The gaze of the "panoptic monarch," in fact, now extended beyond the nobility to the whole kingdom. He (or rather the impersonal procedures increasingly set up in his name from the time of Louis XIV onward) now sought to observe and reward merit wherever it appeared. These were values that triumphed in 1789, although it would be a different kind of state that publicly embraced them. Here speaks the true pupil of David Bien, seeing revolutionary values and habits emerging from within the very bowels of the old order, rather than from external criticism.

Such a bald summary does little justice to a subtly mounted argument marred only occasionally by excursions down byways and some abstruse language. Yet it is an argument based largely on tracts, theoretical writings, and dictionary definitions. Real nobles and how they behaved only flit rarely through these pages. This is true even for the eighteenth century, when the analysis focuses on discussions about the army rather than the nobility in general. The archival sources from Vincennes on which the author draws are mostly argumentative and prescriptive rather than analytical and descriptive. This he readily admits and at several points explicitly recognizes the drawbacks. But in the end he is not really interested in what actual people did. "One needs," he tells us (p. 89), "to focus not on kings or old nobles as such but on the culture in terms of which their respective roles were articulated." A few sentences later he comes close to arguing that this is the only possible approach. But what people do is often a sobering corrective to speculation about how they might think or feel. This book stops in 1789 when, it is argued, the French nobility had quite lost that sense of personal loyalty to the monarch that had been so dear to them in the previous century. But had they? The massive concentration of military emigration in the second half of 1791 suggests that noble army officers felt overwhelmingly bound by personal loyalty to Louis XVI until the king himself attempted to emigrate, and they were subjected to a new oath which made no mention of the monarch. Like previous macrohistorical systems, the cultural approach to history which so few dare to question at present has still to come to terms with events and individuals. Without that, it is doubtful how much of human behavior in the past it can convincingly explain.

William Doyle

University of Bristol

The Encyclopedists as a Group: A Collective Biography of the Authors of the "Encyclopédie." By *Frank A. Kafker.* Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, volume 345. Edited by *Anthony Strugnell.*
Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1996. Pp. xxvii+222.

No work is more exemplary of the French Enlightenment than the *Encyclopédie* of Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert. Produced in seventeen volumes of letterpress and eleven volumes of plates, this massive undertaking was "a greater collection of learning than any of the encyclopedias published from 1675–1750" (p. 63).

The project began in 1745 as a translation and amplification of Chambers's *Cyclopaedia,* "[o]ne of the outstanding encyclopedias of the century" (p. 36, n. 2). The original aims were commercial and scholarly; the *Encyclopédie*'s role as an organ of subversive ideas was a later development spearheaded by Denis Diderot, who succeeded to the editorship in 1747. Under Diderot the project expanded into an ambitious presentation of a vast store of knowledge and controversial ideas to the reading public.

Given that many of its articles are unsigned, identification of the contributors to the

Encyclopédie has been difficult. John Lough led the way in this effort (*The Encyclopédie* [London, 1971] and *The Contributors to the Encyclopédie* [London, 1973]). Building on Lough's work and on his own earlier contributions, Frank A. Kafker provides an eminently readable and useful examination of the 140 men who have been identified as contributors (see *The Encyclopedists as Individuals: A Biographical Dictionary of the Authors of the Encyclopédie* [Oxford, 1988], produced in collaboration with Serena L. Kafker). Working in the mode of "collective biography," which has "had little influence in eighteenth-century French studies" (p. xi), Kafker examines the similarities and differences among the authors, grouping and comparing them on the basis of their geographical and socioeconomic origins, educational backgrounds, professional affiliations, social connections, and political and religious views. The result is a more nuanced and detailed understanding of the participants in this enterprise than has previously been available.

The aims of Kafker's work are threefold: (1) to provide a collective biography of the Encyclopedists; (2) to overturn the long-standing stereotype of the Encyclopedists as "a cohesive group of religious and political reformers in close-knit association" (p. xii); and (3) to enlarge our knowledge of the French Enlightenment as the creation of "thousands of individuals," rather than as the product of a small coterie of "stars" such as Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Diderot (p. xiii). This last goal is worth stressing, since "a great deal of the text of the *Encyclopédie* was in fact contributed by fairly obscure figures . . . the size of whose contributions tended to be in inverse relation to their fame" (Lough 1971, p. 56).

Kafker makes useful corrections of prior work. He shows that it is insufficient to characterize the Encyclopedists' class origins simply as bourgeois (p. 3); they ranged from nobility of the highest rank (e.g., the Chevalier de Jaucourt) to men of peasant origin (e.g., Dr. Quesnay, a royal physician and founder of physiocracy). Kafker refutes a recurring theory that the *Encyclopédie* was "launched and controlled by Freemasons" (p. 25). He identifies the salon of Baron d'Holbach and the Académie royale des sciences as sources of important contacts for Diderot and d'Alembert.

