Notes

Introduction


4. As reported by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre; see, e.g., Chérel, Fénelon au XVIIIe siècle en France, 396; more recently see, e.g., Matthew D. Mendham, “Rousseau’s Partial Reception of Fénelon: From the Corruptions of Luxury to the Contradictions of Society,” in Ahn et al., Fénelon in the Enlightenment, 50.


7. In his Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, Godwin introduced his “famous fire cause,” which argued that forced with a choice between saving Archbishop Fénelon or our valet (or for that matter, our brother or father) from a fire, our duty is to save Fénelon, benefactor to all humanity. Godwin elaborated on his argument in his famous reply to Parr; see esp. his “Thoughts Occasioned by the Perusal of Dr. Parr’s Spital Sermon,” in Political and Philosophical Writings of William Godwin, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1993), vol. 2, pp. 185–88. On Fénelon’s influence on


12. Œuvres complètes de Fénelon, ed. Jean-Edmé-Auguste Gosselin, 10 vols. (Paris and Lille: L. Lefort, 1848–52) [OF] (incomplete owing to the exclusion of works censured by the Church, as well as several works only published in the twentieth century and others that remain unpublished); and Correspondence de Fénelon, ed. Jean Orcibal, Jacques Le Brun, and I. Noye, 18 vols. (Paris and Geneva: Droz, 1972–2007) [CF].

13. See the translator’s acknowledgments in Télémaque, Son of Ulysses, trans. Patrick Riley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), xi. And even the impact of this edition seems limited. Four years after its release, a leading scholar of French literature lamented that Télémaque “has quietly slipped unnoticed into oblivion,” and remains a work that he doubted “whether more than a handful of modern students of French have ever heard of”—leading him in his own right to conclude that “there can have been fewer more dramatic declines in literary reputation than Fénelon’s” (Peter Bayley, “Fénelon’s Melancholy Fate,” Times Literary Supplement, May 1, 1998, p. 8). Some sense of just how different things are in France is captured in the observation of Marc Fumaroli, Fénelon’s fellow immortel, that Fénelon remains “les plus chimérique et le plus exquis” of all “nos génies littéraires” [Partis pris: littérature, esthétique, politique, ed. Paul-Victor Desarbres (Paris: Robert Laffont, 2019), 177].

15. The closest we have to an interpretive work on Fénelon’s thought in English is James Herbert Davis’s intellectual biography Fénelon (Boston: Twayne, 1979), which, while admirably broad in its scope and helpful on Fénelon’s intellectual context, announces in its introduction that it “makes no claims to new discoveries or innovative approaches,” instead drawing “freely” on the interpretations of the leading French scholars (9).


20. Gorday’s biography is by far the best source on Fénelon’s life currently available in English; most of the details of the brief biographical sketch that follows are drawn from his account, supplemented by reference to the helpful chronology included in Le Brun’s Pléiade edition (Pl. 1:xxix–xxxix) and the outstanding chronologies that conclude each commentary volume in CF. Shorter but also valuable to English readers will be Davis, Fénelon, 15–34, as well as the brief sketches of Fénelon’s life in Riley’s introduction to Telemachus (xiii–xvii) and H. C. Barnard’s introduction to the education writings (Fénelon on Education, vii–xxx).
21. Thus Gorday’s observation that this task, which so often “lent itself to mean-spirited intimidation and bullying,” was generally regarded to have been conducted by Fénelon in a “sensible, reasonable, and even compassionate” manner (François Fénelon: A Biography, 24–28, quote at 27); see also Marguerite Haillant, “Fénelon pasteur des hommes,” in Fénelon, évêque et pasteur en son temps, 1695–1715, ed. Gilles Deregnaucourt and Philippe Guignet (Lille: Centre d’Histoire de le Région du Nord et de l’Europe du Nord-Ouest, 1996), esp. 164. For additional helpful background, see, e.g., Albert Chérel, “La pédagogie fénelonienne, son originalité, son influence au XVIIIe siècle,” Revue d’histoire littéraire de la France 4 (1918): 507–510.

22. Fénelon’s influence on Anjou has been much less studied than Fénelon’s influence on Burgundy. For an important exception, see esp. Jorge Fernández-Santos Ortiz-Iribas and Sara Muniaín Ederra, “Prendre modèle sur Télémaque: The Fénelonian Underpinnings of ‘Cultural Policy’ at the Court of Philip V of Spain,” in Ahn et al., Fénelon in the Enlightenment, 129–46.


