

Historical Trajectory of the Development of the Concept of Civil Society in Europe: From Aristotle to Gramsci

Tanvir Anjum*

Abstract

The term civil society has become a part of the contemporary political lexicon. Despite its popularity in the contemporary development discourse, it is a polysemous concept, which has been given different meanings in varied historical-temporal contexts in Europe by thinkers and theorists having diverse theoretical positions. That is why the concept is characterized by much theoretical ambiguity and conceptual complexity. The present article intends to explore the development of the concept of civil society in Europe through the ages in a historical perspective since it is a historically-embedded concept. Civil society was understood as a political community by Aristotle, as a sphere of absolute sovereignty or state in contrast to the state of nature by Hobbes and Locke, as a critique to absolutism or monarchy by Montesquieu and Kant, as a self-regulatory and self-governing society in opposition the state by Ferguson, as a realm of economic relations by Smith, as a legal sphere of the state by Hegel, as an economic structure in a polity by Marx, as a realm of secondary institutions and intermediary organizations by de Tocqueville, and as a domain of voluntary associations counterpoint to the state by Gramsci. This paper is an attempt to briefly investigate and examine the contributions of the above-mentioned political thinkers and theorists in the conceptual development of the idea of civil society.

Key-words: Civil society, state, economy, European history, European political thought/philosophy

In the contemporary development discourse, the concept of civil society has become a catch-phrase and a part of the contemporary political lexicon. Despite its popularity, the concept is much debated and contested by

* Author is Assistant Professor, Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad - Pakistan

activists and development practitioners as well as scholars and academicians. It is a polysemous concept, since there are multiple and often conflicting understandings of civil society, especially in relation to the state. It is a historically-embedded, which has been given different meanings in varied historical-temporal contexts in Europe by thinkers and theorists having diverse theoretical positions. Therefore, it is characterized by much theoretical ambiguity and conceptual complexity.

The development of the concept over centuries reveals that there is little common in various definitions and understandings of the concept of civil society. The contested understandings of the concept betray the meanings the concept has acquired over time reflecting quite different connotations in different theoretical traditions and historical contexts. For instance, in the liberal Western intellectual tradition, the history of the concept of civil society has been intertwined with concepts such as market economy, citizenship, sociability, liberalism, civility, social cohesion, etc., while in the Anglo-Scottish and French idioms, the term civil society was seen as the opposite of despotism and barbarism, whereas in the German tradition, it has been conceived as opposed to community or the state.¹ For this reason, pointing out the 'inflation' in the use of the term, Seligman remarks that the concept has been used in every context imaginable and imbued with as many meanings as their authors.² The present article intends to explore the development of the concept of civil society in Europe through the ages in a historical perspective.

1. Civil Society or *koinonia politikè* as Political Community

The origin of the concept of civil society is generally traced from the Greek concept of *koinonia politikè* (political community) employed by Aristotle (384-322 BC), who identified it with the existence of different social spheres in which people having different status live. However, according to some scholars of civil society, Aristotle's *koinonia politikè* did not imply civil society in any modern sense.³ According to Dominique Colas, the term 'civil society' is only remotely related to Aristotle's concept *koinonia politikè*.⁴ In the opinion of Govert J. Buijs, Aristotle's *koinonia politikè* or political community carries connotations which are quite different from the contemporary conception of politics. The *koinonia politikè* refers to a sphere in which it is possible for man to achieve his full moral status, which is the goal of his life (*telos*). It was only in the public life of the *polis* that man became man. So for the Greeks, *civil society* was coextensive with the *polis* as a moral community.⁵

Cicero (106-43 BC) defines civil society or the commonwealth as ‘an assemblage (of men) associated by a common acknowledgment of right and by a community of interests.’⁶ It includes groups, institutions and individuals who organize their activities in such a way as to create a balance among them. In other words, it refers to a civilized political community.⁷ During the Renaissance, Florentine humanist Leonardo Bruni translated Aristotle’s *koinonia politikè* as *societas civilis* in Latin. Later, the German reformer, Melanchton, who produced a Latin commentary on Aristotle’s *Politics*, used the term *societas civilis*, which suggests the rebirth of the ancient Greek political concept.⁸ The term *societas civilis* was later translated in English as civil society. Later, in the last decade of the sixteenth century, the term civil society was revived as an English phrase, and it referred to people living in a community.⁹

