

Notes

Introduction

1. This claim has become a staple of English-language scholarship; see, e.g., Patrick Riley, “Rousseau, Fénelon, and the Quarrel between the Ancients and the Moderns,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Rousseau*, ed. Riley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 81; and Istvan Hont, “The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,” in *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, ed. Mark Goldie and Robert Wokler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 383. The commonly credited source for the claim is Albert Chérel, *Fénelon au XVIIIe siècle en France (1715–1820): Son prestige—son influence* (Paris: Hachette, 1917). One of Chérel’s most valuable contributions is his documentation of the remarkable number of eighteenth-century editions of *Telemachus*; see the *supplément* to his main work, published as *Fénelon au XVIIIe siècle en France: Tableaux bibliographiques* (Fribourg: Fragnière Frères, 1917).
2. On Fénelon’s eighteenth-century influence beyond France, see esp. the essays recently collected in Doohwan Ahn, Christoph Schmitt-Maass, and Stefanie Stockhorst, eds., *Fénelon in the Enlightenment: Traditions, Adaptations, and Variations* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014).
3. Montesquieu, *Pensées*, ed. Louis Desgraves (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1991), no. 115, p. 214; as translated by Henry C. Clark in Montesquieu, *My Thoughts* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2012), 40.
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.
5. Hume, *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 7.15, p. 62; see also Hume, “Of the Standard of Taste,” in *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. Eugene F. Miller (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1985), 228.
6. As quoted in Emmanuelle de Champs, *Enlightenment and Utility: Bentham in France, Bentham in French* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 22.
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

244 NOTES

- Godwin's thought, see esp. Graham Allen, "Godwin, Fénelon, and the Disappearing Teacher," *History of European Ideas* 33 (2007): 9–24.
8. As quoted in Patrick Riley, *Leibniz' Universal Jurisprudence: Justice as the Charity of the Wise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 151, citing Emilienne Naert, *Leibniz et la querelle du pur amour* (Paris: Vrin, 1959), 98.
 9. Herder, *Letters for the Advancement of Humanity*, tenth collection, no. 115, in *Philosophical Writings*, ed. Michael Forster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 386; see also 387–89.
 10. Goethe, *Autobiography*, as cited in Peter Sajda, "François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon: Clearing the Way for *The Sickness unto Death*," in *Kierkegaard and the Renaissance and the Modern Traditions*, vol. 2: *Theology*, ed. Jon Stewart (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 133.
 11. The best guide to Fénelon's influence on the Stuarts is Andrew Mansfield, *Ideas of Monarchical Reform: Fénelon, Jacobitism, and the Political Works of the Chevalier Ramsay* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015). On Frederick the Great, see, e.g., Françoise Gallouédec-Genuys, *Le prince selon Fénelon* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), 3; A. T. Gable, "The Prince and the Mirror: Louis XIV, Fénelon, Royal Narcissism and the Legacy of Machiavelli," *Seventeenth-Century French Studies* 15 (1993): 244; and Isaac Nakhimovsky, "The Enlightened Price and the Future of Europe," in *Commerce and Peace in the Enlightenment*, ed. Béla Kapossy, Isaac Nakhimovsky, and Richard Whatmore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 46. On Jefferson, see Patricia A. Ward, "Fénelon and Classical America," in Ahn et al., *Fénelon in the Enlightenment*, 183. On Robespierre, see, e.g., Alfred Adler, "Fénelon's *Télémaque*: Intention and Effect," *Studies in Philology* 55 (1958): 592; Pierre-François Moreau, "Les racines de la loi: Fénelon et utopie," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 61 (1977): 85; and Henk Hillenaar, *Le secret de Télémaque* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994), 5, 8.
 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 censored 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 *Telemachus, 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 *Telemachus* "has quietly slipped unnoticed into oblivion," and remains a work that he doubted "whether more than a handful of modern students of French have even 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].

