

of an eighteenth-century constitution, Americans have met these problems by a peaceful revolution, evolving a pluralistic society with six independent power centers: the White House; the Congress; the managerial elite; the Pentagon; the opinion makers; and the labor unions.

The author's intention was to present the history of the United States "with clarity, with affection, and without prejudice" (p. vi). He has admirably fulfilled the first two goals but not the third, for Maurois is biased in favor of America. He stresses idealistic and generous actions from the fourteen points to the Marshall Plan, while ignoring or sliding over some less happy facts. His heroes are democratic leaders in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He is evasive and unconvincing with less enlightened leaders. His attempted explanation of John Foster Dulles' policies in the Suez crisis is less than satisfying. Maurois is excessively optimistic in viewing the successes of American domestic policy. It is questionable whether American giant corporations have become "private public services" to the extent that there is "scarcely any real difference" between them and Renault, a state-owned enterprise (pp. 328-29). Many Americans will doubt whether a 5 per cent rate of unemployment may be dismissed as merely normal for "so great a body of workers" (p. 329). It is perhaps significant that Maurois, who has taught at several American universities, is rather uncharacteristically pessimistic about American education, the aspect of American culture with which he is most intimately familiar.

This is a first-rate popularization; it should provide a healthy corrective to the anti-Americanism so rife in the author's own country. One can only hope that it will be widely read there.

Purdue University

Edwin Layton

The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640. By F. Smith Fussner. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962. Pp. xxiv, 343. Notes, index. \$7.50.)

The thesis of Professor Fussner's book is that the period from 1580 to 1640 in England represented nothing less than a "historiographical revolution" which "helped to create those historical attitudes and questionings that we recognize as our own" (p. xxii). Fussner has chosen the 1580's as the beginning of significant changes in English historical writing because in that decade "more adequate facilities for research became available, and the antiquaries began to question their medieval authorities" (p. 300). For example, many of the scholars who published in the post-restoration period worked long hours in the library assembled by Sir Robert Cotton in the first half of the sixteenth century. Or again, the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries was founded in order to answer many of the "what and when" questions which were so important for the "why and how" questions asked by the Society of Antiquaries founded in Queen Anne's reign. The most obvious characteristic in this revolution in historical writing, according to Fussner, was

"the proliferation of new types of history" (p. 302). Therefore, the heart of this study is a series of five chapters carefully delineating the diverse interpretations of five distinguished men.

Sir Walter Raleigh wrote a universal history of the world—partly on the basis of Biblical authority—within the framework of the Christian doctrine of providence. John Stow wrote a local history of London after a personal survey to discover what actually happened. William Camden wrote a national history of contemporary England as a political narrative of Elizabethan statecraft and diplomacy. John Selden wrote an ecclesiastical history of tithes with the utilitarian hope of making the past answer the problems of the present. Sir Francis Bacon wrote a political history of Henry VII—which owes more to Machiavelli and Guicciardini than it does to a rigorous application of the scientific method—and some philosophical treatises on the nature of history as memory or the recall of facts on the one hand and imagination or the use of judgment on the other—an inconsistency which Fussner skillfully shows was never resolved by Bacon.

Fussner states that "there can be no question that what especially distinguishes sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historiography is a new attitude towards historical evidence and proof" (p. xix). Furthermore, he accounted for this "new attitude" by making it a part of the larger "intellectual revolution" of the seventeenth century whereby scholastic forms were replaced by a new scientific ideal. The personal survey of Stow and the utilitarian view of Seldon do indeed anticipate the future of historical method, but Bacon's notion of history as memory or Raleigh's as divine revelation had much in common with the medieval scholastics. Despite the fine advances that were made in philology and the use of original sources, the sometimes fumbling efforts of the Elizabethan antiquaries, or even of Bacon himself, in obtaining objectivity in the handling of historical evidence and proof with respect to the "what and when" questions make one wonder if the transformation from the medieval chronicle to modern history took place all that quickly. David C. Douglas (*English Scholars, 1660-1730*) and Thomas P. Peardon (*The Transition in English Historical Writing, 1760-1830*) indicate that the full impact of the "intellectual revolution" was felt later.

What some of Fussner's historical writers do seem to share, as distinct from those of the late Stuart period, is a deep involvement in the political issues of their time. Raleigh was a courtier until his long imprisonment by James I enabled him to write his history; Bacon was Lord Chancellor under James I until his conviction for bribery allowed him time to write history and philosophy; Selden was a common lawyer who met disfavor with James I for writing history; Cotton's library became the meeting place for historians and members of Parliament in the 1620's. The quarrel between King and Parliament caused historians to look to history for the answers to their problems. Not until the issues of the English Revolution were resolved did the writing of history become a full-time occupation and the boundaries between history and the other disciplines become clearly drawn.