

# *political economy* Studies in the Surplus Approach

volume 4, number 1, 1988

- 3 **Piero Tani**, Flows, Funds, and Sectorial Interdependence  
in the Theory of Production
- 23 **Robert Boyer and Pascal Petit**, The Cumulative Growth Model Revisited
- 45 **Marcelo de Paiva Abreu**, On the Memory of Bankers: Brazilian Foreign Debt,  
1824-1943
- 83 **Pier Francesco Asso**, Bilateralism, Trade Agreements and Political Economists in  
the 1930s: Theories and Events Underlying Hirschman's Index
- 111 **Albert O. Hirschman**, Statistical Study of the Trend of Foreign Trade Toward  
Equilibrium and Bilateralism
- 125 **Roberto Zapperi**, For a New Edition of the Writings of François Quesnay.  
Bibliographical Revisions and Additions
- 153 **Piero Sraffa**, A Letter to Luigi Einaudi on the "Physiocratie"

# For a New Edition of the Writings of François Quesnay\*

## Bibliographical Revisions and Additions

Roberto Zapperi

The first collection of Quesnay's writings goes back, as far as one can tell, to the writer's own initiative, though he handed over the editorship to his pupil, Pierre-Samuel Dupont. *Physiocratie*<sup>1</sup> appeared, in still rather obscure circumstances,<sup>2</sup> in November 1767. It collects in two volumes with continuous pagination, some of the most important writings, certainly chosen by Quesnay himself who, for the occasion, considerably reworked and extended those previously published and added an entirely new work (*Second Problème Economique*). The book contains the following writings: *Le droit naturel*; *Analyse du Tableau économique*; *Maximes générales du gouvernement économique d'un royaume agricole* (vol. I); *Problème économique*; *Du commerce. Premier dialogue entre Mr. H. et Mr. N.*; *Sur les travaux des artisans. Second dialogue*; *Second problème économique* (vol. II). With the single exception of the *Second problème économique* and the *Maximes* which reproduced, with some modifications and additions, the text of the *Extrait des Economies Royales de M. de Sully*, and of the third edition of the *Tableau Economique*, the rest of the writings had all appeared in the "Journal de

\* This article originally appeared in Italian under the title "Per una nuova edizione degli scritti di François Quesnay. Revisioni e integrazioni bibliografiche", *Annali della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi*, vol. VI, 1972. The author regrets that in the long period that has elapsed funds have not been made available, either in Italy or in France, for a new edition of the works of Quesnay, so that economists interested in the subject will still be compelled to approach it through the old editions. It is hoped that the present work will help them to decide which editions are reliable and which must be used with caution. The translation from the Italian was made by Derrick Plant.

<sup>1</sup> Cfr. J. CONAN, *Les débuts de Dupont de Nemours et la publication de la "Physiocratie"*, "Revue d'histoire économique et sociale", 1955, pp. 206-223; L. EINAUDI, *A propos de la date de publication de la "Physiocratie"*, in *François Quesnay et la Physiocratie*, I, Paris, 1958, pp. 1-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Physiocratie, ou Constitution naturelle du gouvernement le plus avantageux au genre humain*, recueil publié par Du Pont, des Sociétés royales d'agriculture de Soissons et d'Orléans, et correspondant de la Société d'émulation de Londres, Leyde; et Paris, Merlin, 1768; *Discussions et développemens sur quelques-unes des notions de l'économie politique, pour servir de seconde partie au recueil intitulé: Physiocratie*, Leyde; et Paris, Merlin, 1767.

l'agriculture, du commerce, et des finances" in the course of the years 1765 and 1766, during which Dupont acted as editor. He prefaced the entire collection with a long *Discours de l'éditeur* (vol. I, pp. I-CI) and a *Table sommaire* (pp. CII-CXX), and each single article with an *Avis de l'éditeur*.

The *Physiocratie* has till today been considered to be a choice of the most authoritative of Quesnay's writings, in conformance with the author's last wishes and with his most mature positions in matters of theory. However, strong reservations as to its reliability have been raised in the past by Schelle and now once more by Marguerite Kuczynski, following the discovery of one of the extremely rare copies of the third edition of the *Tableau économique*.<sup>3</sup> A comparison between the *Maximes* and the *Extraits*, which served as a test, made it possible to ascertain that the former volume reproduced the old text of the latter in a new edition, which is guided by a strong preoccupation with systematization and degenerates at times into the heavily doctrinaire. The fact that the publication of the *Physiocratie* had been left to the editorship of Dupont, who was more respondent than any of Quesnay's other pupils to the requirements of the school,<sup>4</sup> gave rise to extremely pessimistic conclusions, which seem unjustified.

Dupont was certainly not an over-scrupulous editor and the circumstances of the publication of Turgot's *Reflexions*, previously reconstructed by Schelle,<sup>5</sup> proved this inconfutably. It is also well known that Dupont took the same liberties, as editor of the *Ephémérides du citoyen*, with the Marquis of Baden and his minister, Schlettwein, who was also a *Physiocrate*. This behaviour was severely criticized by Mirabeau, who also complained of a rather unfaithful *extrait* from his *Leçons économiques*.<sup>6</sup> In a letter of 1777,

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. SCHELLE, *Quesnay et le Tableau économique*, "Revue d'économie politique", XIX, 1905, pp. 491-521; F. QUESNAY, *Tableau économique* (3. Ausgabe, 1759), edited by M. Kuczynski, Berlin, 1965.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Discours de l'éditeur* Dupont affirmed that he had collected Quesnay's articles "Pour rendre leurs rapports plus sensibles, et pour en former un corps de doctrine déterminé et complet, qui expose avec évidence le *droit naturel* des hommes, l'*ordre naturel* de la société, et les *loix naturelles* les plus avantageuses possibles aux *hommes réunis en société*". Cf. *Physiocratie*, ed. cit. I, p. II. As is well known, he was reproached by Turgot for the excessive systematization which pervades the *Discours*. On November 18, 1767 Turgot wrote to him: "L'analyse des idées ne m'a paru ni complète, ni même exacte; leur développement systématique est trop systématique, trop resserré, trop abrégé par des omissions essentielles; cela tient un peu à l'asservissement aux idées du maître; quelque respectable que soit celui-là, il ne peut faire exception à la règle qui dit qu'il n'en faut aucun en matière de science". Cf. *Oeuvres de Turgot*, edited by G. Schelle, II, Paris, 1914, p. 677.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. G. SCHELLE, *Pourquoi les "Reflexions" de Turgot sur la formation et la distribution des richesses ne sont-elles pas exactement connues?*, "Journal des économistes", 1888, pp. 3-16, and *Oeuvres de Turgot*, op. cit., II, 26-30; III, Paris, 1919, pp. 372 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1770, VI, pp. 137-160; VIII, pp. 93-131. Of Schlettwein Dupont published the *Opérations faites pour l'amélioration de la culture, et pour la réforme de l'impôt dans les Etats de S. A. S. Mgr. le Margrave de Bade Dourlach*, *ibid.*, 1771, VII, pp. 190-216 and of the Marquis the *Abrégé des principes de l'économie politique*, *ibid.*, 1772, I, pp. 1-51. Ample references to Dupont's editorial faults in his correspondence and in Mirabeau's with the Marquis.

he informed his friend Alfonso Longo, that Dupont had played more than one dirty trick on him, but without going into any more precise details. According to Dupont, at the source of the bad relations with the man whom he still recognized as his first master, were private quarrels, entirely devoid of political or doctrinal significance. Mirabeau, on the contrary, always stressed the sympathies with the Enlightenment of the aged "pensionnaire de Voltaire", whom he found utterly insufferable. Their relations were however never of the best and did not fail to provoke lively clashes, also in the delicate sphere of Dupont's work as editor. In the autumn of 1765, for example, Mirabeau rebuked him with obvious reference to the "Journal", for "l'orthographe et ... la façon d'écrire par notes", but in none of his numerous outbursts, whether direct or indirect, does he ever accuse Dupont of having reworked, or in any way tampered with, any one of the many articles that he had published in the "Journal" or in the "Ephémérides".<sup>7</sup> It does not seem therefore that Dupont ever interfered with Mirabeau's text. The hypothesis of attributing such recklessness to him with regard to the writings of Quesnay, who was certainly a much more authoritative and undisputed master, thus seems even less plausible.

In the letter to Longo already referred to, Mirabeau also mentions a quarrel that Dupont had had with Quesnay, to which a letter from Dupont to Mirabeau of February 26, 1776, in all probability refers. This was the very year in which work was set under way for the *Physiocratie*.<sup>8</sup> However, the quarrel concerned purely personal matters, entirely foreign to the intellectual cooperation of the pupil, who showed himself always to be a faithful executor of the master's orders. As is confirmed in a postscript in the same letter, in which Quesnay approves of certain notes by Dupont on British trade which had appeared in the 1765 number of the "Journal" and in which he gave Dupont instructions as to the editorial tactics best suited to neutralize the threatening attitude of the censor.<sup>9</sup>

Quesnay's supervision is also testified in the case of the "Ephémérides": the modifications in the Marquis's text were in fact made by Dupont without

Cf. *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, edited by di C. Knies, Heidelberg, 1892, I, pp. 58-59, 61, 129, 140-142, 152-153.

<sup>7</sup> Mirabeau's letter to Longo dated November 25, 1777 is conserved in the Musée Paul Arbaud at Aix-en-Provence, Fonds Mirabeau, vol. 19, cc. 93 ff. Various extracts from it were published by L. DE LOMÉNIE, *Les Mirabeau*, Paris, 1889, pp. 246 ff, 252 ff. For Dupont's point of view, cf. *L'enfance et la jeunesse de Du Pont de Nemours racontées par lui-même*, Paris, 1906, pp. 274 ff. The rooted incompatibility which always poisoned their relationship is attested by their correspondence, unfortunately only partially conserved, at the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library of Greenville. Cf. especially Dupont's letters of October 28, 1765 and September 12, 1773 and those of Mirabeau of September 6 and 21, 1773.

<sup>8</sup> By explicit instruction from Dupont. Cf. *Notice abrégée des différents écrits modernes qui ont concouru en France à former la science de l'économie politique*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, V, p. V.

