

the withdrawal of the saints from the company of the reprobates proved to be the means of spreading abroad ideals of toleration. In their pamphlets and in the debates of the Westminster Assembly (which Dr. Jordan has summarized admirably) they pleaded the cause not only of their own sect but of others. Yet their charity was not extended outside Protestantism. The most valuable part of this section is the discussion of John Goodwin, whose spiritual pilgrimage from Calvinism to Arminianism is traced with sympathy and skill.

The Presbyterian group, like the Independents, as Dr. Jordan points out, also included men of widely diversified attitudes. Nowhere is the difficulty of putting the thinkers of this individualistic age into pigeonholes more clearly seen than in Dr. Jordan's classification of the Presbyterians into "Ir-reconcilables" and "Moderates". The first group Dr. Jordan blames for the failure to achieve a national church on a broad basis, with toleration for those who could not be included in it. Even the Moderates, however, never strayed far from the illiberal implications of Calvinism. Dr. Jordan, recognizing the failure of the Presbyterians to add to the development of toleration, finds their chief contribution in their "revolt against Arminianism". Yet it must be questioned whether in the first place they did check Arminianism, and whether in the second place, if they had, it would have aided freedom of thought. Calvinism and Arminianism lived side by side in the Church of the Restoration, but quietly (except for the Bull-Tully controversy) now that such rigid Calvinists as Lazarus Scaman and Edmund Calamy had left its ranks. A review is no place for a theological controversy, but it is certainly a disputable point whether the theology of Laud and Cosin had a "corroding influence".

Dr. Jordan has skillfully provided brief biographical sketches of the advocates and critics of toleration, so that men significant in their own day but now overlooked receive their proper recognition. The contributions of ministers, like Thomas Manton, and of laymen, such as John Cook and Samuel Richardson, are appraised, with the result that Roger Williams becomes merely an incident, although an important one, in the history of toleration. Yet Williams's contribution must not be underestimated, for he succeeded in putting toleration into practice. Our age, which sees Protestantism vainly dreaming of reunion, may find comfort in the thought that political liberty, which Dr. Jordan regards as the great contribution of sectarianism, is still intact in a few countries, at least. The author, very correctly, has deduced from his study the responsibility of this age to hold fast to this heritage.

*Providence; Rhode Island.*

ETHYD WILLIAMS KIRBY.

*The Anatomy of Revolution.* By CRANE BRINTON, Associate Professor of History, Harvard University. (New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 1938. Pp. 326. \$3.00.)

*Six Contemporaneous Revolutions.* By ROGER HIGGLOW MERRIMAN. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. viii, 239. \$2.50.)

BOTH books would be normal academic products if their topic, "revolution", were not allergic to their method. They sum up facts, believing in them as facts; revolutions, however, proclaim what shall be called a fact in the universe, from now on. Mr. Brinton compares four revolutions: the French, Russian, English, and American, as though they were separate entities; and Mr. Merriman calls his book *Six Contemporaneous Revolutions*. In concentrating on the latter volume first, this common belief and its efficiency as well as its limitations will become clear. From 1640 to 1660 political unrest made itself felt all over Europe from the Ukraine to Spain, from Naples to Denmark. Everywhere, the lower estates, as John Knox had called them, tried to challenge the higher. This is one universal movement. In this one revolution Mr. Merriman has singled out six events—in Catalonia, Naples, England, France, Holland, and Portugal—and, after giving their particular histories in brief, with the exception of the English Civil War, he goes on to draw the lines of interplay between them. This chapter is the real contribution of the book. The political equation of the two decades has never been reduced so neatly to binomial relations as here. All the diplomatic negotiations between the six areas of unrest are listed. The student of political history will not even miss the narrative of the English revolution because it has been told so often. And since the over-complex particulars between Dutch and Portuguese, Neapolitan and Catalonian, French and English, etc., etc., are put before us in a straightforward fashion, we may forget that the number "six" conceals from us the common pattern of all and the problem of totality of this movement.

Mr. Brinton has written on the four revolutions which are foremost in an American's memory. He is not unaware of the quandary in which he finds himself as a historian, devoted to particulars, and as an adept of science, operating with abstractions like a "fever curve". He restates several rules. Revolutions are not made by destitute people. The intellectuals desert the old order of things before the revolution occurs. The sequence of moderates and extremists seems unalterable (with the exception of the American Revolution which Mr. Brinton excuses as a peculiar case). Terror and abstract virtue are found everywhere before a Thermidorian reaction. Because these generalities have long been known, beginning in fact with Hobbes and Goethe, the significance of the book is not in any of its positive statements. It lies in the fact that Brinton, who, by the way, does not give credit to the discoverers of these uniformities, asserts that his is the only "scientific" method. This is a relapse to the *more geometrico* superstition of Spinoza. Limiting his "facts" by the "case" method, Brinton fails to see why wars are essential elements in the pattern of 1789 and 1917, preceding the Russian, following the French revolution. Atomizing further, Brinton suggests that the rest of the world got hold of the decimal system

"without benefit of revolution". This is the logical conclusion when the French Revolution is treated as lasting only from 1789 to 1814. In this case the later adoption of the decimal system by other countries does not appear to be the fruit of French suffering.

