Ramsay seemed to have become awe-struck by Fénelon, and after Fénelon's death his *Anecdotes* intimate a closeness with the Archbishop.⁶⁵ This closeness does appear to have been one-sided as Fénelon did not mention Ramsay in any of his own voluminous correspondence which included an expansive range of people. Whatever their relationship, Ramsay appears to have developed a zealous protectiveness over the legacy of the Archbishop – as he did with Guyon – and his editorial responsibilities and feelings for Fénelon combined to create his own version of the prelate.

Ramsay's adulatory attitude and zealous involvement and placement of himself in Fénelon's life was manifest in the *Vie de Fénelon* (1723). As mentioned, it is an unusual work that contains a great deal of material on people other than Fénelon; notably Ramsay and Madame Guyon. The work provided Ramsay with an opportunity to answer Poiret's

⁶³ Andrew-Michael Ramsay to Lord Deskford, (13th March 1715), *Mystics of the North-East*, 96.

⁶⁴ Henri François d'Aguesseau (1668-1751), Chancellor of France. For the quote see Cardinal Bausset's *Life of Fénelon*, Volume I, 54.

⁶⁵ Ramsay, *Anecdotes*, 11-17.

biography of Guyon as he described her relationship with Fénelon and their struggles against Bossuet in the Quietism Affair.⁶⁶ The consequences of the Affair saw Fénelon exiled from Paris to Cambrai and removed from the presence of his pupil the Duc de Bourgogne (Louis XIV's grandson). Fénelon was portrayed as a saint by Ramsay, bearing all he was subjected to without objection.⁶⁷ A man who aided the injured from both sides of the conflict in the War of Spanish Succession (1701-14),⁶⁸ who welcomed many individuals who came to visit him due to his fame for charity and toleration, who entertained princes from across Europe, including James Stuart. Yet Fénelon still found time to converse with the most humble of his parishioners despite such an elevated status. Crucially, he also found the time to converse with and convert Ramsay to Catholicism: 'It was thus that *Monsieur de Cambray* made me see, that a sober thinking Deist must of Necessity become Christian, and that a Christian cannot reason philosophically without becoming Catholic.'⁶⁹ While the work contained certain aspects of Fénelon's life it was in many ways not about him as the work contained a great deal of material about other people. It was clearly an opportunity to discuss Madame Guyon⁷⁰ and write his own small biography of her but more importantly it provided Ramsay with an opportunity to describe his relationship with the prelate.

The view of the *Vie* as a eulogy of Fénelon has important consequences for the legacy of Fénelon.⁷¹ Ramsay's *Vie de Fénelon* created a view of Fénelon that was replicated for two centuries and in some sense is still extant today. As has been argued this may have been an overly enthusiastic hero-worship of his subject or through the hope of wanting him to believe as he did.⁷² It enabled Ramsay to intimately inculcate himself into the legacy of Fénelon.

⁶⁶ For an account of the Quietism Affair see 'The Political Fénelon' chapter, pages 105-8.

⁶⁷ Ramsay, *Life of Fénelon*, 247.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 278.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 247.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 73-74.

⁷¹ This view of Ramsay's hagiographical depiction of Fénelon can also be found in Paul Janet's *Fénelon: His Life and Work*, 150, and G.D. Henderson's *Chevalier Ramsay*, 82.

⁷² Henderson, *Chevalier Ramsay*, 82.

However, there was also a large element of Ramsay using the legacy of Fénelon for his own personal gain. A connection with Fénelon may be something that many would use to their advantage, but Ramsay also used the *Vie* to artificially place himself very prominently in Fénelon's life. Furthermore, Ramsay used the *Vie* to corroborate the political principles ostensibly from Fénelon that he espoused in the *Essay de Politique* to promote the Jacobite cause.⁷³ This served Ramsay's interests personally, for at the time that he was writing the *Essay* and then the *Vie* he had become more involved with the Jacobite cause and court. He was eventually introduced to James Stuart in 1723 mainly through his connection to Fénelon, and his work on the *Essay* and *Vie* helped Ramsay secure a pension, a title, and employment: James had a fondness for Fénelon and had sought him out at Cambrai in 1709. An episode that Ramsay recounted in the *Vie* in which he vividly depicted Fénelon's approval of James' plight and cause. Yet, it was an episode that Ramsay could not have witnessed as he did not arrive at Cambrai until the following year. This highlights the problem of Ramsay's involvement in the legacy of Fénelon and his intentions towards that legacy. For while there is much ambiguity there also appears to be deception. The ambiguity of intent is possibly best summed up by Ramsay himself: 'I shall make use, as far as I am able, of his own Words, and shall only perfect what he has written, by what I have had from his own Mouth. 'Tis no improper Digression to relate his Way of thinking, while I am writing the History of his Life.'⁷⁴

Regardless of Ramsay's intention towards the legacy of Fénelon the result was that his employment as editor of his papers was terminated by the Marquis de Fénelon. The Marquis was apparently outraged at the depiction of his uncle in the work, a depiction he found to be

⁷³ As will be demonstrated in the 'Ramsay's Jacobitism' chapter, his Jacobitism was more overt in the second edition of 1721 notably due to its dedication to James Stuart. This revised edition was written shortly before the *Vie*.

⁷⁴ Ramsay, *Life of Fénelon*, 249.

completely divorced from the reality of the man.⁷⁵ There was further dissatisfaction at Ramsay's role in the *Vie* itself. The Fénelon family commissioned the historian and biographer Prosper Marchand in 1734 to write an accurate biography of the Archbishop using all of his papers, something that Ramsay did not have. Yet, as Cherel pointed out it was too late: '*Je commence par Ramsay, car c'est lui qui s'est d'abord chargé de présenter Fénelon au siècle nouveau: il a composé son Histoire dix ans avant que le marquis écrit sa Vie; et la Vie, comme nous le verrons, a été destinée par le marquis à compléter ou à corriger l'Histoire.*'⁷⁶ With the exception of Cardinal Bausset who had access to all of Fénelon's papers for his *Life of Fénelon* (1809), nearly all other biographers until Paul Janet in 1892 accepted Ramsay's view of Fénelon.⁷⁷ Ramsay had therefore managed to create an interpretation of his Fénelon that was subsequently used by a succession of biographers for over one hundred and fifty years, and accepted predominantly without question due to his association with him. The obvious result for this acceptance was that a view of Fénelon was promulgated that was not accepted by his family or close associates, and a view of his work that was not accurate. The *Vie* made Fénelon famous for his toleration and spiritual piety, yet in so doing it hid his political views and behaviour. Furthermore, it made Ramsay's *Essay* and his apparent use of Fénelon's political principles for a Jacobite cause – supported by the *Vie* – the embodiment of a spurious Fénelonian political philosophy.

⁷⁵ G.D. Henderson, *Chevalier Ramsay*, 67. This claim is supported by the production of Marchand's work by the Fénelon family and will be discussed in Chapter Two..

⁷⁶ Albert Cherel, *Fénelon au XVIIIe Siècle en France (1715-1820): Son Prestige – Son Influence*, 31.

⁷⁷ Biographies on Fénelon, such as by d'Alembert and William Henry Melmoth (London, 1770), John Kendall (London, 1797), Charles Butler (Philip H. Nicklin & Co., Baltimore, 1810), and Henrietta Louisa Lear (London, 1877) simply repeat Ramsay's *Vie*.

Ramsay and the Jacobites

Ramsay's association with the Jacobites dated back to his time in London in 1709. Yet rather like the beginning of his fateful relationship with the legacy of Fénelon, his Jacobite affiliations appear to have become far more involved after the death of Madame Guyon. Ramsay already had made a number of Jacobite contacts such as Alexander Forbes, Lord Pitsligo (1678-1762) from within the Garden Circle, but from 1717 it becomes clear that he associated with leading figures within the movement. As will be discussed, Ramsay was particularly friendly with the Earl of Mar and it is known that Mar was in Paris during October of 1717. Mar rather indiscreetly discussed with Jacobite sympathizers the potential of a Spanish-aided uprising in 1719.⁷⁸ One can only speculate as to Ramsay's attendance or knowledge of these meetings, but it would be easy to hypothesize that the notion of an impending uprising well may have been the catalyst for his *Essay de Politique*, announced within a few months and published in 1719. His introduction into Jacobite circles started with his move to Paris as tutor to the son of the comte de Sassenage. Ramsay was befriended by an English Benedictine Thomas Southcott (1678-1748), and Father Lewis Innes (1651-1738) from the Scots College. Together with Southcott Ramsay managed to muster up support in France to attack a British tax imposed on Catholics. Ramsay successfully lobbied the bishop of Fréjus, later Cardinal Fleury (1653-1743) and a disciple of Fénelon, to protest to Walpole about his tax's high rate. Ramsay's zeal and ability to make contacts impressed the Jacobite court. In a letter to James Stuart, Southcott writes that, 'He [Ramsay] has certainly a great deal of merit himself and it were a pity he should not continue to improve his

⁷⁸ Henrietta Tayler, *The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719*, 9. The work includes a brief introduction by Tayler but is predominantly a collection of Jacobite letters and a manuscript (memoir) written by Pitsligo on the Jacobite court in Rome and dated September 16th 1720.

talents which sooner or later cannot fail of being one way or another employed.’⁷⁹ The date of 1722 for this letter is interesting. Firstly it shows that Ramsay had not met James at this point despite his claim in the *Vie* to have met him at Cambrai in 1709. Secondly, it was written after the release of both editions of the *Essay*, and would perhaps imply that his ‘talents’ had not been overly successful in the field of governmental theory.

It was in part due to his political theory, in part his ability to network and in part through his connection to Fénelon that Ramsay finally obtained an audience with James.⁸⁰ The first edition of the *Essay* had been released in 1719 which coincided with the Jacobite uprising of that year, and the second edition of the *Essay* was released in 1721 and coincided with the potential Atterbury Plot (1722). The 1719 Rising (‘The Nineteen’) was funded by the Spanish king’s minister Cardinal Alberoni who paid for 5000 soldiers on twenty seven ships to land in England. This failed due to bad weather dispersing the ships, and two frigates that landed in Scotland could only muster tepid support for James. The Atterbury Plot was named after Francis Atterbury (1663-1732) bishop of Rochester, who became a Jacobite sympathizer through his loyalty to what he perceived to be the true line of succession of the English (British) crown. The failed Plot involved the idea of capturing the Hanoverian royal family and placing James on the throne. Atterbury’s refusal to sign a pledge to the Protestant line of succession in 1715 and his pamphleteering ensured his arrest and several months incarceration in the Tower of London.

The second edition, dedicated to James, was more overtly supportive of Jacobitism and James’ legal and divine claim and right to the English throne through its attack on contract

⁷⁹ Southcott to James, (16th November 1722), Pauline McLynn “Factionalism among the Exiles in France: The Case of the Chevalier Ramsay and Bishop Atterbury” (Huntingdon, The Royal Stuart Society, 1989. The Royal Stuart Papers XXXIII), 3.

⁸⁰ According to Henderson’s *Chevalier Ramsay* (page 87), attempts had been made as early as 1720 by Lord Lansdowne to place Ramsay in the sight of James.

theory. This was followed in 1723 by the dedication of the *Vie de Fénelon* to James also, of which James received copies, and in which Ramsay pledges his loyalty: ‘*Au Roy de Grande-Bretagne. Sire, c’est par les malheurs soutenus avec courage & vertu, que se forment les Héros.*’⁸¹ Importantly, the French edition of the *Vie* also contained a letter – removed from the English *Life* – by Fénelon discussing James. The letter was used by Ramsay as a recommendation of James’s character by Fénelon. A stamp of approval for a usurped prince and of his aims to reclaim his rightful lands, as the *Vie* placed James in the role of Telemachus: a prince without his crown. Yet in reality Fénelon merely offered him words of comfort and praises his religious sensibilities.⁸² Consequently, the use of Fénelon for Jacobite means and his relationship with the Archbishop appears to have ensured that Ramsay was received by James at Saint Germain-en-Laye.

After his dismissal as the editor of the works and papers of Fénelon in 1723, Ramsay seems to have been taken into the bosom of the Jacobite court. He received his peerage and a pension in 1723 and was offered the role of tutor to the young prince Charles at Rome. This proved to be a disastrous experience for Ramsay. Ramsay had already nurtured his ‘most significant rapport’ with the Earl of Mar,⁸³ and had also become strongly attached to Lord Lansdowne and General Dillon. These three men had formed ‘The Triumvirate’ around James in the Jacobite leadership, but by the time Ramsay went to Rome they lacked influence and men such as James Murray (1690-1770) and John Hay (1691-1740) had become pivotal figures at court. Mar was in fact viewed as a dangerous buffoon at court, and both Hay and Murray were aggressively attempting to replace him as James’ Chief Minister. The former Tory minister had joined the Jacobites in 1715 after George I rejected his advances and

⁸¹ Ramsay, *Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, Preface (i).

⁸² March 1709, *Correspondance de Fénelon, Tome 14*, ed. Jacques Le Brun & Irénée Noye (Librarie Droz, Genève, 1976 - 1999), 134-36

⁸³ Pauline McLynn, “Factionalism among the Exiles in France: The case of Chevalier Ramsay and Bishop Atterbury,” 2.

refused to receive his loyal address. His answer was to march to Scotland to lead the 1715 uprising where he, ‘proceeded to waste both his master’s money and every opportunity for success in the most deplorable fashion.’⁸⁴ His later insipid involvement in the uprisings of 1719 and 1721 were viewed as deeply suspicious with some justification. For, while Mar’s visit to Paris in 1717 was to ostensibly drum up funds and support for the Jacobite cause he actually met with Lord Stair (1673-1747), the former soldier and diplomat, in an attempt at his own reconciliation with the British government.⁸⁵ Indeed, during the period between 1717 and 1724 Mar was working as a double-agent for the British government. While informing the Jacobites and James he was negotiating with the government, he was in fact attempting to aid himself and return to Britain by providing information on the Jacobites.

The involvement of Mar in the Jacobite court was seen as a reflection of James’ poor Stuart judgement and a general ineptitude of the Jacobites and their organization. By the time that Ramsay arrived in Rome the court was a hotbed of intrigue and in-fighting. In his 1719 manuscript *Pitsligo* depicts a court that was shambolic, toxic, filled with ‘Quarrels and Humours.’⁸⁶ The court was made up of disunited band of people headed by a vacillating leader who ‘saw the finger of fate ...against him,’ and who was ‘(with somewhat excessive resignation) inclined to abandon all hope.’⁸⁷ The court consisted of a few loyal old (noble) families but many such as Mar, Murray and even Bolingbroke were Jacobites through disaffection.⁸⁸ In their cases, their political careers had been ended by the Hanovers, and much of their involvement in the Jacobite cause was self-serving. Many of those who joined the Jacobite cause held either anti-English or British sympathies or to be more exact, held

⁸⁴ *Pitsligo Manuscript, Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719*, 10.

⁸⁵ On Mar’s activities see E. Gregg, ‘The Jacobite career of John, Earl of Mar’, *Ideology and conspiracy: aspects of Jacobitism, 1689–1759*, Ed. E. Cruickshanks (John Donald Publishers Ltd., Edinburgh, 1982), 179–200.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 89.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 9.

⁸⁸ For a discussion of the Jacobite supporters and their theory see the following chapter.

anti-Whig sympathies. Jacobitism gave people who held opposing views a figurehead with which to attack Whig supremacy and the sweeping reforms enacted throughout Britain.⁸⁹ Yet despite this crucible of disaffection Pitsligo reveals the unrealistic optimism of the court at James' hopes when he writes in 1719 to Mar that 'much of the expectations of ...happiness after his restoration.'⁹⁰ The machinations of Murray and Hay and their fight for control over James and the direction of the court were played out against a back-drop of a delusional court separated from its home and the reality of their plight. Individuals continued to inform James that he would one day return to his rightful throne for their own gain and advancement, while any opportunity of this success had long since died.

It was into this crucible that Ramsay, known for his close association with Mar, entered Rome to be the tutor to the young prince. Before he had arrived at the court some courtiers were already deeply suspicious of his appointment, notably Murray. Murray appeared to have passed on these doubts to James, for in a letter to Hay James writes, 'I have stopped literal Ramsay's journey till further order. There is something looks odd as to that affair, which I will see clear through before I engage him, though I should be sorry if I could not make a pedagogue of him, for I know not where I shall find another.'⁹¹ In a return letter Hay soothes James' fears by claiming that Ramsay's connection to Mar could have little effect as the prince was only three years of age, and that the prince required a first class tutor. The words of Hay appear to have calmed the fears of James and he was reinstated as the prince's tutor. Ramsay's recommendation as a tutor stems from his relationship with Fénelon who tutored the grandsons of Louis XIV, and in turn Ramsay's work with the Sassenage family.

⁸⁹ See *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1680-1759*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks.

⁹⁰ Pitsligo to Mar (April 1st 1719), *The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719*, 167.

⁹¹ James to Hay, (4th October 1724), "Factionalism among the Exiles in France," 3.

Unfortunately, the suspicions of his connection with Mar appear to have been well-founded and it was ‘abundantly clear that Ramsay acted the part of Mar’s “eyes and ears.”’⁹²

Within a few months of his arrival Ramsay was encircled at Rome. He had upset James and could no longer aid Mar as his “eyes and ears.” His dire situation became untenable after an argument with a Scots Jacobite, Forster. The resultant fight saw Forster first stab Ramsay with an épée and then Ramsay disarm Forster before being prevented from running his assailant through by Hay and others. James was apparently scandalized by the incident and it had to be covered up.⁹³ In juxtaposition with Atterbury’s attacks on Mar in Paris and information passed to Hay by Atterbury, Ramsay the ‘spy’ was no longer wanted in Rome. Ramsay asked James’ permission to leave Rome, and while James was initially reticent a deluge of negative information from members of the court persuaded him to allow Ramsay to leave with 100 guineas. He returned to Paris in the following February amid accusations that he had been dismissed, which provoked Ramsay to write to James to ask to return, however James found this to be impertinent. James wrote to Fleury that Ramsay was ‘*un esprit tracasseur et superficiel, occupé de lui-même*’ possessing neither ‘*les solides principes et maxims de la véritable morale de la bonne politique*.’⁹⁴ In a later, more circumspect frame of mind he wrote: ‘Ramsay is an odd body. He exposed himself strangely here to myself and many others, but as yet I will be charitable enough to think him a madd man.’⁹⁵

⁹² McLynn, “Factionalism among the Exiles in France: The Case of the Chevalier Ramsay and Bishop Atterbury,” 4.

⁹³ PRO. SP Italian States (85) is f.99. A report by Philip Stosch a British spy codenamed “Walton” in which only Forster’s surname is provided (6th May 1724), “Factionalism among the Exiles in France,” 6.

⁹⁴ James to Fréjus, (25th March 1725), RA Stuart 81/ 26, “Factionalism among the Exiles in France,” 7.

⁹⁵ James to Murray (July 1725), *The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719*, 135.

Ramsay would seem to have had little success as a Jacobite. Even before becoming *persona non grata* within the court of Rome his talents as a writer and political theorist were already questioned. James wrote that, 'Ramsay is not to be anyways concerned in writing or politics. I know him well enough and shall be able to employ him according to his talents.'⁹⁶ Ramsay's *Essay* written three years before had therefore already been dismissed as an unsuccessful piece of Jacobite propaganda. This failure of Ramsay as a Jacobite and of the *Essay* as propaganda may actually be emphasized by the later success of *Cyrus*. In 1730 a Jacobite sympathizer Dr William King petitioned his University of Oxford to recognize the achievements of Ramsay as a man of letters and for the astounding success of *Cyrus*. Objections were raised to his award of an honorary doctorate as a Catholic, but these were overcome and Ramsay received his doctorate. In celebration of this achievement his *Essay upon Civil Government* was republished in 1732 so that it could be included in the renewed *pro* and *con* debates with other opposition works to Locke at Oxford. The works that were selected were deemed unthreatening by the Whig government which had been a harsh censor to many Jacobite works viewed as inflammatory or populist from the time of the Glorious Revolution (1689).⁹⁷ Ramsay's *Essay*, which had initially been published in Britain in 1722, was therefore already deemed safe enough for public consumption only a decade later. The *Essay* was neither subversive enough nor Jacobite enough to be of concern to the government, thereby symbolizing Ramsay's failure as a Jacobite and the lack of success of the *Essay* as a Jacobite work.

⁹⁶ James to Murray (3rd April 1724), *The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719*, 229.

⁹⁷ For a discussion of the *pro* and *con* debates at Oxford and the relaxation of censorship on some works under the Whig government see J.C.D. Clark's *English Society, 1688-1832* (Cambridge UP, 1985) 152-53, and Paul Kleber Monod's *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1799* (Cambridge UP, 1989), Chapter Eight.

II: Jacobitism in England and fear of the French, 1701-1722

In this chapter I will examine the rise and fall of the fear and potential threat felt of Jacobitism in the political literature.⁹⁸ After a discussion of the background and driving forces of the fear of Jacobitism I will discuss works from four distinct time periods: 1701, 1711, 1716, and 1722. These dates have been selected to enable a closer examination of the contemporary reaction to Jacobite activity and English (British) events up to that date. The year 1701 has been selected as it saw the Act of Settlement, and it was also the year of James II's death and the beginning of his son James Francis Edward's claim to the throne. 1711 was chosen as a time of a great activity in the political literature over concern with the security of the Act of Settlement over fears of the health of Queen Anne and a need to protect Protestantism and Parliament. 1716 reveals the point at which the Jacobite threat was no longer a real concern under James Stuart as George I had ascended to the throne (1714), the French had signed the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), and the Duke of Mar's 1715 invasion spectacularly failed: all allaying fears of Jacobitism. I will then discuss 1722 and the dearth of Jacobite material as the British focus moved away from fears over Jacobitism and the succession towards concerns such as commercial interest. The discussion of Jacobitism through these four periods covers the time from James Stuart's claim to the throne and the publication of the English translation of the second edition of Ramsay's *Essay*. Due to Ramsay's residency in France, the pretended influence of Fénelon upon the *Essay*, and the impact of the French on Jacobitism I will conclude the chapter with a discussion on French events and political theory between 1714 and 1721. A period of apparent introspection

⁹⁸ While the chapter title focuses on England and this will indeed be the general focus of the political literature in the chapter, it also refers to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland and theorists from all four countries. While Britain came into being through the Act of Union (1707) many theorists continued to refer to 'Britain' as 'England' and I will not necessarily distinguish between them unless specified.

during the Regency of Orléans (1715-23), that led to a belief in the need for the reform of Louis XIV's absolutist state and a (temporary) cessation in the pre-occupation with military aggrandizement. This serves a two-fold purpose. The first is to explain why the French posed less of a threat to Britain after the Treaty of Utrecht from its finalisation (1714) until the second French edition of Ramsay's *Essay*. The second purpose is to place Ramsay's *Essay* into both a French and British context in relation to the discussion of government and Jacobitism.

The Glorious Revolution of 1689 altered the English monarchical succession when James II's reign ended in favour of James' daughter Mary II and her husband (and James' nephew) William III. The ostensible reason for the need to change the succession was James II's overt Catholicism and preference for Catholics in key positions at Court. James II's propensity towards Catholicism and absolutist behaviour in government was brought to a head by his perceived abandonment of his crown as he fled his country upon the impending arrival of William of Orange and his troops at Torbay, who had arrived at the behest of Parliament.⁹⁹ The nature of this abandonment proved to be the source of Jacobitism and much of the disaffection that followed for arguably another seventy years,¹⁰⁰ but for the purpose of this chapter it will be argued the next thirty years. While many viewed the dropping of the Great Seal into the Thames by James (11th December 1688) and eventual escape to France (23rd December) as an abdication of his crown, others did not. The resultant activity of supporters of James II (and then his son) was referred to as Jacobitism from '*Jacobus*' the Latin for James. Due to the poor health of Queen Anne (1665-1714) and the death of her son the Duke

⁹⁹ For a detailed analysis of the reasons behind the events of the Glorious Revolution and the reforming behaviour of James II as monarch see Steve Pincus' *1688: A Modern Revolution* (Yale, 2009). Pincus argues that James wanted to aggressively follow the reforms of his cousin Louis XIV in Britain, and thereby follow a Gallican model of change that was absolutist, centralized in the king's favour and Catholic. Parliament and other members of the nobility desired to follow the Dutch example as a model for a modern government that focused on trade, greater freedom for Parliament, and was ultimately Protestant.

¹⁰⁰ For the longer term activity and implication of Jacobitism see Paul Kleber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989). Monod points to three distinct periods of Jacobitism under: James II, James Stuart (the 'Pretender'), and Charles Edward Stuart ('Bonnie Prince Charlie').

of Gloucester in 1700, William III secured the English crown under Protestant rule in the Act of Settlement (1701). The Act promoted the claim of the Protestant line of the royal family now to be found in Princess Sophia (1630-1714) of the House of Hanover and her heirs. The Stuart line and claim to the throne was to die with Queen Anne, thereby removing the threat to the English nation and their liberties from the Catholic Stuart princes.

Jacobitism at the beginning of the eighteenth-century under James Francis Edward Stuart (1688-1766) is hard to define. It has been described as having a 'near-mystical nature,' due to its belief that 'God was on their side' and would eventually restore them to their rightful throne.¹⁰¹ Their sanguinity led them to pursue a cause which has been viewed as doomed to futility, but which led to 'five rebellions, six near invasions, and innumerable scares.'¹⁰² The apparent futility of the cause had masked certain Jacobite achievements, notably the scholarship particularly among the non-jurors. The non-jurors, many of them high-church Anglicans who had refused to swear an oath of allegiance to William III and Mary II, propounded notions such as the divine right of kings and hereditary succession in their support of the cause of James II (1633-1701). Their achievements in Jacobite political literature were at its zenith between 1688 and 1701 as theorists and pamphleteers attempted to assist James II's right to the lost throne of England. This was followed by a second period (examined here) which attempted to assert the rights of his son James III, or the 'Pretender' as he was referred to in England. Such works, propaganda and efforts made by the Jacobites enabled them to haunt the English consciousness and instil fear in the government and the people. The Jacobites were therefore consequently more than 'a tiny fringe of extremists with no place in a world of Whig practicalities.'¹⁰³ The later historical scholarship on the

¹⁰¹ D. Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-14* (John Donald Publishers Ltd., Edinburgh, 1984), 1.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 2.

¹⁰³ J. C. D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion: State and society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Cambridge, 1986), 152.

Jacobites of the late 1970s and 1980s¹⁰⁴ no longer viewed Jacobitism as effete and argued that to some it offered an attractive alternative perhaps foiled only by Pretender's Catholicism.¹⁰⁵

The attraction of Jacobitism for some was that it offered a political alternative in Britain to the Whigs. Conversely, it afforded the Whig Ministry the opportunity to create a shapeless enemy with which to accuse their enemies, shadows to distract from their own unpopularity or as a stick with which to beat any individual or group that opposed the government or dissented against the Church.¹⁰⁶ Jacobite action and opposition was mainly plebeian in nature and reflected direct opposition to Whig suppression.¹⁰⁷ Rioting and brief bouts of popular support for Jacobitism in England were often a direct reaction to the Whig Ministry. The 'Pretender' thereby provided a figurehead in whom opposition groups or the disaffected could run to or hail as their champion. Within the tumult of such riots lies the key to Jacobitism: the fear that it engendered within the hearts and mind of the majority who did not actively oppose the government or the Succession. This fear was born from the Whigs creation of inner political enemies, from doubts over the legitimacy of the altered Succession, from a reaction to the overly-optimistic Jacobite propagandists, a fear of absolutism and Catholicism, and crucially the Jacobite association with the French.

The Jacobites' effectiveness stemmed from their ability to utilize propaganda and political theory in an attempt to state their cause and promote the rights of James Stuart. This Sisyphean task faced an immediate struggle as many opposing English theorists,

¹⁰⁴ A good example of this reassessment of the Jacobites can be found in the collected essays of *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689 -1759* (ed. Eveline Cruickshanks).

¹⁰⁵ J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1977), 104. For a description of James' refusal to convert to Protestantism with a view to a possible restoration in 1713 in his correspondence with the Tory Bolingbroke and Harley see J.H. & Margaret Shennan "The Protestant Succession in English Politics, April 1713-September 1715," *William III and Louis XIV*, Ed. Mark A. Thomson (Liverpool UP, 1968), 252-59; also G. H. Jones, *The Main Stream of Jacobitism* (Harvard, 1954), 94-95.

¹⁰⁶ Nicholas Rogers, "Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England" in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689 -1759*, (ed. Eveline Cruickshanks), 70.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 74.

pamphleteers, and the wider public genuinely believed James Stuart to be illegitimate and a ‘pretender’ to the crown. The general belief in James Stuart’s illegitimacy was expressed by Sir Thomas Burnet in *Some New Proofs, By which it appears that the Pretender is truly James the Third* (1713). Initial doubts originated from the fortuitousness of James II managing to produce a male heir on the 10th June 1688 when his throne was under threat. Burnett, claiming to rely on eyewitnesses, stated that the Queen had actually miscarried at Easter before James’ birth in June. While witnesses present at the birth heard the Queen cry-out in pain, no one saw the child, and only a ‘Mrs Pearse’ saw the ‘Marks of Delivery.’ Furthermore, it was believed that the Queen had miscarried at Easter and a replacement child was found for the birth. Witnesses again claimed that this child had also died three to four weeks after the birth through illness and was also replaced. Leading Burnett to claim that ‘the Pretender is *James the Third*; or to put it more plain, that this is the Third Pretended *James*,’ thereby having ‘neither an Hereditary nor Divine Right to this Crown.’¹⁰⁸ While Burnett offered more detail than most, this account was not unique and can be found in Defoe and William Wake for example, (see below). It reflected a very strongly held belief that James Stuart was not the true son of James II extant in England, and that he was in fact a Catholic imposter.

These claims of illegitimacy were so damaging to the Jacobite cause that the non-juring theorist and Bishop of Thetford George Hickes (1642-1715), attempted to dispel such attacks by citing *Notorium Praesumptionis*. Quoting Calvin’s *Lexicon Juridicum*¹⁰⁹ Hickes stated that *Notorium Praesumptionis*:

¹⁰⁸ Sir Thomas Burnet, *Some New Proofs, By which it appears that the Pretender is truly James the Third* (London, 1713), 24.

¹⁰⁹ George Hickes, *Some Queries propos’d to Civil, Canon, and Common Lawyers* (London, 1712). Hickes’ use of Calvin to provide weight to his argument was born from an understanding that politicians of both Houses and both sides of Parliament would have read this work in relation to 1689. See T. P. Slaughter, “‘Abdicate’ and ‘Contract’ in the Glorious Revolution,” in *The Historical Journal* (1981), 24, Cambridge UP, 323-337.

[I]s what the Law does *vehemently presume to be true*, without requiring *proof*; as that a Father is Father to such a Son, and such a Son the *Son* to such a *Father*: In which case no other proof is required but *Presumptions* or *Conjectures*. For it cannot be truly nor properly proved that this is the *Son* of that *Man*; from whence it is taken for granted that he is the *Son* who is born in *Wedlock*. For if a *Husband* and his *Wife* educate a Child, and say he is their Son; then he is *presumed to be their Son*. Therefore *Notorium Praesumptionis* is the Evidence of a thing which the Law *presumes to be true*.¹¹⁰

Yet such attempts as Hickes' did not dispel the doubts over James' paternity and claim to the throne. The Archbishop of Canterbury William Wake claimed that the Stuarts had taken a resolution to 'have a *Prince of Wales*; to perpetuate our Misfortunes; and to continue Us under that Tyranny of *Popery*, and *Arbitrary Power*, to which we were condemned.'¹¹¹ The birth of the Prince of Wales was nothing more than a desperate attempt by James II to stay in power, and after his death Britain continued to suffer the threat of a Jacobite restoration under his illegitimate son.

The battle against such claims regarding the Prince's illegitimacy left the Jacobites operating in these margins of paternal doubt while promulgating theories initially for the restoration of James II. Until the Protestant succession was actually secured in 1714 through George I's accession, the Jacobites utilised the arguments of the 1690s supporting James II against the unpopularity in some quarters of the Hanovers. This activity and propaganda peaked during a time of uncertainty over the Succession between 1708 and 1714 as the Jacobites played on English fears that an invasion or restoration may be imminent as a childless Queen Anne's health worsened. Jacobite political argument thereby required flexibility, while constantly reiterating themes that had been established by the Nonjurors in the 1690s. By pursuing James Stuart's true legitimacy the Jacobites claimed 'that

¹¹⁰ Hickes, *Ibid.* 5-6.

¹¹¹ William Wake, *A Vindication of the Realm, And Church of England, from the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion and Schism, laid upon them by the Non-Jurors: And the Rebellion and Schism shewn to lie at their Doors* (London, 1716), 9. In this work Wake repeated the claims of Sir Thomas Burnet of the miscarriage of a child at Easter by the Queen and the replacement of the child by an imposter.

government must rest upon secure foundations of legitimacy,’ and ‘from the Jacobite perspective, the Revolutionary settlement was a massive fortress built on sand.’¹¹² The Jacobites relied on five key (absolutist) monarchical doctrines: the divine right of kings, patriarchy, the indefeasible hereditary right, the accountability of kings to God alone (and not to subjects), and the spiritual injunction of non-resistance and passive obedience. The use of these arguments tied James Stuart to the cause of James II and the original Jacobite political theory of the 1690s by claiming that he had been deprived of his rightful claim to the English throne, both legally and in the eyes of God. For the English to alter the Succession and enshrine it in law was both civilly and divinely illegal. Such arguments created a plethora of responses far out-weighting Jacobite support, demonstrating the Jacobite ability to prick the English political conscience and the need to destroy such claims.

It is worth spending some time here on a delineation of religious disaffection and events that England experienced during this period. In England there was a deep sense of anti-Catholic feeling which would have been a preventative issue for the restoration of a Catholic monarch to the throne. There was also great antipathy over the need to change the succession due to distaste towards James II’s manifest Catholicism and his favouritism towards Catholics in key positions at Court. The schism in the Anglican Church caused by a clash over the ‘abdication’ of James II and the requirement to swear an oath of allegiance to William III and Mary II, created numerous political issues and wider dissatisfaction. Members of the Anglican high-church and members of the nobility such as the Earl of Melfort (1649-1714) and the Irish parliament for example, did not believe that James had abdicated. The Anglican members included a group of high-churchmen such as the Archbishop of Canterbury William Sancroft (1617-93), the Bishop of Bath and Wells

¹¹² Paul Kleber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*, 42-3.

Thomas Ken (1637-1711), the Bishop of Ely Francis Turner (1637-1700), and about 400 Anglican clergy and many Scottish Episcopalians. In fact, a large proportion of these supporters argued that James in such circumstances could not renounce his throne or the claim of his newborn son James as they were divinely appointed to the throne. Much of the high-church, which retained many Catholic features in its ritual and ceremonial practices, believed itself to be duty-bound in its Oath of allegiance to James II and could not swear allegiance to William III as king. This group of abstainers to the Oath became known as the non-jurors. Consequently, by 1690 many of these bishops had been deprived of their sees, others either resigned or lost their positions, and Presbyterianism was re-established in Scotland as William established state control over the Anglican Church. The result was the creation of a very vocal opposition group who produced standard theoretical arguments of support for James II as king, such as the doctrines of hereditary right, passive-obedience and non-resistance, patriarchy, and divine right which re-emerged as arguments in the 1710s.¹¹³ This group of non-jurors later included leading opponents to the change in Succession and prominent Jacobite theorists such as George Hickes, Henry Dodwell the Camden Professor of History at Oxford (1641-1711), and Charles Leslie (1650-1722), the divine and author of the Jacobite periodicals *The Observer* and *The Rehearsal*.

Yet these churchmen also brought with them the stain of their earlier activities and the accusations of Catholicity, augmenting the antipathy toward Jacobite supporters and the belief that all Jacobites were Catholics. Historically, the wider problem for the high-church and non-jurors was the notion that much of their behaviour was an attack on the state, religion, and the people. The ‘Nonjuring schism was the clerical counterpart of Jacobitism,’ and the ‘Nonjurors believed that the established Church, born of the Revolution of 1689, was

¹¹³ For a discussion on the re-emergence of these old ideologies see, J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, social structure and political practice during the ancient regime*, and Steve Pincus *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, (pp. 446-50) for their original use in the 1690s. Pincus claims that the use of divine right theory ended by 1696 and Clark argues that use of the theory has passed by 1714, (see footnote 141).

as illegitimate as the new political regime. They stood beyond the pale of the Revolution and cherished a self-image of martyrdom to a purer Anglicanism, now perverted by an Erastian state.’¹¹⁴ The non-jurors were attempting to defend the independence of the powers of the Church from the state while also attacking secularism and the rise of deism. They effectively allied themselves to the Jacobites as they had a common enemy, namely William III and then the future Hanoverian regime. The changes instituted by William III to consolidate his power ran contrary to the high-church and its desires, and against God’s law regarding hereditary monarchy. What can be found in members of the high-church was firstly an unshakable belief in religious ideals of kingship as well as a desire to protect and expand the interests of the Church. Non-jurors ‘were unflinching adherents of divine right’ and the belief that ‘the authority of kings derived from God and that they were consequently not to be resisted,’ although this ‘did not entail support for the freedom of monarchs to do as they pleased.’¹¹⁵ For non-jurors ‘not only Scripture, but English law, natural law, and history designated who was the true king. The 1689 Revolution, therefore, was an offence against nature and the constitution as well as against God.’¹¹⁶

After the foiled attempt in 1696 by supporters of James II to assassinate William (the Assassination Plot) an abjuration oath against the claim of James II’s son, James Francis Edward Stuart to the throne caused a significant number concerns. “An Act for the further Safety of His Majesty” of that year was a result of the Plot, and acknowledged William as the ‘rightful and lawful’ king some believed that abjuring the ‘Pretender’ to be a breach of faith.¹¹⁷ It was argued that the acceptance of William as *de facto* king in 1689 was the result of a contract and thereby the line of succession had changed which had to be recognized. To

¹¹⁴ Mark Goldie, “The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy” in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689 -1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks, 15.

¹¹⁵ Paul Kleber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*, 17.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* 22.

¹¹⁷ Mark A. Thompson, “The Safeguarding of the Protestant Succession, 1702-18,” *William III and Louis XIV*, 242.

ensure that the Act was passed the 'Pretender' was linked to the French and the recognition of his claim to the throne by the Louis XIV. In 1701 opposition to abjuration was therefore branded as unpatriotic, for support for the 'Pretender' was an attack on the rights of the Protestant succession and the English nation:

On which said Acts the safety of your Majesty's royal person and government, the continuance of the monarchy of England, the Preservation of the Protestant religion, the maintenance of the Church of England as by the law established, the security of the ancient and undoubted rights and liberties, and the future peace and tranquillity of this kingdom do (under God) intirely depend.¹¹⁸

Yet despite the utilisation of religion and the protection of English Protestantism against the designs of an apparently Catholic English monarch, non-jurors still found the Oath of Allegiance problematic, thus affirming the schism within the Church of England. 'The tragedy of this separation was that ...[the high-churchmen] took with them out of a position of influence a large number of people who were among the most comprehending, leaving the field clear for the broad-church men, bigots and sheer place seekers.'¹¹⁹ These High-churchmen believed that from a position of independence they would keep alive the true spirit of the Reformation. While there were some accusations of Catholicity due to the support of the Catholic king in exile¹²⁰ and there were indeed elements within the Anglican Church,¹²¹ such arguments were not likely to have led to any concrete reform within the Anglican Church. There was such strong antipathy felt toward the Catholic Church by the majority of the populace and the low-church and these ideas of the high-church perhaps reflected its disaffection at being disenfranchised. The late seventeenth-century and first quarter of the eighteenth-century therefore demonstrated intense anti-Catholic feeling among

¹¹⁸ "An Act for the further Safety of His Majesty," 1701, (13 & 14 William III, c 6), *Statutes of the Realm: volume 7: 1695-1701*, (Ed. John Raithby, 1820).

¹¹⁹ Bernard and Margaret Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries*, 49.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ George H. Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity: A Study in Anglicanism*, (Burns & Oates, London, 1963), 70.

the general populace and low-church with a shared distrust of the papacy among nearly all aspects of society, including the non-jurors.¹²²

This anti-Catholicism prevalent in Britain can be emphasized through the contemporary discussions on toleration.¹²³ Catholicism could not be tolerated as it would not live in harmonious juxtaposition with Protestantism as its very nature was to be universal and thereby the only extant religion within a state. The principle of toleration could not be ‘applied to Roman Catholics since their faith was a politically corrosive doctrine rather than a theological belief,’ and ‘Popery was a form of tyranny.’¹²⁴ The idea of toleration was extended only to dissenters as it was deemed to be fair and it was politically expeditious. Dissenters had aided in both the English Civil War and the Glorious Revolution and they supported English liberty. An extension of toleration towards these disparate sects was not only born from a desire for equal status, it was a shrewd political move that appeased ‘potentially seditious religious bodies scattered throughout the realms.’¹²⁵ Conversely, Catholics could not be trusted by the state as their loyalty was perceived to lie with the Pope rather than the monarch and parliament, as expressed by John Toland:

[W]hatever Indulgence may be due to other Persuasions, *Papists* ought not to be tolerated in any free State, because they not only deny Liberty to all others, and pronounce ‘em eternally damn’d but also because they are Subjects to a foren Head whose Authority they prefer to their native Magistrats, and that their Doctrin of Dispensation leaves ‘em under no Tyes of Oaths or other Ingagements, as their allowing *no Faith to be kept with Heretics* makes ‘em incapable of any fellowship on the Square with such as those not reckoned *Orthodox* by their infallible Head, another Doctrin inconsistent with all privat or public Society.¹²⁶

¹²² Bernard and Margaret Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries* (Mowbray, London, 1974), 46.

¹²³ James E. Bradley, “The religious origins of radical politics in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1662-1800” in *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe*, Ed. James E. Bradley and Dale K. Van Kley (University of Notre Dame, Indiana, 2001), 187.

¹²⁴ Justin Champion, *Republican learning, John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester UP, 2003), 146.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.* 189.

¹²⁶ John Toland, *Anglia Libera* (London, 1701), 101-2.

Catholics for Toland, operated externally of society to a large degree - governed by a foreign head, their ability to potentially disregard oaths and contracts and removal of themselves from fellow citizens - and hence they could not be accorded the same rights and toleration as Protestants. John Jackson explained in his *Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government* (1718) that atheists had no right to be tolerated and Catholics had 'less Right to be *Tolerated* in any *Protestant* Nation.' For, 'being by their Principles not only *permitted*, but *obliged* to be *Traitors* to all *Protestant* Governments, and bound in Conscience, when ever it is in their Power, for the Good of the *Church*, to destroy them.'¹²⁷ The bigoted and superstitious views held by Catholics acted contrary to Protestantism and attacked the fabric of civil society, thereby precluding them from toleration. A Protestant government had to protect itself from the designs of the Pope and the Catholic faithful, as Catholics maintained 'it to be not only lawful, but their Duty to extirpate Hereticks.'¹²⁸ Ultimately for many, Catholics were simply not to be trusted as their oath could not be tolerated and their design was to destroy English liberty and remove the rights of Protestants.

The issue of toleration reflected the disparate nature of religion in Britain at that time but fundamentally shows a strong anti-Catholic belief system that permeated England. Even discussions of toleration were utilized to zealously guard the Protestant political liberties of the people and the (low) church seen to be under threat from religious (Catholic-leaning) elements. The Anglican Church was, at the end of the seventeenth century, an institution riven with disagreement and faction as different elements of the Church tried to attain their own political aims. The high-church and non-jurors had attempted to put their theological weight behind the legal rights of James II (and later his son) to the crown which led to accusations of Catholicity, and their difficulties with the change in succession led them to be supplanted by the low-church. This revealed the political dimension of religion and theology

¹²⁷ John Jackson, *Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government* (London, 1718), 36.

¹²⁸ Edward Synge, *The Case of Toleration consider'd with respect both to Religion and Civil Government*, 42.

at this time, as a disaffected high-church attempted to fight for its own cause and power in the name of the King. Over time the low-church became attached to the Whig Party, firstly in William and Mary's reign and then critically in the reign of George I as the Whigs gained the ascendance. This meant the diminution of the high-church as its episcopate's grasp on the Anglican Church failed. It was churchmen such as these, failed and disaffected that supported the Jacobite cause and the claims of James II. They provided Jacobitism with its theoretical foundation in the 1690s and continued to assert the claims of his son after James' death (16th September 1701).

From the first decade of the 1700s the Anglican Church's divisive struggle for political power was set against a Whig-led ministry that pursued the principle of Erastianism in an attempt to subordinate the high-church and clergy to civil authority. The 1701 trial of Sacheverell, one in a long line of priests who had challenged the authority of the state, reinforced its commitment to Protestant civil liberties and was a warning to the Church that it should not meddle in the affairs of government.¹²⁹ While the immediate aftermath was the loss of the 1710 general election to the Tories, a loss that kept them out of power until the Hanoverian succession, it revealed the ascendance of Parliament. The Trial also emphasized the separation between the aspirations of the high and low-church, with the former driven by its disaffection from the loss of previous power it once held before 1689. Religion was a dominant area of disaffection and disunity within Britain, as it became more embroiled with the effects of the Revolution and the parties that came to dominate British politics. The high-church found themselves allied with the traditionalist and monarchist Tories and the low-church with the reforming and parliamentary Whigs. Ultimately, both elements of the Church were subsumed by the power of the state, and what can be seen in the second decade

¹²⁹ Justin Champion, *Republican learning, John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696-1722*, 142. The trial of Henry Sacheverell was an action taken by the Whig government against the preacher who sermonized against the Whig Ministry, particularly for its violation of non-resistance. The Trial saw a guilty conviction in which the sermons were burnt and Sacheverell was suspended for three years.

of the eighteenth-century was the ascendancy of political (notably Whig) power over religion in the state.¹³⁰ While anti-Catholic feeling remained and religious division too, the accession of George I laid to rest the hope of a restoration for James as the ascendancy of the Whigs helped to consolidate George's position and the Act of Settlement. The ascendancy of the Whigs became a focus of disaffection *per se*, and much opposition was directed at them rather on the position of the king. This aided in quenching or at least severely stultifying, much of the fear felt in Britain of the Jacobite threat.

However, the real fear surrounding the Jacobites in Britain was its association with the French. France was the traditional enemy of England and under the rule of Louis XIV had become the most powerful state in Europe, partly through its foreign policy of war.¹³¹ James Stuart had been removed to France as a baby of several months with his father King James II and his mother Mary of Modena (1658-1718). Louis XIV (1638-1714) had provided the former king with his protection, money, and a place for him to establish his court at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. After the death of his father in 1701 James, now styled James III, continued in his father's role and court at Saint-Germain under the auspices and patronage of Louis XIV. The Jacobite court was composed of three groups: the 'inner kernel,' the 'politically embittered,' and 'adventurers.' The 'inner kernel' were ideologically committed Jacobites, people who stood aloof from post-Revolutionary society and brought up their children to 'follow the true path.' The 'politically embittered' were a thicker outer layer of disaffected individuals who drifted in and out of support for the Jacobites. This often contained members of the Tory party who had lost power and their seats as well as members of the High-church, similarly stripped of office or bound to their Oath of Allegiance to James II. The final group of 'adventurers' were a very thin layer of desperate men attempting to

¹³⁰ For a discussion on the supremacy of the Whigs and the evolution of Whiggism see J. G. A. Pocock, "The varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform: A history of ideology and discourse," *Virtue, Commerce, and History* (Cambridge, 1985), 239.

¹³¹ See below in the final section of this chapter for a discussion of France.

improve their fortunes often with nothing to lose, this enthusiastic group frequently abandoned and betrayed the Jacobites.¹³² The Jacobite exiles were formed predominantly of Irish (60%) and English (35%), with about 5% Scots, and their religious orientation was predominantly Catholic with Anglican non-jurors and Scots Episcopalian. About 40% of the court was of noble birth, and the Household was dominated by English and Scottish courtiers, who had been dispossessed of land at home after the Revolution.¹³³ The court was not therefore representative of the former British realms of the Stuarts in the numbers of nobility and in the predominance of Catholics. James' Catholicism may have been true of Ireland but was wholly inaccurate as regarded England or Scotland, countries staunchly Protestant and often anti-Catholic.

The patronage of Louis XIV and support of France for the Jacobite cause created justified fear in England. It was a connection fully embraced by many Jacobites including James who demonstrated an 'adulatory attitude towards France.'¹³⁴ The fear of French political intentions had been born from an awareness that the Jacobites were used as a political pawn by the French to gain leverage over the British. While the French were initially very sympathetic towards James Stuart and his plight and 'spoke of troops, ships and money for an expedition,' the French later became eager for peace in the War of Spanish Succession (1701-14). They had 'no intention that the Jacobite issue should impede or spoil their negotiations,' and 'at critical stages in the peace-talks, the Jacobites were wholly in the dark.'¹³⁵ The Jacobites were used by the French as a thorn in the side of the English with which they could gain greater bargaining power: a ploy later used by both the Swedes (1717)

¹³² D. Szechi, *The Jacobites, Britain and Europe 1688-1788* (Manchester UP, 1994), 15-16.

¹³³ See Nathalie Genet-Rouffiac, "Jacobites in Paris and Saint-Germain-en-Laye," *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites*, Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (The Hambledon Press, London, 1995), 18.

¹³⁴ D. Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-14*, 46.