<sup>9</sup> The letter is conserved in the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library of Greenville. In it Quesnay makes his apologies to Dupont for his unjustified interference in his marital affairs.

the knowledge of Mirabeau, who had at that time left Paris, though unknown to Quesnay, whose authoritative opinion Dupont called upon expressly in order to justify the modifications to the Marquis.<sup>10</sup> The master's supervision in any case went beyond the limit of editing the "Ephémérides" and extended to all the writings of all the pupils whom he commissioned and whom he used to follow in minute detail through all the stages of their work, correcting and rewriting in his own hand, at times entirely, as will be seen in what follows. The founder of the discipline would never have allowed his youngest and least prepared pupil to manipulate the writings destined to pass on to posterity the main elements of his own thought. And even if Dupont had managed to avoid the supervisory attentions of such an exigent author, he would most certainly have incurred the most inexorable of disavowals of which there is however no trace. Indeed, the *Physiocratie* was republished in 1768 at Yverdon, beyond the reach of the French censor, but without the slightest variation from the edition of 1767.

But there is even more to the matter than this: two notes, hand-written by Quesnay in the MS of Mirabeau's *Les économiques*, refer explicitly to the 1767 edition of the *Physiocratie* and specifically to the text of the *Analyse*, one of those works in the collection which appeared to have been most fundamentally reworked, compared to the first edition.<sup>11</sup> Finally, Mirabeau, in different circumstances, mentioned the *Physiocratie* and always to credit it as the "Koran of the economists", as to the authenticity of which he never raised any doubts.<sup>12</sup>

As things stand at present with regard to the documentation, it is quite out of the question that Dupont made changes to the texts without the master's knowledge.<sup>13</sup> It is possible, on the other hand, that he proposed corrections and additions, in accordance with the practice which ruled amongst the Physiocrats, of discussing and annotating the writings of each

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Dupont's letter to the Marquis dated July 11, 1772 in *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, op. cit., I, pp. 140-142.

<sup>11</sup> In a note in the margin of the manuscript of *Les économiques*, Quesnay noted: "Le Table devroit estre placé ici. Il faut prendre celui de la Physiocratie avec la petite explication du représentatif de la page 62 de la phys. et ensuite le petit resumé de la page 61". And further on again: "Mettre ici les trois petites colonnes qui sont à la page 48 de la Physiocratie". Cf. Archives Nationales, M 782, N. 4.2., pp. 186 and 192. The reference is to the 1767 edition, where in fact the "resumé" is on p. 61, "l'explication du représentatif" on p. 62 and "le trois petites colonnes" on p. 48. In the 1768 edition they are instead on pp. 49 ("resumé"), 50 ("explication du représentatif") and 40 ("les trois petites colonnes").

<sup>12</sup> Cf. The letter to the Marquis on March 31, 1770 in *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, op. cit., I, p. 22, to Longo on September 5, 1775 in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, ms. 12101, to Count Scheffer on April 8, 1782 in Riksarkivet, Stockholm, Schefferska Samlingen, Skrifvelser till Karl Fr. Scheffer, vol. V, c. 78r.

<sup>13</sup> In the *Notice abrégée*, Dupont points out several times that Quesnay had introduced additions and modifications to his texts. Cf. *Ephémérides du citoyen*, 1769, V, pp. XXIX-XXX and VI, p. 39 (for *Analyse*); V, p. XXXVI (for *Premier Problème économique*); VI, pp. 37-38 (for *Droit naturel*); VI, pp. 40-41 (for the *Maximes*); VI, pp. 42-43 (for the two *Dialogues*).

member of the group, before a work was handed over to the printer.<sup>14</sup> But it is still difficult to believe that Quesnay accepted such proposals, all the more so, if it is remembered that he systematically excluded from the text which he printed in the *Ephémérides* all those corrections by other hands which were present in a MS of *Despotisme de la Chine* that was kept among Dupont's papers.<sup>15</sup>

These conclusions are in no way disturbed by a direct examination of the variants in the *Maximes*, which on the contrary fully confirm them. In fact, none of them, as Schelle, who spoke of "interpolations of DuPont", contradict the "opinion que Quesnay pouvait avoir adoptée en 1767".<sup>16</sup> Nor are even the variants used by Ms. Kuczynski, who judges the replacement of "bas peuple" by "une partie du peuple des campagnes" to be suspect.<sup>17</sup>

In the *Extrait*, to describe the lowest orders of the population, Quesnay used the expressions "menu peuples" and "bas peuple". In the *Maximes*, the former expression was retained, but the latter, which occurred three times, was replaced in two cases by "dernières classes de citoyens" and "une partie du peuple des campagnes" and in the third was left unchanged. In the first two cases, it referred to the large mass of the peasant population which was compelled, by a policy of blind and senseless exploitation, to live in conditions of famine and unemployment, to the great damage of the entire country. In the third case, it referred to the coarse and ignorant members of the population who allow themselves to be dazzled by the flaunted wealth of the merchants and money-lenders. It is easy to see, then, why Quesnay, when revising his text, replaced "bas peuple" in the first two cases and left it in the third. In fact, it is only in the first two that the heavy load of contempt present in the expression "bas peuple" is in open conflict with the general tenor of the discourse, which was violently opposed to the policy of exploitation.

The need for the other variant, which eliminates the profit motive from international trade and is considered by Ms. Kuczynski to be a falsification introduced by Dupont, is still more obvious. The variant in the *Maximes* corrects a mercantilist error present in the old version of the *Extraits*, in conformance with the new thesis of the sterility of trade and the exchange of equivalents. In the light of the new theses, it had now become inadmissible to talk of the export of money "à plus haut prix qu'il n'a coûté" to realize "un gain assuré" with the purchase of goods. The passage was therefore

<sup>14</sup> One must not forget that the *Assemblées économiques* held in Mirabeau's house had the aim of institutionalizing this practice intent on conserving and cementing the ideological unity of the Physiocratic school. Dupont recalled it at the close of the 1773 *Assemblée*. Cf. *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, op. cit., II, p. 109.

<sup>15</sup> See note 68 on p. 50.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. G. SCHELLE, *Quesnay et la Table économique*, art. cit., p. 519.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. F. QUESNAY, *Tableau économique*, edited by M. Kuczynski, op. cit., pp. XIX-XXI.

corrected by a rigorous formulation which refers to the export of money "au meme prix qu'il a couté" for the purchase of goods "dont on a besoin".<sup>18</sup>

As we see, without further proof to the contrary, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the texts collected in the *Physiocratie*. Schelle's and Ms. Kuczynski's reservations have however the merit of calling the attention of scholars of Quesnay to the differences between the various editions of these texts, which not only reflect deeper theoretical research work still in full development, but also give evidence of the ideological preoccupations and the doctrinal decadence for which Quesnay himself was primarily responsible.

After the two editions of the *Physiocratie*, 18<sup>th</sup> century interest in the writings of Quesnay rapidly waned, until it finally disappeared. Only towards the middle of the next century was the need felt to put these works once more into circulation and the merit went to E. Daire who, in 1846, published an extensive collection of physiocratic texts including Quesnay's writings in the *Physiocratie* and the two entries in the *Encyclopédie: Fermiers and Grains*.<sup>19</sup> In comparison, the subsequent work of A. Oncken was more meritorious. In 1888, Oncken prepared, not without scholarly pretensions, the first edition of the works of Quesnay.<sup>20</sup> Following the bibliography of these writings reconstructed by Dupont in the *Notice Abrégée* of 1769, Oncken added numerous new titles to his edition. Besides the *Questions intéressantes*, which he reproduced from the fourth part of the *Ami des hommes*, he also unearthed the articles published anonymously and under pseudonyms, in the "Journal de l'agriculture" and in the "Ephémérides", which Dupont had noted.<sup>21</sup> He also added an abundant collection of

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *idem*, pp. 10, 18, 20 and *Physiocratie*, *op. cit.*, pp. 117, 152, 167.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Physiocrates. Quesnay, Dupont de Nemours, Mercier de La Rivière, l'Abbé Baudeau, Le Trosne, avec une introduction sur la doctrine des Physiocrates, des commentaires et des notices historiques*, I, Paris, 1846, pp. 1-306.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Oeuvres économiques et philosophiques de François Quesnay, fondateur du système physiocratique. Accompagnées des éloges et d'autres travaux biographiques sur Quesnay par différents auteurs. Publiées avec une introduction et des notes par Auguste Oncken*, Francfort-Paris, 1888.

<sup>21</sup> The articles, besides those republished in the *Physiocratie* mentioned above are: *Lettre à MM., les auteurs de la Gazette et du Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce et des finances. Par M. H. Mémoire sur les avantages de l'industrie et du commerce, et sur la fécondité de la classe prétendue stérile par quelques auteurs économiques, envoyé avec la lettre précédente*, "Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce et des finances", III, November 1765, pp. 150-165; *Réponse au Mémoire de M. H. sur les avantages de l'industrie et du commerce, et sur la fécondité de la classe prétendue stérile, etc., inséré dans le Journal d'agriculture, commerce et finances, du mois de novembre 1765. Par l'ami de l'auteur de ce Mémoire, ou Lettre aux auteurs, etc.*, *ibid.*, IV, January 1766, pp. 4-37; *Lettre aux auteurs du Journal, etc. Réponse à la question proposée dans la Gazette du commerce du 24 décembre 1765 sur les profits de la fabrication des bas de soie en France*, *ibid.*, IV, January 1766, pp. 38-45; *Observations sur l'intérêt de l'argent. Par M. Nisaque*, *ibid.*, IV, January 1766, pp. 151-171; *Questions sur les deuils. Par M. N. Les deuils sont-ils nuisibles au commerce des manufactures? Réponse*, *ibid.*, IV, January 1766, pp. 172-173; *Répétition de la question proposée dans la Gazette du commerce du 24 du mois de décembre 1765, au sujet du bénéfice que la fabrique des bas de soie établie à Nîmes produit à la France. Réponse par M. N.*, *ibid.*, IV, February 1766, pp. 37-74; *Lettre de M. de l'Isle aux auteurs de la Gazette et du Journal d'agriculture, commerce et finances. Remarques sur l'opinion*

biographical testimonies, a selection of philosophical writings and an apparatus of full, if not actually at times redundant, notes. Oncken's edition, which is still useful and from certain aspects difficult to replace, is however seriously defective both at the level of the completeness of the writings and its lack of scholarly rigour. In particular, the apparatus for the variants in the texts reproduced from the *Physiocratie* seems particularly defective. Variants in the first edition are only approximate and haphazardously reproduced and in the case of certain of the writings, for example, the *Second Dialogue*, are omitted entirely.

