

**Eve Chiapello, Associate Professor**  
**HEC School of management, 78 350 Jouy-en-Josas, France**  
**chiapello@hec.fr**  
**Phone: 00 33 1 39 67 94 41**  
**Fax: 00 33 1 39 67 70 86**

### **Accounting and the birth of the notion of capitalism**

**Abstract:** The purpose of this paper is to cast a new light on the post-Sombartian debate. As we know, Sombart (1916) thought that the invention of double-entry bookkeeping was essential to the birth of capitalism. Max Weber developed the same theme, but to a lesser extent. Accounting scholars have debated the idea quite extensively during the 20th century. All these previous works have in common the fact that they address the historical question by comparing accounting practices to business practices, some of which are interpreted as capitalist. In this paper, my aim is not so much to understand the birth of capitalism, but to contribute to some understanding of the birth of the concept of capitalism itself. The concept was forged during the 19th century. At that time, capitalism and a certain kind of double-entry bookkeeping practice that was able to highlight the circuit of capital were inextricably linked. It might be suggested that this historical situation greatly helped the scholars of the period to conceptualize what they called capitalism, and it is easy to show that the notion of capitalism itself is rooted in accounting notions. I will thus argue that the history of how the concept of capitalism was invented is an example of the influence of accounting ideas on economic and sociological thinking.

**Keywords:** Capitalism, Accounting, Karl Marx, Werner Sombart

---

In his major work, *Der Modern Kapitalismus*<sup>1</sup>, Werner Sombart asserts that capitalism and double entry bookkeeping (hereafter referred to as DEB) are indissociably interconnected, and devotes more than ten pages to the various relationships he sees between the two phenomena. These few pages have aroused the interest of accounting historians, who despite their differences have generally concluded that Sombart's assertion was not valid for the whole period prior to the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. A review of a few major texts involved in the debate shows the differences in their treatment of Sombart's writing, which aspects are examined and which ignored, pointing to opportunities for further testing of Sombart's claims. Other authors, having noted the difficulties involved in proving congenial links between DEB and capitalism, have sought new interpretations. Bryer (2000) leaves aside the concept of DEB to concentrate on accounting signatures. Carruthers and Espeland (1991) set out to study the relationship between accounting practices and capitalism not as a technical connection (in the sense that accounting makes it possible to reach more rational decisions), but as a rhetorical bond and a justification (even when badly kept and useless as a decision aid, accounting contributes to the legitimacy of practices originally considered illegitimate). This article is a new attempt to understand the links between DEB and capitalism, bringing a new approach to the issue. All the previous works have in common the fact that they address the historical question by comparing accounting practices to business practices, some of which are interpreted as capitalist. This paper sets out not so much to understand the birth of capitalism, but to contribute to some understanding of the birth of the concept of capitalism itself. Rather than concentrating on the remote periods of the origins of capitalism, the focus here is on the much more recent period that saw the birth of the concept of capitalism, with an attempt to trace its genealogy. The aim is to show that this concept could not have come into being in the minds of social scientists without some

---

<sup>1</sup> The first edition dates from 1902. In 1916, Sombart published a second, completely revised version, in two volumes, and a third volume was added in 1928. The debate refers to the revised edition of 1916.

knowledge of the DEB practices of their time. I will argue that the history of how the concept of capitalism was invented is an example of the influence of accounting ideas on economic and sociological thinking.

The plan of this article is as follows. The first part discusses Sombart's writings and analyses the subsequent controversy. The second part then looks into the matter of not the origins but the concept of capitalism itself. The aim is to show that the concept of capitalism is indissociable from a representation of economic life shaped by an accounting outlook. The conclusion opens out the issues, identifying directions for analysis of the influence of accounting representations in the representations produced by the emerging social sciences (particularly the field of economics, still called political economy at the time). The concept of capitalism is here considered to be just one of many examples of this as yet unexplored phenomenon.

## 1. The post-Sombartian debate

### 1.1. Sombart's writings

It was Werner Sombart (1863-1941) who declared that "*capitalism and double entry bookkeeping are absolutely indissociable; their relationship to each other is that of form to content*" (Sombart, 1992, p. 23). Sombart belongs to what has been called "the German historical school in economics", which put "*the emphasis on the relativity of economic systems and epochs, and the necessity of analysing each on its own merits with a view to working out its own particular characteristics rather than getting at general economic law*" (Parsons, 1928, p. 643)<sup>2</sup>. This school was to produce a theory of stages, identifying various periods and their related economic systems. This was at the origin of the idea of capitalism as an epoch of history, but also the idea that there were separate identifiable periods within capitalism itself. Sombart, in his major work *Der Modern Kapitalismus*, first published in 1902, identified three stages in the development of capitalism: early capitalism or *Frühkapitalismus* (from the thirteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century), full capitalism or *Hochkapitalismus* (from the middle of the eighteenth century to the first World War) and late capitalism (since 1914) (Sombart 1930). This approach to economic phenomena explains Sombart's interest in all the cultural developments taking place as capitalism itself developed, particularly in accounting. The section of his book covering these questions starts with a presentation of "development of systematic account-keeping". Apparently relying largely on the work of H. Sieveking, Sombart identifies a certain number of stages that can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The first appearance of accounts. They brought order to the "inextricable confusion" of merchants' records, which previously had no purpose other than to prevent oversights, and took the form of basic notes with no underlying system. According to Sombart, the first accounts were developed in Italy in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.
- 2) Development of DEB: "*each entry is recorded in two accounts, as a debit in one, as a credit in the other. This is the fundamental principle of DEB. Through this system, an enterprise's accounts are inextricably linked, tightly bound together like a bundle of sticks.*" (Sombart, 1992, p 20). Sombart thought this stage was reached from the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. In particular, he mentions the accounts of the city of Genoa, which were kept under a DEB system from as early as 1340.

---

<sup>2</sup> Sombart was a student under Gustav Schmoller, a major theorist of the German historical school. Schmoller became involved in a disagreement with the Austrian marginalist school known as the quarrel of methods, following publication in 1894 of his book on political economy and its methods. In this book he contrasted his recommended empirical, inductive method with the deductive approach used by the Viennese school and the marginalists. The Viennese economist Carl Menger published a response to this work, thus feeding the controversy.

- 3) A third stage came about with the introduction of the capital account and a profit and loss account, used to close all the ledger accounts. This is *"the very essence of double entry bookkeeping"* which *"can without a doubt be summed up in this objective: keeping track of every movement throughout the company's capital cycle, quantifying it and recording it in writing"* (Sombart, 1992, p. 21). The capital account seems to have appeared in the books a little later than the profit and loss account. 1430 is the date proposed for the earliest capital account. Later on that century, brother Luca Pacioli (1494) published his treatise, considered *"the first scientific system for DEB in which all previous empirical discoveries were theorised into a coherent, comprehensive representation"* (ibid, p. 21). Pacioli's work presents the first three stages identified by Sombart, who however recognised that *"it was not such an advanced accounting system as our modern system"* (ibid, p. 22), since Pacioli was unaware of the practice of closing the accounts, or establishing an annual balance sheet.
- 4) 1608, the date Simon Stevin's textbook was published, is taken as the year it was first proposed to close annual accounts and establish a balance sheet within a DEB system.
- 5) The final stage considered by Sombart saw the introduction of stocktaking in closing procedures, principally in order to restate stock value if necessary. Although the French *ordonnance* of 1673 required merchants to perform a stocktake at least every two years, the link between establishing the balance sheet and this non-accounting procedure does not appear to have been realised until very late on; in Sombart's opinion, it went unnoticed throughout the whole early capitalism period. Apart from this point, which troubled him, Sombart maintained that *"for the moment it is sufficient to have clearly established that the double entry bookkeeping system had already reached maturity in the early capitalism period"* (Sombart, 1992, p. 23).

Sombart was obviously far from ignorant of accounting history, and considered that DEB underwent an improvement process throughout the early capitalism period. He described the main features of the period as follows: *"the capitalistic entrepreneurs, and their subordinates, the workmen, still bear the earmarks of their feudal or handicraft origin: their economic outlook still exhibits the superficial characteristics of pre-capitalistic mentality. The economic principles of capitalism are still struggling for recognition"* (Sombart, 1930, p. 25). However, *"in the period of full capitalism (...) the principles of profit and economic rationalism attain complete control and fashion all economic relationships. (...) Scientific, mechanistic technology is widely applied."* (Ibid, p. 25). Once DEB was fully developed, it became part of this technology, necessary for the rational capitalism of the second period.

Having established these historical milestones, Sombart went on to bring out "the significance of a systematic accounting system in the development of capitalism", highlighting various aspects:

- 1) Keeping accounts encouraged **order** and **clarity**, which Sombart believes are necessary for successful development of a capitalist system. Accounting brought to business the mathematical order which was later to prove its worth so brilliantly in the field of astrophysics, through the idea of quantification for each event.
- 2) The idea of **accumulation** also developed thanks to DEB: *"double entry bookkeeping has only one objective: to increase the value of a sum measured in a purely quantitative manner. When one plunges into double entry bookkeeping, the nature of all the goods and products is forgotten, the principle of satisfying demand is forgotten, all that matters is the idea of accumulation: no other approach is possible if one wants to occupy a coherent position within this system: the aim is no longer to see sheaves or cargoes, flour or cotton, but only values which appreciate or depreciate (...)* The concept of capital was created essentially from this point of view", since the concept of capital can be defined *"as the capacity for accumulation as assessed through double entry bookkeeping"* (p. 24).
- 3) Through DEB, **rationalisation** of commerce became possible. DEB reflects the *"close cohesion between the reign of the principal of accumulation, and the trend towards rationalisation"*, both being founded on *"codification of the business world into figures"* (p.25).

