

## François Guizot: The Historian in Politics

*N. P. Tanshina*

**For citation:** Tanshina N. P. François Guizot: The Historian in Politics. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2021, vol. 66, issue 4, pp. 1161–1176.  
<https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2021.408>

The purpose of the article is to analyze the role of intellectuals in the political life of France based on the study of the views and state activities of the famous French historian and political figure François Guizot (1787–1874). The author examines the relationship between the historical views of Guizot, his understanding of the main problems of French and European history, his public and state activities during the Restoration (1814–1830) and the July Monarchy (1830–1848). The theme of the intelligentsia in power is most vividly revealed through the personality and activities of F. Guizot. He was more than just the leading politician of the July Monarchy. He enriched such fields of knowledge as history, pedagogy, constitutional law, sociology, political science. Similarly to many of his contemporaries, Guizot pursued two careers at the same time: scientific and political. However, Guizot's failure as a politician overshadowed Guizot as a scientist. The article concludes that history and politics have always been closely intertwined for Guizot. Guizot searched in the past for answers to questions pertaining to modern France. Guizot saw history as a direct continuation of politics. In doing so, Guizot took into account not only the lessons of the past. He formulated his concept of French leadership in Europe and built a theoretical framework for his foreign policy based on knowledge of history. In addition, the article concludes: turning to the historical heritage of France and Europe for Guizot was important not only from a practical point of view, but also from the point of view of morality and education. For him, the history of the development of civilization was the history of the moral improvement of mankind.

*Keywords:* François Guizot, intellectuals, the restoration of the Bourbons, July Monarchy, French Revolution, liberalism, orleanism.

---

*Nataliya P. Tanshina* — Dr. Sci. (History), Professor, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, 84, pr. Vernadskogo, Moscow, 119991, Russian Federation; Professor, Moscow State Pedagogical University, 88, pr. Vernadskogo, Moscow, 119991, Russian Federation; [tanshina-np@ranepa.ru](mailto:tanshina-np@ranepa.ru)

*Наталья Петровна Тяньшина* — д-р ист. наук, проф., Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Российская Федерация, 119991, Москва, пр. Вернадского, 84; проф., Московский педагогический государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 119991, Москва, пр. Вернадского, 88; [tanshina-np@ranepa.ru](mailto:tanshina-np@ranepa.ru)

This research was prepared in the framework of the project “The intellectual elite in the political life of Europe (exemplified by professional historians)” supported by the Center for Advanced Social Research (grant of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation No. 075-15-2020-908).

Статья выполнена в рамках проекта «Интеллектуальная элита в политической жизни Европы (на примере профессиональных историков)» в рамках деятельности научного центра мирового уровня «Центра перспективных социальных исследований» (ЦПСИ) (грант Минобрнауки РФ № 075-15-2020-908).

© St. Petersburg State University, 2021

## Франсуа Гизо: историк во власти

Н. П. Таньшина

**Для цитирования:** *Tanshina N.P.* François Guizot: The Historian in Politics // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2021. Т. 66. Вып. 4. С. 1161–1176.  
<https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2021.408>

На примере изучения взглядов и государственной деятельности известного французского историка и политика Франсуа Гизо (1787–1874) в статье анализируется роль интеллектуалов в политической жизни Франции. В статье прослеживается взаимосвязь исторических взглядов Гизо, его понимания основных проблем французской и европейской истории с его общественной и государственной деятельностью в годы Реставрации (1814–1830) и Июльской монархии (1830–1848). Через личность и деятельность Ф. Гизо тема интеллектуалов во власти может быть раскрыта наиболее рельефно, поскольку он являлся не просто ведущим политиком Июльской монархии, но внес важный вклад во многие сферы научного знания, такие как история, педагогика, конституционное право, социология и политология. Как и многие его современники, он сделал одновременно две карьеры, научную и политическую, однако неудача второй на долгое время затмила блеск первой. На основе анализа публицистических, исторических работ Гизо, его лекций и мемуаров в статье делается вывод о том, что для него история и политика всегда были теснейшим образом взаимосвязаны. В истории он искал ответы на вопросы, стоявшие перед современной ему Францией, и считал историю прямым продолжением политики. При этом он не просто извлекал уроки из прошлого; опираясь на него, он выстраивал свою концепцию как социально-политической системы Франции, так и французского лидерства в Европе, выводя из этого теоретическую базу своей внешней политики. В статье также делается вывод о том, что для Гизо обращение к историческому наследию Франции и Европы было важным не только в целях использования исторического опыта для решения насущных проблем современности, но и с точки зрения морали и воспитания, а сама история развития цивилизации была для него историей нравственного совершенствования человечества.

*Ключевые слова:* Франсуа Гизо, интеллектуалы, Реставрация, Июльская монархия, Французская революция, либерализм, орлеанизм.

Examination of the role of intellectuals in politics has always been important not only as a subject field of intellectual history, but also as one of the actively developing areas of historical research. In all epochs, starting with Plato and Thomas More, political thinkers, philosophers, those who since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, since “the Dreyfus affair” in France and then — in the world, had been called “intellectuals”<sup>1</sup>, dreamed of a time when the state would be ruled by scientists, philosophers and thinkers understanding how to properly and effectively organize the work of the social mechanism. However, in practice, examples of effective state management by intellectual scientists are quite rare. For the same Thomas More, an attempt to show disagreement with the policy of King Henry VIII ended not just in defeat, but in the death penalty. The Frankfurt Parliament of 1848, which had a large percentage of professors in its composition, went down in history as an un-

<sup>1</sup> For the birth of the concept of “intellectuals” in France, see: *Charle C.* Naissance des “intellectuels” (1800–1900). Paris, 1990; *Charle C.* Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIX e siècle: Essai d’histoire comparée. Paris, 1996; *Sharl’ K.* Intellektualy vo Frantsii. Moscow, 2005; *Winock M.* Le siècle des intellectuels. Paris, 1997.

successful experience of the activity of a legislative body consisting of people who were intellectually gifted but divorced from the pressing political realities. Perhaps the first successful experience in Modern history, when theory and practice went hand in hand, was an example of early American history, when the founding fathers not only developed the theoretical foundations of the future American state, but embodied their political ideas in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of 1787, and the Bill of Rights. However, in my opinion, the most striking example of intellectuals being in power was the period of the existence of the July monarchy regime in France (1830–1848) and the political activity of one of the leading politicians of King Louis-Philippe I, François Pierre Guillaume Guizot (1787–1874)<sup>2</sup>.

