

The Bourbon Restoration: One Century of French Historiography

G. de Bertier de Sauvigny

The historiography of nineteenth-century France, remarked Gordon Wright, has been shaped by political chronology, the chronology of the recurring upheavals that initiated as many different regimes. "It is as though Frenchmen had thoughtfully sawed up their history like cordwood into lengths of fifteen to twenty years in order to make them more easily manageable to the historian."¹

Each of these sections of "cordwood" becomes then a valid subject of attention for the history of history. The historiography of the first Revolution and that of Napoleon have variously been explored,² and in September 1972 the historiography of the Second Empire was the subject of a colloquium held in Marseille.³ But hardly anything has been done for the period falling between the two empires. The present essay is a first attempt to bridge this gap, or at least that part of it corresponding to the fifteen years of the Bourbon Restoration.⁴ The survey has deliberately been restricted

G. de Bertier de Sauvigny is professor emeritus of the Institut catholique of Paris and Honorary President of the Société d'Histoire Moderne et contemporaine. He taught history at the Institut catholique of Paris and also at the University of Notre Dame.

¹ Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times* (Chicago & London 1960) p. 259.

² E.g.: Alice Gérard, *La Révolution française. Mythes et interprétations, 1789-1970* (Paris 1970); Peter Geyl, *Napoleon: For and Against* (New Haven, 1949); Charles-Olivier Carbonnell, *Histoire et historiens. Une mutation idéologique des historiens français, 1865-1885* (Toulouse, 1976). This doctoral dissertation suggests many more approaches in the vast landscape of historiography.

³ See the special issue of *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, XXI (January-March 1974). Also a more recent survey by Stuart L. Campbell, *The Second Empire Revisited: A Study in French Historiography* (Rutgers University Press, 1978).

⁴ This article is an elaboration of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for French Historical Studies in Pittsburg (March 29-April 1, 1979). This circumstance may explain, if not excuse, the fact that many quotations remain without precise references. The author, at the time, had not considered publication, and since has found himself discouraged at the prospect of the work involved in retrieving notes taken at various times and sometimes under precarious conditions. He expresses his gratitude to the editor for his forbearance and for stretching, on this occasion, the usual forms of scholarly publication.

to a well-defined category of works: those books that present themselves by their titles as complete histories of the period and only those published in France. Included are some that were parts of series covering larger areas of French history but only if they were expanded enough to appear eventually as separate volumes and if they entailed some original reading and reflection by the author. Obviously it was unfeasible to examine how the period was treated in the hundreds of more general histories of France published in the course of a century. It would also have been of little significance, because the authors of these books could only have transmitted some superficial views gathered from reading one or the other of the above mentioned specialized histories existing at the time. But one can argue that it might be interesting to see how the image of the Restoration period was presented in the textbooks and popular historical literature that shaped the mentality of three or four generations. This kind of study, however, could not validly be attempted before laying some foundations such as the one presented here.

Narrowly encompassed in its defined subject this essay is also limited in its time dimension; it covers publications of roughly one single century. *The terminus ad quem* can be objectively justified as will be done in the conclusion, but I must also admit that I would not have felt completely at ease when commenting on the works of the latest generation of historians, some of whom are still with us.

For many reasons it was much easier in 1830 to write about the fallen monarchy than it had been the case after 1815 for the Napoleonic period. Whereas in 1815 it had been impossible to print anything that could resemble an apology of the fallen tyrant, in 1830 the July Monarchy was committed to full freedom of expression. Whereas in 1815 the publishing trade was recovering with difficulty from years of repression and scarcity, in 1830 the printing industry and journalism had enormously increased their output capacity. Whereas in 1815 historical literature was still dependent on eighteenth-century tradition and stunted by years of censorship, after 1830, as a result of a brilliant burst of creativity in the field of history, there were authors ready to write sound history for a large reading public. Indeed the conditions were so favorable that *Clio* started to look at the Restoration even before the gates had closed on its retreat.

The precocious historian was Jean-Charles-Dominique Lacretelle (1766-1855), a member of the *Académie française* and perennial holder of a chair in history at the University of Paris from 1812 to 1848. The venture was natural enough for an author who had already written series of volumes on French history from the sixteenth century to the Revolution. But why did he suddenly abandon chronological order and leave for some future time the composition of the normal sequel on the Napoleonic period? He explains in one of his prefaces: "Je voulais mêler les avertissements de l'histoire à ceux que la tribune et la presse opposaient à sa fatale imprévoyance" (that of Charles X). Translated in concrete terms it means this: Lacretelle was a friend and admirer of Chateaubriand, and when this great man turned against Villèle in 1824, Lacretelle followed him in his opposition. In 1828-29 he supported the Martignac ministry; he believed that he could somehow help this attempt at conciliation between the supporters of the dynasty and those of the constitutional system by examining how the misunderstandings had arisen.

The two first volumes of his *Histoire de France depuis la Restauration* were published in 1829, a third in March 1830. The fourth and last volume was published only after a delay of five years, in 1835. Lacretelle was well aware of the objections that could be raised against this kind of instant history; at three different places he entered into lengthy apologies for what he calls "contemporary history," and his arguments are worthy of consideration even today. The sources he uses are practically limited to the parliamentary debates, the daily reading of newspapers, and what he may have gathered from conversations. The style is a good example of that used by university professors of the time, who were induced to speak almost as actors on a stage in order to draw and keep an audience of students and idle amateurs with a mixture of a small amount of factual information and a great display of rhetoric. One can almost imagine the tone and gesticulation with which passages like this one were delivered:

Je quitte pour quelque temps la Grèce et c'est avec douleur que je rentre dans ma patrie. Mon sujet s'abaisse. Encore un moment et les Jésuites vont régner sur la France et le monde catholique. . . . Tout à l'heure je montrais la renaissance du premier peuple de l'antiquité; maintenant il faut expliquer l'étrange conspiration qui tend à faire rétrograder le premier peuple des temps modernes vers un âge d'ignorance et de barbarie. Armons-nous de courage; j'ai mesuré d'avance les écueils de mon

sujet. Il est beau de pénétrer dans les replis de l'opinion et de prouver l'inutilité des fers que l'intrigue et le pouvoir veulent donner à cette reine des nouveaux siècles.

In spite of all this, Lacretelle's *Restauration* cannot be dismissed as completely negligible. Indeed it was so much appreciated by contemporaries that it went through a second printing in 1844 and a third one as late as 1851-52. In some instances Lacretelle's account has the value of that of an eyewitness; as for example in his report of the episode when he and some fellow members of the Academy decided to raise a protest against legislation proposed by the Villèle government limiting the freedom of the press. Equally interesting are the finely drawn portraits of the two kings and other personalities whom the author had known personally.

Lacretelle had been the first on the starting line, but because of those five years which he allowed to elapse between his third and fourth volumes he found himself finally outdistanced by some other contenders. I shall mention only two essays published in 1831 and 1832—the first by an enthusiastic champion of the 1830 revolution, Nicolas-Auguste Dubois,⁵ the second by a devoted legitimist, Edouard Mennechet.⁶ Neither qualifies as a genuine history of the Restoration, the first one covering only the reign of Charles X, while the second, starting in 1814, does not go further than September 1820, despite the deceptive title.

