Looking for a «Patriot King» Scholar of the «Science of Politics»: The English Translation of Jacques-Joseph Duguet's *Institution d'un Prince* in the Walpole Era[1]

Aris Della Fontana, Institut des sciences sociales du politique (ISP), Université Paris Nanterre (Postdoc Mobility Fellowship, Swiss National Science Foundation)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36253/ds-15987

Abstract: This article analyses the English translation of Jacques-Joseph Duguet's *Institution d'un Prince* (1739). *The Institution of a Prince*, published in 1740 by Robert Dodsley, was the result of an editorial project orchestrated by the Patriot Opposition with two essential objectives. First, to use the contents of the *Institution* to criticise the Walpole government by exposing the political, economic and moral shortcomings that were leading Great Britain into decline. Second, to use the work as a tool to educate Frederick, Prince of Wales, ensuring that – unlike his father, George II – he would become a true «patriot king». This article also underscores that those who imported Duguet's text were careful to emphasise that the Jansenist abbot advocated an absolutist model of «pure» and «irresistible» monarchy – an aspect at odds with the Glorious Revolution's principles of limiting royal prerogative and sharing power between the king and Parliament. By addressing this apparent paradox, this case study contributes to the scholarship on the active role played by recipient entities in cultural transfers, implying that interpretation can be highly flexible and creative. Indeed, the English disseminators of the *Institution d'un Prince* did not treat the text with reverential awe; rather through the use of a hugely significant paratext and a 'creative' translation, they critiqued and selected Duguet's heterodox content to serve a political and intellectual agenda of which he himself would never have approved.

Keywords: Mirrors for Princes, Jansenism, Patriot Opposition, Walpole, Absolutism.

Introduction

The story of the *Institution d'un Prince* begins in the Trappist Abbey of Notre-Dame de Tamié, to where the Duke of Savoy, Victor Amadeus II (1666-1732), had retired in the summer of 1711. The Duke was looking for someone to write a text for the education of his eldest son, Victor Amadeus John Philip (1699-1715), and his request reached Arsène de Jougla, the abbot of Tamié, who suggested his *ami proche*, Jacques-Joseph Duguet (1649-1733), for the task. Duguet, a French Jansenist theologian who had taken refuge in Tamié after having refused the *Unigenitus* (1713)[2], agreed and completed much of the *Institution* by the end of 1715.

Since Duguet intended his work for strictly private use, it remained unpublished until 1739, when it appeared in Leiden, six years after his death[3]. Its combination of theoretical originality and practical value gave the *Institution* a notable European resonance, perhaps furthered by its condemnation by the papacy: on 22 May 1745, it was placed on the Index of Forbidden Books for advocating the principle of episcopal

[1] This article draws on a paper presented at the workshop *(Re)thinking Translations. Methodologies, Objectives, Perspectives*, held at the European University Institute on 11 and 12 October 2018 and organised by Professor Alessia Castagnino and Professor Ann Thomson. I would like to thank Professor Antonella Alimento for warmly encouraging me to explore the English adventure of Duguet's *Institution*. The same thought goes to Professor Mario Rosa, who passed away in 2022.

[2] On the life of Duguet, see: H. Savon, «Duguet, Jacques-Joseph», in *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, edited by A. C. Kors, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2003, vol. I, pp. 366-367. On this, see also the texts cited in footnote 4.

[3] J. J. Duguet, *Institution d'un prince, ou Traité des qualitez, des vertus et des devoirs d'un Souverain, Soit par rapport au Gouvernment Temporel de ses Etats, ou comme Chef d'une Société Chrétienne qui est nécessairement liée avec la Religion. En quatre Parties*, Jean Nourse, Londres [Leiden] 1739.

elections[4]. The work also crossed the Channel, with an English translation published in 1740 by Robert Dodsley (1704-1764)[5].

Dodsley was a rather singular character who had worked as a footman but, by 1735, had risen to become a bookseller, funding this ascent through both his prolific literary activity and a loan from Alexander Pope. Right from the start, Dodsley's publishing activities were closely linked to the Patriot Opposition and, with it, to the Country Party platform[6]. He was particularly associated with Cobham's Cubs[7], an Old Whig circle centred around Richard Temple[8], which included figures such as Richard Grenville, Thomas Pitt and George Lyttelton[9]. It was Lyttleton who spearheaded a campaign of «patriot writing» that culminated in this period, the late 1730s, and was aimed at deepening the theoretical and cultural foundations of the opposition. There are good reasons to believe that this translation aligned with this militant publishing initiative and fed into the Patriot Opposition's broader narrative[10]. The *Institution* attracted interest because it provided material for the criticism of Walpole's government while also being a source of ideas in the construction of a political alternative.

---

[4] On the publishing history of this work, as well as its significance as a *specula principum*, see: P. Stella, *Itinerari portorealistici. Jacques-Joseph Duguet (1649-1733) e le sue fortune in Italia*, Società editrice internazionale, Torino 1966, pp. 630-631; M. Rosa, *Settecento religioso. Politica della ragione e religione del cuore*, Marsilio, Venezia 1999, pp. 76-78; G. De Thieulloy, *Le prince dans les traités d'éducation jansénistes*, in *Le savoir du prince du Moyen Âge aux Lumières*, édité par R. Halévi, Fayard, Paris, 2002, pp. 261-293: 261 and 266-267; A. Alimento, *L'Institution d'un prince de l'abbé Duguet*, in *L'Institution du prince au XVIII^e siècle.* Actes du huitième colloque franco-italien des sociétés française et italienne d'étude du XVIII^e siècle tenu à Grenoble en octobre 1999, édité par G. Luciani et C. Volpilhac-Auger, Centre international d'étude du XVIII^e siècle, Paris 2003, pp. 105-114 and 107-108; M. Cottret, *L'*Institution d'un Prince *de Jacques-Joseph Duguet (Leyde, 1739). Un dernier miroir?*, in *Le Prince au miroir de la littérature politique de l'Antiquité aux Lumières*, édité par F. Lachaud et L. Scordia, Publications des universités de Rouen et du Havre, Rouen 2007, pp. 393-403: 393-394 and 399-400.

