



**Thomas Babington Macaulay**

---

**NAPOLEON AND THE  
RESTORATION OF THE BOURBONS**

---

The completed portion of Macaulay's projected  
*History of France, from the Restoration of the Bourbons  
to the Accession of Louis Philippe*

Edited by Joseph Hamburger



LONGMAN

**Longman Group Limited** London

*Associated companies, branches and representatives  
throughout the world*

This edition © Longman Group Limited 1977

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

*First published 1977*

ISBN 0 582 50827 4

Set in Monophoto Garamond  
and printed in Great Britain by  
William Clowes & Sons, Limited  
London, Beccles and Colchester

**NAPOLEON AND THE  
RESTORATION OF THE BOURBONS**



Thomas Babington Macaulay,  
from an 1833 engraving by S. W. Reynolds, senior,  
after the portrait by S. W. Reynolds, junior.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

We are grateful to the following for permission to reproduce copyright material:

Cambridge University Press for a number of small extracts from Vol. 1 and Vol. 2 of *The Letters of Thomas Babington Macaulay*, editor T. Pinney; Mr R. W. P. Cockerton and Mr W. M. Brooke-Taylor for permission to reproduce extracts from the letters of John Taylor; The National Trust and the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, for extracts from the 1852 shelflist of *Macaulay's Library*; Macmillan Administration (Basingstoke) Ltd., for a short extract from *Selection From The Correspondence of The Late Macvey Napier*, edited by his son Macvey Napier, by permission of Macmillan London and Basingstoke; the National Portrait Gallery (Archives), London for the frontispiece.

---

## PREFACE

---

Macaulay's unfinished *History of France* is published here for the first time. The surviving pages of the work are probably all, or almost all, that Macaulay wrote of this history, which, had he completed it, would have been his first book. He planned it as a history of the Revolution of 1830, including its immediate background. The portion that he completed consists of an analysis of the Napoleonic regime and an account of the restored Bourbon regime from the collapse of the Empire to the Hundred Days. Thus the book has been given the title *Napoleon and the Restoration of the Bourbons*. It should be noted, however, that Macaulay's title, which does not accurately describe the portion he completed, was *The History of France, from the Restoration of the Bourbons to the Accession of Louis Philippe*.

Macaulay's narrative, here as in most of his historical writing, presents certain political themes, and these reveal something about his purposes as a politician. In addition, because of the presence of these themes Macaulay's writing may be considered a part of the literature of political theory. Thus there is evidence of his concern with the character of despotism, the causes and justification of revolution, the problem of legitimacy, and, above all, the problem of maintaining moderate regimes of the center which combine order and liberty and which avoid the extremes both of despotism, which seeks order but sacrifices liberty, and anarchy, which seeks liberty but sacrifices order. Discussion of such things was a reflection of his belief that the results of historical inquiry should be made available to politicians who faced problems for which there were historical parallels. Because these themes are interwoven with Macaulay's analysis of events in France, the unfinished history is more important for what it reveals about his manner of thinking about politics than for what it tells us about French history; therefore the introductory commentary

emphasizes how his analysis of French politics reflects his political understanding as it was shaped by his observation of English developments.

Finding the unfinished *History* was the successful culmination of a search that took place intermittently during a period of about four years. As scrutiny of various collections of Macaulay papers led to negative results, a search was made for the papers of Dionysius Lardner, the editorial entrepreneur who invited Macaulay to write the history for the *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*. This led to the Longman archives, for Longmans, with John Taylor, had published the *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*. A visit was made to the archives at the University of Reading in the hope of finding in Longman's records of dealings with Lardner some clue to the next stage of inquiry. Examination of a list of books by Longman authors uncovered the entry, 'Macaulay, Thomas Babington. Elements of a History of France – unpublished. 1830.'

It is pleasing to record that my son Philip played an important part in finding the unfinished history. By asking probing questions and by prodding me to follow up improbable but conceivably fruitful clues after I had all but given up the search, he was instrumental in locating the document. Having played this role, it was especially appropriate that he was the one who found the reference to the unfinished history in the list of holdings. My sights were on a more modest target, and I was looking at business records for the *Cabinet Cyclopaedia* when Philip announced, with the voice of one who never doubted this result, 'Here it is.'

I am greatly indebted to Professors Robert Palmer and Stanley Mellon for their informative comments on Macaulay's text and my introduction. They have saved me from errors and have been most helpful in many ways. Without help from Dr Stephen Parks, Curator of the Osborn Collection at the Beinecke Library, Yale University, I would not have been able to draw the conclusions on the basis of bibliographical considerations which are discussed in the introduction. Indeed, he suggested the explanation of how the surviving printed pages originated.