Much more worthy of attention is the *Histoire de la Restauration et des causes qui ont amené la chute des Bourbons*, which was issued in ten volumes in breath-taking succession throughout the years 1831-33. The author at first remained anonymous, signing with no excess of modesty "Un homme d'Etat." Talleyrand, in his London embassy, was intrigued; he wanted to know about this author who seemed so well informed and had also some good things to say about Talleyrand, especially about his part in the events of 1814-15. He asked his friend Dalberg to enquire, and here is part of Dalberg's reply.

Vous me demandez qui est l'*homme d'Etat* qui publie la médiocre histoire de la Restauration. C'est un nommé Capefigue, journaliste et auteur de quelques autres ouvrages. Lié avec Mignet, il a eu, sous M. Molé,⁷ accès

⁵ *Histoire du règne de Charles X et de la révolution de 1830, jusqu'à l'avènement de Louis-Philippe I^{er}* (Paris, 1831).

⁶ *Lettres sur la Restauration. Seize ans sous les Bourbons, 1814-1830*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1832).

⁷ That is to say, when Molé was minister of foreign affairs in the first administration set up by Louis-Philippe in August 1830.

aux archives. Il va chez Molé et Pasquier qui ont lu et corrigé sa publication. Il a cherché pendant plusieurs années à réunir un tas d'anecdotes en causant avec les uns et les autres; et il a conçu son plan pour se faire de l'argent . . . Il écrit pour son libraire; il veut faire dix volumes, et, pour les remplir, il accapare tout ce qui lui vient sous la main. M. Decazes s'est maintenant emparé de lui et il lui fournit des matériaux pour écrire ce qui regarde son ministère.⁸

Molé himself mentions Capefigue in his well known *Souvenirs*,⁹ confirming that Capefigue used documents provided by Decazes, Pasquier, Dalberg, and Talleyrand. He says scornfully that Capefigue's book is "plein de mensonge, d'ignorance et de faux jugements," but he fails to add what we learn through a third party, the Baron Mounier,¹⁰ who was intimate with Molé, namely, that this gentleman—Molé—revised Capefigue's manuscript to make certain that he, at least, would be depicted as he wished to be.

Who then was this Capefigue? Jean-Baptiste-Honoré-Raymond Capefigue (1802-72), born in Marseille, came to Paris in 1821 to study law, but he soon was admitted in the first class in the Ecole des Chartes, just established by Louis XVIII. There he learned sound methods of historical research, and he might have become a luminary of the new school of history, as one can see by some of his earlier published works devoted to medieval history, which show a very high level of scholarship. Unfortunately, very soon, either through ambition or because of need for money, he drifted into journalism, first with the legitimist *La Quotidienne* and then with *Le Messager des Chambres*, a journal established by Martignac to support his middle-of-the-road policies. During the July Monarchy and even the Second Republic we find Capefigue involved with half a dozen newspapers, mostly of the Legitimist persuasion. But it would seem that Guizot finally managed to buy him out. All the while Capefigue was pouring out a steady stream of historical and pseudo-historical books on subjects ranging from the earlier Church to the mistresses of Louis XV. In all, this prodigious output numbers seventy-five titles, and since many of these are multivolume productions, Capefigue's bibliography amounts to more than a hundred printed volumes. Of course, such a quantity precludes quality. Through all this production Capefigue displays that blustering verbosity of the

⁸ Letter of Nov. 21, 1831, in *Mémoires du prince de Talleyrand . . . publiés par le duc de Broglie* (Paris, 1891-1892), IV, 350.

⁹ *Le comte Molé (1781-1855), sa vie, ses mémoires* (Paris, 1921-1930), IV, 276.

¹⁰ *Souvenirs intimes et notes du baron Mounier, publiés par le comte d'Hériscen* (Paris, 1896), p. 55.

typical Marseillais coxcomb, a fatuous pretense to be the first and only one to speak the objective truth. He likes to strut on the front of the stage, with numerous expressions like “J’ai dit . . . j’ai parlé de . . . j’ai indiqué . . . je reviens sur . . . Je dois insister encore . . . je puis affirmer que” No less ridiculous is his claim to have seen and consulted all available sources. He dares write in the Introduction for the second edition of his *Restauration*, “Je me suis éclairé de tous les faits. J’ai consulté toutes les sources; j’ai mis mon devoir à recueillir tous les documents” A barefaced lie—anyone can figure out that even by working fifteen hours a day Capefigue would hardly have had the time just to write all of his books and articles.

Once all this has been said, Capefigue’s *Histoire de la Restauration* can be considered as one of the best pieces in his vast production. It represents the kind of history of the period that could have been conceived by the quartet Talleyrand, Pasquier, Decazes, and Molé. In many pages there are facts and documents that could have been provided only by one of them; for instance, letters written by Louis XVIII to Decazes, reports of conversations between the old king and his favorite and between Charles X and Martignac, and reports of discussions in the council of ministers. Of course, the exact wording may have been different, but the general sense remains credible. We know, furthermore, that there was a second edition in 1842,¹¹ an edition which, the author claims, embodied corrections inspired by readers. It is most likely that Decazes, who had so generously provided Capefigue with much material, would have had the interest and the authority to compel him to correct those statements that he found inaccurate. And the same may be said for Pasquier and other concerned personages who were still living in the eighteen-forties.¹² As for the political tendency prevailing in the book, the names of those persons who provided Capefigue’s information are a good indicator. They situate it in what was called at the time the right-center, with Richelieu, Decazes, and Martignac cast as the heroes, the ultraroyalists and the liberals as the fools or the villains jointly responsible for the unfortunate collapse of a regime which had been, on the whole, so beneficial to the country.

Such an approach might have been satisfying for those men

¹¹ The same material, and even more, was then compressed into four volumes instead of ten.

¹² Martignac had died in 1831, and this circumstance may explain how Capefigue could have had the impudence to present himself as an intimate confidant and coworker of the minister.

who had served the Bourbon monarchy before 1830 and had felt free to transfer their loyalty to the July regime, but it could not please either the true republicans or the faithful Legitimists. The first would cringe at the idea that any good could be said for the fallen monarchy; the others would view Capefigue's book as a brazen attempt to whitewash Decazes and friends. From both sides retorts came almost immediately.

The title of the republican manifesto is significant by itself: *Histoire de la Révolution française de 1814 à 1830*.¹³ The nominal author was Jacques-Antoine Dulaure, a former member of the revolutionary Convention and the Assembly of the Five-Hundred, a most versatile scholar and writer. But we cannot dwell upon this interesting personality because the real author was his friend Pierre-René Auguis, son of a member of the National Convention, a much younger (1786-1846) and less original personality. The spirit of his production is given by the following quotation from his foreword:

Nous nous sommes proposés d'enseigner à l'immense majorité de nos concitoyens déshérités de tout droit politique . . . ce qu'était réellement ce faux-semblant de gouvernement représentatif, à l'aide duquel une poignée d'intrigants et de traîtres a, pendant quinze années, insulté à toutes nos gloires nationales, essayé de nous faire reculer vers un régime d'oligarchie ennemi de tout progrès social et accompli autant qu'il lui était donné de réussir la mission contre-révolutionnaire qu'elle tenait de la Sainte-Alliance.

In his book Auguis displays an almost inexhaustible rage against crown, aristocracy, and above all, clergy. The prolixity of his invectives was such that with the seventh volume he had reached only the end of the reign of Louis XVIII. It is likely that his publisher lost patience and compelled Auguis, much to his sorrow we may believe, to deal with Charles X in a single and last volume. In spite of this two further editions of the work appeared in 1838 and in 1870. The last one may have contributed to shaping the mentality of the insurgents of the Paris Commune of 1871.