The personality and activities of François Guizot can clearly exemplify the topic of intellectuals in politics. Guizot is one of the key figures in the political life of France during the Restoration era (1814–1830) and the July Monarchy, who contributed to many areas of knowledge, such as history, pedagogy, constitutional law, sociology and political science. Similarly to many of his contemporaries, he pursued two careers at the same time, scientific and political, but the failure of the second one for a long time overshadowed the brilliance of the first one. After the Revolution of 1848 not only a major publicist of the Restoration era, but also a deep historian, an expert on the history of France, Great Britain and European civilization was forgotten. Only since the end of the twentieth century, starting with the work of the famous French specialist Pierre Rosanvallon, the perception of Guizot as one of the significant political figures and political thinkers of the XIX century's France had emerged.

For Guizot, history and politics had always been closely interrelated, and in history he sought answers to the questions contemporary France faced. As noted by the famous Soviet literary critic B. G. Reizov, Guizot in his lectures “On representative government” (1821) set himself the task “to make history not only a pure study, but a practical guide to political activity”<sup>3</sup>. At the same time, he did not just learn from the past; based on it, he built his theory of both the socio-political system of France and the French leadership in Europe, deriving from this the theoretical basis for his foreign policy. Moreover, Guizot quite consciously established a connection between history and politics and considered history to be a direct continuation of it. “The events of the present illuminate the facts of the past”, he wrote in “The Essay on the History of France”<sup>4</sup>.

First of all, it concerned his understanding of the Revolution<sup>5</sup>, which is still regarded by the French as the matrix of modern France, the basis of liberal-democratic traditions and institutions not only of their country but also of the whole Western civilization. For Guizot, the Revolution was not just a subject of scientific studies and historical reflections.

---

<sup>2</sup> For F. Guizot, see: *Rosanvallon P.* Le moment Guizot. Paris, 1985; *Broglie G.* Guizot. Paris, 1990; *François Guizot et la Culture politique de son temps.* Colloque de la Fondation Guizot — Val-Richer. Paris, 1991; *Theis L.* François Guizot. Paris, 2008; *Triomphe P.* L'Europe de François Guizot. Paris, 2002; *Tanshina N.*: 1) François Guizot: teoriia i praktika frantsuzskogo umerennogo liberalizma. Moscow, 2000; 2) François Guizot. Politicheskaja biografija. Moscow, 2016; *Matveev S. R.* Svoboda i poriadok: liberal'nyi konservatizm François Guizot. Moscow, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> *Reizov B. G.* Romanticheskaja frantsuzskaja istoriografija (1815–1830). Leningrad, 1956. P. 221.

<sup>4</sup> *Alpatov M. A.* Politicheskie idei frantsuzskoi burzhuaiznoi istoriografii XIX v. Moscow; Leningrad, 1949. P. 85.

<sup>5</sup> “The Revolution” in this article is called the French Revolution of 18<sup>th</sup> century although modern researchers such as T. Lentz, J. Tulard, P. Branda, A. Chevallier bring its chronological framework to 1815, including the years of the Consulate and the First Empire.

It was an objective reality of his childhood and adolescence, and which gradually began to become history in the years of his youth. He was born in 1787 in the south of France, in Nîmes, two years before the Revolution. His father, a talented lawyer who sympathized with the Girondists, was guillotined during the years of Terror, and his grandfather, the prosecutor of Nîmes, a supporter of the Jacobins, did nothing to save his son-in-law. That is, the Revolution for Guizot was a tragic life itself. Many contemporaries and researchers attributed the fact that he never wrote the history of the French Revolution<sup>6</sup> to a sad personal experience and an unwillingness to relive this tragedy. I share the position of Pierre Rosanvallon who believed that the reason for this should be sought in the interpretation of Revolution by Guizot. He did not consider it expedient to focus on the factual side; he was primarily interested in analyzing the most important problems of the Revolution. Guizot looked upon the Revolution as the most important stage in the centuries-old development of French civilization, the need for which began to be felt long before 1789, and the results of which had a huge impact on the further development of the country. Guizot, according to the correct observation of P. Rosanvallon, sought to understand the revolution “not so much in its events as in its principles”<sup>7</sup>. Indeed, Guizot did not engage in a detailed study of the actual side of the revolution; he considered it most important to understand its ideological and political origins, causes and significance for the subsequent development of France and European civilization.

He addressed the topic of the Revolution in many works, including his journalism (about current political events, which, in his deep conviction, were inextricably linked with the Revolution).

In 1812, at the end of the First Empire, Guizot's career as a historian began<sup>8</sup>. This year, he headed the specially created Department of new or modern history at Sorbonne although he had neither historical education (he studied in Law School of Paris) nor teaching experience. Moreover, the rector of the university (in the terminology of the time, “grand master”) M. Fontaine violated the University's charter because the young professor was not yet twenty-five years old. Guizot's introductory lesson at the Collège du Plessis on 11 December 1812 took place in front of the students of the Ecole Normale and, as he noted in his memoirs, a small audience. According to the tradition, during the first lesson, the lecturer had to say a few welcoming phrases to the Emperor Napoleon. However, Guizot showed character pointing out that he did not want to mix politics with science, and, despite all the exhortations of Fontanes, who claimed that the emperor was paying special attention to this, refused to say a welcome address<sup>9</sup>. According to the view of the modern Russian researcher S. R. Matveev expressed in his article devoted to the early period of Guizot's intellectual activity, in this act he showed himself as “an apolitical intellectual”<sup>10</sup>. Perhaps this impression was created due to the fact that Guizot himself in his memoirs

---

<sup>6</sup> Only at the end of his life Guizot created “History of France told to my grandchildren”, which included the history of the Revolution. However, he outlined his view of the Revolution in many of his works.

<sup>7</sup> *Rosanvallon P.* Le moment Guizot. P. 205.

<sup>8</sup> Since 1807, Guizot was actively engaged in journalism; he collaborated with the magazines “Le Publiciste” (Publicist), “Les Archives littéraires d'Europe” (Literary Archives of Europe), “Le Mercure” (Mercury), and in 1811 he created the magazine “Les Annales de l'éducation” (Annals of Education).

<sup>9</sup> *Guizot F.* Memoirs to illustrate the history of my time: vols. 1–8. Vol. 1. London, 1858. P. 16–17.

<sup>10</sup> *Matveev S. R.* Bez politiki: istoriosofia François Guizot do 1814 goda // Vestnik Baltiiskogo federal'nogo universiteta im. I. Kanta. Seriya: gumanitarnye i obshchestvennyye nauki. 2015. Issue 12. P. 23.

dated the beginning of his public career by 1814, thereby emphasizing that he did not serve either the Revolution or the Empire. Why didn't he serve? As he explains, he didn't serve the first one — due to age, and the second one — due to beliefs<sup>11</sup>. As we can see, it is not indifference at all, but, on the contrary, a clearly expressed civic position. Yes, he noted in his memoirs that he was not involved in politics at that time, but emphasized that he was in a kind of aristocratic-liberal opposition in the spirit of the salons of the XVIII century: “They still held to freedom of thought and speech, but had no aspirations after power”<sup>12</sup>.