14. The best of these are *Fénelon: Selected Writings*, ed. Chad Helms (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006); and *The Complete Fénelon*, ed. Robert J. Edmonson and Hal M. Helms (Brewster, MA: Paraclete Press, 2008). One of the more interesting stories of Fénelon's afterlife in English is how the spirituality of a Catholic archbishop came to be of particular interest to evangelical Protestants; on this front, see Patricia A. Ward, *Experimental Theology in America: Madame Guyon, Fénelon, and Their Readers* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), esp. ix–xi and 208–209. Three valuable translations for scholarly audiences that deserve mention at the outset are *Fénelon's Dialogues on Eloquence*, ed. Wilbur Samuel Howell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951); *Fénelon on Education*, ed. H. C. Barnard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966); and *Fénelon's Letter to the French Academy*, ed. Barbara Warnick (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984).
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).
16. In addition to Hont, as cited in n1 earlier, see, e.g., Jeremy Jennings, “The Debate about Luxury in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century French Political Thought,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68 (2007): 79–105; Paul Schuurman, “Fénelon on Luxury, War and Trade in the *Telemachus*,” *History of European Ideas* 38 (2012): 179–99; Arnaud Diemer, “Quand le luxe devient une question économique: Retour sur le querelle du luxe du 18e siècle,” *Innovations* 41 (2013): 9–27; and the several additional works cited in chapter 2, n1.
17. Peter Gorday, *François Fénelon: A Biography—The Apostle of Pure Love* (Brewster, MA: Paraclete Press, 2012).
18. Cf. Mendham, “Rousseau's Partial Reception of Fénelon,” 76.
19. Thomas Merton, “Reflections on the Character and Genius of Fénelon,” in *Fénelon: Letters of Love and Counsel*, ed. John McEwen (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964), 11; in this context, see too Louis Dupré, *The Deeper Life: An Introduction to Christian Mysticism* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), esp. 14–15. And similar to Merton, see also Gorday's lovely claim, in his discussion of “Fénelon for us,” that “Fénelon's spiritual writings will always appeal to people who have his high idealism about love and loving deeds, but also his elegiac sense of the sadness of the world as it normally is” [*François Fénelon: A Biography*, 207].
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).

246 NOTES

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 Deregnacourt 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 Muniain 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.
23. See, e.g., CF 2:85; CF 2:133; CF 2:133. For commentary, see esp. Louis Cagnet, *Crépuscule des mystiques: Bossuet-Fénelon* (Tournai: Desclée and Co., 1958), esp. 120–26.
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).
27. Chérel, one of the most thorough scholars of Fénelon's legacy, notes that the *Education* was considered one of Fénelon's classic works into the twentieth century ("La pédagogie fénelonienne," 505). On its legacy, see also, e.g., Jean Orcibal, "L'influence spirituelle de Fénelon dans la pays anglo-saxons au XVIIIe siècle," *Dix-septième siècle* 12–14 (1951–52): 276; Jacques Le Brun, "Du privé au public: l'éducation du prince selon Fénelon," in *Le savoir du prince, du moyen âge aux Lumières*, ed. Ran Halevi (Paris: Fayard, 2002), 236; and Claire Boulard Jouslin, "Conservative or Reformer? The History and Fortune of Fénelon's *Traité de l'Éducation des filles* in Eighteenth-Century England," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 12 (2012): esp. 48–50.
28. Useful English-language surveys of this quarrel include, e.g., Ulrich L. Lehner, *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 19–25, 49–53, 170–73; and Michael Moriarity, *Early Modern French Thought: The Age of Suspicion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 20–41. Fénelon's anti-Jansenist writings have received relatively little attention from specialists; for an important and indeed indispensable exception to this general rule, see François Xavier-Cuché's "Les Provinciales anti-Janénistes de Fénelon," in *L'Absolu et le monde. Etudes sur les écrits du Petit Concile: Bossuet, La Bruyère, Fénelon et leurs amis* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2017), 131–56. I intend to examine Fénelon's campaign against Jansenism in detail in a separate work.
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-Eugene Leroy's preface to his edition of the *Lettre 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 *Telemachus* that "*tout le monde sait qu'il ne m'a échappé que par l'infidélité 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&msa=0&ie=UTF8&mid=1gnbV3uiCVf5neqH9Cs_SlvIqGFQ&ll=34.14938711069237%2C18.00109865624995&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