2. Civil Society as a Sphere of Absolute Sovereignty or State in Contrast to the State of Nature

In the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe, when many unitary states with extensive control over definite territories emerged, and consequently replaced the fragmented system of feudal rule, civil society was understood as the sphere of absolute sovereignty or the state. At that time, political or civil society was no longer understood in terms of a politically constituted community. Seventeenth-century English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1674) posited the concept of civil society in his two works *De Cive* (1651) and *Leviathan* (1660). He lived at the time of the English Civil War (1642-51). He perceived civil society as an alternative to kingdom and Church. He made the important theoretical distinction between public and private. For him, civil society was a sphere of collective public life as well as of self-interest. Thus he recognized a sphere of self-interested activity with which the state should not interfere. Hobbes’s civil society is politically organized, i.e. constituted and held together by state power. It was the sovereign power that coercively organizes civil society as an alternative to the state of nature. Civil society cannot exist in the absence of state power. Rather, it cannot be formally distinguished from the state. It is the commonwealth, a fusion of state and society, which is represented by the sovereign’s will. Thus, for Hobbes, there was no significant distinction between the state and society.¹⁰

Another seventeenth-century English philosopher John Locke (1632-1704) contributed to the debate on civil society through his work *Two Treatises of Government* (1689). He saw civil society as an alternative to the state of nature, which is a synonym of anarchy. For him, civil society is a legitimate political order, and the historical remedy for the inconveniences of the state of nature, in particular the individual physical vulnerability to external

violence. He viewed the absolutist monarchies, particularly the French monarchy, as a continuation of the state of nature.¹¹ What is important to note is that he saw civil society less in relation to the market but more in political terms. However, Locke made no distinction between civil society and political society. In other words, he equated civil society with the state.

3. Civil Society as a Critique to Absolutism

Civil society as a relatively systematic concept started taking a definite shape later in the eighteenth century. The term had a positive connotation in the Enlightenment era as it stood for a utopian conception of a society in which there was peace, freedom, tolerance and no repression by authoritarian and absolutist state. The idea was, in fact, an “anti-absolutist, anti-corporative ‘plan’ for future society, culture and politics” which was “critical of tradition, utopian and way ahead of its time.”¹² The concept emerged as a critique to the political realities of the age of absolutism, particularly in the works of Montesquieu and Kant, and therefore, had an anti-absolutist thrust.

Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755), who was a vehement critic of despotism, in particular of the eighteenth-century French *ancien régime*, perceived *l'état civil* ('civil state' or civil society) as a site for negotiation of the absolute power of the monarch. However, his civil society was not a domain separate from the monarchy.¹³ In fact, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries or the Enlightenment era in Europe witnessed the emergence of modern state system with highly centralized and increasingly bureaucratic forms of absolute monarchical rule. Therefore, the concept of civil society emerged as a critique to absolutism or monarchy.

The notion of *bürgerliche Gesellschaft* or civil society in the works of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is understood as an arena restraining the absolute power of the ruler. He saw civil society as an arena beyond the political order, or an organized society outside the state, which was meant to check and contain the absolute power of the monarch.¹⁴ In short, in this era, civil society stood for a utopian conception of a society in which there was peace, freedom, tolerance, and hence, no repression by authoritarian and absolutist state. In fact, Kant tried to bridge the gap between the old classical conception of civil society and its newly emerging concept. He attempted to solve the problems inherent in the old concept by redefining it.¹⁵

Further historical evolution of the concept of civil society may be sought in context of the socio-economic conditions in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe. The new emerging mercantilist and industrial societies in

Europe led the classical thinkers to search for a new theory of society, which could adequately explain their contemporary developments. European thinkers during the two centuries came across a set of problems regarding the relationship of an individual to a social whole. The crux of the matter was to find a balance between mutually antagonistic self-seeking individuals and the concern for public good and interests. To put it more explicitly, the problem was to make an individual's free pursuit of his selfish interests compatible to the collective interests of a community without encroaching upon his freedom.¹⁶ This problem remained the central theme of European political thought for a long time.