As for the assessment of Napoleon Bonaparte, one of the most famous but also controversial personalities in French history, Guizot outlined his view of him only many years later, in “The Memoirs” written after his retirement starting in 1853, as well as in journalistic works of this period, primarily in the work “Three Generations. 1789–1814–1848” (1863)<sup>13</sup>.

His attitude to Napoleon is consonant with his assessment of the Revolution as such. Perceiving the Revolution as the main event of French history, accepting it in its principles, he rejected its extremes, terror and violence. Guizot noted the striking contrast between the first steps of the Revolution and its further development, “between the hopes of today and the spectacle that unfolded tomorrow. What a distance, what a gulf between 1789 and 1793! In just four years, France overcame this path and fell into the abyss at the very moment when it was already knocking on the doors of a paradise created by its own hands!”<sup>14</sup>. Talking about the English Revolution, he stressed that the Revolution was inevitably in danger of drowning in blood; it “is already a disorder in itself, passionate and unknown, which plunges society into great disasters, great dangers, great villainies”<sup>15</sup>.

Guizot continued to develop the idea of his friend and teacher Pierre Royer-Collard (and in general — the idea of the French liberals at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century) about the intertwining of creative and destructive tendencies in the Revolution. At the same time, he strongly disagreed with those adherents of the Old Order for whom the very word “Revolution” was synonymous with crime, madness and disaster<sup>16</sup>. Condemning the Jacobin Terror, Guizot, who lost his father on the guillotine, wrote: “Terror destroyed the Revolution. But Terror is not the whole Revolution...”<sup>17</sup> Moreover, Terror was an incident that wasn't mandatory. In the modern French historiography of the Revolution, the problem of Terror is one of the most debatable and studied. While Guizot did not consider that Terror had no alternative, modern researchers often say that Terror is a logical consequence of the Revolution as such. In particular, this approach is followed by a major modern researcher Patrice Gueniffey<sup>18</sup>.

The Revolution for Guizot did not end with the fall of the dictatorship of the Montagnards; it did not end with the coup of 18 Brumaire, which meant the fall of the Directory regime and the establishment of the Consulate. He extended the chronological framework of the Revolution to 1815, that is, including the Napoleonic era. Moreover, the

---

<sup>11</sup> *Guizot F.* Memoirs to illustrate the history of my time. Vol. 1. P. 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* P. 6.

<sup>13</sup> *Guizot F.* Trois générations. 1789–1814–1848. Paris, 1863.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* P. 46.

<sup>15</sup> *Guizot F.* Istoriiia Angliiskoi revoliutsii: vols 1–3. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1868. P. 75.

<sup>16</sup> *Guizot F.* Trois générations. P. 49.

<sup>17</sup> *Girard L.* Les libéraux français. 1814–1875. Paris, 1985. P. 73.

<sup>18</sup> For details see: *Genife P.* Politika revoliutsionnogo terrora. 1789–1794. Moscow, 2003.

period from 1789 to 1799, which is traditionally limited to the Revolution in historiography, Guizot considered only its first stage. The next stage was marked by the years of the Consulate and the Empire. Moreover, for all his ambiguous assessment of the personality of Napoleon Bonaparte, he interpreted the period of the Consulate and the First Empire as the highest stage of the Revolution, when its main conquests were strengthened.

In relation to Napoleon, Guizot's romantic view of the role of personality in history was clearly manifested: "In the crisis moments of their history, nations cannot do without a great man... When he came... France recognized in him the one she was waiting for. He went ahead, she followed him"<sup>19</sup>. It was Napoleon, according to Guizot, who did what France vainly called for during the Terror: there was a "reaction of the Revolution against itself"<sup>20</sup>, in other words, "consolidation of the most important achievements of the Revolution with the rejection of some of its most legitimate aspirations and the most exalted hopes"<sup>21</sup>.

For Guizot, Napoleon is, first of all, a man of order, an excellent administrator and statesman. "Freedom and order" was the motto of the liberals during the July monarchy. The main merit of Napoleon, according to Guizot, lay in his restoration of the "social structure" in France, creation of the organs of state government, overcoming anarchy and destruction.

A little over a hundred years later, in 1969, the idea that Napoleon was not only a man of Revolution, but also a man of order and state power, would be developed by French President Georges Pompidou in his speech at Charles de Gaulle Square in Ajaccio on August 15, the day of the centenary of Napoleon Bonaparte. As the president stated, "in a few years, almost in a few months, the First Consul created a modern French state"<sup>22</sup>.

Guizot, unlike Pompidou, is not an apologist at all. For him, "under the Empire there was too much of the arrogance of power, too much contempt of right, too much revolution, and too little liberty"<sup>23</sup>.

Why did the First Empire collapse? The answer for Guizot is unambiguous: Napoleon, like his predecessors, neglected human rights and freedoms. He wrote in his Memoirs: "Since I have had some share in the government of men, I have learned to do justice to the Emperor Napoleon. He was endowed with a genius incomparably active and powerful, much to be admired for his antipathy to disorder, for his profound instincts in ruling, and for his energetic rapidity in re constructing the social framework. But this genius had no check, acknowledged no limit to its desires or will, either emanating from Heaven or man, and thus remained revolutionary while combating revolution: thoroughly acquainted with the general conditions of society, but imperfectly, or rather, coarsely understanding the moral necessities of human nature; sometimes satisfying them with the soundest judgment, and at others depreciating and insulting them with impious pride"<sup>24</sup>.

But still, the overall result is this: far from idealizing Napoleon and criticizing him, Guizot believed that in those years France needed just such a statesman. In his opinion, no one better than Napoleon could have overcome the state of anarchy in society. That

---

<sup>19</sup> *Guizot F.* Trois générations. P.57.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* P.56.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Napoléon, de l'histoire à la légende: actes du colloque des 30 novembre et 1er décembre 1999, organisé par le Musée de l'armée, Hôtel national des Invalides / sous la dir. M. Arrous. Paris, 2000. P. 441.

<sup>23</sup> *Guizot F.* Memoirs to illustrate the history of my time. Vol. 1. P. 5.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* P. 4.

is, Napoleon for Guizot was the same romantic hero, or “archetype of the savior”, about whom the most famous French Napoleonic scholar Jean Tulard would write in the twentieth century<sup>25</sup>. “It is very much to be at the same time a national glory, a guarantor of the Revolution and a principle of power” — these words of Guizot, in my view, are quite consonant with modern assessments of Napoleon: his rule is perceived by modern historians as the culmination of the Revolution, and he himself is evaluated as the creator of the political institutions of modern France<sup>26</sup>. What is even more important is that it was during the July monarchy that King Louis-Philippe legitimized Napoleon to legitimize his own power, rehabilitating Napoleon’s ideas and memory of him, and turning his cult into an official ideology. The apotheosis of this cult was the grand ceremony of the reburial of the remains of Napoleon in the Cathedral of the Invalides on December 15, 1840.

