

The Criminal Law Thought Implied in the Enlightenment Literature of England

Chunyuan Liu*

Associate professor, College of Criminal Justice, Shanghai University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai, China.

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Consistent with the idea of "natural rationality" advocated by English Enlightenment literature, almost all criminal law scholars during the Enlightenment period were of "the Natural Law School". The natural law and rationality advocated by criminal law scholars of the Enlightenment School were almost synonymous. One of the theoretical cornerstones of the classical criminal law school, the social contract theory, is the logical premise for the germination of modern Western political and legal thought. It is described in the topic of human nature's good and evil and natural social state in Enlightenment literature, and then derived modern criminal law principles such as legality of crime and punishment, equality of application, and balance between crime and punishment in the field of law. The second theoretical cornerstone of the classical criminal law school, the theory of freedom of will, is closely related to the independence of human spirit and freedom of will affirmed and praised in Enlightenment literature, which solves major issues such as the basis of punishment power and absolute retributive punishment in classical criminal law.

Keywords

English enlightenment literature, criminal classic school, Criminal Law Thought.

1. General Introduction

In the works of Enlightenment literature in England, Defoe's "Robinson Crusoe" and "Moll Flanders" are modern men nurtured by human civilization. When they are abandoned on a deserted island or exiled to barren soil far away from human civilization and laws, their inherent wisdom, rationality, and virtues are stimulated, and they finally become true men. Swift's "Gulliver's Travels" deeply experiences and enthusiastically praises the natural law of "innate rights" and "human beings are born free" during his journey to Lilliput, Brobdingnag, and the Houyhnhnms. The charm of Voltaire's "Candide" comes from his preservation of the humanity of original justice and natural intuition. Montesquieu's "Persian Letters" describes the exiled Persian wandering in several European countries in search of natural humanity free from feudal fetters and the social system compatible with it. Diderot's "La Religieuse" spends her whole life pursuing secular happiness opposite to religious life. Rousseau's "new men", whether it is Emile, Julie, Saint-Preux, or the confessing "I", are all outsiders of realistic civilization. All the literary characters are "natural men" who maintain natural emotions and rationality. Goethe's "Faust" is a vivid portrayal of the historical process of Westerners' unremitting pursuit of freedom and rationality since the Renaissance, which fully demonstrates the booming progress and infinite pursuit of the new men.

Corresponding to the idea of "natural rationality" advocated by Enlightenment literature, almost all criminal law scholars during the Enlightenment Movement belonged to the "natural law school". They advocate natural law and believe that natural law exists before statutory law

and eternally guides the development of human society and the evolution of human civilization. They believe that the existing religious legal system violates natural laws and infringes on human natural rights, so it does not conform to the principle of rationality and must be reformed or abolished. In this sense, the natural laws advocated by the criminal law scholars of the Enlightenment school are almost synonymous with rationality. Criminal law scholars of this period put forward the slogan of "innate human rights". The essence of "human rights" is freedom, which originates from natural law and is inherent in human beings, including the rights to self-preservation, personal and ideological freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. These rights are not allowed to be infringed by the government or any other person. Based on the innate nature of rights, criminal law scholars criticized the medieval status-based, arbitrary, cruel, and theological criminal law, put forward the spirit of democracy, freedom, and equality, advocated natural law based on the theory of human nature, and tried to liberate criminal law from the shackles of royal power, advocated rationalism and utilitarianism, and accumulated theoretical origins with far-reaching influence for the modern Western criminal law system.

2. The First Theoretical Cornerstone of the Classical School of Criminal Law: Theory of Human Nature and Social Contract Theory

The first theoretical cornerstone of the classical school of criminal law is the "social contract theory". The disputes about "human nature" during the classical and Enlightenment periods and the social contract theory based on the theory of human nature are the logical prerequisites for the germination of modern Western political and legal thoughts. However, the conclusion of the social contract is closely related to the natural state of the primitive society.