[5] J. J. Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince: Or, a Treatise of the Virtues and Duties of a Sovereign. Translated from the French of the Abbé Duguet*, R. Dodsley, London 1740, 2 vols.

[6] H. M. Solomon, *The Rise of Robert Dodsley: Creating the New Age of Print*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale 1996, pp. 50, 60, 62 and 71; I. Crowe, *Patriotism and Public Spirit: Edmund Burke and the Role of the Critic in Mid-18th-Century Britain*, Standford University Press, Standford 2012, p. 22. On the Patriot Opposition, see: C. Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole. Politics, Poetry, and National Myth, 1725–1742*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1994; M. Skjönsberg, *Patriots and the Country party tradition in the eighteenth century: the critics of Britain's fiscal-military state from Robert Harley to Catharine Macaulay*, «Intellectual History Review», 33, 2023, 1, pp. 83-100.

[7] On this, see: M. Kilburn, «Cobham's Cubs (*act.* 1734-1747)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004, online edition, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/93706> (01/2025).

[8] Temple, following a quarrel with Walpole (he had opposed the introduction of the general excise, and had criticised the abandonment of the investigation concerning the South Sea Company), had been dismissed from government circles. On Temple, see: M. Kilburn, «Temple, Richard, first Viscount Cobham (1675-1749)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004, online edition, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/27119> (01/2025).

[9] Much of Lyttelton's writings were published by Thomas Cooper, a trade publisher who worked with Dodsley. Since this professional title was used by booksellers to hide their participation in controversial publishing projects, we may hypothesise that, with regard to the publication of the works of Lyttelton, Dodsley sought the help of Cooper. On the close professional ties between Dodsley and Cooper, see: J. E. Tierney, *Introduction*, in *The Correspondence of Robert Dodsley (1733-1764)*, edited by J. E. Tierney, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988, pp. 3-61: 41-42.

[10] J. E. Tierney, «Dodsley, Robert (1704-1764)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7755> (01/2025); Solomon, *The Rise of Robert Dodsley*, cit. p. 51; P. Baines, J. Ferraro and P. Rogers, *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Eighteenth-Century Writing (1660–1789)*, Wiley-Blackwell, West Sussex 2011, p. 103.

Yet, as we know, translation – and reception more broadly – is never a passive process. Every act of cultural transfer entails the creative involvement of the transfer agent[11]. The *Institution* was thus reinterpreted and reshaped, with both text and paratext serving as instruments for this resemanticisation. Examining the translation thus offers the opportunity to decipher the intellectual efforts of the Patriot Opposition from a fresh and revealing viewpoint.

Rewarding merit and promoting virtue: an intelligent patriotism

Duguet offered a surprisingly modern analysis of social dynamics, attributing them to a single fundamental law: individual self-interest. All men seek happiness, and everything they do ultimately serves this goal. The sovereign, therefore, is like a conductor of an orchestra: his role is to coordinate these private interests, harmonising them to achieve the desired effect, which is to «faire concourir le bien particulier au bien public». Moreover, through a «étude particulière» that allows him to penetrate the *fond du coeur* of his subjects[12], the sovereign must recognise their natural proclivities and talents in order to «donner de l'autorité à proportion du mérite»[13].

For the Patriots, too, merit was a paramount concern, and their battle against corruption and favouritism reflected a commitment to rewarding «men of ability»[14]. In this sense, it is striking how closely the *Institution*'s denunciations of the trading of positions and the manipulation of the sovereign's dispensation by court favourites and by the prime minister mirrored the Patriots' criticisms of Walpole. Significantly, the English translation amplified these passages considerably[15]. Dodsley himself had written several works condemning the arrogance of the inept, who used the prestige of titles to hide their incipience and advance in

[11] P. Burke, *Cultures of translation in early modern Europe*, in *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, edited by P. Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007, pp. 7-38; S. Stockhorst, *Introduction. Cultural transfer through translation: a current perspective in Enlightenment studies*, in *Cultural Transfer through Translation. The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation*, edited by S. Stockhorst, Brill/Rodopi, Amsterdam/New York 2010, pp. 7-26; A. Thomson and S. Burrows, *Introduction*, in *Cultural Transfers. France and Britain in the Long Eighteenth Century*, edited by A. Thomson, S. Burrows and E. Dziembowski, Voltaire Foundation, Oxford 2010, pp. 1-18: 3 and pp. 13-14; L. Raw, *Introduction. Identifying Common Ground*, in *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation*, edited by L. Raw, Continuum, London/New York 2012, pp. 1-20; M. C. Pérez, *Introduction*, in *Apropos of ideology. Translation studies on ideology - Ideologies in translation studies*, edited by M. C. Pérez, Routledge, Abingdon/New York 2014, pp. 1-22; S. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, Routledge, New York/London 2014, pp. 11-15, 105, 118-124 and157-177.

[12] B. Papasogli, *Il «fondo del cuore». Figure dello spazio interiore nel Seicento francese*, Goliardica, Pisa 1991, p. 77; A. Alimento, *La direzione spirituale giansenista*, in *La direzione spirituale tra medioevo ed età moderna*, a cura di M. Catto, Il Mulino, Bologna 2004, pp. 71-103: 89.

