gical pluralism" relates only to the circumscribed universe of debates among historians of ideas about the relevance of context to meaning. The differences between More's thought and Winstanley's are a central theme of this book, but Kenyon is adamant in his assertion that explanation for these differences "is not to be sought in any fundamental societal transformation that occurred between 1516 and 1652, but in the intellectual changes that had begun to inform the world of ideas by the mid-seventeenth century" (p. 234). In line with this principle, changes in concepts of property are attributed to advances in "the sophistication of legal theory" – though at one point Kenyon does hint that the buoyancy of the land market in England from the 1530s onwards may have had something to do with Winstanley's attitude to the buying and selling of land. The question of whether sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England underwent social changes which can be judged fundamental is, of course, a hotly debated one on which Marxists and revisionists have their entrenched positions. But historians such as Keith Wrightson and Barry Coward have presented balanced accounts which conclude that the question of deep and lasting changes in English society in this period cannot simply be brushed aside, as Kenyon seems to imply. To recognize this would oblige the historian of ideas to discuss the possible connections between social and intellectual change. The fence which many practitioners such as Kenyon have erected around "the History of Ideas" (and in many cases institutionalized in courses and departments in higher education) is a barrier which it is surely in the interests of both social and intellectual historians to demolish.

Finally, it has to be said that this book is sometimes hard to read because it has been rather badly produced. It contains a quite extraordinary number of uncorrected typographical errors, and some consistent spelling mistakes (presumably the author's) which have not had the attention of a conscientious editor; occasionally the meaning of a crucial sentence seems to have disappeared into some word processor's limbo. This is rather hard on undergraduate students and speakers of other languages, who are expected to derive their knowledge of English at least in part from academic books. If the content of a book is worth publishing (which this one certainly was), the text is surely worth editing carefully.

Norah Carlin

GRANDJONC, JACQUES. Communisme/Kommunismus/Communism. Origine et développement international de la terminologie communautaire prémarxiste des utopistes aux néo-babouvistes 1785–1842. Tome 1: Historique. Tome 2: Pièces justificatives. [Schriften aus dem Karl-Marx-Haus, Nr 39/1,2.] Karl-Marx-Haus, Trier 1989. 559 pp. DM 35.00 per vol.

Jacques Grandjonc, who has already published pioneering studies on internal migration in Europe in the nineteenth century and on the early history of the expatriate German labour movement, has now published, with a ten-year delay, his doctoral thesis as one of the Karl-Marx-Haus Schriften. Readers have to prepare themselves for a tour around a scholar's workshop filled to the brim with items of terminological history. At the same time they can also indulge their own curiosity, for they will encounter an unexpected wealth of the most varied finds.

The starting-point for Grandjonc's investigation seems remarkably simple. He

sets out to establish the date of the "origin and development of the concepts *communiste* and *communisme*" (p. 13) and their equivalents in English and German. In so doing he engages not so much in lexicographical research, but makes the scope of his investigation the developmental history of a whole clutch of terms, the "communitary, revolutionary and internationalist vocabulary" (p. 9), including Marxist terminology, in the context of the historical period from the eve of the French Revolution to the July Monarchy and the pre-1848 period in Germany. At the same time he intends to make a contribution to the history of the "change of social mentalities in Western Europe in the course of the industrialization process in the first half of the nineteenth century" (*ibid.*). The perspective from which he begins this history of ideas and mentalities is regarded by Grandjonc as very topical even in 1989, namely as an "approach to current socialism and communism by exposing their deep common roots". This, he writes with a certain optimism in the light of political events, "is essential for a true understanding of the phenomenon and to ensure clarity and accuracy in the debates around socialism and communism" (p. 266).

Grandjonc justifies restricting his investigation to France, Britain and Germany (the "European triarchy") by pointing to historical circumstances. French, English and German were the dominant languages in the internationalist, democratic and communist organizations in the period before 1848, and they were the first to spread the new vocabulary. Moreover, contemporaries like Moses Hess and Friedrich Engels agreed that "Germany, France and Britain are the three leading countries of current history", as the young Engels put it in 1844 (a formulation still rather reminiscent of Hegel's philosophy of history).

The results of Grandjonc's extensive studies are published in three volumes. The third volume, which will include a dictionary of the "political and social vocabulary of communitary, democratic, revolutionary, egalitarian and humanitarian character", was due to appear in 1992. The first volume contains the actual presentation of the material, which I would like to summarize here briefly. The second volume contains an annotated collection of source material and other background documents.

Grandjonc distinguishes four broad historical phases in the development of the vocabulary of communism and socialism: (i) a more or less archaic usage during the eighteenth century, linked to the traditional village community and natural-law thinking, (ii) the context of the French Revolution and the sansculotte movement, (iii) an intermediate period in the nineteenth century, during which the term "communism" appeared to be forgotten but which utopian socialism provided with a plethora of neologisms, and (iv) finally the modern usage proper of the terms *communiste* and *communisme*, which emerged around 1840 and then spread quickly until 1848.