When it comes to the natural state determined by human nature before the emergence of the state and law, there are vivid descriptions in Enlightenment literary works, including Hobbes's theory of "human nature is evil" and the theory of universal wa[1]r, Locke's dual theory of human nature that "human nature is neither good nor evil", [2]and Rousseau's theory of the golden age that "human nature is good"[3]. Corresponding to the three "theories of human nature" advocated by Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, the "social contract" mainly carried by legal provisions also includes three types:

2.1. Hobbes's "monarchical contract"

Hobbes believed that human nature is full of selfishness and evil. In order to end the "state of war where all men oppose all men", the fear of death and the instinct of survival force people to use rationality to summarize some terms for peaceful coexistence, which is the natural law. To ensure the implementation of the natural law, people must conclude a contract, on the one hand, agreeing to hand over all rights and powers, including freedom and the right to life, to the "most powerful" individual for safekeeping; on the other hand, for the peace and security of the society as a whole, this "most powerful" individual should strive to use the rights and powers collected from citizens, and his authority to ensure the compliance of the contract should be supreme and unconstrained by law. This is the inevitable result of Hobbes' theory of original sin, because only absolutely powerful and unrestricted power can maintain peace and order in a "society of wolves and wolves". Hobbes' contract theory has a clear one-way nature, that is, it only or mainly binds the people who sign the contract and become subjects under the rule of the monarch. The people become insignificant insects sheltered by the monarchy. They acquire a certain sense of peaceful survival rights, but they have no free will at all. Of course, Hobbes was also aware of this point, but "Leviathan" is a creation of mankind itself. People should weigh the pros and cons and choose the lesser evil: on the one hand, absolute freedom but full of the danger of destruction; on the other hand, absolute autocracy but enjoying safety and peace. Obviously, Hobbes believed that the choice of the latter is the manifestation of human rationality. This view is vividly and accurately described in Hobbes' work "Leviathan"

2.2. Locke's Advocacy of "Constitutional Monarchy Contract"

Contrary to Hobbes' extreme concern for social security, Locke's contract theory emphasizes the pursuit of freedom. Locke believed that human nature is inherently neither good nor evil, and the state of nature is a state of complete freedom, adjusted by natural law. People decide their own behavior with their inherent natural wisdom and accept the blessings or punishments of nature. On the one hand, everyone is equal; on the other hand, everyone has the right to punish criminal acts that they believe violate natural law. The drawbacks of this society are: first, the natural state enjoyed by people may be destroyed or infringed by others; second, when everyone acts as a judge to adjudicate criminal acts according to natural law, it is easy to exceed rational rules. Therefore, people must conclude a contract to ensure that natural law continues to play a role in society. According to the contract, people agree with each other to form a community - the state. Unlike Hobbes' theory of "the transfer of all rights," the key to Locke's contract theory is that people retain all their natural rights after entering the contract, and what is transferred to the state is only the power to enforce natural law. Locke was the first jurist in the West to propose the theory of separation of powers and the division of powers. The essence of his contract theory is to constrain the power of the government - to "put Leviathan in a cage."

2.3. Rousseau's Appeal for "Democratic Republic Contract"

Rousseau believed that barbarians in the state of nature were in the "golden age" of human social development. Their intellectual faculties were underdeveloped, without norms for doing good or evil, suppressing the germination of selfishness with their instinctive compassion and love, and fulfilling the duties of natural law, customs, and morality. Private ownership is an important step for humans to enter a state of inequality from the state of nature, and this inequality is the driving force for the continuous evolution and development of society, as well as the originator of human civilization. People in the state of ignorance and nature can enjoy the freedom to do whatever they want, but as inequality gradually intensifies and human civilization emerges, people are shackled forever. The purpose of Rousseau's "contract theory" is to restore the lost state of freedom for humanity. This state of freedom is not the freedom of primitive society, but it is based on fully drawing on the accumulation of human civilization. Its characteristic is that in this state of social union, each individual's obedience to the contract is essentially obedience to himself, and the full strength of social union will safeguard the personal and property rights of each individual. In other words, "to find a form of association that can protect and safeguard the person and wealth of each associate with all its common forces, and because of this association, each individual associated with the whole is only obeying himself and remains as free as before." [4] To achieve this goal, each person participating in the contract must transfer all their rights to the union, and each right is "equal," which is to prevent privileged individuals from only surrendering part of their rights; those participating in the contract give their rights to the collective rather than to individuals, with the aim of preventing individuals from abusing their powers when preserving and exercising collective rights; in addition, after forming a country through a social contract, if natural law lacks natural sanctions, the law of justice will be illusory among humans. Therefore, it is necessary for the social contract to endow the executive and administrative agencies with life, and for legislation to endow government officials with actions under their will. The code, as the carrier of the contract itself, is a regulation made by all people for all people, with the universality of will and the universality of objects.