Two years after the beginning of Guizot’s teaching activity, Napoleon’s empire collapsed, and the monarchy was restored in France, led by the brother of the executed king Louis XVI, Louis XVIII. For Guizot, there was no problem of choice: he was completely on the side of the restored Bourbon monarchy, under the patronage of P. Royer-Collard, becoming an assistant to the Minister of the Interior Montesquiou. However, he had not served in his new position for a year when a Hundred Days broke out. Despite his ambivalent attitude towards the Napoleonic regime, Guizot demonstrated his loyalty to the emperor and immediately accepted an Additional Act. This did not help, and he was dismissed. Initially, together with Royer-Collard and other liberals, he opted for passive opposition but soon came to the conclusion that Napoleon’s regime was extremely fragile, so it was necessary to prevent second Bourbon restoration from repeating the mistakes of the first one. At the end of May, he was sent to Ghent, Belgium, with a special assignment: to counteract the influence of the ultra at the court of Louis XVIII and persuade the king to adopt a moderate-liberal policy. Subsequently, this “run to Ghent” became one of the favorite attacks on Guizot by his political opponents.

The result of The Hundred days was Waterloo. The Revolution was over, but it was important for French society to develop a “correct” view of it, to sort the wheat that is, its positive socio-political gains — equality of all citizens before the law, the elimination of class privileges, the constitutional form of government — from “the chaff”, i. e. anarchy and despotism<sup>27</sup>. Moreover, in the conditions of the anti-enlightenment and anti-revolutionary reaction, the rehabilitation of the Revolution was the only way to reconciliation of France and to national consensus, to a compromise between the Old Order and the new, post-revolutionary France.

It was the idea of compromise that became the key one for the political group of doctrinaires — moderate liberals of the Restoration era, one of whose leaders was François Guizot<sup>28</sup>. Since the group was small, it was said that the doctrinaires could all fit on one sofa, and Guizot was called “sofa’s Montesquiou” as the ideology of the doctrinaires went back to the ideas of the famous educator.

---

<sup>25</sup> Tulard J. Napoleon, ili mif o «spasitele». Moscow, 2009.

<sup>26</sup> For details see: *Tanshina N. P.* Napoleon Bonapart: mezhdou istoriei i legendoi. St. Petersburg, 2020.

<sup>27</sup> *Kaplanov R. M.* François Guizot: u istokov liberal’nogo evropeizma // *Evropeiskii al’manakh. Istoriia. Traditsiia. Kul’tura.* Moscow, 1990. P. 59.

<sup>28</sup> For details see: *Butenko V. A.* Liberal’naia partiia vo Frantsii v epokhu Restavratsii. Vol. 1. 1814–1820. St. Petersburg, 1913; *Kiseleva E. V.* Liberaly «konstitutsionalisty» v epokhu Restavratsii vo Frantsii. 1814–1830 gg. / *Evropeiskii liberalizm v novoe vremia. Teoriia i praktika.* Moscow, 1995.

For Guizot, the question of the attitude to the revolutionary heritage was not theoretical but purely practical. For him, the Revolution itself was inextricably linked not only with the past but also with the subsequent history of France. “The Revolution is the daughter of the past and the mother of the future”, he wrote later. From the first years of the existence of the Restoration regime, he followed “the golden mean” in assessing this event, trying to find a way to establish a parliamentary monarchy in France equally removed from both absolutism and the extremes of Jacobinism, and the quintessence of his view of the Revolution can be considered the future motto of the Orleanists — “Freedom and Order”.

However, after the assassination of the heir to the throne, Duke of Berry, the son of Count d'Artois, on February 13, 1820, and the fall of the Ministry of Decazes, a period of reaction began in France. The changes in the government's course had a very direct impact on Guizot's career: he was removed from his post in the State Council and returned to scientific studies. Madame Condorcet gave him her country house situated within ten leagues from Paris, where Guizot immersed himself in historical studies and writing journalistic works on current politics, considering his duty was to express his civic position<sup>29</sup>. In his work “On the government in France since the Restoration, and on the Present Ministry”, he assessed the main achievements of the Revolution as follows: equality before the law and the idea of the middle class as the basis of the social system. In his “Memoirs”, written almost forty years later, he quoted from this work emphasizing that he did not renounce either his words or his ideas, which very accurately characterizes the essence of his concept: “For thirteen centuries, there have been two peoples in France, the victorious people and the defeated people. For more than thirteen centuries, the defeated people fought to throw off the yoke of the victorious people. Our history is the history of this struggle. A decisive battle, called the Revolution, broke out before our eyes. Its result is that the defeated people have become the victorious people. He conquered France”<sup>30</sup>.

Guizot developed his ideas that the Revolution was caused by the entire previous development of France in a course of lectures on modern history, which he read at Sorbonne in 1820–1822, and then in a course of lectures on the history of civilization in France and in Europe (1828–1830). At the same time, he decided to use his lectures on the history of civilization in Europe from the fall of the Roman Empire to the beginning of 1789 as well as journalism as a means of influencing the authorities, about which he wrote in his “Memoirs”, but sought, in his own words, to abandon any comparisons with modern politics. Subsequently, he wrote about the specifics of his course: “I removed from my course everything that could cause analogies with the circumstances of that time, with the system and the way of government actions. I forbade myself all thoughts of attacking the government and its criticism, abstracted myself from any associations with modern events and political struggle. I was deeply immersed in the sphere of ideas and ancient history”<sup>31</sup>.

These lectures, begun by Guizot on December 7, 1820, were a huge success and became an event not only in the academic but also in the socio-political life of France be-

---

<sup>29</sup> *Guizot F. Memoirs to illustrate the history of my time. Vol. 1. P. 279.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid. P. 296.* — We are talking about the Germanic-Romance problem, the design of which in French historiography dates back to the beginning of the XVIII century, and which still worried historians in the XIX century. Within the framework of this approach, the Franks — the lords — were considered a victorious people; the Gallo-Romans — the common people — a defeated people.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid. P. 312.*

cause Guizot, turning to the past, voluntarily or involuntarily spoke about the present. In 1851, the “History of the Origin of Representative Government” was compiled on the basis of this course, and this is also indicative: thirty years later, Guizot remained faithful to his beliefs.