248 NOTES

- 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*.
39. Charles Urbain, “Introduction,” in *Fénelon: Ecrits et lettres politiques* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1981 [1920]), 11. Among the most important studies that Urbain would likely have had in mind are Denis, *Politique de Fénelon* (1868); Henri Sée, “Les idées politiques de Fénelon,” *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 1 (1899–1900): 545–65; Gilbert Gidel, *La politique de Fénelon* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1971 [1906]); Moïse Cagnac, “Politique tirée de L’Evangile,” in *Fénelon, apologiste de la foi* (Paris: De Gigord, 1917); and Chérel, *Fénelon au XVIIIe siècle en France*.
 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: Denöel et Steele, 1934), 171–72.
 42. See, respectively, Cagnac, “Politique tirée de L’Evangile,” 267; and Chérel, *Fénelon, ou la religion du pur amour*, 166, as quoted in Jean-Vincent Blanchard, “Entre cité terrestre et cité céleste: La machine de *Télémaque*,” in *Intersections*, ed. F. E. Beasley and K. Wine (Tübingen: Narr, 2005), 346.
 43. See, respectively, Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France*, 341; and Riley, “Rousseau, Fénelon, and the Quarrel,” 85. Riley tempers this assessment slightly in his later “Fénelon’s ‘Republican’ Monarchism in *Telemachus*,” in *Monarchisms in the Age of Enlightenment: Liberty, Patriotism, and the Common Good*, ed. Hans Blom, John Christian Laursen, and Louisa Simonutti (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 85.
 44. See, respectively, Christopher Brooke, *Philosophic Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 151; Charly J. Coleman, “The Value of Dispossession: Rethinking Discourses of Selfhood in Eighteenth-Century France,” *Modern Intellectual History* 2 (2005): 314, and Coleman, *The Virtues of Abandon: An Anti-Individualist History of the French Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2014), 80–81, 84–85; and Barbara Falgoust Mennite, “The Philosophical and Theological Foundations of François Fénelon’s Political Theory: Love, Free Will, and Disinterested Virtue” (PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 2015), 281; see also Mennite’s claims that Fénelon’s concept of love “is the connecting thread of his entire system theologically, philosophically, and politically” (126), and that Fénelon “based his political theory on mysticism” (282).
 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 Vetö, *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.”
48. Perhaps the most important presentation of Fénelon as an “idealist” is Roland Mousnier’s; see his “Les idées politiques de Fénelon,” *Dix-septième siècle* 12–14 (1951–52): esp. 204–206. For helpful articulations of Fénelon’s realism, see, e.g., Pierre Lorson, “Guerre et paix chez Fénelon,” *Dix-septième siècle* 12–14 (1951–52): esp. 213; Moreau, “Les racines de la loi,” 84–86; and, in a somewhat different vein, Hillenaar, *Le secret de Télémaque*, 62; and Falgoust Mennite, “The Philosophical and Theological Foundations of Fénelon’s Political Theory,” 179. I return to this debate in chapter 3.
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.
50. See esp. Henri Gouhier, *Fénelon philosophe* (Paris: Vrin, 1977); and Denise Leduc-Fayette, “Fénelon philosophe?,” *Revue philosophique de la France et de l’étranger* 128 (2003): 148; see also François-Xavier Cuche, *Une pensée sociale catholique: Fleury, La Bruyère, Fénelon* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1991), esp. 137. For important exceptions to this rule, see the reference to Fénelon’s “systematic political philosophy” in James P. Gilroy, “Peace and the Pursuit of Happiness in the French Utopian Novel: Fénelon’s *Télémaque* and Prévost’s *Cleveland*,” *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 179 (1979): 171; and the invocations of Fénelon’s “philosophie politique” in Gouhier, *Fénelon philosophe*, 118; and André Robinet, “Gloire et simplicité dans l’utopie fénelonienne,” *Revue de sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 61 (1977): 69. In this context see also Cuche’s recent suggestion that “la pensée philosophique de Fénelon a une consistance et une cohérence qui assurent à bon droit à l’archevêque le titre de philosophe” [“La philosophie de Fénelon devant la critique. A propos d’un mémoire de Jacques Rivière et d’un livre récent de François Trémolières,” *Dix-septième siècle* 70 (2018): 327–28]; and Fumaroli’s suggestion that while the various parts of Fénelon’s corpus seem “à première vue disparate et austère,” in fact “tout se tient chez Fénelon” (*Partis pris*, 178).

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

1. On the Mentor–Telemachus relationship as a model pedagogical relationship worthy of study in its own right, see esp. Jacques Le Brun, “Du privé au public: L’éducation du prince selon Fénelon,” in *Le savoir du Prince, du Moyen Âge aux Lumières*, ed. Ran Halevi (Paris: Fayard, 2002), 243; Emmanuel Bury, “La *paideia* du Télémaque: Miroir d’un prince chrétien et lettres profanes,” *Littératures classiques* 70 (2009): 83–86; and Robert Grandroute, *Le roman pédagogique de Fénelon à Rousseau* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1985), 58ff. George Armstrong Kelly similarly calls attention to the centrality of the mentor–pupil relationship in the *Dialogues of the Dead*; see his *Mortal Politics in Eighteenth-Century France* (Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo Press, 1986), 82.
2. Doohwan Ahn, Christoph Schmitt-Maass, and Stefanie Stockhorst, “Introduction: Early Modernism, Catholicism and the Role of the Subject—Fénelon as a Representative of the Age of Enlightenment,” in *Fénelon in the Enlightenment: Traditions, Adaptations, and Variations*, ed. Doohwan Ahn, Christoph Schmitt-Maass, and Stefanie Stockhorst (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014), 18.
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].