The Legitimist counterpart appeared at a much slower rate, its six volumes being published over a span of ten years, from 1837 to 1847.¹⁴ This simple fact suggests that they embodied a much

¹³ The first edition (1834-1835) was in eight volumes, as was the second in 1838. The third one (1870) was presented in three volumes of a large format (almost in-4°) and under the simple title *Histoire de la Restauration*.

¹⁴ Étienne-Pierre Lubis, *Histoire de la Restauration, 1814-1830* (Paris, 1837-1847), 6 vols.

greater effort of serious research. The author was Etienne-Pierre Lubis (1806-59), a journalist who had an active career on various ultraroyalist and Legitimist newspapers—*la Quotidienne*, *la Gazette de France*, *la France*, *l'Union* and others. He certainly had been encouraged and perhaps even commissioned by a group of the bigwigs of the Legitimist party. The first edition was published under the auspices of a *Société d'histoire de la Restauration*, of which there is no further trace. Throughout the book we see carried on the old feud of the ultraroyalists against Decazes, of whom Lubis writes "Ministre de circonstance, tout son mérite avait été dans son crédit; tout son crédit dans la déception et le mensonge." The real, fundamental cause of the failure of the Restoration is to be found in the unfortunate concessions made by Louis XVIII to the principles of the Revolution in his declaration of Saint-Ouen and his constitutional Charter. Even if such opinions would today seem absurd, Lubis remains a useful corrective to the more clever Capefigue. And, just as Capefigue had drawn upon documents and notions provided by Decazes, Pasquier and associates, Lubis was able to use material entrusted to him by important figures of the former ultraroyalist party: Vitrolles, Lainé, Chabrol, Clausel de Coussergues, Marcellus, Blacas, Polignac, and perhaps even members of the exiled royal family. At the end of each volume is a section of "Pièces justificatives," where, among documents that are now of common knowledge, one can find some rarely printed pieces.

The work of Lubis may well have served as a challenge to republican opinion: to refute Lacretelle, Capefigue and Lubis, all favorable to the monarchy, it contained only the ridiculous exaggerations of Auguis. Republicans soon found a much worthier champion in Achille de Vaulabelle (1799-1879). He also came from journalism. A moderate republican, he was a member of the Constituent Assembly in 1848, and during the short-lived administration of General Cavaignac he was minister of public instruction. He refused to serve Louis-Napoleon and lived thereafter in retirement. The eight volumes of his *Histoire des deux Restaurations* began to come out in 1844, although his research had begun a few years earlier. The work met with immediate and durable success: there

The second edition is dated 1848, and edited by Parent-Desbarres, who presents himself as "éditeur de l'Encyclopédie catholique."

were no less than seven reprintings,¹⁵ some of them incorporating revisions by the author. The last printing appeared in 1874.

Among the larger histories of the Restoration, Vaulabelle's has probably been the most widely read and has inspired most of the second-hand accounts of the period—books, chapters, or other. This success is understandable. Vaulabelle's style is elegant and lively. The attention of the reader is sustained by anecdotes, dialogues, and quotations. Important documents are reproduced *in extenso*. These documents and other long quotations are set in a smaller type, a device that lightens the appearance of the pages. Research is made easier by subtitles set at the top of the pages. Furthermore, from place to place the chronological account is interrupted by chapters describing "l'état moral de la France."

Unfortunately these commendable features serve to give more credibility to a book that Charles de Rémusat branded as "l'histoire si partielle et si fautive des Deux Restaurations par Vaulabelle." Vaulabelle's hatred against the monarchy colors his entire presentation. The only statesman of the Restoration who earns some grudging respect from him is Richelieu. Decazes, he says, "ne connaissait d'autre loi que son intérêt ou sa fortune." His hero is the ultraliberal orator Manuel. The bloody episodes of the White Terror are gleefully chronicled in detail, filling almost a whole volume. The French intervention in Spain is a "guerre impolitique et impie." Vaulabelle is especially vitriolic against the Catholic clergy. He seems to have gathered all the small incidents, true or false, that the liberal paper, *le Constitutionnel* fed to its readers day after day, so that the general picture of the period is something like the one which would be produced for our times by compiling a history from a file of *l'Humanité*. Finally—and this is a most annoying defect—Vaulabelle does not give the slightest indication or even hint of his sources; the eight volumes include not a single footnote. One can only guess that he used extensively the newspaper and pamphlet press, and that without too scrupulous discrimination.

With Lacretelle, Capefigue, Auguis, Lubis, and Vaulabelle we have now covered what could be classified as the first generation of Restoration historiography. It is remarkable that all these authors

¹⁵ *Histoire des deux Restaurations jusqu'à la chute de Charles X en 1830*. The exact date of the several editions is not clear. The author seems to have started revision of the first volume before the actual publication of the last. Catalogues do not always distinguish between a simple reprint and a revised edition.

who wrote under Louis-Philippe showed little sympathy for the Orleanist monarchy. Perhaps it is just a case of the general rule that the intellectuals are always hostile to any government that they must live with. Perhaps those historians who could have written in support of the Orleanist point of view were too busy enjoying the trappings and performing the duties of the political power they had gained by the 1830 Revolution.

In the wake of the great multivolume histories mentioned above one could expect to find a squadron of one-volume compendiums. In 1843 appeared an extravagant rhapsody by Jérôme Delandine de Saint-Esprit (1787-1858).¹⁶ His style is studded with jewels like this: "Dans nos orages récents, toutes les doctrines de déceissance furent reproduites. De grands holocaustes et des fleuves de larmes furent mis en relief pour caresser les passions." On the opposite side is the book by Jules Ferrand and Jules de Lamarque, the sixth volume of a *Histoire de la Révolution française, du Consulat, de l'Empire, de la Restauration* (1845). The authors follow closely Vaulabelle and Capefigue, with a strong leaning toward Bonapartism. Finally, the crown should go to a rather short book—only 350 pages—by a certain Emile Renard.¹⁷ The author has not been identified, but his work is remarkably well written, well balanced, and moderate in its judgments.

The Revolution of 1848 and, shortly after, the advent of Louis-Napoleon, had two results in the field of historiography. First, it brought into play some new criteria or perspectives. Second, it excluded from public service and left marooned on dry land a number of able individuals who would seek a diversion or solace in turning to the writing of history.

The ideological contribution of the spirit of 1848 is mainly visible in the six-volume *Histoire de la chute des Bourbons. Grandeur et décadence de la bourgeoisie*.¹⁸ The author, Albert Maurin, was an obscure journalist who ended his career as editor of two provincial newspapers in Troyes. His information is drawn from his predecessors, mainly Vaulabelle, but his interpretations are clothed in socialist ideology. The whole history of the period is considered in the guise of a class struggle, that of the bourgeoisie against the

¹⁶ *Histoire de France*, Vol. XI: *Histoire de la Restauration* (Paris 1843).

¹⁷ *Histoire de la Restauration, suivie d'un précis de la révolution de Juillet* (Paris, 1842).