24. See, respectively, CF 8:101; CF 8:188; cf. CF 8:128; CF 8:179; CF 8:197.

25. Details on the texts and their publication history are principally drawn from the excellent editorial notes in Le Brun’s Pléiade edition.

26. On the influence of Fénelon’s rhetorical theory, see, e.g., Barbara Warnick, “Fénelon’s Recommendations to the French Academy Concerning Rhetoric,” Communications Monographs 45 (1978): 75–84, which cites W. S. Howell’s observation that Fénelon’s is “‘the first modern rhetoric’” (quote at 75).


29. See, e.g., IPJ OF 5:453; the phrase is drawn from Timothy 2:17.
30. For a helpful guide to the context that emphasizes the impact of the climatological events of the 1690s, see Pierre-Eugène Leroy’s preface to his edition of the Letter in Lettre à Louis XIV et autres écrits politiques (Paris: Bartillat, 2011), esp. 24–25.
31. See, e.g., Leroy, in Lettre à Louis XIV et autres écrits politiques, 39.
32. He was also uncle to the Duke of Burgundy; see Pl. 2:1658n6.
33. Fénelon’s paean to the happiness of life at Chaulnes offered in correspondence with the Duke of Chevreuse (CF 14:470) is well known. But more revealing of the actual intentions of the “Tables” is Fénelon’s letter to Chevreuse of six months earlier, in which he proposes meeting at Chaulnes to hold conversations “on spiritual authority, on temporal authority, and on Rome.” Fénelon here promises: “I would limit myself at Chaulnes to putting in a sort of table, like a diary, the result of each conversation,” in the hopes that “this table would remind you of all the maxims we have settled on amongst ourselves, and the maxims we have settled on amongst ourselves would put you in a position to supply the key to the tables” (CF 14:392).
34. The question of how a broad popular audience came to find meaning and relevance in a work intended to teach the virtues of kingship to a single prince is beyond the scope of this work but deserves study in its own right. For an important formulation of this question, see Le Brun, “Du privé au public,” esp. 244–45 and 249–50; see also Karl Holzamer, “Die religiös-sittliche Erziehung des politisch verantwortlichen Menschen,” in Fénelon, Persönlichkeit und Werk, ed. Johannes Kraus and Jean Calvet (Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1953), 146.
35. Fragments of this memoir were published in OF 7:661–66. Fénelon himself referred to the memoir in his correspondence with the Duke of Chevreuse (CF 14:204); see also the editorial note at CF 15:157n1.
36. As reproduced in OF 7:665. See also among many other references, e.g., Jacques François Denis, Politique de Fénelon (Caen: F. le Blanc-Hardel, 1868), 7; Christine Noille-Clauzade, “La morale du Télémaque: pour une poétique platonicienne de la fable,” Revue des sciences humaines 254 (1999): 85; and Riley, “Rousseau, Fénelon, and the Quarrel,” 82. This is also the letter in which Fénelon makes his oft-cited claim with regard to the manuscript of Télémaque that “tou le monde sait qu’il ne m’a échappé que par l’inflidélité d’un copiste.”
37. Helpful to some readers may also be the map of Telemachus’s travels that I prepared to help my students track his movements across the Mediterranean using modern place names. NB: as this is an open-access and publicly editable document, no guarantee can be made that its information remains accurate (last accessed August 9, 2019): https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?hl=en&oe=UTF8&vps=2&utm=0&ie=UTF8&mid=1gnbV3uiCvI5neqH9Gs_SvlqGFQ&ll=34.14938711069237%2C18.0109865624995&z=4.
38. Among the most important of these studies to which this project will have reason to make frequent reference in what follows are Lionel Rothkrug, Opposition to Louis XIV: The Political and Social Origins of the French Enlightenment (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965); Judith Shklar, Men and Citizens: A Study of Rousseau’s Social Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969); Nannerl Keohane, Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment (Princeton: Princeton
University Press, 1980); George Armstrong Kelly, *Mortal Politics in Eighteenth-Century France* (Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo Press, 1986); and Riley, “Rousseau, Fénelon, and the Quarrel.” More recently, Andrew Mansfield has helpfully continued this tradition of taking up Fénelon’s political thought in the context of broader debates; see his *Ideas of Monarchical Reform.*


40. What follows extensively engages this scholarship. For a brief introductory guide to the key developments in French scholarship on Fénelon’s political thought in the period since Urbain, see Jacques Le Brun, “Fénelon et la politique,” in *Nouvel état présent des travaux sur Fénelon*, ed. Henk Hillenaar (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000).