¹³⁵ G. V. Bennett, "English Jacobitism, 1710-1715: Myth and Reality," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Vol. 32 (1982), pp. 137-151, 140.

and more successfully the Spanish (1719) in their (potential) support of uprisings.¹³⁶ Yet while later French support lacked substance and verve it must be stated that in the first decade of the eighteenth century at least, they were serious in their support to aid a Jacobite invasion and thus English fears were real. Indeed, in 1708 James sailed with 6000 men and thirty ships of the French navy from Dunkirk with the intention of invasion, only to be intercepted and forced to retreat by Admiral Byng (1668-1733). These palpable fears of the French only began to be assuaged after the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), although slowly and with scepticism in some quarters. Richard Steele in *The Crisis* argued that the Treaty actually strengthened the French quest for Universal Monarchy as Louis's grandson, Philip V, was still the Spanish king. Daniel Defoe responded to such fears in his *View of the real danger of the Protestant Succession* by arguing that the Treaty removed the French as a threat to Europe and as supporters of the Jacobites.¹³⁷

However, the Jacobite relationship with the French was actually their undoing and revealed the separation from the Britain they hoped to rule. This relationship was not only problematic due to English enmity towards the French, but the Jacobites' life in France kept them in a bubble divorced from the reality of the situation in England. The location of their Court in France appears to have isolated them from the true depth of antipathy toward a French-led Jacobite invasion. The Catholicism of the Court meant there was a 'basic inability of the Jacobite Court to comprehend the degree of religious feeling in Britain' over religion, and the level to which Britons 'detested Roman Catholicism.'¹³⁸ Moreover, since the court had been based in Saint-Germain after the Revolution it had politically developed in an 'entirely separate direction' from that of Britain. Absolutist tendencies were 'naturally

¹³⁶ On the Spanish support of the Jacobites see L. B. Smith, "Spain and the Jacobites, 1715-16" *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689 -1759*, (Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks).

¹³⁷ Richard Steele's *The Crisis* (London, 1713), and Daniel Defoe's *View of the real danger of the Protestant Succession* (London, 1714).

¹³⁸ D. Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-14*, 47.

encouraged by the exigencies of running an extremely loose organization in which the only real authority was that of the monarch' (James).¹³⁹ A consequence of this lack of perspective meant that the Jacobites believed themselves to be better supported than they actually were. This Jacobite self-delusion stemmed from their confusion that support for the Tory Party was support for themselves and their plight. The links between the two groups meant that dissatisfaction with the Whigs, especially after 1714, led to a growth in support for the (opposition) Tories. This did not necessarily mean however, a support for the Jacobites. In many instances this political support was only for the Tories as the party of opposition not for any connection with the Jacobites. The Jacobites thereby had far less support than they believed, and after the accession of George I the Whig regime came to symbolize for many people 'the perfect and indispensable embodiment of English liberties' which 'could demand towards it an obedience which was, paradoxically, more complete than the Stuarts could expect.'¹⁴⁰

While religion had been a major factor of disaffection and fear in the first decade, notably through the Jacobite connection to Catholic France, the political ascendancy of the Whigs meant that religious and political disaffection was gradually relieved. The Treaty of Utrecht (1713) was also a critical component in alleviating fears of the French and it proved hugely decisive in altering Jacobite hopes and British fears. An alleviation of fear that was reflected in the political literature of the time as the propounding of Jacobite theory greatly declines from 1714. Works used by the Jacobites to espoused doctrines such as divine right were obsolete by 1716. While it has been claimed that divine right theory was moribund at the accession of George I (1714) it is perhaps more accurate to claim that use of the theory was at

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* 49.

¹⁴⁰ J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, social structure, and political practice during the ancient regime*, 150.

an end by 1716.¹⁴¹ To this time the Jacobites were still active in their promotion of the cause and the fear of them is still represented in the political literature. The dissipation of Jacobite material from 1714 can be explained by the Hanoverian Succession. Prior to this event there was still hope and optimism amongst the Jacobites that James would still be crowned king James III. The Hanoverians were not an overly popular choice in Britain and the notion of a hereditary claim to the throne did resonate with people both in James' favour and against George.¹⁴² Importantly, the Tory government from 1710 under the acquiescence of Queen Anne had been in covert contact with James about a restoration in preference to the Hanovers. The stumbling block proved to be James's Catholicism and a wider distaste of the public for potential absolutism. The leading Tory ministers Viscount Henry St. John Bolingbroke (1678-1751) and Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford (1661-1724) had corresponded with James Stuart on a potential restoration if he would convert to Protestantism, and by March 1714 James had informed them that he would not convert. The response ended any real opportunity of a Jacobite restoration, and Bolingbroke revealed to the Jacobite court via letter that the "Sultan of Turkey" had a greater chance of gaining the throne of England.¹⁴³ The final death knell in Jacobite theory was sounded by the former Tory Secretary of State Robert Erskine (1675-1732), the Jacobite Duke of Mar's disastrous 1715 uprising in Scotland, in which Scottish support was eventually routed. In the uprising Mar prematurely proclaimed a rebellion in the name of King James, and his ineptitude as a general led to the Jacobite loss at Sherrifmuir (November 1715) to the Duke of Argyll despite superior numbers. After the defeat of Mar British Catholics swiftly swore an Oath of

¹⁴¹ J.C.D Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion: State and society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries*, (Cambridge, 1986), 93. Clark argues that divine right theory is over as a doctrine by 1714, yet it is clearly extant in 1716. It is also therefore possible to disregard Steve Pincus' recent contention that divine right theory was dead by 1696, made in 1688, *The First Modern Revolution*, pages 455 and 472.

¹⁴² J. H. and Margaret Shennan, "The Protestant Succession in English Politics, April 1713-September 1715," *William and Louis XIV*, 252-70.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

Submission to George I (1715), a symbol perhaps of the death of meaningful Jacobitism in Britain under James Stuart.¹⁴⁴

By 1716 much of the fear and apprehension over Jacobitism that had been created as a threat and as a political entity had been alleviated. Crucially the early fears of French intentions had been assuaged by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) and Louis XIV's recognition of the Protestant Succession. The years of a very palpable threat (1708-14), a period of ill-health for a childless Queen Anne, had eventually been negotiated despite an augmentation of Jacobite political output and propaganda. The Act of Succession under George I had been accomplished and in 1715 the Jacobites had seen a humiliating defeat in Scotland, and without French military support the Jacobites posed no military threat. By 1716 the Jacobites were at a low ebb and by 1722 and the failed Atterbury Plot 'the British Government was no longer in any fear.'¹⁴⁵ This Plot reflected the condition of the Jacobite threat to the government: foiled by British spies in Paris before it had begun. A Plot inspired and designed to play on the catastrophe and disaffection of the South Sea Bubble, in which Atterbury would rouse Jacobite support during the 1722 general election while awaiting a foreign army led by James. No such support existed and Atterbury was found guilty and banished and this proved to be the last planned attempt at uprising by the Jacobites under James Francis Edward Stuart. For their part, the European Jacobites were successful in raising funds and gaining support from European states. Yet, for these states their interest was not so much to restore the Stuarts to the throne but to distract Britain from their own personal quarrels. So by the time of the South Sea Bubble (1720) when the Jacobites hoped to utilize disaffection with government for support for a restoration of James, the British had moved on. Their focus had moved away from fear of the Jacobites and any support for their

¹⁴⁴ Paul Kleber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*, 132-34.

¹⁴⁵ G. V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State: 1688-1730. The career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975), 251-2.

cause to ideas such as commerce and there was no desire for restoration. Consequently, the Jacobites were to many later supporters little more than an ale-house toast of opposition to the government, or a figurehead of the unknown enemies within and outside the country.

1701

The standard Jacobite arguments used in opposition to the altered succession in the Act of Settlement (1701) can be demonstrated by the theologian William Nichols' *The Duty of Inferiours Towards their Superiours, In five practical Discourses*, and the non-juror George Hickes' *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales*, both works written in 1701. Nichols (1664-1712) the canon of Chichester (who was not an overt Jacobite), argued that there were three 'things' that were of divine right (*Jure Divino*): the Christian religion, which was from divine revelation; the rules ('laws') of the Christian religion, as they are instituted by God; and the offices of the Apostles and Prophets, as these roles were set out by God. Government and its rules were not the invention of people but had been 'first made known to the World by Almighty God, and are consequently ...of Divine Right.' The 'Princes or others, who dispense or exercise these Rules, which are of this Divine Original, have a *Jus Divinum*' to their character.¹⁴⁶ The supreme authority of magistrates (princes) was from God as it must be 'vested with the Power of Life and Death' and the people do not have this power. Nichols argued that for the people to have the power over life and death they would have to have this power of death over their own body, and since they legally do not as this was 'Self-Murder' authority for such decisions and matters in government emanate from God.¹⁴⁷ The distinction between consent and authority which people confused according to Nichols was that the

¹⁴⁶ William Nichols, *The Duty of Inferiours towards their Superiours* (London, 1701), 4.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 33-4.

original authority was from God: the institution and creation of government. Consent, which was necessary for the effective administration of a state and its laws to avoid tyranny, was a public involvement in the creation of law and their active obedience to them.

Part of ‘the Plan which God Almighty first gave out for the Government of Men’ was that it should be monarchical and ‘under the form of Paternal Jurisdiction.’¹⁴⁸ Nichols conceded that this form had been made a ‘jest of’ recently due to the exaggerated efforts of others, such as Sir Robert Filmer, author of *Patriarcha*. He argued that both aristocracy and democracy had not entered the world until it was a thousand years old. Monarchy must therefore have been the original form of government, arising from a single ruler under a patriarchal system as male-dominated families expanded in size. As was evident from the Scripture of the Jews, as families merged and colonies became nations, it was the strongest leader who they turned to for rule. While this leader (king) may have eventually allowed some members to leave and colonize other lands – leading to the creation of aristocracy and democracy as they chose their own government – in ‘Primitive Ages’ it was necessary to use absolute monarchy as there was an absence of law.¹⁴⁹ Absolutism and its power for the monarch to act in the ‘last resort,’ enabled the laws of a country to be ‘founded upon God’s Authority.’ God had ‘antecedently granted’ kings ‘a Power over Men’s Lives’ with which ‘they may dispose of them in what just ways they judge convenient.’¹⁵⁰ Absolutism therefore was a cohesive force (law) and a sacred validation of the king’s position over his relationship with his people. Central to this relationship was the need for duty and absolute (passive) obedience from the king’s subjects:

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 81.

¹⁴⁹ For discussions of Absolutism and its impact on monarchy and Europe see J. P. Sommerville, “Absolutism and royalism,” *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700* (Ed. J.H. Burns, Cambridge, 1991), pp. 347–73; G. Burgess, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); and C. Cuttice and G. Burgess, *Absolutism and Monarchism in Early Modern Europe* (Pickering & Chatto, London, 2011).

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 39.

[The] Bible, which positively asserts, that no lawful Power can lawfully be Resisted ...For Right can be but of one side; and if the Power which commands be lawful, that which resists must be unlawful. For the supreme Power whenever it is lodged in every Nation, is absolute and uncontrollable, and therefore whatever it commands it oblige either to Obedience or Suffering. And in a limited Monarchy, when the Prince puts in Execution the force of a severe Law, Persons that cannot comply with it, must suffer by it. This is *Passive Obedience*.¹⁵¹

‘Passive Obedience’ for Nichols, was a demonstration of the subjects’ complete obedience to their king as it was legally and spiritually impossible to resist the will of the sovereign. Even if a king became tyrannical or his reign created suffering they could not oppose the rule of their king, thereby invalidating the 1689 Revolution. Yet ‘Passive Obedience’ was also meant to impact upon the behaviour of the king in a positive manner by pricking their (Christian) conscience, thereby preventing the abuse of his people.

A similar approach to duty and obedience was expounded by the Jacobite George Hickes, but in an overt attack on the legitimacy of the 1689 Revolution. So ‘Sacred and Inviolable does our Religion make the Ties of Duty and Civil Obedience, to our *Rightful King*: And therefore to cast off our *Sovereign*, that we may keep our *Religion*, is but a weak Plea, and will certainly be over-rul’d before the Tribunal of Heaven.’¹⁵² It was a ‘Violation of the Hereditary Title (which will hover over all Usurpations) [that] may yet cost this already near ruin’d Nation.’¹⁵³ The ‘Christian Foundation of Loyalty’ required that it was the duty of the state and of the people to observe the Laws of Nature as was God’s will. It was illegal in the eyes of Hickes, for the crown of England to be disposed of by the will of the people as it was God who chose the destination of the crown through hereditary succession. The Revolution therefore rejected the will of God, and the people of England faced a terrible (future) price for such action. Moreover, whilst the crown followed the royal hereditary line by passing to the daughter of James Queen Mary II (1662-94) and her husband King William (1650-1702), it

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.* 103-4.

¹⁵² George Hickes, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales Examin’d, and Rejected* (London, 1701), 4.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.* 12.

had passed over the rightful claimant: James Stuart. This omission was illegal and ignored the rule of God, and it meant that the rightful king had been excluded from the throne and it was to him that the English people were obligated. Hickes claimed that, if there was ‘any Person of the *Royal Line*, to whom by the Course of *Succession* the *Crown* does of Right belong, so long we shall be bound in Conscience to be in Subjection.’¹⁵⁴ God’s will and rightful heir had wrongfully been deprived by the people of England in a manner that was against the natural law.

In his work *Anglia Libera* (1701), the Irish freethinker John Toland (1670-1722) attacked the permanent view of government (and monarchy) as expressed in both Nichols and Hickes, and thereby the Jacobites. Toland argued the people had formed society through a natural and beneficial inter-dependent relationship that provided security and assistance, ‘It being therefore for the good of the whole Community.’ For, ‘every Individual Member thereof, that Men enter into Society, they agree among themselves (or by such as they authorize to represent them) on certain Rules and Laws.’¹⁵⁵ What this meant for government in England was that while the legislative power held supreme authority in society and the Executive was ‘styled’ the government, both were accountable to the people. As such, law could not be abused and the government must be ‘order’d for the common good of Society,’¹⁵⁶ thereby pursuing its original mandate. For Toland, English history was filled with examples of contests between the king, the nobility and the Commons as they jostled for power, and crucially over time the power of the Commons grew and there it was ‘fixt.’ By the time of James II’s reign the Commons had the established power and right to act in accordance with the original compact of government:

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 15.

¹⁵⁵ John Toland, *Anglia Libera*, 2.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 16.

King James the Second having forfeited his Rights to the regal Government of these Nations by a Notorious Neglect of his Declaration when he ascended the Throne, by an open Breach of his Coronation Oath and of the natural Relation or original Compact between all Kings and their Subjects; but more particularly by endeavouring to extirpate the *Protestant* Religion, to subvert our Laws and Liberties, and actually being guilty of several arbitrary and tyrannical Proceedings, the free People of this Kingdom invited over the Prince of *Orange*, under whom they put themselves in a Posture of Defence, and successfully recover'd the Just Rights of themselves and their Posterity.¹⁵⁷

According to Toland's view, the Commons or people (which included the nobility), were acting for the security of their rights against a monarch (James II) who had shown his unsuitability to rule England. Even ignoring the popular belief that James had abdicated by fleeing his country Toland accused him of being perfidious, a Catholic sympathizer and threat to Protestantism in England, and above all of having pretensions towards absolutism. The danger of absolutism was that it was essentially worse than the state of nature: an environment of chaos. The 'Rule of Men's Actions [was] inconstant, dubious, or altogether unknown, since the Prince (without being accountable to any) can abolish tomorrow what has bin solemnly establish to day.' Moreover, an absolute monarch's power and will was such, that if he desired he could 'dispense with the very Laws of God, and oppose the clearest Dictats of Nature.'¹⁵⁸ The immensity of the power that could be invested in one man under absolutism and which could be used against the entirety of society beggared the notion of government and destroyed its mandate for the public good. Under an 'Arbitrary' government most of the 'Inhabitants are for ever excluded from all Hopes of changing the Condition of their Birth by any certain or regular Steps, whereas it is one of the noblest Effects of free Governments, that a Man may ascend from the Meanest to the Highest Degree according to

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 22-3.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 6-7.

his Merit.¹⁵⁹ In relation to popular government, no King could ‘ever be so good as one of their own making’ for ‘the Voice of the People is the Voice of God.’¹⁶⁰

The 1689 Revolution was therefore a necessity for Toland, as it not only ensured the (divine) basis of popular government it also ensured the liberties of the English people while preserving the Protestant faith from James II’s Catholic proclivities. The Act of Settlement in the mind of Toland was nothing more than the ‘zealous attempts’ by William III to ensure acts such as *Magna Carta* and the Declaration of Rights for a Protestant England. William had hoped ‘*in a little Time our infamous Distinctions and Partys, but particularly Jacobitism, should be wholly abolish and extirpated.*’¹⁶¹ The 1689 Revolution and Act of Settlement were a reflection of the need for the government to represent the peoples’ ability to ‘dispose of themselves in the Manner they shall think most likely to secure their Liberty of Wealth, and to procure their Happiness.’¹⁶² However, Toland saw a dual threat to this ‘happiness’ and liberty: the ‘Pretender’ and the French. The ‘Pretender’ posed a very obvious threat to the liberty of England. If he proved to be successful in a restoration he would subject the nation ‘at the very first stroke to *Popery* and arbitrary Power.’ England would be plunged into:

...the most dismal and lasting Scene of Violence and Blood that can be imagin’d; the People on the one Hand contending for their Religion and Liberties, and the Prince on the other Hand with a foren mercenary Army establishing his Tyranny and Superstition, revenging the Outrage don to his Family, and especially the unpardonable Disgrace of a second Expulsion.¹⁶³

The fear of the ‘Pretender’ according to Toland was born from a fear of any attempts to return England to the same danger his father before him had offered to the Protestant free

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 12.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 26.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.* 50-1.

¹⁶² *Ibid.* 107.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.* 32.

nation. Yet this time the fear was greater, as a restoration could be achieved was through a force of arms:

[T]hose of the *Popish* Line, conceiving their own Claim to be good, will assert it by Arms; to which it is answered that the Nobility and People of England have (in the late Act of Succession) *faithfully promis'd to stand by, to maintain, and defend the Princess SOPHIA and the Heirs of her Body being Protestants, to the utmost of their Power, with their Lives and Estates, against all Persons whatsoever that shall attempt any Thing to the contrary.*¹⁶⁴

The only manner by which the 'Pretender' and his Jacobite followers could affect such an invasion of England to claim the throne was through French assistance. The combination of these Catholic forces was a foe to fear not only through potential invasion, but also because war was part of the Catholic nature.¹⁶⁵ It was a religious obligation for a Catholic prince to engage non-Catholic (or Protestant) nations in war in order that they may be converted.

Towards the end of *Anglia Libera* Toland expounded his belief that England and Holland should unify to ensure Protestantism and to act as a European balance of power 'against France.'¹⁶⁶ The French nation had to be restrained at all costs as it posed such a threat to England particularly as the benefactor of the Jacobites, to European peace, to Protestantism, and its aspirations towards unification with Spain were a 'visible danger.'¹⁶⁷ A unification between England and Holland would be akin to the alliance between the Spartans and Athenians in their resistance of the might of Persia.¹⁶⁸ If the French were to be successful in their aggrandizing attempts at hegemony Europe would collapse into Catholic 'slavery:' a slavery of the individual as well as the state as liberty would be lost under French absolute rule.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 132-3.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 133.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 141-2.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 170.

¹⁶⁸ See Book XVIII of *Anglia Libera*.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 170.

Before fighting had begun in February 1702 in the War of Spanish Succession, the polemicist and novelist Daniel Defoe (c.1660-1731) had warned of the inevitability of a war with France. Charles II's bequeathing of the Spanish throne had been 'a tacit Invitation to all the Competitors to a Dangerous and Bloody War.'¹⁷⁰ While Defoe had accepted that Duc d'Anjou had a claim to the Spanish throne, his claim was inferior to both the Dauphin (his father) and the Duc de Bourgogne (his older brother). The answer to the bequest therefore lay in Louis XIV's desire to secure the French succession while extending French influence in real terms by annexing Spain. Defoe posited the notion that the inheritance of Anjou revealed French fallibility, for if France had been as superior as many believed, Louis XIV would have marched into Spain upon the death of Charles and claimed the throne for himself in the name of his son. Yet, Louis had been 'too Wise a Prince not to see that his Interest will Oblige him to act in Concert with his Neighbours, as far as conveniently He can.'¹⁷¹ While Louis was indubitably the strongest monarch in Europe he had recently lost battles during the Nine Years War (1689-97) against England, The United Provinces, and the Holy Roman Empire and Spain, in which the French had also lost vast amounts of money and had been forced to make concession in the Peace of Ryswick (1697). The problem for Defoe was that England itself was presently in a weakened state as 'her People [were] more divided in Temper than 'twas hoped they wou'd have been under so mild and gentle a Government, [and] makes but a very mean Figure abroad.'¹⁷² Defoe attacked the non-jurors for focusing their energies upon attacking the altered succession rather than calling for a League to preserve the European peace against the French. He also attacked Protestant Jacobites for feeding information to their Catholic counterparts in France. His answer to the French threat was an end to division within England and an alliance with the Dutch and Austrians to

¹⁷⁰ Daniel Defoe, *The Two Great Questions Consider'd* (London, 1701), 347.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.* 349.

¹⁷² *Ibid.* 356.

maintain the balance of power within Europe. The consequence of not healing such divisions was a French dominance of Europe:

If the French get the Spanish Crown, we are beaten out of the field as to Trade, and are besieged in our own Island, and never let us flatter our selves with our Safety consisting so much in our Fleet; for this I presume to lay down as a fundamental Axiom, at least as the Wars go of late, 'tis not the longest Sword but the longest Purse that Conquers. If the French get Spain, they get the greatest Trade in the World in their Hands, they that have the most Trade, will have the most Money, and they that have the most Money, will have the most Ships, the best Fleet, and the best Armies; and if once the French master us at Sea, where are we then?¹⁷³

Defoe and Toland's desire to effect a European alliance with the Dutch (and the Austrians in Defoe's case) was an attempt to counter France's formidable power, size, wealth, army and natural resources. Indeed, Defoe argued that such was the strength of France in comparison to the rest of the individual states of Europe they could not be blamed for pursuing the model of universal monarchy.¹⁷⁴ As history had shown, the strongest nations had made attempts at a universal monarchy. What was important for both Defoe and Toland was that England was part of a league that stood against the threat of the French to Protestant Europe.

1711

A decade later the French were still perceived as the greatest threat to English liberty in the political literature. This fear was still driven by French power in Europe and their association with the Jacobites and their court located in Saint-Germain-en-Laye under the auspices of Louis XIV. The knowledge of this connection created a fear of a Jacobite invasion led by the French in an attempt to restore the 'Pretender' to the throne. There was great concern regarding French intentions towards universal monarchy and aggrandizement,

¹⁷³ *Ibid.* 364.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 357.

augmented by their competition in trade and the ancient rivalry between the two states.

Sitting between this rivalry and enmity were the Jacobites and a prince whose aims to secure the crown of England were dependent upon the beneficence of the enemy. A repeated view was that Louis' championing of the cause of the 'Pretender' had left him in French debt.

This view was argued in *Reasons against receiving the Pretender* (1708):

Who shall repay the *French King* that vast Debt contracted by his entertaining the *Pretender*, his pretended *Mother*, and *Sister*, and Adherents? By what means shall those Obligations be answer'd? Do you think that that *Monarch* will generously forgive all that is past, and be content with the glory of Restoring a *Young Prince*?¹⁷⁵

The anonymous author argued that the 'Pretender's' debt would be two-fold. It would not only be financial but it would also be as a pupil toward a teacher. Through his life in France under the patronage of Louis XIV the 'Pretender' had learned lessons in kingship that would be French. The threat of a French-led Jacobite invasion would mean slavery, the death of liberty, and the destruction of Parliament. The Catholicism of the 'Pretender' (and Louis XIV) would force 'their deluded Consciences ...to use all their *Endeavours* to subject a Protestant People to the *Tyranny*, and *Superstition of Rome*.'¹⁷⁶ The absolutism of a Stuart king (and Louis XIV) would destroy Parliament as his reign would swiftly culminate in 'Absolute Monarchy,' ensuring that Parliament was that 'only in Name, without Force or Power in reality.'¹⁷⁷ The French influence upon the 'Pretender' would ruin England:

For such is his Religion, such his Education has been, and such are the Principles he has been, and such are the Principles he has imbib'd originally, that no Peace, nor Security, nor Common Comfort of Life can be expected under him, but a meer Arbitrary Lawless Sway, Sacrificing without Equity or Conscience whosoever of his Subjects he pleases, and whenever his own insatiable Thirst of Blood, or some other as dishonourable Ends, shall require the removal of them.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁵ [Anonymous], *Reasons against receiving the Pretender* (London, 1710), 5.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 3.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 4.

¹⁷⁸ Joseph Cannell, *The Case of the Pretender stated, and our Duty on that Occasion* (London, 1708), 10.

Underlying the desire to turn England into a nation bound by slavery and tyranny would be a thirst for vengeance at the treatment of his father. The combination of a proselytizing Catholic faith in a Protestant realm, absolutist French support, and vengeance, born not only from the treatment of his father but his French upbringing would lead to English ruin. A restoration of the 'Pretender' would lead Britain to become nothing more than a subsidiary of France as he sacrificed subjects to French hegemony. England must thereby be protected so that 'none of the Popish Religion should ever sit upon our Throne, which is no more than to erect a Fence for the Vineyard of God.' This would protect the English 'Religious and Civil Rights, and all that is Dear and Valuable to [them] by making the most effectual Provision for their future Settlement and Security.'¹⁷⁹

Such 'Provision' was not only to be achieved through the alliances advocated by Toland and Defoe, but also through the reinforcement of the political changes enacted in 1689. There was not only a fear of external enemies but also internal enemies, and this fear was expressed through the desire to consolidate political change and defend the alteration of the Succession. This defence of English political change created by popular government can be found in the political work of the Benjamin Hoadly in his rebuttals of Jacobite doctrine. In these rebuttals Hoadly attacked the rigid espousal of a divine decree in favour of a permanent (and oppressive) monarchy which the public must accept. In *The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Consider'd* (1706), Hoadly argued that no particular form of government had been favoured by God in Scripture. There was nothing 'to signifie that God had himself appointed for all the Kingdoms of the Earth, one particular Form of *Government*; and that all Deviations from that, or Alterations in it, are Unlawful, as they are Transgressions of the positive Institutions of Almighty God.'¹⁸⁰ It was God's will that there should be a government to create peace and happiness for human society but the institution of the form of

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 11.

¹⁸⁰ Benjamin Hoadly, *The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Consider'd* (London, 1706), 2.

government was a human endeavour. Those who were selected to administer and run government, in whatever form, ‘may be styl’d the Ministers of God, because they act his Pleasure whilst they do the Duty of good Governours’ and it is God’s will that ‘some Persons’ govern.¹⁸¹ The crux of government which reflected the will of God was that it should pursue the public good and for magistrates who ‘do the contrary, they cannot said to be from God, or to act by his Authority.’¹⁸² For a ruler not to pursue the public good was a rejection of God’s authority of which they were invested, as the public good was God’s mandate. Such behaviour in a ruler thereby exempted the people from their normal bond of obedience as they were no longer served in accordance with God’s decree, and crucially for Hoadly, submission was not ‘unlimited.’ If a ruler no longer pursued the public good as St. Paul stipulated as the end of government, Hoadly argued that resistance and rebellion were permissible. The ruler no longer had the authority from God to rule and this made it beholden upon the people to defend their rights. It was not for the sake of a Prince that the people should act, but for the sake of the ‘*Public*, that a Man is under the least obligation to submit to any signal instance of *Oppression*.’¹⁸³ The:

Submission to such Governours, *helps to destroy and raise the Public Interest, and to betray the Public Happiness*; it is manifest that this Sentence frees *Subjects* from *Submission*, in Point of *Conscience*, to no *Governors* but those only, under whom the *Universal Happiness of the Society* is not secured; and to whom, if they should pay *Submission*, they would help forward the Destruction, and Ruine of the *Public Interest and Happiness*, which they are bound to Regard above their own private *Interest*, or that of any Mortal upon Earth.¹⁸⁴

Hoadly expanded upon his theory of resistance in *The Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed* (1710) by clarifying his earlier discussion by claiming that the public right to resistance acted as a safety-mechanism within a state: a right to self-defence. Hoadly

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.* 3.

¹⁸² *Ibid.* 4.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.* 28.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 39, (Hoadly was quoting St. Paul).

argued that God had not chosen or favoured any particular form of government, nor had God sanctioned patriarchy or absolutism (spuriously taken from Scripture) to support lineages that could not be proven. Over time, (absolute) monarchies and governments had relied on such concepts as ‘obedience,’ ‘subjection,’ ‘rule,’ and passive obedience to enforce their power and authority:

Amongst all who contend for an *Unlimited Passive Obedience* to the *Civil Power*, there are none who are more confident in their Assertions, or more secure of their *Cause*, than those who espouse the *Patriarchal scheme of Government*, and found *Civil Authority* entirely upon the *Paternal Authority* devolved by *Almighty God* himself upon the *Governours* of this World.¹⁸⁵

Yet Patriarchy according to Hoadly, was not justified as the only power granted to Adam was the paternal power of a parent over a child, it was not a mandate for monarchical rule that had descended to all the rulers of the earth. Juxtaposed with this power was the claim that a king had the right to dispose of his subjects in the ‘last resort’ for the good of the state. The primary argument for the defence of absolute power and unlimited obedience was the need to counteract the wickedness of their subjects through the ‘last resort’ (in law and justice). However, the doctrine of ‘*Passive Submission*’ (obedience) removed the people’s ability to defend themselves against the ‘*Desolation*’ of Government, placing them ‘under an *Absolute Monarch*’ without any ‘possibility of *Redressing* the greatest *Universal Misery* that can be conceived.’¹⁸⁶ Such a situation would equate to ‘the miserable Condition of the whole of the *People of France*, which hath proceeded from the *King’s* being *Absolute*.’¹⁸⁷ A nation that embodied patriarchy and absolutism in the person of Louis XIV who claimed to reign by divine right, yet who would not be able to trace back his ancestors to Noah or Adam, as no other king could.

¹⁸⁵ Benjamin Hoadly, *The Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed*, in *The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D. D.*, Volume II, p. 189, Edited John Hoadly (London, 1773), 189.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 187.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 187.

The answer to the French ‘Condition’ which the English had found and which Hoadly needed them to continue to exercise was the concentration of government on the people. It was Hoadly’s contention that the true authority from God for government was to serve the public good not itself. So, in those exceptional cases when the government truly strayed away from its *modus operandi*, the public was left with recourse to self-defence: resistance. In such circumstances the public could either choose to ignore the government through ‘passive submission’ or directly resist and protect the public good:

[The] Law of Nature, and of God, which allows of Self-defense, and Self-preservation in Societies, as well as in particular Persons. As therefore a Man may lawfully defend his Life against the Attaques of another, who is Superior in other Respects, so may a People, or Nation, defend itself against any *Attempts* to ruin it, though coming from Persons who have Authority in other Cases.¹⁸⁸

Furthermore, as God had not chosen a particular form of government it was perfectly reasonable to suggest that God had allowed his authority to be used in the creation of a compact between men when they decided on society. ‘*Humane Compact* might found Government,’ wrote Hoadly, ‘and yet be *superior* to it, so as to be its *Rule*; and so as that the whole *Society* might still have the Right to take care of themselves, superior to the *particular Right* of any Man to govern, which was given only for the good of the whole.’¹⁸⁹ The compact and the institution of a state’s government thereby reflected the ‘Equality’ and ‘Independency’ that existed before the contract, as well as the need for the ‘Dependency’ that brought the people together. It also reflected the people’s ability and power to change and restructure government, as the ‘Right of preserving [society] ...and its Privileges against those who have no right to invade, or destroy them.’¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 203.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 256 .

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 204.

Hoadly's rejection of divine right and his espousal of the belief in the people's ability to alter the Succession by resisting the ruler were strongly disputed. This proved to be particularly true between 1710 and 1714, as there was an increase in Jacobite activity as it readied itself on the (seemingly) impending Hanoverian accession. In *Obedience to Civil Government clearly stated* (1711), the anonymous author stated that the 'Christian Religion having its Foundation laid in the Humility and Contempt of the World, could not but commend to its Disciples *Self-Denial*, and all the whole Train of *Suffering –Graces*.'¹⁹¹ The author attacked those who believed in resistance – the Whigs and anti-Papists – by arguing that mankind's desire to rebel developed from the Fall, needed to be 'guarded against' and not encouraged. It was God's will that people should not be able to resist the 'Magistrate' or his 'Ministers' and Christians are duty bound to obey. To 'legalize Resistance' against the sovereign 'directly overthrows all Government,' as it overturns the relationship between superiors and inferiors. Hoadly's theories the author claimed, were dangerous to the existence of government as they threatened the need for obedience and would lead to chaos. 'Rebellion is Rebellion, tho' they can make great Complaints upon their Prince ...The sufferings of many People are not of that value, that God's Righteous Laws should be Silenced or Rejected for their sake.'¹⁹² While the author claimed that James II had 'abdicated' thus preventing a revolt, they continued to attack the potential danger of the multitude. A multitude that must be controlled by the power of Patriarchy as has been the case since Adam. The 'Multitude were never trusted with any Power: For the Multitude are all continued in Families, of which none have Power to govern but the Father, all the rest are excluded from Power, which makes the Bulk of the People; therefore the Multitude never had Power given them by God.'¹⁹³ Under the authority of God, kingship and paternal authority was the natural form of government (and law). To allow the 'Multitude' to rule would lead to

¹⁹¹ Anonymous, *Obedience to Civil Government clearly stated* (London, 1711), 1.

¹⁹² *Ibid.* 81.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.* 17.

a chaos in which the government would be held to ransom by the ‘People or Demagogues’ when ‘they pleas’d.’¹⁹⁴

This argument was supported by Jonathan Smedley in *The Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance Stated* (1710). Smedley (1671-1729), the Dean of Clogher, stated that ‘UNITY, PEACE and LOVE in their own Nature so truly charming, and [which] so justly endear themselves to all Mankind’ are what mankind strives to achieve.¹⁹⁵ If these qualities of mankind and society are what men aspire for why advocate resistance and rebellion. Resistance meant the ‘taking Arms to fight or coerce the Prince, the taking the Sword and smiting with it,’¹⁹⁶ causing an internecine destruction of the virtues they covet. For Smedley, God did not want the people to have this power to destroy the peace of society and it was not for the people to judge the actions of the king. If the ‘Prince is to be judg’d by the People, when he is judg’d, he commences a Subject to them, and so consequently must cease to be an Independent Sovereign.’¹⁹⁷ The essence of sovereignty shaped by divine right was a need to elevate the monarch above his people to ensure his power and ability to rule them by not being one of them: a king must be on high. According to Smedley, divine right and the role of kingship under God was predominantly effective and king’s ensured the well-being of their subjects. While ‘History does afford us some *Monsters*, some *Neroes*, some *Caligulas*,’ on the whole there have ‘been a greater, far greater Number, just the Reverse of these, whose Qualities have been brighter than their Diadems.’¹⁹⁸ Resistance was therefore not necessary as it would create too much harm to society. Smedley further argued that there was a difference between the recourse to ‘Passive Obedience’ for a beleaguered people under a poor monarch, and ‘Active Obedience.’ By either observing the bare minimum of their duty

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 18.

¹⁹⁵ Jonathan Smedley, *The Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance Stated* (London, 1710), 3.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 6.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 14.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.* 16-17.

or resisting certain commands a king would be forced to rethink his position, behaviour, or course of action and be forced to reconsider:

For if the People all keep steady to their Duty, and don't in the least recede from it, to gratify his Desires, it is out of his power to affect them; if his Soldiers desert him, or at least Disobey his Commands; if his Judges tell him his Proceedings are directly contrary to the Laws of the Land; if his Divines inculcate his Breach of his Coronation Oath, and thereby the contracting the heinous Guilt of Perjury; if his Council dissuades him, his Ministry neglects him; and in fine, his whole Kingdom remonstrates against his conduct, and earnestly intreats him to desist so Oppressing them ...what Prince can be so Savage, so void of Gratitude, and common Humanity, still to continue Tyrannical to a People, which he can't but know deserve better Treatment, and more obliging returns?¹⁹⁹

Passive obedience towards the monarch therefore worked for Smedley as it corrected a wayward monarch without destruction of the state and society. It might perhaps be added here that for Smedley, as with the author of *Obedience to Civil Government* clearly stated, James II was viewed as vacating his throne and thereby making obsolete the need to use passive obedience. As Smedley claimed, James II 'was not FORC'D OUT, he WITHDREW HIMSELF',²⁰⁰ an uncomfortable distinction that allowed for the altered Succession.

1716

The alteration of the Succession was not, however, accepted by the Jacobite supporters who argued that it was both illegal civilly and according to the laws of nature. Perhaps one of the most infamous Jacobite works during this period was *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted* (1713) by the non-juror George Harbin (1665-1744). There are two main points to the work. The first is that England relied on monarchical hereditary right for the transmission of government. Harbin claimed that the 'Kings of *England*, who had not

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 17-18.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 24.

Hereditary Right, have claim'd it for many Ages; never was any King in England, who wou'd not have preferr'd Hereditary Right to all other Titles.'²⁰¹ The key to Harbin's hereditary right was that over the previous 900 years the English crown had relied upon it. Even when there was no direct line or if the crown had been usurped, and new kings had been offered the title under hereditary succession. Many English kings, therefore, had not been the next heir to the throne but had been 'esteemed *Rightful Successors*.' This had been the case through a combination of blood-tie to the royal line, and that the successor had been named heir by the previous king through a will and testament. Hereditary right provided a *de facto* king with *de jure* status and ratified his claim to rule. The second main point made by Harbin in the work was that a monarch could resign by using the precedent of Richard Plantagenet Duke of York's resignation as opposition (in 1453) to Henry VI. The inference thereby, was that Queen Anne as the presumptive heir should resign in their favour of the true and direct heir: her half-brother James Stuart.

In *The Finishing Stroke* (1716), a response to Hoadly's *Original and Institution of Civil Government*, the nonjuring divine and staunch Jacobite Charles Leslie (1650-1722), also attempted to argue for the position of James Stuart by returning to the old Jacobite method of the 1690s. Leslie claimed that the 'Authority of a Father is Civil Government; and *Absolute* where there is no *Superior Authority* to Controul it.'²⁰² This power of patriarchy – discussed in Genesis V – was passed down the male line by primogeniture as Adam passed his authority to Cain, down to the father of every family (clan) as could be seen in the 'Indians of America.' The importance of the relationship of the father (king) and child (subject) as witnessed with the Biblical kings was the clarity of each role and the obedience of the latter toward their (civic) ruler. It was certain 'that *Joshua* was sole *Monarch*, and as *Absolute* as *Moses*, that it was *Death* to any who should *Rebell* against him, or not Obey him *in all that*

²⁰¹ George Harbin, *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted* (London, 1713), 13.

²⁰² Charles Leslie, *The Finishing Stroke* (London, 1716), 11.

he Commanded (Josh. I.17, 18).²⁰³ There could therefore be absolutely no resistance to a Prince in Leslie's eyes, nor any thought of rebellion, for the people must not be allowed to take the 'Reins of Government' and lead it to 'Ruin,' 'Injustice and Violence.' It was the duty of the subject to accept tyrannical monarchs, who still do 'so much Good, that he may be truly called a *Terroure* to *Evil-doers*, tho he may be an *Evil-doer* himself.'²⁰⁴ There could therefore be no justification for the removal of James II in the Revolution of 1689 for even the worst of tyrants must be tolerated and obeyed. Leslie's use of patriarchy as a doctrine after 1688 was designed not only to defend a Stuart restoration but was a further attempt to keep the social strata intact at a time in which popular consent and the power of Parliament were being frequently discussed. Leslie was attempting to galvanize Jacobite support after the accession of George I and the disastrous failed uprising in Scotland in 1715 by appealing to those unhappy with Whig reforms of state and Parliament. In many ways it had a sense of one last roll of the dice for Jacobite propaganda for James Stuart due to the damage created for the cause by the uprising which effectively killed it off in England. However, the inclusion of Leslie is worthwhile in demonstrating how late the Jacobites were still relying on the theory of divine right.

Such Jacobite appeals to divine right, patriarchy, and hereditary succession were vociferously attacked and ridiculed, particularly Harbin's work notably for its support for hereditary succession. The period in which Harbin's work was written was a time of great uncertainty and fear in England over the Succession and the intentions of the Jacobites. Yet, by the time that Leslie had written *The Finishing Stroke* this fear had abated significantly due to the accession of George I and the disastrous 1715 uprising. It was within this climate of fear that the anonymous author of *The British Liberty Asserted* (1714) attacked the defence of hereditary right by Harbin as an:

²⁰³ *Ibid.* 64.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 95.

Abuse of Scripture Phrase prophecies ... [for] the Restauration of the Pretender, who, if ever he should come here, must bring a French Army and a French Government with him, Popery, Slavery, Whips, Gallies, Wheels, and all the Instruments of Popish Tyranny; and yet according to him shall the Nations be convinc'd that the Heavens do rule.²⁰⁵

The 'Pretender' would have to enforce God's will of his hereditary right upon the British people in a kingdom that did not want him, and in a land that had not historically followed hereditary right. The Irish politician John Asgill (1659-1738), attacked in *The Succession of the House of Hanover Vindicated* (1714), attacked Harbin's notion that a monarch could leave a will selecting the next monarch. For while a king may select a successor, that successor must be ratified by Parliament, as kingship was a role within the state rather than a king's private property: 'Now I have heard the Lawyers say, That the King cannot, by Will, dispose the Jewels of the Crown.'²⁰⁶ Parliament had historically always had the '*Dernier Resort*' over the succession as it could limit the inheritance and change it. Any argument to the contrary was the work of Jacobite casuists attempting to assert the 'Pretender's' claim by (ancient) arguments. Asgill claimed, that they 'would have the Britons and *Hybernians* turn *Galatians desiring again to be Bondage*; and to exchange their Religion and Liberties (which they have defended with much Blood and Treasure) for Superstition and Slavery.' Following the doctrine of '*Hereditary Intention*' was nothing short of 'Inticing them to burn their own House.'²⁰⁷

One of the most effective attacks upon Harbin's work was executed by Viscount John Shute Barrington, (1678-1734) lawyer and theologian. In *The Revolution and Anti-Revolution Principles Stated and Compared* (1714), Barrington concurred with Asgill by arguing that to withstand the Jacobite threat and the remaining French spectre haunting the

²⁰⁵ Anonymous, *The British Liberty Asserted* (London, 1714), 62.

²⁰⁶ John Asgill, *The Succession of the House of Hanover Vindicated, Against the Pretender's Second Declaration in Folio, intituled, The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted, &c* (London, 1714), 63.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 68.

English, the people must unify. Things had reached such a state that unless people ‘do not of themselves drop their unreasonable Dissentions, they will be quickly forc’d to it’ as ‘Liberty it self [was] lost, and all that [was] dear to them [would] be at the Mercy of Arbitrary Power.’²⁰⁸ The divisions had enabled the Jacobites to instil fear in the English, while further fear was created by the proclamation of Jacobite principles such as absolutism, absolute submission, and divine hereditary right. Yet for Barrington there was no hereditary right, and Harbin was grossly mistaken in his claims as he highlighted through his discussion of *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted*. Not since the youngest son of Noah, Ham, had a ruler inherited his title through true hereditary right: ‘The present French king [Louis XIV] is descended from Hugh Capet and he is not from Lorain or Pepin,’ and ‘Queen Anne is part of a broken English line.’ English history was filled with episodes of rebellion and usurpation and throughout the deciding element of kingship was the possession of the crown. This had been accepted practice for centuries and was reflected in law, thereby ‘the *Jacobites* can have no Pretence to disown the Authority of the late and present Government’ as in past generations they had themselves profited from it.²⁰⁹ To deny this would be to remove the authority of all the governments of the world. The Jacobites had to accept that its line was broken as Queen Anne’s would be broken, and then the Hanoverian line would begin.

The truth of English government was that the state was run by the legislative, in its three constituent parts: king, Lords, and Commons. These three parts are equal under God who they obtain their supremacy from, and these parts work together for the good of the English state and people. While they work together they also act as blocks to any attempt by one of those parts to obtain supremacy above the others alone, and this was the case with James II.

²⁰⁸ Viscount Barrington, *The Revolution and Anti-Revolution Principles stated and compar’d, the Constitution explain’d and vindicated* (Third Edition, London, 1714), 3.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 80.

His attempts to augment his power at the cost of the other two estates forced them to exercise their legal authority and remove him from power and alter the Succession. This action was essential in ensuring the rights and freedoms of the people:

If it be lawful to frame such a Constitution as ours, it must be as lawful to defend it against any Part, who shou'd endeavour to destroy the whole, since every such Attempt must be Renouncing and Abdicating that Authority, which it held by Vertue of the Constitution: And if the People may oppose either or both Houses, should they endeavour to overthrow the Constitution, the same Reason would justify them in defending it against the Prince, since the Constitution as little allows of an Absolute Monarchy, as it does of an Aristocracy, or a Republick.²¹⁰

The absolutist aspirations of James II to Barrington's mind, had to be stopped as they had no place within the English constitution nor within the English legislative, as absolutism usurped the power of the whole. If the Lords and the Commons had not acted as they had England would have found itself in a 'state of irretrievable Slavery.'²¹¹

Barrington's *A Dissuasive from Jacobitism* (1713) was an attack upon the implications of a Jacobite restoration in England. There were three main strands to Barrington's argument against Jacobitism and the 'Pretender.' The first was religion. Any restoration of the Jacobites would mean the restoration of the Catholic faith in England imposed from the top. Catholics, who were obligated to God and the Pope before their own state, who had a duty to proselytize all non-Catholics: Protestants. In his position as monarch, James Stuart would be duty-bound to God to return the English people to Catholicism or 'to destroy them.'

Barrington cited the example of Mary Queen of Scots (1542-87), who justified her frequent breaches of engagements by claiming that "Faith was not to be kept with Hereticks;" Queen Mary (1516-58) had enthusiastically attempted to eradicate Protestantism, and James II turned against the Churchmen who would not implement his Catholic reforms.²¹² Moreover,

²¹⁰ *Ibid.* 48.

²¹¹ *Ibid.* 38.

²¹² Barrington, *A Dissuasive from Jacobitism* (London, 1713), 5.

the Catholic states of France, Spain, and Hungary provided examples of the barbaric treatment of Protestant subjects. Barrington asked, ‘what can we expect but authoriz’d Villany from a Church whose infallible Head claims a power of annulling Contracts between Man and Man, and dissolving Oaths between Princes, and between them and their Subjects?’²¹³ He cited the example of France, a nation once graced with the liberties of England but now, under the power of the Church, weighted down by ‘Arbitrary Power’ and the insatiable desire for greater even power through ‘Universal Monarchy.’²¹⁴

The second argument juxtaposed the potential power of the ‘Pretender’s’ restoration and Catholicism with his desire for vengeance. Barrington noted that there were a number of (Protestant) Churchmen and pastors who had railed against Popery for over two decades but who had lately softened in the tone of their sermons against Catholicism. These churchmen – Smedley and the clergyman Luke Milbourne (1649-1720) for example - had also begun to discuss the doctrines of Hereditary Right and Non-Resistance, through their fear of a potential Jacobite restoration. In discussing a potential restoration Barrington dismissed any discussion that the ‘Pretender’ may convert to Protestantism to assuage English fears as erroneous, instead focusing on his desire for revenge:

He who believes himself to be the Son of King *James*, and the rightful Heir to the three Kingdoms, will without co[st] look upon those who have expos’d him for a *Warming-Pan Imposture*, and represented King *James* as conspiring with his Queen to disinherit his own Royal Issue, by putting a Cheat upon the Nation, as guilty of a Crime not to be forgiven, and which Rivers of Blood can never extirpate?²¹⁵

Not only would the fear of revenge ring throughout the government but it would contaminate the entire nation, as the people would not trust a Catholic ‘Pretender’ or ‘depend even on the

²¹³ *Ibid.* 17.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.* 34.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.* 20-1.

Oaths of such' a man.²¹⁶ Yet, it was Barrington's third argument that caused him the greatest concern, which was the attachment of the 'Pretender' to France. Barrington argued that not only would the 'Pretender' want retribution for his father but he would also want vengeance for the nation of his upbringing.²¹⁷ The French were a nation who had an 'antient Hereditary Hatred' of the English, fuelled by historic war and competition. The 'Pretender,' in the debt of Louis XIV, would be forced to follow the French lead and acquiesce in their plans for greater power. Such a passive economic and political foreign policy toward the French would ruin England.²¹⁸ Dismissing recent discussions that it was the Dutch who were England's greatest rivals in trade, Barrington stated that 'the French alone are our Rivals in Trade.' If England was not then 'a Match for France,' how would it be in a weakened position under the Jacobites. England would not be able to withstand a strengthened France and would lose its trade and colonies to the French navy, both economically and politically England would become a 'Province' of France.²¹⁹ A Jacobite restoration would not only ruin English power and trade, it would erode its religious and civil liberties and place the people into the position of slaves.

