

Victoria Kahn, Neil Saccamano, and Daniela Coli, eds. *Politics and the Passions, 1500–1850*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. 314 pp. index. bibl. \$70 (cl), \$24.95 (pbk). ISBN: 0–691–11861–2 (cl), 0–691–11862–0 (pbk).

The studies in this collection address a theory proposed in various forms by Norbert Elias, Max Horkheimer, and Albert Hirschmann: that early modern

political centralization and the concomitant rationalization of economic life altered the conception of the passions in European thought, producing a new kind of self-constraining, individual consciousness and an autonomous subject imbued with the bourgeois value of self-preservation. While they disagreed on details — for example, Hirschmann thought the critiques of the aristocratic passion for military glory were pivotal in producing the change, Horkheimer opted for the materialism and skepticism of early modern philosophy — all of these scholars asserted that this shift in the conceptualization of human motivation had a profound impact on the development of modern political theory.

Although widely acknowledged, the relationship between early modern politics and the passions has not been widely researched. This volume takes a step in that direction, presenting twelve studies on authors from Machiavelli to Bentham. Dissecting the structure and rhetorical flow of *The Prince*, John P. McCormick interprets Machiavelli's work as an attempt to manipulate and restrain the passion for oppression found among the Florentine *grandi*. Timothy Hampton explores the novelties in Montaigne's notion of successful public service, particularly his emphasis on control of the destructive directions in which will and passion could draw leaders. John Guillory addresses Francis Bacon's singular redefinition of philosophers as bachelor lay intellectuals, bound by *amicitia* as a governing class and conditioned by the passion of pity to the largesse essential to successful governance. Hobbes's fusion of passion and reason to build an anthropology of politics is Daniela Coli's theme, and Victoria Kahn probes Descartes's treatise on the passions for its connections with political theory — particularly his attempts to blend traditional notions of self-mastery with modern, indirect methods of government. Judith Butler reviews Spinoza's discussion of the tensions between the desire for individualism and the need for collective unity, while Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse use a reading of Locke and Hutcheson to challenge the opposition of reason and emotion commonly attributed to eighteenth-century conceptions of human nature, finding in Locke a reinterpretation of the rational operation of the mind that permitted subjects control of their emotions and, consequently, sovereignty over the internal domain of the self. Patrick Coleman considers the consequences of Rousseau's attempt to disentangle the emotion of gratitude from political dependence, particularly dependence upon the sovereign state, and Neil Saccamano links Hume's aesthetic theory, rooted in pleasure and consequently in the passions, to his theory of politics. Riccardo Caporali identifies Vico's ongoing concern with passion and emotion as an attempt to find a basis (in tenderness) for civilized society and government. Finally, Howard Caygill examines Kant's desire to remove the passions from the important role they had played in ethics for so many other early modern philosophers, and Frances Ferguson contests a standard misconception regarding nineteenth-century liberalism with a study of the central place of emotion and belief in Jeremy Bentham's vision of government.

These essays take our understanding of the shifting role of passion and emotion in early modern political thinking well beyond Elias, Horkheimer, and

Hirschmann. Although the collection is slightly disappointing in its failure to reexamine the suggestion of these authors that medieval political theory lacked dynamic shifts, it offers substantial verification of the essential role played by the conceptualization of the passions in the development of modern political discourse.

THOMAS TURLEY
Santa Clara University