Oncken's collection, which until only a few years ago was still the most complete and reliable, led to research-work which secured for scholarly examination important new texts by Quesnay. In 1890, S. Bauer<sup>22</sup> announced the discovery of a manuscript of the article, *Hommes*, and of a group of texts which in 1894 were reproduced in the first modern edition of the *Tableau économique*.<sup>23</sup> It was a rather unreliable edition, in which some proofs, corrected in Quesnay's handwriting, of two parts of the third edition of the *Tableau* and the *Explication* were arbitrarily associated with the text of the second edition. A few years later Oncken identified, also among Mirabeau's papers, and reproduced in facsimile, a three-page manuscript of the first edition of the *Tableau économique*.<sup>24</sup> An extremely rare copy of the third edition was discovered soon afterwards by Schelle, who however published only the twenty-four *Maximes* and some fragments of the notes.<sup>25</sup> Schelle also published in 1908 the article *Impôts* from a manuscript discovered among Turgot's papers<sup>26</sup> and, at the same time, the

*de l'auteur de l'Esprit des Lois concernant les colonies. Liv. XXI, chap. 17, ibid., V, April 1766, pp. 3-34; Suite de la répétition de la question des fabricants des bas de soie de Nîmes, sur les effets productifs de la classe prétendue stérile. Par M. H., ibid., V, April 1766, pp. 60-64; Lettre de Mr. N. aux auteurs, etc., au sujet de l'objection qui lui a été faite par Mr. H. relativement à la productibilité du commerce et de l'industrie, ibid., V, June 1766, pp. 58-61; Observations sur le commerce, par Mr. De Montaudoin de l'Académie de La Rochelle, insérées dans le Mercure du Mois de septembre 1766, copiées et accompagnées de notes, par M. H., ibid., VII, October 1766, pp. 51-63; Analyse du gouvernement des Yucas du Pérou, par M. A. in Ephémérides de citoyen, 1767, I, pp. 35-47; Despotisme de la Chine, ibid., 1767, III, pp. 5-88; IV, pp. 5-77; V, pp. 5-61; VI, pp. 5-75; Lettre de M. Alpha, maître-ès-arts, à l'auteur des Ephémérides, sur le langage de la science économique, ibid., 1767, X, pp. 163-227; Lettre d'un fermier et d'un propriétaire, par M. A., ibid., 1768, II, pp. 81-100; Lettre à l'auteur des Ephémérides, de Versailles, ce 17 juin 1768, ibid., 1768, VII, pp. 9-11.*

<sup>22</sup> Cf. S. BAUER, *Zur Entstehung der Physiokratie. Auf Grund ungedruckter Schriften François Quesnay*, "Jahrbuch für Nationalökonomie und Statistik", XXI, 1890, pp. 113-158.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Tableau économique. First printed in 1758 and now reproduced in facsimile for the British Economic Association*, London, 1894.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. A. ONCKEN, *Geschichte der National-Ökonomie*, I, Leipzig, 1902, p. 324.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. G. SCHELLE, *Quesnay et le Tableau économique, art. cit.*, pp. 508 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Impôts par Quesnay. Article inédit, avec notes de Turgot. Édité par G. Schelle*, in "Revue d'histoire des doctrines économiques et sociales", I, 1908, pp. 137-186. The manuscript was mentioned and described in *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Haute-Vienne. Archives civiles. Série C. Fonds de l'intendance de Limoges*, edited by C. Rivain et A. Leroux, Limoges, 1891, p. 22.



article, *Hommes*, also appeared, edited by Bauer. However, these were not very correct editions and particularly Schelle's has a mass of omissions, reworkings of the text, cuts and errors of transcription.

Within the same period of time some of Quesnay's letters also came to light: two to Mirabeau, regarding the composition of the *Tableau économique*, were published by Bauer; one to Méliand, an "inspector" of Soissons, by Thiele, two others to Th. Tronchin by one of his descendants, and another to Mirabeau by Schelle.<sup>28</sup> The main contribution in this sense came however from G. Weulersse, who in 1910 compiled the inventory of Mirabeau's manuscripts kept in the Archives Nationales, and published a large number of letters, notes and various fragments.<sup>29</sup> Also under his editorship there appeared immediately afterwards, almost in its entirety, an unpublished pamphlet by Mirabeau, with copious annotations in the margins by Quesnay.<sup>30</sup>

All this research-work provided the premises for a new complete edition of Quesnay's writings which, considering only the last discoveries mentioned, would have proved far more complete than Oncken's by now outdated edition. But Quesnay has never enjoyed much fortune in France and the new, much needed publishing venture had to wait for over half a century. Only in 1958, at the time of the second centenary of the first edition of the *Tableau économique*, did the Institut National d'Etudes Demographiques dedicate two volumes to Quesnay, the second of which brought together what had been published so far with few additions and with the glaring omission of the unpublished letters, notes and fragments.<sup>31</sup> Of this edition, produced by J. Hecht, little good can be said. To what was already known, it adds only the three short pages of the *Aspect de la psychologie*, the seventh chapter of the *Philosophie rurale* and two unpublished letters to Fortbonnais. But the worst thing is that the edition took all the texts from the old incorrect editions and managed to introduce new errors into the bargain. The articles *Impôts* and *Hommes*, are taken from Schelle's and Bauer's editions, the *Questions intéressantes*, and the

<sup>27</sup> Cf. L'article "Hommes" de François Quesnay publié par E. Bauer, "Revue d'histoire des doctrines économiques et sociales", I, 1908, pp. 3-88.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. S. BAUER, Quesnay's "Tableau économique", "The Economic Journal", V, 1895, pp. 20-21; O. THIELE, François Quesnay und die Agrarkrisis im Ancien Régime. Dargestellt auf Grund zweier Briefe, "Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial und Wirtschaftsgeschichte", IV, 1906, pp. 644-652; H. TRONCHIN, Un médecin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Théodore Tronchin (1709-1781), Paris, 1906, pp. 356-360; G. SCHELLE, Le docteur Quesnay, chirurgien, médecin de Madame de Pompadour et de Louis XV, physiocrate, Paris, 1907, pp. 396-399.

<sup>29</sup> G. WEULERSSE, Les manuscrits économiques de François Quesnay et du marquis de Mirabeau aux Archives Nationales (M. 778 à M. 785), Paris, 1910.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Bref état des moyens pour la restauration de l'autorité du roi et de ses finances par le marquis de Mirabeau avec des notes de François Quesnay. Publié par G. Weulersse, "Revue d'histoire des doctrines économiques et sociale", VI, 1913, pp. 177-211.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. François Quesnay et la Physiocratie, II, Textes, Paris, 1958.

articles from the "Journal" and the "Ephémérides" come from Oncken's edition, almost always without any of the necessary comparisons with the originals and without much trouble taken over the apparatus of the variant readings. Of the three editions of the *Tableau économique*, besides the facsimile of the first edition, the facsimile of the *Tableau* and the *Extrait* of the second edition, and only the *Explication* of the third were republished, following a rather odd criterion. Of *Despotisme de la Chine*, only chapter 8 was reproduced.

Despite its serious limitations, this edition went some way to arousing interest in Quesnay, particularly outside France, and started off new ventures for translations into English, Italian and German, which were productive also at the level of research and in encouraging a better edition of the original texts. In 1962, R. L. Meek<sup>32</sup> translated a selection of Quesnay's writings into English and noted the deficiencies, in the Bauer edition, of the article, *Hommes*. He also rediscovered the importance of the Mirabeau manuscript, called particular attention to those of the *Philosophie rurale* and put order into the intricate question of the three editions of the *Tableau économique*. Put on guard by the reservations expressed by Meek, R. Zangheri, in translating Quesnay's first economic writings into Italian, extended the collation of the manuscripts to the *Impôts* article and found serious flaws in Schelle's edition.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, the anonymous editor of a short collection of economic writings that has recently appeared in France, with a preface by M. Luftalla,<sup>34</sup> has followed J. Hecht's edition faithfully.

The most important contributions to the publishing history of Quesnay's work came however during these years from Marguerite Kuczynski: to her is due above all the merit of discovering a copy of the third edition of the *Tableau économique*, which she reproduced in facsimile with an extensive and solidly based apparatus criticus.<sup>35</sup> Important new discoveries go to the credit of the German translation of the economic writings, the first volume of which brings<sup>36</sup> together the four articles written for the *Encyclopédie*, the three editions of the *Tableau Economique*, and the two letters to Mirabeau annexed to it and also the two to Fortbonnais. The translation of *Hommes* is based on a new manuscript, found among Dupont's papers, which offers a more reliable version than that presented in the manuscript

<sup>32</sup> Cf. R. L. MEEK, *The Economics of Physiocracy*, London, 1962.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. F. QUESNAY, *Scritti Economici*, edited by R. Zangheri, I, Bologna, 1966, pp. 322-324.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Tableau économique des physiocrates*, Paris, 1969. This small volume does not reproduce any of the three editions of the *Tableau économique* properly speaking, but only the *Analyse*, the *Premier* and the *Second Problème économique* and the article *Grains*.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. F. QUESNAY, *Tableau économique* (3. Ausgabe, 1759), edited by M. Kuczynski, Berlin, 1965. Another rare example of this edition has been found recently in Florence by V. Becagli who gave notice of it in *A proposito della prima edizione del Tableau économique*, "Studi storici", XII, 1971, pp. 171-181.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. F. QUESNAY, *Ökonomische Schriften. 1756-1759*, edited by M. Kuczynski, I, Berlin, 1971.

published originally by Bauer. Among Dupont's papers Mr. Kuczynski found another manuscript of *Despotisme de la Chine* and, in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal de Paris, a group of manuscripts related to the *Tableau économique avec ses explications*, published in the fifth part of the *Ami des hommes*, which makes it possible to attribute the work almost exclusively to Quesnay. Based directly on the manuscripts and on the original editions, Ms. Kuczynski's collection is furnished with an impressive apparatus of variants and notes on the texts which fill an entire volume and excels for the rigour of its scholarship and for the reliability and quality of its information. Such dedication goes far beyond the limits of a simple work of translation and leaves only one regret: that it has not been put at the service of a new edition of Quesnay's writings in the original French. Finally, a splendid new publishing venture for the Royal Economic Society and the American Economic Association is the reprinting in facsimile, with an English translation *en face*, and an abundant collection of notes, of the three editions of the *Tableau économique*, also thanks to the editorship of Ms. Kuczynski, in cooperation with R. L. Meek.<sup>37</sup>

At the present stage of research, the plan for a new edition of Quesnay's writings which has claims to completeness and scholarly rigour cannot leave out the basic question of his cooperation with his pupils. This is a question which is bound to restore the authorship, often in practice exclusively to Quesnay, of various works attributed for example to Mirabeau by Dupont, this spokesman of the physiocrats himself, who claimed to be the best accredited of the school's chroniclers. The entire responsibility for this removal of so much of Quesnay's work by this equivocation is the responsibility of Quesnay himself.