4) More broadly, DEB created a **"system of concepts"**, including *"those that are familiar to us because we use them to understand the world of the capitalistic economy"*. For instance, the concept of capital: *"It could be said that before double entry bookkeeping, the concept of capital was inexistent, and that without DEB it would not have come into being. We could even go so far as to define capital as the capacity for accumulation as assessed through double entry bookkeeping"* (p.24). The same applies to *"the concepts of fixed and circulating capital", "rotating capital", "production cost"* etc. (p.25). *"The conceptual artillery of the private economy and the political economy being applied to the capitalistic economy is largely (and people are often unaware of this) derived from the arsenal of DEB (...) To the extent DEB engenders the notion of capital, it simultaneously engenders the notion of the capitalist enterprise as an organisation designed to increase the value of a given capital. This reveals the creative contribution of DEB to the arrival of the capitalist enterprise."* (p.25)

5) Finally, W. Sombart stresses DEB's contribution to the **separation of the business and its owner**. *"The existence of the capitalist enterprise"*, he says, *"must be considered as the organisation of production in such a way as to free each undertaking from its owner (...) it must be acknowledged that accounting has contributed significantly to this emancipation."* (p.25). *"The company becomes autonomous and stands apart from the businessman; it changes from the inside according to its own laws. Once again, there are two reasons: 1- because the company, as a channel for capital, appears to be an entity constructed by integration into the accounting system, 2- because the company's unity cannot be deduced from the owner as a person, who simply occupies the role of a creditor supplying capital"*. (p.26)

The theme of the link between accounting and capitalism is also present in the writings of Max Weber, but to a lesser extent. The existence of a capital account is central to Weber's definition of capitalism: *"The most universal condition for the existence of modern capitalism is, for all large lucrative businesses supplying our daily needs, the use of a rational capital account as standard"* (Weber, 1991, p. 297)<sup>3</sup>. But Weber develops this idea no further, turning instead to the requirements for using a *"capital account as standard"*<sup>4</sup>. The book *Economy and Society* (Weber, 1971, for the French edition, p. 92-98), published as we know posthumously from a collection of notes organised by Marianne Weber, also devotes some pages to the capital account, discussing the definition of "rational economic profit-making" and what should be understood by "capital" and "return on capital". Weber clearly states that *"the notion of capital is understood exclusively in the context of the private economy, and in an accounting sense"* (Weber, 1971, p. 95). However, he makes not a single statement on the contribution of accounting to the birth and development of capitalism, even though he would later present a theory about Protestantism's contribution to this historic process. In contrast to Protestantism, which exists independently of capitalism, capital accounting is consubstantial to capitalism. Rational accounting is not one of a range of institutions of rational capitalism, but is the institution *par excellence*, whose progress is an indicator and sign (Bryer (2000) calls it a signature) of the advance of capitalism. It does not bring capitalism into being, but its existence is a sign of capitalism, as it needs all the other institutions of capitalism (free labour market, significant monetary circuits, calculability etc) in order to function. The Weberian approach will be examined further later in this article, but clearly the theory that began the controversy among accounting historians discussed in this article relates more to Sombart's ideas than Weber's.

The relative oblivion that later engulfed Sombart's work (a situation that can be attributed to his pro-Nazi stance in 1930s Germany and his anti-Semitic writings (Funell 2001; Stehr and Grundmann 2001), but also to the liberties he took with historical facts to further his own

---

<sup>3</sup> See also Weber (1985).

<sup>4</sup> The *Economic History* lists six: 1) appropriation of production resources by private autonomous lucrative businesses 2) a free market 3) rational technique, with maximum calculability, 4) rational law 5) free labour market 6) commercialization of the economy (Weber, 1991, p. 297-8)

theories<sup>5</sup>) no doubt explains why his major work, *Der Modern Kapitalismus*, has never been fully translated into English or French<sup>6</sup>, and many of his other writings are also untranslated. Non-German speaking commentators on Sombartian themes (and this includes myself) are thus at a disadvantage in assessing his thesis and its relationship to the rest of his work, independently of the works of Max Weber, which are more easily available in translation.

## 1.2. The post-Sombartian debate

The few pages of *Der Modern Kapitalismus* devoted to accounting have inspired many researchers, principally in the field of accounting history. Below is an examination of the arguments put forward by a certain number of these authors to defend or contradict Sombart's theories. It was not possible to mention all the relevant works. This article refers to the best-known articles, or those which in my opinion appear to bring the most new information to the debate upon their publication.

### **Basil Yamey**

The English historian Basil Yamey wrote about this subject several times (Yamey, 1949, 1964), and can be considered Sombart's most hostile commentator. In his 1949 article, he mainly examines the issue in the light of the most ancient practices, thus going beyond Sombart's knowledge of the historicity of accounting. For Yamey, *"the thesis linking systematic bookkeeping with the development of capitalism implies that from an early date accounts were used in certain ways and for certain purposes, and had the effect of rationalizing and methodizing business life"* (Yamey, 1949, p. 100). He set out *"to show that the claims made for the double-entry system cannot be reconciled with the early practice of the system as illustrated and discussed in texts on accounting published during the first three hundred years after Luca Pacioli's first printed exposition appeared in 1494"* (Yamey, 1964, p. 118).

In his 1964 article, the only contribution by DEB to the development of capitalism that Yamey acknowledges relates to Sombart's first argument, namely its influence in increasing discipline and bringing order to business transactions<sup>7</sup>. Other than this, he seeks to weaken Sombart's case with three arguments:

- 1) Sombart allocates *"a central place"* in his theory to *"the calculation of the profits and capital of an enterprise"* (p. 119). B. Yamey attempts to show that businessmen did not often undertake such calculations and that regular, at least annual, closings only became common practice relatively late in history<sup>8</sup> (during the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century). In any event, knowing *"the aggregated profitability or the rate of return"* of the business does not help a businessman in his day-to-day decisions, being at most a source of satisfaction.
- 2) Yamey (1964) then challenges Sombart's claim that DEB contributed to the business/owner separation: *"Any notion that the double-entry system of accounting is in some sense necessary for the separation of the firm from its proprietors is invalid. Its lack of*

---

<sup>5</sup> As explained in a positive light by Parsons (1928), *"he digs out and reduces to order an enormous mass of historical material. (...) But he is not a "mere" historian. He is interested, not in working out the particular circumstances of the economic history of any single country for its own sake, but in presenting European economic life as a whole, in its great common trend, and in getting at the laws of its development. His aim is thus definitely theoretical."*(p. 643) Backhaus (2001, p. 602) also said about the same subject *"Sombart is not engaged in legal history nor in historiography; his work consists in establishing the subdiscipline of comparative economics with a historical perspective in order to capture the developmental process leading up to a particular institutional realization."*

<sup>6</sup> Only the third volume was translated in French under the title: *"L'apogée du capitalisme"*, Paris, Payot, 1932

<sup>7</sup> *"From the point of view of routine administration and the control of assets, the merit of the double-entry system lies in its comprehensiveness and its possibilities for the orderly arrangement of data."* (Yamey, 1964, p. 133)

<sup>8</sup> *"There is little to establish that the double-entry system went together with regularity in balancing and in the preparation of summary accounts"* (Yamey, 1964, p. 124).

validity is apparent from the fact that partnership concerns were in operation before the invention of double entry." (p. 126)

3) Finally, Yamey explains that accounting data can only ever concern the past, while decisions relate to the future; therefore, accounts can only have a very small role to play in decision making and thus in business rationalisation.

### **James O. Winjum**

Another famous contribution to the debate was made by James O. Winjum in 1971. He takes a less negative position than Yamey (1964), beginning with the question of what DEB is understood to mean, and notes that at least four different definitions coexist:

*"(1) a bookkeeping system constantly in equilibrium in which the only criterion is the equality of debits and credits,*

*(2) the addition of a capital account to the first system,*

*(3) the use of nominal accounts (revenues, expenses, ventures, etc.) in addition to the capital account of system 2, but an irregular closing of these accounts to capital. Under this system there is no periodic calculation of net income.*

*(4) the same as system 3 except for the periodic closing of nominal accounts to capital and the annual calculation of net income".* (Winjum, 1971, p.335)

The general line of argument is this: if DEB is taken to mean system 4, then clearly Sombart is wrong (but Sombart never thought of system 4 prior to a relatively late period in his early capitalism stage – see above). *"However, if we adopt system 3, the evidence against double-entry is not so overwhelming"* (p. 335). Winjum (1964) believes that system 3 was broadly *"implemented by merchants in the eighteenth century"*. So, *"If the Sombart thesis is to receive an impartial hearing, it must be evaluated on the basis of this system."* (p. 335). Winjum then goes on to discuss, and on the whole defend, four theories attributed to Sombart. The theories are as follows:

1) *"Double-entry contributed to a new attitude toward economic life. The old medieval goal of subsistence was replaced by the capitalistic goal of profits. (...) Double-entry was imbued with the search of profits. The goals of the enterprise could be placed in a specific form and the concept of capital was made possible."* (p. 336). In this respect, Winjum (1964) acknowledges the validity of Yamey's arguments, while also showing that DEB's capacity to supply capital valuation and summary accounts was referred to in very early textbooks (for instance by James Peele in 1569). And DEB, although it may not be the only possible technique for calculating capital (the inventory-based method is also mentioned in the texts – e.g. by John Mellis in 1568), remains the practice that provides the fullest information, since the end-of-period summary accounts also bring out information concerning the individual accounts.