The moderate-liberal magazine “The Russian Bulletin”, which published excerpts from Guizot’s “Memoirs” in the 1860s, wrote about the relationship between history and politics in his course: “...his political way of thinking was reflected in the entire teaching of Guizot, completely independently of him. Before looking at Guizot as a scientist, one must see in him a political person; his lectures were not only the fruit of a calm study of the subject in the past, without any relation to the present. Guizot is a supporter of constitutional rule; he served it by his activity, in the governmental sphere; when it was closed to him, he transferred his beliefs to the department and continued to serve them in a scientific way»<sup>32</sup>. The main idea of the course was also formulated in “The Russian Bulletin”: «...to prove that the constitutional way of government naturally followed from all the previous historical development of France»<sup>33</sup>. We see a very close relationship between the Guizot-historian and the Guizot-politician, and, as a historian, he used the examples and experience of the past for the sake of the present and the future. Moreover, with the help of history, relying on the past, he constructed the future.

Guizot explained the tasks of his course himself: “I selected for the subject of my course the history of the old political institutions of Christian Europe, and of the origin of representative government, in the different forms in which it had been formerly attempted, with or without success. I touched very closely, in such a subject, on the flagrant embarrassments of that contemporaneous policy to which I was determined to make no allusion. But I also found an obvious opportunity of carrying out, through scientific paths alone, the double object I had in view. I was anxious to combat revolutionary theories, and to attach interest and respect to the past history of France”<sup>34</sup>. In addition, being a staunch supporter of a compromise between the old, pre-revolutionary France, and the new, post-revolutionary society, Guizot sought to show the need to rely on traditions, to use the rich experience accumulated by French civilization: “I particularly wished to associate old France with the remembrance and intelligence of new generations; for there was as little sense as justice in decrying or despising our fathers, at the very moment when, equally misled in our time, we were taking an immense step in the same path which they had followed for so many ages”<sup>35</sup>.

However, as expected, the course of lectures by François Guizot was perceived by the authorities as excessively liberal. On October 12, 1822, it was banned, and Guizot was deprived of his post. Only six years later, on April 9, 1828, he continued lecturing. This time it was a course dedicated to the history of civilization in Europe. In it, Guizot continued to develop the key idea for him: the continuity of the New France and the France of the Old Order, dating the birth of European civilization to the fall of the Roman Empire.

Also, Guizot spoke about this during his next course of lectures on the history of civilization in France, which he began reading on December 6, 1829: “So, we probably know

---

<sup>32</sup> Feoktistov E. M. Zapiski Guizot. Imperiia i Restavratsiia // Russkii vestnik. 1858. Vol. 15, no. 5–6. P. 362.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Guizot F. Memoirs to illustrate the history of my time. Vol. 1. P. 300.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid. P. 301.

that striving for free rule we not only do not renounce France, created for centuries, but continue its creation, and that defeats do not take away our hope of success”<sup>36</sup>. The course remained incomplete: finishing the academic year in June 1830, Guizot thought to continue it (up to the French Revolution) the next academic year. However, the July Revolution involved him in political activities, and he did not return to teaching.

During “The Three Glorious Days”, as the French call the July Revolution, King Charles X lost his throne, and a representative of the younger branch of the Bourbons, Louis-Philippe of Orleans, took it. Guizot, similarly to other doctrinaire liberals, had the opportunity to put his ideas into practice. Now the liberals, supporters of Louis-Philippe of Orleans, began to be called “Orleanists”, and the ideology of the moderate-liberal movement — “Orleanism”<sup>37</sup>. It was based on the idea of “a golden mean” and a compromise between the most important achievements of the Old Order and the new post-revolutionary France; between the aristocracy, the nobility, and the middle strata.

The July Revolution of 1830 itself, which, at first glance, was prepared by no one, and which was a popular protest against the violation of the Constitutional Charter by King Charles X, was directed in the right way by journalists, namely, the opposition newspaper “Le National”. Adolphe Thiers, one of its creators and editors, contributed to the formation of the image of Duke Louis-Philippe of Orleans as “the savior of the nation” and to his “election” as “the king of the French”. Moreover, one of the factors that ensured the victory of the July Revolution was the successful reconciliation of French public opinion with the Revolution of 1789 implemented by talented and young historians of the Restoration era, namely, François Guizot, François Mignet, Adolphe Thiers, Augustin Thierry, in their brilliant works. As noted by a well-known expert on the history of the French Revolution, A. V. Tchudinov, the liberal historians of the Restoration era, in fact, “reformatted” the national memory creating a beautiful “myth about the French Revolution”, which was the inevitable result of all the previous development of the country and opened the way “to the establishment of a new, progressive world order”<sup>38</sup>. Therefore, the July Revolution was perceived in the public consciousness as a continuation of the grandiose project of social reconstruction at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Moreover, the July monarchy “rehabilitated” the French Revolution by adopting its symbols — “the Marseillaise” as the anthem and the tricolor as the official flag. The Doctrinals of the Restoration period had the opportunity to put their political principles into practice.

For Guizot, the July Revolution was the final victory of the new, post-revolutionary France. Undertaken on behalf of the laws violated by Charles X and with the aim of protecting them, it was intended, as Guizot noted, to restore legal order, but concurrently it dealt a serious blow to the royal power<sup>39</sup>. At the same time, a moderate liberal Guizot emphasized the conservative nature of this revolution: France “wanted a revolution that would not be a revolution, and which would give it, at the same time, order and freedom”<sup>40</sup>. As a historian and an expert on the history of England, he appealed to the English experience and pointed out the striking similarity between the July Revolution and the Glorious Revolution, which, according to him, was also “a matter of pure defense, and

---

<sup>36</sup> Guizot F. *Istoriia tsivilizatsii vo Frantsii*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1877. P. 6.

<sup>37</sup> For details see: Broglie G. *L'Orleanisme. La ressource liberale de la France*. Paris, 1981.

<sup>38</sup> Tchudinov A. V. *Mify o Frantsuzskoi revoliutsii // Istorik*. 2015, no. 7–8. P. 31.

<sup>39</sup> Guizot F. *Trois générations*. P. 181.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* P. 182.

forced defense: this is the root cause of its success<sup>41</sup>. The glorious Revolution was “precise and definite in its goals”<sup>42</sup>, it did not wish “to change the foundations of social life and the fate of mankind; it defended a certain faith, certain laws, positive rights, and all its claims and thoughts were limited to this”<sup>43</sup>. Another important merit of “the Glorious Revolution”, according to Guizot, was that it was committed not by the people but by “organized political parties, and moreover — organized long before the revolution”<sup>44</sup>. “The cause of the English people triumphed through the English aristocracy” — this, according to Guizot, was “the great character of the revolution of 1689”<sup>45</sup>.