Barrington's bleak forecast for a future under a Jacobite restoration was at an apex of fear concerning the potential of the Jacobite threat. There was a real sense as Queen Anne's health failed that the 'Pretender' may become the king of England. Rapidly from 1714 this fear subsided. Arguably the most important element was the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) and the apparent removal of the French threat and their backing of the Jacobites. While this fear did not subside immediately, within a year suspicions had alleviated, and Defoe can be found eulogizing Louis XIV in a *View of the real danger to the Protestant Succession*. Inevitably discussion continued of the threat of French trade (Steele, *The Crisis*, 1713), but politically

²¹⁶ *Ibid.* 26.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.* 21.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.* 30-34.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.* 30-34.

and in terms of a French-led Jacobite invasion this has mainly passed. Some traces can be found in the build-up toward the Jacobite uprising, such as in the anonymous pamphlet *Hanover or Rome*²²⁰ but this is a general fear that the Jacobites would use French (and Irish) Catholic troops in their endeavours. By 1716 and the failure of the 1715 Jacobite uprising fear had been replaced by a rejection of the Jacobite threat. William Wake the Archbishop of Canterbury, stated that George I was *de facto* monarch and that over time he would be viewed as *de jure* king. It was their ‘Duty to be Subject to, and Obey the *King in Possession*,’ and if their ‘Allegiance be due to King GEORGE, we are so far from owning any allegiance to the PRETENDER.’²²¹ Even, the Jacobite sympathizer Francis Atterbury had acknowledged the defeat of the Jacobite restoration.²²² He called upon George I to show his magnanimity by forgiving the rebels involved in the Uprising, and using it as an opportunity to gain greater support for his rule from the English people over the ‘Pretender.’

1722

By 1717 the Jacobites had come to be viewed as a costly annoyance who had wasted money and soldiers, and ‘had much Blood spilt, and *Scotland* half ruin’d, to keep out a Person, that not one in a hundred believes to be the Son of King *James*.’²²³ The Jacobite threat had been removed as the British had achieved a sense of security. French support for the Jacobites had ceased first through Utrecht and then the Anglo-Franco Alliance (1716),²²⁴ the safe transition of power to George I had been achieved and English Protestant liberties had been maintained through a Whig-dominated Parliament. The actuality of a Jacobite

²²⁰ Anonymous, *Hanover or Rome* (London, 1715).

²²¹ William Wake, *A Vindication of the Realm, And the Church of England*, 33.

²²² See Atterbury’s *Affections of the People* (London, 1716).

²²³ Whitelocke Bulstrode, *A Letter touching the Late Rebellion* (London, 1717), 5.

²²⁴ See the following section of this chapter for a description of this Alliance.

invasion had allowed the British to confront their demons and found them wanting and disproportionate to their fears. The Jacobites were therefore no longer to be feared they were to be scorned and ridiculed for their ineptitude, as ‘the *British Jacobites*, who being Slaves by Principle, and generally Sots by Education, are ...a bragging, blustering, cowardly Sett of Men, whom the least kind Usage, they always imputing it to Fear, makes them *insupportably insolent*.’²²⁵ The Jacobite peer Lord Lansdowne may well have rued the Whig Ministry and the ‘Authority which (we know from the general Sense of the Nation) can be continued in the same Hands, by no other Means but Violence and Corruption; must be maintained as it is got.’²²⁶ Yet Lansdowne was in a very small minority of Jacobite supporters and he was one of its leading figures. For many, such as Richard Arnett the ‘Pretender’ was a figure that remained a distant presence but who refused to cease his activities despite having no chance of success. In *A Seasonable Hue and Cry after the Pretender* (1719), Arnett accused the ‘Pretender’ of leading on foreign ministers, such as the Pope with talk of a successful restoration in order to live at the expense of others.²²⁷ When he did occasionally rear his head as he did with the Spanish in 1719, these ventures quickly failed. The vast majority of British people thought it better if he would not attempt them and gave up completely.²²⁸

This desire to move beyond the political considerations and concerns of the Jacobite threat after the Treaty of Utrecht can be demonstrated by the emergence of the new pre-occupation in commerce. Whilst political works, especially in the first decade of the eighteenth-century were particularly focused on war with France and the ongoing discussion of the Succession, from the middle part of the next decade there was a notable rise in the discussion of commerce. In *A General History of Trade* (1713) for example, the author discussed the trade

²²⁵ Matthew Tindal, *The Defection consider'd, and The Designs of those, who divided the Friends of the Government, set in a True Light* (London, 1717), 53.

²²⁶ Duke of Lansdowne, *A Letter from a Noble-Man Abroad, to his Friend in England* (London, 1722), 7.

²²⁷ Richard Arnett, *A Seasonable Hue and Cry after the Pretender* (London, 1719), 6.

²²⁸ *Ibid.* 4.

options now open with France after the Treaty. The author's greatest concern was how to extricate Britain from its treaty with Portugal for goods so that it could focus on cultivating trade with the French. Once trade had been established with France the decision would have to be taken over whether to levy heavy duties upon French goods as they do with Britain, or to lessen duty in an attempt to encourage greater trade. They proposed a 'Necessary Medium:'

[W]e ought to get all possible Burthens taken off from our Manufactures and other Exports from hence in France, and yet at the same time keep on such high part of our high Duties upon French Foods Imported here, as may be sufficient to restrain their Importation in too great quantities, so as to be prejudicial to our Trade in General, and cause an Over-balance in their Trade to our Prejudice.²²⁹

The aim of the work was to ensure the hegemony of British trade in markets that had been ring-fenced by the Dutch and the French. It was proposed that this could be achieved by starving the European market of British wool to create a huge demand for wool (to create woollen goods), in order to gain Britain greater access to other markets. An economic strangulation of a country's trade was also later suggested against Spain,²³⁰ this time in the shape of a naval blockade against the Spanish who had seized English merchant ships. 'The most speedy and effectual Method to reduce our Enemies,' the author argued, was 'to stop the Fountain of their Money, and obstruct their Commerce.'²³¹ As a land war with Spain would be too expensive, Britain should rely upon its superior navy to damage Spanish trade.

The desire to trade with France was not necessarily shared, as to many France was a trading enemy. In *And what if the Pretender should come?* (1713) Defoe emphasized the natural superiority of French trade while attacking the proclivity of absolutism to destroy free

²²⁹ [Anonymous], *A General History of Trade* (London, 1713), 5.

²³⁰ Anonymous, *The Present Exigencies of the Government consider'd* (London, 1719). Interestingly this work was written after the Spanish were funding a potential Jacobite rebellion and supplied ships to this failed invasion, yet no mention was made of the Jacobites.

²³¹ Anonymous, *The Present Exigencies of the Government consider'd*, 64.

(English) commerce through control and restraint.²³² Barrington espoused the beneficial relationship between liberty and British commerce. As had been proven in ancient times in Greece and now with Britain and Holland, liberty in a state allowed commerce to flourish while absolutism extinguished commerce through control:

‘Tis notoriously false, that defending Liberty, destroys more lives than submitting to Tyranny, since those Nations, who have preserv’d their freedom, notwithstanding the Blood and Treasure it has cost them, are Populous as well as rich, abound with all the conveniences as well as necessities of life, have not only the useful Arts and Sciences in perfection, but those which serve for Pleasure and Luxury; and tho’ they are plac’d in never so barren a Soil, and have never so many natural inconveniences to struggle with, they know how to make Nature submit to Art.²³³

Barrington attacked the notion that it was the Dutch that were dangerous to Britain and that the British should favour the French growth over Dutch. He asked, how if Britain alone was ‘not now a Match for France,’ how would it fare against a France strengthened by the Treaty that had access to trade in Spain and upper Germany?²³⁴ This would enable French expansion and an attack on the British wool trade, before allowing French dominance in the Colonies. While some argued that the Dutch were Britain’s greatest rivals in trade, Barrington disagreed and claimed, ‘The *French* alone are our Rivals in Trade, especially with relation to our Woollen Manufactures.’ Prompting his belief that if they ‘were destroyed, then the greatest part of the Trade of the World would center in us.’²³⁵

The disappearance of the Jacobite threat from 1716 was emphasized by the focus on commerce as a central theme in British political literature. A secured succession and a powerful Whig ministry enabled Britain to focus on commercial interests as part of its policy. This policy was attacked by Matthias Earberry’s *An Historical Account of the Advantages*

²³² Defoe, *And what if the Pretender should come?* (London, 1713), 13.

²³³ Viscount Barrington, *The Revolution and Anti-Revolution Principles Stated and Compar’d*, 40.

²³⁴ Viscount Barrington, *A Dissuasive from Jacobitism*, 30-34.

²³⁵ *Ibid.* 34.

that have accru'd to England by the Succession in the Illustrious House of Hanover (1722).

Earberry attacked the present state of Britain with its political in-fighting and financial and commercial situation after the South Sea Bubble (1720). For Earberry the root of these problems could be found in William III who had enacted policies while king that were designed to protect Dutch interests and trade, especially as England was their greatest rival. The South Sea Scheme was therefore designed 'to raise Money, not to discharge National Debts, but to support Foreign Interests, which do not in the least relate to *England*.'²³⁶

From a natural love of his own country William was 'easily inclin'd to be cool in the Affairs of England, and be willing to suffer a Foreign Competitor to reach the Advantage of its Commerce' for the Dutch.²³⁷ Earberry argued that this had led William to select the House of Hanover for the Succession as it would ensure Protestantism, while not posing a threat to Dutch interests. Indeed, George spent time in Holland after his accession to the throne before he reached England, as the Dutch 'took Care to instil such Notions into him, with Respect to their common Interest.' This was at times 'very Inconsistent with that of England.'²³⁸ George I was viewed by Earberry as employing the British government and its finances to benefit Hanover, citing the use of the East India Company, and alliances with France and Spain that profit Hanover not Britain. Ultimately, such policies and the efforts to tackle the National Debt largely expanded due to William's wars against the French, had led to the chaos of the South Sea Bubble. The creation of the South Sea Company was another attempt to reduce the public debt. The Company won the right to effectively privatize the national debt by persuading public creditors to exchange their assets for stock in the

²³⁶ Matthias Earberry, *An Historical Account of the Advantages that have accru'd to England, by the Succession in the Illustrious House of Hanover* (London, 1722), 25.

²³⁷ *Ibid.* 7.

²³⁸ *Ibid.* 15-16.

company.²³⁹ Many people invested in the company and share prices rose quickly, but by the late summer of 1720 it was obvious that the company's prospects were not high and it catastrophically collapsed. Its share price had been artificially inflated through a mixture of insider trading, bad advice and bribery. Yet the result was devastating for many who had invested and numerous noble families lost large parts of their wealth or all of it²⁴⁰ and fuelled, albeit very briefly, another potential Jacobite opportunity due to the emotional response to the Bubble. Yet despite the apparent opportunity of the Bubble which the Jacobites recognized in the Atterbury Plot due to the public outrage at the consequences of the scheme, the government and the king were secure enough to brush aside the Plot.²⁴¹

The South Sea Bubble also afford the opportunity to discuss the moral aspect of commercial activity through an examination by George Berkeley in *An Essay towards preventing the Ruine of Great Britain* (1721). For Berkeley, the 'South Sea Affair ... [was] not the original Evil, or the great Source of our Misfortunes; it is but the natural Effect of those Principles so many Year have been propagated with great Industry.'²⁴² The devastation and 'ruine' caused by the crash were an example of man's quest for easy-money and lacking virtue. Berkeley believed that the crash would not have been so bad if the public had chosen religion and virtue over 'Cousenage and Stock-jobbing.' Yet the abandonment of morality was symptomatic of a debauched Britain. 'Religion,' Frugality,' and 'Public Spirit,' the foundations of public happiness and prosperity, had been replaced by 'Vice and

²³⁹ Julian Hoppit, "Checking the Leviathan, 1688-1832," *The Political Economy of British Historical Experience, 1688-1914*, Ed. Donald Winch & Patrick O'Brien (Oxford, 2002), 290.

²⁴⁰ On the impact of the South Sea Bubble see Julian Hoppit, "The Myths of the South Sea Bubble," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, Vol. 12 (2002), 141-165. Hoppit argues that the disruption to Britain was actually quite modest although people did suffer. The crisis was often used for political ends.

²⁴¹ See the 'Andrew Michael Ramsay' chapter of this Thesis for a description of the Atterbury Plot, (page 32). Also, for a discussion on Jacobite activity in relation to the Bubble see Bruce Lenman "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism in in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689 -1759*, (ed. Eveline Cruickshanks).

²⁴² George Berkeley, *An Essay towards preventing the Ruine of Great Britain* (London, 1721), 25.

Irreligion.’²⁴³ The recent financial schemes with their prospect of huge profit easily gained were simply a further manifestation of man’s already corrupt passions. The difficulty for Berkeley was that such behaviour turned the natural order of morality on its head:

INDUSTRY is the natural way to Wealth. This is so true, that it is impossible an industrious free People should want the Necessaries and Comforts of Life, or an idle enjoy them under any form of Government Money is so far useful to the Public, as it promoteth Industry; and Credit having the same effect, is of the same value with Money. But Money or Credit circulating through the Nation from Hand to Hand, without producing Labour and Industry in the Inhabitants, is direct Gaming.²⁴⁴

In this ‘game,’ some cunning men had done well and made entire fortunes, but some ‘less skilful’ players had been ruined, losing entire long-established fortunes. For Berkeley, this profit was not gained through hard work and industry but by profiteering and ‘chance.’ Under such (immoral) circumstances the outcome is unknown, and while some profit hugely there are many more losers, with some losers left on the Parish by their own ‘Avarice and Credulity, destroyed by ‘Luxury and Wantonness.’ A luxury that historically – Berkeley cited the Persians, Lacedaemonians, and Romans - had been the destruction of numerous states as it offered prosperity and riches without ‘Industry and Virtue.’ Such schemes therefore lacked the ‘moderation’ required for public benefit, and left Berkeley fearing that eventually everyone would lose out. His solution was the need to increase the public spirit of the nation through industry and public works. It was essential to ‘recover a sense of Public Spirit’ which could be achieved through a ‘sense of Religion.’²⁴⁵ Government policy should be adapted to create ‘Courage and Perseverance in a Public Cause. This would be augmented by utilizing the ‘noble Arts’ (architecture, sculpture, and painting) and other means of employment (building for example), to promote virtue. Fundamentally, through industry and labour, ‘new Arts’ would be created to ‘employ many Hands, keep the Mony circulating at

²⁴³ *Ibid.* 1.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 5.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 20.

home, and lastly, that it would be a notable instance of Public Spirit, as well as Motive to it.’ This was ‘no more than the wisest Nations have done before us,’ and was vital for the financial and moral regeneration of Britain.

The attention paid to commercial activity from 1713 emphasizes a tendency to move away from the political concerns of the succession toward a growing interest in political economy. This pattern in the political literature reflects a lessening of the concern especially after 1716, with the fear of the Jacobites as attention focused interest on how to enrich the established government and king’s purse. By the time of the South Sea Bubble and the consequent Atterbury Plot, even despite disastrous commercial activity the government and succession were in such a strong position the Jacobite event failed in its inception. Much of this focus on the potential possibility of commerce was enabled by peace with France in 1713. The reign of Louis XIV had been characterized by frequent wars, and Britain had fought in two wars with France in just over two decades. The creation of a stable peace allowed ventures such as the increasingly important potential of commerce for both Britain and France, and this in turn reflected a focus on the need for internal political reforms.

French Notions of Political Reform, 1714-1721

As has been stated, Louis XIV’s reign was dominated by frequent European wars throughout his long reign. Louis XIV’s engagement of France in the Spanish Wars of Succession (1701-14) was an attempt to consolidate the crown of Spain for the Duke of Burgundy’s brother Anjou (Philip V), although it was seen by many across Europe as a means for potential French universal monarchy. After the death of Cardinal Mazarin (March 1661), France had begun a policy of aggrandizement with Louis XIV’s appointment of

François Michel Le Tellier (1641-91) as his Secretary of State for War and Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-83) as his finance minister. The *raison d'être* of these ministers was to achieve political and commercial French hegemony in Europe.²⁴⁶ From the 1660s and the War of Devolution (1667-68), the French embarked upon a strident (and bellicose) foreign policy designed to promote France's ascendancy in Europe.²⁴⁷ What followed was a number of wars such as the Dutch Wars (1672-78) and the Nine Years War (1688-97) as France began to assert its claim of dominance over the Habsburgs and the rest of Europe in an ostensible attempt to settle the balance of power by achieving a universal monarchy over Europe under Louis.²⁴⁸

This aggressive foreign policy had been matched by great internal reform in France during Louis' reign as government became more centralized and the monarchy became the apotheosis of European absolutism. While the process of centralization had begun before the reign of Louis XIV it was more focused after the death of Mazarin (1602-61).²⁴⁹ Under the guidance of Colbert and Le Tellier government bureaucratization was enhanced as greater information allowed the government to reach all parts of the state. This enabled a more effective collection of taxation as well as a greater control of the apparatus of state, reinforced by a reformed army, such as through the use of a conscripted militia.²⁵⁰ France's internal changes and strengthened state were manifested through the policy of Gallicanism, which asserted the independence of the French Catholic Church from Rome and Papal interference. One of the leading architects of the Gallican philosophy was Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-

²⁴⁶ For a discussion of French economic reforms and Colbertism see Lionel Rothkrug's *Opposition to Louis XIV, The Political and Social Origins of the French Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1965).

²⁴⁷ See J. Lough "France under Louis XIV," chapter 10 of *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 5: The Ascendancy of France 1648-88*, (ed. F.L. Carsten, 1961), and Carsten's introduction to this edition "The Age of Louis XIV" for a discussion of France and the foreign policy of Louis XIV.

²⁴⁸ Maria J. Rodriguez-Salgado, "The Habsburg-Valois Wars" p. 379 in *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 2: The Reformation 1520-1559*, (ed. G. R. Elton, 1990); and H. G. Koenigsberger, "Western Europe and the power of Spain: the French succession and war with England," chapter 9, 3 in *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 3: The Counter-Reformation and Price Revolution 1559-1610* (Cambridge, 1968).

²⁴⁹ David Parker, *The Making of French Absolutism* (Edward Arnold, London, 1983), 119-25.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 124.

1704), the Bishop of Meaux. Bossuet's strong anti-Protestant doctrine²⁵¹ and attacks on the power of the office of the Pope²⁵² led to his rise to prominence in the French court and he worked alongside Le Tellier. Bossuet effectively became the mouthpiece, architect and defender for Gallicanism and his skill as an orator was used to promote the absolutist regime of Louis XIV.²⁵³ Bossuet's absolutist doctrine exemplified in his posthumously published *Politique tirée de l'Écriture sainte* (1709), asserted the king's power through his sacred, paternal, absolute and rational rule.²⁵⁴ Bossuet argued that Louis XIV was sacred in his 'charge, as being the representative of divine majesty, deputed by his providence for the execution of his plans.'²⁵⁵ While the king should not act arbitrarily in his government Bossuet asserted a power, magnificence and absolutism that left Louis XIV's behaviour and policy beholden to God alone.²⁵⁶

Such a belief in the power of the king's will and Louis' proclivity toward *Gloire* through war were contributing factors in France's repeated wars during the reign of Louis XIV.²⁵⁷ Yet during the War of Spanish Succession, French power and ambitions were severely checked by a combined European force comprising of Britain, the Dutch, the Holy Roman Empire and others. Louis' old advisers were dead, Bossuet had died in 1704, and at this time the allied coalition began to win a series of victories.²⁵⁸ By 1709 Louis was willing to make peace but the conditions were not finally acceptable to Louis until 1713 when the Treaty of Utrecht was finally signed in April of that year. In the Treaty France had to make a number

²⁵¹ Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *The Ancien Régime, A History of France 1610-1774* (Blackwell, London, 1996), 190.

²⁵² *Ibid.* 203.

²⁵³ Roger Mettam, "France," *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, Ed. John Miller (Macmillan, London, 1990), 50.

²⁵⁴ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, Ed. & Trans. Patrick Riley (Cambridge, 1990), 57.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 58. A full description of Bossuet's absolutist theory will be given in chapter 4.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 260.

²⁵⁷ John Miller, "Britain," *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (ed. John Miller, Macmillan, London, 1990), 219.

²⁵⁸ Derek McKay & H.M. Scott, *The Rise of the Great Powers, 1648-1815* (Pearson Education Ltd., Harlow, 1983), 60.

of concessions such as the removal of Philip V's claim to the throne in favour of the Orléans branch of the Bourbon dynasty, as well as the removal of the 'Pretender' from French soil. In return for these concession however, Philip V retained his crown despite the loss of some Italian assets (Milan for example) to the Emperor.²⁵⁹

Two years after the Treaty of Utrecht was finalised Louis XIV died in September 1715. Louis' seventy-two year reign, the longest of a European monarch, left an economic, social and political system 'that had been worn down by Louis XIV's costly and aggressive policies.'²⁶⁰ During the establishment of the Regency (for Louis XV born in 1710) under Philippe, the Duc d'Orléans (1674-1723) it had become essential to ensure a time of peace, stability, and renewal. While Louis XIV had attempted to make peace with the Emperor and the Dutch during the Spanish Wars of Succession,²⁶¹ it was after the Treaty of Utrecht that France began to make alliances. After a period of political wrangling in which the French were forced to expel the 'Pretender' from the Papal conclave of Avignon, the Anglo-French Alliance was signed on 28th November 1716. This Alliance later became the Quadruple Alliance through its extension of Britain's Triple Alliance with the Empire and the Dutch (1718).²⁶²

France's peace treaties and alliances served as an opportunity to re-evaluate the condition of France. France essentially turned inwards in many ways by curtailing its foreign activities and concerns through alliance. Part of the explanation for this Regency policy was Orléans' fear of his own position as head of state. Orléans was unpopular among some of Louis' old ministers and branches of the Bourbon dynasty such as Louis XIV's legitimized son the Duc de Maine (1670-1736) who believed that Philip V should have become regent. Orléans'

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 66.

²⁶⁰ Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Saint-Simon and the Court of Louis XIV* (Chicago UP, 2001), 261.

²⁶¹ Derek McKay & H.M. Scott, *The Rise of the Great Powers, 1648-1815*, 105-6.

²⁶² *Ibid.* 109-10.

policy of peace assuaged many of Louis' old ministers who recognized the need for change, and this enabled Orléans to pursue reform through a 'new system of councils of state which Orléans said he wished to establish along lines formerly evoked by the Burgundy Circle.'²⁶³ The Burgundy Circle which included Fénelon, Saint-Simon, and Saint-Pierre created a number of plans for reform some of which had been rejected by Louis XIV in an attempt to move France away from absolutism in preparation for the death of Louis XIV.²⁶⁴ After his death the Gallican ideal of French independence remained but the absolutist reliance on one man controlling government direction was replaced by the use of Polysynody. Polysynody was a term coined by Saint-Pierre to describe the use of councils in a collection of government departments who would work toward rebuilding France that relied on co-operative government and delegation rather than the will of one man.²⁶⁵ In the reformed France of the Regency the ideas of the Burgundy Circle lived on,²⁶⁶ and in beginning his task as regent Orléans quoted Fénelon's *Télémaque* in hoping to be obstructed from doing evil so that he could do good.²⁶⁷

This move away from the absolutism of Louis XIV toward reform in the Regency period can be shown through a discussion of two future members of the Entresol (with Ramsay): Charles-Louis Secondat Montesquieu (1689-1755) and the abbé Charles-Irénée Castel de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743). Montesquieu's satirical *Lettres persanes* (1721) offered a commentary on the late rule of Louis XIV from 1711 and the Regency. Its central characters of Uzbek and Rica, two Persian nobleman who travel to France enabled Montesquieu to acerbically critique France as the two men correspond with contacts at home. Montesquieu's

²⁶³ Colin Jones, *The Great Nation, France from Louis XV to Napoleon, 1715-99* (Penguin, London, 2002), 38.

²⁶⁴ See p. 105 of 'The Political Fénelon' chapter for a description of the Burgundy Circle and its ideas of reform.

²⁶⁵ The origin for the idea of the Polysynody is unclear as it is present in Fénelon's *Tables de Chaulnes*, but also Saint-Simon claimed that the idea had originated from the Duke of Burgundy for his own *Projets de Gouvernement*, while Saint-Pierre was the first to publish and coin the term. For a discussion of the 'Polysynody' see, Harold A. Ellis, *Boulainvilliers and the French Monarchy: Aristocratic Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century France* (Cornell, 1988), Chapter 4.

²⁶⁶ La Roy Ladurie, *Saint-Simon, and the Court of Louis XIV*, 263.

²⁶⁷ Colin Jones, *The Great Nation, France from Louis XV to Napoleon, 1715-99*, 38.

work attacked the regime of Louis XIV for its aggrandizing behaviour, moral and financial bankruptcy, and its obsession with war:

The king of France is the most powerful in Europe ...because his riches are extracted from the vanity of his subjects, which is more inexhaustible than any mine. He has undertaken and sustained great wars with marketable titles as his only source of revenue; and by so prodigious a display of human pride, his troops are paid, his towns fortified, and his fleets equipped.²⁶⁸

Rica's letter proceeds to discuss the near-bankruptcy of the French state through war and Louis' duplicitous schemes in an attempt to generate further income to the detriment of the state for further war. Louis was depicted as a vain king, a king ruled by flatterers who would prefer to reward a flatterer rather than someone who served him truly:

He does not believe that his sovereign grandeur ought to be restrictive in the distribution of favours, and he heaps benefits on some men without investigating their real merits.

...He is magnificent, especially in his building. There are more statues in his palace gardens than there are citizens in the great city.²⁶⁹

Montesquieu's depiction of a destitute France not only discussed the problems with Louis XIV's absolute system of government, it also revealed a new freedom in his ability to critique France in such a manner. In the *Preface* to his *Polysynody* Saint-Pierre stated the difficulties in making known any disagreements with the regime:

I had formed in my Mind, a great part of the Notions you will find in this Treatise, nine or ten years before the late King's death. Now the Reader will be satisfied, that it had been of very dangerous consequence to me, and of very little service to the state, to have publish'd them at that time: But happily Affairs have taken another turn since [Louis' death]; I have therefore resum'd my Work, to contribute all I can towards bringing so noble an Establishment to perfection.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁸ Montesquieu, *Persian Letters*, Letter xxiv (Rica), Tr. George R. Healy (Hackett, Indianapolis, 1999), 42-43.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.* Letter xxxvii (Usbek), 64.

²⁷⁰ Abbé de Saint-Pierre, *Polysynody*, x.

Saint-Pierre had come to attention in Europe through his *Projet pour rendre la paix perpétuelle en Europe* (1713),²⁷¹ a work that attempted to address the issue of continual European war for the benefit of France. Saint-Pierre had been a French delegate at the Treaty of Utrecht although his ideas for a peace plan had been formed over a period of twenty years. His ‘immediate guide was Fénelon, whose plans for reform were often more virtuous than expedient.’²⁷² These ‘reform plans’ were plans created by Fénelon as the leading figure of the Burgundy Circle for the Duke of Burgundy as the heir to the French throne, and included the *Examen des conscience sur les devoirs de la royauté* and the *Tables des Chaulnes*.²⁷³ They were a series of political plans and letters drawn up for the Duke of Burgundy to reform the French monarchy upon his future accession to the throne of France. The main theme of these plans was the reform of France politically and the move away from absolutism and war. Saint-Pierre was a member of the Prince’s entourage and a peripheral figure in the Burgundy Circle, which provided him with access to these plans and to the desire to reform France.²⁷⁴

In a manner redolent of Fénelon, Saint-Pierre’s *Project* blended an appeal to kingly wisdom, virtue, and vanity with a practical plan for how to achieve peace.²⁷⁵ The aim of the work was to ‘discover whether it was not possible to find some practicable Means to terminate their future Differences without War, and so to render the Peace perpetual amongst them.’²⁷⁶ France’s involvement in war, notably the Spanish Wars of Succession had created ‘extreme misery’ for the people of a number of countries, through the destruction of war and the heavy taxation levied to pay for it. The solution to continual war and deprivation was to

²⁷¹ The work was first published in 1712, but Saint-Pierre completed a number of editions, including a two-volumed edition of 1717 and an *Abrégé* in 1729, as he attempted to perfect his *Plan*.

²⁷² Merle L. Perkins, “The Abbé de Saint-Pierre and the Seventeenth-Century Intellectual Background,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 97, No. 1 (Feb. 14. 1953), pp. 69-74, 74.

²⁷³ See the third section of ‘The Political Fénelon’ chapter for a discussion of these works.

²⁷⁴ M.P. Mesnard, *Introduction*, Saint-Simon’s *Projets de Gouvernement du Duc de Bourgogne*, viii.

²⁷⁵ Fénelon, the *Supplément* of the *Examen des conscience sur les devoirs de la royauté* discusses this issue and is also known as *The Ballance of Europe*, (London, 1720). See the following chapter for a discussion of this work and the background behind these two versions.

²⁷⁶ Saint-Pierre, *A Project for Perpetual Peace*, (London, 1714), ii.

create a *perpetual peace* through ‘European Union’ based on Sully’s *Grand Design* of Henry IV (1638).

Saint-Pierre believed that a European Union was necessary because of the abject failure of attempting to maintain a balance or equilibrium between the leading houses of Europe, specifically the Houses of France and Austria. The idea of equilibrium may ‘yield some Cessation of Motion, some truces; but far from being able to produce a solid Repose, an unalterable Peace, it furnishes any Sovereign that is ambitious, impatient, and unquiet, with an easie opportunity of recommencing the War.’²⁷⁷ A Sovereign by his very nature sought more power and this search was the need for ‘aggrandizement.’ The ambition and violent desire contained within the passions of the individual were transposed to the state, which fearful of his neighbours (adversaries) acted in an aggressive manner to assert his power. The greater the power of one state or empire the more danger and threat was produced. Enemies, even allies jealous of the success of the empire conspire to take what they envy. Hobbes’ influence on Saint-Pierre has been documented, and his *Project* has been seen as an international *Leviathan*.²⁷⁸ The aggression between states caused by their fear and competition, which could either be resolved through war (state of war) or through law. Treaties failed as they were not subject to a higher authority and therefore there was no security and perpetual result. The answer for Saint-Pierre was to utilize law by tying all states to a peace union (‘Leviathan’) in which they were protected, had rights, and could enjoy prosperity. The destruction of large empires that over-extended their as was the case with the Roman Empire, led Saint-Pierre to rejected the idea of a universal monarchy, most likely to be led by France through its natural power and current strength. The failure of empire to produce peace led Saint-Pierre back to the belief that only a co-operative ‘*Union*’

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 15.

²⁷⁸ Merle L. Perkins in “The *Leviathan* and Saint-Pierre’s *Projet de Paix Perpétuelle*, (*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 99, No.4, (Aug. 30. 1955), 259-267.

could provide a cessation to Europe's obsession with war. A union which would actually utilize Henry IV's restriction of power but now towards France, whose participation was essential for the success of the 'Union,' but whose ambitions, power, and boundaries had to be contained.

As with Sully's plan, a permanent Senate would be established which all states would submit to in the treaty of union. Utrecht was selected by Saint-Pierre for the Senate as Holland as he viewed it to be tolerant and peaceable not monarchical, thus assuaging fears of aggrandizement, a commercial centre, and its Northern climate would be conducive to hard work. States would contribute to the running of the Senate in accordance with their size, and the number of seats within the Senate would be apportioned likewise. Laws would be established against war that would maintain peace and harmonize the European states in this co-operative Europe. Territorial boundaries would be set with no possibility of further aggrandizement within Europe to eliminate further sources of conflict. Finally, Saint-Pierre felt that it would take 'several Generations and several Ages' for the peace union's efficacy to be fully appreciated. This opinion was born from the belief that it would take 'several generations' of royalty to abandon the recourse to war and the need to expand upon a state's territory. The benefit of the cessation of war and of establishing and protecting one's own state and the king's position, and the fear of European ostracism for not joining the union, meant that states would join and that it could be successful.

Saint-Pierre's desire for 'perpetual peace' was not only governed by a need for a cessation to the constant European wars and the subsequent suffering. He realized that if a state and its people were not pre-occupied with war and its wealth and time consumed by taxation and fighting, it could be more productively used elsewhere. Not only could the arts and sciences be greatly enhanced but so could commerce, as 'nothing enriches a State more than the

Subjects applying themselves to Commerce.²⁷⁹ Saint-Pierre attacked Louis XIV's policy of war arguing that it had manifestly detracted from French trade, particularly foreign trade, which accounted for one third of the total income of France. War provided an obvious barrier to trade and a further consequence was a lack of future trust between states which effected state interaction. Crucially, war pulled subjects away from commerce and reduced the capacity for agriculture and trade and depleted the number of subjects within a kingdom. In relation to France, Saint-Pierre wanted the French to move away from the notion that it was supreme as a producer of goods that could exist through autarchy, and was needed by all other European states as the breadbasket of Europe. He felt this belief to be erroneous, and believed France could be greatly enriched through foreign trade. A 'European Union' would allow trade and commerce to flourish throughout. France would develop its potential, Holland (and to a lesser extent England) would remain superior as trading nations enshrined in perpetual law, and the Union could benefit by taking part of their excessive profits. Furthermore, the Union would be able to guarantee free trade between its states, which would 'facilitate and increase Commerce; how much the Subjects of Sovereign would be enriched by it, and consequently how much his own Revenue would increase by the Augmentation of theirs.'²⁸⁰ The overall benefit to the Union and its constituent states was viewed to be immeasurable. Saint-Pierre was only left to lament the failure of the plan under Henry IV. Had they 'Establish'd the European Society two hundred years ago, Europe would now have been four times richer than it is.'²⁸¹ Thereby, emphasizing Saint-Pierre's conviction of the necessity of the plan and its ability to ameliorate the commerce, wealth and well-being of both sovereigns and subjects.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 89. For a discussion of the French economy in the seventeenth-century see D.C. Coleman's "Economic Problems and policies," chapter 2 of *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 5: The Ascendancy of France 1648-88*, (ed. F.L. Carsten, 1961). Coleman argues that '[r]ecurrent and especially bloody warfare is one of the major themes of seventeenth-century history,' and consequently had a great impact upon economic development (page 20).

²⁸⁰ Saint-Pierre, *Perpetual Peace*, 121.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.* 20.

After the death of Louis XIV Saint-Pierre was able to promulgate his ideas and desire for the necessity for French reform. His *Discours sur la polysynodie* (1718) expressed the Burgundy Circle's to create fully active assemblies for government departments by utilising the languishing nobility, as revealed in Fénelon's *Tables de Chaulnes*.²⁸² Fénelon's aim was to open up government and move the emphasis from one single man to bodies of men as government was effectively decentralized in France. Saint-Pierre argued that the system under Louis XIV had been defective because it led to the dominance of one or two chief ministers. A single dominant figure or 'Grand-Visier' (Mazarin), or two dominant ministers or a 'Demi-Visiership' (Colbert and Le Tellier) predominantly ruled for their own agenda and not for the interest of Louis XIV or the state. The solution to this problem was to rely upon the advice and services of a multitude of ministers in government:

[A] Prince may, in every Affair of State, take the Advice in Council of every Member of that Assembly, and apportion out the seven or eight chief Branches of State-Affairs, to as many Councils, or Assemblies. This Form of a Ministry may be called a Multitude of Councils, or a Polysynody.²⁸³

The use of a panoply of ministers (or councils) was an avoidance of the petty jealousies and vices of the use of one or two chief ministers.²⁸⁴ Under a Polysynody state resolutions would be founded fact and not error as issues and policy would be thoroughly discussed before being enacted.²⁸⁵ The private interest of ministers would be subsumed by the public good²⁸⁶ as an environment of competition and emulation juxtaposed with a rotational policy for ministers roles, would enable a more effective and knowledgeable government.²⁸⁷ The

²⁸² Fénelon, *Tables de Chaulnes, Oeuvres, Tome II* Ed. Le Brun (Gallimard, 1997), 1090-91. The idea of relying on assemblies in government can also be found in Saint-Simon's *Projets de Gouvernement du Duc de Bourgogne* (Hachette, Paris, 1860). A work Saint-Simon wrote based on his conversations with the duc de Bourgogne, (Burgundy).

²⁸³ Saint-Pierre, *Polysynody*, iv.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.* viii.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 2.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 7-8.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 33-34.

Polysynody would rely on members of the nobility unused by Louis XIV,²⁸⁸ but it would be open to all men of ‘merit and industry’ and not simply be restricted to the nobility.²⁸⁹ Saint-Pierre’s aim was effectively to produce a government of professional ministers within a framework based upon rank to promote the virtue of the office of state.²⁹⁰ He wanted to reduce the risks and dangers faced by France such as the excessive warfare which he believed was a consequence of poor advice to Louis XIV.²⁹¹ Ultimately the constitution of the Polysynody and its ethos was meant to ensure that the ministers worked for the good of the kingdom and the reward of government, thereby ensuring the public good:

Now were a Polysynody brought to Perfection, the King would in the disposal of Places and Rewards give ear to the Votes of their Equals, and this single Article by banishing from the Court an infinite number of pestilential corrupted and dangerous Persons, the Courtiers themselves might become excellent Citizens, by the Influence even of their own Interest; and to promote themselves, might labour heartily to a degree of Emulation to advance the true Interest of their King and Country. Thus the Love of one’s Country would not be a Virtue so extraordinary; and will be so much practis’d, as it’s likely to be more taken notice of, and oftner rewarded by the King himself.²⁹²

Saint-Pierre’s depiction of the Polysynody did prove to act as the model that Orléans Regency as it relied upon its demand for councils and the delegation of duties through several chief advisers. The absolutism of Louis XIV and Bossuet had been left behind for a programme of reform in an attempt to repair a French state that was economically, socially, and politically exhausted by decades of war. In order to affect these reforms of state it was felt necessary to devolve power to a multitude of councils in an attempt to improve the quality of government and its aim for the public benefit. This was a notion that had been planned by the Burgundy Circle, notably led by Fénelon as they prepared for him to succeed

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 19.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 21-22.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 27.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.* 47.

²⁹² *Ibid.* 24.

Louis XIV and for them to act as his ministers. Burgundy's death in 1712 did not see the death of their belief in the reform of France, and through figures such as Saint-Simon, Saint-Pierre, and Orléans – all previously advised by Fénelon – the Regency attempted to reform.

An essential component to this reform was obviously a requirement of peace, and after the Treaty of Utrecht this was augmented by the Anglo-French Alliance and then the Quadruple Alliance. This period of discussion (1714-21) was therefore a time of peace between Britain and France, and supports the dampening of fears over French aggrandizement in Britain after Utrecht. While the Anglo-French Alliance was not formalized until 1716, hostilities had ended between the two states under Utrecht and the 'Pretender's' expulsion from France was consolidated as he was removed from Avignon. Jacobite support was thereby formally ended in 1716 as Orléans required peace as did the British in order to establish and consolidate their new kings and new governments. From 1716 therefore, Jacobitism became a largely peripheral inconvenience for both states as they focused upon internal issues and need for reform. The political literature in both France and Britain in the second decade of the eighteenth-century essentially saw the need to abandon absolutism for the prosperity of the state. Both Britain and France concentrated on a strong and expanding government headed by a monarch, in a system that removed absolutism in favour of delegation and co-operative departments as government became the focus of the state.

III: The Political Fénelon

In this chapter I will begin by providing a brief outline of the life of Fénelon. This outline of his life will focus predominantly on the Fénelon that has been promulgated; i.e., the man of the Church and spiritual mystic. The rest of the chapter will examine his political works before ending with a discussion of the role of Ramsay as the editor of Fénelon's work, and his impact on his Fénelon's political legacy. I will be examining Fénelon's political works in two parts, which represent the two distinct periods of his political writings. The first part contains the works used as educational tools for the young prince Duke of Burgundy, covering a period from 1693 to 1695. This period includes *Télémaque*, and this is the work that Fénelon is frequently associated with when delineating his political principles. The second part will discuss Fénelon's later political papers for the adult Burgundy from 1701 to 1712. These papers reveal an astute political thinker preparing a young prince for his eventual succession to the throne of a France that required radical reform.

The Life of Fénelon

François de Salignac de la Motte-Fénelon was born in 1651 at the family Château in Saint-Mondane in Périgord, Dordogne. He was the product of a second marriage between his father Pons de Salignac, Comte de la Mothe-Fénelon and his wife Louise de La Cropte. The Fénelon family had a long tradition of involvement in politics, and one ancestor had been a bishop. From an early age he expressed an interest in pursuing a career in the church, and this interest was nurtured and aided by his uncle the Marquis Antoine de Fénelon, with whom he was very close. The Marquis arranged for him to study at the Collège du Plessis, where he

met his life-long friend Louis-Antoine de Noailles (1651-1729), who was later to become the Archbishop of Paris. In 1672 through the aid of his uncle once more, Fénelon enrolled into the Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice in Paris for his entry into the priesthood. The college was founded in 1641, and during the battles of the 1650s between the Jesuits and the Jansenists it acted as a sanctuary for pious men in pursuit of the priesthood. His mentor whilst at Saint-Sulpice was the highly regarded and influential Louis Tronson (1622-1700).

Fénelon was ordained as a priest in 1675, and he held great aspirations of being a missionary in the East. In a letter to his uncle he wrote:

The whole of Greece opens before me, and the Sultan flies in terror; the Peloponneseus breathes again in liberty, and the Church of Corinth shall flourish once more; the voice of the apostle shall be heard there again ...I seek for the Areopagus, where St. Paul declared to the sages of the world the unknown God! But, after what is sacred, I am delighted with what is profane; and, I disdain not to descend to the Piraeus, where Socrates drew up the plan of the Republic.²⁹³

His missionary work was later postponed indefinitely, but this letter is revealing for two reasons. The first is that it shows Fénelon's attraction to the East, particularly Greece.

Fénelon had excelled in his education of the classics from a young age and was extremely knowledgeable about classical texts. One aspect of his love of the classics stemmed from their acceptability as literature through their pre-Christian ignorance of the true God.

Throughout his life outside of theological works Fénelon would only read the classics and he would apparently never read any contemporary works.²⁹⁴ The second reason that the letter is insightful is the obvious ambition and zeal he had for his work as a priest and a missionary.

In his first role in educating newly converted Huguenot girls as the Superior at *Nouvelles Catholiques*, Fénelon demonstrated particular verve in his role and good success. His first work the *Traité de l'éducation des filles* (1687), was based on his work with these girls and

²⁹³ Fénelon to the Marquis de Fénelon (9th October 1674), Cardinal Bausset, *The Life of Fénelon*, Volume I, 16-17. The original is absent from Fénelon's *Correspondance*.

²⁹⁴ See Bausset's *The Life of Fénelon*, (Sherwood, Neely & Jones, London, 1810), for a discussion of Fénelon's life in which he discusses Fénelon's lifelong love of the classics born from his early education.

had been written privately for the Duchess de Beauvilliers. It reveals a dual function of piety mixed with practicality in bringing up children, and the work proved to be a great success and brought Fénelon to the attention of influential people in Paris.

One of these people was Jacques Bénéigne-Bossuet (1627-1704). After the deaths of his influential uncle and mentor, who appears to have restrained Fénelon's ambition through discipline and equanimity, he attached himself vigorously to Bossuet. Bossuet, for his part, was equally delighted with his new protégé. The two men worked together on his lectures on the Bible at Versailles, and it was Bossuet who encouraged Fénelon to write his *Réfutation du système de Malebranche sur la nation et sur la grace* (1687), in which he attacked Malebranche's writings on optimism, creation, and the incarnation. After Louis XIV's removal of religious toleration under the 'Revocation of the Edict of Nantes' (1685), Bossuet was charged with collecting the great orators of the Gallican Church to infiltrate the country in Huguenot regions in an attempt to persuade them of their error. Fénelon was one of the priests he selected for the task. According to Louis de Rouvroy, Duc de Saint-Simon (1675-1755), it was a task he was ideally suited for in many respects:

His piety delighted them [priests at Saint-Sulpice], his doctrine, based on theirs and discreetly purged of any impurities collected from older associations, his charm, his sweetness, and persuasive eloquence made him very precious ...His was a winning nature, eager to like and liked by everyone, from men of power to labourers and lackeys, and his genius in that respect admirably suited his aims.²⁹⁵

These qualities possessed by Fénelon won him a number of important friends and benefactors. His *Traité de l'éducation des filles* had engendered a friendship with the Duc de Beauvilliers (1648-1714) and his brother-in-law the Duc de Chevreuse (1646-1712), both of whom were government officials and both married to the daughters of Louis XIV's finance minister Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-83). These men were to remain life-long friends and

²⁹⁵ Duc de Saint-Simon, *Historical Memoirs of the Duc de Saint-Simon, Volume I*, p. 73, Ed. & trans. Lucy Norton (Hamish Hamilton, London, 1967-72), 73.

allies, and it was through them that on 17th August 1689 Fénelon was given his role as the preceptor to the seven year-old Duc de Bourgogne (Burgundy). Louis XIV had given Beauvilliers the role of tutor for his grandsons and he was to educate both Burgundy and his younger brother the Duc d'Anjou (1683-1746). In this task he was aided by Chevreuse, and Fénelon (who had helped with his own children and was encouraged by an eager Bossuet), and the future Bishop Fleury (1653-1743) as sub-preceptor. They began work in September 1689 and Beauvilliers gave Fénelon carte blanche to educate Burgundy as he saw fit. This was to prove entirely necessary for the young prince had a reputation as a very difficult and irascible child. The prince was seen to be an intelligent child but could be extremely wilful, and it was believed that an influence such as Fénelon's was sorely needed. Fénelon managed to control Burgundy through rigorous discipline - Burgundy would be ignored by all until he would do as he was asked – and through the use of exciting and interesting works provided by Fénelon. During the period 1693-95 Fénelon wrote for the young princes the *Fables*, *Dialogues des Morts*, and *Télémaque* in which he eschewed the staid and didactic teachings Bossuet had employed for Prince Louis *le Grand Dauphin* (1661-1711), for a more entertaining but moral and classical education relying upon a mixture of Scripture and myth. These educational methods proved to be so successful that Burgundy became pliable, and later on in his life he could be easily led. There is no doubt that in the letters between the adult prince and the Archbishop Fénelon exerted incredible influence over Burgundy. He wrote to advise him on his conduct, and an example of this role can be seen in a letter of September 1708 sent to Burgundy when he was campaigning in The War of Spanish Succession. Fénelon wrote, if 'you employ your hours of leisure in prayer and reading and if every day you walk with God in a spirit of love and trust, then you will have peace, your heart will be opened, and you will be pious without the searchings of a tortured conscience

and happy without the excess of dissipation,'²⁹⁶ Fénelon not only provided commonplace advice, as part of the Burgundy Circle he began to draft plans for Burgundy's future as king in a reformed France. This would potentially mean that Fénelon would act as France's first minister and there can be no doubt that Fénelon and the Burgundy Circle were preparing to dramatically change absolutist France.²⁹⁷

During the period in the mid-1690s Fénelon became more and more influential at court regardless of his avoidance of its trappings and intrigues. In 1693 he was elected to the French Academy, and in 1694 the king named him the abbé de Saint-Valéry. He had also begun to advise the king's consort, the hugely influential second wife of Louis XIV Madame de Maintenon (1635-1719), who believed Fénelon to be an intellectual and pious man. This view of Fénelon was shared by Louis XIV and in February 1696 the king nominated Fénelon to become the Archbishop of Cambrai. However, this favour began to change and a negative view of Fénelon began to circulate at court

The cause for this alteration in favour was Fénelon's (perceived) growing involvement in the doctrine of Quietism and the loss of Madame de Maintenon's favour. In 1688 Fénelon had met (Madame) Jeanne-Marie Bouvier de la Motte-Guyon (1648-1717) a distant relative, and had become an admirer of her works on mysticism. Yet in 1697 Madame Guyon fell under the attention of the Bishop of Chartres, Paul Godet des Marais (1647-1709), who expressed his concern over her orthodoxy to the Catholic faith to Madame de Maintenon.

The Bishop was particularly concerned about the similarities of her work to the mystic

²⁹⁶ September 1708, *Selected Letters of Fénelon*, Ed. and trans. McEwen, (Harvill Press, London, 1964), 160-61.

²⁹⁷ This will be discussed in the third part of this chapter. For a concise examination of the Burgundy Circle and their potential plans to reform France see Sanford B. Kanter, "Archbishop Fénelon's Political Activity: The Focal Point of Power in Dynasticism," in *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3, (Spring 1966), pp. 320-34, Duke University Press. Kanter discusses both the realistic plans of the Burgundy Circle for a future France and Fénelon's central role in that group. Plans of reform were drawn up at the behest and with the involvement of Burgundy for a new France which would move away from the regime of Louis XIV toward a government reliant on ministers, assemblies, and decentralization. The Circle is also discussed by Harold A. Ellis, particularly in chapter three, in *Boulainvilliers and the French Monarchy, Aristocratic Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century France* (Cornell, 1988).

Miguel de Molinos (1628-1696) whose Quietism had been condemned by Pope Innocent XI (1687). Molinos was a Spanish divine who had developed the idea of Christian perfection in his *Guia Espiritual* (1675). For Molinos Christian perfection was achieved through a mixture of contemplation and divine assistance, in which the individual will was forfeited so that God would influence them directly. At the behest of Maintenon a commission was set up at Issy headed by Bossuet and de Noailles, which delivered the 34 *Articles d'Issy* which pointed to the errors in Guyon's work. Guyon submitted to the commission's decision which had been signed by Bossuet, de Noailles, the Bishop of Chartres, and Fénelon.