A complex and in some senses enigmatic personality, as an intellectual of the Ancien Régime, Quesnay was wont to hide his most audacious ambitions in matters of theory and his most radically eversive proposals behind the ideological screen of a reform project. This way of working deteriorates on more than one occasion into the practice of opportunism and intrigue worthy of a courtier. Of this little known aspect of Quesnay's singular character, which nevertheless had a profound effect on all his scholarly work and heavily conditioned certain of his most controversial results, it will one day be necessary to tell the whole story. In the present work, the sole aim is to point out this court physician's caution, fearful of compromising the fruits of a long career, with publications that were too daring. This caution is curiously associated with personal disinterest and a dedication to the objective aims of science, so strong as to constitute the real secret of Quesnay's remarkable intellectual magisterium. With respect to this higher challenge, represented by the search for and spread

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Quesnay's Tableau économique*, edited by M. Kuczynski and R. L. Meek, London - New York, 1972.

of the truth, it mattered little to Quesnay what name the man bore to whom the particular circumstances of those times entrusted the task of expressing, defending and propagating the truth. Moved by this conviction which harmonized so well with his preoccupations about secrecy already mentioned, Quesnay always sought the cooperation of men of thought and action, from the very outset of his interest in economics and politics.

Among his first cooperators it is necessary to mention Henri Pattullo, the Scotsman who emigrated to France and who, in 1758, published a little treatise on agronomy,<sup>38</sup> shot through from beginning to end with theories taken from Quesnay. With regard to the relations between the two men, Marmontel, at that time himself a recruit, though a reluctant one, of the Doctor's school, refers to an episode concerning the dedication of the book to Madame de Pompadour, which was patronized by Quesnay.<sup>39</sup> The latter had certainly played an important part in the composition of the work: the constant reference to his best-known theses during those years, set out in the articles on *Fermiers* and *Grains*, leads one to suppose that he revised and corrected the manuscript and perhaps wrote or rewrote some chapters. The lack of documentation unfortunately prevents one from going beyond these conjectures, which nevertheless seem proven by the decisive circumstance that the *Essai* reproduces (pp. 221-237), without any mention of the author, but with reference to data in the article on *Grains*, a considerable fragment from the article on *Hommes*, which remained unpublished. In all probability Quesnay wrote or rewrote the entire chapter on the corn trade, into which he inserted the passage from the article. Certainly in the *Questions intéressantes*, published immediately afterwards, reference is often made to the *Essai* and particularly to the chapter on the corn trade, which is also mentioned in Mirabeau's *Mémoire sur l'agriculture* and later in the *Premier Problème économique*.<sup>40</sup> Dupont also drew attention to this chapter when, in the *Notice abrégée*, he underlined his adherence to the price theory, expounded by Quesnay in the *Grains* article.<sup>41</sup>

Cooperation with another somewhat obscure person, Baron Etienne-Claude de Marivetz,<sup>42</sup> is better documented. Together with Marivetz,

<sup>38</sup> Cf. H. PATULLO, *Essai sur l'amélioration des terres*, Paris, 1758. However, the printing permit bears the date June 30, 1757. On this obscure personage, cf. the few notes collected by J. VOISINE, *Un appendice à "L'Ami des hommes": le "Corps complet d'économie rustique"*, in *Les Mirabeau et leur temps*, Paris, 1968, pp. 51-66 and F. QUESNAY, *Ökonomische Schriften*, edited by M. Kuczynski, I, *op. cit.*, pp. 661-663.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Mémoires de Marmontel*, edited by M. Tourneux, II, Paris, 1891, pp. 22 ff.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *Questions intéressantes sur la population, l'agriculture et le commerce, proposées aux Académies et autre sociétés savantes des provinces*, in *L'Ami des hommes*, IV, 1759, pp. 265, 272, 274, 289, 293; *Mémoire sur l'agriculture*, *ibid.*, V, 1760, pp. 18, 185; *Premier Problème économique*, in *Physiocratie*, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Notice abrégée*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, p. XXXVIII.

<sup>42</sup> A curious person not devoid of scientific interest, he wrote various geographical works registered in the *Catalogue générale des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, CVII, Paris, 1931, coll. 82-83. A few notes on him in *Nouvelle biographie générale*, XXXIII, Paris, 1860, coll. 828-829.

Quesnay wrote *Questions intéressantes*, published in 1758, in the fourth part of *Ami des hommes*. In the *Avertissement* in which the *Questions* are presented, the only mention is of the existence of "deux auteurs combinés" different from the author of *Ami des hommes*, that is from Mirabeau, and only in 1769 did Dupont reveal that they were Quesnay and a certain Marivelt, not otherwise known.<sup>43</sup> A little group of unpublished letters from the correspondence of Pierre-Michel Hennin<sup>44</sup> has now made it possible to establish the author's identity with certainty and to ascertain that Marivetz did in fact cooperate with Quesnay in the writing of the *Questions*, without it being possible to decide which part was produced by which author.<sup>45</sup>

A letter dated Turin, 20<sup>th</sup> September 1758, refers to a different type of cooperation. In this letter the diplomat, Hennin, announced to Quesnay that he was about to send a report on which he was working regarding Holland, where he had previously resided.<sup>46</sup> As Mirabeau had told Count Scheffer,<sup>47</sup> Quesnay used to avail himself of his influence at court to commission all kinds of *postulants* to provide information and material for him of use in his studies. Within the same court circle, he also recruited his first pupils and supporters, as is shown by his relations with Patullo and Marmontel, Le Roy and Butré. The search for proselytes which forms one of the most bizarre and surprising chapters in Quesnay's intellectual biography, was taken as the necessary premise for an ambitious plan for political intervention, which remained absolutely essential for Quesnay till the end.

Within this framework, the conversion of Mirabeau, the aristocratic writer who had had so much success with *Ami des hommes*, had particular importance for Quesnay, preluding almost his much longed-for conquest of support from all the aristocracy for his programme of reform. Cooperation with the Marquis, the most faithful and prestigious of his disciples, went on uninterrupted till 1757, that is for no less than seventeen years.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Notice abrégée*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, I, p. XXXVIII.

<sup>44</sup> Marivetz's correspondence with Hennin is in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut, Ms. 1269, cc. 341 ff.

<sup>45</sup> Georges Le Roy, friend of Quesnay, author of the article *Ferme* in the *Encyclopédie*, wrote to Hennin on August 13, 1758: "Nous n'avons encor rien d'important dans la littérature; car la 4<sup>e</sup> partie de l'*Ami des hommes*, qui paroît, tient beaucoup plus à la politique. On a imprimé à la suite un grand nombre de questions économiques, partie de Marivetz, partie du médecin notre amy. Tout cela fait un assemblage de choses bonnes et intéressantes, souvent peu liées; mais toujours présentées avec une chaleur qui fait pardonner les écarts". Cf. Bibliothèque de l'Institut, ms. 1268, cc. 215r-v.

<sup>46</sup> The copy of the letter, already mentioned by J. HECHT, *La vie de François Quesnay*, in *F. Quesnay et la Physiocratie*, op. cit., I, p. 259, is in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut, ms. 1274, cc. 394r-396r.

In a previous letter to Le Roy, Hennin excuses himself for still not having completed the transcription of the report. Cf. ms. 1268, c. 213r.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. the letter mentioned in note 50 of p. 46.

Mirabeau's manuscripts, at least that part of them that were saved, first from fire and then from dispersion,<sup>48</sup> prove that it was an extremely intense and thorough-going form of cooperation, in which the part played by the master always loomed large and in some cases was entirely decisive.

Within the range of this long activity of cooperation three periods may be approximately distinguished. At first, from 1757-1759, Mirabeau put before the master the manuscript of works conceived before his conversion, or at any rate when he still was in a fairly independent frame of mind. These Quesnay filled with corrections and annotations that grew steadily more plentiful and more imperious. Subsequently (roughly in the period from 1759 to 1764), the work done in common became much closer and the pupil's dependence on the master became fuller and more absolute. Quesnay mapped out the plan of the work, furnished the scheme for it and supplied it with additional notes, with partly completed sections, tables, calculations, and illustrative material of every kind, borrowed from other lesser collaborators, such as Butré, Morin and Le Grand.<sup>49</sup> On this basis Mirabeau prepared a first draft which he handed over to the master, who in his turn added minute corrections, cutting and replacing, or else simply adding numerous passages in his own hand, which at times ran from page to page, if not for an entire chapter. All these additions and corrections to a large extent were then re-edited by Mirabeau, who thereafter once more delivered them to Quesnay, for a further revision of the text which often was extended by important additions and corrections. Finally, the work went off to the printer's, though Quesnay still took charge of the correction of the proofs!<sup>50</sup> Little of Mirabeau's work remains in these writings: they have thus every right to a place in the *corpus* of Quesnay's work, to which so much of them naturally belongs. In the third and last period, which continued until Quesnay's death, Mirabeau gained a certain degree of autonomy once more: the manuscripts of works belonging to those

<sup>48</sup> Mirabeau had left his papers to the Marquis of Baden who after the former's death asked for them in vain from the executor of the will. Cf. *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont, op. cit.*, I, pp. 96-98, 101-103. A considerable number of them were burned: the Marquise de Pailly informed Butré on July 23, 1790. Cf. R. REUSS, *Charles de Butré*, Paris, 1887, p. 127.

<sup>49</sup> Nothing is known of these minor collaborators of Quesnay. There is some information about Butré in the above-mentioned book by R. Reuss.

<sup>50</sup> Besides the evidence of direct examination of the manuscripts, this method of work is attested by the various references contained in the correspondence of Quesnay and Mirabeau. Particularly interesting is a passage in Mirabeau's letter to Count Scheffer on May 22, 1780: "A l'égard des matériaux relatifs à l'assertion qui vous arrête, je travaillois sous la direction du docteur. Cet homme infatigable et qui n'avoit jamais qu'une seule affaire, celle de l'objet de ses recherches actuelles, au point qu'il n'eût pas eu de chemises si la femme de charge de M.<sup>me</sup> de Pompadour n'en eût eu soin, qui par sa place et son crédit étoit à même de faire travailler les postulants de tout genre qui pour aboutir à luy prenoient les formes prescrites; cet homme rare, dis je, avoit des mémoires de tout genre et passoit sa vie à ces recherches". Cf. Riksarkivet, Stockholm, Schefferska Samlingen, Skrifvelser till Karl Fr. Scheffer, vol. V, cc. 65r-v.

years are still heavily annotated and corrected by Quesnay, but to a much more discrete extent, which leaves them largely under Mirabeau's authorship. It is obvious that the criterion of a single edition cannot be adopted for all these writings. Following the principle that only what belonged to Quesnay should be published and not what belonged to Mirabeau or any of Quesnay's other pupils, a start must be made by rejecting all those writings in which Quesnay's corrections are insignificant or purely a matter of form. On the other hand, Quesnay's notes and corrections should be published only when they make sense in themselves, with Mirabeau's text referred to in the notes only in those cases where it is strictly necessary for the fullest understanding of the corrections and the additions. Those works in which Quesnay's part is prevalent should be published in their entirety with the unpublished passages in the margin and all the preparatory material, including letters and notes appended, and it will be necessary to show clearly, perhaps by printing with a different typeface, those which certainly belong to Quesnay. Among these works, it is absolutely certain that the following ones will have to be included: the *Tableau économique avec ses explications*, published in 1760 in the sixth part of *Ami des hommes*, the *Théorie de l'impôt* (1760) and the *Philosophie rurale* (1763-1764), attributed until now to Mirabeau though with the reservation that Quesnay had cooperated in it.