[13] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 29, 35-37, 50-51, 64-65, 77-79, 82-85, 136, 207 and 285-286. See also: J. M. Smith, *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600–1789*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 1996, pp. 133-136; A. Alimento, *Entre rang et mérite. La réflexion économique de l'abbé Duguet*, in *Il pensiero gerarchico in Europa. XVIII-XIX secolo*, a cura di A. Alimento e C. Cassina, Olschki, Firenze 2002, pp. 11-30: 12, 19 and 21-29.

[14] H. Caton, *The Politics of Progress: The Origins and Development of the Commercial Republic (1600–1835)*, University of Florida Press, Gainesville 1988, p. 313.

[15] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit. p. 125 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 262; Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., p. 194 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, pp. 392-393; Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., p. 204 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, pp. 412-413.

society through adulation[16]. Such figures were nothing but «parasites of power»[17], as Paul Whitehead wrote in a text that earned him and Dodsley a questioning before the House of Lords and several days in custody (opposition circles promptly made Dodsley a martyr to freedom of press)[18]. To be a «Patriot», then, meant not only demanding that governments punish those who displayed a selfish insensitivity to the public interest[19] but also striving, in Duguet's words, to «remplir dignement les places»[20].

Yet, like Duguet, the Patriots did not dismiss the usefulness of individual self-interest. As Thomas Catesby argued in the *Reflections upon the Administration of Government* (1740), incentives were a political tool. Diligence in a chosen activity involved the pursuit of personal advantage while simultaneously advancing the public good. It was thus the government's duty to direct and make productive use of this «passion of life», that is, individual self-interest. Catesby believed that this principle was particularly applicable to the economic sphere, and in this regard he praised the Persia described by Xenophon, where industrious peasants were rewarded with bonuses[21]. Published by Dodsley in the same year, the *Institution* and the *Reflections* overlapped extensively. Duguet, too, had extolled both small-scale peasant property and the use of rewards as incentives for personal initiative[22]. However, it is interesting to note that the English translation of the *Institution* accentuates the primacy of public over private interest. This was probably driven by the pressing need to condemn the selfishness and voracity of Walpole and his associates. Duguet's original «faire concourir le bien particulier au bien public» was rendered as «make private subservient to public good»[23].

It is hardly surprising that another key theme shared by the *Institution* and the Patriot Opposition was the centrality of virtue. Duguet argued that seeking to understand man as he really is does not require abandoning morality. A wise sovereign, he believed, could mitigate the effects of original sin and elevate his subjects to greater purity[24]. More significantly, Duguet insisted on the strong link between this moral progress and the qualitative improvement of political, social and economic life. He did not advocate turning society into a vast monastery: rather, he thought that ethically reprehensible behaviour yields only fleeting benefits, which soon implode, with tragic consequences. This principle applied first and foremost to the

---

[16] R. Dodsley, *The Toy-Shop: A Dramatick Satire*, L. Gilliver, London 1735, pp. 5, 9, 12-13, 25, 28-31, 34 and 45; [R. Dodsley], *Beauty: Or, the Art of Charming*, L. Gilliver, London 1735, pp. 2-3, 6 and 8-9; R. Dodsley, *The King and the Miller of Mansfield: A Dramatick Tale*, R. Dodsley and T. Cooper, London 1737, pp 12, 15, 26-27, 29 and 31; R. Dodsley, *The Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green*, R. Dodsley and T. Cooper, London 1741, p. 10.

[17] P. Whitehead, *Manners: A Satire*, R. Dodsley, London 1739, pp. 4-5 and 7-11

[18] Solomon, *The Rise of Robert Dodsley*, cit., pp. 72-75.

[19] See: R. Glover, *The Preface*, in R. Glover, *Leonidas: a Poem*, R. Dodsley, London 1737, pp. VI-VII, XII and XV.

[20] See also: A. Pope, *The First Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated*, R. Dodsley, London 1737, pp 5, 11, 13 and 21.

[21] [T. Catesby], *Some Reflections upon the Administration of Government*, R. Dodsley, London 1740, pp. 34-53, 64 and 104. For the attribution of this text to Catesby, see: «Thomas Catesby, Lord Paget (1689–1742)», in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1715–1754*, edited by R. Sedgwick (1970), online edition, <https://shorturl.at/OLxQB> (01/2025).

[22] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 210-211.

[23] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., p. 29 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. I, p. 61.

[24] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 243-250 and 361-363; J. J. Duguet, *Lettre sur la grâce générale*, in *Recueil de quatres opuscules fort importants de feu M. l'abbé Duguet*, Aux dépens de la Compagnie, Utrecht 1737, pp. 20-24, 44-45 and 82. See also: R. Taveneaux, *Jansénisme et politique*, Colin, Paris 1965, pp. 7-13, 17-21, 25-29 and 100; D. K. Van Kley, *The Religious Origins of the French Revolution. From Calvin to the Civil Constitution, 1560-1791*, Yale University Press, Yale 1996, pp. 58-60; M. Cottret, *Jansénismes et Lumières*, Albin Michel, Paris 1998, p. 169; C. Maire, *De la cause de Dieu à la cause de la Nation. Le jansénisme au XVIII^e siècle*, Gallimard, Paris 1998, pp. 46, 86-87, 170, 175 and 181.

sovereign – «le chef, le lien, et le centre de la Société» – who was called upon to reject the reason of state. A dishonest ruler, Duguet warned, would legitimise distrust and with it internal conflict, which eats away at the connective tissue of society, creating the conditions for a vicious circle of social and material calamities[25].

Those who imported the *Institution* into England could not have failed to appreciate this insight. Indeed, the Patriots also believed that the atrophy of «manners» was calamitous. In 1738, Dodsley published Samuel Johnson's *London*, a biting satire of the «degen'rate Days» into which the country had sunk[26]. The same year, he published Pope's *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight*, which lamented the «Affront» to «Virtue» and «Truth» and foresaw nothing short of «Ruin»[27]. Catesby's *Reflections* also closely mirrored the *Institution*, openly attacking Machiavelli and the advocates of cynicism. Since only good men could be good subjects, and since bad policies produced bad outcomes, teaching the importance of honour and probity was, in Catesby's words, the «Ground-work» upon which the fate of society depended. Only a «bad administration» would neglect this essential duty[28].