2.4. Beccaria's criminal law thought

The social contract theory of 18th-century Enlightenment thinkers was the cornerstone for Cesare Beccaria (1738-1794) to construct his theory of crime and punishment. Obviously, Beccaria accepted Locke's "universal state of war theory", believing that people "sacrifice part

of their freedom to the sovereignty for the sake of enjoying the remaining majority of their freedom", and the emergence of the power of punishment is exactly a protective and punitive measure agreed upon to prevent some people from "trying to take back the freedom they have given up" or "occupying the remaining freedom of others".[5]

It can be seen that the "social contract theory" runs through Beccaria's criminal law thought from the beginning to the end. For instance, in the principle of legality, he advocated that only the law has the authority to prescribe crimes and their punishments. The essence of the law is a kind of social contract, and it forbids criminal judicial officers from interpreting criminal laws, which should be the common responsibility and right of the contract signers. "Allowing judges to interpret the law would leave the defendant's fate in a precarious and unsecured state, and the life and freedom of the unfortunate would become the victim of some absurd reasoning or the victim of a judge's emotional impulse."[6]

2.4.1. Legislative technique

Beccaria believed that since criminal law is a contract signed by all citizens, legal provisions should be made public and described in clear, unambiguous language. "If the criminal code is written in a language that the people do not understand, it would put the people in a position of dependence on a few legal interpreters and deprive them of the ability to control their own destinies."[7]

2.4.2. The principle of equality in the application of punishment

Beccaria sought to prove that since the rights surrendered to the sovereign by the signers of the contract are equal, punishment should not vary with identity, and the proper exercise of judicial power should not be hindered by any power other than judicial power. "Neither great men nor wealthy people should have the right to redeem their infringement on the weak and poor with money, otherwise, wealth, which is protected by law as labor remuneration, would become a tonic for tyranny."[8] Beccaria also used the social contract theory to propose the inevitability principle of punishment, denying the victim, judicial officer, or monarch the right to forgive or pardon a specific criminal. Because pardon is a humanitarian practice, but it fundamentally violates the public interest in the contract. "The contract is the product of the participation of all the people. The victim may dispose of his civil rights, but he has no right to cancel criminal punishment, because the source of the power of punishment belongs to the common agreement of society rather than individuals." "As a virtue, the radiance of kindness should shine in the code, not in the judicial process. Judicial officers have no right to let criminals be forgiven. If the inevitable causal chain between crime and punishment is broken, the entire legal system may be shaken, and people's psychology may also be disrupted."[9]

2.4.3. The principle of proportionality between crime and punishment

Beccaria believed that severe punishment violates the social contract and criticized the irrationality of the death penalty. "By what right can people kill their own kind?" The justification for the death penalty does not exist because it violates the social contract. "The part of freedom that people are forced to surrender is not cost-free and unlimited. They cannot surrender the absolute power to dispose of their own lives."[10] It is in this sense that Beccaria adopted Locke's social contract theory, differing from Hobbes and Rousseau.

3. The second theoretical cornerstone of the classical school of criminal law: theory of free will

The second cornerstone of the classical school of criminal law concerns whether human will is free. Works like Robinson Crusoe, Gulliver's Travels, and Letters of a Persian, all reflect the Westerners' resistance to classical rationalism, their desire to redeem their soul from the gods, and their aspiration to become the masters of their own spirits. And from "The Nephew of

Rameau", "Confessions", to "Faust", they implicitly reveal the regression of the Western spiritual world from "rationalism" to "natural state". Nevertheless, these enlightenment literatures affirm and praise the independence of human spirit and the freedom of will.

Immanuel Kant, the founder of German classical philosophy and the last thinker of the Western Age of Enlightenment, can be considered as a Faust who explores unremittingly in the spiritual world. Kant's criminal law thought is marked with distinct idealism, and the theory of free will is the cornerstone of his system of crime and punishment theory.