The manuscripts of the *Tableau économique avec ses explications* that Ms. Kuczynski<sup>51</sup> has already studied, prove the existence of three edited versions, in accordance with the workplan followed by Quesnay and Mirabeau and already illustrated.<sup>52</sup> The only thing lacking is a set of letters, notes and preparatory material which, in the case of the other two works, has to a large extent been preserved. An examination of the manuscripts comes down heavily on the side of attribution to Quesnay, who finished up by writing it almost entirely in his own hand.

The manuscripts of the *Théorie de l'impôt* contain a long passage written in Mirabeau's hand, a copy in the writing of an amanuensis, full of additions and corrections by Quesnay and Mirabeau, and the printer's proofs corrected by Quesnay. In addition, there is a large number of letters, notes, tables and various other material by Quesnay.<sup>53</sup> A study of the text has revealed

<sup>51</sup> Cf. F. QUESNAY, *Ökonomischen Schriften*, edited by M. Kuczynski, I, *op. cit.*, pp. 377-378. But now also V. BECAGLI, *Dal "Tableau économique" a "L'Ami des hommes". Note fisiocratiche*, "Studi storici", XIII, 1972, pp. 373-394.

<sup>52</sup> The manuscript of the National Archives (M. 784. N. 57) gives Mirabeau's first autograph draft, produced according to Quesnay's instructions. Two other manuscripts, in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (ms. 12101), by a copyist, give two successive drafts filled with Quesnay's corrections, almost all of which were printed.

<sup>53</sup> The manuscripts of the *Théorie de l'impôt* are in the National Archives, in the order of the text, under the following headings: M. 781. N. 2.1, 2.2-3, 2.4, 2.5. The letters and the various material M. 784. N. 72. A few additions and Quesnay's various letters were published by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-73.

a very high number of interventions by Quesnay, even though the nature of the work, more openly employed in the political arguments of the moment, would have left a wider margin for the intervention of Mirabeau.

For the *Philosophie rurale*, the available documentation is still more abundant. In this case, also, the manuscripts show signs of having been edited three times: first in Mirabeau's hand, but with the exception of most of the seventh part, which was written in the hand of the usual amanuensis; a second one by the same copyist, with additions and corrections by Mirabeau and above all by Quesnay; a third by the copyist with corrections by Quesnay of the seventh chapter, attributed by Dupont entirely to Quesnay. There remain four edited versions, also in the hand of the copyist with corrections by Quesnay (the second *codex* contains two of them), which offer documentary evidence of the tortuous process followed in the elaboration of this text, which is among the most important for the study of Quesnay's economic theory. Letters, notes and various other material, almost all unpublished, have been preserved in large quantities.<sup>54</sup>

The attribution of this work has been somewhat controversial. Mirabeau declared, at various times, that he had written it together with Quesnay, who revised the manuscript and "l'enrichit de plusieurs matériaux de tout espèce" and "de ses morceaux les plus précieux". According to Dupont, it was composed by Mirabeau on the basis of indications by Quesnay "a qui appartient entièrement la septième chapitre".<sup>55</sup> Finally, according to Grimm, the entire work "reste a M. Quesnay, ..., aidé de M. le marquis de Mirabeau",<sup>57</sup> and an examination of the manuscripts shows that he was right. Quesnay's part in it is in fact revealed to be preponderant: the overall design goes back to him, the conceptual substance of each individual part and, in the case of many of them, for the final draft. In order to prepare the critical edition of 1763, defined by Mirabeau in various places as "furtive" and crammed with printing errors,<sup>58</sup> there followed a second, in 1764, different from the first, to which neither Dupont nor Mirabeau ever makes reference.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>54</sup> The manuscripts of the *Philosophie rurale* are also in the National Archives, in the order of the text, under the following headings: M. 779. N. 4, 4 bis, 3. The letters and the other material are to a large extent mixed up with those relating to the *Théorie de l'impôt*, under the heading M. 784. N. 70, 71, 72. Another two letters, already published, are in M. 779. N. 6 (cf. G. SCHELLE, *Le docteur Quesnay*, op. cit., pp. 396-399) and in K. 906. N. 42 (cf. G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, op. cit., pp. 86-89).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *Éléments de la philosophie rurale*, La Haye, 1767, pp. XCVII ff; "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1767, IV, p. 82; *Précis de l'ordre légal, dépravé, rétabli et perpétué*, Berne, 1775, p. I. Cf. finally the letter to the Marquis of Baden of March 31, 1770 in *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, ed. cit., I, p. 22.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. *L'enfance et la jeunesse de Dupont de Nemours racontées par lui-même*, op. cit., p. 248.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal, Meister*, etc., edited by M. Tourneux, V, Paris, 1878, pp. 457-458.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1767, IV, p. 82; *Éléments de la philosophie rurale*, op. cit., p. XCIX; *Précis de l'ordre légal*, op. cit., p. 59.

<sup>59</sup> Dupont in the *Notice abrégée* ("Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, II, p. XXX) mentions



With regard to the initial period of collaboration with Mirabeau, a first fairly large group of notes and additions by Quesnay refers to an unpublished *Essai sur la Monarchie*.<sup>60</sup> Further notes are to be found attached to the texts of the *Introduction au Mémoire sur les Etats provinciaux* and the *Réponse aux objections contre le Mémoire sur les Etats provinciaux*, both published in 1758 in the fourth part of *Ami des Hommes*,<sup>61</sup> in the *Mémoire sur l'agriculture*, and the *Réponse à l'Essai sur les ponts et chaussées, la voirie et les corvées*, all published in 1760 in the fifth and sixth parts of *Ami des hommes*.<sup>62</sup>

To the same period also belong the notes to the *Bref état* published by Weulersse,<sup>63</sup> and a piece on the nobility, together with the two letters to Mirabeau in the *Tableau économique* and the two others to Fortbonnais and that to Méliand.<sup>64</sup> To the third period of collaboration with Mirabeau belong the notes, corrections and additions to the manuscripts of the following works: *Elémens de la philosophie rurale* (1767), *Précis de l'ordre légale* (1768), *Les Economiques* (1769), *Leçons économiques* (1770), *Supplément à la Théorie de l'Impôt* (1774)<sup>65</sup> and finally a group of notes on women's education, fragments and notes on tithes, on the corn trade, on the inauguration of a course in economics and a letter to Mirabeau.<sup>66</sup> Many of these notes found their way back into the works printed by Mirabeau and should be returned to Quesnay, others were never edited and only a few were published, rather carelessly, by Weulersse and are still waiting to find a place, together with the first, in the *corpus* of Quesnay's works.

only the first edition. Mirabeau in the letter to the Marquis of Baden already mentioned speaks of "Une impression furtive et nullement suivie". According to Grimm (*Correspondance*, *op. cit.*, V, p. 415) the work was banned, but, of the censor's intervention no other trace remains.

<sup>60</sup> Conserved in various manuscripts of the National Archives under the headings M. 778, N. 1.1-6. A few of Quesnay's notes were published, with cuts and reworkings of the text, by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-25, 28-29.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. National Archives, M. 784. N. 1 and M. 778. N. 1.2. Some of these notes were published by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-33.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. National Archives, M. 783. N. 5 and M. 783. N. 13. Two notes to the *Mémoire* were published by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-39.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. National Archives, M. 783. N. 2. For the edition of Weulersse cf. note 30 on p. 39.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. National Archives, M. 784. N. 40 (published by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-28); M. 784. N. 70.1-2 (published by Bauer); K. 906. N. 36 (published by Thiele). The two letters to Fortbonnais are in the private archives of Quesnay's descendants and were published by J. HECHT, *Deux lettres de Quesnay à Fortbonnais*, in *François Quesnay et la Physiocratie*, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 295-300.

<sup>65</sup> The manuscripts are conserved in the National Archives, in order, under the headings: M. 784. N. 1.4; M. 781. N. 1.4.b, 1.6.a, 1.6.b, 1.7.b, 1.8.b, 1.9.b, 1.10.b, 1.11; M. 779. N. 2.1; M. 782. N. 1.2-2, 3-2, 4-3, 5-2; M. 780. N. 2.2, 2-3; K. 883. N. 1 bis.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. National Archives, M. 780. N. 2-5; M. 784. N. 70.3; M. 784. N. 70.4 (published in part by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-93); M. 784. N. 70.5 (published by J. CONAN, *Une fantaisie démographique du docteur Quesnay*, in *François Quesnay et la Physiocratie*, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 51-54); M. 784. N. 7.3 (published in part by G. WEULERSSE, *Les manuscrits économiques*, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-99); M. 784. N. 70.12.

Quesnay's cooperation with the youngest of his pupils was of a different character. Dupont had the temperament of a journalist and never had either the desire or the time to cooperate with the master in works of any considerable range and still less in work as a theorist. He was rather Quesnay's publisher and popularizer; in fact it was he who was given the task of editing the writings collected in the *Physiocratie*. He was also entrusted with the publication — which did not in fact take place — of the manuscripts of three unpublished articles (*Hommes*, *Impôts*, *Intérêt de l'argent*) originally written for the *Encyclopédie*.<sup>67</sup> Among his papers, therefore, there is no trace of cooperative work, but, curiously, not even manuscripts corrected by Quesnay.