Civilizing but jealous: the ambivalence of commerce

Walpole's was precisely one such administration. By legitimizing cynicism and deception, he spread a contagious and destructive distrust among Englishmen. This was an issue that caused serious problems beyond the political and social sphere, as the success of commerce also depended on virtuous behaviour. Trade, being rooted in personal interactions, lost its benefits when it was conducted on the basis of deceit. For Duguet, a wise merchant was an honest merchant.

It is telling, then, that in a work written in 1748, Dodsley described commerce as the principal agent of civilisation: it weakened the «language of power», laid the foundations for «justice» and «good Faith», and even necessitated a «political constitution»[29]. A similar view was held by another member of the Patriot Opposition, Richard Glover, who perceived commerce as a «gracious power» equally vital to the social, civil, cultural and human development of society. He therefore denounced the Spanish as the «shame of polish'd lands» for violating established agreements by confiscating English goods. The War of Jenkins' Ear (1739-1748) was therefore legitimate, as it protected Great Britain's «independence» and «liberty» from Spanish insolence[30]. Duguet justified war in similar terms, but, above all, he argued that international

[25] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, pp. 97-101, 232-257, 333-338, 341-48, 357-382 and 389.
[26] S. Johnson, *London: A Poem in Imitation of the Third Satire of Juvenal*, R. Dodsley, London 1738, p. 5. On this important poem, see: *Eighteenth-Century Poetry. An Annotated Anthology*, edited by D. Fairer, C. Gerrard, Blackwell, Malden/Oxford/Victoria 2004, pp. 280-288.
[27] A. Pope, *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight. Dialogue II*, R. Dodsley, London 1738, p. 13.
[28] [Catesby], *Some Reflections upon the Administration of Government*, cit., pp. 2, 4-7, 13-17 and 21-27. For an overview of the eighteenth-century British debate on virtue and morality, see: L. E. Klein, *Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England*, «The Historical Journal», 32, September 1989, 3, pp. 583-605; S. Burtt, *Virtue Transformed. Political Argument in England, 1688-1740*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992, pp. 4-18, 30-35, 102-109, 122-123; C. Maurer, *Self-Interest and Sociability*, in *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by J. A. Harris, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2013, pp. 291-314: 291-293 and 301-304; D. Perinetti, *The Nature of Virtue*, in *idem*, cit., pp. 333-368: 333-336 and 342.
[29] R. Dodsley, *The Preceptor: Containing a General Course of Education*, J. Dodsley, London 1769 [1748], vol. II, pp. 323, 383, 385 and 388-390.
[30] R. Glover, *London: Or, the Progress of Commerce. A Poem*, T. Cooper, London 1733, pp. 4, 11-12, 21-22 and 27. See also: *A Short Account of the Application to Parliament made by the Merchants of London: Upon the Neglect of their*

relations should be governed by justice and good faith – not only because this was morally correct but also because it was commercially advantageous. In short, honesty and competition were not at odds[31].

Virtue, however, was not enough. A positive trade balance also required sound economic policy. Duguet understood this well, and indeed advised the sovereign to promote agriculture and, above all, manufacturing[32]. However, because Duguet saw material development and the protection of individuals from harmful economic processes as inseparable, the *Institution* advocated curtailing industrial development and technological progress whenever such dynamics threatened full employment[33]. The English translation, however, revised this recommendation. In addition to an *amplificatio* in which «il [le roi] regardera cette partie de son administration et de son économie [le développement des manufactures] comme l'une des plus importans au bien de l'état» became «he will look upon this part of his administration and oeconomy as the most important to the publick good[34]», the translation actually removed the passage in which Duguet urged the sovereign to «s'opposer à toutes les inventions qui font qu'un seul homme tient lieu de plusieurs, et qui leur ôtent par conséquent le moyen de travailler et de vivre»[35].

This omission should not surprise us. Most seventeenth-century Commonwealthmen and all their Real Whigs heirs maintained that commercial success depended not so much on natural resources as on the human labour that transformed them[36]. Dodsley, in the aforementioned *Preceptor* (1748), praised the «prodigious benefits resulting from every kind of manufacture», which he saw as the logical outcome of the «superiority of art over nature»[37]. Moreover, England did not suffer from technological unemployment. On the contrary, industrial development alleviated the pressure of the country's inadequate agricultural resources and, by encouraging dual occupations and seasonal variation in working patterns, helped minimise underemployment[38].

Trade, edited by. R. Glover, M. Cooper, London 1751 [1743], pp. 4 and 28; [T. Lyttelton], *Considerations upon the Present State of our Affairs at Home and Abroad*, T. Cooper, London 1739, pp. 6-7.

[31] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, pp. 289-294 and 301. In this sense it has to be said that, while the Patriots firmly upheld the importance of achieving commercial primacy, they never went so far as to advocate trampling on the rights of other countries or violating international agreements.

[32] F. Vanhoorne, *Du jansénisme au mercantilisme. La politique de l'Abbé Duguet*, «Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique», 91, 1996, 1, pp. 41-65. On the intertwining of Jansenism and political economy, see: J.-C. Perrot, *Une histoire intellectuelle de l'économie politique (XVII^{e}-XVIII^{e} siècle)*, Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris 1992, pp. 89-90 and 347-353; J. Heilbron, *French Moralists and the Anthropology of the Modern Era: on the Genesis of the Notions of "Interest" and "Commercial Society"*, in *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity. Conceptual Change in Context, 1750-1850*, edited by J. Heilbron, L. Magnusson and B. Wittrock, Springer Science and Business Media, Dordrecht 1998, pp. 77-106; A. Orain, *The Second Jansenism and the Rise of French Eighteenth-Century Political Economy*, «History of Political Economy», 46, 2014, 3, pp. 463-490.