Kafker shows that the Encyclopedists came from a wide variety of backgrounds and expressed a wide variety of views, especially in philosophy, theology, and politics. His quantitative and descriptive analysis points up the difficulties multiple authorship posed for Diderot's desire for consistency and universality of definition. As Diderot observed, "[an] analytical and universal dictionary of the sciences and the arts cannot . . . be the work of one man alone" (Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts & des métiers*, vol. 5 [Paris, 1755], p. 635). Diverse backgrounds and interests, the difficulties of long-distance communication, and lack of control over the content of contributions resulted in a significant "lack of intellectual accord" (p. 58). Diderot later blamed not himself or the organization of the effort, but the contributors themselves (Lough 1971, p. 84). Kafker suggests that had Diderot directed the recruitment effort, a more consistent product might have resulted (p. 44).

The *Encyclopédie* was therefore a work of glaring inconsistencies: mechanist and vitalist accounts of the human body vie for the reader's attention; widely divergent views emerged across the range of articles on religion, politics, and philosophy, with many authors defending "traditional ideas" (p. 85).

The *Encyclopédie* nevertheless became notorious for its subversive ideas; Kafker links the authors' positions on orthodox religion and the monarchy to personal backgrounds, allegiances, and interests. His analysis shows the work to have been more boldly critical of religious orthodoxy than of political authority (p. 85). Political critique

was less sharp than criticism of orthodox religion because (1) the police powers of the crown exceeded those of the church, and (2) the authors depended on the crown for positions and funding; many of them stood "to gain by bolstering the monarchy" (p. 82).

This collective biography is of great interest to anyone wishing to acquire a deeper understanding of the French Enlightenment, the diverse socioeconomic and geographical origins of the Encyclopedists, and the effects of their identities, interests, and allegiances on their work. We see how their backgrounds influenced the *Encyclopédie* and shaped the attitudes and fate of the still-living Encyclopedists during the revolution and the Terror. Kafker draws our attention to the contributions of such lesser-known figures as Charles-Georges Le Roy, "Lieutenant of the Hunt" at Versailles (hunting, forests, and philosophy), Pierre Tarin (anatomy and physiology), and the Chevalier de Jaucourt (seventeen thousand articles on a wide range of topics).

In this detailed study Kafker has failed to address the contribution of the "anonymous woman" who sent the editors the articles "FALBALA [furbelow], FONTANGE [headdress bow], and others" (the editors, as quoted in Lough [1973], p. 71). According to Lough, "[a] case can be made out for identifying this contributor as Suzanne Marie de Vivens, Marquise de Jaucourt, the Chevalier [de Jaucourt]'s sister-in-law" (Lough 1973, p. 71). Even in the absence of definitive answers, it would be interesting to know how this "anonymous woman" might have become involved in the project and why the editors describe her as "not known" to them (Lough 1973, p. 71).

Overall, this is a work of sound, solid scholarship and well worth a close examination. Those who do not read French should be aware of the author's use of untranslated quotations in the original French.

Alexandra Cook

Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Paysans en révolution: Terre, pouvoir, et jacquerie, 1789–1794. By *Anatoli Ado.* Translated by *Serge Aberdam.* Preface by *Michel Vovelle.* Edited by *Serge Aberdam* and *Marcel Dorigny.* Bibliothèque d'Histoire révolutionnaire, Nouvelle série, number 1.
Paris: Société des Études Robespierristes, 1996. Pp. xviii+474. Fr 200.

Anatoli Ado's book is a classic—not in the sense that Tocqueville or even Georges Lefebvre are classics, but a minor classic nonetheless—and its belated translation from the original Russian should be taken as such. Although Michel Vovelle, the celebrated historian of the French Revolution, tells us in his preface that Ado's views remain as fresh and relevant as they were decades ago, this is not quite the case. His schema and evidence are outdated. Marxism-Leninism does not occupy the position it once did, to say the least. Research on the French Revolution now deals with topics such as violence and gender. Even the world of peasants has been rethought in significant ways.

Ado belongs to an era that investigated the nature of the bourgeois revolution and the "passage from feudalism to capitalism." In the 1960s Ado defended the particular position with which he came to be identified: that the revolution had not impeded the development of French capitalism, but rather had introduced a slower and gentler "French road to capitalism." Whereas most theorists saw the victories of the French peasantry during the revolution as the major drawback to nineteenth-century economic development, Ado taught that the peasantry's access to land did not perpetuate an ar-