Among Grandjonc's new discoveries and rediscoveries are that the hitherto largely unappreciated writer and social utopian Restif de la Bretonne first coined *communiste* and *communisme* in the new sense (1785 and 1797), and that the German term *Kommunismus* was already in use among the Austrian Jacobins in 1794. But even more importantly, he shows that for the terms in question there is a still earlier period of usage in the extended sense. This usage, related to the legal and property rights of the rural communes of the *ancien régime* (Grandjonc also mentions here the description of heretical currents like the Moravian Brothers as *communistae*), was transcended for the first time by Restif de la Bretonne. He

used the term in its modern sense: *communisme* became synonymous with common ownership of goods. This did not happen by accident against the background of the social movements before and during the French Revolution. Grandjonc links the linguistic achievement of Restif directly to the political practice of the Paris sansculottes and in particular to Babeuf's conspiracy.

The intermediate period, which stretched into the 1830s, gave rise to the rich vocabulary of utopian socialism. At the same time the revolutionary Babouvist idea was kept alive above all by Buonarotti's *Conspiration pour l'égalité* of 1828, although the term "communism" for instance was not used at all in the neo-Babouvist secret societies of this time. Grandjonc provides in passing the early history of the word "socialism" since the natural law of the late eighteenth century. He shows that it is only in the 1830s that the term *socialisme* acquired its modern sense (as coined by Leroux). This in turn is put in the context of a whole set of notions specific to the era of the industrial revolution and the early workers' rebellions, the *argot révolutionnaire*, as Grandjonc calls it. Apart from a plethora of now forgotten neologisms (including, for instance, Fourier's numerous efforts!), this is typified by terms like the "social question" or "social revolution", as well as the scientific terminology of the Saint-Simonians, such as the "exploitation of man by man".

It is no coincidence that the focal point of this study are the chapters on the origins of worker internationalism in the 1830s and 1840s, and on that crucial year of the communist movement, 1840. The foundation of internationalism was the internal migration within Europe of artisan-workers, a movement whose transformation in the direction of the modern migration of labour and its importance for the constitution of the proletariat Grandjonc has convincingly argued elsewhere. In the chapters referred to here he provides a lexicographical assessment of the proletarian literature in exile, with special emphasis on the publications of the German exiles, the associations of German artisan-workers in France, Switzerland and Britain. The German-international links which emerged from the 1830s onwards became, as he shows, the pathways of a new language. The consciousness as well as the notion of the "proletarian" first took root here, proletarian internationalism emerged here. (In passing Grandjonc explodes the myth spread by Engels that the Bund der Gerechten was a branch of the French Société des Saisons and was as such involved in the May Rising of 1839 led by Blanqui and Barbès.)

Grandjonc goes on to present the social movement of 1840, the month-long wave of mass strikes by the Paris workers supported also by members of the Bund der Gerechten, and the first "communist banquet" organized on 1 July 1840 in Belleville as the immediate sociohistorical context for the emergence or re-emergence of the communist vocabulary. This now spread rapidly and across the borders. *Communiste* became the key term of 1840; 1840 was the key year for the distribution of the word *communisme* in the modern sense of common ownership of the means of production and the socialization of production; 1840 saw the foundation of the "communist party"; 1840 saw the flourishing of the press of the various communist currents. Grandjonc highlights, correctly in my view, Dezamy's *Code de la Communauté* published in 1842 as the theoretically most advanced work of French communism of this period.

The study is completed by an important chapter on the international slogans ("Proletarians of all countries, unite!"), the various communist tendencies in the 1840s ("worker communism", "philosophical communism" and so on), and the

first great debates within socialism and communism prior to 1848. The final chapter points, to its goal as it were, to Marxism as "scientific socialism", which appears to incorporate or transcend all previous theories and concepts. It is one thing that socialism of all shades saw itself not as "utopian socialism" but as science, and was so regarded by contemporary observers like Lorenz von Stein, and that the term "scientific socialism" had wide currency from 1840 onwards. But it is quite another that from the mid-1840s onwards Marx and Engels first distinguished "artisan communism" (Weitling) or "worker communism" from the "philosophical communism" of the intellectuals, and then launched a strong polemic against both currents in the name of a strictly scientific idea. This concealed not least the fundamental opposition between a practice oriented to communism and social revolution in the tradition of the popular movements of the French Revolution on the one hand, and on the other a theory which saw itself as the expression of an inevitable historical movement, namely the movement of industry and a still to be created industrial proletariat. Unfortunately Grandjonc does not show this opposition in all its dimensions. He does not, for instance, discuss the Brussels controversy between Marx and Weitling in this context (p. 245). Instead he opens out his history of socialism into a comprehensive "socialism and communism both popular and scientific" (p. 246), which is eventually absorbed into the "revolutionary science" of Marxism.