Fénelon's difficulties began in earnest with the publication of Bossuet's *Instructions sur les états d'oraison*, which was submitted to the commission after its decision condemning Quietism. This approach angered Fénelon and he refused to sign its approval for publication as he believed that Guyon, who had submitted to the commission, had already been censured enough. His answer to Bossuet was the *Explication des Maximes des Saints* (1696), in which he provided his own interpretation of the *Articles d'Issy* and his own view of Quietism. Fénelon discussed the five stages of love through which the individual must travel toward the truth path to God. It began with servile or carnal love (self-love); the love of pure concupiscence (self-interest); the love of *hope*, wherein the soul truly loves God; *mixed* love in which hope occupies an important place; and finally, the state of *pure love* (*perfect charity*), in which the soul loves God only for Himself. Only some souls can attain to this level of perfection. Yet all people should surrender themselves to God whilst participating in prayer and contemplation, living a life of frugality and with moderation. Once the individual has resigned himself to loving God with the possibility of not receiving any reward in return they may experience *Pure Love*. A love 'without any mixture of self-interest, is actuated no more by the motive of interest. He wishes beatitude to himself, only because he knows God

will have it so, and will have every one of us to desire it for his own glory.’²⁹⁸ These individuals who love with a *pure love*, Fénelon argued, would do so even if they were subject to the temptations of St. Augustine (354-430), or subjected to the physical suffering of St. John Chrysostom (349-407) despite having committed no sin.

The publication of the *Maximes* resulted in exasperation for Louis XIV and vexation for Bossuet. For Louis XIV, his great fear was that a man who had been educating his grandson and a future king of France held such views. This was not aided by the publication and incredible success of *Télémaque* in 1699, the manuscript of which had been stolen from a copier and which was seen by Louis as a direct attack upon himself and his government.²⁹⁹ He removed Fénelon from his post as Burgundy’s tutor and ordered him to remove himself to his diocese of Cambrai, at a time that Prosper Marchand claimed that Fénelon was about to be made a Cardinal.³⁰⁰ Louis also criticized Bossuet for not knowing that Fénelon held such views and ordered him to respond to the *Maximes*. Fénelon’s former friend, mentor and ally focused all of his efforts in ruining Fénelon and his career. For Bossuet, it was Fénelon’s disinterestedness in his own salvation that proved to be so disturbing to him. What Guyon and Fénelon had in common and which worried Bossuet, was the emphasis of worship and Salvation being placed on the individual rather than the organized Church. This was not only an attack on Scripture in the eyes of Bossuet it was an attack on the Church. This accusation was denied by Fénelon who was a very dedicated and active archbishop, and two years of

²⁹⁸ Fénelon, *Maxims of the Saints* (Published for Dilly in the Poultry, London, 1715), 40.

²⁹⁹ Bausset. *The Life of Fénelon*, Volume I, 315-323. Bausset discusses the charge that the work was a satire of Louis XIV and France, and points out that Fénelon always vehemently denied this charge: “I have not depicted any of these [faults] in such a manner as to represent any particular person or character ...My intention, in writing it, was merely to amuse the Duke of Burgundy, and to instruct him at the same time, without ever wishing to give the work to the public,” (page 317). Bausset argues that this is supported by the circumstances at the time the work was written (1693-94). At this time Fénelon was enjoying great favour at court and Bausset argues it is unlikely that Fénelon would have attacked the king. Furthermore, Bausset points out that Bossuet was sent early drafts of the work to gain his opinion and this opinion had been favourable.

³⁰⁰ Pope Innocent XII had wanted to nominate Fénelon, but the Vatican was warned that such a nomination would cause difficulties with France due to the Quietism Affair. This information was provided to Marchand by the Fénelon family as they commissioned his work. See Prosper Marchand’s *A Short Account of the Life of the late M. Franc. De Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon*, in *Proper Heads for Self-Examination* (London, 1747), 189-90.

publications by the two men was finally closed on 12th March 1699 when the Vatican announced that twenty three of Fénelon's propositions were unorthodox. In passing their verdict on the Quietism Affair, a decision which was actually split, Pope Innocent XII remarked that, the Archbishop of Cambrai had erred due to an immoderate love of God, while Bossuet had erred due to a defective love of his neighbour.

In his final years of banishment at Cambrai from 1699 until his death in 1715 Fénelon fulfilled his duties as an active and conscientious archbishop. As will be discussed below, until the death of his beloved pupil Burgundy in 1712, Fénelon remained an active mentor for the prince and he was engaged in numerous plans for the future of France with Burgundy as king. He also advised Burgundy's brother Anjou, now Philip V of Spain, Madame de Maintenon, Chevreuse, Beauvilliers, the daughters of Colbert, Pope Clement XI, amongst others. He received countless visitors including James Stuart, in a diocese close to the Low Countries where some of the battles of the War of the Spanish Succession were fought (such as Oudenarde, 1708). These years of activity, planning, and hope, were somewhat curtailed after the deaths of Burgundy and other close friends, such as Chevreuse. Yet even after the death of Burgundy he never stopped planning for the future of France.³⁰¹ His close friends and allies continued to press his case to Louis XIV, who remained interested in Fénelon's health, until his death on 7th January 1715.

The Educational Works: (1689-1695)

The educational works were written by Fénelon for the young prince Burgundy (and his brother Anjou) between the ages of seven and thirteen. These works were written between

³⁰¹ As will be discussed below, Fénelon wrote *Mémoires sur les precautions et les mesures à prendre après la mort du duc de Bourgogne* (15th March 1712) after the death of the prince from measles on the 18th February.

1689 and 1695 to ameliorate the young princes while attempting to divert them in their studies. Bossuet had tried to employ a similar technique with their father the Dauphin, by composing the *L'Histoire universelle* (1681), but he had little success as the Dauphin had little taste for education. Fénelon, had learned from the problems encountered by Bossuet and had composed children's myths with adult lessons for a future king. These myths were therefore not meant for public consumption and as such were not part of a political theory espoused by Fénelon, although they contained the truths of governing. *Télémaque* however, was leaked by a copyist in 1699 and became the second best-selling work of the eighteenth-century after the Bible. It is the work that still today is viewed as expounding Fénelon's theories of government and political economy. Yet this was a work that Fénelon continued to amend until his death unhappy with its imperfection. As will be discussed throughout the chapter particularly in the last section, the view that these early works reveal the political Fénelon was promulgated partly by Ramsay. His editing for publication of Fénelon's political works between 1717 and 1718 concentrated on the three educational works: the *Fables* (1689-91), *Dialogues des Morts* (or *Dialogues of the Dead*, 1692-95), and *Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse* (1693-94). In discussing these three educational works I have focused on the three key areas of discussion within them: kingship, war, and commerce. Moreover, despite it not being an educational work I have included Fénelon's *Lettre à Louis XIV.*³⁰² The *Lettre*, a warning to Louis XIV on the condition of France, dates from this period (1693-94) and was thereby written (pre-exile) when Fénelon was still at

³⁰² It is not certain whether the letter was sent to the Louis XIV. The letter was first published by d'Alembert in his *Histoire ...l'Académie Française* in 1787, although its authenticity was doubted until 1825 when the manuscript in Fénelon's handwriting was found by Renouard, see McEwen, *Selected Letters of Fénelon*, 297. For the dates of the other works see Le Brun's notes in his edition of Fénelon's *Oeuvres* (Gallimard, Paris, 1983-97). The dates I have given are a mean estimation based on Le Brun's dates and those given by a number of other biographers and editors; such as Bausset, Cherel, and McEwen. In the case of the *Fables* and the *Dialogues* there are examples of a number of the 'stories' pre-dating the date given, but generally they fall within the range provided.

court. My inclusion of the *Lettre* will help to add some historical context to Fénelon's overall concerns about the French state, at a time when he was educating his young pupil.

Kingship was perhaps unsurprisingly the key theme within the educational works for the young prince. The educational works were used by Fénelon to instil within Burgundy what it was to be a good king, the perils of poor or tyrannical kingship, and that the role itself was one that was isolating and almost slavish. Yet, despite the difficulties and perils the aim of any prince should be to become a good king to his people. Kings were aided in their task by two important boons: counsel from good advisers and the law. The measure of how successful a king had been was gauged by the reaction and behaviour of his people, for if the public good was not pursued vigorously the king may find himself at the mercy of the violent and anarchic masses.

A 'sage monarch' was one who reigned over his people with benevolence and love, and who sought for the public good:

They live happy in the midst of abundance, and love him from which their happiness is derived ...you must reign, and make your people rejoice ...
Love your subjects as your own children, enjoy the pleasure of being beloved by them, and behave in such a manner that they shall never be sensible either of peace or happiness without remembering that it is their good king to whom they owe these rich presents.³⁰³

Happiness for a king was to be found in striving for the public good, and to do this effectively a people must live in peace and virtue. The example for this should originate from within the king and be reflected in his government and rule:

Justice exercised in favour of the poor against the rich, the proper education of the children, who were accustomed to obedience, to labour, and sobriety, to the love of arts and literature; the precision

³⁰³ *Telemachus*, Ed. & trans. Patrick Riley (Cambridge UP, 1994), Bk. I,16.

with which all the ceremonies of religion were performed; the disinterestedness, the love of honour, the honesty in their dealings with men, and the reverence for the gods, which every father infused into his children.³⁰⁴

The ideal state pursued the virtues of ‘health, strength, courage, the peace and union of families, the liberty of all the citizens, the plenty of all necessary things, a contempt of superfluities, a habit of industry, and an abhorrence of idleness: an emulation in virtue, submission to the laws, and reverence’ to God.³⁰⁵ Fénelon advocated a way of living that was hard-working and just, which followed a path of moderation that enabled earthly commodiousness and spiritual reflection. Furthermore, a king’s disinterestedness allowed him to sacrifice his own interests and benefit for the larger concern of his people: he acted for them and not for himself.³⁰⁶ This reference to Quietism and the ‘disinterested’ love of Individuals revealed a relationship with God that was based on pure love of God without personal interest in one’s own salvation. The individuals ultimately sacrificed their own interests and future benefit altruistically to God, as a king should sacrifice his interest for that of the people.

A magnanimous king pursued the public good and virtue by fostering (godly) reason, for there ‘are no true men on earth but those who consult, who love, and who are guided by that eternal reason.’³⁰⁷ The harnessing of ‘eternal reason’ was necessarily augmented by the concentration and exercise of his own wisdom. A king must be a paragon of virtue and reason for his people, an example which they would follow. When a ‘Prince is a Lover of learning, there will arise, during his Reign, many great Men; his Favours and his Rewards, will raise a noble Emulation amongst them.’ If a king does not follow this path he will lead

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 15.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.* Book V, 60.

³⁰⁶ For his discussion of ‘disinterested love’ see, Fénelon’s *The Maxims of the Saints*, Articles v, xxi, xxxiv, and xli.; and *Instructions et Avis sur Divers Points de la Morale et de la Perfection Chrétienne* (Harper & Row Publishers, 1947), Book I, xiii and xvi, and Book II xxx.

³⁰⁷ *Telemachus*, Book IV, 56.

his state into 'Ignorance and Barbarism' which will 'dishonour [the] whole Nation.'³⁰⁸ A good king was therefore concerned with his people above all other things. Henry IV of France (1553-1610) was a good example of kingship as his achievements were based on his honesty, aims for peace, his control of the nobility and ambitious advisers, while 'placing all [his] Glory in easing [his] People.'³⁰⁹ Louis XII (1462-1515) was another example for Burgundy to emulate, as he 'liv'd peaceably, without every forfeiting [his] word, without imbruing my Hands in Blood, and without ruining [his] People.'³¹⁰ The foundation to their success, popularity, and posterity was their duty towards the people, and it was this that defined them as good kings in the eyes of history and Fénelon.

Poor kingship for Fénelon could be demonstrated by the reign of Louis XI (1423-83): known as the Universal Spider due to his reputation for plotting and conspiracy, he was vilified throughout the early *Dialogues of the Modern Dead*. He was attacked for his blood-thirsty and tyrannical rule, and his obsession with his own glory above the interests of the people, which left a legacy found to be 'Odious.'³¹¹ Poor kings were polluted by power and glory. They frequently focused on war in search for immortality desiring conquest when it would have been better 'to have had less Power, and more Justice and Virtue.'³¹² Poor kingship and its superlative tyranny, stemmed from a lack of restraint and an absence of virtue. The egoism required to pursue one's own ambitions at the detriment of the state and people, revealed for Fénelon a distinct deficiency of care for the public interest. A king should be bound through reason and law to pursue the public good.³¹³ Yet, from time to time kings emerged who pursued their own interest over that of the people.³¹⁴ While history

³⁰⁸ Fénelon, *Dialogues of the Dead, Ancient Dead*, (London, 1723), Book IV, 126.

³⁰⁹ *Modern Dead*, Book XIV, 399. Henry IV of France (1553-1610) was first Bourbon king and was known as 'Henry the Great.'

³¹⁰ *Ibid.* Book VIII, 372.

³¹¹ *Ibid.* Book XVIII, 372.

³¹² *Ibid.* Book VII, 140.

³¹³ *Ibid.* Books VII and X.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.* Book XI, 154.

revealed that tyranny has existed in all forms of government, for Fénelon it flourished within an absolutist system:

[N]or can a Human Soul, with Moderation, enjoy a Power as unlimited as theirs is: They imagine that every thing is created for their use, and they dispose of the Lives, Honours, and Estates of other Men. Nothing can be more barbarous than this Form of Government; there are no laws in force, the Will and Pleasure of one Man, whose Passions are all flatter'd, are his and their only Law.³¹⁵

Tyrants used all the means that were at their disposal within the state to achieve their ends: 'intoxicated' by their 'power and good fortune,' they believe 'that all the things ought to yield to [their] impetuous desires.'³¹⁶ The desire to exercise this power was therefore often at the expense of the people. It was frequently consolidated by ruling the people through fear, which was counter-productive for a king. While they want their subjects to be fearful so that 'in being more depressed they may become more submissive,' the fear they desire makes them 'hated, detested, and [produced] more cause to dread their subjects, than their subjects have to dread them.'³¹⁷ The consequence of tyranny was the fear that the king's oppressed subjects will rise up in rebellion against their treatment. All feelings of loyalty would be subsumed by the lack of care their distant sovereign had shown toward them as they rebelled in their own (general) interest.³¹⁸

For Fénelon, the problem with unlimited power in kingship was that with this power came great responsibility, all of which was contained within one man who stands above all others in the state. Evils of tyranny and absolutism arose from a king losing sight of his mortality.³¹⁹ Power notions of divine right and the representation of God on earth turned kings into gods when they are actually just men. Kings began to 'fancy' that they are 'a god'

³¹⁵ *Ibid.* Book XVI, 180.

³¹⁶ *Telemachus*, Book II, 28.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.* Book I, 16.

³¹⁸ *Dialogues of the Dead, Ancient Dead*, Book XXI, 219-20.

³¹⁹ *Telemachus*, Book XIV, 243.

when they should remember that they are ‘of the race of other men.’³²⁰ A delusion for which Fénelon felt some pity:

A private person may, without dishonour, lead an easy, obscure life: but a king cannot, without dishonour, prefer an idle indolent life to the painful functions of government; he owes himself to all the men he governs; he is never permitted to be for himself; his smallest actions are of infinite consequence, entailing misery on his people, and that sometimes for several ages. He must repress the audaciousness of the wicked, support the innocent, and discourage calumny. It is not enough for him to do no ill, he must also do all the good he can for his people. It is not enough that he does nothing but what is right himself, he must also prevent the ill that others would do, if they were not kept in awe.³²¹

A king was isolated within his state. A king was a man who alone must rule, and who must govern the country to the best of his ability while under the scrutiny of the public. It was a king alone who understood the burden of rule but yet he was judged by others who had no comprehension of the role. The role of a king was effectively a ‘slave’ as he served the public without choice, for their benefit in a manner that was as balanced and virtuous as demi-god.³²² Hence the reason why there ‘are only a few good kings who have the fortitude and resolution to guard against the intoxication of power, and the flattery of so many sycophants,’ argued Fénelon, for ‘good kings are very rare, and the generality of monarchs are bad.’³²³

To help kings avoid the temptation of their power and to rule for the public good, Fénelon argued that kings had recourse to two important boons: good counsel and the law.

Throughout the educational works Fénelon impressed upon Burgundy the essential need to surround oneself with good advisers. As early as the *Fables* Fénelon had warned Burgundy that a king must avoid flatterers who would talk to a king with ‘respect,’ admire ‘every one of

³²⁰ *Ibid.*

³²¹ *Ibid.* 255.

³²² *Ibid.* Book XVIII, 323.

³²³ *Ibid.* Book XIV, 254.

his Whims,' and 'will be of his Opinion in everything.'³²⁴ These advisers or 'sycophants' failed to appraise the king of the true state of his country or disagree with a particular course of action. Instead they chose to advance their own ambitions by telling the isolated king what he wanted to hear:

How wretched are kings ...in being placed so far above the rest of mankind!
It is not often that they can see the truth with their own eyes; and they are surrounded by individuals who carefully hinder it from reaching those who command ...They pretend to love the king, when in fact they have no attachment but to the riches which he gives.³²⁵

Such bad advice enabled a king to act arbitrarily and against the public interest. This provided an integral explanation behind the problems faced by Louis XIV's France. In the *Letter to Louis XIV* Fénelon rued Louis' poor choice in advisers and ministers. 'It is nothing short of scandalous that your counsellors [who] have been so long in your confidence should have done so little towards enlightening you. It is their duty to resign if they find you too difficult to deal with and determined to have none but flatterers about you.'³²⁶ Fénelon believed that the poor advice received from his ministers and the lack of opposition to his plans had created a separation between Louis and the French people.³²⁷ Consequently, this had allowed Louis to behave how he pleased which was frequently not in the public's interest:

For some thirty years now your chief Ministers have been over-throwing the ancient laws which governed this state, in order to magnify your authority which, in as much as they wielded it, became their own. Reference is no longer made to the State, but only to the King and the King's pleasure.³²⁸

³²⁴ *Fables*, VIII, 79.

³²⁵ *Telemachus*, Book II, 25.

³²⁶ *Lettre à Louis XIV*, *Selected Letters of Fénelon*, 309.

³²⁷ *Ibid.* 299.

³²⁸ *Ibid.*

Louis XIV's treatment of the state and the laws and the loss of the public good, had inevitably caused problems for France.³²⁹ Louis' poor example of his reliance on flattering ministers as a king was not unique, but it was an issue a good king would have to combat with honest advisers: 'Men who are sincere and virtuous, and without dissimulation, who are always the same and will not deviate from the rules of virtue.'³³⁰ A happy king was one who was 'guided by wise counsellors! A wise and faithful friend is more serviceable to a king than victorious armies.' Moreover, 'doubly happy is the sovereign who feels his happiness, and knows how to make the most of it by following good counsels.'³³¹ Henry IV provided the example of such a king. He encouraged his ministers to give him the truth: "if you love me, speak it freely."³³² Therefore, to be a good king Burgundy must surround himself with good and honest advisers. From them he would learn truthfully what was happening within his realm, and receive advice on his plans and courses of actions. Fundamentally, he should use these advisers to govern the state efficaciously:

It is not requisite that a king, who is above other men, should do everything himself: it is vanity to imagine it possible for him, or to endeavour to make the world believe that it is. A king must govern by choosing and directing proper person to govern under him; but he is not to concern himself with every other detail... He may be justly said to govern extremely well, who judiciously chooses those that are to govern under him, and employs men according to their different talents.³³³

While good advisers were central to running a good government, the second and most important boon a king must utilize to rule effectively was the law. For Fénelon, the laws were sacred. They represented an objective guide and bond between the monarch and the people. The 'chief Duty of him who govern'd the People, was to give Laws which should restrain both the King and People, and make 'em both honest and happy.'³³⁴ The law should

³²⁹ *Ibid.* 304.

³³⁰ *Telemachus*, Book XIII, 222.

³³¹ *Ibid.* Book X, 154.

³³² *Dialogues of the Dead, Modern Dead*, XIV, 401.

³³³ *Telemachus*, Book XVII, 299.

³³⁴ *Dialogues of the Dead, Ancient Dead* XII, 160.

essentially guide the king's principles and behaviour within the state and towards his people.

Unlike Louis XIV's government a king should follow the law to ensure the health of the state:

He can do anything to the people; but the laws can do anything to him. He has an absolute power in doing good, but his hands are tied from doing wrong. The care of the people, the most important of all trusts, is committed to him by the laws, on condition that he be the father to his subjects. The intention of the laws is that one man by his wisdom and moderation should promote the happiness of such numbers ...[and not] misery and abject slavery ...It is not for himself that the gods have made him king, but for his subjects, whose welfare he is to study, and to whom he owed all his time, all his cares, and all his affections: and he is no farther worthy of royalty, than as he forgets himself in order to sacrifice himself to the public good.³³⁵

Law and its representation of the public good were vital to the stability and effectiveness of the state, its government, the king, and crucially, the people. It thereby underpinned the king's power and authority as it enshrined the public good, protected the people from the king, and the king from the people. A king's use of the law could bridle his concern about inordinate liberty in the people, a fear that they would themselves become despotic and rebel against the king. As the 'Liberties of the People' could be restrained 'by establishing' laws and 'not trampling the Laws under foot, to tyrannize the People.'³³⁶ Moreover, the 'despotick Power of a People was a blind and foolish Power,' it always acted 'against it self, and never grows absolute; and above the Laws, but it destroys it self.'³³⁷ The masses lacked cohesion and direction as a rival authority to the king. They may fulminate, riot and rebel, they may even assassinate the king, but they offered no political alternative to the monarch.³³⁸ The power of the law and its reliance upon natural subordination from the people towards the ruler and to the laws themselves returned them to their natural obedience. Subordination relied upon reason as it regulated, pacified and united society. The people understood that it

³³⁵ *Telemachus*, Book V, 60-1.

³³⁶ *Ancient Dialogues*, XI, 156-7.

³³⁷ *Ibid.* XVI, 186.

³³⁸ *Ibid.* XXXI, 266.

was reasonable to obey the laws and that it ‘concur[red] for their common Interest.’³³⁹ A good citizen understood that while it was perfectly reasonable to desire to exercise their liberty to its full extent, and by this Fénelon meant the ability to rebel against the king and to execute a tyrannical monarch, the ‘Dictates of Reason’ would generally prevent this due to the damage caused to society as a whole. To behave according to this principle was to be a ‘good citizen.’³⁴⁰ To ensure that a king’s subjects are ‘good citizens’ he must follow the law and promote the public good. This Fénelon believed Burgundy’s grandfather had forgotten: ‘On every side sedition raises its head. They believe that you have no pity for them in their misfortunes and that you only care for your own power and glory,’ and consequently, [p]opular disturbances grow more and more common.’³⁴¹ Louis XIV’s inability to focus on the public good above his own ambitions was a bar to his success as a good king in Fénelon’s eyes, despite his vast power. Thus the lesson tendentiously instilled throughout the educational works into Burgundy, was to pursue virtue, rely on good counsel, follow the public good, and above all achieve this through the law.

The second key area which preoccupied the educational works was war. France had been embroiled in frequent wars since Louis XIV had been born. Louis XIV had been born during the Thirty Years War (1618-48), fundamentally a religious war between Catholics and Protestants which was fought mainly within the Holy Roman Empire. The war involved many of the lead European states and was concluded by the Peace of Westphalia. Louis ascended to the throne during the *Fronde* (1648-53), a French civil war in two stages: *Fronde parlementaire* (1648-49), and *Fronde des nobles* (1650-53). The first was an insurrection over the protection of the *parlements’* ancient rights and ability to limit the king’s power, and

³³⁹ *Ibid.* XXXI, 264.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

³⁴¹ Fénelon, *Lettre à Louis XIV, Selected Letters of Fénelon*, 308.

the second, was a reaction by the nobility against taxation by Mazarin to pay for the Thirty Years War. The defeat of the *Fronde* enabled the French monarchy to consolidate its power and pursue a path of absolutism that was a symbol of Louis' reign. Louis' reign notably after the death of Cardinal Mazarin (1602-61) was characterized by frequent wars. By the end of the eighteenth century Louis' France had experienced the Thirty Years War, the Fronde, the War of Devolution (1667-68) the Dutch War (1672-78), and the War of the Grand Alliance (1688-97), as well as a number of smaller campaigns. France paid a heavy toll both in terms of financial and human cost as Louis pursued a policy of aggrandizement and glory (*gloire*).³⁴² It was this cost and the wider perception of endless war that provoked Fénelon to write so trenchantly against it within the educational works and the *Lettre*.

The *Lettre* reflected the concern and consternation at years of French war and human suffering. Those 'whom you should love as your own children and who have hitherto so passionately loved you, are now dying of hunger.'³⁴³ Cultivation was now at a standstill according to Fénelon, the population had decreased, trades had declined, and commerce had become virtually 'non-existent.' Instead of being used for war the taxes that Louis had extracted from the people to fund the wars should have been given back to the people to purchase food.³⁴⁴ Things had become so bad, Fénelon argued, even the nobility had become impoverished and were now dependent upon the king. This trouble was all of the king's making:

It is you yourself, Sire, who have brought all these troubles upon your own head since, while the kingdom is in ruins, you keep what there is in your own hands, and no one can live except upon your bounty. And this is that great kingdom so prosperous under a monarch who is always depicted as

³⁴² See J. Lough "France under Louis XIV," chapter 10 of *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 5: The Ascendancy of France 1648-88*, (ed. F.L. Carsten, 1961), and Carsten's introduction to this edition, "The Age of Louis XIV" for a discussion of France and the foreign policy of Louis XIV.

³⁴³ Fénelon, *Lettre à Louis XIV*, 303.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

the joy of the people – and indeed would be so if flattering advice had not poisoned him.³⁴⁵

Constant war had not only damaged France internally and spoiled the reputation of the king with his people, it had made Louis' 'name odious' abroad. Fénelon cited the Dutch War as an example of Louis' perfidious nature in relation to war and treaty-breaking. This explained the foreign dislike and distrust of France, 'since it is not as allies that we have wished to have them, but as slaves.' War had devastated both France and Europe, and for Fénelon the cause of the destruction and suffering was Louis' quest for glory.

Louis XIV's endless pursuit of glory and aggrandizement through war was a theme that translated easily into Fénelon's use of classical myth as a teaching tool for a young prince. In the *Dialogues* Fénelon used Achilles, that paragon of classical empty glory to denounce war. In *Dialogue IV* Homer chastised Achilles for his boasts of empty glory in battle. Homer exclaimed:

Intolerable Vanity! And that for having shed more Blood than another, at the siege of a Town, which was not taken, but after thy Death! How many Heroes have subdu'd Nations, and conquer'd Kingdoms? Not withstanding this, they are bury'd in Oblivion, and their Names are forgotten.³⁴⁶

War led to nothing but destruction and misery, any glory a figure may take from a war was historically transient even when they bathed in blood, and their individual glory did not outweigh the suffering experienced by the people. At its core 'War is an Evil which dishonours Mankind.' Not only were wars 'evil,' they should actually be seen as civil wars because man is fighting against his brethren. 'Any one Nation is as much a Member of the whole Race of Mankind, as any one family is of a particular Nation. Every Man is far more obliged to Mankind in general.' Wars therefore, 'are worse than the Combats of private

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 304.

³⁴⁶ Fénelon, *Dialogues of the Dead, Ancient Dead*, IV, 126.

Families against a Republick.’ So, for this reason unless it was the ‘last Extremity’ (self-defence), a state should never ‘engage in war.’³⁴⁷

However, wars continued to be fought frequently due to their rulers’ lust for power and fame regardless of the cost to their people. The problem stemmed from the inability to slake the thirst of a conqueror (king). ‘A conqueror is a man whom the gods,’ wrote Fénelon, ‘have in their anger sent into the world, to ravage kingdoms, to spread far and wide terror, misery, and despair, and to make as many slaves as there are free men. If a man was ambitious for glory, he will not find enough in ruling.’³⁴⁸ Such rulers are filled with jingoistic hubris which led to ‘haughty, unjust conduct’ against their neighbours. This pursuit for power was paradoxical in its end as it could ultimately ruin a king’s power. For, ‘while abroad, you are the object of hatred and jealousy of your neighbours, you exhaust yourself at home in the efforts and preparations necessary to maintain a war against them.’³⁴⁹ This was not a lesson that had been learned by Louis XIV, but one which Fénelon hoped that he would:

[T]he time will come when God will uncover your eyes and make you see all that you do not see now. For a long time He has held His arm over you poised to strike ...He will know how to separate the just cause from the unjust, His cause from yours, and in order to convert you first humble your pride ...You refer everything back to yourself as if you were God and all things had been created to be sacrificed for your own pleasure. But it is you that God has put into the world for no other purpose than the good of your people. Alas! These truths are hidden from you.³⁵⁰

Fénelon’s antidote for Burgundy to the kingly pursuit of war was his praise for the king who nurtured peace. True glory and strength lay in the maintenance of peace. Not only did it avoid the horrors, destruction, and cost of war, it promoted the happiness of the people and thereby the king. It consequently augmented the king’s standing at home and abroad. A

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.* XVI, 181-83.

³⁴⁸ *Telemachus*, Book VII, 112. In *Dialogue XXIII of the Ancient Dead*, Fénelon used Alexander the Great as an example of such a glory-enthused conqueror.

³⁴⁹ *Telemachus*, Book IX, 135.

³⁵⁰ *Lettre à Louis XIV, Selected Letters of Fénelon*, 306.

peaceful king would be viewed as ‘just, moderate, and easy’ by his neighbouring states, as ‘he will never do anything against them that may trouble the peace.’³⁵¹ His faithfulness in his alliances would make his allies love him rather than fear him, and they ‘will have an entire confidence in him, for his ‘probité, good faith, and moderation’ will ‘make him arbiter of all the states which surround his.’³⁵² A good king according to Fénelon was a peaceful king. A king who was a friend to his neighbours, who sat above the barbarity of war and acts as the wise ‘arbiter’ for the surrounding states to engender further peace. War was undesirable not only because it was destructive and was often caused by the fruitless whims of rulers in their pursuit of *gloire*, but because fundamentally it led man to kill his ‘brothers.’ Kings should be sufficiently educated enough and sage to realize that war was neither desirable nor profitable for anyone.

Fénelon’s political legacy has been fundamentally derived from these early educational works and is often summarized as anti-absolutist and anti-luxury. Indeed, this view matched his two grievances against a king: ‘the unjust and violent authority assumed by kings’ and that was luxury, which ‘corrupts the manners.’³⁵³ Luxury was viewed as extremely pernicious to a state, and Fénelon believed that it had consumed France. In the *Lettre*, Fénelon argued that Louis XIV’s power and *gloire* had ‘reduced France to destitution in order to maintain a state of prodigal and incurable luxury at Court.’³⁵⁴ Such criticisms by Fénelon have led to a particular focus on his view of luxury and commerce which are predominantly drawn from *Télémaque*.³⁵⁵

³⁵¹ *Telemachus*, Book V, 69-70.

³⁵² *Ibid.*

³⁵³ *Ibid.* Book XVII, 296.

³⁵⁴ *Lettre à Louis XIV*, 300.

³⁵⁵ An example is Istvan Hont’s introduction to *Jealousy of Trade* (Harvard, 2005), or Hont’s article “The early enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury,” (*Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought, Volume I*, 2006). Hont’s work discusses Fénelon’s educational view of commerce as a complete theory and plan

While Fénelon's view on commerce was typically associated with *Télémaque*, his view from this period was not exclusively found there.³⁵⁶ In the first *Fable* Fénelon described the preference for a rural life. The ability to be 'contented with a small Income' which should be 'acquir'd by your own Labour,' chargeable to no Man.³⁵⁷ An excess of money in society 'has prov'd [mankind's] greatest Misfortune,' for while men 'are seeking imaginary Wealth, [they] lose that which is really good.'³⁵⁸ The *Fables* warned Burgundy against the pursuit of luxury and the ruination that it could bring to a king or a state, or a court. Fénelon's discussion of luxury in this work (for a very young Burgundy), was a tendentious reminder of the luxury which surrounded the prince and how he must see past this to the truth outside. An allegory of escaping the court's luxury was found in the first *Fable* in which a dejected Melesichton desire to leave the court at Megara. Melesichton was visited by the goddess Ceres in a dream, who told him that true nobility originated from one's own labour. He awakened and immediately began to live a simple rural life, dismissing all but his essential staff. The lesson in the *Fable* was that man should live according to the necessities of life, producing what he needed to live on. As Melesichton's family grew to love the 'plain life' and their labours brought them all that they need, they realized that luxury should be eschewed as a destructive force. It was the court that perpetuated this life of luxury and therefore a king must escape it to find his true nature and needs of the people.

In Fénelon's third *Fable* the Persian king Cha-abbask goes amongst his people to seek the truth of his kingdom and observe his people in natural surroundings:

I am resolved to know what a rural life is, to study that kind of Men who are so much despis'd, but who are the Prop of all Human Society. I am

to reform the prodigal Salentum (France). Luxury would be necessarily eradicated in Salentum, and returned to an agrarian society which focuses on frugality, trade, and 'public spirit.'

³⁵⁶ This concentration on *Télémaque* for Fénelon's view of luxury can be found in Sanders, Cagnac, Carcassone. It might be added that this is not true of Hont, who includes Fénelon's *Fable* (of the Bees) in his delineation of Fénelon's view in his article, ("The early enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury," 383-85).

³⁵⁷ *Fables* (London, 1723), I, 5.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.* XIII, 81.

weary of seeing nothing but Courtiers, who observe me only with a design to overreach me with their Flatteries.³⁵⁹

The allegory of Cha-abbask therefore had a dual function. He served as a wise monarch who searched for the truth of his people because they were the foundation of his state. Within that truth he realized the need to escape the flattery and luxury of the court.³⁶⁰

In *Télémaque* Fénelon's lesson on commerce and luxury was expanded upon as he viewed trade as essential for social existence. A king should ensure that his 'subjects apply themselves to agriculture, to honour that occupation, to favour those who engage in it.'³⁶¹ If men 'live in a simple manner' and are 'content with satisfying their real needs,' they will 'see plenty, joy, peace, and union reign everywhere.'³⁶² Agriculture and the rural way of life provided the needs that men have, and this was virtuously achieved through 'frugality' and hard work. Commerce between individuals and states was vigorously encouraged. Commerce created co-operation between the human family. Fénelon's commercial centre of Tyre (Holland) was so filled with merchants 'from all over the world,' that when one arrived 'one at first believes that it is a city that belongs not to one people in particular, but to all nations in general, and the centre of their commerce.'³⁶³ Trade engendered prosperity and growth, and so the 'liberty of commerce [must be] preserved entire.' The key to its success lay in maintaining an equilibrium, and so 'everything useful [should be] imported and exported without restraint. What [is] carried out must be more than balanced by what [is] brought in return.'³⁶⁴ The emphasis was on trading what was useful and necessary: the 'true secret to gain a great deal, is never grasp at too much.'³⁶⁵ Unfortunately, the ambition of men

³⁵⁹ *Fables*, III, 13.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 14.

³⁶¹ *Telemachus*, Book XVI, 260.

³⁶² *Ibid.* Book V, 56.

³⁶³ *Ibid.* Book III, 36.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.* Book X, 161.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Book III, 37.

and their desire for the 'superfluous' meant that they were not content to live simply and well, and were drawn towards luxury and unnecessary trade.

To protect the state and the people from luxury it was necessary to prohibit it. Luxury must be abolished as it was a weakness within humanity as it led to dissipation, effeminacy, and it attacked the foundation of society.³⁶⁶ People were drawn away from the agricultural life to the cities to work in occupations that frequently supplied luxury goods. This weakened the fabric of the state and turned society on its head as people obsessively craved luxury:

A large city full of artisans employed in promoting luxury and a corruption of manners, with a poor ill-cultivated country about it, resembles a monster with an enormous head, but the rest of the body, for want of nourishment, is meagre and over-extended, and bearing no proportion to the head. The true strength and wealth of a kingdom consist in the number of people, and the produce of the lands.³⁶⁷

Luxury and the desire for money corrupt the mind of the individual becoming their sole pursuit before God and reason, almost before the necessities of life. Living simply or in poverty was viewed as 'scandalous.'³⁶⁸ So, people of all classes tried to emulate the luxury of the court. This in turn fed into a self-fulfilling industry in which people created luxury for the nobility, thus inspiring the lower classes to emulate this wealth. Any means were used (including illicit) to obtain luxury goods as the industry creates newer items for people to desire. 'It is said that luxury maintains the poor at the expense of the rich,' wrote Fénelon, 'as if the poor could not gain a livelihood, and be more useful in multiplying the fruits of the earth, without enervating the rich by the refinements of luxury.'³⁶⁹ Society had therefore become misguided through its obsession with the 'superfluities' of life. Vice had become a virtue, while the kingdom suffered as agriculture was weakened and the populace focused on

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.* Book XVII, 297.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 296.

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 297.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

the accumulation of wealth and goods that profit neither the individual nor the state. Such a state, as France had become according to Fénelon, was not conducive for a healthy kingdom or a healthy kingship, and the ‘insatiable thirst after riches, becomes every day more and more miserable and odious.’³⁷⁰ The solution was a strong and wise king who would remove luxury from his state. Luxury served no other purpose than to bankrupt the king, the nobility, the poor, the state, and morality in general.

Fénelon’s three principle areas of discussion in the educational works - kingship, war, and commerce - effectively reveal one: kingship. As would be expected in works designed to school a young prince in preparation for his later role as the king of France, the central focus was how to be a king. In this lesson Fénelon discussed the rigours of the role and what was required to ensure good kingship and the avoidance of tyranny, absolutism, or simply apathy. Fénelon used his discussions of war and commerce to show Burgundy how some contemporary issues needed to be eschewed in order for him to become the good king France required. While these lessons were submerged in entertaining myths for a young boy they contained Fénelon’s necessary truths for governing. The difference between these early works and his later plans is that while these educational works are based on Fénelon’s political truths they were not an actual expression of cohesive plans for government. They were simply lessons for a young child.

Plans and Reforms: (1701-1712)

Fénelon’s later political works dating after the Quietism Affair and his exile to Cambrai were written between 1701 and 1712. The Affair and Fénelon’s concentration on his dispute

³⁷⁰ *Ibid.* Book III, 32.

with Bossuet explains the gap between the final educational works (1695) and the beginning of his later political works in 1701. The hiatus also corresponds with a lack of contact with Burgundy. Contact was surreptitiously re-established between the two men on 22nd December 1701 through the eighteen year-old Burgundy's instigation: '*Enfin, mon cher Archevêque, je trouve une occasion favorable de rompre le silence où j'ai demeuré depuis quatre ans.*'³⁷¹ Burgundy nonetheless hid the initial renewal of his relationship from his grandfather, who was still angered over both the Quietism Affair and *Télémaque*. The second phase of Fénelon's political works embodied a mixture of letters, plans, and works, and they see a renewal in advice for Burgundy as a man. These works, more mature in tone but still at times pedantic, were used by Fénelon to focus Burgundy's mind on the role of future king. As such there was further discussion on the nature of kingship and the effects of war, yet in a mature and pointed manner with growing expectation of Burgundy's future role of king. After the death of Burgundy's father *le Grand Dauphin* in 1711 Fénelon began to plan for the future of France with the aim of much needed reform. It is here that Fénelon's true political ideas can be seen as the plans would have potentially been affected as state reforms had it not been for the death of Burgundy (1712).

In a letter to the Marquis de Louville, Charles Auguste d'Allonville de Louville (1664-1731), a soldier and chief of the household for Philip V of Spain, Fénelon advised him that good government revolved around a strong and active king. A king who was involved in the nation's interests argued Fénelon, and not the pursuit of war. This letter was advice for the newly crowned Philip V (D'Anjou), Burgundy's brother and Fénelon's former pupil. The

³⁷¹ Burgundy to Fénelon, (22nd December 1701, Versailles), *Correspondance, Tome X*, (Ed. Le Brun, 1989), 214. By 25th April 1702 Bugundy had written to Fénelon to say, 'I must tell you how happy I am to find myself so close to you, and also to know the King has given me permission to see you. He has however forbidden me to speak to you alone, (McEwen, p 142).' The meeting did not take place until some time after this.

*‘grande fonction d’un roi est de savoir choisir les hommes, les placer, les régler, les redresser. Il gouverne assez, quand il fait bien gouverner par ses subalterns.’*³⁷² In a familiar vein to the educational works Fénelon’s later advice on kingship to Burgundy was mainly concentrated within the *Examen de Conscience sur les Devoirs de la Royauté* (*Examination of Conscience on the Duties of Royalty*).³⁷³ The work, a favourite of Burgundy’s, was filled with advice redolent of his youth which incorporated new practical details in preparation for kingship. Such as the advice that Burgundy must have a good practical knowledge of his state and government:

*Je la souhaite pour le bien de l’État. Je la souhaite pour le vôtre même: car un des plus grands malheurs qui vous pût arrive, serait d’être le maître des autres dans un âge où vous l’êtes encore si peu de vous-même. Mais il faut vous préparer de loin aux dangers d’un état, dont je prie Dieu de vous préserver jusques à l’âge le plus avarice de la vie. La meilleure manière de faire connaître cet état à un prince qui craint Dieu, et qui aime la religion, c’est de lui faire un examen de conscience sur les devoirs de la royauté.*³⁷⁴

To enhance his knowledge of his state and his people a king must understand the law. It was not acceptable for a king to sit idly while his magistrates deal with the law and the people as the government rumbles on. Kings *‘ont besoin de se gouverner pour leurs États par certaines maximes de hauteur, de dureté, de dissimulation, en s’élevant au-dessus des règles communes de la justice et de l’humanité.’*³⁷⁵ The king was the *‘premier juge de son État. C’est lui qui fait les lois; c’est lui qui les interprète dans le besoin.’*³⁷⁶ The cultivation of his knowledge of the law was part of a wider cultivation of knowledge generally.³⁷⁷ It was important that a king must study not only theoretical material but also the condition of his

³⁷² “Lettre au Marquis de Louville” (10th October 1701), *Correspondance*, Vol. X, (Ed. Le Brun), 181.

³⁷³ The work is dated by Le Brun to circa 1702, however, it is felt that this would be the latest date of its completion and Le Brun speculates that the work was written as early as 1697. See the notes by Jacques Le Brun in *Fénelon’s Oeuvres, Tome II*, (Ed. Le Brun, 1997), 1664-67.

³⁷⁴ *Examen de Conscience sur les Devoirs de la Royauté, Fénelon Oeuvres, Tome II*, 973.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 974.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 975-6.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 976.

realm and people.³⁷⁸ A connection must exist between the king and his people, and this was achieved through his government and advisers.

Fénelon warned Burgundy that a king could not run a country alone as he would be overwhelmed and it will be the people who suffer as schemes ‘flag.’ The solution was for a king to rely on the efforts of others to ensure that government worked through listening to ministers’ counsel.³⁷⁹ Fénelon argued that to be able to rule his country effectively a king must be as a ‘*président de compagnie*’, sitting at the head of a counsel and listening to the advice given on the condition of the people and the country before choosing a course of action. For this to be effective, he must select good advisers to aid him in government, favourites should be avoided as this frequently worked against the public interest. The crux was to select talented, honest men through a process of elimination in which flatterers and the self-serving are discarded. The ‘*voix d’un seul homme de bien éclair doit souvent être préférée à celle de dix juges timides et foibles, ou entêtés et corrompus.*’³⁸⁰ Burgundy was advised that:

*C’est de bien choisir ceux qui exercent son autorité sous lui. C’est de mettre chacun dans la place qui lui convient, et de faire tout l’État, non par lui-même (ce qui est impossible), mais en faisant tout faire par des hommes qu’il choisit, qu’il anime, qu’il instruit, qu’il redresse: voilà la véritable action de roi.*³⁸¹

As with the educational works, good counsel and the foundation of law formed the basis of the king’s ability to rule. By relying on wise council a king may represent the public good. Fénelon argued that a king must have ‘*consulté sur une si importante question les hommes les plus éclairés, les plus zélés pour le bien public, et le plus capable de vous dire la vérité sans flatterie ni mollesse.*’³⁸² The king’s concern must be for the people at all times. He must

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 977.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 976.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

³⁸¹ *Ibid.* 996.

³⁸² *Ibid.* 982.

avoid the burden of excessive taxation on his people, he must avoid pursuing follies, and avoid going to war for his 'particular interest' or his '*gloire*.'³⁸³ A good king was a balanced king, who walked a line between the interest of the state (king) and the interest of the people:

*Tout au plus, vous pourriez recevoir en de telles occasions les dons des peuples faits par affection, et par rapport à la liaison qui la gouverne en père. Mais selon cette vue vous seriez bien éloigné d'accabler les peuples d'impôts pour votre intérêt particulier.*³⁸⁴

Furthermore as king, Burgundy must avoid the pursuit of his 'particular interest' in war, especially the disastrous example of Charles VIII's campaign against Naples. Charles VIII of France (1470-98) had invaded Italy to claim his right to the Kingdom of Naples in 1494 offered to him by Pope Innocent VIII (1432-92). The speed of the French campaign and its subjugation of Florence worried the Italian states, the Pope, Emperor and other European states and the *League of Venice* was formed which defeated the French at Forvono (1495). For Fénelon, war heaped ruination on one's own state and the states of one's neighbours and with the exception of self-defence must be eschewed at all costs, as there was very rarely a just war.³⁸⁵ The correct way to govern was in peace and with good allies. Burgundy must rule from above, augmented by a desire to be an example to his people: Fénelon believed Burgundy should be '*l'exemple que Saint Louis donnait d'une grande simplicité*.'³⁸⁶ Saint Louis, or Louis IX of France (1214-70), should be followed as an example for his piety and reformation of the French government, including a policy of peace and frugal economic reform, for the benefit of the people. Fénelon particularly targeted his advice against the vice of the court which had been allowed to exist unrestrained in the French court to the detriment of all. The king must therefore remove the contagion of vice from the court so that it could

³⁸³ *Ibid.* 990.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 982.

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 989.

³⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 980.

not destroy the state, and this required the use of law and counsel to achieve this.³⁸⁷ Both boons shaped an effective and balanced government for the interests of the public good, and led to good kingship and peace.

The period of 1701 to 1712 covers almost the entirety of the War of Spanish Succession (1702-14). Burgundy fought in this war as one of Louis XIV's commanders, and the war was fought near Cambrai on the border with the Low Countries. It is perhaps no surprise that the war features throughout these later works. What is surprising were the measures that Fénelon would have been prepared to take to create peace within Europe. Fénelon's distaste for war returned him to the point that wars between states were wars between brothers: 'Your enemy is your brother.'³⁸⁸ For a king to pursue the glory of war as Louis XIV did was to sacrifice the people's interests for the particular will of the monarch. It should not be that the '*millions d'hommes qui composent une nation sont-ils moins nos d'hommes, qu'un seul homme*'.³⁸⁹ Fénelon's distaste for war was consuming, and his view of humanity as 'brothers' spurred him to first propose concessions to ensure peace, before constructing a peace plan to ensure a lasting peace.

In the *Mémoire sur les Moyens de Prévenir la Guerre de la Succession d'Espagne* (1701), Fénelon warned of the potential for a European war over the issue of the Spanish crown.³⁹⁰ This issue of the Spanish succession was created by the death of a childless Charles II (1661-1700). Charles had named Anjou, his sister's grandson as his successor. This alarmed the other European powers as the French House of Bourbon's power base had been considerably enlarged. It posed a potential threat to the security of Europe as a Franco-Spanish combined

³⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 978.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 989.

³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁰ The *Mémoire* is dated 28th August 1701, *Oeuvres, Tome II*, (Ed. Le Brun).

force, but more overtly through the notion of universal monarchy under Louis XIV. The five parts of the work promote conciliatory plans of action to avoid further war, and the provocation of an Anglo-Dutch alliance with Austria after the Peace of Ryswick.³⁹¹ They open with the belief that the Dutch must be made neutral to avoid their participation in a war in which they were seen as the beacon of European liberty.³⁹² This would be achieved if France did not invade the Spanish Netherlands. Further, England and Holland must be assured that Holland was not under threat from French aggrandizement, and that France has no other interest in Holland other than to trade. To alleviate Spanish fears that it would be subordinated by the French, the Spanish must have it made clear that they were an independent state.³⁹³ Moreover, hatred against the French should be further dampened by gaining the neutrality of the German states through diplomacy and manipulation of the succession of princes via subsidies to those who did not favour war.³⁹⁴ The *Mémoire* was to be presented to Louis XIV by Beauvilliers as his own thought, and there was optimism that the plan may have prevented war. Unfortunately for Fénelon and Beauvilliers, Louis publicly acknowledged James Stuart, the son of James II, as heir to the throne of England (1701). This was in defiance of the Ryswick treaty, and it excited the hatred of the English and the Dutch in favour of William III making war inevitable.

After eight years of war, in 1710 Fénelon had once more returned to the role of the frustrated observer in the *Lettre à Louis XIV*. In a letter to the Duc de Chevreuse, Fénelon rued the present state of France and the behaviour of the king:

mais quand on verra Roi accabler les peuples, rechercher les aises, ne payer point ce qu'il doit, continuer ses dépenses superflues, hazarder la France sans la consulter, et ruiner le royaume, pour faire mal la guerre, le public

³⁹¹ Signed on the 20th September 1697 the Peace treaty concluded the Nine Years War between France and the Grand Alliance (of England, Spain, the Low Countries, and the Holy Roman Empire).

³⁹² *Mémoire sur les Moyens de Prévenir la Guerre de la Succession d'Espagne, Oeuvres, Tome II*, 1013.

³⁹³ *Ibid.* 1014.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 1027.

