

goes to the heart of the lived experience of Portuguese colonialism—in this instance in East Timor. Herbert Klein's chapter raises one of the most important differences between North American and Brazilian slaving systems, related to the physical mobility of freedmen. He is also one of the few authors to mention skin colour in systems of racialisation, although it is mainly to acknowledge that it is an important but understudied area. Andrea Daher's chapter on language and otherness provides a welcome glimpse into the categorisation of Brazil's indigenous Indian populations, and José Pedro Paiva contributes an erudite survey of policies and practices of Jewish segregation in Portugal's global empire. Finally, Jean Michel Massing's essay is an evocative glimpse into a fleeting moment of 'discovery' and how it was translated into forms of material culture.

Overall, this is a highly commendable book project which is sure to generate excitement and increased dialogue and investigation among students and researchers in race studies, global history, and Spanish and Portuguese studies.

CHRISTABELLE PETERS  
*University of Warwick*

doi:10.1093/ehr/cevo65

*The French Republic: History, Values, Debates*, eds. Edward Berenson, Vincent Duclert and Christophe Prochasson (Ithaca, NY: Cornell U.P., 2011; pp. 378. \$71.95; pb. \$35).

The French have a particular fondness for 'encyclopaedias' and 'dictionaries' of historical events. For the most part, these are aimed squarely at a student audience. Publishers know that they have a captive market in the army of *lycéens* revising for nationwide *baccalauréat* exams and (a rather smaller number of) students preparing *grande école* entrance exams or the dreaded *agrégation*. The target audience usually means that these books prioritise accessible synthesis over historiographical originality. Occasionally, as with François Furet and Mona Ozouf's famous *Dictionnaire critique de la Révolution française* (1988), they make a mark on academic scholarship, but it is much more common for them to be consigned to library shelves for the benefit of hundreds of overworked students.

It is hardly surprising, then, that this should have been exactly what happened to Christophe Prochasson and Vincent Duclert's remarkable *Dictionnaire critique de la République*, published by the educational press Flammarion in 2002. It ran to 1,300 pages, contained 200 articles by over 100 experts, and represented some of the sharpest scholarship in the field. No-one was ever likely to read it from start to finish, but it served its function exceptionally well: it was an outstanding reference tool and simultaneously made a scholarly contribution to a civic debate surrounding republicanism that has run through French politics since the early 1980s. Nevertheless, it was not an obvious candidate for an English edition. There is not the same tradition of encyclopaedias in the English-speaking world and few British or American publishers would normally be willing to subsidise the cost of so much translation without knowing that there was a vast audience of potential readers. Clearly, Edward Berenson and Cornell University Press were acutely aware of this problem. Their solution was to use the original

*EHR*, CXXX. 543 (April 2015)

French volume as little more than a starting-point. They reused twenty entries from the French volume but they also supplemented these with twenty newly-commissioned articles by English-language scholars. The end result is a modest 300-page book that is much closer to an edited volume than a pedagogical tool.

This difference in form has a direct impact on the content. The original *Dictionnaire critique* was a monument of Franco-French scholarship and, while it did include non-French historians, it focused overwhelmingly on a clear republican canon of names, dates, ideas and events. *The French Republic* is looser and less defined. Because all of the entries on individual figures and republican ‘practices’ were omitted from the English volume, it loses a lot of biographical texture. This leaves essentially two kinds of chapter: those that deal with a particular period (e.g. ‘The Enlightenment’, ‘The Fourth Republic’) and those that deal with debates (‘Fraternity’, ‘Democracy’, ‘Feminism and the Republic’, ‘Immigration’). None of them is more than around ten pages long and they almost all provide pithy introductions to their respective subjects. Most of the contributors opt for a chronological approach, in which their period or debate is treated through time. After a while, this can give the impression that you are simply working through a succession of introductory lectures. Fortunately, this is unlikely to be much of a problem since the book will almost certainly be approached in bits rather than as a complete entity. Moreover, some of the contributions are veritable masterclasses of synthesis. For example, the opening chapters on specific periods—especially those by Julian Jackson on Vichy and Martin Schain on the Fifth Republic—offer up refreshingly short and concentrated summaries of their respective topics. They are models of concision and would be ideal for confused undergraduate students.