Of the three unpublished articles for the *Encyclopédie*, there remains only the manuscript of one, that on *Hommes*, which is a copy of the lost original, but which was however more correct than that in the Bibliothèque Nationale, published by Bauer. Ms. Kuczynski based her German translation on it, which should serve as a basis for the critical edition of the French text. Beside this copy and the letter of 26 February 1776, already mentioned, only one manuscript of *Despotisme de la Chine*, is conserved among Dupont's papers, also written by an amanuensis, but with sporadic corrections by Quesnay and others, which give a different text, with parts unpublished, from that published in the "Ephémérides" of 1767.<sup>68</sup>

Even better than his work as publisher, Dupont understood how to help Quesnay on the more congenial plane of campaigning on current public topics. Over the years in which he was editor of the "Journal" and of the "Ephémérides", he followed the master's directions faithfully, guilty, if anything, of excessive zeal, but without avoiding exposing himself personally on more than one occasion to the reprisals of the censor and the government. Quesnay's contribution to the two publications, which was always covered by anonymity or the use of various pseudonyms, for the reasons of caution already mentioned, was pretty intense, but unfortunately still not fully clarified. The only indications available for the identification of these writings can be read in the *Notice abrégée des différent écrits modernes qui ont concouru en France à former la science de l'économie politique*, a sort of bibliographical chronicle of the physiocratic movement, published by Dupont, undoubtedly under the supervision of Quesnay, in the "Ephémérides" of 1769, but the information is far from exhaustive.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>67</sup> As announced by Dupont himself in the *Notice abrégée*, in "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, I, p. XXXI.

<sup>68</sup> For the description of these manuscripts cfr. J. B. RIGGS, *A guide to the manuscripts in the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library*, Greenville, 1970, p. 217.

<sup>69</sup> It has already been mentioned that Dupont's bibliographical references are sometimes confused and imprecise. As for the collaborators of the "Ephémérides", E. Coleman has recently tried to improve the list, but with little success, "Ephémérides du citoyen. 1767-1772", in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 1962, pp. 17-45, see also for other information about the Journal.

During the previous year, the argument over the question of freedom of the corn trade had become extremely heated and the adversaries of the Physiocrats had succeeded in gaining ground. In 1769, things got even worse, until in December, the rise of the Abbé Terray to General Controller of Finances marked the end of the Physiocrats' fortunes. In the white-hot atmosphere of the polemical wars of those years, Quesnay showed himself even more cautious than usual: his last polemical article, signed with the initials M. A., which were well known to the readers of the "Ephémérides" and were identifiable by a wider public, appeared in the number of February 1768. Negotiations were subsequently started to secure the protection of the Dauphine for the publication. When these failed, Quesnay seemed resigned to silence. The specific circumstances which induced him, still in full possession of his intellectual faculties, to make a show of silence, followed up not long after by his retirement into the world of geometry, are still obscure and this is neither the time nor the place to try to clarify them. What is certain is that the initials M. A. reappeared in the "Ephémérides" only one more time, in the number for November, 1769,<sup>70</sup> at the end of the notes to an article by an anonymous writer from Orléans, who compared the income from land at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century with that of his own day,<sup>71</sup> to drive home Quesnay's well-known thesis of the decadence of eighteenth century agriculture compared with the splendours of the past. M. A. is introduced by Dupont as "un de nos plus grand philosophes" but without the formula "l'Auteur du Tableau économique", regularly used in the *Notice abrégée* to indicate Quesnay. This reticence — all the more significant in that it covered a contribution that is extremely detached in tone and somewhat removed from the polemics of the moment — is accentuated in the *Avertissement*, prefaced to the first volume of 1770, in order to give an account of all the articles published in the previous year, in which there is not the least mention of the authors.<sup>72</sup> This contribution by Quesnay, which was totally unknown, thus finished in the oblivion from which it must be saved. The episode uncovers preoccupations, still at the beginning of the 1770's, which in the previous two years must have been still stronger. So much so that they coinvolved in the suspicion of reticence the information supplied from the *Notice abrégée*. In effect, Dupont's bibliography left a part of Quesnay's writing activity in the shadow — that connected with contingent arguments and likely to cause him trouble at court.

As far as the "Journal de l'agriculture du commerce et des finances"

<sup>70</sup> However, as the censor's approval bears the date January 23, 1770, the volume must not have come out before February, 1770.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *Comparaison des revenus des terres, à la fin du seizième siècle, et de ceux d'aujourd'hui, par M. V.; avec des observations par Mr. A.*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, XI, pp. 85-98.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. *Avertissement, contenant la table raisonnée des matières traitées dans les volumes de l'année précédente*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1770, I, p. 73.

is concerned, an unpublished letter from Mirabeau to Longo contains the indication that Quesnay also published in that paper some articles in the form of letters in which he hid behind the initials M. X.<sup>73</sup> Two letters and a *Memorial*, signed in this way,<sup>74</sup> appeared in the "Journal". Mirabeau's intimation seems to refer to these two letters, excluding the *Memorial*,<sup>75</sup> which had appeared in the December 1776 number, when Dupont had already been forced to relinquish the directorship of the "Journal", and can hardly be ascribed to Quesnay.<sup>76</sup> It was with these articles that Quesnay carried on his game, which he had inaugurated in the November 1765 number,<sup>77</sup> of reproposing the neomercantilist thesis with surprising rigour of method. This was a sophisticated intellectual game, which even so fitted in with the tactics adopted by Quesnay at that moment to guarantee some show of impartiality for the "Journal" and to allow him to reduce the threats from the landowners and the censorship, egged on by the restrictionists, against Dupont. In the first letter, Quesnay spoke on the side of Baudeau in the discussion carried on between him and Le Trosne which was to be concluded soon after with the conversion of Baudeau to "Physiocratie". Regarding this sensational conversion, which assured for the school both a polemicist of the first rank and his journal, Dupont, Le Trosnes and Mirabeau,<sup>78</sup> all laid claim to the honour, but, as Baudeau himself<sup>79</sup> made clear later, the true artificer was Quesnay and the letter in the "Journal" — for which Baudeau showed his particular appreciation by reproducing it also in the "Ephémérides" — must also have played its part. On the

<sup>73</sup> Speaking of Quesnay, he writes on May 20, 1780: "quand nous fîmes d'abord le 'Journal de commerce' avant les 'Ephémérides', ce fut luy qui fit les lettres de M. X." The letter is in the Musée Paul Arbaud at Aix-en-Provence, Fonds Mirabeau, vol. 19, c. 187v.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *Réponse à Mr. M. sur celle à l'auteur des "Ephémérides du citoyen", insérée dans le "Journal de mars", "Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce, et des finances", VI, July 1766, pp. 123-135; Lettre de Monsieur X. à Monsieur \*\*\* d'Angers. Ou sixième mémoire contre la concurrence dans le fret, ibid., VI, August 1766, pp. 150-183.*

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *Moyen de concilier M. Auffrai, et M. de Morpas, sur la question concernant les inspecteurs, et les réglemens des manufactures. Par M. X., ibid., VII, December 1766, pp. 162-176.*

<sup>76</sup> It should be noted however that the pamphlet of December, which by then had passed into the hands of Fortbonnais and his friends, still contains articles of a physiocratic nature, such as the *Réponse à la lettre de M. l'abbé B.*, pp. 107-112 and the *Nouvelles réflexions sur l'impôt arbitraire de la taille*, pp. 3-19.

<sup>77</sup> With the *Lettre à MM. les auteurs de la Gazette et du Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce et des finances. Par M. H.*, *ibid.*, III, November 1765, pp. 150-165.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. *Notice abrégée, "Ephémérides du citoyen"*, 1769, V, pp. XXX-XXXII and Dupont's letter to the Marquis of Pezay of March 12, 1776 in the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library of Greenville; Le Trosne's letter to the Economical Society of Berne, January 7, 1767, in A. ONCKEN, *Der ältere Mirabeau und die ökonomischen Gesellschaft in Bern*, Bern, 1896, p. 72; Mirabeau's letter to Rousseau, December 20, 1767 in *Correspondance générale de J. J. Rousseau*, edited by Th. Dufour, XVIII, Paris, 1932, p. 29.

<sup>79</sup> "J'ai appris, pour la première fois, en 1766, à l'école du respectable docteur Quesnay, à distinguer les bons principes d'avec les paradoxes qui m'avoient séduit". Cf. N. BAUDEAU, *Idées d'un citoyen presque sexagénaire sur l'état actuel du Royaume de France, comparées à celles de sa jeunesse*, I, Paris, 1787, *Preface*, pages unnumbered.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1766, V, pp. 211-224. On p. 210 Baudeau thanks "l'ingénieux anonyme" who introduced himself so courteously into the argument.

basis of Dupont's affirmation, in his presentation of M. X.'s first letter,<sup>81</sup> two further articles of polemics against the Physiocrats, published the previous year in the "Journal", need to be reassigned to Quesnay.

As far as the "Ephémérides" is concerned, it has unfortunately proved impossible to find information as certain as that supplied by Mirabeau's letter to Longo. It will therefore be necessary to rely on a more careful examination of the review itself and of the contemporary declarations of Dupont: a mine-field into which one needs to move with the maximum caution. In effect, only one case gives sufficient data for an attribution to Quesnay. This is the *Examen de l'Examen*, a pamphlet attacking Fortbonnais, published as a supplement to Volume XI in 1768.<sup>83</sup>

In August of that year, Abeille, a physiocratic writer who was however to defect, had published a *brochure* in defence of freedom of the corn trade, to which Fortbonnais had immediately replied with a supplement to the number, also for the month of August, of the "Journal de l'agriculture du commerce et des finances", which had been under his control since 1767.<sup>84</sup> Fortbonnais' new attack, which caused the argument to flare up for more than a year, provoked the angry reaction of a group of Physiocrats who dedicated many pages of the "Ephémérides" to him. Dupont added a poisonous note in Volume XI and a long review in Volume XII, which earned him the enthusiastic praise of Turgot.<sup>85</sup> Between these two he inserted the *Examen de l'Examen*, in the form of a supplement to Volume XI, which was published together with Volume XII, which had the approval of the censor, dated 26 December 1768.

On the second of the same month, Turgot had written to tell Dupont that he had received a copy of Volume XI and had noted "avec grand plaisir" that the *Examen de l'Examen* did not appear in it. On January 13 following, announcing the receipt of Volume XI, he stated his approval of the decision to have it published separately. "Cela s'appelle lever noblement les difficultés", he commented. To what difficulties he refers we are unfortunately not informed, but they must be considerable if they compelled

<sup>81</sup> "Nous avons quelques raisons de croire que cet auteur est celui qui a daté de Lisbonne la lettre que nous avons imprimée à la tête de notre "Journal" de Novembre, ou celui qui a fait les *Observations critiques* qui se trouve à la fin du volume d'octobre. Cependant, dans la crainte de nous tromper, nous ne le désignerons que par le nom de M. X." Cf. "Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce, et des finances", VI, July 1766, p. 122.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. *Observations sur la "Gazette du commerce" of August 6, 1765, et sur le "Journal de commerce" du 15 Août de la même année, ibid.*, III, Octobre 1765, pp. 172-197; *Quatrième mémoire contre la concurrence dans le fret, ibid.*, III, November 1765, pp. 6-31.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *Supplément au onzième tome des Ephémérides du citoyen, pour l'année 1768, ou Examen de l'Examen du livre intitulé, Principes sur la liberté du commerce des grains.*

<sup>84</sup> Abeille's brochure, published anonymously, had the title *Principes sur la liberté du commerce des grains*, Paris, 1768. Fortbonnais' reply, likewise anonymous, was called *Examen du livre intitulé "Principes sur la liberté du commerce des grains"*, Paris, 1768, supplement to the number of August 1768 of "Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce et des finances".