¹⁸ Albert Maurin, *Histoire de la chute des Bourbons. Grandeur et décadence de la bourgeoisie* (Paris, 1849-1852). Suggestive is the mention of the publishing house: "Aux bureaux de la Société des travailleurs réunis."

aristocracy. Maurin is severe in his judgment of Decazes and also of Napoleon and Louis-Philippe. His great man is Voyer d'Argenson: "Sa présence suffit pour que le dogme de la souveraineté du peuple, de l'égalité des droits, de la solidarité des membres de la famille sociale ne se perde pas." Financial and economic questions receive much greater attention than they do in other works. Theories of Saint-Simon and Jean-Baptiste Say are discussed. One can even perceive Marxian undertones in passages like this one:

Appauvris par la rente de la terre qui prenait le plus net de son produit . . . les prolétaires de la campagne désertaient en masse les travaux agricoles pour les travaux de la manufacture. . . . Ce mouvement économique qui poussait le paysan échappé de la glèbe seigneuriale par la révolution de 1789 vers un glèbe industrielle . . . préparait l'avènement d'une autre aristocratie, en concentrant peu à peu dans quelques mains la possession du capital argent, comme la féodalité avait concentré chez quelques privilégiés le capital terre. . . ."

In short, Maurin's work appears as the forerunner of the great Jaurès *Histoire socialiste* and probably deserves careful study.

The same cannot be said for the next work encountered, Lamartine's *Histoire de la Restauration* published in 1851-52.¹⁹ It is one of the many products that the unfortunate poet-statesman was compelled to churn out in order to meet his enormous debts. The eight volumes were written in less than two years, while other products were at the same time flowing from his tireless pen. His devoted wife, who acted as secretary, complained to a friend, "J'ai beau faire, je ne puis copier aussi vite qu'il produit." His method of work was simple: he took from Lubis on one side, Vaulabelle on the other, combined the material according to his fancy, throwing upon the whole the glittering cloak of his romantic prose. As an illustration, here is how he describes the French armies cheering Napoleon at the onset of the Battle of Waterloo: "Il y avait dans les acclamations l'accent lugubre des funérailles et dans les physionomies la pâleur et l'empreinte d'une tragique résolution, dans les regards la tristesse d'un adieu."

There is a nasty article by the critic Sainte-Beuve in his famous *Causeries du Lundi*²⁰ where he points out pages that Lamartine simply lifted from Lubis. He adds tartly, "Il se souvient peu et il a la mémoire docile à son imagination." The lack of proportion re-

¹⁹ While the first edition (Paris) was in eight volumes, a second, in 1869, was compressed into only four.

²⁰ Aug. 4, 1851. In *Causeries du Lundi* (3rd ed., Paris, 1859), IV, 389-408.

flects the author's haste and carelessness; the reign of Louis XVIII fills seven volumes, and poor Charles X has to be content with a single one. In that eighth and last volume Martignac's administration is dismissed in thirty-four pages and the first eight months of Polignac's in twenty-five.

The general tendency of the author is expressed in his own words: "Mon coeur est du parti de cette génération oubliée entre l'enthousiasme et la gloire de l'Empire et l'utilité vulgaire du règne de Louis-Philippe." The principal permanent interest of the work lies perhaps in the finely drawn portraits of the main personalities. There is much fantasy, of course, but also some authentic personal impressions. Polignac, Lamartine's chief in his diplomatic career before 1830, is most generously treated: "Ame pure, caractère honnête, esprit cultivé, coeur dévoué, M. de Polignac était un de ces hommes auxquels on ne peut reprocher pour tout crime qu'une erreur qui accuse les bornes de leur intelligence . . . mais qui ne deshonne pas leur nom." Lamartine has an interesting account of his last visit with his chief, when Polignac told him, "Vous partez, vous êtes bien heureux. Quand vous rentrerez vous vous reposerez à l'ombre de ce que j'aurai accompli." Here, and in some other places, Lamartine's fairy tale takes the value of personal testimony.

Among the members of the Orleanist establishment who lost their positions and influence after the advent of the Second Empire and found some comfort in history, the most famous is, of course, Adolphe Thiers, with his great *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*. In his footsteps followed Prosper Duvergier de Hauranne (1798-1881), who had been his most active lieutenant before 1848. Duvergier decided to use his forced leisure in writing a *Histoire du gouvernement parlementaire en France*.²¹ The wording of the title underscored the purpose of the venture, that of defending the parliamentary form of government at a time when the nation seemed satisfied with the authoritarian rule of Louis-Napoleon. In his preface he writes bitterly:

On ne manquera pas s'étonner qu'après les dures leçons de l'expérience il se trouve encore une poignée d'hommes assez aveugles pour ne pas voir la lumière, assez étrangers à leur pays et à leur temps pour s'acharner à la poursuite d'une chimère et pour former au milieu de la satisfaction générale une petite tribu de mécontents. . . .

²¹ First edition (Paris, 1857-1871). A second, started in 1870 (Paris 1870-1872) remained incomplete, including only the first three volumes.

His intention had been to cover the whole span of the constitutional monarchy from 1814 to 1848. But he toiled with such scrupulous attention to detail that when he reached the July Revolution he had already produced ten massive volumes, totalling some fifty-five hundred pages. He was by that time, in 1872, a member of the French Academy and somewhat tired. He decided to call a halt, giving as a reason that, after all, it might be better not to discuss the events to which he had been an active party in the chambers of the July Monarchy.

Duvergier's political allegiance is that of an Orleanist, holding that "la révolution de 1830 a été la plus juste, la plus nécessaire, la plus salutaire des révolutions et que le gouvernement né de cette révolution était le plus conforme aux vœux et aux intérêts de la France." If we wanted to situate him in the political spectrum of the Restoration, we could call him a left-center Doctrinaire; indeed, as a young man he was active in the editorial team of the Doctrinaire newspaper *Le Globe*. It therefore goes almost without saying that Duvergier likes Decazes and Martignac, that he castigates the ultraroyalists but also the extreme liberals, the latter especially for their collusion with the Bonapartists, in which he saw a distant factor in the establishment of the hated Second Empire.

Masters such as Georges Weill and Charles Pouthas held Duvergier's history in great respect, and one might say that it was a bible for academic historians throughout half a century. It has indeed much to be commended. First, Duvergier read most of the printed sources then available, not only the newspapers but also many brochures, memoirs, and correspondence, notably the great collections of Wellington's and Castlereagh's papers, which were then in the process of being published in England. Furthermore, through his political and social connections he was able to use private papers, among them those of Decazes and Villèle, but also many others: those of Vitrolles, La Maisonfort, Beugnot, Pasquier, de Serre, and more. However, the author remains often annoyingly vague about the identity of his sources. He writes, for instance (vol. X, p. 312): "J'avertis une fois pour toutes qu'une grande partie des détails qui suivent sont empruntés à des Mémoires inédits parfaitement authentiques dont j'ai pu prendre connaissance." But there is no hint as to the authorship.

A second laudable feature is the care—not always genuine or successful—Duvergier takes to sound impartial and fair. As a good Doctrinaire he strives to give balanced judgments, oftentimes draw-

ing infinitely subtle distinctions and conflicting arguments to the point where he becomes downright tedious. At least, because of this effort, Duvergier's *magnum opus* is much less colored by partisanship than that of Vaulabelle.

Its utility is unfortunately lessened by some defects in addition to those mentioned here above. First, instead of simply reproducing important documents he often gives a detailed analysis or a paraphrase. Secondly, it is pure political history; there is nothing on social, economic, nor even cultural developments as such. Thirdly, the presentation follows chronology slavishly, summarizing events, speeches, publications, trials, and foreign relations, as they present themselves on the calendar. The effect is that of a condensation of *Le Monde*, read day after day—a large gray stream of solemn prose, flowing relentlessly on and on.