2) *"This new spirit of acquisition was aided and propelled by the refinement of economic calculations (...) Rationalisation could be based on a rigorous calculation"*(p. 336). In support of this statement, Winjum (1964) mentions that accounting ledgers with enough detail and organisation for calculation of profit or loss on each venture, market or commodity existed as early as the 16<sup>th</sup> century. He also refers to the importance the earliest texts attributed to the role of accounts in monitoring the general state of affairs (particularly the work of Ympyn, 1547). It thus appears that even though DEB's potential contribution to the rationalisation process was clearly not activated in every merchant's affairs, some took up the opportunity fairly early on. Finally, Winjum (1964) vehemently disagrees with Yamey's argument that knowledge of the past is no help for more rational decisions concerning the future. On the contrary, he believes that the past has contributed to forming the business owner's judgement and market knowledge, and this helps him to anticipate events in a more realistic way.

3) *"The new rationalism was further enhanced by systematic organisation. Systematic bookkeeping promotes order in the accounts and organization in the firm"* (p. 336). Winjum

(1964) confirms this, stressing that accounts were seen right from the start as a tool fostering order. For example, this idea is clearly stated in Ympyn's 1547 text.

4) *"Double-entry permits a separation of ownership and management and thereby promotes the growth of the large joint stock company. By permitting a distinction between business and personal assets it makes possible the autonomous existence of the enterprise"* (p. 336). Winjum (1964) here adds that *"the oldest surviving records in double-entry, those of the Massiri in the Genoese commune for the year 1340, reveal just such a separation"* (p. 348), indicating that people were aware of this opportunity in DEB from the earliest days, although it was not used by most merchants, who had no need for it. When partnerships were set up, however, *"double-entry was generally considered the fairest method in situations where diverse interests were concerned"* (p. 349).

### **Yannick Lemarchand**

The French accounting historian Yannick Lemarchand later put forward new arguments against Sombart (Lemarchand, 1992, 1993, 1994). He found that double-entry bookkeeping was not the only accounting model used by capitalist enterprises at least up to the 19th century. Lemarchand states that two types of accounting coexisted: a DEB system inherited from merchants' records, and a "financial" system derived from the accounting practices of landowners, who in the 19<sup>th</sup> century were also mine-owners, and that these two systems were only combined into a single DEB system, at least in France, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This created a certain amount of hybrid vocabulary and practices, including a much more detailed profit and loss statement than for standard DEB. Here again we find the idea that the actors of capitalism had other calculation and valuation methods available to them, not only DEB, and that they used these other methods, just as they could calculate capital by stock-taking (Yamey 1964).

It cannot be denied that Max Weber was much more cautious than Sombart on this point (Weber, 1991, 1985, 1991). As he explains in the 1920 introduction to his essay *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*:

*"the important fact is always that a calculation of capital in terms of money is made, whether by modern book-keeping methods or in any other way, however primitive and crude. Everything is done in terms of balances: at the beginning of the enterprise an initial balance, before every individual decision a calculation to ascertain its probable profitability, and at the end a final balance to ascertain how much profit has been made"* (Weber, 1985, p. 12, our emphasis)<sup>9</sup>.

Yamey's criticism concerning the other capital calculation methods is invalid for Weber's theory. Lemarchand's position, on the other hand, is unshaken, since accounts in finance operated on the basis of lists of expenses and income, possibly classified into categories, but with no balance sheet or capital account<sup>10</sup>. Although it would be possible in the finance system to calculate profit, it would be impossible to relate the profit to investments or a capital. Only DEB can keep a trace in the accounts of the value of investments – and later the practice of depreciation – while in the finance model, investments are immediately charged to expenses. Using DEB, however, cannot in itself guarantee all its potential, *"keeping track of every movement throughout the company's capital cycle"* as Sombart says. Lemarchand unearths some late 19<sup>th</sup> century accounts – thus dating from the height of *Hochkapitalismus* – which, while they use DEB, apply principles inherited from a "finance" approach, and do not facilitate traceability of capital flows.

Lemarchand is also interested in the distinction between fixed capital and circulating capital, which Sombart takes as deriving from accounting practices. In economic theory, the

<sup>9</sup> English translation taken from Miller (2000).

<sup>10</sup> Stocks, movable and immovable goods were not recorded by value but by nature, with non-accounting inventories sometimes carried out.

distinction between fixed capital (primitive advances) and variable capital (annual advances) was first made by F. Quesnay in 1758 in his *Tableau Economique*, and later taken up by the economists' sect, then Turgot and A. Smith. In fact, this distinction – which partly echoes the difference between investment and consumption – had been thought of much earlier by other accounting authors (Lemarchand quotes the 1610 Moschetti text as an example). Knowing this, can it be concluded that accounting revealed the concept? Lemarchand prefers to think that accounting thought, like economic thought, was influenced by the merchants' practical experience and their perception of the different uses or applications for certain expenses (he quotes an expense report of 1667 for an ironmongers, in which an "advance" was broken down into different uses: "solid, real expenses" (for land, buildings and the hammering shop) and "provisions").

The table overleaf summarises the positions of Sombart and Yamey, Winjum and Lemarchand concerning the contribution by DEB to the development of capitalism.



Sombart (1916)	Yamey (1964)	Winjum (1971)	Lemarchand (1992)
1. DEB contributes to order and discipline	Agrees	Agrees	Not discussed
2. DEB constructs the idea of accumulation: - everything is expressed as a value that appreciates or depreciates - the concept of capital	Disagrees, because establishing summary accounts is rare and not performed on a regular basis. Capital can be calculated without using DEB (based on inventory and debts).	Observes that the method for calculating capital is explained in texts as early as the second half of the 16th century.	There are two accounting models for capitalism. Monitoring of the entire capital cycle is only possible with appropriate recording of stocks, investments and depreciation in a DEB system. This does not become standard practice until the end of the 19 <sup>th</sup> century.
3. The accounts are a tool for economically rationalising decisions, by relating them to the capital accumulation objective.	The accounts are not very useful in taking decisions concerning the future.	Although not used by all traders, this opportunity was known to some and recommended by the textbooks. Knowledge of the past is a help for decisions involving the future.	Not discussed
4. Creation of a system of concepts used by actors and economists in their view of economic life in the capitalist world.	Not discussed	Not discussed	Some concepts appeared in accounting before being used in political economy, but does this mean that accounting is the source of economic representations? Another hypothesis is that tradesmen's reasoning influenced both accounting and economics.
5. Separation of the business from its owner	Disagrees, the separation results from "partnerships"	But there was awareness from the start of the possibility of separating ownership and management through DEB, although it was rarely used (most merchants had no partners).	Not discussed

As the table shows, one part of Sombart's theory goes mostly unchallenged (except partially by Lemarchand): the contribution of accounting to the birth of concepts used to understand the economic world. As we shall see later, this idea appears worthy of further examination, and Sombart's work itself can be used as an example of thinking that has been conceptually influenced by accounting.

Let us now turn to authors who have sought to renew the debate significantly, expressing it in terms other than those of the historians' controversy discussed above.

### ***Bruce G Carruthers and Wendy Nelson Espeland***

Carruthers and Espeland (1991), noting that in practice, merchants and businessmen only rarely – or only fairly late in time – took advantage of all the opportunities DEB had to offer, proposed a new angle: if there is a link between DEB and capitalism, it should not be analysed in terms of technical use, i.e. along the lines established by Yamey in 1949 and followed by Winjum and Lemarchand. The important factor is not the technical advantages of DEB, but its advantages in terms of legitimacy; otherwise, these authors say, the accounts would not have been so badly kept.

DEB's contribution to legitimacy varies according to the period. In view of the precapitalistic mentality's low opinion of the aim for profit and commercial activities, 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century merchants would have been quick to take advantage of the legitimacy conferred on their activity by the practice of mathematical skills (just as Renaissance artists sought to raise their status by displaying their mathematical knowledge in the accurate perspectives they painted). The constant equilibrium guaranteed by the equal value of credits and debits in DEB could make business deals appear fair and legitimate, in keeping with the Aristotelian representation of perfectly balanced transactions. The accounting record books invoked God at the start and thanks were given for any profit made. Only gradually did the rhetoric of accounting come to be expressed in a vocabulary of rationality, leaving behind the need to call on the rhetoric of Cicero, or Aristotle's models of justice, or God to establish the legitimacy of transactions. Little by little, accounting became the incarnation of rationality, in line with the new source of legitimacy provided under high capitalism. However, this only became possible with the development of literacy and numeracy skills in the users of accounts.

Carruthers and Espeland (1991) thus brought a fresh angle to the central question underlying Weber's *The protestant Ethic and the spirit of Capitalism* ("how did an activity that from the point of view of moral ethics was, at best, tolerated, manage to turn itself into a vocation as referred to by Benjamin Franklin?") and attribute to DEB a role in changing legitimacy. Although this is a useful addition in respect of the writings of Weber and Sombart, who did not discuss these aspects in detail<sup>11</sup>, this interpretation of the relationship between accounting and capitalism is nevertheless coherent with their conceptual outlook (both refer to the notion of the spirit of capitalism, and consider rationalisation and calculability as important; for Weber the issue of legitimacy is important).

