deep, Aristotelian sense; while Smith's correspondence, on the whole, is both less frequent and less friendly. And it was Hume who time and again entreated, even begged, Smith to visit him, write to him, and speak with him, while Smith again and again unaccountably simply did not. It is hard not to come away from Rasmussen's book sympathizing deeply with Hume, and wondering how he managed to maintain his characteristic cheerfulness when he had every reason to abandon it, and how he managed to be generous and magnanimous toward others, even those whose disappointments were best positioned to cut him deeply.

Rasmussen's book does an excellent job not only of articulating the philosophy of Hume and Smith and putting their respective work in fruitful intellectual juxtaposition, but of bringing to life their robust humanity—their virtues and vices, their strengths and weaknesses, their desires, their ambitions, and their frailties. It is a compelling episode of genius and *philía,* and the story is compellingly told. Rasmussen has a command not only of Hume's and Smith's texts and the vast secondary literature, but also of their historical contexts—a rare combination, deftly executed. After reading Rasmussen's book, one might, perhaps somewhat impertinently, wonder whether his follow-up could be something like *The Tragic Life of "le Bon David."* In any case, their story, tragic or not, is complex and fascinating, and issued in crowning achievements the likes of which we have not seen since. Rasmussen deserves credit, and thanks, for giving this momentous episode in human history and thought its due.

James R. Otteson, Wake Forest University
10.1215/00182702-7685330

Lionel Robbins on the Principles of Economic Analysis: The 1930s Lectures. Edited by Susan Howson. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018. xx; 335 pp. $165.00.

Edwin Cannan retired as professor of political economy at the London School of Economics (LSE) in 1926, having taught at the school since its foundation in 1895 and been appointed to his chair in 1907. For many years he taught two main courses: a first-year introduction to economics pitched at a very general level and which was taken by most students, latterly taught by Hugh Dalton; and a course of sixty lectures over two years for those second- and third-year students specializing in the study of economics, "Principles of Economics, including the History of Economic Theory." Taking advantage of a recent Rockefeller Fund grant, William Beveridge, the school's director, determined early in 1926 to convert Cannan's imminently vacant post into a full-time appointment, and also widen the field of candidates to be considered for it. In the spring of 1926 he offered the vacancy to Allyn Young of Harvard, who did accept but who had a number of conditions, negotiations not being resolved until February 1927. In these circumstances Cannan might have been asked to continue his teaching on a provisional basis, but he and Beveridge were not the best of friends and instead the director offered Lionel Robbins, teaching for one year at New College Oxford, an assistant lectureship. Robbins had graduated from the school in 1923 and had taken both of Cannan's courses; in October 1926 he took over the first year course from Dalton, and taught the principles course alongside him. This arrangement lasted for two years; in 1928 Robbins went back to a fellowship at New College, and Young began teaching the principles course. But then Young died in March 1928, midway through the academic year. Beveridge immediately asked Robbins to take the economics classes up to the June exams, and following that, decided to offer Robbins a junior professorship—not a formal replacement for Young, but a temporary arrangement that became permanent.

Robbins was not quite thirty when he joined the school in the autumn of 1929, but he was thoroughly familiar with the school's two main economics courses, and the broader field of applied economics and commerce that the school offered. Unlike Young, who had adopted the teaching program much as he found it, Robbins determined from the very first to revamp the teaching of economics at LSE. Actually there were not that many LSE students who specialized in economics—at the time perhaps 20 percent of the internal Bsc. (Econ.) students—but Robbins was clearly a young man in a hurry and gave the impression, first, that the teaching of economics at the school was in need of radical reform; and second, that economists to teach it were in short supply (xi–xii). Neither of these claims was strictly true, but Robbins pressed ahead anyway and extended the teaching of economics, while also disparaging the teaching of commerce both at undergraduate level and, from the early 1930s, within a graduate program. In both cases he argued that students were too occupied in learning about the world of business and commerce (also known as the real world), and would be better occupied being taught modern economics (also known as academic economics). From this his course on the "principles of economic analysis" was born, "the centrepiece of economics teaching at LSE" (xii). In the British context, Robbins's lectures are recognizable as the template for the teaching of undergraduate economics in Britain for most of the remainder of the century, as represented by three key textbooks directly or indirectly based on the LSE's teaching: Benham's *Economics* (1938), Stonier and Hague's *Textbook of Economic Theory* (1953), and Richard Lipsey's *Introduction to Positive Economics* (1963).