Duvergier's Orleanist approach was far from satisfying to the Legitimist royalists. The task of presenting their side of the story was taken up by Alfred Nettement.²² At the age of fifty-five he was a veteran of Legitimist journalism, and besides, he had written a number of biographies and articles of literary criticism. Not long before, he had published a *Histoire de la littérature sous la Restauration*²³ and another work of the same vein on the July Monarchy. These books were highly praised by Guizot and are still quite useful. Nettement's *Histoire de la Restauration*²⁴ is frankly politically slanted. Because of his connections with all the Legitimist families, Nettement was given access to a number of private archives, those of Vitrolles and Villèle—which he seems to have been able to use more freely than Lubis or Duvergier, but also papers that had not been seen until then—those of Mathieu de Montmorency, d'Haussez, La Ferronnays, Guernon-Ranville, and, above all, those of Blacas, which since have remained closely guarded. Because of this circumstance and the skillful use Nettement makes of all the available material, including what had been made public by Duvergier, his book is a valuable corrective to the Orleanist historian. It is also much easier to use. The eight volumes which were published from 1860 to 1872 are written in a lively prose; important documents are given *in extenso* at the end of each volume; others, as well as long quotations, are printed in smaller type in the

²² There is a good biography of this author: Edmond Biré, *Alfred Nettement* (Paris 1901).

²³ Alfred Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature française sous la Restauration*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1858).

²⁴ Alfred Nettement, *Histoire de la Restauration*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1860-72).

text pages; there are many footnotes referring to sources and sometimes discussing them; subtitles at the top of the pages help the researcher. In sum, *Nettement* does not deserve the disdainful treatment he got from those who did not like his ultraroyalist leaning.

What has been said of Duvergier can almost be repeated about another *Histoire de la Restauration* that started to appear at the same time as the two previously mentioned. The author was Louis de Viel-Castel (1800-87), a gentleman who had entered the diplomatic service before 1830 and served the July Monarchy as one of the directors in the Foreign Ministry. His history is twice the size of Duvergier's—twenty volumes, totalling 12,253 pages!—published from 1860 to 1878. Its forbidding approach is accented by the mode of composition: massive chapters of one hundred to two hundred pages without the slightest subtitle to help or guide the reader, not a single footnote nor a clear indication as to the sources used, a style that a reviewer said “manque d'animation et de vie,” the pompous and bland style of nineteenth-century diplomacy. In one regard, at least, Viel-Castel may be considered as superior to Duvergier: as a former member of the foreign service he gives much more attention to external policies, and he includes pages on economic and cultural developments.

Politically Viel-Castel might be situated as a center-right royalist. He is more truly impartial in his approach than is Duvergier, as shown, for instance, by his carefully balanced judgments on the French intervention in Spain. One is tempted to believe that if Viel-Castel had taken the time to write only two volumes instead of twenty, his monument would *not* have deserved its place on those library shelves where books remain purely ornamental objects.

With the publication, in 1878, of the last volume of Viel-Castel came to a close what we might call the “era of the dinosaurs.” From then on no one would attempt to enter into more detail. Until the end of the century and beyond, these early, massive pyramids of facts would be mined as quarries for all the shorter histories of the Restoration. Even before 1860 single or two-volume histories had appeared on the market. In 1858 came one by Frederic Rittiez.²⁵ In spite of his pretense to objectivity, it was not much more than a condensation of *Vaulabelle*. A phrase from his introduction will

²⁵ *Histoire de la Restauration, ou précis des règnes de Louis XVIII et de Charles X*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1858).

mark his political faith. "Il s'agissait de savoir si la France serait ou ne serait pas à nouveau sous le joug des prêtres et des nobles et si le régime féodal affublé d'un nouveau manteau ne viendrait pas encore étendre sur elle ses bras sanglants." In 1863 appeared a single volume of less than five-hundred pages by a young professor of Aix-en-Provence, Hermile Reynald, who published at first under the alias of Jean Verdier.²⁶ He also follows Vaulabelle but with greater care to show the positive aspects of the Restoration. He writes judiciously: "La Restauration a le rare mérite d'avoir posé à peu près toutes les questions qui intéressent le droit public et les conditions d'un gouvernement libre."

The two volumes by Jean-Joseph-François Poujoulat were the first, in 1865, of a more ambitious series entitled *Histoire de France depuis 1814 jusqu'au temps présent*.²⁷ The author had been a close friend and collaborator of Joseph Michaud, longtime editor of the Legitimist *La Quotidienne*. No wonder, then, that Poujoulat's contribution is an all-out apology for ultraroyalist policies.

In 1866 came the translation of a history published in 1852 in Germany by August-Ludwig von Rochau.²⁸ His approach is that of a moderate liberal, and his presentation appears fairly objective when compared to the French counterparts of the time.

The shorter *Histoire de la Restauration* of Frédéric Lock²⁹ is a call to the republican youth of 1867 to emulate their fathers in their struggle against an oppressive regime. His great man was Manuel, and he also relied entirely upon Vaulabelle.

After the War of 1870, hope revived among the royalists for a third Restoration, which inspired renewed interest in the reigns of Louis XVIII and Charles X. This curiosity could be amply satisfied by the multivolume histories of the Restoration then in progress—those of Duvergier, Nettement, and Viel-Castel, not to mention a new printing of Vaulabelle. But there was a place or a need for books of more manageable format. Of that kind were the two essays by Henri de l'Épinois³⁰ and Roger de Larcy.³¹ Both were

²⁶ *Histoire politique et littéraire de la Restauration* (Paris, 1863). There were also a second and a third edition.

²⁷ The Restoration is covered in two volumes (Paris, 1865).

²⁸ *Histoire de la Restauration*, Traduite de l'allemand par M. Rosenwald (Paris, 1866).

²⁹ *Histoire de la Restauration* (Paris, 1867).

³⁰ *Histoire de la Restauration, 1814-1830* (Paris, 1873).

³¹ *La Restauration* (Paris, 1878). This piece was an offprint of a series of articles that had appeared first in the *Correspondant* (vols. CVI and CVII) in 1877, and in 1878 (vols. CX and CXI).

unmitigated apologies for the Bourbon monarchy. The influence of the circumstances is visible in the emphasis they place upon the wisdom of the king's foreign policies, which raised France from the depths of disaster, whereas the two Napoleonic regimes ended in humiliation and loss of national territory.

These authors were only distinguished amateurs, but Antoine Dareste de la Chavanne was a university professor and administrator. His two-volume *Histoire de la Restauration*³² had been written, he says, for the purpose of making available to a larger public the contributions of the great works that had been published in the course of the last twenty years, nothing original, therefore, but a grayish, honest presentation. The general spirit is favorable to the Restoration, on a middle ground between Duvergier and Nette-ment.

Next came, in 1881-89, three volumes signed by a Joseph-Adolphe Petit.³³ They were part of a much ampler series, *Histoire contemporaine de la France*. The only original feature of this undistinguished compilation is an odd combination of admiration for Napoleon and devotion to Charles X, whereas Louis XVIII and Decazes are severely treated.

The last child of this family of books was that of Ernest Daudet,³⁴ the elder brother of the famous novelist Alphonse Daudet. He had already produced three historical works on the period: *Le Ministère de M. de Martignac* (1875), *Le Procès des ministres de Charles X* (1877), and *La Terreur blanche* (1878). His account of the policies of the Restoration is very favorable to Decazes, a tendency that may be connected with the fact that Daudet had been, in his capacity of administrator of the National Assembly and before that as journalist, in the service of the Broglie government, in which Decazes' son was foreign minister.