The classical theorists of the French, Scottish and German Enlightenment attempted to resolve the dichotomy. To them, answer to the problem could be found in the idea of civil society but the civil society was differently conceived and explained by different theorists. However, one common theme running through all versions of the idea of civil society was the concept of an arena where an individual satisfied his wants and caprices and fulfilled his interests.¹⁷ The Scottish Enlightenment thinkers like Adam Ferguson (1723-1816) and Adam Smith (1723-1790) greatly contributed to the concept of civil society.

4. Civil Society as a Self-regulatory Society in Opposition the State

When the latter part of the eighteenth century witnessed the mushroom growth of voluntary organizations, self-help groups and charitable societies in Europe, particularly in Britain, a new understanding of civil society was developed: British thinker Adam Ferguson (1723-1816) elaborated it in his work *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767).¹⁸ He conceived of civil society as an autonomous sphere, a self-regulatory and self-governing society in opposition to the state.¹⁹ According to this new understanding of civil society, it was a site of self-regulation, as a self-regulatory and self-governing society in opposition to the regulatory, political domain of the state. He conceived of civil society as networks of self-governing and self-regulating voluntary associations which help increase civility. To him, these voluntary associations could play a crucial role in enhancing civility—the basis of social cohesion. These voluntary associations function beyond the interests of the state and commercial enterprise. He saw it as a protective shield from the uncertainties of social and political life. His theories talk about civil society as an autonomous sphere separate from the state, though not in opposition to the state. He, nonetheless, envisaged dependence of civil society on the state. Moreover, he did not offer a compact definition of the term and the categories of civil and non-civil were blurred in his description.²⁰

On civil society, the ideas of David Hume (1711-1776) were almost similar to those of Ferguson. He did not make a systematic use of the term civil society in his works.

5. Civil Society as a Realm of Economic Relations

Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe witnessed the emergence and development of capitalism and market economy. The understandings of civil society that developed in context of the socio-economic changes brought about by the rise and growth of capitalism and industrialization stressed the significance of economy. Therefore, many political economists of the era conceived of civil society in economic terms, and civil society was considered to have been created by groups having economic or commercial interests.

One of them was Adam Smith (1723-1790), a Scottish Enlightenment thinker, who elaborated the concept in his monumental work *The Wealth of Nations* (1776). In the opinion of Ehrenberg, he is credited with articulating for the first time 'a specifically bourgeois conception of civil society'.²¹ According to him, civil society was a realm where economic relations and social transactions take place. He viewed civil society as a market-organized network of mutual dependence and reciprocal relationships. He perceived these relations and transactions as important as political institutions.²² For him civil society was comprised of self-regulating and interdependent market-organized networks of economic relations among individuals and groups. He stressed the development of a market economy as the basis for civil society, which he also calls 'civilized society'.

For Smith, civil society was a sphere of economic activities, separate from the state and governed by its own laws. It was a self-correcting sphere, and so the state did not need to interfere with it.²³ In this way, he linked the concept of civil society to capitalism and market economy. He conceived the concept more in economic terms than political. Like David Hume, however, Smith also did not make a systematic use of the term civil society.

English utilitarian Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and German social economist Lorenz von Stein (1815-1890) equated civil society with the market economy. However, Bentham avoided the usage of the term civil society and instead preferred to use the term 'political society'.²⁴ Nonetheless, Bentham and Stein did not elaborate on the concept of civil society. It is interesting to note that all pre-Hegelian understandings of civil society generally represented its positive images. However, during the last decade of the eighteenth century, when struggles against the absolutist

regimes began, the term civil society came to be equated with bourgeois society which manifested extremes of wealth and poverty. Thus the concept acquired a negative connotation in addition to the positive one.