[33] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 55-70 and 219-220.

[34] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., p. 219 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 440.

[35] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit. p. 220 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 441.

[36] I. Kramnick, *Republican Revisionism Revisited*, «The American Historical Review», 87, June 1982, 3, pp. 629-664: 644-645 and 661-663; S. Pincus, *Neither Machiavellian Moment nor Possessive Individualism: Commercial Society and the Defenders of the English Commonwealth*, «The American Historical Review», 103, June 1998, 3, pp. 705-736: 712, 717-722 and 736; B. Worden, *Republicanism and the Restoration, 1660-1683*, in *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society 1649-1776*, edited by D. Wootton, Standford University Press, Standford 1994, pp. 139-193: 173-174 and 188.

[37] Dodsley, *The Preceptor*, cit., vol. II, p. 438.

[38] J. Mokyr, *Technological change, 1700-1830*, in *The Economic History of Britan since 1700. Vol. 1. 1700-1860*, edited by R. Floud and D. N. McCloskey, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 12-43: 13; K. Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750*, Penguin Books. London, 2002, pp. 227-228, 237-239 and 274.

Opposition to «luxury», on the other hand, was unanimous[39]. Like Duguet, Catesby believed that «prodigality» and «dissoluteness» led to rising imports and declining exports. This was also tied to the «universal Depravation of Manners», which blinded the population to its own condition and stopped it from finding a remedy, hastening its «Decay»[40]. In this sense, Lyttelton, who preached «national and private frugality», warned that England was following in the footsteps of Rome: «she was arrived at her highest degree of power and glory, and by a natural consequence of excessive prosperity was fallen into [...] vices and corruptions»[41]. Thus, by extolling frugality, both Duguet and the Patriot Opposition emphasised its moral and commercial value. However, the Patriots placed greater weight on the latter. It is interesting to note that the *Institution*'s English translation accentuated and clarified Duguet praise of a country's frugality and industriousness. «Il faut qu'il ait peu de besoins, et que les autres états ne puissent se passer de son commerce» became «it must have few wants when other nations have great occasion for the produce of the country»[42].

According to this view, "luxury", in addition to endangering the moral health of citizens, became economically harmful when it was fuelled by the importation of foreign goods. Those who indulged in it were therefore engaging in unpatriotic behaviour, which impoverished Britain while enriching its competitors.

But what motivated this commercial «Jealousy» between countries? While Duguet only implied an answer[43], the publications of the Patriot Opposition – which, in this case, reflected a belief widespread in eighteenth-century England – made it explicit. After the «Military Revolution»[44], the «Balance of Power» came to depend on the «Balance of Commerce». Success in international markets was therefore essential to safeguarding national independence and liberty[45]. Only by recognising this conviction can we fully understand the opposition to Walpole's government. His submissiveness in the face of Spanish abuses, along

[39] On the luxury debate, see: M. Berg and E. Eger, *The Rise and Fall of the Luxury Debates*, in *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century. Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*, edited by M. Berg and E. Eger, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke 2003, pp. 7-27; I. Hont, *The early Enlightenment debate on commerce and luxury*, in *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, edited by M. Goldie and R. Wokler, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006, pp. 377-418; R. Whatmore, *Luxury, commerce and the rise of political economy*, in *The Oxford handbook of British philosophy in the eighteent century*, edited by J. A. Harris, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2013, pp. 575-595.

[40] [Catesby], *Some Reflections upon the Administration of Government*, cit., pp. 53-4, 63-64 and 103.

[41] G. Lyttelton, *An Epistle to Mr. Pope. From Rome, 1730*, in *The Works of George Lord Lyttelton*, edited by G. E. Ayscough, J. Williams, Dublin 1775, p. 454; G. Lyttelton, *Observations on the Life of Cicero*, Lawton Gilliver, London 1733, pp. 1-2; [G. Lyttelton], *Letters from a Persian in England*, J. Millan, London 1735, pp. 10, 14, 22-23, 34-35, 74, 99-100, 173-176, 180, 206, 212-219 and 222-223; [G. Lyttelton], *A reply to a pamphlet intitled, Popular prejudices against the Convention and Treaty with Spain*, T. Cooper, London 1739, pp. 6-7; [Lyttelton], *Considerations upon the Present State of our Affairs at Home and Abroad*, cit., pp. 4-5, 10-11, 15, 19 and 25.

[42] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., p. 215 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 434.

[43] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 71-78 and 119-123.

[44] G. Parker, *The Military Revolution. Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500–1800*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1988.

[45] On this important topic, see: J. Dunn, *The Economic Limits to Modern Politics*, in *The Economics Limits to Modern Politics*, edited by J. Dunn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990, pp. 15-40; A. Finkelstein, *Harmony and the Balance: An Intellectual History of Seventeenth-Century English Economic Thought*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 2000, pp. 93-97; S. Pincus, *From holy cause to economic interest*, in *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration*, edited by A. Houston and S. Pincus, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001, pp. 272-298: 272-275, 280, 283, 286-294 and 298; I. Hont, *Jealousy of Trade. International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge/London, 2005, pp. 1-6, 10 and 185-187; D. Onnekink and G. Rommelse, *Introduction*, in *Ideology and Foreign Policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)*, edited by D. Onnekink and G. Rommelse, Routledge, New York 2016, pp. 1-10: 5-6.

with his economic and fiscal mismanagement (the Patriots criticized the negative impact of excessive taxation on trade) undermined the conquests of the Glorious Revolution. Lyttelton had no doubts: even in a «balanc'd world» governed by the «law of nations», Great Britain had to be «feared» again by relaunching the competitiveness of its goods and reinvigorating colonial trade through the protection of the «freedom of navigation» – in short, by returning to view «whatever affects our Trade» as «our nearest Concern» and «our principale Care»[46].

