promising avenues for further study, not least a greater interaction between Western thinkers and their non-Western counterparts.
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In his sweeping study of the Enlightenment, Anthony Pagden offers an interpretation of the era, entering the historiographically contested field with a presentation of the Enlightenment as centred around cosmopolitanism. *The Enlightenment and why it still matters* is framed by a treatment of influential intellectual precursors and reflections upon the relationship between the Enlightenment and our own time.
Pagden’s argument is three-fold: (1) The Enlightenment aimed to understand a universal human identity and thereby its destiny, tying Enlightenment objectives to cosmopolitan aspirations; (2) We owe our contemporary cosmopolitan sensibilities and our global, international organisations to the Enlightenment, and for that reason, the Enlightenment still matters; (3) This interpretation is fundamental to both re-establishing, with qualification, a unity to the Enlightenment as well as defending contemporary cosmopolitan ideals. 1 While Pagden adroitly uncovers and expounds the Enlightenment’s cosmopolitan thread, his argument that ‘it still matters’ is less convincingly defended.

Pagden’s introduction highlights the complexity of the Enlightenment, tracing various historiographical contributions and criticisms. Conferring a unity upon the Enlightenment reminiscent of Peter Gay’s 1960s study (long since challenged by the likes of Darnton and Pocock), Pagden argues that the Enlightenment is essentially ‘an assault on the past in the name of the future’, comprised of thinkers who ‘spoke in many different voices, wrote in many different languages, and used many forms of expression, from poetry to biology’ yet who ‘all contributed to a single “project”’ (10-11). 2 Pagden proceeds thematically by identifying a dialectic coursing through post-Reformation theological disunity, the universalism of sympathy, atheistic scepticism, and the science of man, which ultimately produced the need to understand natural man, defend ‘civilisation’, and look towards a cosmopolis that accounted for man’s universal nature as well as his ‘polished’, forward-thinking attitudes. This ambitious exposition is admirably executed.

---

1 Pagden’s project is similar to Israel’s identification and defence of ‘radical’ Enlightenment thought and its place in the modern world; Pagden differs in that his interpretations prove far more defensible: see Israel 2001.
Pagden begins with the breakdown of universal consensus about man’s nature and his place in the cosmos, which followed from the toppling of the previously authoritative teachings of Catholic theology, scholastic Aristotelianism, and Thomistic natural law. In the wake of this fragmentation, thinkers like Hobbes and Grotius introduced ‘profoundly unsettling’ human universals (52). Pagden next explores the notions of universal pity and sympathy, which responded to this bleak view of human nature caught between uncompromising Lockean sensationalism and reductionist Hobbesian self-interest; Pagden asserts that the universal sympathy of common interest, explored by Hume and Rousseau (among others), necessarily entails cosmopolitanism. Next, Pagden explores how Enlightenment scepticism and atheism reinforced this cosmopolitan conclusion, demonstrating how ‘the science of man’ (the non-theological, study of human nature, which prioritised manners over first principles) grounded conjectural history and cosmopolitan ambitions. Accordingly, Pagden proceeds with a discussion of Enlightenment observation of ‘primitive man’, and he explains how meditations upon natural man served Europeans in reconsidering mores and identifying the origins of a historical, ‘civilizing process’ (203). Employing the natural-political polarity, Pagden devotes the next chapter to the vindication of civilisation, arguments for progress, and how conjectural history and notions of ‘hospitality’ complemented theories of commercial cosmopolitanism. The final two chapters survey Enlightenment interest in the great common will of humanity and the view towards a secular, all-encompassing, peaceful commonwealth. Pagden uses Kant’s *Toward Perpetual Peace*, and examples of twentieth-century political speeches that quote it, to transition to an examination of contemporary institutions, which we owe to the ‘Enlightenment ambition to create a historically grounded human science which would one day lead to the creation of a universal civilization’ (314). Critiquing the Enlightenment’s detractors, Pagden concludes that we owe the rich
vitality of our valuable global mentality to ideas and arguments rooted in the Enlightenment’s science of man.

Pagden deftly expounds and interweaves essential Enlightenment ideas, putting seemingly discrete concerns of Enlightenment thought in dialogue with one another and tying them all to the unifying theme of cosmopolitanism. Disparate theories and thinkers are treated with sophistication and subtlety, and amusing asides and anecdotes pepper the sometimes-challenging content. Even in his synoptic conclusions, Pagden remains impressively attentive to diachronic changes and geographic difference (107, 253). Finally, Pagden’s study includes often-overlooked figures; for example, he identifies Hutcheson and Shaftesbury as essential links in the ‘genealogy’ of ‘sympathy’, connecting Pufendorf’s response to Hobbes and Grotius to the well-known theories of pity and sympathy of Hume, Rousseau, and Smith (70-3). Altogether, these factors make for a compelling and worthwhile historical study.

The work has only one principal drawback, but one which does not detract from its contribution to historical scholarship.3 In short, the ‘and why it still matters’ part of the title is not thoroughly argued. Pagden only briefly discusses the correspondence between the Enlightenment project and modern globalism, (evident in organisations like the United Nation and the European Union), and his own two-page, conjectural history, exploring ‘what if the Enlightenment had not happened?’ seems to offer only a rushed counter-factual (345-7). Beyond this, Pagden does not rigorously argue why the preservation of Enlightenment cosmopolitan ideals is crucial. By bookending a methodical study with underdeveloped claims to contemporary significance, the value of the Enlightenment is exhort, rather than demonstrated. In walking the (admittedly

3 Apart from a handful of typographical errors; e.g. (‘) where (”) is the book’s norm, pp. 4, 17; ‘argent’ for ‘ardent’, p. 112; ‘faulty’ for ‘faculty’, p. 155.
difficult) line between rigorous intellectual history and contemporary relevance, Pagden leaves the reader wanting more. While it is clear that the genesis of contemporary notions of cosmopolitanism occurred in the long eighteenth century, the lack of clear philosophic arguments for cosmopolitanism means the ‘why it is a legacy we must fight to preserve’, which the back of the book promises, proves somewhat hollow. This drawback prompts one to reflect far more upon problems related to the practice of popularising intellectual history, and how intellectual history intersects with contemporary political philosophy, rather than upon any fault of Pagden. Is it not the case that in order to thoroughly address ‘why it still matters’, Pagden would have to make normative arguments that lie outside the disciplinary bounds of intellectual history? This reviewer is left impressed by Pagden’s historical study yet wondering, to use two of Quentin Skinner’s formulations, about the relationship between ‘bringing buried intellectual treasure back to the surface’ and ‘do[ing] our own thinking for ourselves’.4
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Though stating from the outset that he is an historian, and that this work should be thought of as ‘historically informed’ (6), Toye’s work does not represent a history of rhetoric. Instead, readers are presented with a targeted discussion of rhetoric as a linguistic tool; a means of communication systemic in private and public parlance from ancient to modern times, and, as becomes clear, one by which the author considers the understanding of both the expression and generation of political ideas to be fundamentally underpinned (5).

The opening chapter, however, does provide a history of rhetorical development; examining the progression from its conception as a ‘distinct branch of knowledge’ (7), to being the means by which political policy is communicated in contemporary mass democracies (30). Toye touts rhetoric as a legitimate and ‘marketable skill’, distinct from other forms of public address. Indeed, the study can be read as a reaction to the traditional criticism of rhetoric, centred initially upon the Sophist attestation that personal virtue, including skilled oratory persuasion, could be taught, as opposed to being the innate reserve of the aristocracy (8).