6. Civil Society as a Legal Sphere of the State

German Enlightenment thinker G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) is regarded as one of the notable and most influential thinkers on the subject of individual freedom on the one hand and state restrictions on the other. The debate on civil society is to be found in the second section of his work *The Philosophy of Right*, published from Berlin in 1821.²⁵ Hegel defined civil society as a 'sphere of interests existing outside the state [where]...individuals pursue their self-interests often without regard for obligations and duties that are considered essential for protecting the rights that all members are to be accorded.'²⁶

According to Hegel, "[t]he civic community is the realm of difference, intermediate between the family and the state.... It... must presuppose the state."²⁷ Moreover, the civil society or the 'civic community' contains three elements: (i) the system of wants; (ii) administration of justice; and (iii) police and corporations.²⁸ For Hegel, civil society or the *bürgerliche Gesellschaft* is a legal sphere to govern civil life, which include institutions that are higher than individual but lower than the state. So his concept of civil society entailed intermediate institutions between the familial and the political relations of the state. Hegel, in fact, defined the state in opposition to civil society. For him civil society was a sphere where individuals satisfy their selfish needs, but the sphere is essentially regulated by law. Thus, his conception of civil society was juridical-legal and political.

Nevertheless, for Hegel, civil society was also a sphere of ethics, differentiated both from family and the state, where societal ethics and individual morality can be reconciled. Moreover, he also elaborated on the role of civil society in the development of freedom, and argued that subjective freedom can flourish only in a civil society, where individuals achieve their social status through their choice, efforts and good fortune.²⁹

Hegel understood the concept of civil society as a legal sphere of the state. Legal institutions that administer the state and dispense justice constituted Hegel's civil society in the first place. Hegel also perceived civil society as an Ethical State consisting of institutions like hereditary monarchy, an executive protecting universal interests and a legislature representing several interest groups organized into corporations. In this state, the individual freedom would be guaranteed by voluntary organizations (such as corporations, guilds, interest groups, etc.) which would exert pressure on the executive in

order to work as a neutral body as between interest groups. In this way, the state, now including civil society, would exercise an internal check on the authority of government. In a nutshell, he included executive, bureaucracy, public authority, legislature, legal framework, state assemblies, corporations, voluntary organizations and public opinion in civil society, which exercise an internal check on the authority of government.³⁰ In this way, he included civil society in the state, though he drew a distinction between civil society and state at conceptual level. Thus, Hegel is credited with bifurcation of the concept of civil society and state at conceptual level, though, for him, both were inextricably linked together and were mutually interdependent. According to Pelczynski, the conceptual separation of state and civil society is one of the most original features of Hegelian philosophy.³¹

Hegel was mindful of the dangers of civil society. He perceived its destructive potential, and saw it as a site of conflict and oppression, as an arena of self-interest and divisiveness. For him, there is a need of the state to regulate society. Both the state and society depend upon each other, yet the relationship is conflictual, and needs to be balanced out.

He explained the concept more in political and legal connotations than economic. He used the concept of civil society as an analytical category to explain a sphere that is distinct from the state. Nonetheless, Hegel could not come up with a systematic theory of civil society.³²

Hegel attempted to resolve the private vs. public or selfhood vs. community dichotomy in his own way by incorporating the civil society in the state structure. He seemed to identify his Ethical State with the Prussian Monarchy of his time, and Karl Marx came out with critique of such Hegelian identification.

7. Civil Society as an Economic Structure in a Polity

Another German intellectual Karl Marx (1818-1882) was critical of the idea of civil society promoted by the bourgeois theorists. Therefore, he came out with the critique on the Hegelian idea of civil society, which, according to Marx, was understood by Hegel in a narrow sense. Marx critically reviewed the Hegelian views on it, and wrote *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* in response to Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*.

While criticizing Hegel in the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx wrote:

...[L]egal relations as well as forms of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum total of which Hegel, following the example of the Englishmen and Frenchmen of the eighteenth century, combines under the name of "civil society," that, however, the anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy.³³

According to Marx, it was not the state which conditions and regulates civil society, but civil society which conditions and regulates the state.³⁴
In the words of Engels:

"[T]he state—the political order—is the subordinate, and civil society—the realm of economic relations—the decisive element.... [T]he will of the state is determined by the changing needs of the civil society, by the supremacy of this or that class, in the last resort, by the development of the productive forces and relations of exchange."³⁵

Marx criticized Hegel for incorporating civil society institutions in the state. Marx viewed state institutions like executive or bureaucracy not as a mechanism for safeguarding individual interests but as an instrument for promoting the interests of the ruling classes. Marx equated civil society with bourgeois capitalistic society. While countering the Hegelian idea of civil society, Marx broadened it. To him the relations of production, and the division of society into the haves (possessing classes) and haves-not (non-possessing classes) were the defining characteristics of civil society.