Unfortunately, Guizot stated, this did not happen in France in 1830; the spirit of consensus and social harmony, as in the years of the Revolution of the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, gave way to popular passions; after the victory of the July Revolution, the agreement in the camp of the victors was replaced by a fierce struggle between the supporters of the Movement group (moderate liberals who advocated deepening the Revolution) and adherents of the Resistance group (convinced that it was necessary to stop there). In general, the liberals, supporters of King Louis-Philippe, were named “Orleanists” after the ruling dynasty.

Guizot joined the flank of the Resistance from the very beginning. He was convinced that the Revolution must be completed. France no longer needed innovations and constant modernization of the political system but was interested in consolidating the achievements. The main guarantee of this, according to Guizot, lay in strengthening the constitutional monarchy regime in France, in the synthesis of tradition and modernity. As P. Rosanvallón noted, in France, the equality of citizens before the law was established, and the monarchical principle itself was preserved, that is, the connection with the previous tradition was continued. As a result, the July Revolution was a “political compromise and a historical synthesis of new and old France”, a “golden mean”, equally hostile to both despotism and anarchy, both revolutionary upheavals and counter-revolution<sup>46</sup>. As B. G. Reizov rightly observed, “seeing an element of reason and justice in all the traditions and institutions of the past, Guizot tried to preserve them in the new representative system”<sup>47</sup>.

Guizot was a real voice of the July monarchy, which was the embodiment of his political ideal of the rule of “the middle class”, the same one about whose long struggle he wrote, and whose mouthpiece at the very beginning of the Revolution was the abbe de Sieyes in his famous pamphlet.

In general, the ideology of Orleanism was the ideology of social compromise, including one between the nobility and the bourgeoisie, between them and the rest of the people. At the same time, in social terms, Orleanism had become a pronounced ideology of “the new aristocracy” (“notables”) — influential people, representatives of the nobility, large landowners, rich entrepreneurs and the intellectual elite. It is not by chance that the July monarchy is called the “board of professors” and the “board of journalists”, as well as “the board of talents” (so-called “capacités”, the capable” people for whom the missing property qualification of 200 francs was compensated by intellectual merits). The French researcher Christophe Charles traces the genesis of intellectuals in France from the “the capable”

---

<sup>41</sup> *Guizot F. Istoriia Angliiskoi revoliutsii. Vol. 1. P. 75.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid. P. 78.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid. P. 80.*

<sup>46</sup> *Rosanvallon P. Le moment Guizot. P. 211.*

<sup>47</sup> *Reizov B. G. Romanticheskaiia frantsuzskaia istoriografiia. P. 196.*

of July monarchy. This is the title of one of the subsections of his book “The Intellectuals in France”: “From “the capable” to “the intellectuals”: free professions between economics and politics”<sup>48</sup>. The July monarchy regularly drew its cadres from Sorbonne, it is enough to recall the famous triumvirate of ministers-professors: F. Guizot (Minister of the Interior in 1830, Minister of Public Education in 1832–1836 with interruptions, Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1840–1848, in 1847, he officially headed the government), Victor Cousin (in 1840 he was Minister of Public Education), A.-F. Villemain (in 1839–1844 he held the post of Minister of Public Education). Very often, the ministers were politicians who came out of the sphere of liberal professions, primarily from the depths of the bar and journalism, and here the most striking examples are François Guizot and Adolphe Thiers<sup>49</sup> (whom envious people even called “an upstart from the pen”, “parvenu de la plume”)<sup>50</sup>.

However, not all contemporaries shared the opinion that the July monarchy was a “rule of talents”. Thus, Honoré de Balzac, a legitimist by conviction, who became a world-famous writer but never achieved political recognition and position under Louis-Philippe, in his “The Human Comedy” in the words of Z. Marcas gave a simply damning description of the July monarchy, emphasizing that it was primarily the power of money not talents: “The pear-shaped skull of the stupid son of a rich grocer will be preferred to the square head of a sensible young man, gifted with talent, but without a penny in his pocket... Nowadays, talent can only break through on the same condition as mediocrity — if he is lucky”<sup>51</sup>. Balzac characterized the people surrounding the throne, the politicians and ministers, as “devoid of intelligence and abilities, who have not become famous or studied anything, people without social weight and without spiritual greatness”<sup>52</sup>. But this is, in my opinion, a personal grudge of the famous writer.

Balzac really did not want to be a representative of “the middle class”, he wished to belong to aristocracy, hence the particle “de” attached to his surname. At the same time, Guizot’s arguments about the July monarchy as the time of a desired compromise between social strata, as the time of the domination of “the middle class” turned out to be illusory in many respects. Actually, by “les classes moyennes” the French liberals understood a broader social category than was customary in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, where the “middle class” meant “bourgeoisie” in the traditional sense of the term, that is, a layer intermediate between the nobility (gentry) and the common people.

Guizot interpreted the term “middle class” very broadly — as including all social strata except aristocracy and the poorest part of the population, that is, wage workers and peasants, emphasizing that the boundaries of middle class were not fixed. Probably, he deliberately proposed such a very streamlined scheme trying to smooth out obvious contradictions in society and unreasonably expanding the social block of the middle class, which in fact did not yet exist in those years. It was the unresolved social problems, as well as narrow social base of the regime due to the refusal of the Orleanists to reform the electoral system towards its democratization, that became the most important factors behind the unpopularity of the regime and its collapse in 1848.

<sup>48</sup> Charle C. *Intellektualy vo Frantsii*. P. 31.

<sup>49</sup> About A. Thiers, see: *Ignatchenko I. V. Adol’f T’er: sud’ba frantsuzskogo liberala pervoi poloviny XIX veka*. Moscow, 2017.

<sup>50</sup> *Lévêque P. Histoire des forces politiques en France. 1789–1880*. Vol. 1. Paris, 1992. P. 236.

<sup>51</sup> *Balzac H. Z. Markas // Balzac H. Sbranie sochinenii: vols. 1–20*. Vol. 7: *Chelovecheskaia komediia*. Moscow, 1995. P. 636.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* P. 637.

At the same time, as a historian, Guizot understood all this perfectly well and warned about it during his lectures in the 1820s. Reflecting on the reasons for the fall of the Roman Empire, he emphasized: “In all countries at all times, whatever the form of government, after a more or less long time, due to the use of power, wealth, intellectual development, all social advantages, the upper classes lose their strength, are exhausted; it is necessary that they are constantly excited by competition, renewed by the entry into their ranks of persons from those classes who live and work under them”<sup>53</sup>. He came to similar conclusions when analyzing the state of society in fifth-century Gaul: “People in it were divided into two large classes, between which there was a huge space: there was no diversity, no progressive movement, no true democracy...”<sup>54</sup>

In other words, the lack of social harmony, social elevators, the narrowness of the social base, the ossification of power structures — all this destroyed the Roman Empire and Gaul as its component part. This was the cause of the French Revolution of the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century; it also led to the crisis of the regime of the July monarchy in 1848. That is, while studying the ancient heritage, Guizot as a historian was well aware of the problems that resulted in the collapse of both Roman society and the Old Order. However, unfortunately, Guizot as a politician could not avoid these mistakes in his own state activities.