To counter all these proroyalist productions, the republicans had little to show except the durable Vaulabelle. In 1878, however, appeared the fourth volume of a series *Histoire de la France depuis 1789 jusqu'à nos jours*, by Henry Martin.³⁵ This man was the Great Lama of official history in the early Third Republic. At the time he was too busy with political and social commitments to involve him-

³² 2 vols. (Paris, 1879).

³³ (Paris, 1881-1889). The Restoration was covered in volumes VII, VIII and IX.

³⁴ *Histoire de la Restauration, 1814-1830*. (Paris, 1882)

³⁵ Curiously, the Restoration is treated in vol IV, which covers the years 1812 to 1832, and thus its identity seems to be denied.

self in original research, and his book slavishly follows Vaulabelle, sprinkling his condensation with remarks as clever as “Charles X, entièrement dans la main de la Congrégation, ne quittait pas les processions et les églises.”

The two-volume *Histoire de la Restauration*³⁶ published in 1887-88 by Ernest Hamel was also part of a more extensive series, *Histoire de France depuis la Révolution jusqu'à la chute du Second Empire*. Hamel's purpose was that of a loyal servant of the Republic. In his own words it was “montrer que de tous les gouvernements qui, depuis un siècle, ont dirigé les destinées de la France, celui de la République est encore le plus stable, le plus doux, le plus favorable au progrès et le plus conforme à la dignité humaine.” One therefore can imagine the general tome of his presentation. His heroes are Benjamin Constant and General Foy. Oddly, Hamel sounds kinder toward Villèle than toward Decazes.

Hamel's was the last specific history of the Restoration that was published before the turn of the century. The long silence of almost twenty years, following such an abundance throughout two generations, is in itself a significant fact. Was it because everything had been said and repeated *ad nauseam* as much as the existing printed sources would allow? Was it because these older people who had lived before 1830 had passed away? Was it because of the fading of all hopes of a third Restoration? Was it because the emergence of new problems—social, economic, colonial—tended to make purely academic those issues that had been so passionately discussed between 1815 and 1830? Whatever the cause, the historiography of the Restoration fell into an almost cataleptic slumber until it was brought back to life by the clarion call of Jean Jaurès.

In 1898 the great socialist leader had temporarily lost his seat as deputy. His friend, the publisher Jules Rouff, took advantage of this involuntary vacation to involve Jaurès in the production of a large scale *Histoire socialiste, 1789-1900*. Jaurès undertook the task with enthusiasm, and the ten volumes appeared in rapid succession from 1901 to 1908. His tireless pen was responsible for a large part, mainly that concerning the Revolution, but he had farmed out sections to a team of collaborators. The history of the Restoration was entrusted to René Viviani (1863-1925), a brilliant barrister

³⁶ *Histoire de la Restauration, faisant suite à l'histoire du Premier Empire (avril 1814-juillet 1830)*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1887).

who was to have his own niche in history as the chief of the government that led France into World War I. Viviani was no professional historian, and this shows in his contribution.³⁷ Different in this from Jaurès, who voraciously read printed sources, Viviani relied for his information almost entirely on Vulabellé, and sometimes with astonishing results, especially in the misspelling of names; worse, the Congress of Verona becomes the “Congress of Vienna.”

The most glaring shortcoming perhaps is the fact that in this history, advertised as “socialist,” the economic and social aspects of the times are largely ignored. An example is the inadequate chapter entitled “Etat matériel et moral de la France,” in which the several pictures drawn by Vulabellé for different periods are mixed without regard to time. At the end is a summary of Saint-Simon’s doctrine, but Fourier is not even mentioned.

Throughout the pages one can see reflected the policies and the language of the “Bloc des gauches,” which dominated the political scene in the first years of the century. Approving, for instance, the execution of Marshall Ney, Viviani writes: “Le pouvoir civil, si avili qu’il soit, ne peut durer s’il n’a pas la main sur l’épée des chefs militaires.” One is reminded here of the circumstances of the Dreyfus Case. Speaking of the law passed in 1825 to ease the legal status of women’s religious orders, Viviani comments:

C’était lever toute difficulté à l’éclosion monstrueuse de ces associations innombrables qui vont envelopper d’invisibles et mortels réseaux la conscience du pays . . . arracher aux familles pauvres ou riches les missionnaires gracieux et fidèles de la religion, guetter l’heure opportune où la faiblesse, la douleur, la désespérance, le dégoût de vivre . . . livrent ces femmes débiles au cloître . . . ce fut toujours le but suprême de la religion qui a besoin de dévouement, de la discipline d’esprit, de l’abdication de la nature pour prospérer.

Not only a good example of the anticlerical rhetoric of the times, this is also an example of the style by which the followers of Jaurès tried to emulate the master’s voice.

In spite of these flaws, and in part because of them, Viviani’s book makes entertaining reading. He has felicitous formulas to depict some personalities. Richelieu: “pauvre et sans tache.” Decazes: “davantage homme d’expédients que de principes.” Pasquier: “conscience servile, parole enchaînée au succès, roulant de rares

³⁷ *Histoire socialiste, 1789-1900*, sous la direction de Jean Jaurès. VII: René Viviani, *La Restauration (1814-1830)* (Paris, 1906).

idées dans les flots d'une facon de fleurie." Villèle: "homme de budget et de chiffres." Polignac: "jamais gouvernement plus aveugle n'a conquis l'impopularité avec un art plus savant." The socialist approach inspired Viviani to challenge in many places the tradition of liberal historiography that associated Napoleonic worship with republican ideals.

Personne plus que Bonaparte n'a haï la Révolution. . . . Il attendait tout des baïonnettes, rien des bras nus et libres. . . . Le mal qu'il a causé et cause encore est insondable. . . . Ah! que les prolétaires se disent et se répètent cette histoire maudite et qu'ils n'oublient pas que . . . même une ombre de parlementarisme, un oripeau de République . . . tout vaut mieux que l'insolence de l'oligarchie militaire.

Elsewhere Viviani denies that the liberal opposition in the elected chambers truly represented the nation. "Le libéralisme parlementaire, s'il n'était pas factice, ne correspondait pas à une force égale dans le pays." The *Carbonari's* plots of 1822 had objectives "chimériques et contradictoires." The bourgeois liberals were no better friends of the people than the aristocracy:

Au fond, c'était la même classe qui, divisée en fractions politiques ennemies, tenait le pouvoir économique. . . . Autant de richesses se trouvaient représentées sur les bancs libéraux que sur les autres bancs . . . à droite de grands seigneurs égoïstes et implacables; à gauche les faiseurs d'affaires, banquiers infatigables exploités du travail humain. . . . Il n'était pas défendu de penser que l'ambition, la convoitise, l'intérêt menaient les chefs du libéralisme."

In spite of all his rantings against monarchy and church, Viviani recognizes some positive elements in the Restoration regime. Oddly, among these contributions he mentions the efforts to improve the lot of the poorer people by charitable institutions and public relief but hastens to add, "efforts qui seraient louables n'était l'intérêt égoïste qui les dicta."

