

was to enable them so to do. This is, at any rate, true of the Wollstonecraft of *A Vindication of the Rights of Men* and of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792). Her intellectual life was compressed into a relatively short span, roughly the ten years between 1786 and 1796, but it is nonetheless important to be chronologically sensitive and thus alert to the fact that, like any other author, she responded to changing personal circumstances and her growing experience of an exceptionally tumultuous world.

Though this is detectable even in her early writings, she came to understand that the emotions—which are no less essential to human existence than the development of reason—create dependencies that no social organisation can, or indeed should, seek to erode. She wanted men and women to treat each other with respect and, crucially, to be worthy of respect. Respect was not to be felt indiscriminately: it was conditional on people deserving it. Desire and love may or may not be unconditional, but, as she came to realise as a lover and a mother, if they are dependent on certain qualities, they are not so on merit, nor on the moral desert that in her view ought to provide the sole ground for respect.

There is no denying that Wollstonecraft argued for an education that would free women from economic dependency and all the forms of subjugation that it entails. Nor is there any question that she envisioned a far more equal and equitable world. Thinking through her works about freedom as independence from arbitrary power may well prove fruitful. Whether casting her as a republican feminist helps us capture the subtlety of her understanding of the human condition is another matter.

SYLVANA TOMASELLI

*St John's College, Cambridge*

doi:10.1093/ehr/cew223

*Imperial Portugal in the Age of Atlantic Revolutions: The Luso-Brazilian World, c.1770–1850*, by Gabriel Paquette (New York: Cambridge U.P., 2013; pp. 450. £65).

In the past two decades, scholars have sought to reframe Brazilian independence as a bottom-up process in which subaltern groups were fully engaged in social and political processes before, during and after Brazil's break from Portugal in 1822. Notably, this approach has also been applied to the many regional and social revolts that shook Brazil after independence and before the consolidation of the nation state in the 1850s. Examples of this rich historiography are multiple, ranging from Richard Graham's most recent book on Salvador during the era of independence to Jeffrey Mosher's study of Pernambuco in the first half of the nineteenth century. The bulk of current scholarship (perhaps the best of it) is produced in Brazil itself, both by established scholars and in many freshly minted Ph.D. dissertations and M.A. theses.

In this, his latest book, Gabriel Paquette makes a major contribution to the historiography of the Portuguese empire by moving scholarship away from this bottom-up approach. In his view, scholars have focused too much on social history and, in the process, have unfairly relegated elites to the periphery of imperial scholarship. To redress this imbalance, Paquette unabashedly focuses on how elite players shaped the unmaking and remaking of Portuguese colonialism in the South Atlantic between the mid-eighteenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries. The result is dense and stimulating, though this *tour*

*de force* might sometimes leave the reader hungering for more subaltern perspectives and wondering if the focus on high politics might not a few times overcompensate for a 'pure' social history approach.

Rejecting the paradigm of Atlantic revolution which centres on the premise that revolutionary movements swept away ancient regimes throughout the Atlantic world, the book provides a forceful argument for the importance of continuity to understanding the end of Portuguese colonialism in Brazil, as well as the relationship between Portugal and its empire after Brazilian independence. Paquette frames eighteenth-century Portuguese reformism as a set of coherent policies devised to maximise profits from Portugal's sprawling empire. Notably, Lisbon did not seek to alter the centre of gravity of its empire away from Brazil, its most prized colony since the seventeenth century. Instead, Portugal developed deliberate and concerted policies to reassert a metropolitan presence across its global empire even as it grappled with an increasingly diminished standing in continental Europe. Although primary emphasis is given to Portugal's relations with Brazil throughout the book, Paquette makes a point of framing the Portuguese empire as a transnational zone characterised by the circulation of people, ideas and political projects.