*recommencer à crier plus haut que jamais, et il n'est Presque pas possible qu'il n'arrive à la longue quelque soulèvement. Il est impossible que le Roi paie ses dettes. Il est impossible que les peuples paient le Roi, si les choses sont au point d'extrémité qu'on nous représente. La France est comme une place assiégée.*³⁹⁵

Fénelon wanted Louis to re-establish contact with the French people and pursue a policy of peace. In both of the later reform works, the *Tables de Chaulnes* (1711) and the *Mémoires sur les précautions et les mesures à prendre après la mort du Duc de Bourgogne* (1712), the need for immediate peace is the starting point to reform France: '*Paix à faire doit être achetée sans mesure.*'³⁹⁶ Fénelon's desire for peace led to extraordinary concessions he would have been willing to make to achieve it. Fénelon had previously decried the condition of France in the *Mémoire sur le situation déplorable de la France en 1710*. A work despairing of the humiliating and degrading position France found itself in after eight years of war. It portrayed the army as demoralized and under-funded, the French borders as constantly threatened, trade very near collapse, and a debt untenable.³⁹⁷ In the *Tables*, Fénelon expanded on this view by arguing that the army should be withdrawn from active campaigns and used only for the defence of France.³⁹⁸ The hazards of war and the huge national debt and the destitution of the nation needed to be combated by large cuts to the army (and war effort). Both the number of soldiers and the number of garrisons had to be reduced to limit public expenditure on costly wars of esteem and aggrandizement.³⁹⁹ This change of policy would be juxtaposed with a cessation of future French wars with particular effort made towards a treaty with English and the Dutch, and Europe generally.

Fénelon's solution for the creation of a lasting peace had already been written as a (perpetual) peace plan, a *Supplément* added to the end of the *Examen*. While the work was

³⁹⁵ Fénelon to Duc de Chevreuse (4th August 1710), *Correspondance*, Tome XIV, 261.

³⁹⁶ *Tables de Chaulnes*, (also known as the *Plans de Gouvernement*), *Oeuvres*, Tome II, 1085. The work was written in November 1711 several months after the death of the Dauphin.

³⁹⁷ *Mémoire sur le situation déplorable de la France en 1710*, *Oeuvres*, Tome II, 1038.

³⁹⁸ *Tables de Chaulnes*, *Oeuvres*, Tome II, 1085-86.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 1087.

dated to 1702, it was not published until 1720 in an inaccurate form in London under the title of *Two Essays on the Ballance of Europe*. An exact version was published in 1747 as part of the *Examen*.⁴⁰⁰ The work argued that:

Neighbouring states are not only obliged to behave mutually towards each other according to the rules of justice and honesty, but ought likewise, as well as the sake for their own security, as of their common interest, to form themselves into a kind of society and general republic.⁴⁰¹

Fénelon argued that states were distinct entities with boundaries and had a natural desire to enlarge.⁴⁰² This becomes a problem when the larger states who crave domination confront and threaten the boundaries of other states. The ultimate and terrifying realization of this desire to dominate was the potential of France to create a universal monarchy in which it would dominate Europe entire.⁴⁰³ For Fénelon universal monarchy was unnatural, and the *Supplément* was added to the *Examen* to (apparently) dissuade Burgundy from this undesirable form of aggrandizement. Universal monarchy was unjust as it was an attempt to stamp the ‘laws of a particular country’ on other states that it has subjugated. The ‘written laws of a particular people, cannot prevail over the natural law of liberty and the common security, engraven in the hearts of all the other people of the world.’⁴⁰⁴

Fénelon’s petition for peace and the end of fruitless destruction in Europe relied on his belief that men were all ‘brothers.’ This belief engendered in Fénelon the idea that man’s connection in Europe could be used to create a bond between states that would ensure the

⁴⁰⁰ The provenance of this work will be discussed in the next section but it has been argued by Le Brun that the work is actually older than 1702 and may date from 1697. The work does certainly discuss the potential problem of Charles II of Spain dying without issue at one point and he died in 1700. In discussing the work I will be using the *Supplément* which was published in 1747 as part of the *Examen* under the title of the *Proper Heads of Self-Examination for a King*.

⁴⁰¹ Fénelon, *Proper Heads of Self-Examination for a King*, 72.

⁴⁰² *Ibid.* 73.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.* 77.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 77.

cessation of war.⁴⁰⁵ Europeans were united through Christianity and other shared interests, such as commerce. The solution for preventing any attempt at European hegemony meant that a confederation of states must unite against any aggressor: ‘the others have a right to combine together to prevent the increase, in consequence of which it would be too late to defend the common liberty.’⁴⁰⁶ The confederation was designed for peace and its very existence should be enough to dissuade any state from attacking one of its European brothers. While the ‘league’ was predominantly defensive in nature, Fénelon argued that the league should have recourse to force. The use of force:

[S]hould be grounded upon breaches of the peace, or upon the detention of some country belonging to the allies, or upon some certainty of some other resembling foundation. Father ...when one nation lays hold of the necessity of humbling another, which aspires to universal tyranny, in order to aspire to it itself in turn.⁴⁰⁷

The effect of the league would be to ensure peace amongst a continually quarrelsome and warring Europe. Europe frequently ignored its treaties, and Louis XIV had been accused of doing so in the past by Fénelon. It had forgotten that the ‘proper way of making treaties of alliance, as well as the justest and honestest,’ was to make them ‘free from all equivocal terms, and precisely limited to the certain benefit you more immediately desire to obtain from them.’⁴⁰⁸ A league between the states would act as a permanent treaty of peace, in which all the doubts and vagaries of treaties would be ended. Thus reducing the ability to behave aggressively towards other European states and promoting co-operative union.

The motivation of the work resurfaced in its conclusion where Fénelon instructed Burgundy on the perils of superiority for a young king, particularly when a young prince inherits a state vastly superior to its neighbours. Superiority had two forms, ‘external’ and ‘internal,’ and the king must attempt to strike a balance of ‘equality’ between them.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 78-9.

⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 77.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 80-1.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 81.

‘External superiority’ was found in comparison to ones neighbours. Fénelon felt this to be a position a new king should not be left in by his predecessor as the temptations to aggrandize are ‘fatal’ and stem from a ‘false appearance of glory.’⁴⁰⁹ This superiority created jealousy from other states and led to ‘hatred’ and leagues of opposition which occasion war. The second kind, ‘internal superiority,’ consisted ‘in more numerous people, well disciplined and better exercised in tillage and necessary arts.’⁴¹⁰ This superiority was easy to obtain and maintain, and could not ‘be too much sought after, nor the former too much avoided.’⁴¹¹ It returned Fénelon to his tendentious advice that a king should focus on the internal health of his state. Balance for a state was vital internally and externally. Internally, a state ensured its health through its people, its agriculture and commerce, and its government. It was the responsibility of the king to protect his people and the public good, and externally this was achieved by ensuring peace. The best way to achieve a lasting peace was through a league of states that protected the sovereignty of each state and the balance of Europe as a whole.

Fénelon’s discussion of peace not only originated from a personal distaste for the barbarity of war but also the need to reform France which had been impeded by a jingoistic king (and ministry). Fénelon wanted to reform France both internally through its government, and externally by improving France’s damaged reputation. Yet it was the need to critically change the French state that led to the creation of two sets of plans for reform. One, the *Tables de Chaulnes* was sent to Burgundy when he was the dauphin in November 1711. The second, *Mémoires sur les précautions et les mesures à prendre après la mort du Duc de Bourgogne* written only four months later after Burgundy’s death (and shown to Louis XIV), was designed to install change and ensure stability after the death of the king.

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 86.

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid.* 87.

⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*

The *Tables* were created by Fénelon with the assistance of the Duc de Chevreuse for Burgundy when he had become the heir to the throne. After the death of Burgundy's father on 14th April 1711 from smallpox, Fénelon and Chevreuse met at Chaulnes to discuss the state of France in November. This conference resulted in the *Tables de Chaulnes* also known as the *Plans de Gouvernement*, a list of short points and maxims called *Tables*. The *Tables* proposed ideas to reform France, and focused on seven categories: the military, court expenditure, internal administration, the Church, the nobility, justice, and commerce. The work began by stating the need for an immediate cessation of war.⁴¹² If this could not be achieved France would have to cede territory in an attempt to ensure peace by March 1712. An alternative option was also provided and born of pragmatism, if the present government and army wanted to continue fighting. This would be the creation of a '*conseil de guerre à la cour*' to plan any military activity in which ministers and generals decided what the best decisions for France were.⁴¹³ Fénelon's desire for peace was paramount and the *Tables* were formed from the basis of established peace. Peace would allow a dramatic cut in military expenditure through troops and garrisons and would enable France to rely on a reduced army of 150,000 men to protect the nation. The cuts made from Louis XIV's pursuit of war would be followed by cuts made at court. There had to be a '*[r]etranchement de toutes les pensions de cour non nécessaires*' and '*[m]odération dans les meubles, equipages, habits, tables,*' in short, a '*[s]upputation exacte des fonds pour la maison du roi nulle augmentation sous aucun pretext.*'⁴¹⁴ Such a calculation would allow an exact understanding of how much the king's household and court actually required (with wages and pensions) to run. In so doing, waste and excessive expenditure of the rapacious court would be stopped, allowing France '*rétablir l'agriculture, les arts utiles,*' and '*le commerce.*'⁴¹⁵

⁴¹² *Tables de Chaulnes, Oeuvres, Tome II*, 1085.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.* 1086.

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.* 1088.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.* 1089.

Internal administration was also to be reformed. Local government would be reformed through the establishment of an *Assiete*, a small assembly in each diocese, such as in Languedoc. Each region would be able to control their own police, funds, election, and use of taxation, while contributing to the state's expense. This would be possible through general levies on goods such as salt, and would remove the need for financiers. For France, there would be an '*établissement d'États généraux*.'⁴¹⁶ The deputies would be free in their parliamentary behaviour and voting, and while their duty was to serve the king they were there to serve the interests of their region. Composition of the Estates-general would be taken from '*l'évêque de chaque diocese, d'un seigneur d'ancienne et haute noblesse, élu par les nobles,*' and '*d'un homme considerable du tiers-état, élu par le tiers-état.*'⁴¹⁷ Elections would be free and devoid of any interference of the king. The Estates would be superior to the Assietes and have the power to overturn important decisions, but its function would be to discuss issues of key importance to France. This would mean issues such as 'extraordinary expenditure,' war, maritime policies on trade, justice, the police, finance, alliances, peace negotiations, agriculture, and trade. The Estates would also be responsible for '*pour abolir tous privilèges, toutes lettres d'état abusives,*' and '*tout commerçant d'argent sans merchandise, excepté les banquiers nécessaires.*'⁴¹⁸ The Estates therefore, would aid the reform of France both politically and through wider policy that would reach out throughout the entire state.

Fénelon's reform of the financial situation and the government led to a discussion of the pressing need to tackle both the 'Nobility' and 'Trade.' The nobility had been corrupted and impoverished by the luxury of court and its inability to earn money under Louis XIV. They were a vital resource to France that had been neglected. A 'catalogue of nobles' would be

⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.* 1090.

⁴¹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.* 1091.

produced to provide proof of the honours, titles, and descent of each family and those that could not prove their lineage would be deemed 'illegitimate.'⁴¹⁹ Nobles of both branches would be given positions throughout the palace and court to enable them to work. The necessity for the nobility to work rather than sit idle and in poverty, meant that they would be allowed to undertake 'wholesale trade' and would be free to enter the magistracy. All noble families were to have 'permanently entailed property' rather than residing at Versailles. Ultimately, Fénelon desired to examine and control the nobility to restore its fortunes while removing the surfeit of 'sycophants' who had been rewarded for poor work.⁴²⁰ While positions would be based upon rank and therefore favour the old nobility (who had an historic duty to France), their contribution to France would be augmented while drastically reducing the nobility's numbers. Yet, for Fénelon part of the problem in Louis XIV's France was that there were too many nobles, many of them newly created, who drained the state and lived a life of idleness. Fénelon's reforms tackled this issue and enabled the nobility to work in the service of the king and state as they had done in the past, thereby removing the need to provide for it.⁴²¹

Fénelon also dealt with the 'Church' and 'Justice.' The reform of 'Justice' concentrated on the regulation of the courts by the chancellor, and how the courts were to be run and structured. Fénelon's treatment of the 'Church' was more interesting as he advocated 'reciprocal independence of the two powers' spiritual and temporal.⁴²² Fénelon was interested in freeing both institutions from interference by the other, although there should be a great deal of co-operation and mutual assistance. Yet when it came to the running of their own temporal or spiritual affairs they both knew better how to do so. A further point that should be made about Fénelon's Church, was his insistence that it created a '*plan pour*

⁴¹⁹ *Tables de Chaulnes, Oeuvres, Tome II*, 1100.

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.* 1101.

⁴²¹ *Ibid.* 1102.

⁴²² *Ibid.* 1093.

*déraciner jansénisme.*⁴²³ Fénelon wanted to root out those who practised Jansenism from the Church (at all levels) to avoid any possibility of schism. To achieve this he wanted the Benedictines to impose doctrinal rule. The significance of this belief is that it counters the belief that Fénelon was a bastion of religious toleration, a view promulgated by Ramsay and a view derived publicly from *Télémaque* due to his attack on absolutism. Fénelon, as he had in his youth when dealing with Huguenot girls, believed like Bossuet in one faith and that people had to be returned to it.

Fénelon's final area for reform was that of 'Commerce.' Fénelon wanted to promote '[g]rand commerce de derées bonnes et abondantes en France' and that were the '*ouvrages faits par les bons ouvriers.*'⁴²⁴ French manufactures and crafts were to be encouraged to flourish. Agriculture, in which France was 'sufficiently rich,' was also to be harnessed so that goods like grain, oil, wine, and cloth could be exported. A 'freedom of trade' would enable the French to trade with the Dutch and the English in a manner that would greatly benefit France, as the Estates-general (and individual Estates) would set the import and export tariffs. In this foreign trade foreigners must be left unmolested to trade in France, and the French must desist in attempting to compete with the Dutch.⁴²⁵ While the English and the Dutch traded in 'spices and curiosities' these were inferior goods to the necessities that France could offer. French goods would augment revenues as France developed its ability to produce essential goods for export. Luxury goods were 'superfluous' in nature and were to be discouraged. There were to be '*Lois somptuaries et pour chaque condition. On ruine nobles pour enricher les marchands par le luxe. On corrompt par ce luxe les moeurs de toute la nation. Ce luxe est plus pernicieux que le profit des modes n'est utile.*'⁴²⁶ Luxury was to be restrained by a 'council of commerce.' Its presence had damaged France and it should

⁴²³ *Ibid.* 1099.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.* 1104.

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.* 1105.

therefore be prohibited due to its effect on the king, the nobility, and the state generally. All trade derived from luxury or trade that was superfluous, such as speculation and usury ('the trade in money') was to be prohibited in a France focused on the trade and wealth of essential goods. Fénelon's attack on luxury was so encompassing he even advocated that the king should only be allowed to buy crafts: 'when he has paid his debts.'⁴²⁷ Commerce and the cuts made through peace and the re-organizing government were to be used to drive through the reform Fénelon felt France needed under the rule of a new king Burgundy.

Within four months of the *Tables* creation Burgundy was dead. Despite his grief, Fénelon foresaw impending problems with the transfer of the succession from Louis XIV to his great-grandson Louis, the orphaned son of Burgundy. His response was to compose the *Mémoires sur les précautions et les mesures à prendre après la mort du Duc de Bourgogne* composed on the 15th March 1712.⁴²⁸ The work reflected real concerns held by Fénelon about the potential transfer of power after the death of an elderly king and an infant heir. The work began with the dismissal of the rumour that Orléans had murdered Burgundy.⁴²⁹ The Duc de Orléans (1674-1723) would become Regent of France to Louis XV in his minority. Fénelon gave no credence to the rumour that his friend had killed Burgundy as he believed there would have been no advantage to it as he was not the heir to the throne. With this issue addressed Fénelon moved to the issue of peace:

II. *Il est à desirer que tous les ministres se réunissent pour rendre sa majesté très facile à acheter très chèrement la paix: c'est unique moyen de la débarrasser pour le reste de sa vie, et de la prolonger.*

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁸ Fénelon in his grief at the death of Burgundy wrote on 27th February to Chevreuse, 'Alas! My good Duke, God has shattered all our fondest hopes for Church and state,' p. 178 (*Selected Letters of Fénelon*, McEwen).

⁴²⁹ *Mémoires sur les précautions et les mesures à prendre après la mort du Duc de Bourgogne, Oeuvres de Fénelon, Tome XI*, (Dufour, Paris, 1826), 86-90.

III. *Ils peuvent lui faire entendre que c'est ce qu'il doit à sa gloire et à sa conscience. Il ne doit point s'exposer à laisser un petit enfant avec tout le royaume dans un si prochain peril.*⁴³⁰

The issue of internal security once more was used as the foundation for future plans. Peace had to be assured in France while Louis XIV was still alive, for a regency France had much to fear excluding war. The potential threats were both external (other states) and internal, such as discontented classes, princes excluded from the regency, the Huguenots, undisciplined troops, and those who were owed money by France.

Peace would be augmented by the implementation of a '*conseil de régence*' to be established immediately while Louis XIV was alive.⁴³¹ The 'council' would need to involve the king to ensure that issues such as the national debt were tackled without delay. The need for expeditious reform meant that Fénelon had Beauvilliers use his influence on Madame de Maintenon in order that she could in turn influence Louis, but he rejected the plan. The 'council' would be comprised of an 'assembly of notables.' This would be composed of members from the Burgundy Circle such as Beauvilliers, Chevreuse, Saint-Simon, and de Tallard, other ministers and secretaries of state, and would be headed by the grandson of Louis XIV, the Duc de Berry (1686-1714). The council would have two main roles. One would be the education of the young Dauphin until his majority using a curriculum that could be set by Louis XIV. The other role carried out with the king's authorization was the use of the council '*qui est conforme au gouvernement de la nation.*'⁴³² The council would be attached to the parliament of Paris and assemble at least six times a year. Its councils would replace the single secretaries of state, and in a manner redolent of the *Tables*, power would be devolved throughout the nation to a greater extent. Less power would be concentrated in the

⁴³⁰ *Ibid.* 91.

⁴³¹ *Ibid.* 92.

⁴³² *Ibid.* 98.

monarch as more would be devolved to the council, the Estates-general, and the *Assietes*.⁴³³

While Fénelon foresaw ‘dreadful difficulties’ he believed that to tackle the problems faced by France there had to be a radical departure from Louis XIV’s absolutist rule. Louis’s extraordinarily long reign - ‘*Depuis long-temps la nation n’est plus accoutumée qu’à la volonté absolue d’un seul maître*’⁴³⁴ – would be hugely problematic for France. If Louis died without making plans for the succession government would have to unify and organize itself in an attempt to stabilize the state and a people without Louis XIV. By assembling the council immediately and using it to run government and tackle the issues of France now, this ‘Polysynody’ would allow for a smooth transition of power.⁴³⁵ Its existence could then be used to reform France and continue to aid in the running of the state when the Dauphin entered maturity. France would therefore evolve from absolutism and begin to use a government that relied upon this council, the Estates-general, and local assemblies comprised of men from all three Estates.

As has been discussed, Fénelon’s focus in these plans for government was predominantly on reforming the monarchy, government, and the state. War was continuously used as a starting point for reform, for as was highlighted in the *Tables* reform could not take place in France whilst so much was being expended on fighting. An overhaul of expenditure on war was expanded upon to examine expenditure within the state generally, leading to a discussion of how the state could be improved and how revenue can be generated by areas such as commerce to remove the national debt, reform the country, and improve the morals of the people. Underlining the need for reform and the move away from the absolutism of Louis XIV is Fénelon’s didactic repetition of what the Duke of Burgundy needed to remember to be a good king. A new France needed a new king, and Fénelon’s king Burgundy needed to embrace the law, shun excess, seek good counsel, and at all times pursue the public good.

⁴³³ *Ibid.* 97-8.

⁴³⁴ *Ibid.* 99.

⁴³⁵ *Ibid.* 99-100.

Ramsay's Editing of Fénelon's Political Works

As discussed in the first chapter, Ramsay was awarded the role of editor of Fénelon's works and papers by the Marquis de Fénelon in 1717. He had been given the position in response to his *A Discourse upon Epick Poetry, and the Excellence of the Poem Télémaque*, juxtaposed with his stay with Fénelon at Cambrai. Ramsay duly helped to edit and publish a new version of *Télémaque* in 1717 followed the next year by several other publications including a two-volume edition of the *Fables* and *Dialogues de Morts*. As has been previously stated, Ramsay's editing of the works of Fénelon may have contributed to the later view that Fénelon's political principles were primarily expressed in *Télémaque*. Indubitably, the success of the work across Europe by 1717 had already helped to frame a particular opinion of Fénelon's ostensible political views; yet Ramsay, with full access to his papers and works did nothing to change this view, and in his own work demonstrated that he viewed Fénelon in this way also. In this section therefore, I will endeavour to ascertain how Ramsay's actions as an editor led to the focus of Fénelon's political legacy being fixed predominantly on *Télémaque*. By discussing the *Supplément* and Ramsay's editing I hope to argue that Ramsay helped shape Fénelon's political legacy, an occurrence that appears to have been overlooked by Fénelon's biographers.

Prosper Marchand's *A Short Account of the Life of the Late M. Franc. De Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon* had been commissioned by the Marquis de Fénelon to restore the Archbishop's real character, in an attempt to remove the memory of Ramsay's *Vie de Fénelon*. Marchand's *Account* was written in 1734 and re-published in 1747 as part of the *Proper Heads*. It has been claimed that Marchand's *Account* was an attempt by the Fénelon

family to erase the false depiction of the prelate promulgated by Ramsay.⁴³⁶ It was an attempt that did not work, as Ramsay's *Vie de Fénelon* had become an accepted depiction of Fénelon and his political philosophy. If one examines the later *Histoires* of Fénelon, over a two hundred year period this claim is borne out: with the notable exceptions of Bausset and Janet most biographies are based on Ramsay's *Vie*. It was not until the twentieth-century and the Albert Cherel's biography that Fénelon biographers began to rely on their own research rather than replicating Ramsay's *Vie*. Yet despite this the origins of the *Essay de politique* still cause confusion over whether the work represented Fénelon's political principles, with many biographers still believing the work does.⁴³⁷

Marchand's work contained a number of accusations about editorial changes of Fénelon's works from the originals:

Those persons [Ramsay] into whose hands the manuscripts had fallen, did not print them without taking the liberty to alter them, under a pretence of making such corrections, as their want of judgement in matters of this nature had led them to think necessary.⁴³⁸

The works that were cited by Marchand are the *Spiritual Compositions* and *Select Sermons* which were greatly altered and added to, and the *Philosophical Works*. The first volume of the *Works* had been previously published but the second volume had never been before been 'printed, and the manuscript was taken from among the author's papers after his death.'⁴³⁹ All of these works were published in 1718 when Ramsay was editor of Fénelon's papers.

During an examination of Fénelon's manuscripts on behalf of the Fénelon family it was discovered that portions had been added to *Télémaque* that did not exist in the original. The manuscript upon which all subsequent editions are based had sections written in a different hand from Fénelon's. This hand had added an apology for Fénelon's perceived criticism of

⁴³⁶ See Albert Cherel, *Fénelon au xviii^e Siècle en France (1715-1820: Son Prestige - Son Influence)*, 31.

⁴³⁷ In the twentieth century this includes M. Cagnac, *Fénelon: Politique tirée de l'Evangile* (Paris, 1912); E. Carcassonne, *Fénelon: l'Homme et l'Oeuvre* (Boivin & Cie, Rue Palatine, Paris, 1946), and F. Gallouédec-Genuys, *Le Prince selon Fénelon* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1963).

⁴³⁸ Marchand, *A Short Account in Proper Heads* 194.

⁴³⁹ *Ibid.* 233.

Louis XIV in Book XII, as Mentor admonishes Telemachus for his criticism of Idomeneus (Louis XIV).⁴⁴⁰ The importance of this discovery which appears to have been lost is that all later editions of *Télémaque* were based on Ramsay's 1717 edition. This meant that later versions of *Télémaque* predominantly contain parts that were not written by Fénelon, and which may potentially have been written by Ramsay: a section that acts as an apology for Fénelon's perceived attack on Louis XIV.⁴⁴¹ It is entirely plausible as Ramsay had access to the manuscripts as editor, he apparently revelled in his connection with Fénelon, and he had a propensity to manipulate Fénelon's work. In his own work also, Ramsay had a proclivity for using and plagiarizing the works and ideas of others which can be seen in the publication of his *Travels of Cyrus*. A work that borrowed heavily from *Télémaque*, and as discussed in the 'Andrew Michael Ramsay' chapter, was proven to plagiarize a number of other authors including Fénelon and Bossuet. For whatever reasons, Ramsay as editor appears to have been active in shaping Fénelon's legacy while potentially adding to it himself.

Ramsay's manipulative behaviour as Fénelon's editor is possibly best highlighted through the life of the *Examen de conscience sur les devoirs de la royauté*. As I have stated, its *Supplément* was published separately and inaccurately twenty years before as the *Two Essays on the Ballance of Europe*. This was fifteen years before the first publication of the *Examen* (without the *Supplément*), and twenty-seven years before they were published together as the *Proper Heads of Self-Examination for a King*. The *Supplément* was written as an attachment to the *Examen* at the same time between 1697 and 1702. It was given to Burgundy in 1702 but it had been thought lost. Burgundy had stored the work with other *Mémoires* and letters in a personal box which was found after his death in 1712. According

⁴⁴⁰ See Cardinal Bausset, *The Life of Fénelon*, (London, 1810). Bausset wrote: 'this whole passage, which occupies six pages in our original copy, is in a different hand from the rest of the copy ...the original manuscript of Telemachus having been recovered, all of which is written in the handwriting of the Archbishop of Cambrai, the addition from the present copy has been added to' (Volume I, 323).

⁴⁴¹ See *The Adventures of Telemachus, Son of Ulysses*, Book XII, Volume I, (London, 1719), 286-88.

to Madame de Maintenon the *Examen* was one of the works that she managed to rescue from Louis XIV who in his grief burned the contents of the box. An important point here is that there were two copies of every work and letter sent to Burgundy, one for Burgundy and one Fénelon kept for himself and this is why Fénelon's *Mémoires politiques* are extant. For while Louis managed to burn most of Burgundy's copies Fénelon's copies survived. The interesting point with the *Examen* and its *Supplément* was that Fénelon family did not have a copy of the work until they received Burgundy's copy. Madame de Maintenon sent the letters and work she had managed to save to the Duc de Beauvilliers, and the Duchess eventually returned them to the Marquis de Fénelon circa 1734. In 1734 the work was to be published for the first time bound with a copy of *Télémaque* and titled the *Education royale ou Examen de conscience pour un grand prince*. Publication was halted at the request of the French ministry due to concerns over the *Supplément* and its discussion of the balance between the European states and aggrandizement. However, a small number of copies of the *Examen* were promulgated without the *Supplément*.

In 1747 the *Examen* was published by two individual sources. One was by Jean Neaulme in The Hague and this was based on the 1734 original titled *Directions pour la Conscience d'un Roi*, again without the *Supplément* and together with *Télémaque*. The second was an original manuscript purchased by John Carteret, Second Earl of Granville while in The Hague, and it contained both parts of the *Examen*. It was put together for the Earl under the title of *Proper Heads for Self-Examination for a King* and published in London and Dublin. The work not only contained the *Examen* with the *Supplément* but also Marchand's *Account*, a genealogy of the Fénelon family, and an authorized bibliography by Marchand. These latter works had been commissioned to correct the interference by Ramsay with Fénelon's work and legacy. The question that arises is how, if the *Examen* was thought lost and not in

Fénelon's papers was it published (in an altered form) in London in 1720 as the *Ballance of Europe*?

The answer to this question would appear to be Ramsay. Marchand had accused the editor (Ramsay) of publishing the *Philosophical Works* which were no longer in the possession of the Fénelon family. When one adds to this the sale of a number of papers to the Foulis brothers at the death of Ramsay which belonged to Fénelon, it is perhaps not a large leap to assume that Ramsay had taken some of Fénelon's papers.⁴⁴² Furthermore, Ramsay appeared to have attempted to cover the theft in the *Vie de Fénelon*. In discussing the return of the *Examen* and other letters to Beauvilliers Marchand quotes Maintenon's letter to the Duke in which she explained that she had returned it as she was "greatly concerned for it."⁴⁴³ However, in Ramsay's *Vie* Madame de Maintenon's letter became: "I regret the loss exceedingly,"⁴⁴⁴ thereby implying that the works had been burnt by Louis XIV. While definitive proof would be hard to ascertain, a great deal of circumstantial evidence does point to Ramsay taking the work from the Fénelon family.

Further issues arise with Ramsay's role of editor as signified by his abuse of the *Supplément*, the manipulation of the actual works and his creation of a view of Fénelon that was inaccurate. This problem came to light on the 9th December 1780 when the Abbé de Fénelon, a family descendant, responded to a piece in the *Mercure* that stated that Fénelon had told Burgundy to "tolerate all religions, since God tolerates them."⁴⁴⁵ The Abbé responded by arguing that this was erroneous and was in fact a corruption of the advice given to Burgundy by Fénelon. Whilst Fénelon had given Burgundy advice its tone was different. Instead, Fénelon had advocated "civil toleration" and gentle persuasion in private individual

⁴⁴² See Henderson's *Chevalier Ramsay* (p. 243) for an inventory of works sold to the Foulis' after Ramsay's death in 1743.

⁴⁴³ Marchand, *Brief Account*, 184-5.

⁴⁴⁴ Ramsay, *Vie de Fénelon*, 328.

⁴⁴⁵ See Bausset, *The Life of Fénelon*, Vol. II, 98.

belief, in the hope of reconverting them back to Catholicism. Ramsay had ostensibly used a discussion without proof in the *Vie*, and the Abbé believed that the advice was contained within the *Supplément* of the *Examen*. What the Abbé did not know was that Ramsay appeared to have been in possession of the work from which he could alter its content to suit his delineation of Fénelon. The result was that Ramsay used Fénelon as a vehicle to express ideas that were not his for his own purposes and in doing so altered the perception of Fénelon's political work.

The effect of Ramsay's involvement with the *Supplément* was the *Two Essays on the Ballance of Europe*. While the overall points of the work are similar, there are differences between the two works. For example, the *Ballance* lacks the authority and didactic tone of the original and is more aggressive in nature. In the original the league is more defensive in nature, and more attuned to the aggressive nature of states in their desire to aggrandize. Perhaps the most notable difference is one of style, and it is a criticism that Marchand levelled at Ramsay's editorial alterations. In adding and changing Fénelon's work Ramsay's prose was an extremely poor imitation of Fénelon, and effectively lost the essence of Fénelon. This is highlighted by the second *Essay*, which I believe to be Ramsay's work. This *Essay* replicates some of the errors that can be found in his wider editing such as basic errors, the uncredited plagiarism of others works, and a florid prose style.

Ramsay's behaviour as an editor may stem from a misguided view of what Fénelon actually believed. Ramsay may well have focused on the spiritual side of Fénelon's nature and work. Indeed he published mainly spiritual works as his editor, but in doing so he was unable to grasp the pragmatic politician within Fénelon. Ramsay's focus was on Fénelon as a Classical idealist, and *Télémaque* grandly represented this element of the prelate while expressing certain political 'truths.' In relying on the success of the leaked work from 1699 Ramsay harnessed a popular view of Fénelon's political principles that was unsophisticated

and lacked substance, and perpetuated the view in his *Vie* and editorial work. Rather than enlighten a public eager for Fénelon's political views with the reform works he had in his possession, Ramsay chose to rely on the fame of the earlier works to aid his connection with Fénelon and his own *Essay de Politique*. Despite the publication of the *Supplément* surreptitiously in an inaccurate form in London, none of Fénelon's late *Mémoires politiques* or even the *Lettre à Louis XIV* were used by Ramsay. Within these later works Fénelon developed his 'political truths' into pragmatic plans of reform as the lead thinker within the Burgundy Circle, dealing with the problems faced by Louis XIV's France and Burgundy as a future king. Their didactic and simplistic departure from the elaborate myth and idealism of the earlier educational works may not have been palatable for a Ramsay who wanted to preserve the reputation of the author of *Télémaque*. The difficulty with this reputation was that it did not accurately reflect how Fénelon would direct his political principles practically in the real world of government. In the end Ramsay chose to focus on the myth and kingship of *Télémaque* as he wanted to associate his *Essay* and his promotion of the Jacobite cause with Fénelon's popularity. What is contained within the *Essay de Politique* has little relation to the works of Fénelon from either period, and Ramsay's '*plan de gouvernement*'⁴⁴⁶ certainly bears little resemblance to the pragmatic reforming ideas of government found in Fénelon's later plans.

⁴⁴⁶ Andrew Michael Ramsay, *Essay de Politique*, ii

IV: Essay de Politique

The *Essay de Politique, où l'on traite de la nécessité, de l'Origine, des Droits, des Bornes, et des différentes formes de la Souveraineté. Selon les Principes de l'Auteur de Télémaque* was published in 1719.⁴⁴⁷ Ramsay states in the *Preface* that the aim of the *Essay* was to 'former un plan de Gouvernement' by addressing the premise that, 'L'Amour de l'Autorité sans borne dans ceux qui gouvernent, et lui de l'indépendance dans le peuple.'⁴⁴⁸ This struggle for power and liberty between the sovereign and the people led to the creation of the state maladies of despotism and anarchy. Such imperfections had to be addressed by the utilization of 'fixed' laws (of nature) which could assuage man's 'imparfait' nature and abuse of government. The objective of Ramsay's *Essay* was to establish maxims that returned men 'bons Citoyens & bons sujets, Amateurs de leur Patrie & de leurs Souverains, soumis à l'ordre sans être Esclaves.'⁴⁴⁹ In so doing, his 'plan de gouvernement' would prevent the battle for power and liberty between a sovereign and his subjects, and ultimately that would prevent the possibility of revolution.⁴⁵⁰ This 'plan' was theoretical and thereby was stripped of context in many respects. While Ramsay relied upon histories of the Spartans, Carthaginians, Romans, and English, they were used to elucidate his discussion of liberty and the danger of popular involvement in government. The chapter will therefore deal with the theory of the work as Ramsay had attempted to provide a (quasi-universal) theory of government.⁴⁵¹ Some context will be discussed in relation to his history of England, as the covert message of the work was an attack on the 1689 Revolution. It must also be stated that within this chapter I will not deal with the potential influences on the work other than his use

⁴⁴⁷ The work was published in 'La Haye' (The Hague) by Henri Scheurleer.

⁴⁴⁸ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique*, i.

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid.* iii.

⁴⁵⁰ *Ibid.* ii.

⁴⁵¹ The contextual aspect of the *Essay* emerged in the second edition of the chapter which will be dealt with in the following chapter.

of certain quotes specifically from Fénelon. Ramsay's use of quotation and attack in this edition was frequently hidden, so it must be discerned who he was actually focusing on, and this is again a task for the next chapter. I will also refrain from comparing Ramsay's theory with other Jacobite works as this will be done in the Conclusion of the Thesis. Ramsay's '*plan*,' however, can be delineated through three key areas. The first is his description of man, civil society, and sovereignty which reveals Ramsay's view of human nature, its relationship with God and Providence, the origins of civil society, and the basis for sovereignty. The second area reflected his concern over an 'excess of liberty' and the struggle for power between the sovereign and the people, in which Ramsay provided examples from history, particularly English history to prove his case. This discussion of liberty led Ramsay to his solution of how a government may prevent the battle for power and revolution: a government of monarchy moderated by aristocracy.

Man, Civil Society and Sovereignty

For Ramsay, mankind was governed by natural law or the Laws of God, which were universal and infinite and originated from God's Providence.⁴⁵² The guiding principle of these laws was that all things must follow their nature, and for man this meant to seek God's infinite love. God's love was combined with His laws to guide the universe and the behaviour of man, and for which as the creator of man, God was owed reverence. Through worship and revelation man understood that he must be obedient to God's laws and that he must love God, himself, his family, his country and his fellow man.⁴⁵³ Love from God was a cohesive force between men and expressed a natural law that God's law was constant and

⁴⁵² *Essay de Politique*, 4.

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.* 9-10.

expressed universal ‘truths.’ These ‘truths’ were revealed in the religions of the world, and the laws that religions are based upon predate people and society as they were from ‘*l’Esprit divin*.’⁴⁵⁴ Ramsay used Cicero’s description of the ‘divine spark’ and his argument that as man was created by God he in some way shares certain qualities of God such as reason.⁴⁵⁵ As God was a benevolent power, man must employ reason correctly and this reason was the law man created, which reflected God.⁴⁵⁶ Relative to government, this meant that while the state did not form its laws from the maxims of religious scripture directly it did take them from the same source: God.⁴⁵⁷ Thereby the laws of government which controlled the people and shaped the world were founded upon God’s will, His laws, and His divine plan. Government was therefore planned by God and had not grown from the teachings of the Bible, as it was predestined before the creation of man: ‘*elle n’est point fondée sur l’accord des Nations, & [sic] sur le contentement libre des Législateurs; mais sur les rapports immuables de nôtre Etre à tout ce qui l’entourne*.’⁴⁵⁸ For this reason, a work on government must not rely on history or custom, as these ideas differed over time and in relation to geography and so did not express the fundamental law beneath.⁴⁵⁹

The common bond of love that men shared from man’s innate sociability forced the individual to search out his fellows for company. Man required, ‘*un commerce mutuel d’amitié*. Or tous les êtres raisonnables sont obligés par la loi immuable de leur nature, de vivre ainsi ensemble.’⁴⁶⁰ Man’s sociability and desire for ‘mutual commerce’ had four components. The first, was that man identified with his fellows as a rational being, thus allowing the individual to see oneself as a member of society. Secondly, man’s indigence

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 15.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 13.

⁴⁵⁶ Ramsay was quoting Cicero’s *De Legibus* (‘*Lib. 1 and 2, and De Leg 4*’).

⁴⁵⁷ *Essay de Politique*, 15.

⁴⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 13.

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 12-13.

⁴⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 15-16.

(weakness) left him at the mercy of nature as well as other (malicious) men.⁴⁶¹ Man therefore required the support and protection of others, a reliance that created friendship and happiness. The third component was ‘*Ordre*.’ Order within society found its genesis in the ‘*liens du sang & de la naissance*,’ which act as ‘*une source d’union & de société*.’⁴⁶² Reciprocity and a sense of obligation within a family lead to duties of tenderness, love, and respect, and led Ramsay to conclude that a man’s country was an extension of the family.⁴⁶³ The connection between the family and the country plays a vital role in creating order within society at large. While an individual had a duty to preserve his life, it was never at the expense of his family or at the expense of the state. The individual should see themselves as part of a whole in which they put the whole (and the general good) above them:

*Toutes les intelligences qui se connoissent sont obligés de vivre dans un commerce mutuel d’amitié, à cause de leur rapport essentiel au père commun des Esprits, et de leur liaison mutuelle comme membres d’un même republique qui est gouvernée par une même Loi. C’est ainsi que nous concevons qu’il peut y avoir une société d’amour parmi les pures intelligences, dont le bonheur commun est augmenté par la joie, et les plaisirs nobles et généraux qu’a chacune, de voir toutes les autres heureuses et contentes.*⁴⁶⁴

The need for order and obedience to a greater whole was based upon the natural inequality between men.⁴⁶⁵ While Ramsay attacked the notion that man was obliged to create society through ‘fear’ as he was naturally sociable, he nonetheless believed that ‘*crainte, l’avarice, l’ambition & les autres passions rendent le gouvernement & la subordination, nécessaires, mais être sociable, c’est un caractère essentiel de l’humanité*.’⁴⁶⁶ Furthermore, Ramsay argued that those⁴⁶⁷ who believed in natural equality ‘deceived themselves,’ as there was a

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.* 18.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.* 19-20.

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.* 20.

⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 17.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 23.

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 22.

⁴⁶⁷ The references that Ramsay made of people’s work and who he was attacking theoretically was predominantly left unsaid. This will be dealt with in the following chapter.

natural order of minds and the '*dependance nécessaire qu'il y a dans l'ordre de la génération corporelle*.'⁴⁶⁸ Natural inequality was manifest as some men had superior talents to the vast majority of others, and some people were born into positions of privilege. The importance of those with superiority of minds was that these men were born to lead society through God's '*L'Ordre de la Providence*.'⁴⁶⁹ While these men ruled, the order of nature meant the majority of men were ruled and obeyed and this was accepted within society.

Government (in each country) under these men became necessary as the passions of man and his '*liberté sauvage*' allowed avarice (the desire for what one does not need) and ambition (a supremacy of the individual not given to them by nature) to create anarchy. The Golden Age of mankind, when all were chaste and lived in accordance with the (positive) laws of nature had been lost. Government had therefore to regulate, '*la propriété des biens & le rang que chacun doit tenir dans la Société; afin que tout ne soit pas en proie à tous, & que chacun ne soit pas l'esclave de tous ceux qui sont plus forts que lui*.'⁴⁷⁰ Order required that the '*multitude ignorante & mechante*' should not have the liberty of judging for themselves, as this led humanity into dismal '*Anarchie*,' where the strongest do as they please.⁴⁷¹ The solution to this despotic anarchy was '*gouvernement absolu*.'⁴⁷² If a government was not absolute and allowed the individual to enter a contract freely it could be discarded or overthrown when the government was perceived by the people to have acted unfairly or erroneously. An absolute government with supreme power prevented this. It could use its puissance to maintain peace and order by providing each individual with strength and security in common under a sovereign body: a union of the '*Corps Politique*.'⁴⁷³ Moreover, absolute power would not mean arbitrary power for Ramsay, a power in which a king had no

⁴⁶⁸ *Essay de Politique*, 23.

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 24.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 30-1.

⁴⁷¹ See below for Ramsay's discussion of English history.

⁴⁷² *Essay*, 30.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.* 34.

other restraint ('bridle') other than his own will. It meant the '*par le pouvoir absolu je n'entens autre chose qu'une Puissance qui juge en dernier ressort.*'⁴⁷⁴ The alternative was to live under '*l'indépendance & l'Anarchie*' of the people which was '*absolument incompatibles*' with order and peace.⁴⁷⁵ A strong and unified state required government, and for that government to work effectively the people needed to be subordinate to it, and to a ruler invested with absolute power.

The sovereign authority invested in the men with superior talents from God became rulers. God granted this status to a few above the rest so that the powerful could imitate God's authority and protect the weak. This rank was fixed by God and therefore was natural, making unequal society part of God's will:

Violer les droits de la subordination établie est donc un crime de leze-Majesté divine; vouloir renverser la supériorité des rangs, réduire les hommes à une égalité imaginaire, envier la fortune & la dignité des autres, ne se point contenter de la médiocrité & de la bassesse de son état, c'est blasphémer contre la Providence, c'est attenter sur les droits du souverain Père de famille, qui donne à chacun de ses enfans la place qui lui convient.

*Voilà le fondement sur & immuable de toute Autorité légitime*⁴⁷⁶

Sovereign authority was founded on the authority and model of God as it was unequal and monarchical in nature. God's plan according to Ramsay, was that a few powerful individuals should rule the rest of society: a relationship that was subordinate and in which the mass of society were not free.⁴⁷⁷ The masses must be ruled (and protected) in this manner as their terrible thirst for freedom drove towards anarchy and rebellion, threatening the (natural) laws that protect order within society. '*Rien par conséquent n'est plus faux que cette idée des Amateurs de l'indépendance que toute Autorité reside originairement dans le Peuple.*'⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷⁴ *Essay*. 32. The power of acting in the *dernier resort* applies to all forms of sovereign government; i.e. monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy.

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 33.

⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 39.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 41-42.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 39.

This idea was predicated on the '*fausse supposition*' that every man was born for himself and entered society for his own benefit with a share in sovereignty, and that he was absolute master of himself.⁴⁷⁹ For Ramsay, sovereign authority resided in God (as part of 'Providence') and existed prior to the creation of man. The individual, therefore, did not enter into society of his own volition as he was born into it. Popular consent was consequently spurious, as was the notion of the individual's involvement in (a predetermined) government as sovereigns were sovereigns through providence, not through contract and the power of the people.⁴⁸⁰

Ramsay believed that sovereignty was enshrined by three key factors: order, subordination, and paternal authority. The natural order enshrined inequality within society and created rank, as rank was based upon the natural inequalities of talent and family. This enabled a few individuals to rule over the rest, and rule in a beneficent manner that mirrored the rule of God. To ensure an acceptance of this structure within society, man had to be subordinate to government and this was created in two ways. The first was an acceptance through God's love by the individual that he was part of something bigger than himself, something he must love above himself and sacrifice himself to. That something was the state ('*patrie*').⁴⁸¹ The other way that subordination was achieved through the 'Order of Generation,' the begetting of children. Children under the authority of their parents were from birth accustomed to obeying the authority of their parents. This ability was instilled into the individual as a child and never left it as an adult. Adults were consequently able to except the authority of someone above them as they accept that they were unequal.⁴⁸²

Parental power, or 'paternal power' as Ramsay preferred it, was adapted by rulers who were the father of the state. While fatherhood did not give a father an inherent right over the

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 40.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 42.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.* 45.

⁴⁸² *Ibid.* 46.

life of a child, it was however the first principle channel through which authority passed to man. It was the first origin of government and '*l'autorité des anciens, si respectée parmi les Juifs, les Spartiates, les Romains, & chez toutes les Nations du monde, soit polies, soit barbares. C'est pour cela qu'anciennement on appeloit les Rois Pères dans presque toutes les langues.*'⁴⁸³ From the Biblical fathers such as Adam and Noah, fathers had begotten children and then ruled them as they become the chief of large tribes (families). Tribes developed into states that a father would govern as a king and the people as children obeyed. Whilst this was not the source of sovereign authority it was a 'canal' to it.⁴⁸⁴ The different forms of government that had emerged were shaped by the particular family divided into smaller units. Importantly for Ramsay, once a government had been created into a particular form it must stay in perpetuity in that form:

*Ces formes ayant été une fois établies, il ne doit plus être permis de les changer. La même Raison qui rend le gouvernement en général nécessaire, demande aussi que la forme en soit Sacrée & inviolable. Comme les hommes seroient sans cesse en trouble s'il n'y avoit point de gouvernement, de même ils seraient toujours exposés à l'agitation, si les formes du gouvernement une fois établies pouvoient être changés au gré de chaque particulier qui voudrait s'ériger en réformateur. Rien donc ne doit être plus Sacré aux nations que la Constitution primitive & fondamentales des Etats. Quelle que soit la forme du gouvernement, quelle qu'en paraissent les défauts & les abus, s'il a été établi de temps immémorial, s'il a été confirmé par un long usage, il n'est plus permis aux particuliers de l'atterrer, ni de le détruire sans le concours de la Puissance souveraine.*⁴⁸⁵

A form of government in a particular civil society must be inviolable to prevent instability and the interference of outside agencies. Vital to the integrity of the society's form of government was that the people must not be permitted to involve themselves in its authority. Their limited reason and exaggerated passions threatened the fabric of the state and meant that it was necessary to exclude them from government.⁴⁸⁶

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.* 45.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 43-45.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 46-47.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 48-49.

The development of civil society in Ramsay's 'plan of government' ensured particular rights and freedoms for the individuals within it, although natural rights did not correspond to natural fairness.⁴⁸⁷ Unequal society was based on divine law and enshrined by it, the vast majority of men were therefore born to be poor and to serve. By 'Right' Ramsay meant the power of doing and possessing certain things according to the law, so 'Right' was either 'Natural or Civil.'⁴⁸⁸ Civil law was created to ensure that men's ability to obtain their right through their own power was limited to protect other individuals. Civil rights emerged such as the '*droit de domaine, & le droit de domination étant tous deux fondez sur la nécessité de conserver l'ordre.*'⁴⁸⁹ The right to pass on possessions and the right to own land became enshrined by civic law and become civic rights, and while they were 'hereditary rights' that preserved order by utilizing the law and standardizing the interaction and practice between men, they were not natural rights.⁴⁹⁰ A king's succession and dominion were therefore not protected as natural rights but as civic rights forged from ancient practice, custom, and law. Once possession or ownership had been established it was enshrined through civic practice and was accepted by law, although not by God for whom the world was one '*Republique.*'⁴⁹¹ Peace, unity and stability were ensured by the protection of these rights through the foundation of law. Law controlled behaviour, the type of government in place, the succession of the crown, inheritance, titles, land, labour, and contracts. All of which were fixed (in perpetuity) by law as man was propitiated by the security of his rights.⁴⁹²

The 'Rights' that produce the law and were protected by it helped to frame the authority of the sovereign and his rights over his subjects. Ramsay listed the sovereign's recourse to three rights over his subjects:

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 50.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 54.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 63.

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 55.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.* 58.

⁴⁹² *Ibid.* 59.