<sup>85</sup> Cf. "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1768, XI, pp. 195-198, XII, pp. 149-174.

Dupont to replace the *Examen de l'Examen* at the last moment, when it had already been printed and paginated in Volume XI,<sup>86</sup> with a long instalment of Mirabeau's "lettres sur la stabilité de l'ordre légale". The preceding paragraph of the same letter was however dedicated to relations with the authorities, which to Dupont appeared troubled by a threatening distrustfulness, the nature of which is not however explained in detail. Turgot promised to remove distrust, in the conviction that Volume XII, which had come out with the *Examen de l'Examen* would prove wholly acceptable. If the point of attrition with the government, till then generally well disposed towards the "Ephémérides", was in fact due to the *Examen de l'Examen*, it is not easy to decide. It is quite certain that Quesnay's last two articles in the "Ephémérides" (which appeared in the numbers of October 1767 and February 1768) were dedicated to the fierce and open attack on Fortbonnais and must have provoked unpleasant reactions for Quesnay. The quarrel in the "Ephémérides" with Fortbonnais went on quite regularly, but without Quesnay's participation. He had in all probability been invited discretely to keep quiet — just as Mirabeau was later to be. The *Examen de l'Examen* might therefore create difficulties with the censor only if it could be thought that Quesnay had had a hand in it. However, Turgot, who during this period showed himself to be ever more hostile with regard to the two heads of the "secte", Quesnay and Mirabeau, defined Dupont's review as "un chef-d'oeuvre", but did not appreciate the much more balanced and topical reply in the *Examen de l'Examen*, which he dismissed with an extremely caustic jibe about the prolixity of Mirabeau's contributions, equally worthy to finish up confined in appropriate supplements.<sup>88</sup>

In the presentation of the *Examen de l'Examen* Dupont made not the least mention of the difficulties which publication of the brochure had brought him. He limited himself to a declaration that he had been unable to insert it in Volume XI of the "Ephémérides", as the author had requested, because he wanted to intervene with the utmost speed in the polemic against Fortbonnais, while however remaining incognito. Dupont introduced him as a new collaborator and gave him as his initial the letter N, forgetting that he had already reserved this for another of the Physiocrats, Saint Péravy who had begun to write for the review with an article which appeared in Volume X, also in 1768, in other words the one which immediately preceded Volume XI, which was to include the *Examen de l'Examen*. This oversight, after so short a period of time,<sup>89</sup> leaves one to suppose that Dupont, rather

<sup>86</sup> As can be deduced from the various typographical characteristics of the supplement, already noted by E. Coleman, "Ephémérides du citoyen. 1767-1772", *op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>87</sup> On June 14, 1772, Mirabeau communicated it to the Marquis of Baden. Cf. *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, *op. cit.*, I, p. 59.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Oeuvres de Turgot*, III, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 56.

<sup>89</sup> It should be noted nonetheless that in the *Notice abrégée* ("Ephémérides du citoyen",

than choosing it on his own initiative, had acceded to a request from the author. Later in the *Notice abrégée*, he apologized for the error committed "par un mal-entendu" and revealed the name of the first collaborator who had hidden his identity under the letter N, but not that of the second to whom he left the N, assigning a new letter "Q" to Saint Pérary.<sup>90</sup> From this it can be surmised that the second "N" was anxious to preserve both his anonymity and the letter "N", unlike Saint-Pérary who, in gentlemanly fashion, gave up both the letter and his own anonymity in favour of the other man. At this point the circumstance that Quesnay used precisely the letter "N" to indicate the protagonist of his antimercantilist polemics debated in the "Journal", particularly in the two *Dialogues* republished just before in the *Physiocratie*, must surely be significant. The initials M. N., well-known to readers of the "Journal" of the time and of the *Physiocratie*, that is to friends and sympathizers, might easily suggest a connection with the polemics of two years earlier, without disclosing to the uninitiated — and the authorities in particular — the true identity of the anonymous writer. This same preoccupation seems to be at the bottom of the enigmatic and elusive indications that Dupont supplied in the *Notice abrégée* as to the author of the *Examen de l'Examen*: "un de nos correspondants de Versailles, et celui qui a inspiré le goût et donné la connaissance de la philosophie économique à l'Anglois M. E. auteur des trois lettres pour la Défense de la Physiocratie, que nous avons publiées dans nos volumes troisième, cinquième et neuvième de 1768".<sup>91</sup> Now, it was well known that Quesnay lived in Versailles, still obsessed with the desire to recruit new proselytes, and the real artificer of the conversion of all the best known promoters of Physiocracy from Mirabeau to Dupont, from Le Mercier de La Riviere, to Baudeau and Le Trosne. Whoever he was, M. E., the zealous disciple who took to the field to praise the *Physiocratie*,<sup>92</sup> the "master from

1769, p. 42), Dupont attributes the publication of the October volume to Baudeau. In fact in the autumn he went to the south of France, but in a letter from Toulouse dated September 28, 1768 (in Eleutherian Mills Historical Library of Greenville), he replied to Baudeau, who complained about having to be in charge of the October volume, that he had already taken care of all the details. Court de Gébelin, his real substitute in the editing of the review, "en a l'ordre et tous les matériaux entre les mains, hors un seul de la queue que j'ai bien le temps d'envoyer et j'ai porté la prévoyance jusqu'à indiquer les morceaux qu'il faut retrancher et renvoyer à novembre s'il vous plaît de fournir un mémoire et qu'il faut imprimer en octobre".

<sup>90</sup> Cf. *Notice abrégée*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, IX, pp. 44-45, Saint Pérary had begun to use the letter Q in an article that appeared in volume IV of 1769, pp. 63 ff.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *Notice abrégée*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, IX, p. 50.

<sup>92</sup> Unfortunately it has proved impossible to identify it. In the volumes for March, May and September, 1768, one of those pretended arguments, so dear to Quesnay in his writings collected in the *Physiocratie*, was carried on, between two unidentified persons who pass themselves off as English. Cf. *Première lettre écrite de Paris, par un Anglois, à un de ses amis à Londres. Sur la Physiocratie*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1768, III, pp. 183-191; *Réponse à la lettre écrite de Paris, par un Anglois. De Londres ce 14 février 1768*, *ibid.*, V, pp. 190-207; *Suite des lettres de deux Anglois sur la Physiocratie*, *ibid.*, IX, pp. 176 ff. In the *Notice abrégée* (*ibid.*, 1769, VIII, pp. 24, 29-30; IX, pp. 39-40), Dupont does no more than draw brief attention to the polemic,



Versailles" who converted him to the new science could only be Quesnay.

In favour of this conclusion, which attributes to Quesnay the authorship of the *Examen de l'Examen*, there is also the circumstance, of considerable weight, that the *brochure* reproduces (pp. 81-100) the chapter of Patullo's *Essai sur l'amélioration des terres*, dedicated to the corn trade and written in all probability entirely by Quesnay, who inserted into it a long passage from the article on *Hommes*, still unpublished. Quesnay had recently referred in the *Premier problème économique*<sup>93</sup> to this chapter, which contained his first systematic treatise on the advantages that accrued to agricultural production from the free export of grains. Following this quotation, one of the newest recruits of the School, the Abbé Roubaud, had quoted it in an article published shortly before in the "Ephémérides".<sup>94</sup> But the initiative for a total reprinting of the chapter must be attributed, rather than to any other Physiocratic author, to Quesnay himself, until there is proof to the contrary. He was certainly the person most interested in it, if not actually the only one who knew that he was the author of the chapter.<sup>95</sup>

Also in the *Notice abrégée*, Dupont attributes to the author of the *Examen de l'Examen* the authorship of another *brochure* which came out anonymously at the beginning of 1769 and which seems to provide a new episode, and the last, in Quesnay's polemic with Fortbonnais.<sup>96</sup> In July 1768, one of the last recruits to *Physiocratie*, the Greek scholar, Vauvilliers, had entered the fray in defence of freedom of the corn trade with a *brochure* that was extremely successful and provoked the usual reply from Fortbonnais.<sup>96</sup> M.

but without giving any indication as to the identity of the two anonymous persons, who still remain obscure. The discussion started by M. E. hinged essentially on Quesnay's political philosophy, in perfect harmony with Dupont's introduction to the *Physiocratie*. This circumstance suggests the attribution to those pupils who were most sensitive to the master's politics, in the first place to Le Mercier de La Rivière, and to Dupont himself.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. *Physiocratie*, ed. cit., p. 193. The quotation is missing in the first edition of the essay, published in "Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce et des finances", VI, August 1766, p. 106.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. *Lettre de M. G. à un magistrat, sur les discussions relatives à la liberté du commerce des grains*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1768, VIII, p. 101. That this quotation stems from Quesnay is obvious: Roubaud similarly quotes the same works in the same order and even with more bibliographical details. For the identification of Roubaud with M. G., cf. "Ephémérides", 1769, VI, p. 210.

<sup>95</sup> Quesnay does not appear to have mentioned his collaboration with Patullo to any of his pupils — silence was his habit in such circumstances. Dupont himself, who even referred to the *Essai*, and particularly to the chapter on the corn trade, does not give it the least mention. Cf. *Notice abrégée*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, I, pp. XLVII-XLVIII.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. *The Lettre d'un gentilhomme des Etats de Languedoc, à un magistrat du Parlement de Rouen, sur le commerce des bleds, des farines et du pain*, s.l.n.d. and the *Réponse du magistrat du Parlement de Rouen, à la lettre d'un gentilhomme des Etats de Languedoc; sur le commerce des bleds, de farine et du pain*, "Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce et des finances", November 1768, pp. 3-40, but also in a separate *brochure* with the same title, Amsterdam and Paris, 1768. The two *brochures* were reviewed by Dupont in "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1768, VIII, pp. 145-158; XI, pp. 161-166 and mentioned in the *Notice abrégée*, *ibid.*, 1769, IX, pp. 19-20, 37-38. Turgot found "l'extrait du Magistrat de Rouen bien maigre" and called for that full-blown "refutation" which the *Réplique* was to provide. Cf. *Oeuvres de Turgot*, III, op. cit., p. 20.