Nonetheless, like Hegel, Marx also incorporated civil society into state arguing that such a social order would be achieved only in future with the establishment of a classless Communist society. Only there, he idealised, the true freedom would be achieved.³⁶ In this way, Marx identified the idea of civil society with the future reunification of civil society and state. According to this futuristic idea, civil society was equated with economic structure in a polity, and thus included it in infrastructure as opposed to the superstructure.³⁷ Thus, Marx reduced the concept to civil society to economic life.

8. Civil Society as a Realm of Secondary Institutions

Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) was a French sociologist and politician who visited America in 1831-32, and offered a contemporary analysis of American society. The mushroom growth of diverse voluntary civil

associations in American society greatly inspired him. Moreover, he was very critical of the centralized administrative state, and considered it a 'new despotism', and therefore, urged for placing checks on it. So he conceived of civil society as a realm of intermediary organizations and representative secondary institutions that exist between the individual and the state. His *société civile* or civil society was thus meant to contain the state, promote democratic equality, and check 'democratic despotism' and 'administrative despotism'. Moreover, his civil society was also meant to provide services which people expect from the state.³⁸

In the late nineteenth century, the idea of civil society disappeared from political and academic discourse, the only exception being Antonio Gramsci, who contributed to the idea in the 1930s and 1940s, but his work was later recovered by scholars in 1970s.

9. Civil Society as a Domain of Voluntary Associations Counterpoint to the State

The exponents of the current idea of civil society owe much to the thought of Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), a twentieth-century Italian thinker and political activist, who is considered to be a revisionist Marxist.³⁹ He re-theorized the Marxist-Hegelian understanding of civil society. For him, civil society is a domain of voluntary associations counterpoint to the state.⁴⁰ He defined it as a realm of the private citizen and individual consent, and placed civil society between the coercive relations of the state and the economic sphere of production. He viewed it as a sphere where the capitalist state establishes hegemony over society. It is a sphere where the hegemony of the ruling class and consent to its rule was negotiated. He relocated civil society at the level of the superstructure, along with the state, and he argued that civil society was the site for contest and conflict for establishing hegemony over society.

Contrary to Hegel and Marx, Gramsci differentiated civil society from both the state and economy. This distinction between state and civil society guided further theorists to explain civil society functioning outside the state apparatus. For him, civil society is a sphere of social life where individuals exercise their free will without any control of state.

Quite contrary to Marx, he did not include economy in civil society, and instead included churches, schools, trade unions and media in it.⁴¹ Moreover, unlike Marx who included civil society in the infrastructure or base of the society, Gramsci puts it in the superstructure.⁴² For Gramsci, civil society belongs to the superstructure as it comprises ideological/cultural

relations.⁴³ He also identified civil society with the 'ensemble' of voluntary associations, which would progressively take on state functions and gradually result in the withering away of the state, though he doubted the possibility of achieving a fully 'regulated society'.⁴⁴ After Gramsci, the concept went into background for sometime, and it resurfaced in 1970s and again in 1990s.

Concluding Remarks

The historical overview of the development of the concept of civil society reveals how the meaning of the term has changed over time, acquiring quite different connotations in different historical, spatial and temporal contexts. In fact, the meaning of the term civil society is embedded in historical developments taking place in Europe across centuries.

However, the concept acquired meanings which were quite often contested and conflicting. Therefore, different genealogies of meanings are still attached to the term civil society, and we have Lockean, Hegelian, Marxian, Tocquevillian and Gramscian understandings of civil society which have made it difficult to offer an authoritative definition of civil society in contemporary times.