1. *Le Droit de marquer aux Sujets des règles constants & généraux de conduite, par les quelles chacun soit instruit de ce qu'il doit faire ou ne pas faire pour conserver la paix de l'Etat, & ce qu'il doit souffrir s'il manque à l'observation de ces Loix. C'est ce que les Politiques appellent le pouvoir législatif.*
2. *[Un] pouvoir d'armer les Citoyens contre tous ceux qui veulent les attaquer, c'est ce qu'on appelle le pouvoir de faire la guerre & la paix.*
3. *Les besoins de l'Etat demandent necessairement des frais considérables soit dans le temps de guerre, soit dans le temps de paix. Il faut que les Souverains ayant pouvoir de lever des impôts & d'obliger les Citoyens de contribuer ce qui est necessaire pour satisfaire à ces besoins.*⁴⁹³

Ramsay's sovereign effectively had rights over his subjects' actions, persons, and their goods. The onus was on the sovereign to not abuse these rights as there was no law above him on earth, judgement on his conduct would come in the afterlife, and this was his only sanction. While this stricture on a sovereign's behaviour was for the individual ruler to follow or not, Ramsay argued that there were three areas that a sovereign had no right over:

1. *Nul Souverain ne peut, par exemple exiger la croyance intérieure de ses Sujets sur la Religion. Il peut empêcher l'exercice public, ou la profession ouverte de certain formules, opinions, ou ceremonies qui troubleraient la paix de la Republique par la diversité & la multiplicité de sects. Mais son autorité sur leurs biens...*
2. *Les Souverains n'ont aucun droit sur les personnes de leurs Sujets, qu'autant qu'il est nécessaire pour le bien public...*
3. *Les Souverains n'ont aucun droit sur les biens particuliers du sujet qu'autant que cela est nécessaire pour le bien public.*⁴⁹⁴

The role of sovereignty within a civil society was to prevent abuses that arose from it.

Government was necessary to avoid the 'frightful evils of anarchy' and the slavery caused by not possessing a government when man followed his passions. To ensure that these abuses did not occur a sovereign must through the law and his authority protect the people from themselves, from external threats, and from his own power and potential abuse. The sovereign achieved this by pursuing the public good.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.* 110, (this is Ramsay's numerical list).

⁴⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 111-14.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 114-15.

The first of Ramsay's prohibitions upon the sovereign was interesting as it was the only true area that the king could not control within Ramsay's 'plan.' While the sovereign should not abuse and use the person, actions, and goods of his subjects, if he believed it to be for the public good he could act as he pleased in the *dernier ressort*.⁴⁹⁶ While Ramsay did not delineate further the boundaries of the public good, the abuse of a subject's internal belief was something that he legislated for. He did so by quoting from *Télémaque*: '*La religion vient de Dieu ...elle est au dessus des Rois. Si les Rois se mêlent de la Religion, au lieu de la protéger; ils la mettent en servitude.*'⁴⁹⁷ Ramsay used the quotation to argue that the sovereign could not interfere with the internal belief of a subject as religion was not the province of a sovereign. For Fénelon, however, the actual context of the quote echoed the need – also expressed in the *Tables de Chaulnes* – to separate the authority of the state and Church so they can run their own affairs effectively.⁴⁹⁸ Fénelon did not discuss the sanctity of the individual's internal belief but the interference that stultified the efficacy of how the two institutions worked. Yet Ramsay manipulated the meaning of the quote to delineate his notion of the sanctity of internal faith above the sovereign. The love that humanity owed God must be reflected through the obeisance of public worship as this was an essential part of the *Laws of Nature*. Moreover:

*l'essentiel de la religion, croire tout ce que Dieu veut que nous croyons, aimer tout ce qu'il veut que nous aimions. Cette religion subsiste dans le coeur quand même on ne pourrait pas l'exprimer extérieurement. Nul Souverain, nulle creature visible ni invisible, nulle Loi, nulle prince ne peut la mettre dans la coeur, ni l'en ôter.*⁴⁹⁹

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 115.

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 113. The quote is taken from Book XXIII of Ramsay's 1717 edition of *Télémaque*, and can be found on p. 220 of the 1719 English translation of *Telemachus*, Volume II.

⁴⁹⁸ See *Tables de Chaulnes, Oeuvres, Tome II*, (Le Brun), 1099.

⁴⁹⁹ *Essay*, 77.

No power on earth had authority over the individual's internal belief in God, and that the individual must not obey the sovereign over the dictates of God if the course of action was contrary to divine law.⁵⁰⁰

The trouble foreseen by Ramsay was that this religious pretext may be given as a reason for civil disobedience or rebellion. However, he felt that this would not be the case, and he used Fénelon's description of Pygmalion's tyranny to underline a need for obedience even if it was in the form of passive obedience. Ramsay quoted, '*pour moi je crains les Dieux, quoiqu'il m'en coûte je serai fidelle au Roi qu'ils m'ont donné, j'aimerais mieux qu'il me fit mourir, que de lui ôter la vie & même de manqué à le défendre.*'⁵⁰¹ For Ramsay, there was a significant difference in what he described as 'Active Obedience,' which would make a man a minister of evil if he betrayed his conscience and 'Passive Obedience,' which made a man suffer what he could not help. Through 'Passive Obedience' the individual agreed to the punishment of the sovereign without protest, thereby not threatening the established order and the dictates of subordination.⁵⁰²

Ramsay's desire to protect the obedience owed to the sovereign stemmed from his antagonism toward the possibility of rebellion. Ramsay attacked the '*amateurs de l'indépendance*' and '*Republicains outrez*' who claimed that the only solution to the outrages of sovereignty were to permit the people to rise up against an unjust king.⁵⁰³ To advocate such a principle in attacking arbitrary power was '*tomber dans l'Anarchie.*'⁵⁰⁴ Ramsay provided six reasons why such maxims were dangerous. The first was that rebellion against the king was to attack *Providence* itself. It was to reject the 'plan' of God and throw the world into '*hazard.*'⁵⁰⁵ Secondly, even if authority was in the people, they could not rebel

⁵⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 81-82.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.* 76. This was from Book VIII of *Télémaque*, (Ramsay's 1717 edition).

⁵⁰² *Ibid.* 83.

⁵⁰³ The identity of the '*amateurs de l'indépendance*' will be dealt with in the following chapter.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 65.

⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 66.

each time they had a grievance as this would lead to continuous and capricious anarchy.⁵⁰⁶

No subject would choose to live in a society of chaos so would prefer to live under despotism rather than anarchy. At least under despotism a king would eventually die, under an anarchic state nothing was certain or controlled. The third point relied upon Fénelon's description in *Télémaque* of the difficulties of sovereignty.⁵⁰⁷ The troubles and cares of sovereignty were greater than could be understood by any other member of the kingdom, a burden the sovereign must shoulder alone. Kings as men may err in a manner that had great consequence, but the people never made allowances for this, which they must.⁵⁰⁸

Furthermore, this was exacerbated by Ramsay's fourth point, that the people did not understand politics. '*Les affaires politiques sont souvent si obscures & si délicates que non seulement le common peuple, mais même les personnes les plus éclairées d'ailleurs, ne sont pas toujours capable d'examiner si les mesures qu'on prend sont justes.*'⁵⁰⁹ Fifthly, the law and the public good should rule. If the people were permitted to judge what was right they would attack the sovereign authority and this would lead to revolt.⁵¹⁰ Revolution afforded troublesome individuals the opportunity to incite rebellion in others as they attack the authority of the state for their own ends. These individuals rose up and misled the mass of the people against the sovereign, and even if the people did rebel this did not ensure that they would improve their situation with a new sovereign: he may be even more tyrannical.⁵¹¹

Ramsay's avoidance of rebellion was found in '*le Bonheur du peuple,*' which was to be found in the '*supreme Loi,*' the '*fin de tout gouvernement.*'⁵¹² The public happiness had to be the aim of the king (and the law). By ensuring that this was the case the people would not want to rebel as their needs would be ensured and this would be further augmented by the

⁵⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 67.

⁵⁰⁷ Ramsay quotes from *Télémaque* Book XII, (p. 247 of the 1719 English translation).

⁵⁰⁸ *Essay*, 69.

⁵⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 70.

⁵¹⁰ *Ibid.* 71-72.

⁵¹¹ *Ibid.* 74.

⁵¹² *Ibid.* 75.

restriction of exorbitant taxes and by allowing the people to air their grievances publicly. The Law of Nature dictated that the people should be able to enlighten the sovereign on their condition and it was his duty to listen. In return, the people had a duty to inform the sovereign of any dangers that he faced also. As the sovereign could not be challenged legally ultimately the public happiness relied upon the behaviour of the individual sovereign.⁵¹³

Subjects must therefore hope that their monarch was just, and if he was not they must accept his behaviour under the will of God and the law. For their part, monarchs must realize that if they acted tyrannically this could destroy their power. The problem with rebellion or the assassination of a tyrant was that it would unleash anarchy and did not guarantee the improvement of the people's condition. Consequently, this returned Ramsay to the premise of his *Preface* that no matter under what circumstance the people must never rebel:

*On ne doit jamais prendre les armes contre les Souverains légitimes. Nous l'avons vu. Quelque bonnes que soient les intentions des sujets; quelques grandes que soient les extremitez où ils sont réduits, le remède est toujours fatal parce qu'il ouvre la porte à des désordre encore plus funestes que ceux dont on voudrait se délivrer.*⁵¹⁴

An 'Excess of Liberty'

Ramsay's belief in the need to control the people for the prevention of the anarchy of rebellion led him into a discussion of which form of government was best suited to the role. This was, '*le dessein de tous les sages Ligislateurs & le but de tous les differens Systems de Politique a été de regler l'autorité souveraine, de telle sorte qu'on évite également ces deux inconveniens. Le pouvoir arbitraire & l'Anarchie, le Despotisme des souverains ou celui de la Populace.*'⁵¹⁵ The design and wisdom behind all government and legislation whether it

⁵¹³ *Ibid.* 75.

⁵¹⁴ *Ibid.* 83.

⁵¹⁵ *Essay*, 117.

was a Monarchy, Aristocracy, or a Democracy, was to control arbitrary power and tyranny in the sovereign or in the people.

Ramsay briefly outlined his definitions of the different forms of government. A democracy was a '*gouvernement populaire*,' which '*n'est pas celui ou chaque particulier a voix deliberative, & un égal pouvoir dans le gouvernement*.'⁵¹⁶ Democracy was not an equal society, it was a system in which the people submitted themselves to a certain number of magistrates, whom they had a right to choose or change if they were not content with the administration. Aristocracy was when '*l'autorité souveraine est confiée un conseil suprême & permanent de sorte que le Senat seul a le droit de remplacer ses membres*,' when other members died '*ou autrement*.' And finally, Monarchy was when '*souveraineté reside toute entiere dans une seule personne*.'⁵¹⁷ Sovereignty was not shared with a council or advisers, the king was answerable to no man only to God, and importantly sovereignty was not divided. Ramsay's brief description of the different forms of government was followed with Herodotus' discussion of Darius and the Persian Empire to elucidate their advantages and disadvantages.⁵¹⁸ Ramsay concluded with Darius that Monarchy was the most suitable form of government as it was the least beset by problems. Of which the main problem was the division of sovereignty and this was particularly true of mixed government (and democracy), as they were plagued by faction, ambition, intrigue and ultimately, conflict. A single ruler prevented the separation of power and thereby prevented rebellion and anarchy.

The damage caused by division of authority was most notably seen in mixed government, in which power had been shared between a monarch and either the people or the aristocracy or both:

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.* 117-18.

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.* 118.

⁵¹⁸ King Darius of Persia (550-486 BCE) was discussed by Herodotus in Books III, IV, V, and VI of his *Histories*. Darius' rule was marked by the suppression of several (internal) rebellions and an expansionist policy that failed in its ambition to subjugate Greece.

*Plusieurs ont crû que le seul moyen de trouver le milieu entre ces deux extrémités étoit le Gouvernement mixte, ou le partage de la Souveraineté entre le Roy, les Nobles, & le peuple, entre un seul, plusieurs, & la multitude, à fin que chacune de ces puissances étant balancé par l'autre, elle reste toute dans leurs bornes & dans un juste équilibre.*⁵¹⁹

While the attempt to establish a mixed government may appear ‘*belle*,’ in reality it created ‘*combat perpétuel*’ until one part of government overcomes the other and reduces society to ‘*Despotisme ou à l’Anarchie*.’⁵²⁰ For his examples of this ‘*combat perpetuelle*’ Ramsay focused on a mixed government in which monarchy had ceded some power to the people, and he used the examples of Sparta and Carthage, Rome, and England.⁵²¹ His examination of Sparta was brief, but in summary Ramsay argued that the involvement of the people in government inevitably made them greedy for a greater share in power. He wrote of, ‘*cette indulgence suivit une dissolution & un désordre affreux qui dura jusqu’au temps de Lycurgue. Le peuple deviant audacieux & mit souvent à mort les Rois qui voulurent reprendre leur ancienne autorité.*’⁵²² Moreover, this division of power was repeated by Rome, the greatest of empires. The peoples’ involvement was, ‘*attribua le pouvoir de confirmer ou de rejeter les Senatus Consultes. Ce désordre fut suivi encore d’un plus grand. C’est que le peuple changea & multiplia les Loix selon son caprice.*’⁵²³ Fundamentally, the problem of involving the people was their thirst for more power juxtaposed with a capricious nature which left the state, its laws, and its equilibrium in chaos. In Ramsay’s opinion, the people had no right to be involved in sovereignty at all, neither the legislative nor the executive as they lacked reason and were driven by their passions.⁵²⁴ Consequently, ‘*pouvoir populaire*’ fundamentally caused the destruction of the republics of Sparta, Carthage, and

⁵¹⁹ *Ibid.* 124-5.

⁵²⁰ *Ibid.* 125.

⁵²¹ Ramsay’s use of Carthage, a classically interesting example of government I believe shows Ramsay’s use of Bossuet’s political theory which will be discussed in the following chapter.

⁵²² *Essay*, 126.

⁵²³ *Ibid.* 141.

⁵²⁴ *Ibid.* 143.

Rome as an unreasonable populace demanded more than could be given by their particular form of government.

It was in the history of England however, that Ramsay found his greatest example of the failure and destruction of mixed government.⁵²⁵ Ramsay argued that there had been a number of specific episodes that had destroyed the unified sovereignty in England and that it had begun with King John.⁵²⁶ King John's acquiescence in 1215 to the signing of the *Magna Carta*:

*C'est cette grande Chartre qui a été le grand pretext de toutes les factions qui agitent si souvent l'Angleterre. Ce n'est pas qu'il y ait rien dans cette Chartre qui diminue les vraies prerogatives, & l'autorité des Rois. Elle ne contient pour la plûpart que les Loix de St. Edouard, & ces Loix étaient des Privilèges accordés à la nation par les bons Princes pour servir de barrier contre les méchants Rois. Ces Privileges ne regardent que la liberté, & la propriété des sujets, & l'immunité de toute taxe extraordinaire sans le consentement des Barons. Mais les amateurs de l'indépendance se sont servis du beau pretext de liberté & de propriété accordées dans cette Chartre pour en abuser & pour donner des atteintes à l'autorité Royale.*⁵²⁷

The *Magna Carta* had confused authority in England as the *Charter* was merely a form of protection for the liberty and property of the people against a wicked king. However, this liberty has been transformed into a liberty used to attack royal authority and the sovereignty of the state. In his description of English history Ramsay discussed the *Charter's* origin which dated back to the reign of Henry I (r. 1100-35) as the *Charter of Liberties* (1100). This was eventually forced upon John who later revoked the act with Pope Innocent III's blessing in the same year (1215). The *Charter* was finally decreed by Henry III (1258) which saw the creation of the first true parliament in 1264 after his son Edward I had defeated the rebels.

⁵²⁵ *Essay*, Part II, chapter v: 'Du Gouvernement d'Angleterre & de différentes forms qu'il a pris.'

⁵²⁶ King John (1167-1216), had been forced to sign the *Magna Carta* due to his dispute with the Barons. The Charter provided certain rights for freemen bound by law and protected key rights for subjects.

⁵²⁷ *Essay*, 151-2.

Edward I's use of regular parliaments further undermined royal authority as it led to the king granting the Commons a fixed seat in Parliament (with the Lords), which eventually became a separate chamber.⁵²⁸ Edward I (1239-1307) reformed parliament as a source of revenue, and in so doing allowed parliament to meet in order for representatives to give their assent to acts on behalf of their communities. At this stage the Commons were merely *suppliants*, as it was the king (and the lords as advisers) who created policy and law. Yet Edward's aim of using the Commons for his own benefit was a self-deception that had fatal long-term consequences to sovereign authority in England. For it meant that the '*pouvoir populaire augmentant peu à peu dans le Parlement la Constitution fondamentale de la Monarchie Anglaise fut altérée & en fin totalement renversée.*'⁵²⁹ Edward's reign and his concessions were a crucial point in the destruction of sovereign authority which were felt four hundred years later. This self-deception was replicated by Henry VII, who Ramsay viewed as somewhat of a political genius.⁵³⁰ He seized the opportunity at the end of the War of the Roses (1455-87) to disable and bring to order a weakened and luxurious nobility. He made them divest themselves of ancient privileges through the sale of their '*Manors*,' which was done partly to satisfy Henry's rapacious taxation. Yet this once again produced long-term effects:

*Par cette vente des fiefs, les Communes devinrent propriétaires des terres comme le peuple Romain par la Loi agraire. Mais cette démarche contribua dans la suite à ruiner tout ensemble le pouvoir Royal & Aristocratique. Les Communes se voyant propriétaires des terres voulurent aussi avoir part à l'administration des affaires publiques. Nous verrons l'autorité populaire s'accroître insensiblement, prevaloir dans les Parlements, & se porter par degrés aux plus grands excès.*⁵³¹

⁵²⁸ *Essay*, 147. Ramsay relied upon Robert Brady's *Rights of the Commons* (London, 1680) a much used reference book for law as his legal source, (pp. 140-150). Brady was a royalist and an advocate of absolutism.

⁵²⁹ *Essay*, 154.

⁵³⁰ *Ibid.* 162.

⁵³¹ *Ibid.* 161-2.

While Henry VII did this to diminish the power of the aristocracy and advance his own royal authority, he actually enriched the (common) people whom he thought would be in his debt. In creating greater political power for the Commons he created a desire within them to obtain more power.⁵³²

Ramsay's praise for Henry VII's political abilities was surpassed in his discussion of his son Henry VIII,⁵³³ who he believed embodied true sovereign authority:

*Le Royaume (disent ces actes) est un Empire gouverné par une chef suprême. Les Rois d'Angleterre, leurs héritiers, & leurs successeurs ont une autorité Imperiale, & ne sont obligés de répondre en quelque cause que ce soit à aucun supérieur, parce que le Royaume ne reconnaît point d'autre supérieur après Dieu que le Roi.*⁵³⁴

Henry VIII's reign encapsulated the perfect authority which a sovereign should possess. A monarch, whose power was undivided, answerable to God alone and the succession of his land and titles to his heirs enshrined through the law. Despite the religious upheavals that England experienced under the reign of Henry VIII, there could be no doubt that he was an absolute monarch who was in control of the government and whose sovereignty was undivided. Relative to his admiration for Henry VIII's absolute sovereignty, Ramsay discussed his father's crucial step of having parliament accept the principle of hereditary succession for his offspring despite his status as a usurper. Hereditary succession for property, rights and titles were crucial to all men but were vital to a monarch as they ensured the succession of a king's heirs. This use of 'héritiers' and 'successeurs' was extremely important to Ramsay's concept of absolute sovereignty as it ensured the stability of government and the position of the king.⁵³⁵ According to Ramsay, kingship was based on the

⁵³² *Ibid.* 161.

⁵³³ Henry VII (1457-1509), and his son Henry VIII (1491-1547).

⁵³⁴ *Ibid.* 162-3. Ramsay used the Parliamentary Rolls (24, xii & 25, xxi) for this quote on Henry VIII.

⁵³⁵ *Ibid.* 162.

hereditary principle: '*le droit héréditaire des Couronnes*.'⁵³⁶ Hereditary *Right* was true for all men and was not a 'Natural' (or Scriptural) 'Right,' it was a civil 'Right.' From this civil right monarchy had adopted the use of hereditary succession. It was a pragmatic and practical solution for the distribution and desire of the king to pass his property and possessions to his children upon his death. This right enshrined in the civil law (of many nations) dated back to the first kings, as they had desired to pass on their possessions in the same manner as anyone who was not a king.⁵³⁷

When the line of succession was directly broken in England with the accession of James VI of Scotland English sovereignty had been fatally damaged.⁵³⁸ James' continued use of parliament for '*le consultant non seulement dans le affaires d'Etat, mais presque dans toutes celles qui regardoient sa famille*,'⁵³⁹ enabled dissension to develop in the Commons and the desire for greater power. Ramsay argued by the time that Charles I came to power in 1625 parliament had split into two parties: the (aristocratic supporting) Episcopal Party, and the Presbyterians (Puritans). The latter craved evangelical and spiritual simplicity, and wanted to create a 'pure' democracy. Religious division spread into civil dissension and Charles' attempts to unite the country under Episcopacy failed and resulted in the first Civil War (1642-46). The second Civil War (1648-9) and Charles' downfall began as a result of his petition to Parliament in order to raise taxes for a war against Austria. The Commons used the opportunity to criticize the monarch after a long absence, and the Lords left the House in disgust at the treatment of the monarch. In both cases, the power that had slowly developed in the people over a number of centuries, particularly in relation to the use of parliament as an active tool of government, led to the execution of Charles I (1649). The people felt

⁵³⁶ *Ibid.* 56-57.

⁵³⁷ *Ibid.* 58-59.

⁵³⁸ James I (1566-1625), was initially James VI of Scotland and became James I of England on the death of his second-cousin Elizabeth I (1603). James was succeeded by his son Charles I (1600-49) who was executed during the English Civil War (1649).

⁵³⁹ *Essay*, 165.

emboldened over time and with the advent of a monarch who was both arrogant and not politically astute, the Commons felt in a strong enough position to confront him for their own interests. Ultimately, Charles was ‘*condamné à mort & on lui tranche le tête publiquement sur un échafaud. Cromwell se rendit maître absolu sous le nom de Protecteur & regna jusqu’à sa mort d’une manière plus arbitraire & plus despotique, qu’aucun Monarque de l’Europe.*’⁵⁴⁰

Parliament’s execution of Charles I swept away any true vestiges of monarchical sovereignty in England. The power of the people had reached such a level that it was now able to execute the (divinely) anointed king, and also to change the established form of government.⁵⁴¹ While Ramsay saw the seeds of ruin sown as early as the reign of Henry I and the Charter of Liberties (1100) which had instigated the inception of mixed government and divided sovereignty, he claimed it reached its apotheosis with the removal of James II in 1688.⁵⁴² James’ removal over his religion and policy was unacceptable to Ramsay and could not be justified:

*Les Partisans de la révolution disent que l’obéissance n’est point due à la personne du Roi, mais à l’autorité des Loix. Ils sont condamnés par leur propre maxime. Les Loix portent, que le Roi n’est sujet qu’à Dieu seul, qu’il ne peut être jugé par personne, que le Parlement, ni le peuple n’a aucun droit de changer la succession. Voilà la Constitution fondamentale & primitive de la Monarchie Anglaise.*⁵⁴³

In the Revolution of 1689 William III (1650-1702), Prince of Orange (Holland), was invited to take the ‘absent’ throne of England with his wife Mary II (1662-94). James II had fled the capital fearing an invasion by William’s Dutch forces which acted as a pretext for Parliament to invite (the Protestant) William to take the throne after a disastrous and brief reign by the

⁵⁴⁰ *Essay*, 171.

⁵⁴¹ *Ibid.* 170-71.

⁵⁴² *Ibid.* 177-84.

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.* 175.

Catholic James (1633-1701). The removal of James II and coronation of William III (1689) was unacceptable for Ramsay in two ways. The first point was that the people had no right to remove a king no matter how he had behaved as only God could judge a monarch. The solution was for the people to wait for him to die if he has proved to be a tyrant. They could not make their own judgement and rebel let alone commit Regicide. The point was combined with Ramsay's notion that hereditary kingship in England was the established form of sovereignty and had been so from the time of the tribes. To remove the king and to alter the mode of government to a mixed government was therefore against the 'Will' of God. The second point was that the coronation of William contradicted both the 'Natural Law' and the civic law of England.⁵⁴⁴ It broke the natural law as James' natural successor was his son James Francis Edward Stuart and the Revolution prevented the true succession. The Revolution also broke the 'Civic law' for in response to the Interregnum (1649-60) the 'Royal Veto' enshrined the right of hereditary succession for the king's heirs. The Revolution was therefore illegal, and was only made possible through the diminution of sovereign authority through the inclusion of the people led to a mixed government. Ramsay concluded, '*Sparte, Cartage, Rome, & l'Angleterre, nous montrent donc les funestes suites d'un pouvoir partagé où le peuple a la plus grande autorité.*'⁵⁴⁵

'Monarchy moderated by Aristocracy'

Ramsay's solution to the problem of an 'excess of liberty,' mixed government, and revolution was a '*Monarchia moderée par l'Aristocratie.*'⁵⁴⁶ Monarchy provided '*l'Unité de la Puissance suprême a toujours été regardée comme un très grand avantage,*' and '*le grand*

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 184.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 185.

*bien de la société.*⁵⁴⁷ This would be achieved as monarchy only relied on one leader rather than fragmenting authority between a number of people or all of the people. Monarchy had one man at its head who embodied the sovereign power of the state, and only relied upon one to make (swift) decisions. A king could be expeditious in his creation of laws, and unlike an aristocracy or democracy he was not impeded by the involvement of other people, which was especially useful for the military.⁵⁴⁸ The monarch and royalty generally, also played a crucial role within society by maintaining the equilibrium between the two classes: the possessors of land and the people. Royalty '*est comme le point d'appui d'un levier, qui en s'approchant de l'un ou de l'autre de ces deux extrémités les tient dans une juste balance.*'⁵⁴⁹ Royalty sat between the aristocracy and the people, maintaining the peace and equilibrium in the state. Equilibrium was assured by monarchy as it prevented the passions of a government of aristocracy from oppressing the poor, and a popular government from subjecting the nobility to hatred.⁵⁵⁰

The relationship between the two classes and royalty was extremely important to sovereignty, and it enabled Ramsay to expound his system of government. Ramsay's great concern of the threat of the '*Despotisme de la populace*' led him to believe that the people could be well maintained and loved by a monarch through continuous employment and the restriction of excessive taxes upon them.⁵⁵¹ By keeping the people active and not oppressing them, they would not demand representatives, nor a share in government. The monarch should be assisted in this duty towards the people by using the aristocracy as advisers.⁵⁵² This had the benefit of tempering any leanings the nobility may have toward '*Despotique tyrannique.*' Ramsay's government called for a mixture of monarchy through whom all

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 187.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 190.

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 189-90.

⁵⁵¹ *Ibid.* 193.

⁵⁵² *Ibid.* 194-95.

things must pass, and aristocracy, who acted as advisers to the king and help to offset his absolute will. For both ranks the position must be hereditary to protect government and the exchange of power (between generations) through a traditional and enshrined process in law:

*Il est nécessaire aussi pour la même raison que le pouvoir Aristocratique qui excède le pouvoir Royal soit fixe, héréditaire, & non pas électif. La Nature & la naissance donnent à chacun son rang. On n'a pas besoin de la briguer par les cabales & les élections injustes & tumultueuses.*⁵⁵³

The expedience of a hereditary and fixed aristocracy (from the ancient families) was that it would dissuade the king from the temptation of filling the legislative body with new nobles who acted as yes men.⁵⁵⁴ In this discussion of the use of the nobility in government Ramsay quoted Fénelon's description from Book XII of *Télémaque*. The virtue of the nobility when serving a king removed the opportunity to be idle as they would be occupied with actively serving the king. The nobility would view themselves as '*l'esprit*' of the state, the king as the head, and the people as the body, who work and toil physically under the instruction of those ranked above them. According to Ramsay, monarchy moderated by an aristocracy was the ancient and natural form of government as it was founded upon 'paternal power' and drew its civil authority from the family.⁵⁵⁵ Moreover, as in a family where the father found counsel in his wise children, a king should consult his nobility. Monarchy moderated by aristocracy was the form of government least encumbered by inconvenience. The '*trois grands droits de la souveraineté, disent-ils, savoir le pouvoir militaire, le pouvoir législatif, & le pouvoir de lever les subsides doivent être tellement réglés qu'on ne puisse pas en abuser facilement.*'⁵⁵⁶ In Ramsay's government the king would be solely in control of the military power, which enabled celerity and secrecy of action, order and union essential to the military. A king should also partake in a fixed senate for the legislative power, as he could not judge

⁵⁵³ *Ibid.* 196-7.

⁵⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 198, (Volume I, p. 466 in 1719 English translation of *Telemachus*).

⁵⁵⁵ *Essay*, 199.

⁵⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 202.

everything for himself.⁵⁵⁷ Crucially, the aristocracy (and senate) should be used to ensure that the king did not levy excessive taxes upon the nation, and the levying of taxes can only be achieved when every state in the kingdom agreed.⁵⁵⁸ For Ramsay, this form of government removed any inconvenience in government, harmonized the three orders of society, facilitated tradition, and vitally maintained a '*l'amour de l'ordre & la Paix de la société*.'⁵⁵⁹ Unfortunately, rather like Ramsay's discussion of law and religious freedom (toleration) ostensibly taken from Fénelon, this did not mesh with the rest of the work and the scheme or theory he espoused. In reality, they undermined his system as he had advocated an absolutist system and then attempted to mitigate it with aristocracy to form the mixed government he had earlier rejected.⁵⁶⁰

As a 'plan of government' Ramsay's theory provides a rather unsatisfactory conclusion to the end of the *Essay de Politique*. Within the *Essay* Ramsay delineated a theory that showed man to be a passion-driven, ambitious, unequal, and liberty-obsessed creature. The inequality that existed within a predetermined society was reflected in its sovereignty, as a few are born to rule and the rest are born to obey. This divine order created a tension between the all-powerful sovereign and all-consuming desire of the people to have a greater share in sovereign authority. The desire to have greater liberty, as shown in his depiction of English history, led man inexorably toward rebellion as the people unwisely rejected God's providence in search of their own ends.

Ramsay's solution to this 'excess' and the need to create peace and unity for an absolute monarch is to advocate a system of absolute monarchy while tenuously relying upon certain comments by Fénelon. The difficulty with Ramsay's solution was that he literally advocated

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 203.

⁵⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 204-5.

⁵⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 206.

⁵⁶⁰ This will be discussed in the next chapter on the second edition of the *Essay*.

a system of government that was already in place in France under Louis XIV. Ramsay wanted an absolute monarch who would listen to the advice of the nobility but who did not have to use it. This was the reality in the court of Louis XIV, except that Ramsay had timidly followed Fénelon in calling for the wider use of the ancient nobility. Ramsay's *Essay* therefore delineated the French absolutist system of government as it was a system that managed to exclude the people from the sovereign authority with great success.

V: Ramsay's Jacobitism: The *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* and the *Vie de Fénelon*

The second edition of Ramsay's *Essay* was published in London in 1721 under the title of the *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*. The new edition was a review, a correction, and an expansion of the *Essay de Politique*. Much of what was contained within the first edition remained within the second but there was an overt shift in Ramsay's support for the Jacobite cause of James Stuart. This support became immediately apparent as the work was dedicated to him. Much of the alteration found in the second edition was designed to promote the plight of James Stuart on philosophical grounds through an augmented attack on the 'Lovers of Independency' who perpetuated popular government and defended the principles that justified the 1689 Revolution. This Jacobite support within the *Essay* was once more promulgated under the ostensible auspices of the principles of Fénelon. A support bolstered by his *Vie de Fénelon* (1723) and its claim that Fénelon had 'instructed' James Stuart in the principles of government, the very maxims Ramsay had outlined in both editions of his *Essay*. However, contained within the new *Preface* of the second edition emerged the actual hidden influence upon the work: Bossuet.

There was an immediate difference between the first and second editions of Ramsay's work in the change of the title. The title of the first edition, the *Essay de Politique, Où l'on traite De la Nécessité, de l'Origine, des Droits, des Bornes, & des différentes formes de la Souveraineté; Selon les Principes de l'Auteur de Télémaque*, was changed to the *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil, Où l'on traite De la Nécessité, de l'Origine, des Droits, des Bornes, & des différentes formes de la Souveraineté; Selon les Principes De feu M. François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon, Archevêque Duc de Cambray*. In the second

edition title the principles contained within the *Essay* were attributed to Fénelon by name rather than merely as the author of *Télémaque*. This alteration was made for two important reasons. Firstly, Ramsay had apparently broadened the scope of Fénelon's principles for his *Essay* by not simply tying them to one work, *Télémaque*, which people could access readily. By 1721 there had been six editions of *Télémaque* including Ramsay's own two-volume edition of 1717. The work was famous for its apparent attack upon the absolutism of France and Louis XIV. Yet it was known to be an educational work for a young prince and did not necessarily sate the public desire for a mature tome by Fénelon on government. Ramsay's role as Fénelon's editor had given him access to all of Fénelon's papers and manuscripts and he was well aware that there was a public desire for more work on Fénelon's political ideas. Ramsay had duly obliged through the publication of the *Fables* and *Dialogues of the Dead* in 1718, yet these were political works in mythic form for children and the public lacked a cohesive political work on government by Fénelon. By claiming in the title of the second edition that this work on government was '*selon les principes*' of Fénelon, Ramsay inferred that the work was based upon the private and perhaps hitherto unknown political ideas of the Archbishop. This claim was implied in the expanded *Preface*:

The only Merit of the Author, is to have been brought up many Years, in the bright Sentiments of the late *Messire Franis de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambray*. He hath taken the Advantage of the Instructions of the Illustrious Prelate to write this Essay.⁵⁶¹

The alteration of the title in which Fénelon was named therefore allowed Ramsay to infer a special knowledge of the political principles that were not manifest in the *Télémaque* so easily accessible. His stay with Fénelon had given him access to the Archbishop's political

⁵⁶¹ Andrew Michael Ramsay, *An Essay upon Civil Government*, viii, (and page vi of the French edition). Unless stated I will be using the 1722 English edition of the 1721 French edition - with the exception of three areas which will be discussed below - as the *Essay* (and *Vie*) were an attempt to join the British political debate on government.

‘instruction’ that would move beyond the use of *Télémaque* in the first edition of the *Essay* to reveal something ‘philosophically’ new in the second.

The second reason for the alteration of the title was related to Ramsay’s growing involvement with the Jacobite movement in Paris at the time, as discussed in the ‘Introduction’ of this Thesis. At the time of the first edition Ramsay had still not been introduced to James Stuart but by 1720 he had. One of the primary reasons for the introduction was because of Ramsay’s connection to Fénelon and James’ partiality for the Archbishop, whom he had met and liked. The inclusion of Fénelon in the title and the implication that the *Essay* was based upon his principles was not only an endorsement of Jacobite principles of sovereignty, but also a link between Fénelon to James through Ramsay. This method had a dual function for Ramsay. The first was that Ramsay had stated that the work would rely upon Fénelon’s political principles, thereby relying on the European popularity of Fénelon. As Voltaire was to later claim this was a popularity that was evident in England:

Fénelon lived on in his diocese highly esteemed as an archbishop and a man of letters ...His persecution and his *Télémaque* won for him the veneration of Europe. The English, above all, who were fighting in the district that contained his diocese, were particularly anxious to show him their respect.⁵⁶²

Ramsay was therefore attempting to utilize this good feeling to promote the cause of James (through his connection) to the English people. The second function of the new title was as an apparent method of personal ingratiation into higher Jacobite circles. As discussed in the ‘Andrew Michael Ramsay’ chapter, this approach worked and Ramsay was awarded with his baronetcy and a brief role as the tutor to the young princes in Rome.⁵⁶³ Ramsay presented

⁵⁶² Voltaire, *The Age of Louis XIV* (Everyman, London, 1966), 448.

⁵⁶³ See the ‘Andrew Michael Ramsay’ chapter, 33-34.

James with a copy of the second edition, which James believed to be a reference to *Télémaque* and the notion of his own plight as a king outside of his rightful lands.

This show of support for James' cause was clearly demonstrated in the dedication '*au roy de la Grande-Bretagne*' of the 1721 French second edition.⁵⁶⁴ In the dedication, Ramsay likened the suffering that James had experienced to other 'heroes' and great kings such as Robert I (of Scotland), Henry VII (of England), and Charles II (of Britain) had. A suffering created by removal from his own lands and throne and an '*exilez dans les Pays Etrangers*.'⁵⁶⁵ Yet it was a suffering borne with 'moderation' and the knowledge that James was the '*vrai Père du Peuple*' which Ramsay recognized:

*Je n'ai entrepris cet Ouvrage, SIRE, que pour soutenir vos Droits.
Daignez l'agréer comme un Tribut de ma fidélité, comme une marque
de mon hommage, & comme un gage du très-profond respect avec lequel
j'ai l'honneur d'être, SIRE, DE VOTRE MAJESTE.*⁵⁶⁶

His dedication was (pseudo-anonymously) signed '*les très humble, très-fidele & très-obéissant serviteur & Sujet, SAYMAR.*'

Ramsay claimed the alteration of the second edition for his '*entreprise*' was defined by the '*imparfait*' nature of the first edition.⁵⁶⁷ For the second edition Ramsay's method was, 'in some Manner chang'd by ranging every Truth in its proper Place, and giving it new Strength, by this Disposition.'⁵⁶⁸ Much of what was found in the 1721 edition of the *Essay* could be found in the 1719 edition, it was essentially just restructured and extended. Ramsay had no real need to alter the work greatly as the first edition had also espoused Jacobite sympathies,

⁵⁶⁴ The dedication was not present in any subsequent editions; i.e. the third French edition (reprint) of 1722, or the two English translations of 1722 and 1732. According to Henderson (*Chevalier Ramsay*, 74) it was removed at the request of the British government due to its censorship of works displaying any Jacobite sympathies.

⁵⁶⁵ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil* (1721 French second edition) *Dedication*. Robert I of Scotland (1274-1329), known as Robert the Bruce was an ancestor to James Stuart and leader of the Scots fight for independence against the English.

⁵⁶⁶ Ramsay, *Essay*, *Dedication*

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.* viii, (French v).

⁵⁶⁸ *Ibid.* viii, (French v).

yet in a more subtle manner as a pure work on government theory. As discussed in the previous chapter, the first edition was fundamentally set out as a universal theory for government, and as such its support for the Jacobites was covert. As also stated in the ‘Andrew Michael Ramsay’ chapter, the genesis of the *Essay de Politique* coincided with his introduction to the Duke of Mar in 1717. Mar was then in Paris rousing Jacobites for what was to be the failed 1719 Rebellion aided by Spain. It is conceivable that the first edition was produced to coincide with this Jacobite activity, and was supportive through its criticism of the 1689 Revolution and a need to restrain the power of the people. In the second edition support for Jacobitism was quickly established and this was achieved through Ramsay’s declaration to James. This enabled him to breathe life into imperfections that required attention for a new edition while stating his Jacobite political principles more overtly. Its publication followed the difficulties experienced in Britain over the South Sea Bubble (1720) and the stillborn Atterbury Plot (1722).⁵⁶⁹

Part of the original *Essay*’s imperfection was its structure as a two part work. The first part was an explanation of the origins of sovereign government and the second part was a description of the extent, origins, and forms of sovereign authority.⁵⁷⁰ The second edition removed this division of the work and used a single linear discussion of sovereignty as a progressive argument from origins to examples to a solution and proof. Within this new structure there was an alteration of certain chapters. The chapter ‘*Du Gouvernement de Sparte & de Carthage*’ in the 1719 edition was removed to allow Ramsay to directly compare the fate of England with the destruction of the once great empire of Rome due to popular involvement in government. In keeping with this theme but expanding upon it for the elucidation of James’ plight and the troubles of England, two new chapters were added to the end of the new edition: ‘*Of Government purely Popular*’ and ‘*Of Government where the*

⁵⁶⁹ See the chapters One (p. 32) and Two (pp. 85-86) for discussion of the Atterbury Plot.

⁵⁷⁰ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique*, 109.

Laws only Preside.' These chapters were followed by the chapter '*Of the Ideas which the Holy Scriptures give us concerning Government*,' moved from the end of the first part of the first edition to add proof to arguments in the second edition. Finally, two chapters fundamentally unchanged had their titles altered in the second edition to aid Ramsay's theoretical promotion of the Jacobite claim to the English throne. The opening '*Introduction*' of the 1719 *Essay* became '*Of the Different Systems of Policy*,' and the '*King of Providence*' became '*Of a King de Facto, and a King de Jure*.' Both alterations were used by Ramsay to place the *Essay* in a diametrically opposed position to the contract theorists and supporters of 1689 and the altered succession: the 'Lovers of Independency.'

'Lovers of Independency'

As discussed, Ramsay's '*philosophique*' approach to his new edition on civil government was made clear in an extended *Preface*. The new *Preface* had a dual function. It was used by Ramsay to anchor the *Essay* firmly in the political principles of Fénelon and in so doing connected Fénelon and the work to the principle of 'divine philosophy' and 'order.' Ramsay used Fénelon to promote his own notion that God had created an 'order' in which society and government were determined and fixed by God, not man. Ramsay's new 'Truth,' not present in Fénelon's political work, was that natural laws revealed to man the 'Idea of Divine Perfection' given by God to man and manifested in society and government.⁵⁷¹ This 'Truth' was taken from 'divine philosophy' and according to Ramsay this 'philosophy' meant that God was the father and man was not an individual but part of the whole.⁵⁷² The happiness and good of God and the people relied on the sacrifice of the individual to the whole. Public

⁵⁷¹ *Ibid.* vii, (In the French edition, v-vi)

⁵⁷² *Ibid.* vi, (French v)

good was above private interest, and for this reason the individual was subsumed by the whole which created ‘unity’ and provided the foundations for law and the state.⁵⁷³ Through providence God shaped the unity of man and society and prevented individualistic interests ‘from violating the most sacred Rights of Humanity.’⁵⁷⁴ God’s plan would therefore be used by Ramsay to prevent revolution and to control an ‘excess of liberty’ in both the ‘people and princes.’ Ramsay’s ‘philosophical’ or theoretical approach, was an augmentation of the earlier *Essay*’s aim to delineate through a discussion of natural laws, the nature of sovereignty, and how English popular involvement in government had induced its current position; i.e. the exile of its rightful king.

The alteration of the 1719 chapter ‘*The King of Providence*’ to ‘*The King de Facto, and a King de Jure*’ was an example in which both chapters were actually the same but were renamed. The chapter discussed ‘Subordination’ and the notion that man ‘must submit to every thing which God permits.’⁵⁷⁵ Subordination must be maintained at all times to maintain the peace within a state and avoid anarchy. Ramsay discussed the obedience due to a king, and cited the example of Christ’s obedience to the Emperors of Rome.⁵⁷⁶ Ramsay’s submission to monarchy reflected a need to maintain its existence, as the frequently chosen form of government fixed in perpetuity. This extended to the people’s acceptance of both tyrants and usurpers to ensure peace. There could be no rebellion, even against a usurper as this created anarchy. ‘It is certain,’ Ramsay wrote, ‘that the judicial Acts which an Usurper who is in Possession exercises have an obligatory power, not by virtue of his Right, because he hath none, but because he hath the true Right over the State.’⁵⁷⁷ A usurper must be obeyed as sovereign for although he was not *de jure* king he was *de facto* head of the state,

⁵⁷³ *Ibid.* vii, (French v).

⁵⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 57, (French, 58).

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 58-59, (French, 60).

⁵⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 58, (French, 59).

although for *Providence* the usurped king remained the true sovereign. Through the new title of the chapter, Ramsay ensured that he more overtly entered into the debate he had already discussed on *de facto* and *de jure* ownership of property and the throne of England in 1719. The alteration of the chapter title placed a greater emphasis on the situation of James Stuart and placed Ramsay in opposition with contract theorists. For while James would remain the ‘*King of Providence*’ according to Ramsay’s principle he was not factually king of England as that was George I. Ramsay’s use of ‘*King de facto*’ and ‘*de jure*’ enabled the distinction of his situation while he attempted to argue against it and the legality of James’ position in an established theoretical debate on government.

Ramsay’s clearer position was further established with the modification of the first edition’s *Introduction* into the first chapter ‘*Of the Different Systems of Policy.*’ The chapter which was the same in both editions, was a discussion of theories of the origins of the state which ‘establish two sorts of Principles, quite contrary to each other.’⁵⁷⁸ The first was the policy of popular consent in which power resided in the people and society and laws were framed by men for their own advantage.⁵⁷⁹ In this society all men were born ‘independent and equal,’ and were free to ‘violate the original Contract’ if they were dissatisfied with the sovereign. The second policy maintained:

That the love of Order, and the publick Good in general, is the source of all Duties of the Law of Nature; that antecedent to every free Contract, we are all born more or less dependant, unequal, and Members of the Society to which we belong; that the Form of Government being once establish’d it is not allow’d particular Persons to trouble it, but that they should suffer with Patience, when they cannot, by lawful Means, hinder the Abuses of the Sovereign Authority.⁵⁸⁰

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 9, (French, 1).

⁵⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 10, (French, 2).

⁵⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 10-11, (French, 2-3).

This latter position was of course Ramsay's, which he had distinguished from the beginning of the 1719 edition in opposition to works that advocated popular consent. As Ramsay had stated in the *Preface*, government was part of God's system of 'Order' in which individual desire was unified and subsumed by a whole which must protect the status quo and not pursue its own requirements.⁵⁸¹ The pursuit of the individual and their passions, for Ramsay, was an ever present problem that existed within contract theory and popular consent.

As stated, commentators on Ramsay believed this attack upon popular consent and contract theory to be a response to John Locke (1632-1704).⁵⁸² Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* (published 1689) was an attack on the absolutist *Patriarcha* of Sir Robert Filmer (published 1680), which defended the divine rights of kings, patriarchal government, and the arbitrary power of kings. His use of patriarchal government has been viewed as a particular link between Ramsay and Filmer (1588-1653). Filmer argued that, 'I see not how the children of Adam, or any man else can be free from the subjection to their parents,' and believed that Adam's parental authority had descended to each king via Noah's sons.⁵⁸³ Yet while there was similarity in their notion of patriarchy and the obedience of children replicated in kingship, Filmer's anchoring of his theory in Scripture differed from Ramsay. Ramsay stated that he did not wish to rely upon Scripture as the foundation of his theory in the *Preface*, he would instead argue through 'divine philosophy.' Ramsay was thereby attempting to promulgate a non-historical or cultural philosophy that attempted to grasp God's natural laws while avoiding theological restrictions for his 'plan.'⁵⁸⁴

⁵⁸¹ *Ibid.* vi, (French v).

⁵⁸² Albert Cherel, *Fénelon au XVIIIe Siècle en France (1715-1820)*, 94, and Jean Molino's "L'Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil. Ramsay ou Fénelon," in *La Régence* pp. 276-292 Ed. By Henri Coulet (Librarie Armand Colin, Paris, 1970).

⁵⁸³ Filmer, *Patriarcha*, I, ii. For a discussion of Filmer's *Patriarcha* see Cesare Cuttica's *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (Manchester: MUP, 2011); and Gordon J. Schochet's "Patriarchalism, Politics and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England" in *The Historical Journal*, Volume 12, No. 3 (1969), pp. 413-441, (Cambridge University Press).

⁵⁸⁴ Ramsay, *Essay*, v-vi, (French, iv).

Locke dismissed Filmer's use of patriarchy and its reliance on Adam's authority, stating that Adam 'could not *de facto* be by Providence constituted the Governor of the World at a time, when there was actually no Government, no Subjects to be governed.'⁵⁸⁵ Moreover, Locke argued against Filmer's belief that sovereign power came from God and was invested in monarchy without contract by claiming that authority was given to the government by the people contractually. 'The Liberty of Man, in Society, is to be under no other Legislative Power, but that established by consent, in the common-wealth, nor under the Dominion of any Will.'⁵⁸⁶ Patriarchy was a parental power exercised by both parents over their children. It was not a political power given to Adam by God to be exercised over the people and to be passed down to lost heirs in the mist of future generations.⁵⁸⁷ Government was created to remove man from the uncertainty of the state of nature in order to protect the labour and property of the individual.⁵⁸⁸ In order to create government all people had to choose to divest some of their rights to form the state, its laws and federative power, and thereby create their equality.⁵⁸⁹ The power of popular consent was so essential to government that if a sovereign behaved in a manner contrary to the interests of the people they could take back their authority by rebellion if necessary.⁵⁹⁰ Moreover, Locke attacked James II 'abandonment' of the throne, his arbitrary proclivities and his attack on Protestant rights. Ramsay's *Essay* was thereby a response to Locke's *Two Treatises* which had set out to:

[E]stablish the Throne of our Great Restorer, Our present King William; to make good his Title, in the Consent of the People, which being the only one of the lawful Governments, he has more fully and clearly than any Prince in Christendom: And to justifie to the World, the People of England, whose

⁵⁸⁵ Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, Ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge UP, 1999), I, iii, 16.

⁵⁸⁶ *Ibid.* II, iv, 22.

⁵⁸⁷ See Book I, vi-viii on Patriarchy. Locke argues (I, xi, 106) that any descendants of Adam potentially invested with his authority would have been lost through time, so this authority cannot be claimed by kings.

⁵⁸⁸ *Ibid.* II, v, 27.

⁵⁸⁹ *Ibid.* II, xix, 222.