Several others have been helpful. Eugenia and Robert Herbert offered many suggestions in aid of my search for the engraving that was planned as an illustration for Macaulay's book. Mr Neil Howe did most of the research and writing for the biographical glossary. Thomas Pinney was generous, as always, in responding to my inquiries. Miss J. Sinar, County Archivist at the Derbyshire Record Office, Mr J. A. Edwards, Archivist at Reading University Library, and Mr Trevor Kaye of Trinity College Library generously helped during my visits to their institutions.

Several persons and institutions have kindly allowed me to publish extracts of manuscripts in their possession, and I am glad to record my gratitude to them. Mr R. W. P. Cockerton, of Burre House, Bakewell and Mr W. M. Brooke-Taylor (papers of John Taylor); Derbyshire County Record Office at Matlock (papers of John Taylor); the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest and Natural



## PREFACE

---

Beauty (the shelf list of Macaulay's library in 1852); the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge (Macaulay's Journals); and Longman Group Ltd (miscellaneous ledgers and records, and the printed pages of Macaulay's *History of France*).

Some of the research required for the introduction was supported by grants from the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society and the A. Whitney Griswold Faculty Research Fund at Yale University. I am glad to record my gratitude to both institutions for their generous help.

J.H.

---

## CONTENTS

---

Preface vii

Introduction i

*Notes to introduction* 27

Bibliographical note 38

NAPOLEON AND THE  
RESTORATION OF THE BOURBONS 41

*Notes to Macaulay's text* 105

Biographical glossary 107

Table 117

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

In 1876 Thomas Babington Macaulay's nephew and biographer, George Otto Trevelyan, reported the survival of the proofs of the first 88 pages of Macaulay's 'History of France, from the Restoration of the Bourbons to the Accession of Louis Philippe.' Trevelyan had seen the proofs at the Spottiswoode printing office.<sup>1\*</sup> Even earlier, in 1862, one of Macaulay's earliest biographers, Frederick Arnold, having seen the work mentioned in the press of the early 1830s, suggested that 'the public would be pleased indeed by such a valuable and important fragment.'<sup>2</sup> But since the time of Trevelyan's report it has disappeared from general notice and has escaped scholars' searches, leading the late A. N. L. Munby to call it one of 'those *introuvables*' that brought despair to researchers and collectors.<sup>3</sup> The fragment published here is that described by Trevelyan in 1876.

Macaulay had planned the history as an analysis of the Revolution of 1830 and the events leading up to it, and he composed it during late 1830 and 1831. At age twenty-nine, Macaulay had just become a Member of Parliament. When he first formed his plan for a 'History of France' he had given his maiden speech on the civil disabilities of the Jews, but he had not yet given the speeches on reform that were to make him famous as a parliamentary orator. His reputation at this time mainly rested on his notable contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*. His articles on Milton, Canning's coalition, Hallam, and James Mill displayed verve and erudition, and they presented a political outlook that was thoughtful, even speculative, and yet which also had a bearing on the politics of the day. It was said that the articles on James Mill and the Benthamites led Lord Lansdowne to offer Macaulay his pocket borough of Calne. To some, of course, he was also known as the son of Zachary

---

\* Notes to Introduction are on pp. 27-37.

Macaulay, the spokesman for the Evangelicals, especially on the anti-slavery question. And to some he was also known for his achievements at Trinity College, Cambridge, and as a speaker at the Union Society. But above all, it was through his important articles in the *Edinburgh Review* that Macaulay had achieved prominence in 1830, identifying him as a man of letters and a political writer of note. Of course, this was a far cry from the fame that came later from his service in India, his achievement of a leading position in the Whig party, and his *History of England*, but in 1830, although not yet at this pinnacle of fame, the signs of future eminence were discernible.

Had it not been for Henry Brougham, Macaulay's writing on France would have been somewhat different, and it would not have disappeared from view. Soon after the July Revolution, like many others in England, Macaulay was eager to go to France to observe events at first hand. He also planned to write an article about French politics for the *Edinburgh Review*. The article, as he described it to Macvey Napier, the editor, would have been 'on the politics of France since the Restoration, with characters of the principal public men, and a parallel between the present state of France and that of England.' He warned that it would be quite long, and although he made no immodest claims for it, he was confident that it would be 'an article of extraordinary interest.'<sup>4</sup> On 1 September he sailed for Dieppe on his first continental journey, carrying with him Napier's approval of his proposal for the article.