41. Both claims are Hillenaar’s; see “Le projet didactique de Fénelon auteur de *Télémaque*: enjeux et perspectives,” *Documents pour l’histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde* 30 (2003): sec. 10 (see also sec. 3); and *Le secret de *Télémaque*,* 11 (see also esp. 20, 22–23, 28, 74, 93); see also, e.g., Albert Chérel, *Fénelon, ou la religion du pur amour* (Paris: Denoël et Steele, 1934), 171–72.


45. I am explicitly anticipated in this claim by Volker Kapp, who in the course of arguing that in fact “Fénelon ne mélange pas la mystique et la politique,” argues that
“néanmoins, la politique et la morale féneloniennes ont un adversaire commun: l’amour-propre” [Télémaque de Fénelon: La signification d’une œuvre littéraire à la fin du siècle classique (Tübingen: Narr, 1982), 133]; see also e.g., Eva Mohr, Fénelon und der Staat (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1971), 22; and Miklos Vető, Fénelon, penseur de la volonté: lecture spirituelle d’un philosophe (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2017), 77, 96–97, 107–109, 152.

46. See, e.g., LAF Pl. 2:1194–95; for commentary, see Riley, "Rousseau, Fénelon, and the Quarrel," 81–82 (from which the quote is drawn).

47. See, e.g., the chapter dedicated to the Letter to the Academy by the Viscount St. Cyres in his François de Fénelon (London: Methuen and Co., 1901), 269–80; as well as, more generally, Riley, "Rousseau, Fénelon, and the Quarrel."


49. At the risk of saying the obvious: there is of course no necessary connection between being moderate and being modern; examples abound of radical moderns (Nietzsche) and moderate ancients (Aristotle). In Fénelon’s case, however, the two dovetail insofar as his own moderation consists precisely in his prudent accommodation of his proposed political reforms to the conditions of modernity. In emphasizing Fénelon’s efforts to synthesize these various strands, I aim to develop Ely Carcassonne’s observation that “Christianisme, amour de l’antiquité, fierté de race avec un sens aigu des réalités présentes, tous ces éléments combinés selon les circonstances firent la politique de Fénelon” [Fénelon, l’homme et l’œuvre (Paris: Boivin and Co., 1946)], 87). Cf., e.g., Olivier Leplatre, Fénelon ou l’inquiétude du politique (Paris: Hermann, 2015), esp. 135–36.

250 NOTES

51. Fénelon frequently contrasts the “sensus obvius” with the “sensus ab auctore intentus,” which concerns the intention of the author, and which he often suggests, in the contest of his debates over the orthodoxy of positions, is fundamentally “unknown and impenetrable” insofar as it exists “in the head of the author alone” (CF 12:153–54; cf. CF 8:73–74; CF 12:63); see also Robert Spaemann, Reflexion und Spontaneität: Studien über Fénelon (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1963), 27; and François Trémolières, “Qui peut juger du sens d’un texte?,” in Fénelon et Port-Royal, ed. Patricia Touboul, Laurence Devillairs and Alberto Frigo (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2017), esp. 42–43, 47–48.

52. The philosophical context of seventeenth-century France has been recently and helpfully sketched for English-language readers in Desmond M. Clarke, French Philosophy, 1572–1675 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); see also Coleman, Virtues of Abandon, esp. 48ff.

53. It seems fair to say that the evolutionary presentation of Fénelon’s ideas has been the most common; for defenses of this approach with regard to his political ideas, see Gidel, La politique de Fénelon, 85; and from a philosophical context, Gouhier, Fénelon philosophe, esp. 12. The more thematic approach that I take follows the lead of scholars like Mousnier; see “Les idées politiques de Fénelon,” 191; and Le Brun, “Fénelon et la politique,” 46. On the relative systematicity of Fénelon’s political thought, see esp. Gallouédec-Genuys, Le prince selon Fénelon, 286–87; and Cuche, Une pensée sociale catholique, 14.

Chapter 1


3. Representative of this position is Henk Hillenaar, who argues that “le grand enjeu de l’éducateur qui écrit Télémaque est d’inculquer à son élève l’idéal de désintéressement dans tous les domaines de la vie” and that this ideal demands from the recipient of this education “l’oubli de son propre intérêt, de sa propre gloire, de ses ambitions personnelles” (“Le projet didactique de Fénelon auteur de Télémaque: Enjeux et perspectives,” Documents pour l’histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde 30 (2003): sec. 5).