

républicain, quelque peu calqué sur le baptême catholique. On y constate que jusqu'à la Seconde Guerre mondiale, le choix des parrains/marraines était celui d'un couple, issu du même groupe politique et militant. Par après, les milieux populaires se sont tournés davantage vers le réseau familial ; les classes moyennes et supérieures, vers le réseau d'amis. Enfin, depuis les dernières décennies, le parrainage est double – civil et catholique – et vise à renforcer les liens et les devoirs des parrains/marraines.

Il s'agit là d'un ouvrage de référence remarquable qui, avec les deux livres précédents, nous apprend énormément sur les pratiques, les valeurs et les effets du parrainage selon les territoires, les périodes et les religions. Par ailleurs, il met en évidence le potentiel du champ d'études, chaque auteur soulignant combien sa recherche reste incomplète, notamment en ce qui concerne les Amériques. L'ouvrage ouvre donc de nouvelles perspectives et présage de nouvelles publications, individuelles ou collectives.

Marie-Pierre Arrizabalaga  
*Université de Cergy-Pontoise*

BAKER, Keith Michael, and Dan EDELSTEIN (eds) – *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015. Pp. 438.

The recent uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa, the “Arab Spring,” demonstrated the continuing importance of revolution to world history. As the editors of this fascinating collection of essays point out, the usual approach to the comparative study of revolutions has been sociological. The basic methodological framework for this approach, which can be traced back to Karl Marx, insists that the essential causes of revolutions are socio-economic conflicts: the political crises that launch revolutions or change their direction are seen as secondary phenomena, indicative of deeper structural tensions. Yet, since the 1970s, investigations of specific revolutions have turned increasingly to hermeneutic approaches. Rather than focusing exclusively on material structures, historians have examined how revolutionaries interpreted their experiences, how ideas informed their actions, and how new political culture gave revolutions meaning. Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein suggest that such approaches can be applied to comparative history using the notion of the “revolutionary script.” Revolutionaries have always been intensely self-conscious of previous revolutions, which offered frameworks to define situations, suggest actions, and project narratives. Revolutionaries have not merely followed existing scripts, but also adapted, revised, and transformed them. This collection makes the compelling case that comparative history should examine how scripts for revolutionary action and understanding are played and replayed, improvised and altered.

The evolving meaning of revolution as a concept is central to this approach and to the book's key argument. The modern revolutionary script was written during the French Revolution of 1789 when the notion of revolution as descriptive fact was replaced by the conceptualization of revolution as self-conscious act. The essays in Part I provide background by exploring the genealogies of revolution in seventeenth-century England. Tim Harris points out that the term was frequently employed in a political context, not simply in the classical sense of circular return to starting point, and could be linked to defence of a threatened traditional order. David R. Como examines how books describing uprisings against the Spanish monarchy normalized the political conception of revolution. David Armitage explores the influence of Roman narratives of civil wars on European historical writing in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Part II focuses directly on writing the modern revolutionary script. Baker's essay argues that, despite celebration of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the shift to conceiving revolutions as being made, not simply occurring, required the Enlightenment's vision of them as transformations advancing human progress. He suggests that Raynal's narrative of the American Revolution presented the events as a dynamic process and opened conceptual space for the French Revolution, which sought to achieve universal values, but found them at risk in the contingency of political time. Jack Rakove's essay examines how the logic of the American script dictated the termination of revolutionary spontaneity as quickly as possible and the restoration of legal rule under constitutional authority. Constitutionalism was also the paramount French ideal in 1789, but Edelstein argues that in 1792-1793 the Jacobins abandoned the constitutional script based on justifications of natural rights or social contract and appealed to a higher authority: the Revolution itself. By appropriating to the state power previously attributed to popular sovereignty, the Jacobins introduced a concept of permanent revolution that would be revived by Marx and used by Lenin. Two other essays explore the importance of this period: Guillaume Mazeau suggests that Marat's assassination led to invention of the Terror as a new revolutionary script; Malick W Ghachem examines Haiti's place in the development of an ambiguous anti-slavery script.

If the French Revolution provided the modern script, the essays in Part III examine how revolutionaries and social theorists rescripted revolution in the nineteenth century. *The Communist Manifesto* was addressed to a radical German readership, but Gareth Stedman Jones argues that it had little value in explaining the events of 1848. Marx and Engels referred not to specific German groups, but conjured an imaginary conflict between abstract characters. Only after memories of the specific context subsided did the text acquire the status of iconic revolutionary script. France revisited the revolutionary script multiple times in the nineteenth century, and Dominca Chang's essay looks at the critique of revolutionary mimicry used to discredit revolutionaries for mindlessly imitating events and actors from an inauthentic past. Claudia Verhoeven explores how Russian theorists in the late nineteenth century invented a new paradigm for a "truly scientific" terrorist revolution to escape the failures of the European revolutionary script. Marxists dismissed terrorism as unscientific, but possessed no monopoly on revolutionary

ideology. Ian D. Thatcher's essay on the Russian Revolution of 1917 analyses the competition among a liberal script, a moderate socialist script, the Bolshevik extreme left script, the nationalities' scripts, and a script articulated by the people themselves. If the Bolsheviks' success reflected a convergence with the popular script, these two scripts disagreed on the revolution's fundamental meaning.

Part IV on revolutionary projections goes beyond 1917 and Europe, exploring how the revolutionary script has been transformed and subverted. The essay by Jeffrey Wasserstein and Yidi Wu on competition between revolutionary and reformist notions in China focuses on intellectual debates in 1895, following Japan's defeat of China, and in the aftermath of the 1989 crisis: proponents of change were both attracted to and suspicious of foreign revolutionary scripts. Alexander C. Cook examines Mao's Little Red Book as an alternative revolutionary script or, as Lin Biao called it, "The Spiritual Atom Bomb" that affirmed the primacy of spiritual over material factors. While capable of causing chain reactions of escalating violence, it failed to fuse a socialist collective. Lillian Guerra's essay argues that documentary film-makers who gave a voice to ordinary citizens inadvertently undermined the Cuban Revolution's grand narrative by exposing the ambiguity and induced euphoria in their participation. Julian Bourg's examination of the events and representations of 1968, in Paris and globally, suggests that the "anti-scripts" of students and intellectuals rejected not only the postwar order, but the Communist Party's tired revolutionary script. Abbas Milani argues that the confusion of different scripts shaped the Iranian Revolution of 1979: while the Shah refused to share power with moderate forces, Khomeini misled the inchoate democratic coalition before revealing his determination to establish an authoritarian theocracy. Silvana Toska's essay on the Arab Spring also identifies multiple revolutionary scripts to explain the outcomes: no group had a coherent plan for the future, and the different groups had incompatible goals beyond overthrowing existing regimes. While Toska's suggested parallel with 1848 in Europe, where lack of a dominant paradigm resulted in immediate failure but long-term success, is interesting, his claim that the Arab uprisings have not produced French-style millenarian revolution should be qualified: the vision of Islamic State militants, while opposed to liberty and equality, is arguably as chiliastic as those of the Jacobins or the Bolsheviks. Yet this observation only reinforces the value of applying consideration of scripts and scripting to the comparative study of revolutions.

William S. Cormack  
*University of Guelph*