Napier and Macaulay had not counted on Brougham, who also planned an article on French politics. Brougham's claims on the *Review* were considerable. He had been present at its founding in 1802 and had been the most prolific contributor, being responsible for as many as four articles in some of its quarterly numbers. In addition, as one of the leading spokesmen for the Whigs in Parliament, he often wrote articles to shape opinion and to muster support for the Whig cause – or for his own view of that cause. The article on France was to be no exception. When he told Napier that he intended to 'make a point of giving . . . my thoughts on the Revolution,' he explained that 'all our movements next session turn on that pivot, and I can trust no one but myself with it, either in or out of Parliament.' Indeed, he insisted that his should be the lead article, and he imperiously told Napier to 'send off your countermand to Macaulay,' which the editor promptly did.<sup>5</sup>

Macaulay was furious. He had turned down another offer to write on French affairs, and he had thrown away the labor of a month. Writing, as he later admitted, 'in haste and warmth,' he severed his connection with the *Edinburgh Review*. He did not blame Napier; on the contrary, he acknowledged that any editor of the *Review* would be obliged to yield to Brougham's demands, for to refuse them would risk ruining the publication. This was hard on Macaulay's pride and the chief cause of his anger. He and Brougham were not on easy terms. Brougham had long enjoyed success and prominence: eminently successful at the bar, to which Macaulay could

bear witness, as they both travelled on the Northern Circuit; a leader of his party in the House of Commons, where he had served since 1810; a prolific pamphleteer and publicist since 1802; and an active supporter, indeed often leader, in public causes, including the anti-slavery movement, in which he cooperated with Macaulay's father, who appreciated and even venerated Brougham.

Macaulay, on the other hand, was at the beginning of a career in which he could hope for eminence in both literature and politics at least as great as that enjoyed by Brougham and perhaps more deserved. Confident about his own talent, and resentful of Brougham's slights and condescension, he was hypercritical of what he regarded as Brougham's undeserved reputation. Brougham, he said, '*half knows* every thing from the cedar to the hyssop.'<sup>6</sup> Their mutual suspicions became most evident in connection with the *Edinburgh Review*. They were often in competition for favored subjects and for public favor. Brougham complained about the length of Macaulay's review of Hallam and about the substance of his articles on the Canning coalition and on James Mill and the Benthamites. He also opposed the proposal made by Francis Jeffrey, as retiring editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, that Macaulay be his successor. Macaulay, on his side, noting that Brougham 'became extremely cold to me,' explained that Brougham 'felt that his power over the Review diminished as mine increased.' Macaulay suggested that it was jealousy which Brougham regularly felt for those who were political allies and even friends but who demonstrated promise of achieving eminence, thereby threatening to eclipse Brougham himself.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, Macaulay's resentment was accentuated by obligations to Brougham, who had shown interest in Macaulay's career and who, as recently as 1828, had recommended to the Lord Chancellor Macaulay's appointment as a Commissioner of Bankrupts, a post that was welcomed as it brought in almost £300 annually.

Against this immediate background of rivalry and resentment it is not surprising to find Macaulay reacting with 'haste and warmth' when he learned that Napier had yielded to Brougham's demand. Brougham, he said, was 'the person of all persons on earth to whose dictation I feel least inclined to stoop. Your intentions towards me,' he told Napier, 'I know, are perfectly kind and fair. I have no such confidence with respect to his. I would sacrifice much to your convenience. But I cannot tell you how my whole heart and soul rise up against the thought of sacrificing any thing to his love of domination.' Brougham was pictured as thinking of himself as 'a man who act[s] a prominent part in the world: he [Macaulay] is nobody.' And Napier was told that

no man likes to be reminded of his inferiority in such a way: and there are some particular circumstances in this case which render the admonition more unpleasant than it would otherwise be. I know that Brougham dislikes me; and

I have not the slightest doubt that he feels great pleasure at having taken this subject out of my hands, and at having made me understand, – as I do most clearly understand, – how far my services are rated below his.

The incident made the connection with the *Edinburgh Review* ‘a source of humiliation and mortification.’<sup>8</sup>

In the end Macaulay stayed within the fold and became the most admired and the most highly valued of contributors to the *Review*. Meanwhile he had already made alternative arrangements for the publication of his writing on France. The offer he had turned down was from Dionysius Lardner, editor and one of the proprietors of the *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*.<sup>9</sup> (The other proprietors were Longmans and John Taylor,<sup>10</sup> best known as publisher and friend of Keats and John Clare.) Lardner’s offer was repeated in October 1830, and Macaulay agreed to write ‘an account of the political changes of France since the Restoration and of this late revolution.’<sup>11</sup> Macaulay’s contract has not survived, but judging by payments made by the *Cabinet Cyclopaedia* to comparable authors, Macaulay probably would have received no more than £200.<sup>12</sup> Had it been published, the French history would have been his first book.