For Viviani, the parliamentarian, the greatest gift of the Restoration was to have established representative assemblies. "Là, au moins, même faible comme un souffle, la parole se pouvait entendre. Ce n'était pas la nuit complète et comme un reflet du ciel aperçu du fond d'un gouffre, la liberté attirait tous ses fils à la fois obscurs et glorieux." The same thought, fondly repeated, serves as a conclusion with a typical display of verbal pyrotechnics. After censuring the perfidy of Louis XVIII and of Charles X, who had neither the courage to restore the ancient customs nor the honesty to accept the new order, Viviani goes on:

La Restauration eut cependant des mérites. Elle prit le fardeau des défaites nationales et déshabituait la nation de la gloire militaire. Elle créa la tribune parlementaire et ce trône nouveau, dans le chancellement des trônes anciens, est demeuré debout, supérieur aux tempêtes. C'est le bienfait inestimable de ce régime d'avoir laissé vivre l'instrument qui devait lui donner la mort."

At the time when Jaurès and his friends were putting the finishing touches to their *Histoire socialiste*, another team, one of confirmed scholars, was at work under the leadership of Ernest Lavisse, the great panjandrum of the French University. The eighteen volumes of the *Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution* were published all together in the year 1911. The sequel, which was to follow directly, was delayed by the war, and only in 1921-22 was the publisher able to bring out the ten volumes of the *Histoire de France contemporaine, depuis la Révolution jusqu'à la paix de 1919*. The author of volume IV, *La Restauration*, was Sébastien Charléty (1867-1945). A doctoral dissertation, on the Saint-Simonian movement³⁸ had oriented his attention on the period. After that, as professor in the university of Lyon, his work had been mainly centered on the history of that city and area. His two contributions to the Lavisse series—*La Restauration* (397 pages) and *La Monarchie de Juillet* (408 pages) must have been written before the war and were to be his last important pieces of historical work, because, starting in 1917, Charléty became involved in the higher levels of the French educational administration, ending his career as rector of the University of Paris.

His style was that favored in the French University of the time, that of the so-called positivist or scientific school, whose masters, Langlois and Seignobos, had set the rules in their famous manual *Introduction aux études historiques* (1898). After Viviani's colorful prose that of Charléty seems stale; but he manages to pack into his pages an enormous amount of sound, factual information. There are no footnotes, but each chapter is supported by an excellent critical bibliography. Paradoxically, Charléty, the liberal bourgeois, gives more attention to economic matters than Viviani, the socialist; they are treated in two special chapters full of interesting information. There is also a chapter on the intellectual movement, with Saint-Simon, of course, in the foreground. The highest praise that can be expressed for Charléty's *Restauration* is the same that can be

³⁸ *Histoire du saint-simonisme (1825-1864)* (Paris, 1896).

afforded for almost all the volumes of the Lavisserie series, namely that the lapse of sixty years has not made them obsolete.

Charl y's book served the limited constituency of university professors and students well, but it was too technical and dry for the ordinary educated reader. It was with this public in mind that Pierre de la Gorce (1846-1934) undertook to write his own version. Perhaps he also wanted to offer a counter to Charl y's presentation, which, in spite of its claims to objectivity, reflected a mentality basically hostile to the monarchy. La Gorce was a pure royalist, in the tradition of Lubis and Nettement. A staunch Catholic also, he had abandoned his career in the magistracy in 1880, refusing to be an instrument of the measures of persecution initiated by Jules Ferry against the religious orders.

As can be expected, then, La Gorce's *Restauration*³⁹ is an apology for the Bourbon monarchy, an apology mellowed by the detachment of an old age and by wisdom gained through historical experience, and also tinted by the bitterness of the man who knows he speaks for a lost cause. "On dit que les peuples heureux n'ont pas d'histoire. On se trompe. Ils en ont une, celle de leur ingratitude envers qui les rend heureux." Special attention is given to foreign affairs, and perhaps La Gorce is recapturing some of his old memories of 1880 when he dwells at length on the war waged by the liberal party against the Jesuits before 1828. Although he adopted for this book a style more synthetic than the one he had used so successfully in the great works that had established his reputation⁴⁰ and though he did not provide a bibliography, La Gorce was still careful to show that he was no amateur. Footnotes refer with great precision to some printed sources as well as to recently published contributions, such as the dissertation on Guizot by Charles Pouthas published in 1923, and there are many references to original documents from the Foreign Ministry archives.

The story that de la Gorce tells is confined to purely political matters; there is not the slightest reference to social, economic, and even intellectual aspects of the period. But, on the other hand, La Gorce's book has a notable advantage over other histories of the Restoration; most of them dwell at length on the reign of Louis XVIII, leaving that of Charles X to a hasty account, whereas La Gorce devotes an equal number of pages to each sovereign.

³⁹ *La Restauration. Louis XVIII* (Paris 1926); *La Restauration. Charles X* (Paris 1928).

⁴⁰ *La Seconde R publique* (Paris, 1887); *Le Second Empire* (Paris 1895-1905), 7 vols.; *Histoire religieuse de la R volution fran aise* (Paris, 1909-1923).

Any one interested in the Restoration should read La Gorce. Not only because of the many thought-provoking remarks scattered all through those two volumes, but also for the sheer pleasure of savoring some gems of his slightly pompous style reminiscent of that of the great writers and orators of a bygone time. Often the balanced and moralizing statements sound like some legal decision delivered in court by a justice. Characters are especially well depicted. Richelieu: "Dans la galerie des hommes d'Etat il tient une place à part; il fut le ministre qui ne mentit jamais." Lainé: "Plus irritable qu'il ne convient à un homme d'Etat." Royer-Collard: "A la fois hautain et morose, déclinant tout et s'irritant secrètement contre quiconque acceptera ce qu'il a refusé." Villèle: "Ministre aux allures d'intendant . . . cet homme sage eut peut-être un défaut: celui d'avoir trop peu d'imagination en un pays qui en avait trop." Martignac: "Doué de toutes les qualités qui charment, non de celles qui permettent de fonder." Polignac: "Il méditait trop pour son intelligence." Louis XVIII: "Sage, spirituel, instruit, lettré, avisé, mais confiné dans son palais, un peu replié dans son égoïsme de vieillard, sans que passe sur sa mémoire ce beau rayon de bonté qui éclaire tout." Charles X: "Il portait en lui tant de majesté héréditaire qu'il réussit à demeurer auguste même en se montrant sot."

Finally no one has so well expressed the difficulty and ambivalence involved in all attempts to deal with the history of the period.

On pourrait tracer de la Restauration deux histoires. L'une, probe, sévère et sans grand éclat apparent, est celle de ses services accomplis au jour le jour, obscurément et sans réclame, et même avec trop peu de réclame; car nul gouvernement ignore davantage l'art de se faire valoir. L'autre histoire est celle qui s'est créée par l'image: Ney couché sous la fusillade, Hudson Lowe, le tombeau de Sainte-Hélène, les quatre sergents immolés, surtout Manuel expulsé. Plus tard, la collection s'enrichira: Voltaire sorti de sa tombe et chassant les jésuites; des nuées de gros moines tous armés d'éteignoirs, Charles X à l'époque du jubilé, suivant, l'air hébété, les processions. Ces grossières images, on les retrouvait encore au temps de ma jeunesse, dans les cabarets de villages, dans les chambres d'auberge, dans les cantines des villes de garnison. C'était l'histoire populaire des Bourbons, la seule qu'on savait, celle qui s'était si bien enfoncée dans les cerveaux qu'aucune des catastrophes survenues plus tard ne réussirait à la faire oublier. (II, 256).