---

<sup>11</sup> There was, however, strong disagreement between them on the relative role of Protestantism and Judaism in the change of legitimacy.

### **Robert A. Bryer**

Bryer's articles (2000 a, 2000 b) also offered a completely new perspective on the subject. What is important for him is not the kind of accounting used (double-entry or single-entry) but the accounting signature associated with each calculative mentality (feudal, capitalistic and capitalist). As seen above, the historian's debate focused on the question of DEB and Sombart's theory was regularly weakened by evidence proving that it was not using DEB that made the difference, but actually reasoning in terms of capital and return on capital. This kind of reasoning can operate without DEB (Yamey 1964) and DEB can be used without applying this reasoning (Lemarchand 1992).

Bryer has come up with an ingenious idea. Taking up the link that Sombart and Weber saw between accounting and the spirit of capitalism, he looks at accounting calculations rather than recording methods, and suggests that the calculations performed reflect the mentalities and spirit of a period.

Another point of interest in Bryer's work lies in the connection he establishes between Marx's theories and those of Sombart and Weber<sup>12</sup>. Bryer's purpose is to show that it is possible to translate to accounting Marx's theory of the transition from feudalism to capitalism and to find evidence of such a transition through the analysis of accounting archives. Specifically, he believes it is possible, through analysis of accounting methods, to identify for various business sectors (trade, farming, etc) and countries the periods when capitalistic mentalities appeared and the way they developed<sup>13</sup>. His aim is not to determine the contribution made by accounting to the birth and development of capitalism (which he sees above all as a product of the class struggle) but to date the various stages of capitalism by reference to accounting, and to validate Marx's historical theory on the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

Apart from their varied approaches, all the works in the post-Sombartian controversy considered above share the same main method of demonstration. They aim to date certain accounting practices or accounting systems (based on extracts from accounting records and accounting texts), and to place them in a general common history of capitalism, that is hardly explained<sup>14</sup> (and never refers to Sombart's stages of capitalism). Depending on the date chosen, the historical theory under examination by the author is backed up or weakened.

None of the authors studied, except Bryer, really takes the trouble to explain what they mean by capitalism. It goes without saying that just as it is important to define what is meant by DEB (Winjum 1971), it is essential to define the other term in the debate, particularly as the two terms are fairly different in nature. Capitalism is a concept that comes from the social sciences, used to refer to a certain perceived way of thinking in an economic system, and as a basis for interpretation of historical facts. It is not a concept that originated in the world of business, as accounting did. Any historicity it may have is to be found in the history of thought, not in the history of commerce and business.

---

<sup>12</sup> In fact, almost no further reference is subsequently made to Sombart, maybe because much of his work was not available in English, but perhaps also because the theme of the signature of capitalism by accounting is much closer to Weberian than Sombartian ideas (see above).

<sup>13</sup> Bryer's translation of Marx's theory of transition using accounting ideas "*revealed a two step theory of transition from the feudal mentality to capitalistic mentality. First the appearance of capitalistic mentalities in farmers using wage labour and in merchants who socialise their capital*" (Bryer, 2000b, p. 328). Farmers' accounting signature is the "*consumable surplus*" (e.g. receipts minus payments) which should be maximised, while for merchants it is the "*feudal rate of return*", corresponding to "*feudal surplus divided by the initial capital employed*". The modern capitalistic mentality is born later out of the interaction between these two early mentalities, and has its own accounting signature: "*the rate of return on capital employed in production*". Bryer attempts to validate this theory in his second article of 2000 based on a review of the accounts kept by farmers, merchants and the English East India Company, with examples covering a period of three centuries (16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries).

<sup>14</sup> Only Robert A. Bryer explains his theory of the development of capitalism (in fact Marx's theory).

I shall now return to the Sombartian thesis and add this point of view. The second part of this article argues that the link between DEB and capitalism is to be found within the concept of capitalism itself, which could not have come into existence without a certain level of familiarity with DEB practices. As the concept of capitalism emerged at a late period in the development of the economic system it sought to define, its birth was contemporary with highly developed accounting practices, as depicted by Sombart. This hypothesis explains the difficulties identified by historians in proving the relationship between DEB and capitalism for the earliest periods, without invalidating the existence of a close link between the two phenomena. This solution is different from both the proposals of Carruthers and Espeland, and Bryer.

## 2. Accounting and the notion of capitalism

### 2.1. The notion of capitalism

The concept was forged during the 19th century. Deschepper (1964) finds the word "capitalism" penned for the first time in 1850 by Louis Blanc in his treatise *Organisation du Travail*, where it is used to distinguish between capital and capitalism, which presumes private appropriation of capital: "*This sophism consists of perpetually confusing the usefulness of capital with what I shall call capitalism, in other words the appropriation of capital by some to the exclusion of others. Let everyone shout "Long live capital". We shall applaud and our attack on capitalism, its deadly enemy, shall be all the stronger.*" (Blanc, 1850, quoted by Deschepper, 1964, p. 153).

But the word was in fact seldom used in the 19th century. Proudhon used it very little but provided a definition which also refers to a certain ownership system: "*Economic and social regime in which capital as a source of income does not generally belong to those who implement it in their own work*" (quoted by Braudel, 1979, p.276). Marx hardly seems to have known the term, although F. Engels used it, and the German economist Alfred Schaffle used the word *Kapitalismus* as early as 1870 (Braudel, 1979, p. 766).

It is only at the turn of the 20th century that the word "took off" on the intellectual and political scenes, becoming the natural antonym of socialism. In fact, once again it was Sombart who popularized the term, in his 1902 work *Der moderne Kapitalismus*. The word was then incorporated into the Marxist vocabulary in order to talk about the different stages of economic development as outlined by the author of *Capital*. It was thus Sombart who gave the term capitalism its full glory and associated it very rapidly with DEB. Is this mere coincidence, or should we consider that on the contrary, DEB and its principles contributed to the construction of Sombart's concept of capitalism?

What did Sombart understand by capitalism? First of all, he acknowledges the heritage of the socialist writers: "*The concept of capitalism and even more clearly the term itself may be traced primarily to the writings of socialist theoreticians. It has in fact remained one of the key concepts of socialism down to the present time.*" (Sombart, 1930, p.3) In this literature, the term of capitalism has negative moral connotations, making it a deeply divisive concept: "*The older German economists and to a much greater extent the economists of other countries rejected entirely the concept of capitalism*" (ibid, p.3) Some authors did not even mention it (Gide, Cauwes, Marshall, Seligman, Cassel); others including Gustav Schmoller, Sombart's teacher, did discuss it but the "*concept is subsequently rejected*" (p. 3-4).

All the evidence suggests that Sombart took his initial approach to capitalism from Marx, although Marx never used the word, rather than from the German historical school, which as we have seen was aware of the term. Sombart first encountered the issue in its Marxian form: he made no secret of this fact and, at least in the first part of his career, openly

expressed his indebtedness to Marx's analyses. He even participated *"in the social movement, earning a reputation as a Marxist which brought him many difficulties in his life and career and cost him at least six offers of full professorships in subsequent years"* (Backhaus, 2001, p. 602) Friedrich Engels recognised him as one of his friend's most talented disciples<sup>15</sup>.

In seeking to present the concept of capitalism, Sombart explains quite naturally that it was Marx *"who virtually discovered the phenomenon"* (Sombart, 1930, p. 3). The first definition he proposes is fairly explicit: *"Capitalism designates an economic system significantly characterized by the predominance of "capital"* (p. 4). The author must be well acquainted with all of Marx's work to be satisfied with such a compact definition, which can say nothing very clear before Marx: not because the concept of capital was unknown (it was already in use in the field of political economy) but because it had not yet been raised to the status of a central symbol and structure of the bourgeois period's economic system and associated with all the typical capitalist social relationships.

In order to understand the concept of capitalism, it is necessary to understand the Sombartian notion of the "economic system", since capitalism is seen as a specific economic system. *"The function of such a conception [of an economic system] is to enable us to classify the fundamental characteristics of economic life of a particular time, to distinguish it from the economic organization of other periods and thus to delimit the major economic epochs in history"* (p. 5) It is *"a formative conception not derived from empirical observation" which enables economic science "to arrange its material in systems"* (p.4-5). Sombart goes on to define an economic system as *"a mode of providing for material wants"* comprising three aspects: 1) a mental attitude or spirit, 2) a form of organization, 3) a technique.

In relation to capitalism, these three aspects are described as follows:

1) *"The spirit of capitalism is dominated by three ideas: acquisition, competition and rationality. (...) The aim of all economic activity is not referred back to the living person. An abstraction, the stock of material things, occupies the center of the economic stage. (...) There are no limits to acquisition, and the system exercises a psychological compulsion to boundless extension."* (Sombart, 1930, p. 6-7). Capital is the abstraction that private businesses exist to accumulate: *"the idea of such an economic system is expressed most perfectly in the endeavor to utilize that fund of exchange value which supplies the necessary substratum for production activities (capital)"* (ibid, p. 6).