In the fragment that is here published for the first time Macaulay dealt with two historical episodes – the Napoleonic regime as the immediate background to the restoration, and the restoration of Louis XVIII in 1814, including an analysis of the difficulties Louis faced as he tried to gain support for his regime. This is considerably less than Macaulay had planned for his book, for his intention was to focus on the events of 1830 and to include as background an account of the fifteen years preceding the revolution. Evidently Lardner thought of it as a supplement to Eyre Evans Crowe’s *History of France*, also published in the *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*, which ended with the fall of Napoleon’s empire in 1814.<sup>13</sup> Thus Macaulay did not provide accounts of Louis’s reign after Waterloo, the reign of Charles X, or of the July revolution. Most of this probably was never written, although Macaulay, while still believing that his work would appear in the *Edinburgh Review*, and acting on Napier’s suggestion, had begun work on the events of 1830.<sup>14</sup> Whatever he wrote on this has not yet been found.

What survives of Macaulay’s *History* was written between August 1830 and November 1831, and almost all of it was written by June 1831.<sup>15</sup> After it became clear that he could not publish in the *Edinburgh Review*, he turned to the historical background to the Revolution. Already in October 1830 he hoped to finish by Christmas, and he appears to have been working intensively on it in January 1831, judging by Francis Jeffrey’s hope that he finish so ‘that he will soon be restored to his disconsolate friends.’ He seems to have been under pressure of a deadline in March,

for he apologized to Napier for not having an article for the next number of the *Review*, explaining that he had ‘put off the History of [Fr]ance to the last moment,’ and that whatever time he could spare from the House of Commons would be devoted to the volume for Lardner.<sup>16</sup>

Anticipating early completion of the work, Longmans, as publisher (in addition to being co-proprietor with Taylor and Lardner), commissioned the making of an engraving for the illustration that was to appear on the title-page. It was to be a vignette of Arcole, the name adopted by a hero in the street fighting that took place in Paris in July 1830.<sup>17</sup> The engraver, Edward Finden, was paid £27-6-0 as early as 2 February 1831; the engraving was based on a drawing by Henry Corbould.<sup>18</sup> By October 6,000 title-pages were produced.<sup>19</sup> Meanwhile, Macaulay had submitted the first installment; this was probably in May, for on 1 June a copyist had been paid to produce a legible copy for the printer, and later in June the author was receiving proofs.<sup>20</sup> Throughout this period and for about two years or so beyond the work was being advertised.<sup>21</sup>

Although most and perhaps all of the fragment published here was in proof in June 1831, Macaulay worked on the history during the next few months. In October he told Napier that Lardner ‘is very desirous to bring out my book about France – and I wish to finish at least the first part of it for him, before I do any thing else.’ Soon after this all mention of it disappears from surviving correspondence, although advertisements of the work continued to appear. It will be noted that Macaulay referred to the ‘first part’ of the work, indicating that it was to appear in two volumes.<sup>22</sup> This suggests that he was finding it difficult to confine his treatment of the subject to the size of book originally planned. This is also evident in the fragment that survives, for it ends on proof page 89,<sup>23</sup> yet its narrative terminates with the allies’ entry into Paris after the battle of Waterloo.

It seems unlikely that Macaulay wrote more on the historical background to the Revolution of 1830 than has survived (except, of course, for the small number of missing pages). Therefore it is necessary to dispute G. O. Trevelyan’s inference from a marginal note in the fragment ‘to the effect that most of the type was broken up before the sheets had been pulled.’<sup>24</sup> The words that Trevelyan evidently saw were, ‘Distributed. (greater part before it was pulled.)’ This notation appears in the head margin of the first page. Trevelyan, apparently assuming that this statement referred to the entire fragment, inferred that most of what Macaulay had written had been lost. However, he could not have made this inference if he had examined the analogous notations on the first pages of each of the gatherings that followed, for the fact that such notations were made for each of those gatherings indicates that the marginal notation that appeared to support Trevelyan’s inference applied only to the first sixteen pages. And indeed, it is true that the “greater part” of the type used for

the first sheet was distributed before it was pulled, for it is only pages 1, 8, 9, and 16 that have survived. Although some type was distributed from the pages that made up the surviving sheets, distribution had not proceeded so far that it was necessary to make similar notations with regard to the other gatherings. Thus on the first pages of each of the other gatherings there is only a notation indicating that the type had been distributed, but there is no indication that distribution had occurred before sheets had been pulled (except the second gathering where the notation states that '19 & 20 in part [distributed] before being pulled').