Grandjonc describes the relationship between utopian and scientific socialism in my view quite rightly as "dialectical" (p. 249). There is a problem, however, when this dialectical relationship is overlaid with a rather teleological view of Marxism. As we know, Marx and Engels used the term "scientific socialism", which Grandjonc is obviously trying to save, only rarely and then only very late on. Perhaps account should have been taken here of Marxism's dogmatization process inaugurated by Engels in the early days of the Social Democratic Party and in competition with the other great worldviews of the nineteenth century.

A similar problem emerges in the final pages, which under the title "Democracy or dictatorship" deal in the main with the Marxian concept of the "dictatorship of the proletariat". Grandjonc admits that the concept of a transitional dictatorship, taken from the Babouvist–Blanquist tradition, found a dangerous elaboration in Leninism. And he also points to the coercive nature of many communist utopias. But his terminologically oriented approach – "dictatorship of the proletariat" as the largest class equals democracy (p. 259) – tends to mask the difficult relationship between democracy and communism, bourgeois and proletarian revolution. Incidentally, it is perhaps telling that in his analysis of the Paris Commune Marx replaced this concept with the demand for the "destruction of the state machine".

Grandjonc's second volume essentially provides the background documentation for the exposition in the first volume. It is, as Grandjonc himself explicitly notes, a very heterogeneous collection of documents and sources, though carefully annotated. It covers the period from the early eighteenth century to the origins of modern socialism, communism and internationalism in the 1840s. The criterion for selection is the "emergence of a new language" (p. 24). Exposition and documentation do not cover the same chronological period, however. While the first volume concentrates on the development of the terminology of Marxism, the second volume ends with the year 1842; in other words, there are no text sources for some of the great themes Grandjonc deals with in the first volume (utopian socialism/scientific socialism, democracy/dictatorship and so on).

Overall the documentation volume contains texts of very divergent interest, some new discoveries and rediscoveries, several key texts on the concept of "communism" in 1840 for instance, but (if one relies not only on the guideline of first usage, which in itself may after all not be particularly interesting) also some inconsequential passages by Weitling and others.

In conclusion I would like to make some critical remarks on this study, concerning the methodology, the problem of the relationship between terminological history, conceptual history and realist history, and the limitations of the chosen form of presentation.

Grandjonc's exposition oscillates between a history of terms and concepts in the narrow sense and a history of ideas which continually tries to link up with historical and social reality. The primary and secondary aspects of the intellectual history of early socialism and communism are illustrated within the format of a terminological history, which becomes increasingly wide-ranging (for instance in chapter 4: socialism–social question–industrial revolution). In the process all kinds of interesting material is brought to light. For long stretches, however, we have here not conceptual or terminological history but a history of events; this has little to do with the vocabulary, but can certainly set the concepts in context. The latter must, however, remain inevitably unsatisfactory, because only edited excerpts of a social panorama can be illustrated. In turn the readers may then be overtaxed by the plethora of digressions whose significance remains unclear and by terminological allusions which appear to have been gathered for their own sake. Unless of course readers want to use this study merely as a reference work.

What the book lacks, in my view, is a systematic reflection of the relationship between theory and concept (in the Hegelian sense) and the concept as term. It is from this that the historical stages should be determined, not from the terminological history as such. One wonders, for instance, whether Engels's repeatedly stressed differentiation between "socialism" and "communism" of the 1840s along respective class content lines (petty bourgeois or proletarian), that is, a political and social definition of concepts which cannot be derived from their usage, often offers a more illuminating analysis than any lexicographical research.

As I mentioned earlier, the limitations of conceptual history surface in Grandjonc primarily in the description of the development of socialism and communism in the 1840s, that is, in the immediately preceding Marxist terminology. It seems to me that a purely terminological presentation is no longer sufficient to differentiate between the various communist and socialist currents or to analyse actual class content and differences. Although Grandjonc never resorts to the cliché of the "fusion" of the labour movement and scientific socialism, the history of terms and concepts remains unsatisfactory precisely where the differences between the early socialist and early communist concepts on the one hand and Marxism on the other – which were after all based on real, practical contradictions – are glossed over. The inherent limitations of conceptual history are not exposed by Grandjonc, but quietly compensated by a methodological leap, as it were.

These criticisms do not, however, deflect from the value of the immense wealth of information these two volumes provide on the history of communism before Marx. Nor can there be any doubt that the device chosen by Grandjonc, to approach his subject through an analysis of the terminology, is very illuminating.

Ahlrich Meyer

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020859000111800 Published online by Cambridge University Press