Imagining and educating a «Patriot King»: Frederick of Wales as a «Great Instrument»

Faced with such an emergency, the cause of the Patriot Opposition gained a legitimacy that would otherwise have been inconceivable. It was only right to look with disgust upon those who were bringing the country to ruin, and it was therefore reasonable – rather than seditious – to envisage a radical alternative to an incapable, irresponsible and corrupt ruling class. Thus, in 1737, the opponents of Walpole and of George II (1683-1760) turned to the king's eldest son, Frederick (1707-1751), who had already been contemplating the creation of an alternative court. The same year, the thirty-year-old Prince of Wales visited Temple's country residence, which had effectively become the opposition's headquarters[47].

Thus, by means of a vehement series of publications, mostly edited by Dodsley, Frederick's image underwent a process of myth making. Paul Whitehead's *Manners* (1739) called for his coronation, portraying him as the sovereign who could regenerate Great Britain[48]. Henri Brooke's *Gustavus Vasa* (1739) depicted the Swedish sovereign – «the Deliverer of his Country» – in a way that clearly invited a comparison to Frederick[49]. The Prologue to this tragedy crystal-clear expounded the ideals of the Patriot Opposition:

> Britons! this Night presents a State distress'd,
> Tho' brave, yet vanquish'd, and tho' great;
> oppress'd;
> Vice, rav'ning Vulture, on her Vitals prey'd,
> Her Peers, her Prelates, fell Corruption sway'd;
> Their Rights, for Pow'r, th' Ambitious weakly sold,
> The Wealthy, poorly, for superfluous Gold;
> Hence wasting Ills, hence sev'ring Factions rose,
> And gave large Entrance to invading Foes;
> Truth, Justice, Honour fled th' infected Shore,
> For Freedom, sacred Freedom was no more.[50]

---

[46] G. Lyttelton, *To Mr. Glover. On his Poem of Leonidas. Written in the Year 1734*, [1734], in *The Poetical Works of George Lord Lyttelton*, Cadell and Davies, London 1801, pp. 136-138: 137; [Lyttelton], *Considerations upon the Present State of our Affairs at Home and Abroad.*, cit., pp. 3 and 16.
[47] Kilburn, «Temple, Richard», cit.. On Frederick, see: M. Kilburn, «Frederick Lewis, prince of Wales (1707-1751)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004, online edition, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10140> (01/2025).
[48] Whitehead, *Manners*, cit., p. 20.
[49] H. Brooke, *Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of his Country. A Tragedy*, R. Dodsley, London 1739.
[50] *Idem*, p. XXI.

For his part, Dodsley, in *The King and the Miller of Mansfield* (1737), highlighted the virtues of a monarch who was aware of his status as a «common man» but heroically committed to protecting virtue[51]. Notably, the play's first theatrical performance was held at Leicester House, Frederick's residence[52].

The Prince of Wales seemed to have realised the political value of patronage[53]. On 1 August 1740 – just two months after the publication of the *Institution* (24 May) – the masque *Alfred* was staged at Cliveden, Frederick's country estate. The play celebrated the exploits of Alfred the Great (849-889), the ruler who had resisted the Viking invasion. Like Frederick, Alfred saw himself as a «great instrument» called upon to save his land from the «fierce oppression» from abroad and deliver it from men driven by power and greed. Alfred's deeds foreshadowed those of Frederick: knowing that he reigned over «free-born men», he acted as their «common father», a «patron of honour, virtue and religion», and a champion of justice and commerce. In the play, Alfred also sees glimpses of the future deeds of Elizabeth I, who defeated the Spanish Armada (1588), of William of Orange, who annihilated «superstition» and «oppressive power», but also of a future sovereign, who clearly represents Frederick[54].

Yet Frederick, still only thirty, was unprepared for such a role and required both political and intellectual education. Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751), founder of *The Craftsman*, the leading anti-Walpole journal of its time, provided it. His *Idea of a Patriot King*, a «coterie text» privately circulated from 1738[55], outlined the attributes of a sovereign who, while constrained by laws and obligated to govern through Parliament, remained a true «guide» and «great man» committed to the nation's moral and material regeneration. Such a king would cultivate virtue, reward ability, protect liberties and pursue commercial success[56]. As an alternative to both the Jacobite Pretender and the existing government, this «Patriot King» offered a dual advantage. Unlike the uninspiring George II[57], it projected an aura of myth and *grandeur*, satisfying the population's symbolic and emotional needs. At the same time, he could also appeal

---

[51] R. Dodsley, *The King and the Miller of Mansfield: A Dramatick Tale*, R. Dodsley and T. Cooper, London 1737, pp. 48 e 51.

[52] Solomon, *The Rise of Robert Dodsley*, cit., pp. 54-57; Tierney, *Introduction*, in *The Correspondence of Robert Dodsley*, cit., p. 6.

[53] Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole*, cit., pp. 190-197; D. H. Griffin, *Patriotism and Poetry in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, pp. 185-187.

[54] [D. Mallet and J. Thomson], *Alfred: A Masque. Represented before their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, at Cliffden, on the first of August, 1740*, A. Millar, London 1740, pp. 10-11, 18-19, 30 and 34-35. On *Alfred*, see: O. J. W. Cox, *Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the First Performance of 'Rule, Britannia!'*, «The Historical Journal», 56, 2013, 4, pp. 931-954: 932, 937-940 and 946-948.