⁵⁹⁰ *Ibid.* II, xix, 220-22.

love of their Just and Natural Rights, with their Resolution to preserve them, saved the Nation when it was on the brink of Slavery and Ruine.⁵⁹¹

Yet Locke's influence on the *Essay* may have been an easy conclusion as his theory was the antithesis of Ramsay's, he vociferously supported William III and the Whigs and attacked James II. Locke's perceived influence at that time could also have been a factor in assuming that it was to him that Ramsay was responding.⁵⁹² While it may be true that Ramsay may have included Locke in his attacks on contract theory, it is actually far more plausible that the hidden opponent Ramsay was attacking was Benjamin Hoadly. Ramsay's change of the chapter title demonstrated his 'policy' was to attack the 'Lovers of Independency' (*les Amateurs de l'indépendance*), or contract theorists who defended the 1689 Revolution.⁵⁹³ The contract theorist who staunchly defended the Revolution, stood in opposition to Ramsay's theory, and used the term 'Independency' was Hoadly.⁵⁹⁴

In his 1710 *The Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed*⁵⁹⁵ Hoadly stirred up a frenzy of reaction from both those who supported the 1689 Revolution and those who were opposed to it. The reason for the strength of this reaction was Hoadly's advocacy of rebellion as a safety-mechanism for popular government against a tyrant. Hoadly attacked absolutism, patriarchy, inequality, divine right, the notion of parental power, and the French model of government; all of which Ramsay essentially utilized for his theory. Ramsay's central theme in the *Essay* was the restriction of the liberty and power of the people, and in particular, the removal of their right to rebel. Yet for Hoadly, government depended upon 'Resistance' and 'Universal Equality' for civil government, 'because no one, more than

⁵⁹¹ *Ibid.* Preface.

⁵⁹² See Peter Laslett's *Introduction* to Locke's *Two Treatises* (Cambridge UP, 1960, reprinted 1999).

⁵⁹³ Ramsay, *Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, the phrase is first used on page 13 but then used throughout the work.

⁵⁹⁴ Benjamin Hoadly, *The Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed*, in *The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D.D., Volume II*, 266.

⁵⁹⁵ See the second chapter (pp. 67-72) for a delineation of the key political principles of Hoadly's work.

another, could pretend to a *Right* to it.⁵⁹⁶ As God did not select a particular form of government, God invested a government with authority and His authority was perfectly compatible with a government chosen by the people. This compact would have divine right as much as any monarchical government. Before the creation of government, ‘each *Nation* was in a *State of Equality*: Nor could a *Civil Government* be rightfully settled from that Time, but by *Consent*; supposing *Almighty* God not interpose.’⁵⁹⁷ ‘*Independency*’ and ‘*Equality*’ were compatible with the need for ‘*Dependency*’ under a government, and it was perfectly compatible that this power could be transferred to a civil magistrate in a popular government.⁵⁹⁸ It had ‘no more dishonour to *Almighty God* that He should originally give a People this *Power*, than that He should give it to one single Man. The *one* no more derogates from his disposal of this *Power*, than the *other*.’⁵⁹⁹ Hoadly’s own theory on civil government, therefore, stood in diametric and more recent opposition to Ramsay’s *Essay*.

Not only do the two theories contain a dyadic correspondence, Ramsay’s repeated use of the term ‘Lovers of Independency’ would appear to be a veiled attack on Hoadly. This attack was contained within the first edition, yet in the second edition Ramsay underlined his opposition to anti-Jacobite, pro-Williamite theorists; i.e. Hoadly. Ramsay expanded upon his discussion of paternal authority in what appeared to be a direct yet unspecified response to Hoadly. In the chapter ‘*Of the Origine of Civil Societies*’ in the 1721 edition, Ramsay added a section on the root of paternal authority and kingship. Ramsay also removed his previous discussion of a father’s continued authority over an adult child which proved to be a source of ridicule for Hoadly against ‘*patriarchy*.’⁶⁰⁰ Hoadly had claimed that patriarchy was inconsistent with England’s three-fold sovereign authority of king, Lords, and Commons.

⁵⁹⁶ Benjamin Hoadly, *The Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed*, in *The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D.D., Volume II*, 244.

⁵⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 256.

⁵⁹⁸ *Ibid.* 266.

⁵⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 271.

⁶⁰⁰ See Hoadly’s conclusion on patriarchy in the *Original and Institutions of Civil Government, Discussed*, 247-8.

Ramsay instead argued in the new edition that paternal power was the basis for patriarchal kingship as it prepared children to obey and found kingship in the rule of a father over his young children. Consequently, Ramsay attacked the:

Lovers of Independency [who] endeavour to abuse Paternal Respect, by many frivolous Arguments. *We owe nothing (say they) to our Fathers, for having been the Instruments of our Birth; the Intention of our fathers in begetting us was more to procure Pleasure to himself, than to give us our Beings.*⁶⁰¹

In the second edition the quoted section is italicised whereas it was not italicized in the 1719 edition. While Ramsay does not name Hoadly, the quote was directed at those who scorned the patriarchy and absolutism and advocated an independent and equal mankind in a society where the people were involved in government.

Ramsay's most obvious rebuttal of contract theory and popular consent in the new edition was the creation of two new chapters after his discussion of the ruination of English sovereignty through excess liberty and popular involvement in government. These two chapters are a rejection of the '*Policy*' that advocated popular sovereignty and the legacy of the Revolution of 1689. In the chapter '*Of Government purely Popular*' Ramsay reiterated the need for the people to endure suffering. Suffering was the 'deplorable Condition of Humane Nature,' yet it could be propitiated by following a path that was constant and not based on the whim of the many:

Must we place our selves under a regular Government, where we find sometimes good Masters, and where wicked Princes have always a powerful Interest in managing their Subjects; or must we deliver up our selves to the Fury of the Multitude, in order to become every Moment the Sport of the Caprice, Inconstancy and blind Passions of all those who have no other Principle of Union, but the Love of Independency, and how

⁶⁰¹ Ramsay, *An Essay upon Civil Government*, 32-3, (French, 29). I have been unable to locate this apparent quotation by Ramsay of another source in Hoadly, Locke or elsewhere. As discussed in previous chapters, Ramsay had a habit of hiding the real objects of his influence or focus and for that reason it can be difficult to exactly locate such a source. It is entirely plausible that Ramsay created the quotation himself.

they may divide and subdivide themselves to Infinity, as the Waves of the Sea who successively dash upon, and break one another? There is certainly no choice to be made in these two Extrems.⁶⁰²

Not only was popular power unappealing due to its chaotic nature and the instability it caused government, for Ramsay popular power did not exist.⁶⁰³ The people did not have the authority to choose or change government once it had been established as sovereign authority belonged to God. Ramsay attacked Hoadly's 'Lovers of Independency' who claimed that:

This Stability of Power, *say they*, makes Sovereigns attribute it to themselves as a Right, and so they become Tyrants: The only means of keeping them in order, is to make them sensible, that Sovereigns of all countries and Nations are only Executors of the Laws, that the Supream Authority originally resides in the People; and that the Right is always in them, to Judge, Depose and Punish supreme Magistrates when they violate these Laws. The Design of the first Creation and Institutions of Sovereigns, was for no other intent than to preserve the Order and Peace of Society: they were only chose by the consent of the Majority. Those who give the Authority, may always take it away. The Original Contract between the Prince and People, is upon this essential Condition, That Sovereigns should be Fathers of the People, and Maintainers of the Laws.⁶⁰⁴

Ramsay resoundingly rejected this perspective by arguing that there could not be a state of nature in which people chose a government through contract, as there was only God's plan to create government which predated man. Government was not a free contract, it originated from the 'Order of Generation' and patriarchal right which developed from God's will. So even if there had been an 'Original Contract' it no longer mattered as the people had sacrificed their political rights to the sovereign for his use for the interest of the state.⁶⁰⁵ This precluded individual rights as 'Providence' had ensured that it was not the greatest number

⁶⁰² Ramsay, *Ibid.* 202-3, (French, 198-99).

⁶⁰³ *Ibid.* 202, (French, 199).

⁶⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 196, (French, 191).

⁶⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

who made the laws, the law was determined by rank and the talented few selected (kings) who ruled by nature.⁶⁰⁶

Legitimate popular power was therefore a theoretic myth, something that confused the multitude and destroyed the 'Order' of nature and government.⁶⁰⁷ True sovereign power resided in the 'Unity' and 'Order' shaped by the government and its laws created by God not the people, and that was why the people did not have the authority to take sovereign power. The most successful form of government was the one that attempted to mirror God's own role as the father of humanity: kingship. Monarchy, the more common form of government was built upon the natural laws of order, rank, patriarchy, and subordination, in which all men were unequal and dependent: this was God's plan. Whilst it may be subject to ungodly sovereigns, generally it was the most effective form of government as it provided internal peace and stability.⁶⁰⁸ The 'Universal Law' predominantly ensured that the monarch pursued the public good but if he did not the suffering must be borne by the people as it would be God who judged the monarch. For the people to judge, through assassination or rebellion was to lead to the greater evil of anarchy and chaos, and this could not be borne under any circumstances in a state. As Rome had discovered to its cost, and England would potentially too, popular government and liberty of the people meant ruination for the state.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 198, (French, 193).

⁶⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 197, (French, 192-93).

⁶⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 210, (French, 207).

⁶⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 200, (French, 196).

Promoting Jacobitism

Some aspects of the alterations in the second edition appear to have been an attempt by Ramsay to tone down some of the more offensive rhetoric used in the *Essay de Politique*. The bombastic rhetoric would potentially be offensive in Britain and damaging to the cause Ramsay was trying to promote. For example, Ramsay continued to criticize revolution and contract theorists (Hoadly) for believing in it, but he attempted to move away from blaming the English people. Moreover, certain areas of the first edition that may have been perceived to be too absolutist or too Catholic had been mollified to an extent. This would appear to have been an attempt to make the restoration of a Catholic Stuart king to the throne of England more palatable to a Protestant England with a strong parliament and belief in liberty. This can be seen particularly in the enhancement of his discussion of religion and the freedom of individual religious conscience. Again, Ramsay's final recourse in the attempt to promote the Jacobite cause was once more Fénelon; partly by claiming the principles of the *Essay* to be his, but also by linking Fénelon personally to James Stuart in his lessons on kingship in the *Vie de Fénelon*. Fénelon the arch-absolutist, who attacked Louis XIV and Bossuet was portrayed as instructing a Stuart in the principles government.

As discussed, Ramsay's chapter '*Of the Government of the Commonwealth of Rome*' served as a comparison for the potential plight of England. In the original edition this chapter had followed a similar description of the ruin of Sparta and Carthage by allowing popular involvement in sovereignty in government. The removal of this chapter in the 1721 edition enabled the new chapter on Rome to serve as a direct metaphor for England and its own expansion of popular liberty. Ramsay used this opportunity to expand and alter the new chapter and use it as an instrument of blame for the 1689 Revolution. Gone was the 1719

notion that rebellion prevented ‘*l’esprit de servitude*’ amongst the people. Gone was the discussion of the oppression of the plebeians by the patricians, and gone was the discussion of the *Tribunes* who acted as mediators in the disputes and conflicts.⁶¹⁰

Instead, in the second edition the *Tribunes* were described as flattering the multitude, of attempting to dilute rank and sovereign authority:

The *Tribunes* sought nothing more than gaining Credit in the Multitude by Flattery, and Pretensions of Zeal for the Liberty and Rights of the People. Thus these Artists in Discord, made every Day some new Proposition in order to lessen the Authority of the Senate, to confound the Ranks and Orders of Men, and to lessen the supreme Power.⁶¹¹

The *Tribunes* managed to utilize the growing internal discord of Rome as external war dissipated and they exploited the ‘Agrarian Law’ which divided and sold conquered land to the wealthy and distributed the rest to the poor. The Agrarian Laws regulated the possession and division of public land. Roman land fell into three categories: private, common pasture, and public land. In the Second Century B.C.E. wealthy landowners began to dominate Roman land by renting large tracts of public land, which displaced smaller farmers and caused civil unrest. From 133 to 118 B.C.E. a number of (unpopular) laws were passed to limit the amount of public land that could be held by a single individual, firstly in Rome and then throughout Italy in an attempt to redistribute the land. The Agrarian Law once fought against by the consuls who revelled in their poverty, created a belief in wealth and a notion amongst the plebeians in an ‘Equality of Riches.’ This was exploited by the *Tribunes*:

who were for stretching Popular Power, by increasing the Riches of the *Plebeians*, and confounding all Ranks of Men, never left their Intrigues, until this Law was established.

⁶¹⁰ See *Essay de Politique*, 136-7.

⁶¹¹ *An Essay upon Civil Government*, 121-22, (French, 131).

Luxury having prevailed in *Rome*, Ambition, the Love of Independency, and the Spirit of Rebellion, triumph under the spacious Name of Liberty. Cabals and Violence do every thing in *Rome*. The Love of the Country, and Regard to the Laws are quite extinguished there.⁶¹²

Rome's destruction was therefore caused by a rapacious appetite for popular power, liberty, and wealth amongst the multitude. An appetite that destroyed the order of society and an appetite that Ramsay discussed in the following chapter '*Of the Government of England*' in which the English were repeating the process. The chapter on Rome, therefore, not only acted as another example of the danger of popular liberty but also served as a (indirect) metaphor for the position of England. For Roman *Tribunes* read Members of Parliament, both straining to deceive and flatter the multitude and its desire for political power and liberty for their own ends.

However, Ramsay appeared to have taken care not to directly implicate or offend the English public for their weakness for avaricious liberty while warning against the release of an anarchy that would ruin the state. Furthermore, in the 1722 English edition of the *Essay* it would appear that it was not only Ramsay that took care not to offend the English people as two sections from the 1721 French edition from the chapter '*Of the Government of England, and the different Forms it hath had*' were censored. The first described William III's replacement of his father-in-law James II through 'the authority of a rebel convention to become his master.'⁶¹³ The second piece of censorship was an attack on the authority of parliament to remove the king from a fixed office, as it had no fundamental (natural) authority.⁶¹⁴ It is not clear whether the censorship was made by the government or by the translator Nathaniel Hooke. It is more probable that it was Hooke as the French edition was published in London without the removal of the offending passages. Ramsay further

⁶¹² *Ibid.* p. 128, (French, 139).

⁶¹³ *Essay*, English edition page 161 and in the French edition page 151.

⁶¹⁴ *Ibid.* English edition page 162 and in the French edition pages 152-53.

censored the second edition with the removal of his belief that revolution could never be legitimate as it was too whimsical, and replaced it with the notion that a good prince would always obey the law and seek the public good.⁶¹⁵ Ramsay even went as far as to suggest that if ‘we were sure of preserving the Peace and Order of Society, and redressing of the Evils of our Country, by sacrificing a single Man; without doubt the Laws of simple Policy would require this Sacrifice.’⁶¹⁶ Yet, no one can ever be certain that rebellion would improve the situation as it may provoke something worse, and therefore revolution could not be justified. Fundamentally revolution could never be justified for religion contradicted it through the nature of obedience due to a sovereign and through the observance of God’s will through the established model of sovereign authority. To rebel was to attack the plan of God and His government.

Generally within the second edition, Ramsay had employed a more restrained tone in his discussion of religion. Certain language that may have been construed as too Catholic for example was more measured. In the chapter ‘Rebellion is never allowed’ Ramsay dwelt less on concepts such as the laws of nature’s creation of a perfect sovereign justice and immutable order which through authority brought ‘Justice’ and ‘Virtue.’⁶¹⁷ Instead, he discussed the ‘Right of Nature’ in which people must accept that they did not have an equal right to all things as this created anarchy. God had created society that relied upon ‘rank’ to ensure peace. Ramsay also discussed the notion of humanity as one large family to the different peoples and sects representing the different branches of the same tree.⁶¹⁸ He was attempting to delineate the need for a sovereign to be tolerant of different religions within a state, particularly a state in which the people were of different ‘sects’ (faith) to their monarch.

⁶¹⁵ See *Essay de Politique*, 71-3.

⁶¹⁶ *An Essay upon Civil Government*, 89-90, (French, 96).

⁶¹⁷ See *Essay de Politique*, 54-5.

⁶¹⁸ *An Essay upon Civil Government*, 18, (French, 10).

Ramsay therefore maintained his discussion from the first edition on the individual's right to free (internal) religious conscience.

This freedom was a deliberate attempt by Ramsay to assuage any fears a Protestant England may have to the return of a Catholic monarch to the throne, and Ramsay understood these fears over James' Catholicism.⁶¹⁹ In his attempt Ramsay relied on an argument in *Télémaque* that religion '*est au dessus des Rois, Si les Rois se mêlent de la Religion, au lieu de la protéger, ils la mettent en servitude.*'⁶²⁰ The use of this quote by Ramsay was actually misleading, as Fénelon's actual view of religion was one in which all the sects were reunited back into the Catholic family, hence his desire to 'eradicate' Jansenism which he saw as a source of division.⁶²¹ Yet, this point elucidated Ramsay's use of Fénelon's legacy and work for the benefit of the Jacobite cause (and himself). Ramsay used the idea or myth behind Fénelon as the author of *Télémaque* which attacked absolutism and the paragon of Catholic unity Bossuet, to press a cause he was not involved with. Promoting the cause of a dethroned heir and his restoration in a manner that would hopefully enable the (Protestant) English to swallow a pill that was not absolutist in nature nor apparently dangerously Catholic (or French). This was attempted through the creation of the Fénelon myth, notably through the *Essay* and the *Vie de Fénelon*. The *Essay* produced an incorrect view of Fénelon's political principles and this was compounded by the *Vie* which created an idealized view of Fénelon the man.

As has been discussed in the 'Introduction,' Ramsay created a biography of Fénelon which portrayed him as a deeply pious, tolerant, and generous man. A man of God, who had suffered with great dignity for his religious convictions at the hands of those in the Catholic

⁶¹⁹ For English views of Catholicism see the Thesis second chapter, and in relation to James Stuart see page 55.

⁶²⁰ *Essay de Politique*, 112. Ramsay was referring to *Telemachus*, Book XXIII (1717 edition).

⁶²¹ For Fénelon's lack of tolerance toward Jansenism see 'The Political Fénelon' chapter, page 140.

Church and particularly Bossuet, who lacked the tolerance or vision of Fénelon.⁶²²

Moreover, as the author of *Télémaque* Fénelon had been the individual who had dared to speak out against the oppression and absolutism of Louis XIV's France. Ramsay therefore depicted an independent spirit who had borne his suffering (in exile at Cambrai) with magnanimity, grace and obedience. At Cambrai he had been involved first hand in the suffering of the War of Spanish Succession, and conversed with all the troops on opposing sides:

He receiv'd them with a singular Cordiality and Distinction, of whatever Religion they happen'd to be. He took a Pleasure in discoursing with them of the Manners, Laws, Government, and great Men of their Country. He never made them feel any Want they might have of that Delicacy of good Breeding, for which the *French* are so remarkable. On the contrary he us'd often to say, Politeness is common to all Nations. *The Ways of expressing it are different, but indifferent in their Nature.*⁶²³

This generous man was not only tolerant socially but also tolerant religiously, and advocated a 'liberty of thought' which was:

...an impregnable Fortress which no human Power can force. Violence can never convince; it only makes Hypocrites. When Kings take upon them to direct in Matters of Religion, instead of protecting it, they bring it into Bondage. You ought therefore to grant to All a legal Toleration.⁶²⁴

This quote from *Télémaque* (Book XXIII) used in both editions of the *Essay* was advice given to an unnamed young prince who visited Fénelon in 1709: James Stuart. It was a demonstration of Ramsay's willingness to alter the facts for the benefit of his work, the benefit of the Jacobites, and the erudition of a young prince:

I shall give here a general Idea of his political Principles dispers'd up and down in his *Telemachus*, and in his *Dialogues of the Dead*, and with which

⁶²² Ramsay, *Life of Fénelon*, 60.

⁶²³ *Ibid.* 278.

⁶²⁴ *Ibid.* 307-8.

he often entertain'd the young Prince before mention'd, during his stay at Cambray.⁶²⁵

The discrepancy with Ramsay's faithful (and quoted) retelling of the meeting was that Ramsay did not visit Cambrai until 1710, and he did not meet James until 1720, and there is no account of the conversation that took place.⁶²⁶ What followed was Ramsay's version of a meeting based upon the political principles found in two educational works that he had edited.

The political principles delineated by Ramsay in the *Vie* read as a pithy synopsis of the *Essay*'s principles. All nations are from "many different families" under God who is the common father, and consequently "paternal Authority is the first Model of Government."⁶²⁷ The natural and universal law which governed each family ensured that the public good was pursued over the private interest of the individual. "Love of the People, the Publick Good, the common Interest of the Society, is then the immutable and universal Law by which Sovereigns are to rule."⁶²⁸ A law that was "antecedent to all Contract" and from which all other laws stem. This law was ensured by the ability of a government which had the supreme authority to act in the '*dernier ressort*,' and which was the foundation of 'Political Unity' and 'Civil Order.' Those that govern must ensure this order by serving the public good through "absolute power over the People."⁶²⁹ The happiness of subjects was dependent on their "Subordination" and tradition. "Liberty without Order is a Licentiousness which brings arbitrary Power. Order without Liberty is a Slavery which ends in Anarchy."⁶³⁰ Princes 'jealous of their Power, are always for enlarging it. The People fond of their Liberty, are ever

⁶²⁵ *Ibid.* 310.

⁶²⁶ James did visit Fénelon at Cambrai.

⁶²⁷ Ramsay, *Life of Fénelon*, 309.

⁶²⁸ *Ibid.* 312.

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶³⁰ *Ibid.* 317.

for augmenting it.”⁶³¹ The answer must be to walk a middle path which did not lead to the chaos and tumult of revolution caused by this battle for supremacy between a king and his subjects. It was the duty of every wise King in this conflict, therefore, to “wish to be only the Executor of the Laws, and to have his power moderated by a supreme Counsel.”⁶³² Ramsay concluded the political ‘instruction’ by stating:

It was by these Maxims, equally adapted to all states, that the wise *Mentor* endeavoured to make his Country happy, in maintaining the due Subordination of Ranks. It was thus that he reconciled the Liberty of the People with Obedience to Sovereigns; seeking to make Men at the same time good Common-wealth’s Men and loyal Subjects, submissive without being licentious. The pure Love of Order is the Fountain of all his *political* as well as of his *religious* Virtues. The same Unity of Principle prevails throughout all his Sentiments.⁶³³

As can be seen in relation to the previous two chapters of this thesis almost all of what is stated in the *Essay* was not from Fénelon’s work or political principles. Ramsay’s view of liberty and subordination for example were not shared by Fénelon. For Fénelon, an ‘excess of liberty’ in the people could be controlled by the law, so this was not an issue for government. Subordination also had a different meaning for Fénelon, it was not the subordination of rank, to a parent or the sovereign as created in God’s ‘Order,’ but a subordination to the law which effected both the people and sovereign equally. Fénelon was also not an absolutist, but Ramsay was. This was manifest in the *Vie* (and the *Essay* to a greater extent) in Ramsay’s use of Fénelon’s belief that a king should be advised and aided in government. As was demonstrated in the *Vie*, Ramsay expounded a belief in the king’s “absolute power over the people” and his ability to act in the ‘*dernier ressort*.’⁶³⁴ Yet, as with the *Essay* and Ramsay’s attempted solution to prevent the conflict between the king and his subjects, he contradicted the majority of the work’s theory by using Fénelon’s belief a

⁶³¹ *Ibid.* 315.

⁶³² *Ibid.* 309.

⁶³³ *Ibid.* 319-20.

⁶³⁴ *Ibid.* 312.

king must “have his power moderated by a supreme Counsel.”⁶³⁵ This does not belong in Ramsay’s ‘philosophical’ theory on government. His use of natural law, of patriarchy, rank, order, and a ‘divine’ plan was not Fénelonian, and the use of a moderated monarchy sits uncomfortably in a scheme that rejected it. The use of Fénelon in the *Essay* particularly, was therefore a calculated use by Ramsay to add weight and interest to his own ideas while also using his legacy to promote Jacobitism. Even the quotes used within the *Essay* are misleading and often out of context as were the lessons of the *Vie*. The *Vie* and Fénelon’s words to James Stuart are a validation of veracity of the *Essay* by Ramsay, and a demonstration to the British that James had been schooled in the principles of kingship by an anti-absolutist man of tolerance and reputation. They are words, sentiments, and principles Fénelon did not express in his own political theory. Moreover, Ramsay himself claimed that, ‘I shall make use of, as far as I am able ...his own Words, and shall only perfect what he has written, by what I have heard from his own Mouth.’⁶³⁶ This effectively allowed Ramsay to write what he pleased as he could claim it was an oral lesson from Fénelon to him that was not in print. Thereby enabling him to manipulate Fénelon’s political principles which were quite different from Ramsay’s, and according to the reaction of the Fénelon family blur the truth of the man’s thought and legacy.

The Influence of Bossuet on the *Essay*

As discussed in the ‘Introduction’ and in ‘The Political Fénelon’ chapter, Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) the Bishop of Meaux, was the former mentor turned nemesis of Fénelon. While the attribution of the political theory behind the *Essay* to the enemy of

⁶³⁵ *Ibid.* 309.

⁶³⁶ *Ibid.* 249.

Fénelon may have deflected the attentions of some commentators upon Ramsay, it actually makes a great deal of sense. If one removes two key religious ideals in their political writings - Ramsay's call for toleration and Bossuet's desire for a renewed Universal Church above the state – the basis for their monarchical systems are extremely similar. Both were absolutist, patriarchalist, both relied on providence and appeared to advocate the monarchy of Louis XIV, and both were also anachronistic in Britain and Regency France in 1719 (and 1721). The reason behind the anachronism of Ramsay's *Essay* was that it was based on the theory of Bossuet's *Politique tirée de l'Écriture sainte*, and the general premise of the *Essay* to be taken from the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*.⁶³⁷

Contained within Ramsay's extended use of the Roman Agrarian Law in the second edition of the *Essay* was a direct and uncredited use of Bossuet's *L'histoire universelle*. The two men's delineation of the fate of Rome was very similar as Ramsay used Bossuet's depiction of the history of Rome to emphasize the destructive role of the people and their liberty. For Bossuet, Rome had been a state shaped by war that had collapsed into internecine internal conflict, weak law, and poor leadership.⁶³⁸ Romulus' creation of the two classes within society, the Patricians and Plebeians, had given birth to a source of tension and jealousy driven by both parties love of liberty. This led to a division between the two classes and a mutual enmity as the Patricians believed that an excess of liberty in the people led to destruction and the Plebeians felt that liberty within the Patricians led to tyranny.⁶³⁹ The division between the two warring factions led to repeated revolution and discord within Rome:

⁶³⁷ Both works were written while Bossuet was tutor to the Dauphin, Louis (1661-1711). *L'histoire universelle* was published in 1681, while the *Politique* was left unfinished in 1679 and published posthumously in 1709. While the two works were designed for the instruction of the Dauphin the *Politics* is a demonstration of the belief in Louis XIV (and France's) absolute system of monarchy.

⁶³⁸ Bossuet, *Universal History*, Trans. Mr. Elphinstone (New York, 1821), 400.

⁶³⁹ *Ibid.* 392.

Private interest, which makes those of any side carry farther than they ought, even what they had begun for the public good, did not suffer them to abide moderate counsels. Ambitious and restless spirits excited jealousies, in order to make their advantage of them; and those jealousies ...always alive in the bottom of their hearts, at length occasioned that great revolution which happened in the time of Caesar, and the others that succeeded it.⁶⁴⁰

Bossuet, in a lesson for his pupil the Dauphin, warned against such excess liberty and the power of the people as it led to revolution. A happy state (people) was one that loved its king, its country, and had an army that was loyal.⁶⁴¹ Earlier discord had been offset in Rome to Bossuet's mind, by Rome's continued success in war. However, the later defeats against the barbarians and the debauchery of a developing taste for luxury had caused the eventual demise of Rome.⁶⁴²

Ramsay developed Bossuet's depiction of internal conflict through the discussion of Agrarian Law to emphasize the liberty of the 'Multitude's' impact upon Rome's destruction. Within this delineation, which was essentially identical but with a greater emphasis placed upon an attack of the people, Ramsay plagiarized Bossuet. The most direct example was in Bossuet's delineation of the creation of military tribunes. Bossuet wrote:

*La loi pour les y admettre est proposée. Plutôt que de rabaisser le consultant, les Pères consentent à la création de trois nouveaux magistrats qui auraient l'autorité des consuls sous le nom de tribunes militaires, et le peuple est admis à cet honneur.*⁶⁴³

In Ramsay's second edition of the *Essay* this was:

La Loi pour les y admettre est proposée. Plutôt que de rabaisser la Dignité Consulaire, les Pères consentent à la création de trois

⁶⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 389.

⁶⁴¹ *Ibid.* 400.

⁶⁴² *Ibid.* 402.

⁶⁴³ Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle, Oeuvres de Bossuet*, Ed. abbé B. Velat (Gallimard, Paris, 1961), 1016.

*nouveaux Magistrats, qui auroient l'autorité de Consuls, sous le nom de Tribuns Militaires, & le Peuple est admis à cet Honneur.*⁶⁴⁴

Furthermore, Bossuet discussed the Roman diplomatic party visit Greece to study the laws of the land to aid their own laws:

*La jalousie, augmentée par ces prétentions, fait qu'on résout d'un commun accord une ambassade en Grèce pour y rechercher les institutions des villes de ce pays, et surtout les lois de Solon qui étaient les plus populaires. Les lois des Douze-Tables sont établies; mais les décevirs qui les rédigèrent, furent privés du pouvoir dont ils abusaient.*⁶⁴⁵

In Ramsay's *Essay* this became:

Les Tribuns voulant ensuite établir l'égalité, proposèrent sous pretext de réformer les Loix, une Ambassade en Grèce, pour y chercher les Institutions des Villes de ce Païs, sur tout les Loix de Solon, qui étoient les plus Populaires.

*On en fit un Recueil; & ces Loix appellées les douze Tables, ayant été établies, dix Hommes furent choisis pour en être les Interprètes & les Gardiens, & l'on ne pouvoir appeler de leur Jugement.*⁶⁴⁶

Other examples aside from this use of Bossuet in the *Essay* exist, and much of Ramsay's chapter 'Of the Government of the Commonwealth of Rome' was taken from Bossuet's chapter 'The Progression of Rome's Revolutions explained.' Ramsay either directly plagiarized Bossuet or frequently paraphrased him. It could also be argued that Ramsay's discussion of Carthage and Sparta from the 1719 edition was influenced by Bossuet's *L'Histoire universelle*. Importantly, this use of Bossuet was not cited in a work that used citation frequently, including the citation of Bossuet's *Against Jurieu* in the *Essay* (Chapter

⁶⁴⁴ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, 133.

⁶⁴⁵ Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle, Oeuvres de Bossuet*, 1016.

⁶⁴⁶ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, 132-33.

18).⁶⁴⁷ As with Hoadly, it would appear to be another example of Ramsay hiding the source of his influence by citing the use of Bossuet, but not revealing how he really used Bossuet. Ramsay's subterfuge allowed him to credit the political principles to Fénelon while he actually used the work of Bossuet.

The importance of Ramsay's use of Bossuet's discussion on Rome and the liberty of the two rival classes was that it formed the premise and the *Preface* to the 1719 edition of the *Essay de Politique*. The work was therefore based upon Bossuet's warning to the Dauphin against an 'excess of liberty' within the state. In the extended *Preface* of the second edition, Ramsay further revealed the true influence upon the *Essay* and its principles. Moving his attention from the *L'histoire universelle* to the *Politique tirée de l'Écriture sainte (Politique)*, Ramsay extended his discussion of some the work's themes, in particular the importance of 'Divine Philosophy.'⁶⁴⁸ In drawing from Book I of Bossuet's *Politique* for the extension of his *Preface* Ramsay revealed its reliance on Bossuet's use of natural law to discuss of God's foundation of the state.

Book I of the *Politique* expounded the argument that as God's creation men should love God as their 'common father, whose 'unity is our bond.' All men as fellows and brothers must love one another for 'they are all children of the same God.'⁶⁴⁹ 'If we are all brethren, all made after the image of God and equally his children, all one race and one blood,' argued Bossuet. It was, 'not without reason that it is written, "God has charged every one to have compassion towards his neighbour."⁶⁵⁰ This commonality created in mankind led into a general interest in one another (as it remained to), and the realization that strength was gained

⁶⁴⁷ Ramsay quoted Bossuet twice (pp. 223-6), on the king's use of law from "Avertissement aux Protestants sur les lettres de M. Jurieu" in Book XVIII of the second edition, 'Of the Ideas which the Holy Scriptures give us concerning Government.' There is also a third quote (p. 174) which is vaguely attributed to Bossuet's 'Scripture Policy.'

⁶⁴⁸ Ramsay, *An Essay upon Civil Government*, vi, (French iv).

⁶⁴⁹ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, Ed. & trans. Patrick Riley, (Cambridge UP, 1990), 4.

⁶⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 6.

through co-operation and ‘unity.’ God had provided people with ‘different talents.’ One ‘proper for one thing, and another for another, to the end that they must act together as the members of one body, and their union be cemented by mutual wants,’ as Bossuet argued, ‘the body also [was] not one member, but many.’⁶⁵¹ Society was laid upon the foundation of God and arose from a mutual recognition and need for the support of fellow men as man was made for society. Consequently, society and the state acted as a crucial restraint upon the ‘insatiable’ passions of man, which lead him into jealousy and anger and the violation of a society established by sacred bonds. The result of these diverse and ‘insensate passions’ were ‘so many different interests arising from them’ that ‘no faith’ can be ‘reposed, or safety to be found among men.’⁶⁵² The answer to unrestrained human passion for Bossuet was unification under government from God. A government where ‘the unity of a people, when one renouncing his own will, transfers and reunites it to that of the prince and the magistrate.’ Otherwise there could be ‘no union; [as] the people [would] become wanderers like a flock dispersed.’⁶⁵³ Government authority, for Bossuet, was from ‘divine right,’ and it descended from God to (Biblical) figures such as David and Solomon, passed down through an inalienable and infinite line to their chosen (princely) successors.

When one examines this opening section of Book I of the *Politics* in relation to Ramsay’s *Preface* of the second edition, there is a great deal of overlap (with some variation). Much of the extended material in Ramsay does correlate to what Bossuet discussed in the first Book.⁶⁵⁴ There was a repeated emphasis on the importance of God’s divine influence upon humanity, the mutual bond shared by humanity through God, and the need for society as there was a natural ‘unity’ amongst men. Within society humanity was inter-dependent but it

⁶⁵¹ *Ibid.* 7.

⁶⁵² *Ibid.* 15.

⁶⁵³ *Ibid.* 15.

⁶⁵⁴ See the ‘*Essay de Politique*’ chapter of the Thesis for the delineation of his theory, which Ramsay discussed in the first few books of the first edition.

also needed to be restrained due to the violent passions of the individual. The government that was established took its authority from God as the people cede part of their will for civilized society.

Two things arise at this juncture: religion and Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). My general premise revolves around the notion that the theoretical principles in Ramsay's *Essay* are predominantly taken from Bossuet's *Politics*. However, it must be pointed out that they do not correlate exactly and the reason for this was religion. Bossuet's system, as will be discussed, diverged dramatically from Ramsay's after Book VI of the *Politics*, when Bossuet began to employ the argument for the pre-eminence of the Church. Ramsay, a (necessary) advocate of toleration, subsumed (organized) religion and Biblical revelation within his theory to politics. Yet, both men based their systems on a similar notion: that government authority was derived from God. This was not unique and in fact the basis of this authority was different between the two. For Ramsay, this authority was eternal 'Providence,' a plan that government would exist before humanity and society. For Bossuet, who relied on the authority of Scripture, government (particularly kingship) emerged under Saul and David. Bossuet's reliance on the Bible and a theological view of the world thereby explains some of the differences in the basic principles of government between the two men.

The second component apparent in Bossuet's Book I and Ramsay's extended *Preface*, was a negative conception of humanity extant in both men. As has been discussed, Cherel and Molino believed that the *Essay* was influenced by Hobbes. There can be no doubt that certain Hobbesian elements do appear to be contained within the *Essay*, yet these elements derive from Bossuet. Ramsay had a similar starting position for his government and moves towards a similar end as Bossuet.⁶⁵⁵ That starting position was a basis of government

⁶⁵⁵ See Patrick Riley's 'Introduction' to the *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture* (Cambridge, 1990), for discussion of the influence of Hobbes on Bossuet's political theory. Riley argues that Bossuet

authority from God without contract (missing from Hobbes), yet moves towards a need to restrain the negative passions of humanity to promote what was essentially an absolutist system of government. Hobbes' influence was therefore in providing a negative conception of human nature and the solution for restraining it through absolute sovereignty.⁶⁵⁶ Yet the other facets of Bossuet were not Hobbesian, nor were they subsequently found in Ramsay (as will be discussed). For Bossuet, absolutism was used to promote Catholic absolutism through a religiously-centred argument; and for Ramsay, theology (divine providence) formed a platform on which to argue a case for the illegality of removing James II as king. By utilizing arguments on kingship within Bossuet, Ramsay attempted to promote the hereditary (and Godly) cause of James Stuart who had the (divine) legal claim to the throne of England. A claim that could not have been prevented by the liberty of the people or Parliament, as they did not have the divine authority and mandate from God to remove James II as monarch.

Bossuet's theory of government relied upon 'divine right' as its foundation to propound a brand of Catholic absolutism that underpinned the reign of Louis XIV. For Bossuet, the sacrifice of wills to the whole – without contract – was made by the people in return for a king (Saul). This satisfied the people's desire for a king, and in return imbued that sovereign with the authority of God, thus forming the basis of government:

All strength is transferred to the sovereign magistrate: every one strengthens him to the prejudice of his own, and renounces his own life in case of disobedience. The people gain by this; for they recover in the person of the supreme magistrate more strength than they yielded for his authority, since they recover in him all the strength of the nation reunited to assist them.

displayed a limited Hobbesianism, as he excluded a contract from his scheme, but uses similar principles such as the passions and human negativity to reach an argument for absolutist government: in a manner adopted by Ramsay. Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Clarendon, Oxford, 2002), reiterates this belief, claiming that Hobbes is an unacknowledged influence for Bossuet's Catholic absolutism.

⁶⁵⁶ For Hobbes' negative conception of human nature see Book I ('Liberty') of *De Cive*, and for his solution of absolute sovereignty Book V ('Dominion'). See also Hobbes' *Leviathan* Book I ('Of Man') and Book II ('Of Common-Wealth').

...The sovereign authority has an interest in guaranteeing by force every individual, because if any other force than his own prevails among the people his authority and his life are in danger.⁶⁵⁷

Bossuet's limited Hobbesianism promoted absolute authority to offset the passions of man. Moreover, Bossuet's reliance upon 'divine right' was an attempt to prevent the usurpation of a king's sovereign authority. 'Divine right' meant that God recognized the true successor (under divine law), it also meant that the citizens such be protected by this right as such an attack upon the sovereign would see the collapse of God's creation: government.⁶⁵⁸

Underpinning this system of absolute authority was divine (natural) law. A law created firstly to acknowledge the divinity and through the (later) Mosaic law to control the behaviour of humanity:

All laws are founded upon the first of all laws, which is the law of nature; that is to say, on right reason and on natural equity. The laws ought to regulate all things human and divine, public and private; and are begun by nature.

...The laws ought to establish the sacred and profane right, the public and private right, in a word, the just observance of divine and human things among citizens, together with rewards and punishments.⁶⁵⁹

The law was provided by God to the original kings and people who passed their authority and laws down through the ages to their successors, thereby relying upon wisdom and tradition. The covenant with God united the people to God and through him to each other. 'The people could not unite amongst themselves by an inviolable society,' argued Bossuet, 'if the covenant had not originally been made in the presence of a superior power, such as that of

⁶⁵⁷ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, 16-17.

⁶⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 176-77.

⁶⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 19. See Book II of Ramsay's second edition '*Of the Laws of Nature*' for a comparison with Bossuet.

God, the natural protector of human society, and the inevitable avenger of every contravention of the law.’⁶⁶⁰

Society and government was created using certain fundamental laws which could not be changed as the law required ‘solidity and firmness’ in order to work and strengthen the state. Constant alteration would lead to a weakness in the state. Further strength was created within the law by an enshrinement of the understanding that the rich must protect the poor. Through man’s ‘unity’ from God man had a duty to protect his fellow man, including the defence of the poor, and for Bossuet this rank and defence was part of a general social cohesion. This succour was a derivative of a love of one’s country and was completely natural for a Christian. ‘All the love we have for ourselves, for our family, and for our friends is reunited in the love we have for our country, where our happiness, and that of our family and of our friends is included.’⁶⁶¹ The love of one’s country was used by Bossuet to argue for the total obedience of the subjects of a country, as the seditious ‘who do not love their country and bring division into it, are the execration of mankind.’⁶⁶² As the early Christians obeyed Christ, and Christ obeyed the will of the state, so must subjects of their state obey its commands. Those who are disobedient, therefore, are not to be tolerated as they are ungodly: an ‘enemy’ to themselves ‘and to all mankind.’⁶⁶³

Bossuet’s authority and government was supported by a system of paternal authority (absent in Hobbes). God had placed his authority through divine law into Adam, an act repeated on a number of occasions: Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Saul, David, and Solomon. In a patriarchal view that differed from Sir Robert Filmer, Bossuet discussed how at particular times new laws and sovereign authority were established. Alternatively Filmer

⁶⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 22.

⁶⁶¹ *Ibid.* 27. For comparison see Book II of Ramsay’s *Essay*.

⁶⁶² *Ibid.* 28.

⁶⁶³ *Ibid.* 37. Ramsay wrote in the second edition: ‘The Love of our Country, therefore, opposes the Overthrow of Subordination, and every thing agrees to prove, that Rebellion should never be permitted under any Pretence whatsoever,’ (Book X, ‘*Rebellion is never allowed*,’ 83).

had argued in *Patriarcha* that sovereign authority had passed down to contemporary monarchs through an unbroken line from Adam.⁶⁶⁴ As regards Ramsay it may be noted that his focus was less upon the authority of Adam in relation to kingship but like Bossuet, rather on the relationship between kingship and paternal authority. This is a further reason for disagreement with Cherel and Molino's contention that an important influence on Ramsay's *Essay* was Filmer, or Henderson's belief that it was Bodin. The similarity of the use of patriarchy would suggest to me that Ramsay has used Bossuet as his source, as for the origin of Bossuet's patriarchy, then it may well be claimed that it was influenced by Bodin.⁶⁶⁵

For Bossuet, kingship derived from the relationship between a father and his children and the power he exerted over them. As families gathered together one father would lead many families and this father would come to be known as the leader (king).⁶⁶⁶ Monarchy as a form of government was therefore natural and had 'its foundation and its model in the parental empire, that [was] in nature herself.' As 'men are all born subjects' argued Bossuet, 'the paternal empire, which accustoms them to obey, accustoms them at the same time to have only one leader.'⁶⁶⁷ Kingship thereby was the natural form of government. Its basis upon the paternal model enabled not only a king's divine authority to be established through rule. It allowed the people to obey as they understood subordination and obedience via their relationship with their own father.⁶⁶⁸ Moreover, monarchy was the form of government 'most opposed to division, which is the essential evil in states, and the most certain cause of

⁶⁶⁴ Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha*, I, iii.

⁶⁶⁵ For Bodin's discussion of patriarchy see *Les six livres de la République* (*The Six Books of the Commonwealth*).

⁶⁶⁶ See Ramsay Book III, '*Man is born a Sociable Creature*' for his use of Bossuet in discussing this development of the family into kingship.

⁶⁶⁷ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, 47. For Ramsay's discussion of patriarchy here see Books VI and VII. Prior to these Books, Ramsay had argued that the naturalness of kingship and the people's ability to obey was based in 'the necessary Dependence which there is in the Order of corporeal Generation [paternal power],' (page 31).

⁶⁶⁸ See pages 52 and 53 of the second edition of the *Essay*. These have been added to this edition and are absent from the 1719 edition.

ruin.’ Monarchs provide the ‘unity’ required of a state, and ‘one is never so unified as a under a single leader.’⁶⁶⁹

This security was augmented by a reliance on the hereditary monarchy established by Solomon’s succession from his father David in obedience to the will of God. For Bossuet, it was ‘the most natural’ and ‘durable’ form of government as it ‘perpetuates itself by itself,’ emulating the generation of the human race.⁶⁷⁰ Over generations this natural form of government was established through tradition, prestige, honour and dignity amongst its people and other states, allowing the state to run more efficaciously. For this reason, once a state has established a particular form of government (namely monarchical), it could not be altered:

There is no form of government whatsoever, nor any human institution, which does not have its disadvantages, such that it is necessary to remain in the condition to which at a length of time has accustomed the people. That is why God takes under his protection all legitimate governments, in whatever form they are established: whoever undertakes to overthrow them is not only a public enemy, but also the enemy of God.⁶⁷¹

There could therefore be no rebellion within a state. No subject could rebel against God’s appointed king, nor could they change the government’s form once a branch of monarchy and a form of government was established it was enshrined by God’s will.

As part of God’s plan, a king’s role was to act as ‘the representative of [the] divine majesty, deputed by his providence for the execution of his plans.’⁶⁷² This was to be achieved through humility, despite his absolute power as God’s representative by enforcing the public good. His leadership and care for the public should mean that in ‘times of great

⁶⁶⁹ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, 47-8.

⁶⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 49-50.

⁶⁷¹ *Ibid.* 52. Ramsay upon the same subject: ‘These [government] Forms having been once established, it should never be allowed to change them: The same Reason which renders Governments in general necessary, requires also, that the Form of it should be sacred and inviolable: as Men would be always in Trouble if there was no Government,’ (Book VII, 54).

⁶⁷² *Ibid.* 60.

need, the people [had] a right to appeal to its king.’⁶⁷³ As a public person the king’s duty was to his people and his rule was directed toward that purpose. A king must believe that if something was ‘lacking in him’ then ‘something [was] lacking to the people of the state.’⁶⁷⁴ Such behaviour was not only an ordinance of God it was rational kingship and made for a wise ruler. Observing the public good and natural religious principles maintained the ‘unity’ and health of the state. A loved prince was the ‘light’ of the whole kingdom and the ‘greatest good of the whole universe.’ For Bossuet, ‘a good subject love[d] his prince as he loves the public good, as he love[d] the safety of the whole state.’⁶⁷⁵ Bossuet’s emphasis for the public good (as with Fénelon) was upon the king. It was the king that ensured the public good as he had the power and authority to ensure it.

It was therefore irrational for a king to behave in a tyrannical manner. Not only would this cause disharmony within the state, the king would also run the risk of rebellion or assassination.⁶⁷⁶ While this would remain a possibility, indeed the Dauphin’s great-grandfather Henry IV had been assassinated (1610), such disobedience was not to be permitted. While a tyrant would be most likely reviled by his subjects, as God’s representative they must still obey such a king. They should ‘always respect and always serve [the king] ...whoever they be, good or bad.’ ‘The state is in peril and the public peace is no longer secure, if anyone is permitted to rise up against princes for any reason whatsoever.’⁶⁷⁷ From the time of Saul God’s anointed rulers could not be move be removed from their position by other mortals. Even if they were to act with ‘open impiety’ or

⁶⁷³ *Ibid.* 65.

⁶⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 66.

⁶⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 170.

⁶⁷⁶ See Ramsay’s Book X ‘*Rebellion is never allowed*’ for a discussion of the public good and the role of the king.

⁶⁷⁷ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, 176-77. Ramsay wrote on rebellion: ‘We must obey and suffer, for since we are between two inevitable Evils, we ought to chuse the least. For which is better, to submit our selves to a fixed and lasting Strength, or to abandon our selves to the perpetual Revolutions of Anarchy?’ (Book XVI, ‘*Of Government purely popular*,’ page 202). For a further discussion of rebellion by Ramsay see Book X, ‘*Rebellion is never allowed*.’

‘persecution’ there subjects must remain obedient and loyal toward their king. Their one recourse was through non-violent remonstrance. Under the suffering of the Pharaoh, God had not permitted the Israelites ‘to proceed by mere de facto means against a king whose inhumanity to them was unheard of. They asked with respect, its just complaints by permitted means.’⁶⁷⁸ Ultimately, God was the only one that could judge the actions and behaviour of a king for Bossuet not the people. The most the people could hope for would be that in pleading their case – perhaps through a magistrate – the king may hear their plea: which obviously a good king would.⁶⁷⁹

The crucial elements of kingship for Bossuet were: that it was based upon the sacred nature of the king, his paternal authority, the king’s absolute authority, and the king’s exercise of reason. To be wise a king must observe the public good, but also the king needed to augment this wisdom through study and counsel. A king must be loved by his people, but he must also be feared for his power and authority. A king must be ‘subject’ to the equity of the laws as a symbol of justice but not in fact be ‘subject’ to the penalties of the law. Ultimately, a king must be a paragon of the law, of justice, and of his people by embodying them all in his sovereignty. As Fénelon was to also argue, a king was the superlative example to his people who they must wish to emulate.⁶⁸⁰ For Fénelon this was to be ostensibly as a saintly paragon, for Bossuet it was as a God-like embodiment of absolute power and authority:

God is infinite, God is all. The prince, in his quality of prince, is not considered as an individual; he is a public personage, all the state is comprised in him; the will of the people is included in his own. Just as all virtue and excellence are united in God, so the strength of every

⁶⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 181. Ramsay wrote on the ability to remonstrate: ‘[I]t should always be allowed to represent the Grievances of the Nation, in case of any general Oppression which threatens the Ruin of the Commonwealth. It is the Duty of the Law of Nature, to expose the Condition of the People to their common Father,’ (Book X, ‘*Rebellion is never allowed*,’ page 92).

⁶⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 260.