The remaining chapters on debates are a little more varied in approach and are not always quite as successful. Part of the problem is that the overwhelming majority of contributors are historians of one kind or another, which means that there is usually more focus on narrative than on the concepts that underpin them. Yet there are some real gems scattered throughout the volume. Herrick Chapman’s sparkling chapter on ‘The State’ manages to raise some crucial questions about the relationship of the French people to their most cherished institution in a handful of pages; Jeremy Jennings deploys his considerable powers of synthesis in his lightning discussions of ‘Liberty’, ‘Equality’ and ‘Universalism’; Steven Englund offers a spirited rebuttal of the idea that the French were an anti-Semitic people in the early twentieth-century; and both Alice Conklin and John Bowen offer careful appraisals of ‘The Civilizing Mission’ and ‘The Republic and the Veil’ respectively. Again, these would all provide useful introductions for students, and they are a window into the extremely high quality of English-language historical work on France.

Still, the curious reader cannot help feeling that something was lost in translation. Berenson has brought together an impressive range of experts in an attractive volume but, seen in its entirety, *The French Republic* does not quite have the power of the French original. This is noticeable in the fact that, while many of the contributions highlight the ways in which the Republic has failed to deliver on its promises, we do not get a good sense of who the

Republic's enemies actually were (why were no chapters on 'anti-republicanism' retained?). Likewise, there is a very clear narrative throughout the book about how the French Republic developed from the eighteenth century onwards, but not much on why it eventually became so attractive to such a wide range of actors (this is where we really miss the chapters on individual republicans and the 'practices' of republicanism).

These lacunae make sense in so far as non-French historians are more likely to cast a sceptical eye on the Republic than French historians who have grown up within its discursive and symbolic system. But there is a deeper point here about the very foundations of French republicanism, the power of which lies in its striking *mélange* of ideological plasticity and normative exceptionalism. The original *Dictionnaire critique* managed to capture both of these elements by combining enormous diversity within the classic republican format of a rational and didactic encyclopaedia. The contributors to *The French Republic*, by contrast, are less convinced of the 'exceptional' character of French republicanism and do not see themselves as engaged in a pedagogical project. As a result, their often brilliant contributions sometimes leave us wondering what, if anything, distinguishes republicanism from any other political tradition in modern French history.

EMILE CHABAL

*University of Edinburgh*

doi:10.1093/ehr/cevo33

*The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*, ed. John Breuilly (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2013; pp. xli + 775. £195).

Handbooks are proliferating, high-priced reference works with contributors knowledgeable about a variety of related topics. John Breuilly, a veteran of the study of nationalism, has pulled together almost three dozen experts on every imaginable subject relating to the emergence, evolution, contributions and costs of the making of nations and nationalism. The book is both a handy reference to the state of the field and the place for students and experts alike to begin an investigation of a complex and fraught subject which never seems to lose its potency to disturb. Its editor makes clear that this important, encyclopaedic collection is dedicated to the history of nationalism and not to national histories. While most scholars would acknowledge that nationalism as a discourse and a legitimising principle arose first in Europe, this volume illustrates the diverse adaptations and appropriations of the language of nation across the globe. One of its finest attributes is to relativise the position of Europe in this global story and give the needed space to the nationalisms of the rest of the world.

Variety of experiences and meanings rather than unity and an overall single theory of nationalism emerge from reading through the volume. Appropriately, there is no agreed-upon definition of nationalism which informs all the chapters. The very word 'nationalism' is used to mean many things; from cultural preferences, struggles to form a nation or fights for independence for