Summing up the discussion, Sudipta Kaviraj, nonetheless, identifies three main meanings in which the concept of civil society has been used, and these three meanings are based on dichotomies, and are therefore understood in contrast to others. Civil society is "defined through its opposition to 'natural society' or '*state of nature*' in early modern contract theory (for instance, in Hobbes's and Locke's use); against the state in the entire liberal tradition, and contrasted to *community* (*Gemeinschaft*) in a theoretical tradition of modern sociology (particularly Tönnies)."⁴⁵

The historical trajectory of the development of the concept of civil society reveals how its meaning has changed over time acquiring quite different and even conflicting connotations in different theoretical traditions and historical contexts. The multiple understandings of the concept were embedded in the peculiar historical developments taking place in Europe across the centuries. At one point in time, civil society was equated with the state, while at the other, it was seen as opposed to the state; similarly at one point, it was equated with market economy, but later sharply distinguished from it. Thus different genealogies of the meanings of the notion of civil society partly explain why there is and has been theoretical ambiguity and complexity in its usage and application.

References

- ¹ Sunil Khilnani, 'The development of civil society', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds.), *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 17-18.
- ² Adam B. Seligman, 'Between Public and Private: Towards a Sociology of Civil Society', in Robert W. Hefner (ed.), *Democratic Civility: The History and Cross-Cultural Possibility of a Modern Political Ideal*, New Brunswick and London, Transaction Publishers, 1998, pp. 79-80.
- ³ See, for instance, Wayne Hudson, 'Problematizing European Theories of Civil Society', in David C. Schak and Wayne Hudson (eds.), *Civil Society in Asia*, Hampshire, Ashgate, 2003, p. 9.
- ⁴ Dominique Colas, *Civil Society and Fanaticism: Conjoined Histories*, Eng. trans. from French Amy Jacobs, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997, pp. 44-54.
- ⁵ Govert J. Buijs, 'Sources of Inspiration: Moral Frameworks Supporting the Emergence of a Civil Society', <http://www.istr.org/conferences/capetown/volume/buijs.pdf>
- ⁶ C. McLoy, 'St. Augustine', in Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey (eds.), *History of Political Philosophy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987, p. 181. The statement of Cicero has been approvingly quoted by St. Augustine.
- ⁷ H. Islamoglu, 'Civil Society, Concept and History of' in Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 3, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 2001, p. 1891.
- ⁸ For details, see Peter Hallberg and Björn Wittrock, 'From *koinonia politikè* to *societas civilis*: Birth, Disappearance and First Renaissance of the Concept' in Peter Wagner (ed.), *The Languages of Civil Society*, New York and Oxford, Berghahn Books, 2006, pp. 28-51.
- ⁹ For a brief overview of pre-modern concept of civil society, see Antony Black, 'Concepts of Civil Society in Pre-modern Europe' in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, pp. 33-38.
- ¹⁰ John Ehrenberg, *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea*, New York and London, New York University Press, 1999, pp. 70-75.
- ¹¹ John Dunn, 'The contemporary political significance of John Locke's conception of civil society', in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, pp. 51-52; for details, see pp. 39-57.
- ¹² Jürgen Kocka, 'Civil Society in Historical Perspective', in John Keane (ed.), *Civil Society: Berlin Perspectives*, New York, Berghahn Books, 2006, p. 38.
- ¹³ M. Richter, 'Montesquieu and the Concept of Civil Society', *The European Legacy*, Vol. 3, No. 66, 1998, pp. 33-41.

¹⁴ Manfred Reidel, 'Transcendental Politics: Political Legitimacy and the Concept of Civil Society in Kant' in Reiner Schürmann (ed.), *The Public Realm: Essays on Discursive Types in Political Philosophy*, New York, State University of New York at Albany, 1989, pp. 22-43.

¹⁵ Elisabeth Ellis, 'Immanuel Kant's Two Theories of Civil Society' in Frank Trentmann (ed.), *Paradoxes of Civil Society: New Perspectives on Modern German and British History*, New York, Berghahn Books, 2003, pp. 105-6; for details see pp. 105-31.