[55] Bolingbroke «wrote it in the autumn of 1738 while staying at Twickenham with Alexander Pope. [...] Lyttelton had approached Pope in October 1738 to ask him to help the opposition, in particular by providing advice to Frederick, [...] which might "Animate [him] to [...] the Virtue least known to Princes [...] Love of the Publick". [...] It is possible that Pope passed the task of counselling Frederick and his advisers to his house-guest, and that *The Idea of a Patriot King* was the resulting mirror for a prince ; Lyttelton later wrote that it "was originally writ in the form of a letter to me. I being then in the Prince's service"». *Bolingbroke. Political Writings*, edited by D. Armitage, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997, p. XLI.

[56] Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole*, cit., pp. 185-187, 190-200 and 204-211; D. Armitage, *A Patriot for Whom? The Afterlives of Bolingbroke's Patriot King*, «The Journal of British Studies», 36, October 1997, 4, pp. 397-418: 401-405; D. Ahn, *The politics of royal education. Xenophon's Education of Cyrus in early eighteenth-century Europe*, «The Leadership Quarterly», 19, 2008, pp. 439-452: 446-448; G. Glickman, *Parliament, the Tories and Frederick, Prince of Wales*, «Parliamentary History», 30, June 2011, 2, pp. 120-141: 120-127.

[57] But on this see: H. Smith, *Georgian Monarchy. Politics and Culture, 1714-1760*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006, pp. 2, 15-16, 64, 75, 81, pp. 95-181 and 245.

to the Tories, who traditionally emphasised the importance of the sovereign's role. It is reasonable to assume that the *Institution* aligned with this broader strategy of political propaganda and intellectual refinement, intended for Frederick and his circle of supporters. The aspects of the work considered thus far suggest a sort of «Introduction to the Sciences of Politics», «very proper for all who would understand minutely the Nature of Government»[58].

But two other factors made Duguet's work compulsive reading. Firstly, it presented the image of a compassionate and accessible sovereign – one who was competent and committed to earning his subject's devotion. According to the *Institution*, kings were to play a paternal, pastoral and Christic role, sacrificing their lives for people's well-being. This image stood in stark contrast that of George II, who, according to the opposition, ruled with lazy aloofness, prioritising Hanoverian interests over British ones[59].

Secondly, the work urged the sovereign to respect the laws and rights of the subjects. Notably, the English translation systematically reinforced the intensity of passages in which Duguet condemned the overreach of sovereign power and its insensitivity to the public good. For example, the rethorical question «comment [...] peut-on penser qu'un prince n'ait qu'à […] soutenir ses commandemens par la force, et qu'il ne faille pour regner qu'être absolu», became «how [...] can we imagine that a prince has nothing to do but to [...] support his arbitrary will by force, and that to reign it is only necessary to be despotick». Similarly, the exclamation «quelle difference entre un prince [...] qui veut que tous les autres soient heureux aussi-bien que lui, qu'ils le soient par lui [...]; et un prince qui veut être heureux tout seul», was rendered as «what an immense difference is there between a prince [...] whose earnest desire is that all mankind may be happy as himself, and that they may be so by his means [...]; and a prince who would be happy alone». Elsewhere, «les Princes, à qui tout obéït, et qui ne sont environnez que de Flatteurs» became «Princes environed with Flatterers and accustomed to uncontrouled Rule», and finally, «le Pouvoir arbitraire [...] trouve de la bassesse à donner d'autres motifs de ses actions que sa volonté», was sharpened into «despotic Power [...] thinks it mean to give any other Reason for his Actions but his Will and Pleasure»[60].

Moreover, Duguet believed that before ascending the throne, a prince would benefit from experiencing adversity – living under sovereigns «peu dignes de commander», being «exposé à l'envie et à la calomnie», and facing «en péril à cause de son mérite et de sa vertu». He described a sovereign «obligé de fléchir sous des Ministres fiers, durs, insolens» and «témoin de l'oppression des foibles, et de la cabale de ceux qui ne pensoient qu'à se conserver l'autorité»[61]. This was a reality Frederick could easily recognise as his own.

---

[58] As the advertisements of the 1750s and 1760s put it. See, for example: N. Cotton, *Visions in verse, for the entertainment and instruction of younger minds. The third edition, revis'd and enlarg'd*, R. Dodsley and M. Cooper, London 1752, p. 138.

[59] On this, see: A. C. Thompson, *Britain, Hanover and the Protestant Interest, 1688-1756*, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2006; N. Harding, *Hanover and the British Empire, 1700-1837*, Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2007; *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714-1837*, edited by B. Simms and T. Riotte, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007.

[60] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un Prince*, cit., p. 23 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. I, pp. 46–47; Duguet, *Institution d'un Prince*, cit., p. 180 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 364; Duguet, *Institution d'un Prince*, cit., p. 181 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 367.

[61] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 125-126.

Making the* Institution *palatable in England: Duguet's absolutism, «our Present very happy Establishment», and «Legal Tyranny»

One final factor contributed to the success of the *Institution*: Duguet's exemplarity. According to the anonymous author of the «Letter to the Publisher» – a key text that followed the translation's frontispiece – he was to be admired for addressing a future «absolute prince» without surrendering his «Freedom» and «Boldness». These qualities, the letter argued, had become rare in England, despite its «free government». Instead, a «servile Adulation» now prevailed, or worse, there was a tendency to disguise «blind […] Submission to Governors» with an «Appearance of Virtue». By doing so, one forfeited the right to question the «Reason» and «Tendency» of political measures. «To think freely, and to declare our Sentiments as freely» was «a Part of the Glorious Right and Treasure which the Division of Power and other Orders in our Constitution are designed and adapted to preserve». Only by exercising this right with «Jealousy» could the English avoid becoming «Slaves»[62].