La Gorce was still too austere to please the kind of reader who wanted above all to be entertained. The same publishing house that had staked its claim on the highest level of scholarship with the great Lavisserie series, Hachette, endeavored also to establish a hold

on the lower, and broader, field of popular historiography with a parallel series *L'Histoire de France racontée à tous*, under the general editorship of Franz Funck-Brentano. The Restoration and the July Monarchy were to be treated as a whole,⁴¹ a device which would often be used thereafter, a sign of the waning interest in the Restoration.

The author of this volume was Jean-Marie Lucas de Peslouan (1883-1972), a member of the highest judiciary body, the Conseil d'Etat, where he sat from 1907 to 1940. In order to avoid involving the dignity of the court, he published under the alias of J. Lucas-Dubreton. In the course of his long life he produced some thirty books and numberless articles. Renaissance Italy with Florence and the Borgias, was one of his favorite fields, but the greater number of his works dealt with episodes and personalities of early nineteenth-century France, including Napoleon, and, of course, Louis XVIII (1925) and Charles X (1927). These two volumes, being complete biographies, cover a span of time much exceeding the fifteen years of the Restoration, but they provide useful additions to the shorter presentation of the Hachette series.

Lucas-Dubreton was a master at gathering from the *memoirs* of the time anecdotes, witticisms, and striking quotations that could enliven a text. But the author had also read the best scholarly contributions on the period, and very seldom could any of his statements be challenged.⁴² On the whole, his sympathies were with Louis XVIII and his moderate policies. Lucas-Dubreton's book had a well deserved success, as testify the two reprintings and an English translation.⁴³

The centennial of the Revolution of 1830 provided a natural occasion for historians to reconsider the regime that had been overthrown by the revolution. This was done in many articles and larger publications, but only two books were specifically devoted to the period as such. The first and better of the two is by the Marquis Marie de Roux (1878-1943), a distinguished barrister. He had been among the first followers of Charles Maurras before 1914 and thereafter an active leader in the *Action française* movement. As can be expected, then, his book⁴⁴ was an unabashed defense of the

⁴¹ *La Restauration et la Monarchie de Juillet* (Paris, 1926).

⁴² A very rare example is this astonishing statement: "Le mouvement libéral de l'autre côté des Pyrénées ne faisait évidemment courir à la Restauration aucun danger" (p. 89).

⁴³ In 1933 and 1949. English translation, 1929.

⁴⁴ *La Restauration* (Paris, 1930).

fallen monarchy. For that reason, and also perhaps because it was published in a collection (*Les Grandes Etudes historiques*), known for its rightist inspiration,⁴⁵ the book was icily ignored by learned journals of the time. The disdain was, at least, excessive. True, the author was not a professional historian, though he did produce some commendable studies;⁴⁶ true also, his approach and style were often that of a barrister pleading in court, and there were no bibliographies and footnotes to support his assertions. But his viewpoints are often refreshing, and he has some felicitous formulas (for example, on Richelieu: "Il lui manquait d'aimer le pouvoir autant que le bien de l'Etat"). Furthermore, Marie de Roux had been able to use some important family archives, among them the unpublished *memoirs* of Ferdinand de Bertier, which enabled him to be the first to reveal the existence and role of the royalist secret society of the *Chevaliers de la Foi*. As an admirer of Jacques Bainville, he presents the foreign policies of the Restoration as faultless. Talleyrand receives the highest praise for his performance at the Congress of Vienna, and the expedition of 1823 in Spain is strongly upheld. On one score, however, de Roux deviated from the old Legitimist feud against Decazes; the worst he has to say about him is, "habile homme dans le détail, sans l'ombre d'une idée générale, . . . Decazes combat ceux qui jalourent sa faveur aussi âprement que des factieux." He blames Villèle for not having dared "repandre le programme décentralisateur, corporatif et populaire qui avait été le sien à la chambre introuvable." One recognizes here a cherished thesis of the *Action française*. And Polignac? "S'il avait cessé d'être ministre avant le 23 juillet 1830, son ministère de près d'une année passerait bien pour un des plus glorieux de notre histoire et des plus étrangers à toute préoccupation de politique de parti."

The person for whom de Roux seems to have the fondest regard is Hercule de Serre, the gifted orator who was minister of justice in Decazes' last administration and Richelieu's second. The book ends with three topical chapters concerning institutions, religion, and literature. Economic and social matters are not entirely forgotten, but they are only briefly touched upon in the midst of other developments.

⁴⁵ Among the better known authors whose historical works were published in the collection: Louis Bertrand, Jacques Bainville, Pierre Gaxotte.

⁴⁶ *Louis XIV et les provinces conquises* (Paris 1938); *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution à Poitiers et dans la Vienne* (Lyon, 1952).

The publication in 1934 of the book by Gaston Pastre (1880-1939) passed almost unnoticed—and deservedly so. The author was a wealthy wine merchant of Montpellier who had taken up writing as a hobby, producing three Napoleonic studies of dubious value⁴⁷ and a dozen eminently forgettable novels. His *Restauration*⁴⁸ is as poorly documented as it is clumsily written. An admirer of Maurras and Daudet he follows the same line as Marie de Roux. He forgets the Legitimist grudges against Decazes, who is represented “très autoritaire” and having gained the king’s favor “par son esprit brillant et sa vaste culture” [*sic!*] The provincial preoccupations of the good Languedocien show in the disproportionate place given to the Spanish Expedition of 1823 and the Algerian Expedition, both of course highly praised. Louis XVIII is credited with almost infinite wisdom and cunning. Pastre imagines, for instance, and without the slightest evidence, that if the king allowed the Prussian monarchy to settle on the Rhine, it was with the idea that it would be weakened by the introduction of a Catholic element and also because it would be more feasible one day to recapture the Rhineland if that meant fighting a hereditary foe instead of the allied Saxon family. These and other similar fantasies suggest that Pastre’s book should be consigned to merciful oblivion.

After this undistinguished rear-guard action, the historiography of the Restoration seemed almost to die away. It would take a new national disaster to shake it back to life. The French military defeat of 1940 and the ensuing German occupation brought back the memories of the older disasters of 1814-15. And again the painful task of repairing the damage fell into the hands of an old monarch; from Louis XVIII to Philippe Pétain the transpositions were only too easy. Later, the bloody reprisals after the Liberation were reminiscent of the White Terror of 1815.

These circumstances, bringing new evaluations of known facts, and the prevailing trend toward economic and social history would make possible and desirable the elaboration of updated pictures of the Restoration. The leading influence in this field was that of Charles-H. Pouthas (1886-1974). His courses given in the Sorbonne from 1938 to 1956,⁴⁹ touched upon almost all

⁴⁷ *Bonaparte en Egypte* (Paris, 1932); *Napoléon à Iéna* (Paris, 1933); *Le crépuscule de Napoléon* (Paris, 1940).

⁴⁸ Gaston Pastre, *Histoire de la Restauration* (Paris, 1934).

⁴⁹ Some of these courses were published as crudely mimeographed booklets, which are now rare items.

aspects of French life during the first half of the nineteenth century—or, more precisely, from 1815-1870. But he was too deeply involved in his professional responsibilities and other projects—such as his unfinished biography of Guizot—and never produced the comprehensive new synthesis which he was eminently prepared to write. The present generation of historians acknowledges its debt to Pouthas by following in his footsteps. The responsibility of assessing their work must be left to some future historiographer.