3.1. Theory of free will as the foundation

According to Kant, human dignity lies in the acquisition of freedom. Human beings are always ends, not means or tools. Only the choices of free people can decide everything, and no external or higher laws can dominate them. [11] In Kant's view, the apex of human subjectivity is "free will", but this freedom is not unlimited. It is bound by one's transcendental subjective morality, so it is not a natural law or any man-made law. Kant's transcendental subjective morality means "act in accordance with the maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law" or "I should never act except in such a way that I could also will that my maxim should become a universal law". [12] This is an "absolute command", which exists innately and is not restricted by any specific experience, personal preferences, or interests. Kant warns people that they must unconditionally abide by the above morality in their hearts to liberate themselves from the fate of being dominated purely by nature, and truly acquire free will independently of animal nature. Kant further points out that this absolute moral law is not only the basic norm for regulating people's thoughts and behaviors, but also the basis and criterion that national legislation must abide by. The core value of law is justice, which comes from "the coexistence of this act with the freedom of will of everyone and all people according to universal laws". [13]

3.2. Basis of penalty power—moral responsibility theory

Furthermore, Kant proposed the basis of penalty power—moral responsibility theory. He believed that criminal law shoulders an inevitable moral mission, and moral laws actually become natural laws that exist before the enactment of substantive laws. From the perspective of value content, the two should be consistent so that the law can maintain its nature of justice. Criminal acts not only violate the laws formulated by the state externally, but also violate moral laws internally. As the perpetrators commit these acts under the domination of free will, they should bear corresponding responsibility for such harmful acts. It is because criminal acts are committed out of free will that those with free will should be responsible for criminal acts. In this way, Kant proposed the famous moral responsibility theory based on the freedom of will: "Since people have the free will to choose their actions and dare to avoid good and follow evil, they must bear responsibility for their actions from a moral standpoint." Kant discussed moral commands based on free will, and then discussed legal rules based on moral commands, seeking the basis of penalty power from them, revealing the inevitable connection between criminal law and morality, and also revealing the essence of the harmfulness of crime. In addition, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), a famous representative of the classical school of criminal law, was also a supporter of the theory of free will. He believed that "freedom is the fundamental stipulation of will, just as weight is the fundamental stipulation of objects. Will without freedom is just empty talk." Therefore, based on the recognition of free will, he proposed a famous theory of subjective and objective dialectical unity of imputation: "Actions can only be attributed to me as faults of will." In this way, the view of crime and punishment centered on the theory of free will and moral responsibility gradually improved, and the classical school of criminal law was also established.

3.3. Absolute retributive punishment

At the same time, starting from the independent subjectivity of human beings and the freedom of human will, Kant advocated absolute retributive punishment and the view of equal punishment. Regarding the nature of punishment, Kant still used the theory of free will to elaborate, believing that punishment is purely a method of retaliation for crimes, and cannot have any other purposes or requirements. Because human beings have dignity and free will, they can only be the purpose at any time, not the means. Even for criminals, the punishment imposed on them is only because their actions under the domination of free will have caused harm to others and violated the requirements of justice. The punishment on them is to restore the damaged justice, and there is no other purpose. Regarding the scale of punishment, Kant held a typical view of equal retribution, which is also based on the fact that human beings have free will. Because human beings establish contracts out of free will, "any person's evil act towards others can be regarded as his own evil act." This is the only reliable sentencing standard, while other factors are unstable and difficult to grasp, so it cannot be guaranteed that a strict and fair judgment can be made on criminals in a pure sense under any circumstances.

4. Other criminal law thoughts

Based on the assumption of the origin of social contract theory, and on the basis of free will and natural laws, the classical school of criminal law deduced many theoretical principles—opposing arbitrary determination of crimes and punishments, advocating statutory crimes and punishments; opposing severe and cruel punishments, advocating the compatibility of crimes and punishments; opposing ideological crimes, advocating objectivism; advocating the theory of moral responsibility, and advocating a view of punishment combining retributive punishment and purposeful punishment. These criminal law thoughts have been regarded as the standard by the Western criminal law academic circle until now.

5. Enlightenment Thought: Collision and Fusion of Multiple Civilizations

5.1. The Enlightenment Movement's Advocacy of Rationality

Enlightenment thinkers believe that human awakening, social progress, and the acquisition of modern scientific knowledge all depend on human rationality. Enlightenment thinkers believe that there are universally valid principles governing mankind, nature, and society, and they scrutinize all previously accepted institutions and beliefs with a rational eye. The rationality of Enlightenment thinkers takes "natural rights" as its theoretical core, advocates freedom, equality, and fraternity, promotes education and science, and ultimately aims to establish a "rational kingdom" of happiness for all. This rationality is fundamentally different from the rationalism that advocated monarchical authority and feudal ethics in the 17th century.