⁶⁸⁰ See ‘The Political Fénelon’ chapter, pages 111 and 130.

individual is comprehended in the person of the prince. What greatness this is, for one man to contain so much.⁶⁸¹

The crux to so much power was to ensure that absolute power did not become arbitrary. Absolute authority must be positively used, for without it a king could ‘neither do good nor suppress evil.’⁶⁸² The danger of tyranny (arbitrary rule) was that it made all subjects slaves, it meant the cessation of private property, every man’s life would be forfeit depending upon the whim of the king, and law was removed by the will of the king.⁶⁸³ The fine line between (good) absolutism and its arbitrary counterpart was an adherence by the king to the virtues of justice: constancy, prudence, and clemency. These virtues, reason, the public good, and the will of God must at all times be utilized by a king to enable him to rule well. If this was achieved a good king would be so imbued with God’s will and counsels: His divine inspiration (providence) would lead the king’s actions for good. For, in ‘vain does a king imagine that he is the arbiter of his fate, because he is the arbiter of that of others: he is more governed than governing.’⁶⁸⁴

It was at this juncture that the systems of government for the two men diverge. As can be perhaps inferred by the last quotation, Bossuet attempted to subdue politics under the auspices of religion while defending Louis XIV’s rule, (Books VII-IX of the *Politique*). There was therefore a defence of Louis’ *Gloire* and the need for a warrior king to wage war (in Book IX), and a defence of the need for luxury through a king’s need to demonstrate his wealth (Book X). Yet it is through their views on religion that the two men’s principles manifestly diverge. Ramsay used toleration to advocate the return of the Catholic James

⁶⁸¹ Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, 160.

⁶⁸² *Ibid.* 80. Ramsay wrote on arbitrary power: ‘It is therefore necessary, that every Government should be absolute. I do not understand hereby Absolute, an Arbitrary Power of doing every thing as one Person pleases ...God forbid!’ (Book V, ‘*Of the Necessity of Sovereign Authority*,’ page 38).

⁶⁸³ *Ibid.* 260.

⁶⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 251.

Stuart to the throne of Protestant England by assuaging fears of Catholic absolutism. For Bossuet there could be no toleration and he provided Biblical examples against it:

Thus Asa, thus Ezechias, thus Joseph reduced the idols their people worshipped to rubble. It was of no importance to them that they were established kings. They knocked down their temples and altars; they broke their vessels which had served idolatry; they burned their sacred woods; they exterminated their priests and soothsayers; and they purged the earth of all those impurities.⁶⁸⁵

As for Fénelon toleration led to division and division Bossuet believed led either to religious conflict or it could lead to secularization. Indeed Bossuet, as one of the leading Catholic theorists of Europe during the Counter-Reformation fought the ideological fight against Protestantism. Secularization was not permitted within Bossuet's system as the two realms of Church and state were joined. A king gained his power from the authority of God as did the Catholic Church. Yet while the Church recognized the authority of a king in the temporal realm, he must recognize the authority of the Church in relation to the spiritual realm. Subsequently, the king and the Church had a dual role within the temporal realm while deriving their authority from God. Within this scheme the absolute monarch was God-like on earth, a religious warrior and keeper of the law acting for God with the aid of the Catholic Church.⁶⁸⁶ While Ramsay based his political principles on Bossuet's theological view of God's transfer of authority to a king and sovereign authority, he did not place the system within a Catholic framework. Such a move would have undermined his demand for toleration to an English people that were deeply suspicious if not overtly intolerant of Catholicism, and any erosion of their civil liberties by religion. Ramsay therefore limited his use of Bossuet's principles to the general underlying theory on sovereign for his 'plan of government.'

⁶⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 205.

⁶⁸⁶ See Book VII of Bossuet's *Politique*.

Ramsay's alterations to the '*imparfait*' first edition of the *Essay de Politique* effectively had two purposes. One was to tie himself and his *Essay* closer to Fénelon by expounding political principles claimed to be from Fénelon. This purpose was used to enhance the second, the promotion of the cause of James Stuart in England. In reality the alterations, the slight expansions and the restructuring of the second edition enabled Ramsay to provide a more targeted and cohesive defence for the lost rights of the Stuart heir. Ramsay's attempt became clearer to understand while also revealing the influences upon the work, which were more covert in the first edition. What was clear in both editions of the *Essay* was the influence of Bossuet upon the political principles. The use of Natural Law, divine right theory, patriarchy, hereditary succession, and the need to ensure the people's subordination while never allowing rebellion are all to be found in Bossuet's *Politique*. The central premise of the *Essay*, the danger of an 'excess of liberty,' was taken from Bossuet's *L'histoire universelle*. What became clearer in the expanded *Preface* to the second edition was that Ramsay had based his theoretical system, his 'Divine Philosophy' on Bossuet's *Politique* also.

Yet, while Bossuet's principles formed the foundation of Ramsay's *Essay*, they were not the sole influence. The restructuring of the second edition provided a more prominent attack upon contract theory or the 'Lovers of Independency.' This attack was a direct response to Benjamin Hoadly, whose principles defended the removal of James II and the alteration of the succession to the detriment to James Stuart. While Ramsay quoted works throughout the *Essay* both Hoadly and Bossuet are tellingly absent as he did not reveal the true influences he was responding to. His focus was clandestine, hidden under the apparent principles of Fénelon, although they are found to be absent. Even Ramsay's Jacobite support was covert in the 1719 edition, becoming more apparent in the 1721 edition. Apparent through its dedication (found in this French edition alone), in which the semi-anonymous Ramsay

(‘SAYMAR’) professed his support for James’ cause. This cause was promoted by Ramsay by relying on the renown of Fénelon and his reputation across Europe and within England. A use of Fénelon that involved the manipulation, alteration and falsification of his political principles to support James as was highlighted by the *Vie de Fénelon*. While Ramsay presumably felt that his own name did not carry enough weight for the cause, his connection to Fénelon allowed him to usurp a name and reputation with great weight. Yet even with this deception, the *Essay* failed to hit its mark. A work that promoted Jacobitism by using the divine right principles of Bossuet had ceased to be relevant either in England or in regency France. Its final failure as a political ‘plan’ was ultimately assured by Ramsay’s attempt to fuse Bossuet’s absolutism with Fénelon’s proclivity for a monarchy assisted by the nobility and government. Ramsay’s ‘moderated’ monarchy used two opposing systems of government that cannot coexist; for a king’s sovereignty cannot be both absolute and indivisible while also shared and divided. Ramsay’s determination to use the nobility in his governmental system may have been an acknowledgement of Fénelon, or Bossuet, it may have been an attempt to show a Stuart king would be restrained, or it may have been an attempt to reflect the current method in Regency France of an aided monarch. Whatever the motivation its place in Ramsay’s system was incongruous.

Conclusion

Ramsay's *Essay de Politique* is an interesting work of government theory as not only did the work fail theoretically, the theory employed to promote Jacobitism was inappropriate and anachronistic. This was partly through his employment of Bossuet's seventeenth century system at a time of great anti-absolutist reform in Britain and France, and partly because Ramsay engaged in a Jacobite debate with contract theorists that was over before the work was published. The Jacobite debate and its use of divine right theory had ended in 1716 after the humiliation of the 1715 Uprising, the accession of George I (1714), and crucially the removal of the feared French threat due to the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Ramsay's engagement in Jacobite affairs and the creation of his work enabled an improvement of his personal circumstances. His Scottish contacts in Paris (Mar) and in Scotland (the Garden Circle) were associated with the Jacobites and this was the social sphere in which he operated. His work as the editor of the papers of Fénelon provided him with the opportunity to create principles that would favour the Jacobite cause while relying on his association with Fénelon, a man respected in Regency France and by James Stuart. Therefore on a personal level the *Essay* (and the *Vie de Fénelon*) proved to be a success for Ramsay as it helped to propel his career, it earned him a title and pension, and moved him into higher social and political circles despite the failure of the *Essay*.

Ramsay's dalliance with Jacobitism cooled considerably after his disastrous time in Rome as the tutor to Prince Charles (1724). His later fame was reliant on his *Travels of Cyrus*, but still also on his association with Fénelon and as his biographer through the *Vie de Fénelon*. The two editions of the *Essay* however, had been deemed to be a failure even by James Stuart: 'Ramsay is not to be in any ways concerned in writing or politics. I know him well

enough and shall be able to employ him according to his talents.’⁶⁸⁷ Ramsay’s attempt to blend Bossuet’s absolutist system headed by Fénelon’s use of the nobility discredited his ‘*plan de gouvernement*’ and revealed the weakness in his absolutist theory.⁶⁸⁸ The attempt to create a Jacobite ‘*plan de gouvernement*’ was unsuccessful because it ignored the political distancing of Britain from absolutism some thirty years before, and in France after 1715. Ramsay’s refusal to embrace this departure meant that his ‘*plan*’ became an attempt to mire both Fénelon and Jacobitism in seventeenth century absolutism, particularly the absolutism of Bossuet.

Perhaps the most important consequence of Ramsay’s *Essay de Politique* was the manipulation of the political legacy of Fénelon. Ramsay’s desire to use his association with Fénelon and his role of editor to promote Jacobitism led him to greatly interfere with the true political principles of the Archbishop. If one moves away from the promulgation of false principles in the *Essay*, one discovers that as editor Ramsay actively stole, plagiarized, and inserted himself into Fénelon’s works. Ramsay appears to have stolen the *Supplément* from the *Examen de conscience sur les devoirs de la royauté* and created the *Two Essays on the Ballance of Europe* (1720) juxtaposed with an essay from himself.⁶⁸⁹ He also appears to have inserted six pages into Fénelon’s *Télémaque* as an apology for Fénelon, thereby directly altering the work that subsequent editions have been based upon.⁶⁹⁰ Yet Ramsay’s greatest manipulation was the attempt to alter and subsequently hide the political principles of Fénelon. His *Essay* and *Vie* not only served the purpose of promoting Jacobitism they also promulgated a view of Fénelon that was stuck in his early educational works. This behaviour has meant that since that time more attention has been paid to these early works rather than

⁶⁸⁷ James to Murray (3rd April 1724), *The Jacobite Court in Rome*, 229.

⁶⁸⁸ Ramsay, *Essay de Politique*, ii.

⁶⁸⁹ For the discussion of the *Supplément* see ‘The Political Fénelon’ chapter, pp. 146-49.

⁶⁹⁰ For the alteration of *Télémaque* see ‘The Political Fénelon’ chapter, pp. 145-46.

the later works of reform that helped to influence Regency France's reform away from absolutism.

Instead, Ramsay promoted his theory of absolutism based on Louis XIV's system of government as promulgated by Bossuet. This covert and crucial influence has been lost on later commentators as has Ramsay's absolutism, but actually made perfect sense for Ramsay's true system of government.⁶⁹¹ In his necessity to vilify the threat of popular government, rebellion and contract theory while arguing for the position of James Stuart as (deposed) monarch under God, Bossuet became a natural model. This model became manifest in the *Preface* to the second edition when his plagiarism of Bossuet's ideas and theories became more apparent. The difficulty with the use of Bossuet's model was that while it precluded rebellion and elevated the power of the king, it had been shunned at this point both in Britain and in France where the role and power of popular government was expanding. In relation to the work's intended target, Britain, Steve Pincus has pointed out that one of the causes of the 1689 Revolution was a British desire to eschew the Gallican model of absolutist government advocated by Bossuet, of whom James II was a great admirer.⁶⁹² So why one might ask would Britain return to a potential threat of absolutism it had shunned three decades before?

A further discovery relating to Pincus is the use of divine right theory by Ramsay. Pincus has recently claimed that divine right theory was dead by the mid-1690s.⁶⁹³ Yet this is quite obviously untrue, as firstly Ramsay was trying to employ it himself, and secondly, the reason Ramsay was unsuccessful in using it was that it was theoretically redundant by 1716.⁶⁹⁴ The

⁶⁹¹ Ramsay, *Essay philosophique sur le gouvernement civil*, vii, (French v).

⁶⁹² Steve Pincus, 1688. *The First Modern Revolution*, 134-35.

⁶⁹³ *Ibid.* 455. For another alternative view of Pincus' depiction of the early Enlightenment politics see J.G.A. Pocock's, *Barbarism and Religion, Volume I: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-64* (Cambridge UP, 1999). Pocock argues that faith cannot be separated when discussing politics, a sentiment that fits soundly when discussing Ramsay and the theorists contained within this Thesis.

⁶⁹⁴ See Chapter Two for the discussion of Hoadly's theory (pp. 67-71) and Leslie's (pp. 74-75).

fundamental ideas of absolutism such as divine right, patriarchy, hereditary succession, were no longer discussed in the political literature of Britain after 1716 as the succession had been achieved and the Jacobites repelled. Benjamin Hoadly, the hidden and lost focus of attack in the *Essay* became a passive adversary as the debate in which he played a part had occurred a decade before, and finally ended with George I's (Protestant) accession. Ultimately, absolutism no longer appealed to people in Britain or France and this is why Ramsay's theory based on a Bossuetian model failed as Jacobite propaganda in a time of government reform.

Bibliography

Ramsay's Works

- *A Discourse upon Epick Poetry, and the Excellence of the Poem Telemachus*, (Translated by Mr Is. Littlebury & Mr A. Boyer as part of the 1718 edition of *Telemachus* by Fénelon. Published by William Churchill, London, 1719).
- *Essay de politique, où l'on traite de la nécessité, de l'Origine, des Droits, des Bornes, et des différentes formes de la Souveraineté. Selon les Principes de l'Auteur de Télémaque* (H. Scheurleer, La Haye, 1719).
- *Essay philosophique Sur le Gouvernement Civil, Où l'on traite De la Nécessité, de l'Origine, des Droits, des Bornes, & des différentes formes de la Souveraineté; Selon les Principes De feu M. François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon, Archevêque Duc de Cambrai, Seconde Edition, Revûë, corrigée, & augmentée* (Londres, 1721).
- *Essai Sur le Gouvernement Civil, Où l'on traité De la Nécessité, de l'Origine, des Droits, des Bornes, & des différentes formes de la Souveraineté; Selon les Principes De feu M. François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon, Archevêque Duc de Cambrai, Troisième Edition, Revûë, corrigée, & augmentée* (Londres, 1721).
- *An Essay upon Civil Government, or a treatise on the Necessity, the Origin, the Rights, the Titles, and the Different forms of Sovereignty. According to the Principles of the late Archbishop of Cambrai* (Randal Minshull, London, 1722).
- *An Essay upon Civil Government, Wherein is set forth, the Necessity, the Origin, the Rights, the Titles, and the Different forms of Sovereignty. With Observations on the Ancient Government of Rome and England. According to the Principles of the late Archbishop of Cambrai* (Randal Minshull, London, 1722).
- *Maxims of Civil Government* (William Munro, Edinburgh, 1722).
- *An Essay upon Civil Government* (Olive Payne, New Round, London, 1732).
- *Histoire de la vie de Mess. François de Salignac de la Motte-Fénelon, Archeveque Duc de Cambrai* (Chez de Freres Vaillant et N. Prevost, La Haye, 1723)
- *Life of François Salignac De La Motte Fénelon, Archbishop and Duke of Cambrai* (London, 1723).

- *Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages de Messire François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fenelon, Archevêque Duc de Cambrai* (Chez François l'Honoré, Amsterdam, 1729).
- *An Essay upon Civil Government, Wherein is set forth, the Necessity, the Origin, the Rights, the Titles, and the Different forms of Sovereignty. With Observations on the Ancient Government of Rome and England: According to the Principles of the late Archbishop of Cambray. Written Originally in French by the Chevalier Ramsay, Author of, The Travels of Cyrus* (Olive Payne, London, 1732).
- *Anecdotes de la vie de Messire André Michel de Ramsay ...dictés par lui meme peu de jours avant sa mort pressé par les instances réitérées de son Epouze* (Méjanes Bibliotheque, Aix-en-Provence – MS.No.1188).

Secondary Works on Ramsay

- Cherel, Albert, *Un Aventurier Religieux au XVIIIe siècle: André-Michel Ramsay* (Librairie Académique, Paris, 1926).
- Anonymous, *A Supplement to the New Cyropaedia: or, The Reflections of Cyrus Upon his Travels. In Six Evening Conversations betwixt that prince and his Prime Minister. Being a Criticism on Mr. Ramsay's Cyropaedia. To which is added, Another criticism upon the same Performance. In Four Conversations, betwixt the Marchioness de **** and Two gentlemen of Distinction in France* (Translated into English for J. Pemberton, London, 1729, from the 1728 French originals).
- Henderson, G.D. *Chevalier Ramsay* (Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., Edinburgh, 1952).
- McLynn, Pauline, "Factionalism among the Exiles in France: The Case of the Chevalier Ramsay and Bishop Atterbury" (Huntingdon, The Royal Stuart Society, 1989. The Royal Stuart Papers XXXIII).
- Molino, Jean, "L'Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil. Ramsay ou Fénelon?" In *La Régence* (Paris, 1970).
- Swift, Jonathan, *Correspondence* (Ed. F. Elrington Ball, London, 1910-14).
- Walker, D.P. "'Mon cher Zoroastre' or the Chevalier Ramsay" in *The Ancient Theology* (Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, 1972).

Fénelon

- *Oeuvres de M. François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon, Précepteur des Enfants de France, Archevêque-duc de Cambrai* (Paris, 1792).
- *Oeuvres Complètes de François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon, Archvêque-duc de Cambrai, Prince du Saint-Empire; Nouvelle edition, mise dans un nouvelle ordre , revue et corrigée avec soin* (Dix Tomes, Chez Briand, Paris, 1810).
- *Oeuvres de Fénelon, Archvêque de Cambrai, Publiées d'après les manuscrits originaux et les editions les plus correctes Avec un grand nombre de pieces inédites.* Tome XXII, Edited J-A Lebel (Paris,1824).
- *Oeuvres*, in Two Tomes, Edition présentée, établie et annotée par Jacques Le Brun, (Gallimard, Paris, 1997). In *Oeuvres II* this contains the *Mémoires politiques*, which includes: *Mémoire sur les moyens de prévenir la Guerre de la succession d'Espagne* (28 août 1701); *Examen de conscience sur le devoirs de la royauté*; *Fragment d'un mémoire sur la champagne de 1702*; *Mémoire sur la situation déplorable de la France en 1710*; *Mémoire sur les raisons qui semblent obliger Philippe V à abdiquer la couronne d'Espagne*; *Observations du Duc de Chevreuse sur le mémoire précédent*; *Examen des droits de Philippe V à la Couronne d'Espagne*; *Mémoire sur la paix*; *Mémoire sur la Souveraineté de Cambrai*; *Plans de Gouvernement dits Tables de Chaulnes* (Nov. 1711).
- *Correspondance de Fénelon, Archevêque de Cambrai, Publiée pour la première fois sur les manuscrits originaux et la plupart inédits. Tome Onzième* (Le Clere, Paris, 1829).
- *Correspondance de Fénelon*, 18 Tomes, Commentaire de Jean Orcibal avec la collaboration de Jacques Le Brun et Irénée Noye (Librairie Droz S.A., Genève, 1976-1999).
- *Lettre à Louis XIV* in *Selected Letters of Fénelon*, Ed. John McEwen (Harvill Press, London, 1964).
- *Télémaque* (Paris, 1717).
- *The Adventures of Telemachus Son of Ulysses. Written in the French by the late Mr. Francis de Salignac de la Motte Fenelon, Preceptor of the Children of France, and afterwards the Archbishop of Cambray. Translated from the last Paris Edition, which*

is the only genuine, and agreeable to the Author's Manuscript; and dedicated to the King of France, Two Volumes (London, 1719).

- *Telemachus*, Translated and Edited Patrick Riley (Cambridge U.P: Cambridge, 1994).
- *The Fables and Dialogues of the Dead* (London, 1723, published from 1718 Paris Edition).
- *Instructions et Avis sur Divers Points de la Morale et de la Perfection Chrétienne*, (*Christian Perfection*), Trans. Milfred Whitney Stillman, Ed. Charles F. Whiston (Harper & Row Publishers, London 1947).
- *The Maxims of the Saints Explained Concerning the Interiour Life* (Printed for E. & C. Dilly in The Poultry, London, 1715).
- *Mémoires sur les precautions et les mesures a prendre après la mort du duc de Bourgogne, 15 mars 1712* in Tome Onzième, *Oeuvres de Fénelon* (Dufour, Paris, 1826).
- *Spiritual Letters*, Revised & Updated by Harold L. Chadwick (Bridge-Logos Publishers, Gainesville, Florida, 2002).
- *Two Essays on the Ballance of Power in Europe. The first written in French by the Late Archbishop of Cambray, and translated into English. The Second by the Translator of the first Essay* (Printed by John Darby in Bartholomew Close, London, 1720).
- *A Dissertation on Pure Love* (London, 1735).
- *Proper Heads of Self-Examination for a King. Drawn up for Use for the late Dauphin of France, Father to his present Majesty K. Lewis XV, whilst Duke of Burgundy. By M. De Fénelon, Archbishop and Duke of Cambray. Together with the Author's Life, A complete Catalogue of His Works, And Memoirs of his Family. Translated from the French* (London, 1747).

Secondary Works on Fénelon

- D'Alembert, Jean le Rond, *Eulogy of Fénelon* in *Telemachus* (London, 1770).
- [Anonymous], *The Life of Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambray: Author of Telemachus, &c. &c.* (Published by David Longworth, New York, 1804).

- Cardinal Bausset, M. L.F. de, *The Life of Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai; Compiled, from the original manuscripts ...Translated from the French by William Mudford in Two Volumes* (Printed for Sherwood, Neely, & Jones, London, 1810).
- Broglie, Emmanuel, *Fénelon à Cambrai* (Paris, 1884).
- Cagnac, Chanoine Moïse *Fénelon: Politique tirée de l'Évangile* (Paris, 1912).
- Carcassonne, Ely, *Fénelon: l'Homme et l'Oeuvre* (Boivin & Cie, Rue Palatine, Paris, 1946).
- Channing, William Ellery, *Remarks on the Character and Writings of Fénelon* from the *Christian Examiner*, March 1829 (Second Edition, London, 1830).
- Cherel, Albert, *Fénelon au XVIIIe Siècle en France (1715-1820): Son Prestige – Son Influence* (Librarie Hachette et Cie, 79, Boulevard Saint-Germain, Paris, 1917).
- Cherel, Albert, *Fénelon: Oeuvres Choiesies. Avec Introduction, Bibliographie, Notes Grammaire, Lexique et Illustrations documentaires* (Paris, 1923).
- Cormack, Rev. John, *Lives of the Ancient Philosophers; Translated from the French of Fénelon, With Notes and a Life of the Author* (First American Edition Revised & Corrected, Published 1824).
- Cuche, F. et Le Brun, J. (Ed.), *Fénelon: Mystique et Politique (1699-1999). Actes du colloque international de Strasbourg pour le troisième centenaire de la publication de Télémaque et de la condamnation des Maximes des Saints*, (Honoré Champion, Paris, 2004).
- Davis Jr., James Herbert, *Fénelon* (Twayne Publishers, A Division of G.K. Hall & Co., Boston, 1979).
- Dufournet, Jean, *Un interlocuteur privilégié des princes* (Cahiers de recherche médiévales, 2, 1996).
- Follen, Eliza Lee Cabot, *Selections from the Writings of Fénelon. With a Memoir of his Life by a Lady* (Boston, 1831, Third Edition, Revised & Enlarged).
- Gallouédec-Genuys, Françoise, *Le Prince selon Fénelon* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1963)
- La Gorce, Agnes de, *Le Vrai Visage de Fénelon* (Hachette, Paris, 1958).
- Janet, Paul, *Fénelon: His Life and Works* (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, translated Victor Leuliette, 1914. From 1892 French Edition).
- La Harpe, Jean-François, *Éloge de François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon*, in *Oeuvres Complètes de François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon, Archevêque-duc de Cambrai, Prince du Saint-Empire; Nouvelle edition, mise dans un nouveau ordre*,

revue et corrigée avec soin, précédé d'un essai sur la personne et les écrits de Fénelon, et suivie de son éloge historique, par la Harpe, Tome IX (Chez Briand, Paris, 1810).

- Kanter, Sanford B. "Archbishop Fénelon's Political Activity: The Focal Point of Power in Dynasticism," in *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3, (Spring 1966), pp. 320-34, Duke University Press.
- Kendall, John, *Extracts from the Writings of Francis Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambray, with some Memoirs of his Life. To which are added Letters, Expressive of Love and Friendship, The Writer not Known* (London, 1797).
- Lear, Henrietta Louise Sydney, *Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai: A Biographical Sketch* (Rivington's, London, 1877)
- Mackintosh, Sir James, *A General View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy, Chiefly during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Carey, Lea, & Blanchard, Philadelphia, 1834).
- Melmoth, William Henry, *Memoirs of the Life of Francis Salignac de la Motte Fenelon, Late Archbishop and Duke of Cambray, &c. And Author of the celebrated Adventures of Telemachus, in Telemachus*, (London, 1770).
- Sanders, E.K. *Fénelon: His Friends and Enemies, 1651-1715* (Longmans, Green, & Co., London, 1901).

Primary Works

- Anonymous, *Vox Populi, Vox Dei: Being the Maxims of Government* (London, 1709).
- Anonymous, *The Voice of the People, No Voice of God: Or, The Mistaken Arguments of a fiery Zealot, in a late Pamphlet Entitl'd Vox Populi, Vox Dei, since Publish'd under the Title of the Judgement of the whole Kingdoms and Nations, &c. Fully Confuted, and his Designs prov'd to be Pernicious and Destructive to the publick Peace; which he cannot Answer, without Blasphemy and Perverting the Holy Scriptures, Publish'd for the Rectifying Mens Judgement in their Duty to the Establish'd Government* (London, 1710).

- Anonymous, *Reasons against Receiving The Pretender and Restoring the Popish Line. Together with some Queries of the Utmost Importance to Great Britain* (London, 1710).
- Anonymous, *Obedience to Civil Government clearly stated: Wherein The Christian Religion is rescu'd from the false Notions pretended to be drawn from it; and Mr. Hoadly's New Scheme, in his last Book Of the Origin and Form of Government; Is Fully Considered* (London, 1711).
- Anonymous, *The History of the Jacobite Clubs: With the Grounds of their Hopes from the P__t M__y: As also a Caveat against the Pretender* (London, 1712).
- Anonymous, *A General History of Trade, And Especially Consider'd as it respects British Commerce: In which an Attempt is made to State, and Moderate the present Disputes, about settling a Commerce between Great-Britain and France* (London, 1713).
- Anonymous, *The British Liberty Asserted: Being a full Answer to a late Book, Entitl'd, The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England, Asserted, &c.* (London, 1714).
- Anonymous, *Hanover or Rome: Shewing the Absolute Necessity of assisting His Majesty with such a sufficient force, as may totally Extinguish the Hopes of the Pretender's Open and Secret Abettors* (Dublin, 1715).
- Anonymous, *The Present Exigencies of the Government Consider'd* (London, 1719).
- Anonymous, *What has been, Maybe: Or, Fair Warning to the good of the people of England, Against the Common-wealth Principles industriously propagated by the London Journal, and too unwarily receiv'd by some amongst us* (London, 1721).
- Arnett, Richard, *A Seasonable Hue and Cry after the Pretender* (London, 1719).
- Asgill, John, *The Succession of the House of Hanover Vindicated, Against the Pretender's Second Declaration in Folio, intitl'd, The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted, &c.* (London, 1714).
- Astell, Mary, *An Impartial Enquiry into the Causes of rebellion in this Kingdom: In an Examination of Dr Kennett's Sermon, Jan 31 1704*, Ed. Patricia Springborg (Cambridge, 1996).
- Atterbury, Francis, *An Argument to prove the Affections of the People of England. To be the best Security of the Government; Humbly offer'd To the Consideration of the Patrons of Severity, and applied to the present Juncture of Affairs* (London, 1716).

- Atterbury, *Maxims, Reflections and Observations, Divine, Moral and Political* (London, 1723).
- Barrington, Viscount, John Shute, *A Dissuasive from Jacobitism: Shewing in general what the Nation is to expect from a Popish King; and in particular, from the Pretender* (London, 1713).
- Barrington, *The Revolution and Anti-Revolution Principles Stated and Compar'd, the Constitution Explain'd and Vindicated, And the Justice and Necessity of Excluding the Pretender, Maintain'd against the Book Entitled, Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted* (Third edition, London, 1714).
- Berkeley, George, *The Measure of Submission to Civil Government: An Essay, By George Berkeley, D.D., Late Lord Bishop of Cloyne. With a Dedication by the Editor, to Dr. Beattie* (London, 1784).
- Berkeley, *An Essay towards preventing the Ruine of Great Britain* (London, 1721).
- Bodin, Jean, *Six Books of the Commonwealth*, Ed. M.J. Tooley (Oxford, 1955).
- Bolingbroke, Viscount, Henry St. John, *Patriot King*, Ed. David Armitage (Cambridge, 1997).
- Bossuet, Jacques, *Oeuvres de Bossuet*, Ed. l'abbé B. Velat (Gallimard, Paris, 1961).
- Bossuet, *An Universal History: From the Beginning of the World, to the Empire of Charlemagne*, Translated by Mr Elphinstone (New York, 1821).
- Bossuet, *Politique tirée des paroles de l'Ecriture sainte*, Ed. Jacques Le Brun (Librarie Droz, Genève, 1967).
- Bossuet, *Politics Drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, Trans & Ed. Patrick Riley (Cambridge University Press, London, 1990).
- Bradbury, Thomas, *The lawfulness of Resisting Tyrants, Argued from the HISTORY of DAVID, And in DEFENCE of the REVOLUTION*. Nov. 5. 1713. *With some Remarks on Mr. Luke Milbourn's PREFACE and SERMON* (Third Edition, London, 1714).
- Bulstrode, Whitelocke, *A Letter touching the Late Rebellion, and what Means led to it; And of the Pretender's Title: Shewing the Duty and Interest of all Protestants to be faithful to King GEORGE, and oppose the Pretender, according to Law and Conscience* (London, 1717).
- Burnet, Sir Thomas, *Some New Proofs, By which it Appears that the Pretender is Truly James the Third* (London, 1713).

- Cannell, Joseph, *The Case of the Pretender stated, and our Duty on that Occasion. In a Sermon Preach'd at the Parish-Church of Saint Nicholas Coleabby, On Sunday March 21. 1708* (London, 1708).
- Cocks, Richard, *Over Shoes, Over Boots: Being a Second Part of the Church of ENGLAND Secured; The Toleration Enervated; and the Dissenters Ruin'd and Undone* (London, 1722).
- Collier, Arthur, *Christian Principles of Obedience to the Higher Powers. In a Sermon Preach'd the 29th of May, 1713. At the Cathedral Church of Sarum* (London, 1713).
- Cooke, Shadrach, *Legal Obedience the Duty of a Subject: Consider'd in a sermon at the Archdeacon of Canterbury's Visitation at Sittingbourn* (London, 1718).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Two Great Questions Consider'd* (London, 1701).
- Defoe, *And What if the Pretender should come? Or, some Considerations of the Advantages and Real Consequences of the Pretender's possessing the Crown of Great Britain* (London, 1713).
- Defoe, *A View of the Real Danger of the Protestant Succession* (London, 1714).
- Defoe, *Advice to the People of Great Britain, with Respect to Two Important Points of their Future Conduct. I. What they ought to expect from the King. II. How they ought to behave to him* (London, 1714).
- Earberry, Matthias, *An Historical Account of the Advantages that have accru'd to England, by the Succession in the Illustrious House of Hanover* (London, 1722).
- Ferguson, Robert, *The History of all the Mobs, Tumults, and Insurrections in Great Britain, From William the Conqueror to the present time. To which is added, The Act of Parliament and Proclamation lately Published for punishing Rioters* (London, 1715).
- Filmer, Sir Robert, *Patriarcha and The Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy, Or, A succinct Examination of the Fundamentals of Monarchy, both in this and other Kingdoms, as well about the Right of Power in Kings, as of the Originall or Naturall Liberty of the People*, Ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Gordon, Thomas, *A Supplement to three Political Letters to a Noble Lord, concerning Liberty and the Constitution: With a Political Dissertation on the Act of Settlement* (London, 1721).
- Harbin, George, *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted; The History of the Succession since the Conquest clear'd; and the True English Constitution*

vindicated from the Misrepresentations of Dr. Higden's View and Defence (London, 1713).

- Harrington, James, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, Ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Cambridge U.P., 1992).
- Hickes, George, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales Examined, and Rejected. In a Letter to a Friend in the Country* (London, 1701).
- Hickes, *Some Queries proposed to Civil, Canon, and Common Lawyers. Published in London, July 1712. In order to prove the Legitimacy of the Pretender. With General Remarks upon those Queries* (London, 1712).
- Hoadly, Benjamin, *The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Consider'd. In a Defense of the Doctrine Deliver'd in A Sermon Preach'd before the Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, Sept. 29. 1705* (London, 1706).
- Hoadly, *The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D.D., Volumes I-III*, Ed and Published by John Hoadly (London, 1773).
- Hobbes, Thomas, *De Cive*, Ed. Howard Warrender (Clarendon Press, 1983).
- Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*, Ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge U.P., Revised Student Edition, 1999).
- Holbrook, Anthony, *The Duty of Obedience to Civil Government. A Sermon Preach'd Upon the Occasion of the Northern Rebellion* (London, 1715).
- Hotman, François, *Franco-Gallia: Or, an Account of the Ancient Free State of France, and Most other Parts of Europe, before the Loss of their Liberties* (London, 1711).
- Jackson, John, *The Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government Briefly Consider'd*, (Second Edition, London, 1718).
- Kennett, White, *The Witch-craft of the present REBELLION. A Sermon Preach'd in the Parish Church of St. Mary Aldermary. In the City of LONDON: On Sunday 25th of September, 1715. The Time of publick Ordination*, (London, 1715).
- [Lansdowne, Lord], *A Letter from a Noble-Man Abroad, to his friend in England*, (London, 1722).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *A French Conquest neither Desirable nor Practicable. Dedicated to the King of England* (London, 1748).
- Leslie, Charles, *The Finishing Stroke. Being a Vindication of the Patriarchal Scheme of Government, in Defence of the REHEARSALS, Best Answer, and Best of All. Wherein Mr. Hoadly's Examination of this Scheme in his late Book of the Original*

and Institution of Civil Government, is fully consider'd. To which are Added, REMARKS on Dr. Higden's View and DEFENCE of the English CONSITUTION: In a DIALOGUE between Three H___'s (London, 1716).

- Locke, John, *Essays on the Law of Nature*, Ed. W. Von Leyden (Clarendon, Oxford, 1965).
- Locke, John, *Two Treatises on Government: In the Former, The False Principles and Foundation of Sir Robert Filmer and His Followers, are Detected and Overthrown. The Latter is an Essay Concerning The True Original, Extent, and End of Civil-Government*, Ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Machiavelli, Nicolò, *The Prince*, Translated A. Robert Caponigri (A Gateway Edition, Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1963).
- Machiavelli, Nicolò, *The Discourses* (Penguin Books Ltd., London, 1994).
- Matthews, Edward, *The Divine Original of Civil Government: A Sermon Preached at the Assizes held at Carrickfergus, for the County of Antrim, The 17th of July, 1713* (Dublin, 1714).
- Molesworth, Robert, *An Account of Denmark, As it was in the Year 1692* (Fifth Edition, R. Urie & Company, Glasgow, 1745).
- Molesworth, *The Principles of a Real Whig; Contained in A Preface to the Famous Hotoman's FRANCO-GALLIA, Written by the late Lord-Viscount Molesworth; And now Reprinted at the Request of the London Association* (London, 1775).
- Molyneux, William, *The Case of Ireland being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England, Stated* (Dublin, 1706).
- Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat, *Persian Letters*, Translated by George R. Healy (Hackett Publishing Company Inc., Indianapolis, 1999).
- Moyle, Walter, *Posthumous Works*, Ed. John Thelwall (London, 1796).
- Nichols, William, *The Duty of Inferiours Towards their Superiours, In Five Practical Discourses* (London, 1701).
- Lord Pitsligo, *The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719: From original documents at Fettercairn House and at Windsor Castle*, Ed. Henrietta Tayler (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1938).
- Plato, *Statesman*, Ed. Julia Annas & Robin Waterfield (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Plato, *Laws*, Ed. Trevor J. Saunders (Penguin, 1970).

- Quérard, J.-M., *La France Littéraire, ou Dictionnaire Bibliographique*, Septième Tome (Paris, 1835).
- Cardinal Richelieu, (Jean du Plessis), *The Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu*, 1688. Ed. & Trans. Henry Bertram Hill (Uni. Of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1961).
- Rymer, Thomas, *Of the Antiquity, Power and Decay of Parliaments. Being a General View of Government, and Civil Policy, in EUROPE: With other Historical and Political Observations, Relating thereunto* (London, 1714).
- Saint-Pierre, Charles Irenée Castel de, abbé, *A Project for Settling an Everlasting Peace in Europe* (London, 1714).
- Saint-Pierre, *A Discourse of the Danger of Governing by One Minister. In which is demonstrated, that the most advantageous Administration, both for the KING and the PEOPLE, consists in an Establishment of Many Councils; or, a POLYSYNODY* (London, 1718).
- Saint-Simon, Louis de, Duc de, *Historical Memoirs of the Duc de Saint-Simon: A Shortened Version*, Edited and translated by Lucy Norton (Hamish Hamilton, London, 1967-72, in 3 Vols).
- Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, Ed. Yves Coirault (Gallimard, Paris, VII Tomes, 1983-88).
- Saint-Simon, *Projets de Gouvernement du Duc de Bourgogne*, Ed. M.P. Mesnard (Hachette, Paris, 1860).
- Seyssel Claude de, *The Monarchy of France* (Yale University Press, 1981).
- Sidney, Algernon, *Court Maxims, discussed and refelled*, Ed. Hans W. Blom, Eco Haitsma Mulier, & Ronald Janse (Cambridge U.P., 1996).
- Sidney, Algernon, *Discourses concerning Government*, Ed. Thomas G. West (Liberty Fund, Indiana, 1990).
- Smedley, Jonathan, *The Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance Stated; And its Consistence with Theology, Reason, justice, the Revolution, our Laws and Policy, impartially Consider'd* (Second Edition, London, 1710).
- Steele, Richard, *The CRISIS: Or, a Discourse Representing, from the most Authentick Records, The Just Causes of the late Happy Revolution ...with some Seasonable Remarks on the Danger of a Popish Succession* (London, 1713).
- Synge, Edward, *The Case of TOLERATION consider'd with Respect both to Religion and Civil Government, In a SERMON Preach'd in St. Andrew's, Dublin, Before the Honourable House of Commons; On Saturday, the 23rd of October, 1725. Being the Anniversary of The Irish Rebellion* (Dublin, 1725).

- Temple, Sir William, *An Essay upon the Original and Nature of Government* (The Augustan Reprint Society, No. 109, London, 1964).
- Terry, Isaac, *The Religious and Loyal Subject's Duty considered, with regard to the present Government and the Revolution. A Sermon Preached in the CATHEDRAL CHURCH of CANTERBURY, on Wednesday, January 30. 1722-3. Being the Anniversary of Feast of the Martyrdom of King Charles I* (London, 1723).
- Tindal, Matthew, *The Defection consider'd, and The Designs of those, who divided the friends of the Government, set in a True Light* (London, 1717).
- Toland, John, *Christianity not Mysterious* (Reprinted Friedrich Fromann Verlag (Günther Holzboog), Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, London, 1964).
- Toland, *Anglia Libera: or The Limitation and Succession of the Crown of England explain'd and asserted; As grounded on His Majesty's Speech; The Proceedings in Parliament; The Desires of the People, The Safety of our Religion; The Nature of our Constitution; The Balance of Europe; and The Rights of all Mankind* (London, 1701).
- Trenchard, John, *An History of Standing Armies in England. Written by that eminent Patriot John Trenchard, Esq. With an incomparable Preface upon Government* (London, 1739).
- Tyrrell, James, *Patriarcha non Monarcha. The Patriarch Unmonarch'd: Being Observations on a late Treatise and divers other Miscellanies, Published under the Name of Sir Robert Filmer Baronet. In which the falseness of these Opinions that would make Monarchy Jure Divino are laid open: And the true Principles of Government and Property (especially in our Kingdom) asserted* (London, 1681).
- Voltaire, François-Marie Arouet, *Le Siècle de Louis XIV*, in 2 Vols. Préface et notes par René Groos (Librarie Garnier Frères, Paris, 1947).
- Voltaire, *The Age of Louis XIV* (Everyman, London, 1966).
- Wake, William, *A Vindication of the Realm, And Church of England, From the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion and Schism, Unjustly laid upon them by the NON-JURORS: And the REBELLION and SCHISM shewn to lie at their own Doors* (London, 1716).
- Walpole, Horace, *Walpoliana*, in Two Volumes (London, 1799).

Secondary Works

- Bennett, G.V., *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975).
- Blanning, Tim, *The Pursuit of Glory, Europe 1648-1815* (Penguin, London, 2007).
- Bradley, James E. & Van Kley, Dale, *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe* (University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana, 2001).
- Burgess, Glenn, *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).
- Cerny, Gerald, *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Dordrecht, 1987).
- Champion, Justin, *Republican learning, John Toland and the crisis of Christian culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester University Press, 2003).
- Childs, Nick, *A Political academy in Paris, 1724-1731* (Voltaire Foundation, Oxford, 2000).
- Clark, J.C.D. *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, social structure and political practice during the ancien regime* (Cambridge UP, 1985).
- Clark, J.C.D., *Revolution and Rebellion: State and society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Cambridge UP, 1986).
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, *Political Untouchables: The Tories and the '45* (Duckworth & Co, London, 1979).
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (John Donald Publishers Ltd., Edinburgh, 1982).
- Cruickshanks, Eveline & Corp, Edward, *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (The Hambledon Press, London, 1995).
- Cuttica, C. and Burgess, G., *Absolutism and Monarchism in Early Modern Europe* (Pickering & Chatto, London, 2011).
- Cuttica, Cesare, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588-1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (Manchester: MUP, 2011).
- Daly, James, *Sir Robert Filmer and English political thought* (University of Toronto Press, London, 1979).
- Dietz, Mary G., *Thomas Hobbes and Political Theory* (University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, Kansas, 1990).

- Ellis, Harold A., *Boulainvilliers and the French Monarchy, Aristocratic Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century France* (Cornell, 1988).
- Franklin, Julian H., *Jean Bodin and the Rise of Absolutist Theory* (Cambridge U.P., 1973).
- Fritz, Paul S., *The English Ministers and Jacobitism between the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1975).
- Gregg, Edward, *Queen Anne* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980).
- Hatton, Ragnhild, *Europe in the Age of Louis XIV* (Thames & Hudson, London, 1969).
- Havens, George R. *The Age of Ideas* (Peter Owen Limited, London, 1955).
- Henderson, G.D. *Mystics of the North-East* (The Third Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1934).
- Hont, Istvan, *Jealousy of Trade* (The Belknap Press of Harvard U.P, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2005).
- Hoppit, Julian, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000).
- Jones, Colin, *The Great Nation, France from Louis XV to Napoleon, 1715-99* (Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, London, 2002).
- Jones, G.H. *The Main Stream of Jacobitism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1954).
- Jones, J.R., *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1972).
- Kenyon, J.P., *Revolution Principles: The Policy of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge University Press, London, 1977).
- Keohane, Nannerl O., *Philosophy and the State of France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1980).
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel, *The Ancien Régime, A History of France 1610-1774*, Translated by Mark Greengrass (Blackwell, London, 1996).
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel, *Saint-Simon and the Court of Louis XIV*, with the collaboration of Jean-François Fitou. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer (University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- Lenman, Bruce, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689-1746* (Eyre metheun Ltd., London, 1980).
- McKay, Derek & Scott, H.M., *The Rise of the Great Powers, 1648-1815* (Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, 1983).

- Malcolm, Noel, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2002).
- Miller, John (Ed.), *Absolutism in 17th Century Europe* (Macmillan Press, London, 1993).
- Monod, Paul Kleber, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Nelson, Eric, *The Greek Tradition in Republican Thought* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Ò Ciardha, Éamonn, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment* (Four Courts Press, Dublin, 2004).
- O'Connor, Thomas, *An Irish Theologian in Enlightenment France: Luke Joseph Hooke* (Four Courts Press, Dublin, 1995).
- Parkin, John, *Taming the Leviathan. The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England 1640-1700* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Pawley, Bernard & Margaret, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries: A Study of relations between the Church of Rome and the Anglican Churches, 1530-1973* (Mowbrays, London, 1974).
- Petrie, Sir Charles, *The Jacobite Movement, The Last Phase: 1716-1807* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1950).
- Pincus, Steve, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (Yale, 2009).
- Pocock, J.G.A., *Virtue, Commerce, and History* (Cambridge, 1985).
- Pocock, J.G.A., *Barbarism and Religion, Volume I: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-64* (Cambridge UP, 1999).
- Robertson, John, *The Case for the Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples, 1680-1760* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Lionel Rothkrug's *Opposition to Louis XIV, The Political and Social Origins of the French Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1965).
- Skinner, Quentin, *Hobbes and Republican Liberty* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Sonenscher, Michael, *Before the Deluge: Public Debt, Inequality, and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution* (Princeton University Press, Oxford, 2007).
- Speck, W. A., *The Birth of Britain, A New Nation 1700-1710* (Blackwell, 1994).
- *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7: 1695-1701*, Ed. John Raithby (London, 1820).
- Straka, Gerald M. (ed.), *The Revolution of 1688 and the Birth of the English Political Nation* (D.C. Heath & Company, London, 2nd Edition, 1973).
- Szechi, Daniel, *Jacobitism and Tory politics, 1710-1714* (John Donald Publishers Ltd., Edinburgh, 1984).

- Szechi, Daniel, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1994).
- Tavard, George A. *The Quest for Catholicity: A Study in Anglicanism* (Burns & Oates, London, 1963).
- Thomson, Mark A. *William III and Louis XIV: Essays 1680-1720 by and for Mark Thomson* (Liverpool U.P., 1968).

Articles

- Bennett, G.V., "English Jacobitism, 1710-1715: Myth and Reality" in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Vol 32 (1982), pp. 137-151.
- Berman, "The Jacobitism of Berkeley's Passive Obedience" in the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (Apr. – Jun., 1986), pp. 309-319.
- See Carsten, F.L. "The Age of Louis XIV," Introduction of *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 5: The Ascendancy of France 1648-88*, Ed. F.L. Carsten (Cambridge UP, 1961).
- Fox, Paul W., "Louis XIV and the Theories of Absolutism and Divine Right" in *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (Feb. 1960), pp. 128-142.
- Goldie, Mark, "John Locke's Circle and James II" in *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Sep., 1992), pp. 557-586.
- Hoppit, Julian, "Checking the Leviathan, 1688-1832" in *The Political Economy of British Historical Experience, 1688-1914*, Ed. Donald Winch & Patrick O'Brien (Oxford, 2002).
- Hoppit, "The Myths of the South Sea Bubble" in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, Vol. 12 (2002), pp. 141-165.
- Hulliung, Mark, "Patriarchalism and Its Early Enemies" in *Political Theory*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Nov., 1974), pp. 410-419.
- Koeningsberger, H. G., "Western Europe and the power of Spain: the French succession and war with England," chapter 9, 3 in *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 3: The Counter-Reformation and Price Revolution 1559-1610* (Cambridge UP, 1968).

- Lough, J., "France under Louis XIV," chapter 10 of *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 5: The Ascendancy of France 1648-88*, Ed. F.L. Carsten (Cambridge UP, 1961).
- Perkins, Merle L., "The Abbé de Saint-Pierre and the Seventeenth-Century Intellectual Background," in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 97, No. 1 (Feb. 14. 1953), pp. 69-74.
- Merle L. Perkins in "The *Leviathan* and Saint-Pierre's *Projet de Paix Perpétuelle*," (*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 99, No.4, (Aug. 30. 1955), 259-267).
- Riley, Patrick, "Social contract theory and its critics" in *The Cambridge History of 18th Century Political Thought, Volume I*, Ed. M. Goldie & R. Wokler (Cambridge UP, 2006).
- Rodriguez-Salgado, Maria J., "The Habsburg-Valois Wars" in *The New Cambridge Modern History Vol 2: The Reformation 1520-1559*, Ed. G. R. Elton (Cambridge UP, 1990).
- Rogers, Nicholas, "Popular Protest in Early Hanoverian London" in *Past and Present*, No. 79 (May, 1978), pp. 70-100.
- Schochet, Gordon J., "Patriarchalism, Politics and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England" in *The Historical Journal*, Volume 12, No. 3 (1969), pp. 413-441 (Cambridge University Press).
- Slaughter, T.P., "'Abdicate' and 'Contract' in the Glorious Revolution," in *The Historical Journal* (1981), 24: 323-337 (Cambridge University Press).
- Sommerville, J.P., "Absolutism and royalism" in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, Volume III, 1450-1700*, Ed. J.H. Burns & M. Goldie (Cambridge UP, 1991).
- Straka, Gerald, "The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688-1702" in *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 77, No. 305 (Oct., 1962), pp. 638-658.
- Szechi, Daniel, "The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696," in *English Historical Review* (July 1993), pp. 610-628, Vol. 108, No. 428.
- Thompson, Andrew C., "Popery, Politics and Private Judgement in the Early Hanoverian Period" in *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Jun., 2002), pp. 333-356.
- Tuck, Richard, "Hobbes" in *Great Political Thinkers* (Oxford UP, 1992).