¹⁶ Adam B. Seligman, *The Idea of Civil Society*, New York, Free Press, 1992, p. 5.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Adam Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, Fania Oz-Salzberger (ed.), Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

¹⁹ John Varty, 'Civic or Commercial? Adam Ferguson's Concept of Civil Society', in Robert Fine and Shirin Rai (eds.), *Civil Society: Democratic Perspectives*, London and Portland, OR, Frank Cass, 1997, pp. 29-48.

²⁰ Fania Oz-Salzberger, 'Civil Society in the Scottish Enlightenment', in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, p. 60.

²¹ John Ehrenberg, *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea*, p. 96.

²² Fania Oz-Salzberger, 'Civil Society in the Scottish Enlightenment', in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, p. 58.

²³ For details, see John Ehrenberg, *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea*, pp. 97-108.

²⁴ José Harris, *Civil Society in British History: Ideas, Identities, Institutions*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, rpt., p. 26.

²⁵ Kenneth Westphal, 'The basic context and structure of Hegel's Philosophy of Right', in Frederick C. Beiser (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990 rpt.; first pub. 1993, pp. 234-69.

²⁶ G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of Right*, as cited in Steven M. DeLue, *Political Thinking, Political Theory, and Civil Society*, Boston, MA, Allyn and Bacon, 1997, p. 182.

²⁷ G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of Right*, Eng. trans. S. W. Dyde, Kitchener, Batoche Books, 2001 rpt.; first pub. 1896, p. 154. The second section of the book deals with the concept of civil society, which has been translated by Dyde as the 'civic community'. The work also includes 'additions' to posthumous editions of the work made by the students of Hegel from his oral lectures and comments.

²⁸ See details in *ibid.*, pp. 159-94.

²⁹ For a detailed discussion, see Peter G. Stillman, 'Hegel's Civil Society: A Locus of Freedom', *Polity*, Vol. 12, No. 4, Summer, 1980, pp. 622-46.

³⁰ Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato, *Civil Society and Political Theory*, Cambridge, The MIT Press, 1992, pp. 91-116.

³¹ Z. A. Pelczynski, 'Introduction: The significance of Hegel's separation of the state and civil society', in Z. A. Pelczynski (ed.), *The State and Civil Society: Studies in Hegel's Political Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984, p. 1.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³³ Karl Marx, 'Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy', in *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1968, p. 182.

³⁴ Frederick Engels, *On the History of the Communist League*, in *ibid.*, p. 442.

³⁵ Frederick Engels, *Feuerbach and End of Classical German Philosophy*, in *ibid.*, p. 626.

³⁶ Adam B. Seligman, *The Idea of Civil Society*, pp. 51-52.

³⁷ For a discussion on the views of Marx on civil society, see Joseph Femia, 'Civil Society and the Marxist Tradition' in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, pp. 135-38, total pp. 131-46.

³⁸ For details, see Dana Villa, 'Tocqueville and Civil Society' in Cheryl B. Welch (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tocqueville*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 216-44.

³⁹ Being a revisionist Marxist, Gramsci paved the way for later 'post-Marxists' such as André Gorz (1923-2007), also known by his pen name Michel Bosquet, an Austrian and French social philosopher.

⁴⁰ N. Bobbio, 'Gramsci and the Concept of Civil Society', in John Keane (ed.), *Civil Society and the State: New European Perspectives*, London and New York, Verso, 1988, pp. 73-100. See also Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato, *Civil Society and Political Theory*, 144.

⁴¹ N. Bobbio, 'Gramsci and the Concept of Civil Society', in *Civil Society and the State*, pp. 73-100.

⁴² N. Bobbio, 'Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society', in R. Bellamy (ed.), trans. R. Griffin, *Which Socialism?* Cambridge, Polity Press, 1988, pp. 150-51.

⁴³ Joseph Femia, 'Civil Society and the Marxist Tradition' in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, p. 141; for details see pp. 139-43.

⁴⁴ For a discussion see *ibid.*, pp. 142-43.

⁴⁵ Sudipta Kaviraj, 'In Search of Civil Society', in *Civil Society: History and Possibilities*, p. 288. Ferdinand Tönnies' work in German titled *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* was published in 1931, and later translated in English by Charles P. Loomis as *Community and Association*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.