2) *"It is a system based upon private initiative and exchange. There is a regular cooperation of two groups of the population, the owners of the means of production and the propertyless workers, all of whom are brought into relation through the market"*<sup>16</sup> Here once again is the issue of ownership of production resources that was central to the first uses of the term "capitalism" by Louis Blanc or Proudhon (see above), and also of course to Marx's thinking. The high capitalism period is also marked by the autonomous existence of the company. *"By the combination of all simultaneous and successive business transactions into a conceptual whole, an independent economic organism is created over and above the individuals who constitute it. This entity appears then as the agent in each of these transactions and leads, as it were, a life of its own, which often exceeds in length that of its human members"* (Sombart, 1930, p. 13). The role of bookkeeping is determinant in this emancipation: *"This integrated system of relationships treated as an entity in the sciences of law and accounting becomes independent of any particular owner; it sets itself tasks, chooses means for their realisation, forces men into its path, and carries them off in its wake. It is an intellectual construct which acts as a material monster"*(ibid, p. 13)

---

<sup>15</sup> *"It is the first time that a German university professor succeeds on the whole in seeing in Marx's writings what Marx really says"* (Engels, 1897, "Supplement to Capital volume 3", in Capital Volume 3, English edition 1977, London: Lawrence and Wishart, p. 893-4, quoted by Stehr and Grundmann, 2001, p. xv).

<sup>16</sup> Sombart, "Prinzipielle Eigenart des modern kapitalismus", in *Grundriss der Sozialökonomik*, vol. IV, quoted by Parsons (1928, p. 647).

3) "*Capitalist technology must ensure a high degree of productivity. (...)The compensation of wage earners, which is limited to the amount needed for subsistence, can, with increased productivity be produced in a shorter time, and a larger proportion of the total working time remains therefore for the production of profits.*"(Sombart, 1930, p. 12). Sombart is following Marx's core thesis on non-paid labour as a source of profit.

Marx's influence is thus clearly visible, but unlike Marx, Sombart gives priority in his analyses to the role of the spirit of capitalism, rather than to the role of the class struggle, in describing the historical process. In Sombart's own words: "*It is a fundamental contention of this work that at different times different attitudes toward economic life have prevailed and that it is the spirit which has created a suitable form for itself and has thus created economic organization*"<sup>17</sup>. His original aim was "*to complete the Marxian perspective by adding a socio-psychological and socio-cultural dimension to the analysis of the genesis and the nature of capitalism*" (Stehr and Grundmann, 2001, p. xv).

Sombart's concept of capitalism derives from Marxian analysis, even though Sombart does not stress the same aspects. His notion of capital is thus bound to be imbued with Marx's definition of capital, although Sombart appears to treat the concept largely as an accounting concept. To further investigations, an examination of Marx's concept of capital is required.

## 2.2. Marx's definition of capital

This section refers to Part Two of Volume 1 of *Capital*, entitled "The transformation of money into capital" and containing three chapters. The first (Chapter IV: The general formula of capital) is a marvel of clear exposition. The author contrasts "the direct form of the circulation of commodities" or "simple circulation" with the circulation of capital.

Simple circulation takes the form C-M-C (commodity-money-commodity), that is "*the transformation of commodities into money and the re-conversion of money into commodities: selling in order to buy*". Capital circulates in the opposite direction, "*M-C-M, the transformation of money into commodities, and the reconversion of commodities into money: buying in order to sell*". (Marx, 1990, p. 248)

In the first case, money is merely an intermediary for trading commodities, "*for instance in the case of the peasant who sells corn and with the money thus set free buys clothes*". In the second case, the point of the exchange is to recover the money that has been advanced. "*In the one case both the starting point and the terminating-point of the movement are commodities, in the other there are money*"(p. 249). "*The path M-C-M (...) proceeds from the extreme of money and finally returns to that same extreme. Its driving and motivating force, its determining purpose, is therefore exchange-value.*" (p. 250)

Through simple circulation, buyers and sellers find themselves with different merchandise in the end from at the beginning. M-C-M circulation, on the other hand, "*appears to lack any content, because it is tautological. Both extremes have the same economic form*" (p. 250). For Marx, "*the complete form of this process is therefore M-C-M', where M'= M+ΔM, i.e. the original sum advanced plus an increment. This increment or excess over the original value [he calls] "surplus-value".*(p. 251)

The Marxian definition of capital begins by highlighting the M-C-M' cycle. "*Money which describes the latter course in its movement is transformed into capital, becomes capital, and from the point of view of its function, already is capital.*"(p. 248). Capital is any money thrown into the sphere of circulation for the purpose of being recovered with a surplus, and this cycle is seen as endless: "*the circulation of money as capital is an end in itself, for the valorization of value takes place only within this constantly renewed movement. The movement of capital is therefore limitless*" (p. 253). This limitless accumulation, found at the heart of Sombart's spirit of capitalism, is thus also central to Marx's definition, but for Marx it is first and foremost

<sup>17</sup> Sombart, *Der modern kapitalismus*, vol 1, p. 25, quoted by Parsons (1928, p. 644).

a material process, while for Sombart it is a way of viewing the world and giving purpose to one's actions (even though there would no longer be any need for a spirit once businesses have become autonomous and turned into "material monsters", as the logic of the system would be imposed on all). The capitalist is forever insatiably throwing new capital into circulation, with the aim of increasing the abstract wealth formed by circulating capital<sup>18</sup>. This places him in opposition to the miser, who accumulates a stock of money by removing it from circulation<sup>19</sup>.

And what material form does this capital take? Money or merchandise? *"It is constantly changing from one form into the other, without becoming lost in this movement (...) If we pin down the specific forms of appearance assumed in turn by selfvalorizing value in the course of its life, we reach the following elucidation: capital is money, capital is commodities. (...) it alternately assumes and loses the form of money and the form of commodities, but preserves and expands itself through all these changes, value requires above all an independent form by means of which its identity with itself may be asserted. Only in the form of money does it possess this form. Money therefore forms the starting-point and the conclusion of every valorization process."* (p. 254-5)

Marx then explains in his next two chapters the origin of the increase in value between M and M' that is the purpose for the capitalist process. There can only be capital if there is a surplus-value. Since Marx believes that exchange alone cannot create this surplus value, the origins must be sought elsewhere. As we know, he found it in the consumption by the capitalist of a specific merchandise – labour – which by nature creates value when consumed. In order for this merchandise to be available for purchase, it must be for sale, and this requires two other historical conditions: 1) that the worker is free to sell his capacity for labour, 2) that he cannot use it to produce merchandise for exchange, as he has no means of production. And so for money to be transformed into capital, the existence of a wage-earning class is necessary for the capitalist to extract the surplus value that justifies his activities. Capitalism is indissociable from the wage-earning phenomenon, as Sombart and Weber<sup>20</sup> say, once again repeating Marx's ideas.

Putting aside the question of the wage-earners for a moment, we turn to the other characteristics of capital. Every aspect of this representation of capital corresponds to that given by balance sheets taken from DEB accounts of the kind Marx may have known in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. I am convinced that Marx would not have been able to establish his definition if he had not had the accounting practices of his time as a reference point.

Translating the concept of Marxian capital into accounting terms, we have a capital with the value of the balance sheet total (assuming a simplified business form, with no debts). In the liabilities, we shall see that it comprises the initial capital plus the business's successive profits, as  $\Delta M$  is added to the initial M. But in fact this entry is an abstraction, because apart from the time of the first investment, capital is sometimes money and sometimes merchandise, constantly transforming, always caught up in circulation: the balance sheet assets tell us so. This means the transition from M to M' only becomes clear from comparison between two balance sheets. The surplus value never comes back materially to the form  $\Delta M$ , which can only be the result of calculating the difference between M and M': as Marx explains, *"at the end of the process, we do not receive on one hand the original £100,*

---

<sup>18</sup> *"It is only in so far as the appropriation of ever more wealth in the abstract is the sole driving force behind his operations that he functions as a capitalist"*(Marx, 1990, p. 254)

<sup>19</sup> *"The ceaseless augmentation of value, which the miser seeks to attain by saving his money from circulation, is achieved by the more acute capitalist by means of throwing his money again and again into circulation"*. (Marx, 1990, p. 254-5)

<sup>20</sup> See note 4 above. Weber, in his *Economic History*, explains very clearly that the historical condition of the wage-earning class is absolutely necessary for the capital account to function as standard.

*and on the other the surplus-value of £10. What emerges is rather a value of £110.*"(p. 253). Marx's concept of capital is thus two-sided: on one side, circulation, with constantly changing forms as reflected in the assets, and on the other side, accumulation, which can only be seen in the liabilities and is an abstraction, because the materiality of capital is indicated in the assets. And yet this is the abstraction which makes the world go round.

### **2.3. Consequences for the concept of capitalism**

It is surely thoroughly unlikely that such a definition of capital, so appropriate to business accounting practices and summing up so perfectly the system of sources and applications evident in DEB, could have been arrived at without accounting knowledge. If this theory is correct, then the accounting practices of the time made a significant contribution to Marx's definition of capital, which itself determined Sombart's (and Weber's) definition of capitalism. The DEB system is then encapsulated in the very concept of capitalism, which could not have come into being without it. There is nothing surprising in the fact that Sombart should discover DEB's exceptional acquaintance with capitalism. Weber even later went so far as to define capitalism by the capital account, acknowledging the unbreakable link between capitalism and capital accounting.