These considerations cast doubt on Trevelyan's suggestion that most of what Macaulay had written had been destroyed. There is yet other evidence, however, that the surviving printed pages are all or almost all that Macaulay wrote. For one thing, what follows page 80 appears to be proof copy made for the purpose of identifying and correcting errors in composition, and we may assume that the part in this stage of proof was what had been most recently written.<sup>25</sup> (The first eighty pages were printed for a different purpose, which will be discussed presently.) In addition, the note in the tail margin of page 80 stating that the '8 pages beyond this not imposed' strongly suggests that the pages of proof following page 80 were all the printer possessed, for had there been more, this marginal note would have specified a different number. Also, it should be noted that the type for the last line of the fragment is set in a way that suggests that the compositor had run out of manuscript. The page is incomplete, consisting of twenty-four lines, and the last of these, since there were insufficient words to occupy the entire line, is completed with an elongated ellipsis. Furthermore, it is arguable that the last paragraph has a summary character and shows signs of having been written hurriedly. Finally, Macaulay in his correspondence did not reveal a continuing concern with his French History, although observations about his writing often found their way into his letters. We know that he was correcting proof for gathering E (specifically page 63 in the fragment) in June 1831 and that in October he was too busy with the history to promise more than a short article on Bunyan for the *Edinburgh Review*. Possibly at this later time he was writing the part that survived as proof (the pages following page 80) and conceivably also the part that became gathering F (pages 65–80). However, by December, with the House of Commons recessed, he had 'leisure to think about the Edinburgh Review.' But the history was not mentioned. And in June 1832 he boasted of being 'a gentleman at large; and my employments are, reading Indian history and politics and writing for the Edinburgh Review.'<sup>26</sup> Trevelyan's suggestion that what survives is only a fragment of what Macaulay had written is probably incorrect. It is only a fragment of what had been planned, but (apart from what he wrote about the events of 1830 while still in Paris) probably it is the entirety of what he had written.



In considering why the book was not finished, in addition to the magnitude of the task, the demands made on Macaulay as a politician appear to have been mainly responsible. Initially he seemed able to combine his varied activities as prolific writer for the *Edinburgh Review*, as Commissioner of Bankrupts, as member of Parliament who suffered late sittings of the House, and as dutiful son and brother, though he did complain in December 1830 that ‘my French History, the House of Commons, and the Bankrupts, have almost killed me between them.’<sup>27</sup> The pace of political life intensified in 1831, as the Reform Bill was introduced and popular agitation increased. Macaulay was deeply involved in these developments. He made important speeches on 2 March, 5 July, 20 September, 10 October, and 16 December. He took part in attempts to organize backbench pressure on the Ministry. He also wrote five articles for the *Edinburgh Review* during the approximately fourteen months while he was working on the book for Lardner.<sup>28</sup> In addition, during this period he mourned the deaths of his sister Jane and his mother. Yet all this did not prevent his working on the *History*. However, thanks to his splendid speeches on reform, Macaulay was becoming a leading spokesman for his party. The distractions and the demands grew, and soon the French history was to be put aside. Even though his office as one of the Commissioners of Bankrupts was abolished in January 1832, Macaulay, still engrossed in parliamentary politics and facing the prospect of an election contest at Leeds, was given a minor but demanding appointment in the government. In June 1832 he was made a member of the Board of Control for India and he was also appointed to a committee of inquiry into the East India Company charter, which was to expire the following year. Macaulay became actively involved in the work that led to the government’s recommendations for the revision of the charter, and at this time he also won his seat at Leeds. So fully engaged in parliamentary, electoral and Indian affairs, and soon to go to India as Law Member of the Governor General’s Council, he seems to have neglected the French *History*.

It remains to speculate how the surviving printed pages were made and to describe how these pages reached the archives of Longman Group Ltd, where they are now preserved. Of the 89 octavo pages on which the fragment was printed, pages 1–80, unlike the pages following, were not proofs made for corrections, for we know that in June 1831 when he was correcting proofs Macaulay was defending the formulation of a sentence which was altered before the surviving copy was printed.<sup>29</sup> Although not proofs, pages 1–80 could not have been made in the course of normal commercial production, for, as we know from marginal notes in the fragment, the pages were pulled despite there being missing parts (pages 2–7, 10–15, 35, and parts of 19 and 20).<sup>30</sup> It is the missing parts, which are explained by the marginal notes indicating that type for some pages had been distributed before the pages were pulled, that suggest the circumstances in which the fragment was