N., who only just before had come to the defence of Abeille with a new *brochure* to which Quesnay's young pupil<sup>97</sup> added four very long notes, came to the aid of Vauvilliers. In the *Notice abrégée*, Dupont made no bones about revealing Vauvillier's name, but did not mention that of the author of the text and, persisting in the allusive game that had been inaugurated in the *Examen de l'Examen*, he referred to the anonymous M. N. as the author.<sup>98</sup> The attribution of the *Réplique* to Quesnay appears convincing and is supported by the effective existence of direct relations with Vauvillier, testified by a letter from Quesnay during the same period<sup>99</sup> and by the circumstance that also in this brochure (p. 9), the reader is directed to a complete exposition of the theory of price in the chapter of Patullo's *Essai* on the freedom on the corn trade.

Returning to the "Ephémérides", the initial N. reappears there one more time, at the foot of a letter published in the last volume, number III, of 1772, which marked the end of the periodical, which was suppressed by the censor.<sup>100</sup> It is a short article on one of Quesnay's favourite themes: education for peasants. The article takes as its point of departure an old, confused manual by a German theologian and proposes the composition of a new, modern and functional one, and sketches it out in broad outline. The letter is signed "N. de plusieurs Académies" and, according to the conclusions regarding the author of the *Examen de l'Examen*, it should be attributed to Quesnay, who, as is well known, was in fact a member of various academies in addition to that of the surgeons, including the Académie des Sciences and the Royal Society. In these last years of his life, Quesnay was in any case fully active, as numerous testimonies show, particularly the notes added in 1774 to Mirabeau's *Supplément à la Théorie de l'impôt*.<sup>101</sup>

According to what the biographers say, one month before his death, that is in November 1774, the tireless octagenarian wrote three memoirs on economics, which give proof of surprising intellectual vigour.<sup>102</sup> No trace

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Réplique à la Réponse du magistrat du parlement de Rouen, sur le commerce des bleds, des farines et du pain. Avec des notes de l'éditeur*, s.l., 1969, but Dupont dated it December 1768.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *Notice abrégée*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1769, IX, pp. 51-59.

<sup>99</sup> Quesnay's letter to Mirabeau, already mentioned, is in the National Archives, M. 784. N. 70.12. Like most of Quesnay's letters to Mirabeau, it is undated, but was already noted by J. HECHT, *La vie de F. Quesnay*, op. cit., p. 273, which refers to the composition of *Les économiennes* which appeared in 1769, and it may therefore be dated to 1768. In it Quesnay assures Mirabeau that he has sent him the letter he requested through Vauvilliers.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. *Lettres sur un livre à faire pour les gens de la campagne*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1772, III, pp. 201-206. On page 204 a line was struck out by the censor. The volume came out very late and the censor's approval bears the date September 18, 1772.

<sup>101</sup> This note, already mentioned, is in the National Archives, K. 883. N. 1 bis and was studied by G. WEULERSSE, *La Physiocratie sous les ministères de Turgot et de Necker*, Paris, 1950, pp. 3-8.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. J.-P. GRAND-JEAN DE FOUCHY, *Eloge de Quesnay*, in *Oeuvres économiques et*

of these remains, however, or of the articles which, according to Quérand, Quesnay had published in Abbé Rozier's "Journal de Physique".<sup>103</sup>

The Physiocrats showed themselves well disposed towards this review, and Dupont made favourable note of it from the appearance of the first numbers. Towards the end of 1772, Dupont himself planned to go into association with Rozier in order to transform the periodical and to give life to a new one that could take the place of the "Ephémérides" which by then had been suppressed. The plan came to nothing, however, because of the opposition of the authorities, and Rozier continued to publish his review on his own. At the end of 1773 Dupont recommended it warmly to the Marquis of Baden, without the least mention of any physiocratic element in it, which a direct examination of the review excludes.<sup>104</sup> If at all, Quesnay may have collaborated anonymously or under pseudonyms in Rozier's review with scientific articles, for example, in the field of mathematics. But, without the aid of external evidence, which in this case is entirely lacking, it is impossible to identify them.

Quérand's affirmation thus remains inexplicable, no less than that of Barbier, who attributed to Quesnay a rough little treatise on agriculture which appeared in 1759 under the pseudonym of Bellial des Vertus. This attribution is baseless, as is proved by the arguments used by J. Hecht which appropriate studies have shown to be irrefutable.<sup>105</sup>

The notes to Mably's treatise, *Le droit public de l'Europe* are to be considered lost. Quesnay wrote these in 1764 for the edification of the young Dupont, then at the outset of his career. Of these notes, which in 1769 were in the possession of Abeille, no further word remains.<sup>106</sup> Letters, notes and various writings were certainly in the possession of other pupils of Quesnay, whom he used to assist and guide in their studies of economics.

*philosophiques de F. Quesnay*, edited by A. ONCKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 35; COMTE D'ALBON, *Eloge historique de M. Quesnay*, *ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. I. M. QUÉRARD, *La France littéraire*, VII, Paris, 1835, p. 393.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. the letters from Turgot to Dupont of November 17 and December 18, 1772, in *Oeuvres de Turgot*, III, *op. cit.*, pp. 569, 571 and the letter from Dupont to the Marquis, dated December 26, 1773, in *Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Dupont*, *op. cit.*, I, p. 165.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. A.-A. BARBIER, *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes*, II, Paris, 1882, col. 225; J. HECHT, *La vie de F. Quesnay*, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-262. The brochure by Bellial de Vertus is the *Essais sur l'administration des terres*, Paris, 1759.

<sup>106</sup> In a letter to Abeille, Dupont writes: "Je vous ai prouvé combien elle (la paix) m'est chère lorsque vous vous êtes emparé, malgré Monsieur Quesnay, des notes qu'il a faites sur le traité du *Droit public* de M. l'abbé de Mably, et que vous n'avez jamais voulu rendre ni à Monsieur Quesnay, ni à moi, ces notes que cet homme respectable avait faites uniquement pour moi, pour mon utilité, pour mon instruction, pour mon usage, pour me faciliter, pour me guider dans un travail dont je m'occupais alors, comme je pourrais le prouver par les lettres mêmes de M. Quesnay. Il y a cinq ans de cela, j'en avais à peine vingt-trois, je n'étais connu de personne, j'avais à tous égards le plus grand besoin d'instruction et de secours; ...". The copy of this letter, undated, but easily datable to March 1769 on the basis of Abeille's letter of March 5, 1769 to which it replies, is in the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library of Greenville.

There is precise testimony with regard to Le Mercier de La Rivière, Le Trosne and Baudeau.<sup>107</sup> But it has proved impossible to find the private papers of any of these men.<sup>108</sup>

To conclude, the question of the numerous writings on medicine, mathematics and philosophy has still to be considered. In an age like our own, with its ever growing mania for interdisciplinary research, an editing venture which omitted these would probably come in for bitter comment. The present writer however confesses, with due humility, that he is not competent to judge the practical and theoretical works on medicine, or mathematics, nor could he propose a suitable form for total or partial reprints. One must therefore be resigned to the risk of disappointing and irritating those indefatigable searchers for new fields of epistemology who will be compelled to return to the old eighteenth century editions. In a new edition of Quesnay's work, on the other hand, it would be quite impossible to omit the philosophical writings and all those of methodological interest: in fact Quesnay's economic and political research work obviously has its roots in the humus of eighteenth century "philosophie" and it would be a grave defect not to exhume these documents from this ideological and doctrinal hinterland. This was a criterion already followed during the last century by Oncken, who republished the *Préface* to Volume I of the *Mémoire de L'Académie Royale de Chirurgie*, some extracts from the second edition of the *Essai physique sur l'économie animale* and the article on *Evidence* from the *Encyclopédie*. To these texts should be added the pamphlet, *Aspect de la psychologie*, discovered and published by J. Hecht and the letters to Th. Tronchin.<sup>109</sup>

Unfortunately, Quesnay's collection of letters will still be small in number and almost non-existent, despite all the research-work done, for all of the long period at the beginning of his economic and political studies. Besides

<sup>107</sup> According to Mirabeau *L'ordre naturel et essentiel des sociétés politiques* was written in strict collaboration with Quesnay; cf. *Précis de l'ordre légal*, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-62, and the letter to Longo of May 27, 1788, mentioned by L. DE LOMÉNIE, *op. cit.*, II, p. 334. Le Trosne remembered once, after Quesnay's death, "Les soins qu'il a pris de diriger par écrit et de vive voix mes premiers pas dans l'étude de la justice". Cf. J. MILLE, *Un physiocrate oublié*. G. F. Le Trosne (1728-1780), Paris, 1905, p. 65. Finally Baudeau declared he had "travaillé dix ans sous ses yeux". Cf. *Idées d'un citoyen presque sexagénaire sur l'état actuel du Royaume de France*, *op. cit.*, *Preface*, pages unnumbered. Precise responses to this collaboration can also be found in "Ephémérides". Thus, for example, in an article requested by Quesnay, Baudeau declares explicitly that he was limited in his work to outlines traced out by the master ("La savante note du Maître, nous indiquoit en quatre mots l'objection et la réponse"). Cf. *De l'origine et de la nécessité des hérédités foncières*, "Ephémérides du citoyen", 1767, II, pp. 65-112.

<sup>108</sup> Baudeau's papers were put into order during the last century by L. F. Beffara, who also published a fragment of the diary, but without giving any reference to the whereabouts of the papers. Cf. *Chronique secrète de Paris sous le règne de Louis XIV*, "Revue rétrospective", III, 1834, p. 31.

<sup>109</sup> There are three letters to Théodore Tronchin in the Tronchin Archives at the Public and University Library, Geneva. Two of them were published, with cuts and reworkings of the text, by H. TRONCHIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 356-360.

the three letters to Tronchin, there is a trace, but only in Fischier Charavay, of two other letters, one to the Abbé Le Blanca and the other to F. Boissier Sauvage de La Croix, which it has not been possible to trace.<sup>110</sup>

*Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma.*

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Bibliothèque Nationale, Fichier Charavay, 147. The letter to Le Blanc was described and summarized in the *Catalogue des autographes et manuscrits de M. Lucas de Montigny*, Paris, 1860, p. 454. For both letters cfr. J. HECHT, *La vie de F. Quesnay*, *op. cit.*, p. 252.