5.2. Reflection on the Instrumental Rationality of the Enlightenment Movement

Enlightenment scholars hoisted the banner of rationality, attempting to reclaim the right to grasp truth from the hands of God. When people use their innate intellectual abilities to redefine the universe and society, they clash fiercely with medieval civilization centered on Christianity and gradually gain the upper hand in this battle. However, while Enlightenment rationality encourages and guides people to explore, discover nature, and solve immediate survival issues, it neglects reflections on the ultimate meaning of life, as well as issues of faith, ethics, and morality. This lack of humanity behind the fervent scientific enlightenment has already triggered criticism and reflection from some more profound and sensitive Enlightenment scholars. While denying God, existing civilizations, and the reality of social institutions, Enlightenment thinkers strive to reconstruct a new and reasonable existence with their rationality. However, in this effort to deconstruct and reconstruct, they often fall into a

contradictory and embarrassing situation of cultural choice—the objects of deconstruction often become indispensable elements in reconstruction. Dennis Hay, a British historian, evaluated humanist scholars as follows: “After fiercely attacking medieval civilization, their souls still exist, and they are still as superstition as ever towards the Virgin Mary.”[14]

5.3. The Counteraction of Enlightenment Literary Works Against Instrumental Rationality

This universally contradictory cultural psychology is inscribed in the soul of every Enlightenment thinker.

Rousseau is an Enlightenment thinker who holds the most ambiguous feelings towards Christian culture. Based on the transformation of real society, he possesses a strong secular spirit and has been attacked by the religious sector. However, in terms of his value orientation, he holds a pastor’s heart with an unbreakable religious complex. Because of this, he is also excluded from the Enlightenment camp. Reading Rousseau’s works, we can experience a strong religious sentiment and touch a hot heart full of redemption enthusiasm.

Not only is Rousseau like this, but the theoretical systems of other representatives of the “Encyclopedists” who parted ways with Rousseau due to their advocacy of “rationality supreme” are also difficult to escape the fact of being deeply influenced by Christian civilization. For example, Diderot, the editor of the “Encyclopédie” and the “most brave and thorough atheist,” exhibits a deformed image presented to the world after completely abandoning religious beliefs in “The Nephew of Rameau,” hinting at anxiety about the thoughts and actions of the “rational man” after being baptized by Enlightenment thought. Diderot captured this painful but ubiquitous consequence of the Enlightenment with keen observation, but he hesitated—he had no courage to find a solution to the real-world contradictions in the religious culture he vehemently opposed.

Voltaire, known as the “bannerman of the French Enlightenment”, said on one hand, “The first God was created by the first idiot and the first rogue.” On the other hand, he also said, “If people deny God, they will indulge in their passions and commit great sins, which is indeed terrifying.” Moreover, “I hope that my supplier, my tailor, my servant, and my wife all believe in God, so that few people will rob me or cheat on me.” So “even if there is no God, we must create one.” [15]Voltaire's humorous words hid his high evaluation and habitual dependence on the religious spirit that regulates human soul and behavior.

Montesquieu, who laid the foundation for modern western political and legal theory, mocked on one hand, “If a triangle created a god, it would definitely have three sides, which is the Trinity.” On the other hand, he could not deny the practical significance of religion: “Religion is the only rope to restrain those who are not afraid of human laws. The king is like a wild horse, and the rope of religion can tame him.”[16]

Faust, symbolizing human's dedication to practice and insatiable pursuit of worldly spirit in Goethe's works, alienated from God and was close to devils. He chased after all the good and evil in the world, pursued the ultimate truth of humanity and spiritual freedom, and committed unforgivable sins under the temptation of Mephisto and the domination of original desires. Finally, his soul, which had undergone tribulations and was full of scars, still needed to be forgiven and saved by God. These enlightenment scholars negated God and the religious system from the perspective of “truth”, guiding humans to be close to natural rationality. However, immediately after that, they constantly deepened and affirmed the significance of Christian culture from the perspective of “goodness”.