The Orleanist liberals opposed not only a significant expansion of the right to vote considering it a premature measure; they did not want to expand the social base of the regime by including representatives of liberal professions in it. At the time of the adoption of the electoral law of April 19, 1831, there were few so-called “the capable” among the voters — only 668 people, which constituted 0,3 percent of the voters. This included individuals who paid less than one hundred francs in direct taxes per year (and the right to vote was granted to people who had reached the age of 25 and paid 200 francs in direct taxes per year), for whom intellectual merit compensated the lack of a property qualification<sup>55</sup>. As we can see, this percentage was quite small, and, as Ch. Charle noted, “in the world of notables of the censitarian monarchy, representatives of the liberal professions were in a subordinate position...”<sup>56</sup>. This sometimes led them to the ranks of the opposition.

But here is what Guizot understood very well: before giving the people the right to vote, it is necessary to enlighten them because the right to vote is a function associated with a large degree of responsibility for a person's actions. The French historian Fabien Reboul noted that no one more than Guizot, the former publisher of the *Annals of Education*, the author of *Reflections on the History and Current State of Education in France*, was aware of the vital importance of “the government of reason”<sup>57</sup>. He not only understood this but also actively contributed to it. In 1832, Guizot became the Minister of Public Education<sup>58</sup> and in this position developed the law on primary education, which was adopted on June 28, 1833 and went down in history as “Guizot's law”. Despite the fact that education was not universal and not free, and the salary of teachers was very small, this law was an important step towards the evolution of the education system. It stands

---

<sup>53</sup> *Guizot F. Istoriia tsivilizatsii vo Frantsii*. Vol. 1. P. 54.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* P. 55.

<sup>55</sup> *Rémond R. La vie politique en France. 1789–1848: vols 1–2*. Vol. 1. Paris, 1965. P. 304.

<sup>56</sup> *Charle C. Intellectually vo Frantsii*. P. 33.

<sup>57</sup> *François Guizot et la Culture politique de son temps. Colloque de la Fondation Guizot — Val-Richer*. Paris, 1991. P. 163.

<sup>58</sup> Guizot served as Minister of Public Education for four and a half years, from October 11, 1832, to April 15, 1837, with two breaks.

to reason that Guizot is called the first famous minister of public education in France. In addition, he restored the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, which was abolished by Napoleon at the time.

In 1848, after the fall of the July monarchy, the Second Republic proclaimed universal suffrage, and 15 years after the adoption of the law on primary education, French peasants voted for Napoleon Bonaparte's nephew, Prince Louis Napoleon. They voted not with their minds, but with their hearts, for "the surname" and "the Napoleonic legend".

And here we come to the next important problem — the unpopularity of Guizot's moderate and compromise foreign policy in the broad strata of French society, gripped by revanchist sentiments and living in captivity of "the Napoleonic legend" about the former greatness and glory of France. The king appointed François Guizot Minister of Foreign Affairs at the height of the Eastern crisis on October 29, 1840, replacing A. Thiers who was prone to adventurous actions. The head of the cabinet was the hero of the Napoleonic Wars, Marshal N. Soult, however, it was Guizot who was considered the real leader of the government (Guizot officially headed the ministry in 1847).

Few of the French foreign ministers had such a deep faith in the history of France as he did. At the same time, as a historian, Guizot did not just draw lessons from history, he expounded his theory of French leadership in Europe and built a theoretical basis for his foreign policy from this.

France's claims to moral superiority, according to Guizot, were due to the fact that French civilization was a kind of standard, an exemplary model for him. He attributed it to the very course of the historical development of ancient Gaul, the cradle of French civilization, which, as Guizot noted, "was on the boundary between the Roman and Germanic worlds", and, having absorbed both of these principles, became "the most complete and faithful image of a pan-European civilization"<sup>59</sup>. "The civilization of France, — Guizot emphasized in his "History of Civilization in France", — "follows almost equally from both foundations, conveys from the very beginning the totality and diversity of the elements of modern society"<sup>60</sup>.

At the same time, according to Guizot's deep conviction, the means of France's influence in Europe were not at all to keep it in fear of another possibility of "exporting the Revolution", especially since, as Guizot noted, "in the genius of the French, something of a sociableness, of a sympathy, something which spreads itself with more facility and energy, than in the genius of any other people; it may be in the language, or the particular turn of mind of the French nation; it may be in their manners, or that their ideas, being more popular, present themselves more clearly to the masses, penetrate among them with greater ease"<sup>61</sup>. He was sure that, despite the system of the Vienna Treaties, hated by the majority of the French, France remained "a great power" with a rich civilizational heritage, being the birthplace of many achievements of human thought. He wrote in "The History of Civilization in Europe": "There is not a single great idea, not a single great principle of civilization, which, in order to become universally spread, has not first passed through France"<sup>62</sup>. He wrote: "In a word, clearness, sociability, sympathy, are the particular char-

---

<sup>59</sup> *Guizot F. Istoriia tsivilizatsii vo Frantsii*. Vol. 1. P. 37.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>61</sup> *Guizot F. General history of civilization in Europe*. Edited, with critical and supplementary notes, by George Wells Knight. New York, 1896. P. 2–3.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.* P. 2.

acteristics of France, of its civilization; and these qualities render it eminently qualified to march at the head of European civilization”<sup>63</sup>. The Congress of Vienna established a legitimate order in Europe which was better to accept than to constantly challenge with resentment. “We want the peoples, — he wrote, — to know only the virtues and benefits of the French Revolution; we want the peoples to see that it is not Revolution that dominates in France, but freedom. Not disorder, but internal order and stability”<sup>64</sup>.