Susan Howson's (2011: 173–76) monumental biography of Robbins gives a summary of his teaching in the early 1930s, but as with her treatment there of Robbins's key text, *Nature and Significance of Economic Science* (1932), she avoids being drawn into detailed discussion of the intellectual background to his work. But in her earlier article on *Nature and Significance* (2004) she demonstrated, on the basis of Robbins's reading and lecture notes, that a prime source of inspiration for his well-known definition of economics in terms of the choice of scarce means that have alternative uses to meet given ends had been Wicksteed, and not, for example, Max Weber, who made a rather similar formulation in 1919–20. Howson's biography draws in part upon Robbins's very extensive personal papers, and emphasizes the way that Robbins made a habit of drafting his lectures in some detail as an aid to their subsequent free delivery. The lectures collected together in the book under review are only part of a much larger trove of material, and are organized as three broad sets of notes for the same course: 1929–31, 1932–35, and 1935–40. This means that this printed version can be used as the starting point for considering the shape that the teaching of economics was taking during the 1930s. But the initial issue that this edition of his lectures raises is: how did Robbins arrive at this particular (and enduring) format?

We know that Robbins had a high regard for Frank Knight's *Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit* (1921), and that he referred his students to that work, as also to Taussig's older *Principles of Economics* (1911). But Robbins's lectures are structured like neither of these works, quite apart from the fact that reference to Taussig's general textbook might well be motivated by a wish to ignore Marshall's *Principles* deriving perhaps from Robbins's teacher Cannan. For while the differences between Cambridge and the LSE in the 1930s have generally been associated with Keynes and anti-Keynes, and so with the newly emergent macroeconomic framework, these lectures are resolutely "micro," as we would say today. For Robbins, in these lectures, the instruments of economic analysis are microeconomic instruments: organized around a central conception of economic equilibrium in exchanges, with fixed and flexible factors of production; "special topics" including a discussion of "consumers surplus" that makes clear the disagreement with Marshall, that there is an apostrophe before the final *s*, of *consumers*, and not after (131); or also definitions of costs and of equilibrium that include seven graphs, the lecture primarily taking the form of their elucidation. Here again a difference with Marshall can be established—for Marshall, graphs were visual realizations of equations; for Robbins, there is no mathematics at all, these are just abstract lines illustrating various (discursive) principles. This formal presentation was carried over into Stonier and Hague, extending into the 1950s and 1960s an important feature of the style of economics promoted by Robbins—or John Hicks, for that matter—during the 1930s. This is a formal, abstract presentation of economic relationships that appears to be founded in mathematics, but is not; and which likewise makes little or no use of any statistical data in making arguments about production, distribution, and prices. In this respect, they look rather like Wicksell's lectures on general theory, originally published in 1901 and translated, with an introduction by Robbins, in 1935.

Although Robbins had in 1929 explicitly started out from Cannan's lectures, written up and published that year as *A Review of Economic Theory*, Cannan had taken a historical approach to production, value, and incomes, eschewing all formalism. There is a clear debt to Marshall in these lectures, despite a reluctance to acknowledge the centrality of Marshallian ideas for what he was presenting. Robbins in these lectures presents economics to his students as a set of instruments and formulations, but not in the Marshallian sense of instruments to be chosen for the task in hand, according to policy and circumstance. These are the instruments of a new, positive science, principles conveyed to students in the lecture room so that they might go forth and teach them to others—because, in terms of future employment, that was the best that students possessing a degree in economics could hope for in the 1930s.

Keith Tribe, Tartu University, Estonia
10.1215/00182702-7685342