

Carpenter, Kenneth E., *The Dissemination of the Wealth of Nations in French and in France: 1776–1843* (New York: The Bibliographical Society of America, 2002) pp., lxiii, 255, \$45, ISBN 0-91430-17-6.

Kenneth Carpenter has given us a most unusual and interesting book. It is unusual for it is made of two parts that are very different—both in form and in content—though complementary. The method used by Carpenter makes the book particularly stimulating. Being first and foremost a librarian and a bibliographer, Carpenter introduces materials and methods seldom used in the history of political economy. By considering the early French translations of Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* as concrete objects, by investigating their bindings, the quality of their paper, type-settings, footnote and endnote apparatus, Carpenter is able to uncover a significant aspect of the influence of Smith's economic ideas in France.

The first part of the book is a fifty-page essay showing “the progression of *The Wealth of Nations* in France from marginality to centrality [...] to canonicity.” It shows conclusively how erudition could be transformed into meaningful historical interpretation of *The Wealth of Nations*. His demonstration of the delayed reception and dissemination of *The Wealth of Nations* in France and in French adds much to our understanding of the history of Smith's canonization. On the one hand, it confirms the time-schedule uncovered by previous studies that focused on the English case (Rashid 1998). It is interesting to note that in both cases, 1790–1805 was pointed out as the period during which *The Wealth of Nations* was canonized. On the other hand, Carpenter accurately points out the ideological role that Smith's book played in the beginning of French Revolution. This part of the essay is perhaps the most interesting and Carpenter's title for it—*La Richesse des nations* as a tool for creating a new society—is well-chosen. At that time, Smith's essay was something quite different from the theoretical book it became, if only a decade later with Garnier's edition. In those years, *The Wealth of Nations* was quoted, used, and discussed for his economic policy proposals on labour, grain trade, industrial trade legislations. Carpenter shows the clear link that tied the growing dissemination of *The Wealth of Nations* to moderate revolutionaries (such as Condorcet) who were pleading for free market legislation and constitutional monarchy.

However, I have two minor critical remarks on this essay. First, the marginality of *The Wealth of Nations* during the period 1776–87 has to be understood in the context of economics publishing in French language. In those years, economic publishing, which flourished from 1750, came to a halt, and political economy endured a momentary disinterest in the public (see Théré 1998). It was no surprise that French publishers hesitated to publish a translation of a book as huge as *The Wealth of Nations*, especially when the translator wanted to be paid like Morellet did. Likewise, the number of economics books published skyrocketed in the years preceding the Revolution. It is likely that economics publishing continued on a high level from 1790–92, hence the multiplication of Smith's editions in French at that time.

Second, contrary to what Carpenter implied by stopping his story in 1843, the canonization of Smith in French appears to be incomplete and problematic at this date. From 1843 to the 1990s, there was no new French edition or re-edition

of the complete text of *The Wealth of Nations*! French nineteenth-century economists, although they were liberals, were also patriots: when they needed forerunners, they preferred using Turgot and the physiocrats rather than Smith. Rather than being the father of political economy, Smith was seen as the father of the English school of political economy. One has to wait until in the end of the twentieth-century to see the completion of Smith's canonization in French: not only was Garnier's translation re-edited, but two new translations were prepared (one has already been published; the other is still in progress).

The second part of Carpenter's book (255 pages) is a collection of materials related to *The Wealth of Nations*' dissemination in France during the period 1776–1843. It contains different kinds of materials: descriptions of all the French translations of *The Wealth of Nations*, most of the French reviews of the various editions of *The Wealth of Nations*, and samples from some of the prefaces and notes of the editors of these editions. Although this second part provides the pieces of evidence on which the first part is based, the scope and the profusion of the materials gathered by Carpenter makes it a major source of information for whomever may consider studying the diffusion of Smith's ideas during the period 1776–1843. On the whole, Carpenter's choice of materials is pertinent and consistent. However, I have a few criticisms related to it. First, the logic behind the choice of samples of prefaces and notes of editors is sometimes difficult to understand. On the one hand, one has the impression that some of these samples could have been shortened or canceled, and replaced by a short description (e.g., pp. 60–61); on the other hand, it is difficult to understand—besides the question of the length of the text—why Carpenter sometimes gives all the notes of certain editions (such as Blavet's 1779–80 translation), why he sometimes gives only a description (in the case of the anonymous 1778–79 translation), and why he sometimes gives them all for one volume and not for the others (in the case of Roucher's 1790–91 translation). Second, Carpenter has missed at least one important review in his list: the one made in the *Nouvelles Éphémérides économiques*, the physiocratic journal, in February 1788. This review is especially interesting for several reasons. It took place in the context of the debate between the *Journal de Paris* and the *Mercure de France*. Carpenter, having given in his book the pieces of evidence of this debate (pp. 61–79), could also have included this review in the collection. Moreover, it was written by one of the leading physiocrats, the abbot Baudeau, and gave one of the few statements of their position regarding *The Wealth of Nations*. The physiocrats were at this time showing a growing interest in Smith's book. Two letters, exchanged in June 1788, by the Marquis de Mirabeau and Dupont de Nemours showed that Mirabeau was preparing a longer review of Smith's book for the journal, but the *Nouvelles Éphémérides* ceased publication a month later and Mirabeau's review was never printed.