Interestingly, Paquette does not class Brazil's break from Portugal as an independence movement, choosing instead to name it a 'disaggregation'. This reframing might miff Brazilian nationalist scholars (of whom there are still a few), yet it signals his belief that the key to understanding the end of colonial rule in Brazil lies primarily in Portugal, not Brazil. To make this point, he delves deeply into the crisis generated by the French invasion of Portugal in 1807, graphically demonstrating how, after finding itself caught between a rock and a hard place, the Portuguese royal family eventually relocated to Rio de Janeiro to avoid arrest by French forces. This development up-ended imperial order by turning Rio de Janeiro into the seat of the Portuguese empire, a process that scholar Maria Odila da Silva has magisterially named the '*interiorização da metrópole*' (the internalisation of the metropolis). Key institutions of the Portuguese state were brought to Brazil, and this eventually set the country on a distinct path towards independence from Portugal.

In Paquette's estimation, Brazilian 'decoupling' from Portugal was almost accidental, incomplete and partial—a belief summed up in the following passage: 'It is the survival, and even reconstitution, of certain facets of the overthrown ancient regime that accounts for the trajectories of Brazil and Portugal'. This is also reflected in the use of the Brazilian constitution as an inspiration for the Portuguese constitution of 1826, as well as the role of Brazil's first independent leader (Pedro I, known as Pedro IV in Portugal) in the Portuguese civil war in the 1830s. Paquette justifiably pays close attention to Britain's ability to extend to Brazil the influence that it traditionally held in continental Portugal, for example, in his close examination of a British diplomat (Charles Stuart) whose peripatetic career embodied the frenetic diplomatic negotiations at the time.

The book is probably at its best in Chapter Five, where Paquette essentially reframes current understanding of how Portugal envisioned its empire after the loss of Brazil. The prevailing opinion among scholars has been that Portuguese colonialism only became a serious endeavour in the late nineteenth century. By arguing that Brazilian independence led Portugal to seek to rebuild its empire in the South Atlantic, Paquette deals a blow to the conventional wisdom. As

he demonstrates, despite being plagued by political instability at home, the Portuguese saw their empire as central to their social and political identity. Already, in the first half of the nineteenth century, they prosecuted a series of policies that successfully fended off perceived and actual British threats to imperial possessions in Africa, including the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade, laying the groundwork for continued engagement with Africa well into the twentieth century.

The transnational nature of this book is much to be praised, and it provides a model that should inspire others. Readers will particularly appreciate Paquette's attention to how Africa was affected and how it, in turn, affected Portuguese policy-making, as well as the integration of the history of the slave trade into the wider historiography of the Portuguese empire. Another aspect that should be highlighted is the book's serious engagement with scholarship produced in Portugal and Brazil. This volume will be of interest to a wide range of scholars and students of empires in the early modern Atlantic world.

ROQUINALDO FERREIRA

*Brown University*

doi:10.1093/ehr/cew167

*Russische Staatsgewalt und polnischer Adel: Elitenintegration und Staatsausbau im Westen des Zarenreiches (1772–1850)*, by Jörg Ganzenmüller (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2013; pp. 425. €59.90).

This study of the relationship between the Russian Empire and the Polish-speaking nobility (*szlachta*) of the eastern half of the former Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth is another example of the important work done over the last three decades by German scholars on the history of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russia and Poland. Jörg Ganzenmüller takes issue with much of the earlier 'teleological' writing on the subject which emphasised national conflict in the relationship between the Russian Empire and the Polish nobility, and his monograph fits in well with the recent, more nuanced, approach of scholars in Germany, Russia and Poland to the study of tsarist Russia's dealings with its heterogeneous peripheries. The book is divided into three overlapping parts: the first examines how far the Polish nobility was integrated into Russia's autocratic order; the second deals with the transformation of Polish dietines into noble assemblies on the Russian model; and the third assesses to what extent imperial authority was exercised in practice in the newly acquired provinces.

The author emphasises that, while Prussia and Austria had the bureaucratic means to impose their own legal and administrative systems in their shares of old Poland, the Russian Empire for a long time lacked the personnel and the bureaucratic machinery to do likewise in a vast region comprising today's Lithuania, Belarus and much of Ukraine, and had to rely on the long-established and pragmatic tsarist tradition of respecting local legal systems and co-opting local non-Russian elites in the administration of their respective districts. The governors sent by St Petersburg to oversee the ex-Polish governorships were not tyrants; to be effective they had to integrate themselves into noble society. However, in the case of the lands acquired from Poland–Lithuania, the tsarist authorities found in the *szlachta* an awkward