The “natural man” created by the enlightenment thought criticized religion and society with independent intellectual abilities, while also promoting the connotation of “goodness” in Christianity. What they criticized was the behaviors and thoughts of the church and believers that violated the original intention of religion and went against human nature. However, the

standard of this criticism was still Christianity's "kindness", "benevolence", "equality", and "universal love". It is better to say that this state is a dialectical attitude towards traditional culture rather than an awkward self-contradiction. It is this cultural psychology that makes people see that in the old cultural system that has been negated, criticized, and deconstructed, there are reasonable and inevitable cultural genes that are indispensable for the reconstruction of new culture. This was the case during the Renaissance period, and it was also the case during the Enlightenment period.

6. Extension and Reflection

In summary, the Enlightenment in the 18th century was essentially a return to individualism, extending and developing the original desire-oriented humanism of the early Renaissance. The difference is that the humanism of the Renaissance focused on people's perceptual desires, while the individualism during the Enlightenment emphasized people's intellectual capabilities. Similarly, just as the criminal law thought in the late Renaissance ultimately moved towards a path of integration between secular humanism and religious humanism, after satisfying sensory desires, people gradually began to pursue order and restraint; the individualism in the later stage of the Enlightenment also encompassed the dual orientations of rational spirit and religious belief. Europeans with Faustian free will and constantly expanding egoism and strong free will forebode the formation of modern Western values based on individualism and individualism, and also forebode the arrival of an era full of exploration and creation, advocating free spirit and individual consciousness. They never feel satisfied in experiencing, pursuing, feeling, and bearing endless joy and pain, regarding them as part of life. However, we cannot ignore that the belief pillar that led Faust out of the study, away from lust, passionate about politics, and benefiting the public was always the "nature" of human beings given by God. Due to the inherent sense of repentance and atonement caused by original sin, the ultimate soul of mankind also belongs to the eternal God. Western criminal law thought during this period always hovered between the dual tracks of the original desire spirit of ancient Greece and Rome and the suppressed desire civilization of Hebrew and Christianity. Although it sometimes approached the former, its core and soul were always wrapped in the latter.

References

- [1] It's described in Swift's *Gulliver's Travels: A Voyage to the Country of the Houyhnhnms*, Montesquieu's *Persian Letters: Letters from a Man in the Mountains* and Diderot's *The Nephew of Rameau*.
- [2] Works such as Voltaire's "Such a World", Rousseau's "Confessions", Goethe's "Faust" and other works embody this meaning.
- [3] It is based on the form of biographical literature such as Rahontan's *Memoirs of North America* and Finelon's *Delemark*.
- [4] Jean Jacques Rousseau, translated by He Zhaowu, *On the Social Contract*, The Commercial Press, 1980, p. 65.
- [5] Cesare Beccalia, translated by Huang Feng, *On Crime and Punishment*, Peking University Press, 2008, p. 51-57.
- [6] Cesare Beccalia, translated by Huang Feng, *On Crime and Punishment*, Peking University Press, 2008, p. 12.
- [7] Cesare Beccalia, translated by Huang Feng, *On Crime and Punishment*, Peking University Press, 2008, p. 15.
- [8] Cesare Beccalia, translated by Huang Feng, *On Crime and Punishment*, Peking University Press, 2008, p. 49.

- [9] Cesare Beccalia, translated by Huang Feng, On Crime and Punishment, Peking University Press, 2008, p. 110.
- [10] Cesare Beccalia, translated by Huang Feng, On Crime and Punishment, Peking University Press, 2008, p. 65.
- [11] Kant, Principles of Moral Metaphysics, Shanghai People's Publishing House 1986, p. 81.
- [12] This view is very similar to the traditional Chinese ethic of "do not do the things to others which you do not want others to do to you". Kant, Principles of Moral Metaphysics, Shanghai People's Publishing House 1986, p. 83
- [13] Ma Kechang , History of Modern Western Criminal Law Theory, China People's Public Security University Press, 2008, p. 116
- [14] Denis Hay, translated by Li Yucheng. Historical Background of the Italian Renaissance. Sanlian Publishing House, 1985, p. 174.
- [15] See Dai Jinbo, Biography of Voltaire, Liao Hai Publishing House, 1998, p. 176.
- [16] Louis Degraf, Translated by Xu Minglong and Zhao Kefei. Montesquieu: A Biography. The Commercial Press, 2009, p. 53.