My conclusion is that Carpenter's book is an important one, not only for Smithian scholars but for historians of economic thought: it offers conclusive evidence of the gains that could be expected in terms of interpretation by investigating thoroughly the material aspects of economic texts.

Loïc Charles
INED/Paris 2 University

REFERENCES

- Baudeau, Abbé Nicolas. 1788. "Explication amiable entre M. Smith, célèbre écrivain Anglois, et les auteurs économiques de France." *Nouvelles Éphémérides économiques* 3 (February): 26–51.
- Du Pont de Nemours, Pierre-Samuel. 1788. Letter to the Marquis de Mirabeau, June 29, 1788. Eleutherian Mills Historical Library. Papers of Pierre Samuel Du Pont de Nemours and his two Wives, Série A.
- Mirabeau, Victor-Riqueti. 1788. Letter to Du Pont de Nemours, June 27, 1788. Eleutherian Mills Historical Library. Papers of Pierre Samuel Du Pont de Nemours and his two Wives, Série A.
- Rashid, Salim. 1998. "Adam Smith's Rise to Superior Fame." In *The Myth of Adam Smith* Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar, p. 135–81.
- Théré, Christine. 1998. "Economic Publishing and Authors, 1566–1789." *Studies in the History of French Political Economy: From Bodin to Walras*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998, pp. 1–56.

Peter E. Earl, ed., *The Legacy of Herbert Simon in Economic Analysis, Volumes I and II* (Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2001) pp. xlv, 1163, \$400.00. ISBN 1–85898–526–9.

The Nobel Prize committee recognized Herbert Simon's legacy in economics when it awarded him its 1978 economics honors "for his pioneering research into the decision-making process within economic organizations" (Lindbeck 1992, p. 333). This prize was, in effect, for work he had done more than thirty years before (Simon 1947). In addition, Simon's Ph.D. was in political science, and he had moved from Carnegie Mellon's Graduate School for Industrial Administration to the Psychology Department several years before he received the prize. In response to the award, the popular press described Simon as "not a real economist," "not an orthodox economist," and a "heretic" (see, e.g., Nicholson and Abraham 1978; Silk 1978; *Time Magazine* 1978; Williams 1978). As suggested by these confusions concerning Simon's Nobel honors, his relationship with economics is a peculiar one. According to Simon (1991), "[i]f I was an outsider to the economics profession as a whole, I was an insider to its elite" (p. 326). Hence, when Kenneth Arrow, a member of the elite, proposed Simon to a committee of the American Economic Association, the economics profession, for nomination as a Distinguished Fellow in 1976 as part of his Nobel campaign, Arrow had to explain who Simon was.

Therefore, editing two volumes on *The Legacy of Herbert Simon in Economic Analysis* is no easy task, which makes the reader all the more appreciative of superb service Peter Earl has rendered her. Moreover, with Simon's bibliography nearing 1,000 entries, one can scarcely grasp the number of items the editor had to plow through before deciding on the fifty-one reprints, some from Simon but most from others, included in the books under review here. In a reflexive manner then, Earl suggests that, "the best one can hope for is a collection that will serve as a *satisfactory* research tool, without unacceptably large numbers of oversights" (Volume I, p. xv). Likewise, the best this review can do is to highlight only a few of the fifty-one contributions to the collection.

Volume I contains pieces that represent the impact of Simon's work on research