tional styles or templates are formed and perpetuated
level of expression and by attempting to show how emo-
tions by trying to capture a presumably inaccessible
actor means to achieve. At the same time, she
 tionality and provides no clues to what changes her his-
story involved in this project and the complexity of the intellectual strands that Tresch seeks to weave to-
gether.
The bricolage of machines, ideas, political concerns,
and economic opportunities presented by Tresch mir-
rors some aspects of the ferment of the era, but throughout the work, this reader was struck by the over-
emphasis on the new. Romanticism and romantic ma-
hines did not suddenly materialize after Waterloo. The legacies of the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, Napoleon I, and the first several decades of industrial development in France are all minimized or obscured in Tresch’s account. It deserves emphasis that a strain of romanticism emerged during the Enlightenment, most notably in the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the intellectual hero of the revolutionaries. The heroic
scientists, entrepreneurs, and workers who made the
economic system of the Maximum function well enough
for the Jacobin Republic to defeat both domestic rebels
and foreign invaders in 1793–1794 represented a ro-
mantic industrial and technological achievement of
epic proportions. Many of the ideas and approaches
discussed by nineteenth-century scientists from Am-
père to Arago to Comte and beyond had a profound
heritage that has been left out of Tresch’s account.
Nor can the administrative and educational role
of chemist and educational reformer Jean-Antoine
Chaptal, Napoleon’s most important minister of the in-
terior, be glossed over. After all, Chaptal created or
inspired the institutions that shaped the generation
of 1800, and his policies inaugurated nearly every state ac-
tion discussed in The Romantic Machine. Surely he de-
serves more than a cursory mention (pp. 168–169). In
short, there was far more continuity and far less change
at work between Waterloo and the Revolution of 1848
than can be found in Tresch’s portrayal. A temporary
shift in emphasis between competing strands of En-
lumincion explaining the intellectual shifts de-
scribed here just as convincingly as Tresch’s deus ex
machina interpretation.

Tresch might have realized this continuity if he had
read a bit more deeply in the history of the period: the
absence from his bibliography of accounts like Louis
Chevalier’s groundbreaking study, Laboring Classes
and Dangerous Classes in Paris during the First Half of
the Nineteenth Century (1958; 1973), which has closely
related concerns and even focuses on many of the same
authors, is glaring to any expert of the period. The focus
on issues central to the philosophy of science also led
Tresch to create a straw man in his depiction of the
“standard view” of romanticism as anti-modern or fun-
damentally opposed to machines (p. 32). Historians of
industrialization have long discredited such an under-
standing. Tresch’s arguments are more suggestive than
conclusive, but his book belongs in every research li-
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