Based on the belief about the French civilization as exemplary, Guizot built his concept of “the Greater Europe” under the moral authority of France. In “The History of Civilization in Europe”, he wrote: “...without intending to flatter the country to which I am bound by so many ties, I cannot but regard France as the center, as the focus, of the civilization of Europe”<sup>65</sup>. As the French researcher Pierre Triomphe noted, “Guizot was one of the first in Europe and the first in France to try to comprehend this unity based on historical factors”<sup>66</sup>. Of course, Guizot had never come up with plans for a European federation, or with any national political projects, so the concept of “Europeanism” may not seem quite correct when applied to him. Nevertheless, his attempt to reveal the spiritual essence of Europe is worthy of serious attention and study since it influenced both the policy of Guizot himself and the development of the European idea. He spoke about the common aspirations of the European peoples, about the single movement of European civilization already in “The Origin of Representative Government” and saw this unity in the common desire for representative government<sup>67</sup>. At the same time, he pointed out in “The History of Civilization in Europe” that European civilization differed from ancient civilizations by an amazing variety of institutions, customs, forms, but this same diversity was the strength of Europe: “Such is apparently the general state of the world, while diversity of forms, of ideas, of principles, their struggles and their energies, all tend towards a certain unity, a certain ideal, which, though perhaps it may never be attained, mankind is constantly approaching by dint of liberty and labor”<sup>68</sup>. Guizot wrote: “European civilization has, if I may be allowed the expression, at last penetrated into the ways or eternal truth — into the scheme of Providence”<sup>69</sup>.

What is the result? Let us remember Niccolo Machiavelli who created the most famous practical guide to gaining, strengthening and preserving power, but in his real life violated the rules he himself developed, which became the basis of political science. Unfortunately, the same fate befell Guizot, and his deep knowledge of the past did not help him avoid mistakes in his present.

However, in my opinion, in this case, his intentions are most important. For Guizot, the appeal to the historical heritage of France and Europe was crucial not only from the point of view of using historical experience to solve pressing problems of his time, but also from the point of view of morality and education of universal man. To him, the history of the development of civilization itself was the history of the moral improvement of mankind.

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. P. 3.

<sup>64</sup> Guizot F. L'Histoire parlementaire de la France: vols 1–5. Vol. 5. Paris, 1864. P. 195.

<sup>65</sup> Guizot F. General history of civilization in Europe. P. 2.

<sup>66</sup> Triomphe P. L'Europe de François Guizot. Paris, 2002. P. 84.

<sup>67</sup> Reizov B. G. Romanticheskaia frantsuzskaia istoriografii. P. 204.

<sup>68</sup> Guizot F. General history of civilization in Europe. P. 33.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid. P. 34.

## References

- Alpatov M. A. *Politicheskie idei frantsuzskoi burzhuaznoi istoriografii XIX v.* Moscow, Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1949, 407 p. (In Russian)
- Brogie G. *Guizot.* Paris, Perrin, 1990, 440 p.
- Brogie G. *L'Orleanisme. La ressource liberale de la France.* Paris, Perrin, 1981, 440 p.
- Butenko V. A. *Liberal'naiia partiia vo Frantsii v epokhu Restavratsii.* Vol. 1: 1814–1820. St. Petersburg, Print. M. M. Stasiulevicha Publ., 1913, 629 p. (In Russian)
- Charle C. *Intellektualy vo Frantsii.* Moscow, Novoe izdatel'stvo Publ., 2005, 325 p. (In Russian)
- Charle C. *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIX e siècle: Essai d'histoire comparée.* Paris, Seuil, 2001, 452 p.
- Charle C. *Naissance des "intellectuels" (1800–1900).* Paris, Minuit, 1990, 291 p.
- Feoktistov E. M. Zapiski Guizot. Imperiia i Restavratsiia. *Russkii vestnik*, 1858, vol. 15, no. 5–6, pp. 304–376. (In Russian)
- Girard L. *Les libéraux français. 1814–1875.* Paris, Aubier, 1985, 277 p.
- Gueniffey P. *Politika revoliutsionnogo terrora. 1789–1794.* Moscow, URSS Press, 2003, 319 p. (In Russian)
- Ignatchenko I. V. *Adol'f T'er: sud'ba frantsuzskogo liberala pervoi poloviny XIX veka.* Moscow, Delo Publ., 2017, 461 p. (In Russian)
- Kaplanov R. M. François Guizot: u istokov liberal'nogo evropeizma. *Evropeiskii al'manakh. Istoriia. Traditsiia. Kul'tura.* Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1990, 136 p. (In Russian)
- Kiseleva E. V. Liberaly «konstitutsionalisty» v epokhu Restavratsii vo Frantsii. 1814–1830 gg. *Evropeiskii liberalizm v novoe vremia. Teoriia i praktika.* Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1995, pp. 155–165. (In Russian)
- Lévêque P. *Histoire des forces politiques en France. 1789–1880.* Paris, Armand Colin, 1992, t. 1, 370 p.
- Matveev S. R. Bez politiki: istoriosofiia Fransois Guizot do 1814 goda. *Vestnik of Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University. Seriia: gumanitarnye i obshchestvennye nauki*, 2015, no. 12, pp. 21–28. (In Russian)
- Matveev S. R. *Svoboda i poriadok: liberal'nyi konservatizm Fransois Guizot.* Moscow, Publ. House of Higher School of Economics, 2019, 232 p. (In Russian)
- Napoléon, de l'histoire à la légende: actes du colloque des 30 novembre et 1er décembre 1999, organisé par le Musée de l'armée, Hôtel national des Invalides.* Dir. M. Arrous. Paris, Maisonneuve & Larose, 2000, 447 p.
- Reizov B. G. *Romanticheskaia frantsuzskaia istoriografiia (1815–1830).* Leningrad, Leningrad University Press, 1956, 535 p. (In Russian)
- Rémond R. *La vie politique en France. 1789–1848, vol. 1.* Paris, Colin, 1965, 424 p.
- Rosanvallon P. *Le moment Guizot.* Paris, Gallimard, 1985, 414 p.
- Tanshina N. *François Guizot: teoriia i praktika francuzskogo umerennogo liberalizma.* Moscow, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics Press, 2000, 240 p. (In Russian)
- Tanshina N. P. *François Guizot. Politicheskaia biografiiia.* Moscow, Moscow State Pedagogical University Press, 2016, 362 p. (In Russian)
- Tanshina N. P. Napoleon Bonapart: mezhdu istoriei i legendoi. St. Petersburg, Evraziia Publ., 2020, 224 p. (In Russian)
- Tchudinov A. V. Mify o Frantsuzskoi revoliutsii. *Istoriik*, 2015, no. 7–8, pp. 30–35. (In Russian)
- Theis L. *François Guizot.* Paris, Arthème Fayard, 2008, 553 p.
- Triomphe P. *L'Europe de François Guizot.* Paris, Éd. Privat, 2002, 125 p.
- Tular J. Napoleon, ili mif o «spasitele». Moscow, Molodaia gvardiia Publ., 1997, 382 p. (In Russian)
- Winock M. *Le siècle des intellectuels.* Paris, Seuil, 1997, 695 p.

Статья поступила в редакцию 8 декабря 2020 г.

Рекомендована в печать 14 сентября 2021 г.

Received: December 8, 2020

Accepted: September 14, 2021