The links between capitalism and accounting are thus perhaps more conceptual (since the first could only be born conceptually thanks to the second) than historical (in the sense that the first capitalists would have taken advantage of all the opportunities offered by DEB). This would make sense of the fact that in the historian's debate discussed in the first part of this article, the only period in which all the practical links between accounting and capitalism mentioned by Sombart are actually in existence is the *Hochkapitalismus* period, which begins in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and covers the whole of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This period also saw the birth of the political economy that was to influence Marx and the birth of Marx's thinking itself. At the time, accounting was one of the foundations for the emerging social sciences, helped economists to construct their analyses of the economy, and lit Marx's way in understanding the capitalist system; his analysis, reworked by Sombart, would later lead to the concept of capitalism. In the end, Sombart's fourth argument, concerning the creation of a system of concepts by accounting (see above), makes it possible to understand why the other four arguments only become irrefutable at a relatively late period.

This article now sets out at least to validate the idea that Marx had effective knowledge of accounting, and used it in his reasoning. The point of arrival i.e. his writings, are of course eloquent, but the fact is that he never once mentions accounting in Part II of Volume I of *Capital*, the part of his work we have been discussing.

### **2.4. Marx and accounting**

Marx said very little about accounting in his writings. Miller (2000) has identified a certain number of passages. In volume 1, for instance, there is the passage where Marx mocks political economists' enthusiasm for the Robinson Crusoe stories (Marx, 1990, p.169s). Robinson, of course, has a ledger and commences "*like a true-born Briton, to keep a set of books*". In volume 2 of *Capital*, Marx addresses the issue of the labour-time expended in bookkeeping. This expenditure is part of the "costs of circulation", i.e. it is not considered productive but makes capitalist circulation possible. Through accounting, "*the movement of production, especially of the production of surplus-value (...) is reflected symbolically in*



*imagination*<sup>21</sup>. But this does not mean Marx sees accounting as intrinsically capitalist. Accounting, he states, will be even more important in the collective production system<sup>22</sup>.

While these passages do not contradict the proposed theory, the fact remains that Marx does not indicate any in-depth knowledge of bookkeeping or accounting in them. Proof will have to be sought elsewhere. As Marx did not study business, and had no experience of trade, he can only have had his accounting knowledge second-hand. Friedrich Engels played a decisive role in this respect.

Engels, born in 1820, was, as we know, the son of a textile manufacturer who had founded a cotton mill in Manchester then in Barmen, Germany<sup>23</sup>. His youth was as different as possible from that of Marx. Whereas Marx had hardly glimpsed modern industry, Engels had grown up among factories surrounded by desperate poverty. His father, who wanted him to go into business, took him out of school before he had completed his formal education. First he gave him a job in his own factory, then sent him to Bremen to gain more experience in an import-export company. While there, Engels was gradually converted to radical thinking. When he came to Berlin in 1841 to do his military service, he was already a member of the Hegelian far left and began to publish pamphlets. On his return to Barmen, there was a sort of family meeting, and it was decided to send him away from the liberal atmosphere of Germany to the Manchester factory, where he could learn to be a "good tradesman". If he refused, he would be cut off without a penny. So he left for Manchester in the autumn of 1842. He decided to travel via Cologne to meet the editors of the *Rheinische Zeitung* directed by Marx. This was their first meeting, and it was not a success. Marx was on the point of breaking his association with the "young Hegelians" and saw Engels as one of their allies. Nevertheless, they agreed that Engels could work on the magazine and contribute articles, which he did as soon as he arrived in England. Compared to Marx, Engels had the advantage of being able to study economic reality from the inside, living as he did actually in the environment. He spent two years in Manchester. His *Outline of a Political Economy*<sup>24</sup>, later called a "brilliant sketch" by Marx, was published in 1844 and reveals the knowledge of political economy he had gained during this period. He was living in the heart of the English cotton industry, the most modern industry in the most developed industrial country in Europe. For months, he wandered through Manchester's working class slums, and was horrified by what he saw. His book *Condition of the Working Class in England*, written in the winter of 1844-45, is a searing indictment of the industrial capitalism of the time. In late August 1844, Engels stopped in Paris on the way home to Germany, and met Marx for a second time. They spent 10 days together and noted their "complete agreement in all theoretical fields." This was the starting point for their work together; the meeting put the seal on a lifelong friendship.

In 1844, Engels was well ahead of Marx in analysis of economic phenomena. "*Engels gave Marx more than he received from him. Each, independently of the other, had arrived at Communism, both had seen in the working classes the sector of society that, both as a product and denial of private property, would abolish private property. But Engels had incomparably deeper knowledge of the bourgeois society's economy.*" (Nicolaiëvski and Maenchen-Helfen, 1970, p. 116). Marx had only just begun his own work on political economy (Aron, 2002, p.177) and his own knowledge was still limited. Later, he would have

---

<sup>21</sup> Quoted by Miller (2000, p. 9).

<sup>22</sup> "*Bookkeeping, as the control and ideal synthesis of the process, becomes the more necessary the more the process assumes a social scale and loses its purely individual character. It is therefore more necessary in capitalist production than in the scattered production of handicraft and peasant economy, more necessary in collective production than in capitalist production*" (quoted by Miller, 2000, p. 9). Lenin, once in power, developed this proposal further in practice, considering that accounting had an important role to play in establishing a transitional economy on the move towards socialism (Richard, 1980, vol. 2, p3).

<sup>23</sup> Biographical details are taken from Nicolaiëvski and Maenchen-Helfen (1970).

<sup>24</sup> "Umriss zu einer Kritik der Nationalökonomie", *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, Paris, issues I and II, 1844.

read everything, understood everything, criticized everything. No other economist, except Schumpeter in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, was to achieve this level of encyclopedic knowledge (ibid, p. 178). But at the time of his second meeting with Engels, it was Engels who had the advantage. In the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844, Marx quotes Engels' *Outline of a Political Economy* as a very precious basis for the work he is beginning. These manuscripts make interesting reading in pinpointing Marx's position in 1844: as regards the hypothesis under consideration, it is clear that the concept of capital is not at all clearly defined, as it would be in his major work. There is a short critique of the "classical" economists' view that capital is a production factor just like labour, and their implicit hypothesis that a clash between the two factors is a contingent possibility, independent of their nature. But we are still a long way from the accounting characteristics of capital that would be presented in 1867.

In Engels' 1844 text, however, capital is close to its accounting form and Marx explicitly acknowledges his debt to Engels on this matter, quoting the following extract from *Outline of a Political Economy* in chapter IV of *Capital*, already discussed above: "*Capital is divided (...) into the original capital and profit - the increment of capital (...) although in practice profit is immediately lumped together with capital and set into motion with it*" (Marx, 1990, note 5, p. 253, our emphasis). This passage is all the more remarkable in that it is one of the very rare references to Engels' work in *Capital*, and generally the quoted work is *Condition of the Working Class in England*. As Engels' text clearly indicates, his information derives from experience of actual practices. His concept is transformed by his knowledge of business<sup>25</sup>.

After his decisive meeting with Marx in 1844, Engels went back to Barmen, but had to leave the family home a year later when life with his family became impossible. He joined Marx, who had since become an exile in Brussels, in April 1845, and a period of intense revolutionary activities began, taking him among other places to Brussels, Paris, Germany, Switzerland, and London. In November 1850, Engels moved to Manchester and began to work for the family firm as an "ordinary clerk". He had decided to take up "repugnant business" mainly to provide financial support for Marx and his family, who had emigrated to London the same year. "*For 20 years, Engels did a job he hated and gave up all his own scientific work, so that Marx could fully devote himself to such work*" (Nicolaiëvski and Maenchen-Helfen, 1970, p. 275). To begin with, his salary was fairly low, and his position within the company only improved slowly, but he sent Marx as much money as he could. Engels became a part-owner in the business in 1864 (his father had died in 1860) and was thus able to increase his financial support. He continued to work at the factory until 1869, when he stopped working to devote his time to his political and intellectual pursuits. Once he had sold his share in the business, he paid an annuity to Marx, thus freeing him from all financial worries. Engels moved to London, not far from Marx's home, the following year.

These brief biographical details are a reminder that Engels had personal experience not only of the horror of the working class slums, but also of capitalists' thinking processes. He was initiated into these from childhood, and worked more than 20 years of his life in trade and industry. He not only had more advanced knowledge than Marx of theoretical economics at the time of their second meeting; throughout their friendship, he constantly supplied him with a multitude of details on actual business practices, particularly the subject of interest here, accounting practices.

---

<sup>25</sup> This is an important point, because according to Deschepper (1964), the idea that the gain increases the capital and itself becomes capital is already contained in the 1727 business dictionary, *Dictionnaire de commerce* by Savary des Bruslons (p.79), and in the *Encyclopedie* in 1751 (p. 105). Marx could therefore have found a similar idea from a source other than Engels. Admittedly, Savary's *Dictionnaire* is a business work, not a work on political economy.

Proof of this is found in the correspondence between the two men. This article refers to the selection of letters put together by Gilbert Badia under the title *Lettres sur "Le Capital"* (Marx and Engels 1964), containing 234 letters or extracts from letters by Marx and Engels, organized around the central theme of economic problems (Badia, 1964). The first dates from 1845 and the last from 1895, just before Engels' death. The extracts quoted in this article are eloquent enough, but more in-depth work is needed on the complete correspondence.

Marx's interest in accounting practices and businessmen's calculation methods is clear throughout the correspondence. In a letter to Engels dated March 4, 1858, he asks:

*"how do you calculate capital turnover **in your books**? The theoretical laws on the matter are simple and self-evident<sup>26</sup> but it is still good to have some idea of **how things are presented in practice**"* (Marx and Engels, 1964, p. 90, our emphasis).