What dangers might have prompted such concerns? The «Letter» focused on the health of «civil Government», which depended on an «equal Balance of Power» and the «uniform Operation of all the various Orders which compose it». Yet one of these had now lost its «Integrity», undermining the very notion of «Constitution» and leading to an oligarchic drift[63]. Indeed, those with voting rights, in particular members of the House of Commons, had become vulnerable to the «Corruption» of the Court. For the Patriot Opposition a great cause for concern was the perception that the Court was increasing its power of acquisition. On the one hand, parliamentary cronyism had intensified due to the executive's expanding financial resources. On the other, the growing public administration and the presence of a standing army created a growing number of «salaried servants of the state». More concerning still, the executive exploited the mechanism of interests, using public debt to bind citizen-creditors to itself. Many therefore believed Parliament was incapable of checking the power of the Court and denounced what they called a «Legal Tyranny». Faced with this escalating threat, the Patriot Opposition saw it as grounds for political action in defence of the «Revolution Principles»[64].

However, the author of the «Letter» – in his desire to serve as a consistent spokesman for this political sensibility – also drew attention to the *Institution*'s more problematic aspects. While he praised Duguet for demonstrating that subjects possessed «unalienable Rights» and that the «true *Grandeur*» of sovereigns lay in the happiness of their people, he did not ignore the fact that this *speculum principis* reaffirmed the indivisible, unlimited and irresistible nature of monarchical power, while excluding the possibility of any contract between the ruler and the ruled. According to Duguet, in fact, self-limitation was the defining

[62] [Anonyme], *Letter to the Publisher*, in Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., pp. VI-X.
[63] *Idem*, pp. XI-XIV.
[64] On this, see: K. Wilson, *A Dissident Legacy: Eighteenth Century Popular Politics and the Glorious Revolution*, in *Liberty Secured? Britain Before and After 1688*, edited by J. R. Jones, Standford University Press, Standford 1992, pp. 299-344: 312-313; Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole*, cit., pp. 10, 19, 22-23 and 189; K. Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1995, pp. 3-11, 26, 42-83 and 117-136; J. Champion, *"Anglia Libera". Commonwealth Politics in the Early Years of George I*, in *Cultures of Whiggism. New Essays on Enlgish Literature and Culture in the Long Eighteenth-Century*, edited by D. Womersley, University of Delaware Press, Newark 2005, pp. 86-107: 99-101.

feature of absolutism. From this premise arose the cardinal political value of princely education: since a king had the capacity to commit evil, and no institution or individual could restrain him, shaping his heart at a young age was the only way to prevent despotism[65].

Of course, no aspersions were cast on Duguet. Given that his pupil was destined to become an «absolute Prince», he had not dared «dispute» such principles. It was therefore necessary to make allowances, and not categorise this Jansenist abbot as a crypto-Jacobite. In any case, the English reader had never been in danger of being seduced by this political paradigm, for he was well aware of the «Foundation» of «our present very happy Establishment». As the «Letter» explained, sovereign authority had been voluntarily instituted by men, designed as a power «ballanced by Division» and «circumscribed by Laws». This was the only configuration in harmony with «Reason» and the «Law of Nature», «which is the unchangeable approving Will of God». If rulers strayed from this framework, it was the duty of all to safeguard their rights[66].

In connection with this, the *Institution* cited the existence of individuals who, disapproving of «commandement absolu», asserted their right to participate in «déliberations publiques». English readers likely recognised themselves in this description, as was perhaps confirmed by the translation, which intensified the tone of that particular passage: «se mécontentent aisément […] si l'on ne leur montre que le commandement absolu» became «are easily dissatisfied if they think themselves [...] treated in an absolute or despotic manner»[67].

Conclusion

The *Institution* strongly appealed to the Patriot Opposition. Its unwavering emphasis on merit and virtue, its focus on economic development – especially commercial competition – and, not least, its role as a pedagogical tool for the moral and political education of the Prince of Wales made it both compelling and useful. These qualities ensured its importation into Great Britain. However, through both the text and its accompanying paratext, the translation reshaped Duguet's words, effectively producing a second, that is, new, text. On the one hand, passages that were of most interest were emphasized. On the other, the «Letter to the Publisher», which preceded Duguet's text, served to 'domesticate it', highlighting that the absolutist constitutional framework presented in the *Institution* was incompatible with the spirit of the Glorious Revolution.

---

[65] Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., pp. 2-10, 13-19, 22, 41-42, 111-113, 125-133, 138-144 and 177-181. On this, see: N. O. Keohane, *Nonconformist Absolutism in Louis XIV's France: Pierre Nicole and Denis Veiras*, «Journal of the History of Ideas», 35:4 (October-December 1974), pp. 579-596; G. De Thieulloy, *Le prince dans les traités d'éducation jansénistes*, in *Le savoir du prince du Moyen Âge aux Lumières*, édité par R. Halévi, Fayard, Paris 2002, pp. 261-293: 278 and 281-282; C. Chopelin-Blanc, *L'*Institution d'un Prince *de Duguet, un traité d'éducation à la charnière des XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles*, «Chrétiens et sociétés», 18 (2012), pp. 19-38; A. Jouanna, *Le Prince Absolu. Apogée et déclin de l'imaginaire monarchique*, Gallimard, Paris 2014, pp. 58-59, 63-71, 247 and 249; N. Reinhardt, *Voices of Conscience. Royal Confessors and Political Counsel in Seventeenth-Century Spain and France*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2016, pp. 365-369.

[66] [Anonyme], *Letter to the Publisher*, in Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., p. VII and pp. IX-XIV. On this see: L. G. Schwoerer, *The Right to resist*, in *Political discourse in early modern Britain*, edited by N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1993, pp. 232-252; M. Goldie, *The English system of liberty*, in *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006, edited by M. Goldie and R. Wokler, pp. 40-78.

[67] Compare: Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, cit., p. 134 with Duguet, *The Institution of a Prince*, cit., vol. II, p. 277.