To me the meaning of revolutions does not disclose itself to the man who thinks that he himself moves outside their orbit. It is not to be found in anything happening immediately after and during the fever but in habits, immunities, and powers developed generations and centuries later. Strangely enough Brinton recognizes this for the Spartans of antiquity (p. 229). From this point of view, the same revolutionary processes that are failures to Merriman and Brinton are to me highly rational and effective. To me revolutions call their particular generation back into the phylogenetic history of Man. Do not the authors owe their own chairs of history to the English, the French, the American revolution? Yet, responsibility for the future of social evolution is excluded from their patterns of scientific thinking. Hence the new barbarians reciprocate and exclude scientific thinking and teaching from *their* future world. The books testify to J. Benda's *Trahison des Clercs*. The academic scientists have imperiled our intellectual freedom. They have watched society instead of watching out for it.

Dartmouth College.

EGGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY.

*The Lord General: A Life of Sir Thomas Fairfax*. By M. A. GIBB. (London: Lindsay Drummond. 1938. Pp. xv, 304. 12s. 6d.)

WHEN Sir Clements Markham wrote *The Great Lord Fairfax* (1870), Gardiner's *History of the Civil War* had not yet appeared. Miss Gibb, on the other hand, had access to Gardiner's monumental work and to such facts as more recent historians of the Puritan Revolution have unearthed. To anyone who expects a new biography of Fairfax to throw light on recesses of his life that were dark when Markham wrote, seventy years ago, Miss Gibb's book will be disappointing. True, her account of the campaigns in which Fairfax took part is somewhat more informative than Markham's. It gives us a clearer and more distinct idea of exactly what portion of the field Sir Thomas Fairfax occupied at any given time in any given battle. True also, Miss Gibb publishes some interesting examples of Sir Thomas's excursions into poetry, which seem to prove conclusively that in the scope of his talents Fairfax the bard had little in common with Fairfax the soldier and much in common with Fairfax the statesman. It is Fairfax the statesman, however, who piques the curiosity of the historian, and on this phase of his career Miss Gibb's biography, despite the informative morsels in it, is not entirely satisfactory.

Of the critical three years in Fairfax's political life, from 1645 to 1648, Miss Gibb's account is peculiarly conventional, peculiarly lacking in the inquisitiveness that makes for great biography. It may be that there are no

answers to the questions one wants to ask about Fairfax's political course from the time he became lord general: Did he condone or take part in the activities of the army to influence the election of new members to parliament? How much did he actually have to do with the promotion of radical officers like Barkstead, Hewson, Scroop, and Harrison? How soon did he become aware of the efforts of the Levellers to undermine the officers' control of the army? How closely did he associate himself with the activities of the predominant officer group led by Cromwell and Ireton? When such questions and a dozen more dealing with the relations between Fairfax and the factions in the army are answered, it may be possible to write a life of the lord general that is more than a rehash of the military history of the civil war. The job is still to do. Miss Gibb does not answer the essential questions. She does not even ask them.

*Queens College.*

J. H. HEXTER.

*War at Sea under Queen Anne, 1702-1708.* By J. H. OWEN, Commander, Royal Navy. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. xii, 316. \$7.50.)

ENGLISH historians have long neglected their navy. Our own Captain Mahan, indeed, may be said to have taught his English cousins to appreciate its true significance. Corbett, it is true, thirty-five years ago dealt with the royal navy in the Mediterranean in the seventeenth century, but for its other manifold activities one must, for the greater part, depend upon the co-operative *History of the Royal Navy*, now forty years from the press. Commander Owen has made the first serious attempt to describe English naval achievements in European waters during the War of the Spanish Succession. His failure to include the West Indies might have occasioned greater disappointment had not Professor Ruth Bourne's *Queen Anne's Navy in the West Indies* appeared a few months ago. His brief treatment of the navy's efforts at Cadiz, Vigo, Gibraltar, and Minorca would have been disappointing also had these topics not been recently treated in some detail elsewhere. Even here the reader would welcome a summary, showing how the author differs from others in his interpretation of these events.

The elementary account of the functioning of the navy is well done, but the descriptions of convoy work and of the attack on Toulon are especially good. Marshal Vauban receives much less attention than his work as supervisor of privateering would suggest. The author thinks more highly of Prince George and of George Churchill, Marlborough's brother, than have most historians. He also feels that Sir John Norris has never received his fair need of praise. In discussing the Cadiz fiasco he refrains from blaming anyone in particular. He seems of two minds as to the Earl of Peterborough's exploits at Barcelona, and he ascribes the failure before Toulon partly to the halfheartedness of Prince Eugene.