Marx also asked Engels many times about depreciation; this was a difficult concept for him and he often raised the question. In his letter of March 2, 1858, he needed *"to explain the cycle of several years the industrial movement has been covering since major industry became dominant"* (Letter of March 2, 1858). Engels replied on March 4, providing percentage depreciation rates and various calculations, together with information on the real degree of wear and tear on machines, which differed from the depreciation recognized for accounting purposes. He confirms what Marx thought: based on this information, Babbage is wrong. One of Marx's methods, clearly visible in these passages, is to test economists' theories against what happens in practice. He asks Engels for figures and explanations concerning actual practices, thus "trying out" what he is reading.

Marx returns to the question of depreciation in a letter dated August 20, 1862. This time he is concerned by the fund formed over the years by the accumulation of annual depreciation charges: *"is this not rather an accumulation fund, to be used to extend production? (...) Does not the existence of this accumulation partly explain the very different rates at which capital accumulates in nations (...)?"* Engels replies on September 9: *"I firmly believe you are on the wrong track."*

On August 24, 1867, Marx raises the issue again. His question is intermingled with considerations on the deeply false reasoning McCulloch seems to follow. He wants to know what really happens in practice, so he can reach a final opinion:

*"You, as a manufacturer, must know what you do with the returns [depreciation costs] related to fixed capital before the time it has to be replaced in natura. You must answer me on this matter (not in theory but from a **purely practical point of view**)"* (Marx and Engels, 1964, p. 175, our emphasis).

Engels sent him several pages of tables and calculations on August 27, with figures for various possible scenarios.

But the accounting practice of depreciation remained an impenetrable concept for Marx. Above all, he found it difficult to understand what it was hiding. Marx believed that businessmen were blinded to the fundamental logic of the system they belonged to. They thought that profit was legitimate, whereas in fact it was work for which the workers had not been paid. The way they reasoned (and more specifically, counted) blinded them to this fact. As he neatly puts it in his letter dated March 8, 1858, already quoted above: *"The tradesmen's calculation method is naturally based on illusions that are partly even greater than those of the economists; but it corrects the theoretical illusions with practical illusions."* Marx used practical examples to criticize political economics, but did not believe that practice was telling him the whole truth. He analysed it later in the light of his most deeply-held convictions: profit is illegitimate, the class struggle is inherent to the economic system, the appropriation of production resources by capitalists and the existence of a working class are the underlying roots of the system and worker exploitation, and workers paid a subsistence

---

<sup>26</sup> In English in his letter.

salary are the true face of capitalism. These convictions were firmly established very early on, and he spent his life trying to demonstrate them scientifically.

Marx not only needed to understand practices in order to test the theories he read and those he constructed, he constantly set out to illustrate his discourse with realistic figures. For example, in a letter dated May 7, 1868, he explains to Engels that he would like to use the data he has concerning his factory. These figures are sufficient to illustrate the surplus value rate, but he needs further data for the profit rate. He wants to know the amount of capital advanced for the buildings, the way the turnover of circulating capital is calculated, and the amount of circulating capital advanced. On May 10, Engels replies that he does not understand the question on the turnover of circulating capital. Furthermore, the figures Marx has do not concern Engels' factory. And Engels cannot give him more details because the owner's sons have been forbidden to give him any further information. There is one possibility, contacting H.E., but Engels warns: "*But I am afraid that Monsieur Gottfried [the owner] may have locked away his old **accounting books** a long time ago, and in that case H.E. cannot be any help to you either.*"

From a very early period, Marx was able to view matters from an accounting perspective. The language of accounting was not unknown to him, and he used it in his arguments. One particularly clear example of this capacity is contained in his letter to Engels of February 3, 1851. At that time he was interested in currency and the theory put forward by the banker and economist Lord Overstone, who published a theory on currency circulation. In order to explain this theory to Engels and criticize it, he takes an example with figures, successively constructing four balance sheets for the Bank of England, starting with an opening balance sheet and going on to propose three different closing balance sheets, one for each of his hypotheses. The balance sheets are presented in two columns. The left-hand column includes "Capital", "Reserves" and "Deposits": the liabilities. The right-hand column includes "Government securities", "Bills of exchange" and "Bullion or coin": the assets.

Regarding the capital account itself, a letter from Engels dated April 3, 1851, provides accounting explanations on the separation of the company from its ownership, in response to a question from Marx which is not included in the volume of correspondence referred to. Nevertheless, the solution is expressed directly in accounting language, which Marx must understand. "*The tradesman as a firm, i.e. the person who makes the profit and the same tradesman as a consumer are, in commerce, quite different persons, in fact two enemies. The tradesman as a firm has a name: the capital account, or profit and loss account. The tradesman who eats, drinks, pays rent and has children is called the household expenses account. The capital item debits from the household expenses account every centime that passes from the commercial pocket to the private pocket...*" (a further page of explanations and references to debit and credit entries follows). The economic actors are personified by the accounts, and the capitalist is the capital account personified. There could be no better extract to support our hypothesis.

The contribution of accounting to Marx's thinking is multifaceted and affects many points of his theory. Accounting is always seen in the form of DEB, as shown by the fictitious Bank of England balance sheets, the problems regarding depreciation, which can only be considered this way in a DEB system, or the references to debit and credit entries in the above extract. DEB may even have contributed something extra to Marx: his understanding of the overall economic circuit. The basis used by Marx in developing his own theory was the *Tableau Economique* by Dr François Quesnay, who himself is thought to have been inspired by accounting (Klamer and McCloskey, 1992). And Marx, in reworking this idea, apparently needed accounting information:

"A propos! *If it can be done very briefly, without giving you too much trouble, I would like to have an example of Italian bookkeeping with explanations. This would help to throw light on Dr Quesnay's Tableau Economique...*" (letter of June 18, 1862).

Marx sought to define the specific characteristics of capitalism, and show that the system was born of the previous system and evolved according to certain laws. Intellectually, he had to recreate an interrelated system and its dynamics. For this systemic understanding, the representation in accounting terms of circulation and accumulation played a central role, producing the analogy through which the system could be described.

For mid-19<sup>th</sup> century observer such as Marx, the language talked by accounting was similar to that of political economy, a field in which he read all that was published. Capital, profits, and wages were concepts common to accounting and the political economy of his time<sup>27</sup> (personally, although the matter is outside the scope of this article, I believe that economics generally took these terms from accounting), if not always identical. Marx would choose the closest economic concepts possible to accounting.

The accounting Marx knows about is the practices of Manchester manufacturers, who were at the cutting edge of their time in accounting as much as in capitalism. DEB was the dominant system. Annual closings and balance sheets were standard. Winjum's system 4 was in full speed operation.

More in-depth study of the Marx-Engels correspondence would be necessary to examine how a particular aspect of the Marxian system benefited from the practical and accounting information provided by Engels. It would seem clear enough that Engels' position in business and his intimate, practical acquaintance with the system Marx theorized played a central role that has often been overlooked in Marxology. The traditional approach is to concentrate on Hegel's influence on Marx's conception of history, or Ricardo's on his economics. But Marx also looked to actual trading practices and accounting techniques, as the extracts above have shown.

In view of the eminent position occupied by the concept of capitalism in both past and present intellectual and political debates and current analyses of economic modernity, the fascinating role played by accounting craft in the birth of this concept certainly merits attention.

## **Conclusion**

This article has aimed to offer a new interpretation of the relationship between accounting and capitalism. Its purpose was not to seek links between DEB and capitalism at its origins as predecessors have, but to find them within the concept of capitalism itself. This is exactly what Weber's definition of capitalism says, in defining capitalism by the capital account (see above). For Weber, all the other circumstances required historically by capitalism follow on from the existence of the capital account as a standard for economic activity. But he never really explains the bond between this capital account and the other requirements, and so most commentators have not seen how central the accounting concept is in the Weberian definition of capitalism. It is generally reduced to one aspect among several, a correlate of rationalization in application, rather than the actual principle of this rationalization. Most writers instead stress the importance for Weber of "rational organization of free labour" as a central factor of capitalism.

To understand this core role of the capital account in Weber's thinking (and Sombart's), and particularly its links with other basic elements of capitalism, we have to go back to Marx. Without Marx, the links remain implicit and it is not clear how the "capital account as standard" can require a wage-earning class, for example. The capitalist system described by Marx is more or less the same as capitalism according to Sombart or Weber, at least when

---

<sup>27</sup> With the marginalist revolution, economic concepts gradually begin to diverge from accounting concepts, until they no longer have anything in common (see e.g. the early 20<sup>th</sup> century definitions of Capital and Income provided in the work of Irving Fisher).

they produce a criterial definition. The irony of history is that Marx does not use the word "capitalism" and never or hardly mentions accounting, unlike Sombart or Weber. And yet Marx certainly knew more about the accounting practices of his time than the two German sociologists who were to follow him.

The question remains why Marx does not mention accounting in his writings although he talks about it in his correspondence with Engels, and why, when we know he likes to illustrate all his points, he does not use accounting examples as illustrations. Several hypotheses are possible.

