【書 評】

**Atsushi Komine, *Keynes and his Contemporaries:
Tradition and Enterprise in the Cambridge School of Economics***

London: Routledge, 2014, xx + 167 pp.

This book investigates how Keynes struggled to escape the Marshallian tradition. More precisely, the author investigates not only how Keynes was in line and how he differed from his mentor, Alfred Marshall, and from his senior colleague, Arthur Cecil Pigou, but also how Keynes was in line and how he differed from the other members of the so-called Cambridge School of Economics, C. R. Fay, W. T. Layton, D. H. Robertson, R. G. Hawtrey, H. D. Henderson and F. Lavington among others. The book is divided into seven chapters, plus the Introduction and Concluding remarks; the first chapter is devoted to Alfred Marshall and his disciples, focusing on Marshall's views on entrepreneurship and Pigou's views on corporate unions; each of the central chapters is devoted to a detailed analysis of one of Marshall's main disciple (D. H. Robertson; R. G. Hawtrey, H. D. Henderson and F. Lavington); the final three chapters are devoted to John Maynard Keynes. The period examined is confined to the 1910s and the 1920s, the period of transition from the young Keynes to the older Keynes and to the early members of the Cambridge School.

Komine's investigation is successful. A reader wanting to know about the similarities and differences surrounding Keynes's main ideas in economics and economic policy, especially on social organi-

zation and entrepreneurship, will get details of the points of continuities with Marshall (with Pigou, they are fewer) and will find the book very interesting. Keynes started as a Marshallian and ended as a Keynesian, or better as Keynes himself, as I think Keynes also differed from the (later) so-called Keynesians. Komine's book provides detailed information about Keynes's own contribution, in particular focusing on Keynes and the revision of the Economics Tripos, on Keynes and women's degrees and Keynes and semi-autonomous bodies. As the author writes, "in spite of having grown up in the Marshallian tradition, Keynes gradually developed a distinctive view within the Cambridge School of Economics" (137). A missing point in the book is the lack of any reference to the role played, in those years, by Keynes's early studies on probability and by the role played by Keynes's two other main mentors, in addition to Alfred Marshall, the mathematician-logician Bertrand Russell and the ethical philosopher, George E. Moore, in forming Keynes's own approach to economics.

I like how the book is organized; the author applies multiple types of methodology to describe the history of economic thought and to answer various questions about the ideals concerning social organization and the conception of the kind of

economic agent best suited to actualizing them. In order to answer these questions, the author employs four types of methodology that are used in examining the history of economic thought: 1) rational reconstruction, which involves disentangling a “text,” explicating the rationale behind procedures in economic theory; 2) historical reconstruction, which implies the untangling of a “context” from the social viewpoints, i.e. Schumpeter’s “pre-analytic cognitive act”; 3) the examination of the history of ideas concerning economic policies, which implies crossing the borders between economic history, intellectual his-

tory, the history of policy, and the history of economic thought; 4) the biographical approach to economic knowledge, which implies the reconstruction of portraits of individuals based on detailed historical information such as memoirs, minutes, drafts, memoranda, letters and so on.

The result of the combination of these four methodologies, though the relative proportion of their application differs in each chapter, as the author rightly points out, comes out in the original structure of the book. A reason why you should read it.

(Anna Carabelli: University of
Piemonte Orientale, Italy)