

to describe the French Revolution). It would seem, however, that expressions such as "dialectics" and "practice" do not designate any entities that exist independently of what philosophers say about them. In other words, most discussions about dialectics, or contradiction, or practice ought to be discussions about how to use certain philosophical expressions; for what is relevant to the social scientist is how the real world looks—and dialectics, contradiction, and practice are not parts of this real world but constructs for adequately modeling the given. Accordingly, questions such as those treated by Althusser in the section under review cannot be adequately discussed without a considerable amount of semantic analysis. Since any hint of such an analysis is missing, one puts Althusser's book aside with the unsatisfactory feeling that he may have something to say but does not succeed in getting it across to his reader. This may be different with French readers who share with Althusser the quasi-mystical experience of the role of Marxism and communism during the war and in postwar France. I would argue, however, that scholarly studies should be intelligible even to those who do not share the peculiar experiences of the author.

NIKOLAUS LOBKOWICZ  
*University of Munich*

MARX BEFORE MARXISM. By *David McLellan*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1970. xi, 233 pp. \$6.50.

Although Marx's writings prior to 1845 comprise but two of the forty-two volumes of the complete edition of his works published in East Germany, the ideas of the "young" Marx have, in the last twenty years, been studied infinitely more carefully than his mature thought. The literature on the subject would amount to a middle-sized private library, and new books are unlikely to add anything significant. However, one task still remains meaningful: to familiarize the *English*-speaking reader with this subject (most of the books are in German and French) and to incorporate into one book as much as possible of the relevant scholarship. McLellan, who two years ago published a book on the Young Hegelians and their influence on Marx, has in his recent book admirably succeeded in both respects. After an introductory chapter on Germany before 1848 and another chapter on Marx's birthplace, genealogy, parents, and school days, he traces Marx's intellectual development from his early attempts in poetry to the Paris Manuscripts of 1844. In contrast to most writers on the "young" Marx, he makes virtually no attempt to offer an interpretation which goes beyond the texts and manuscripts as they stand. Thirty years ago H. P. Adams did the same in a book which is all but forgotten now. McLellan's work, however, does not deserve to be compared with Adams's; for although he refrains from analyzing and interpreting, his paraphrases and summaries incorporate virtually all available scholarship concerning the structure of the various manuscripts, the influence of Hegel and the Hegelians on Marx, and the general background. In consequence, his book contains a wealth of information that is relevant even for those who consider themselves "Marxologists." In a concluding chapter McLellan offers a carefully documented analysis of the development of the interpretation of the "young" Marx as well as some well-balanced reflections on the relationship between the "young" and the "old" Marx.

NIKOLAUS LOBKOWICZ  
*University of Munich*