The first is that Marx wanted to criticize traditional political economy by turning its own concepts against it. He therefore remained in the economic debating mode adopted by the objects of his criticism, even though he was constantly using accounting to grasp meaning. Although he was firmly convinced that capitalist accounts which present profits and hide surplus value are biased and give a false representation that is misleading even for capitalists themselves, he never attempted to show that accounting textbooks provided a poor representation of business. That was a task the Marxists were to throw themselves into later, when they sought to construct accounting kept in terms of work-value rather than exchange-value.

The second possibility relates to what has just been said: accounting is the language of capitalists, and as such this language is as suspect as the language of traditional political economy. It is a jumbled collection of false representations originating in the bourgeois conscience. Marx therefore used one biased conscience (accounting and business practices) to fight another (political economy) and form his own view. He was not about to give it the satisfaction of being taken into consideration in his demonstration. The empirical data he used to support his demonstration were economic statistics, data from surveys, investigations into the miserable conditions in the workers' slums, and occasionally data directly taken from the capitalists themselves. It is true Marx twice quotes Courcelle-Seneuil's "business manual" in Volume 1 of *Capital*, but that is the only reference to practical literature observed<sup>28</sup>. Althusser (1969), in his preface to Volume 1 of *Capital*, explained that "*those with no direct experience of capitalist exploitation*" and "*who are dominated in their practices and conscience by the ideology of the dominant class, the bourgeois ideology (...) find it extremely difficult to understand Capital (even if they are "very learned", in fact I would say, especially if they are "very learned"), because there is political incompatibility between the theoretical content of Capital and the ideas they have in their heads, ideas they see (since they put them there) in their practices.*" (p.9) Accounting, being the very form of the bourgeois capitalist conscience, could not have been used to construct a demonstration. In particular, by granting legitimacy to balance sheet representations, which correspond almost totally to his concept of capital, Marx would have run the risk of legitimizing the profit and loss statement, which reduces labour to a cost, brushing aside its value-creating capacity and implying that it is merely one ingredient of production, just another item to be consumed.

The third hypothesis is that Marx wanted his book to be accessible to readers with no knowledge of DEB. No specific familiarity with accounting is necessary to read his books, and indeed they have been read by generations of workers and communist militants, who would have found it a problem if their master spoke the accounting language used by the owners and managers.

Further investigations will perhaps solve this riddle.

Highlighting the conceptual links between accounting and the concept of capitalism, as it originated almost directly from Marx's theories, opens new horizons concerning the contribution of accounting concepts to the production of economic concepts. What of the

---

<sup>28</sup> In the following extracts: "*It is the aim of the capitalist to obtain with his expanded capital, the greatest possible quantity of labour*" (note 3, Marx, 1990, p. 342) and "*conservation of capital requires a constant effort to resist the temptation of consuming it*" (*ibid*, p. 745). While Marx bases his demonstration on the first extract, he scoffs at the second with its "*self-chastisement of this modern penitent of Vishnu, the capitalist*".

concept of capital before Marx? Hicks (1974) is surely right that the classical economists studied by Marx had already taken their concept of capital from accounting ("*It came from outside - from business practice, from accounting practice*" (p. 310)), even though they had not used all the information available from a balance sheet to construct it in both abstract and circulating form, as Marx would. The same is true of the concepts of profit and income, which need further examination from this perspective. The influence of theoretical economics on accounting has been noted several times (cf Hopwood, 1992), and is visible in all the work on what has been called "normative accounting" (after the arrival of the positive theory of accounting). But the reverse influence is still largely unexplored. Yet few economists have actually ignored the accounting question. It is only since the end of the major national accounting projects of the 1960s and the belated supremacy of neo-classical marginalist economics from the 1970s (almost a century after the initial foundations were laid) that pure economics has ignored the issue of accounting measurements and worked with largely irreconcilable concepts. It was precisely this breakdown in relations between the two traditions of accounting theory and economic theory, despite their constant dialogue from the origins of political economy until the work of Hicks, that a few years later enabled conceptualizations from a branch of economics as far removed as possible from accounting to invade the field of accounts in the form of positive accounting theory, holding up for ridicule its metrological approach to economic activities. Since the concepts used in pure economics are broadly based on anticipations, and are thus unmeasurable in accounting terms, accounting is reduced to being seen as a plaything at the mercy of the interests of the actors, devoid of any metrological substance, manipulated by corporate management to optimize their own remuneration or in order to avoid taxes. This is a sad outcome for the long historical relationship between economics and accounting, considering that two centuries earlier accounting was helping the economists forge concepts for understanding economic life.

## References

(Backhaus 1898; Sombart 1916; Parsons 1928; Sombart 1930; Yamey 1949; Deschepper 1964; Marx and Engels 1964; Yamey 1964; Althusser 1969; Nicolaïevski and Maenchen-Helfen 1970; Weber 1971; Winjum 1971; Hicks 1974; Braudel 1979; Richard 1980; Weber 1985; Marx 1990; Carruthers and Espeland 1991; Weber 1991; Hopwood 1992; Lemarchand 1992; Sombart 1992; Lemarchand 1993; Lemarchand 1994; Bryer 2000; Bryer 2000; Miller 2000; Stehr and Grundmann 2001; Aron 2002)

Althusser, L. (1969). Avertissement aux lecteurs du livre I du Capital. Karl Marx, Le capital. Paris, Flammarion. **1**: 7-30.

Aron, R. (2002). Le marxisme de Marx. Paris, Editions de Fallois.

Backhaus, J. (1898). "Sombart's Modern capitalism." Kyklos **42**: 599-611.

Braudel, F. (1979). Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIIe. Paris, Armand Colin.

Bryer, R. A. (2000). "The history of accounting and the transition to capitalism in England. Part One: Theory." Accounting, Organizations and Society **25**: 131-162.

Bryer, R. A. (2000). "The history of accounting and the transition to capitalism in England. Part two: Evidence." Accounting, Organizations and Society **25**: 327-381.

Carruthers, B. G. and W. N. Espeland (1991). "Accounting for Rationality: Double-entry bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality." American Journal of Sociology **97**(1): 31-69.

Deschepper, E. (1964). L'histoire du mot capital et de ses dérivés. Philologie Romane, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres. Bruxelles, Université Libre de Bruxelles: 171.

Funell, W. (2001). "Distorsions of History, Accounting and the Paradox of Werner Sombart." Abacus **37**(1): 55-78.

Hicks, J. (1974). "Capital Controversies: Ancient and Modern." The American Economic Review **64**(2): 307-316.

- Hopwood, A. (1992). "Accounting calculation and the shifting sphere of the economics." European Accounting Review: 125-143.
- Lemarchand, Y. (1992). "Position critique." Cahiers d'histoire de la comptabilité, Editions Ordre des experts comptables et Editions comptables Malesherbes(2): 37-56.
- Lemarchand, Y. (1993). Du dépérissement à l'amortissement. Enquête sur l'histoire d'un concept et de sa traduction comptable. Nantes, France, Ouest Editions.
- Lemarchand, Y. (1994). "Double-entry versus charge and discharge accounting in eighteenth-century France." Accounting, Business and Financial History 4(1): 119-145.
- Marx, K. (1990). Capital. Volume 1. A critique of Political Economy. London, Penguin Classics, New Left review.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels (1964). Lettres sur "Le Capital". Paris, Editions Sociales.
- Miller, P. (2000). How and Why sociology forgot accounting. *Accounting Organizations and Society* 25th anniversary Conference, Oxford, Great Britain.
- Nicolaïevski, B. and O. Maenchen-Helfen (1970). La vie de Karl Marx. L'homme et le lutteur. Paris, Gallimard.
- Parsons, T. (1928). "'Capitalism" in recent German Literature: Sombart and Weber." The Journal of Political Economy 36(6): 641-661.
- Richard, J. (1980). Comptabilité et systèmes économiques. Paris, Paris I- Pantheon Sorbonne: 4 volumes.
- Sombart, W. (1916). Der Modern Kapitalismus. München, Leipzig, Duncker and Humbolt.
- Sombart, W. (1930). Capitalism. Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. E. R. Seligman and A. Johnson. New York, The Macmillan Company. 3: 195-208.
- Sombart, W. (1992). "Traduction de Tome 2, Livre 1, 2eme section: les systèmes économiques, 10e chapitre: les entreprises capitalistes, paragraphe III : " L'entreprise comme une unité comptable ", 110-125, de Der moderne Kapitalismus (1916)." Cahiers d'histoire de la comptabilité, Editions Ordre des experts comptables et Editions comptables Malesherbes(2).
- Stehr, N. and R. Grundmann (2001). Introduction. Werner Sombart. Economic life in the Modern Age. N. Stehr and R. Grundmann. New Brunswick and London, Transaction Publishers: ix-lxii.
- Weber, M. (1971). Economie et société, 1ère partie. Paris, Plon.
- Weber, M. (1985). L'éthique protestante et l'esprit du capitalisme. Paris, Plon, 1964, 2eme édition corrigée 1967  
Pocket coll. Agora, 1985.
- Weber, M. (1991). Histoire économique. Esquisse d'une histoire universelle de l'économie et de la société. Paris, Gallimard.
- Winjum, J. O. (1971). "Accounting and the rise of capitalism: an accountant's view." Journal of Accounting Research: 333-350.
- Yamey, B. S. (1949). "Scientific Bookkeeping and the Rise of Capitalism." The Economic History Review 1(2-3).
- Yamey, B. S. (1964). "Accounting and the rise of capitalism: further notes of a theme by Sombart." Journal of Accounting Research 2(2): 117-136.