

Russians and non-Russians. Third, the collection's focus on the *mobilization of popular Russian nationalism*, as an essential variable in the era's political turmoil, is highly commendable. Although the "Russian right," in all its guises, never achieved a lasting success in the borderlands, it served as a catalyst for fostering non-Russian nationalisms and hugely complicated the task of imperial governance. Thus, far from strengthening the empire, it frequently weakened and subverted it in these "geopolitically sensitive regions" (4).

Given the wide-ranging scope of the volume and its high scholarly quality, I would only make a couple of critical remarks. First, one would wish for (and expect) a somewhat greater interest in the impact of World War I on the region. Second, there are small contextual inconsistencies that are hardly surprising, given the richness of the tackled subject. For example, the periodical *Okrainy Rossii* is assessed by one contributor (Vytautas Petronis) as "moderate, and, to some extent, nationalistic" (316), while Karsten Brüggemann uses much stronger language, calling the same newspaper "chauvinist" (327).

This volume represents a crucial and indispensable contribution to the ongoing debate on the "nationalization" of the late Russian empire, but it goes much further in problematizing the conceptual and practical entanglements between the analytical categories of "nation" and "empire," as such. Therefore, the collection edited by Staliunas and Aoshima will be highly relevant for all students of nationalism and empire in Eurasia.

ANDREI CUSCO

*A.D. Xenopol Institute of History of the Romanian Academy,
Iași, Romania*

1837: Russia's Quiet Revolution. By Paul W. Werth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. xviii, 213 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Tables. Maps. \$49.95, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.270

While academic histories exist to rupture the condescension of presents about pasts, they are sometimes marred by the presentist pomposities and herd instincts of their academic authors. Paul W. Werth's superb study of a single year, 1837, exemplifies the quest and yet exhibits none of the faults. Beyond its interesting theses, always lightly worn and artfully expounded, this is a work to savor with students, because you can use it to explore how histories are constructed, and what ends they can serve. Werth's skillful research is distilled into a venturesome and ironic narrative.

This book is simply a delight to read: witty, creative, and well-referenced. Werth is deeply informed, but also uninhibited by previous scholarship. He keeps the primary sources front and center. Werth is not persuaded that Hegelian reductionist dualisms of Slavophile and Westernizer really suffice. This is historical scholarship that combines creativity with deep research. While Aleksandr Herzen and Nikoli Gogol', Iurii Annenkov, and Aleksandr Pushkin have shaped most of our views of Nikolaevan Russia, most often to cast it aside much as the Renaissance once berated its merely "Middle" Ages, Werth gently widens our frames of reference and (mostly) re-focuses attention on other venturesome activities of the Nikolaevan state not scripted by Sergei Uvarov or Aleksei Arakcheev.

Along with Leonid Brezhnev's doddery era of stagnation (*zastoi*), Nikolaevan Russia (1825–55) might be one of Russianists' and Slavists' least favored eras for historical inquiry. By way of contrast, Werth shows all sorts of fascinating Nikolaevan

developments that otherwise might have escaped our notice. Indeed, Werth shows us arrays of links and ties with Russia's futures that Herzen would always have denied: the provincial press (Ch. 5); a tsarevich's public journey (Ch. 4); a palace fire (Ch. 10) as a nascent tsar-and-people sort of civil society; a railway to the Summer Palace (Ch. 9); a joust with Khiva (Ch. 7) that shows a regime as ready as most other post-1812 hegemonic European societies to try to "develop" Russian society, but perhaps not quite as ready to follow through (137–40, 174–75); an activist Interior Ministry eager to enable Orthodox clerics to put Uniates in the shade (Ch. 6); and a Ministry of State Domains ready to re-engineer the agronomy and society of the residual villages it owned in the guise of guardianship (*opeka*). We certainly glimpse agendas of "The Great Reforms" and way beyond, which is indeed Werth's key point: "a quiet revolution that unified and integrated the country, while also serving to embody a Russian nation in institutions and practices" (201). Werth begins with the familiar ground of the death of Aleksandr Pushkin (Ch. 1), and then takes us through the cultural and intellectual history of Mikhail Glinka (Ch. 2) and Piotr Chaadaev (Ch. 3). But he always adds fresh details and suggestive contrasts, and each episode is narrated with skill.

Werth's central thesis is beguilingly persuasive. Werth finds much more "dynamism, innovation and consequence" (2) in an era most others take pains to avoid. I am ready to believe now in his "Quiet Revolution" even if I still admire Herzen—and Mikhail Bakunin—and even if I still want to offer advice to the Decembrists. Werth's excellent book has shifted the conversation and re-animated the field.

ADRIAN JONES
La Trobe University

War and Enlightenment in Russia: Military Culture in the Age of Catherine II. By Eugene Miakinkov. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020. xvi, 313 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photos. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$75.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.271

Probably the majority of those asked about the attitude of Enlightenment philosophers toward war would recall some passages from Jean-Jacque Rousseau's or Voltaire's works of clearly pacifistic message. Taking this into account, it could seem paradoxical that the thought of that epoch, in the history of culture mostly perceived as a period of promoting rational motives in the conduct of human beings, may have influence reflections concerning war. The connection between war and culture of the Enlightenment existed anyhow. It is an object of studies existing for several years. To this kind of historical reflection belongs Eugene Miakinkov's book concerning military culture in Russia during the reign of Catherine II.

The author assumes that in the eighteenth century debates that created the sphere of Enlightenment reflection also contained an intellectual movement inspired by war. This strand, labelled by Christy Pichichero as Military Enlightenment, created a framework for the discussion on the nature of war and armed forces. The author's research objective was to trace to what extent and in what way Military Enlightenment influenced the Russian military culture defined as a sphere that includes "the political culture of the army, its administrative culture, its disciplinary culture, and its military-technical. . . culture, as well as the culture of relations *within* the military" (8).

Miakinkov analyzes different types of impacts of the Enlightenment on Russian military culture and the different ways of their transmission to Russian military