

the *reis efendis* from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, and of the chief dragomans in different periods. There also is a section on Poland's relations with oriental countries.

In part IV, "Ancillary Disciplines," are included such subjects as: the chronology of Muslim countries, which is indispensable for the study of the paleography and diplomatics of the Ottomans and of the Crimean Tatars; chronological tables of Ottoman sultans, of the Crimean khans, of the shahs of Persia, and of the grand viziers of the Ottoman Empire; the interpretation of geographic names in Ottoman state documents; oriental numismatics, and the available bibliographies on Ottoman-Turkish history. An appendix provides tables for converting Hegira-dates into those of the modern era. And there are three indexes, especially prepared for this edition, of authors, of archives, collections and libraries, and of names. In all, an excellent *Handbook* for students of the Ottoman Empire, the Golden Horde, the Crimean Tatars, and to some extent of Persia.

Brooklyn, New York

ARTHUR LEON HORNIKER

Norman Itzkowitz and Max Mote, *Mubadele - An Ottoman-Russian Exchange of Ambassadors*. Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1970. Pp. X + 261.

Before the treaty of Karlowitz (1699) there was only one known exchange of ambassadors between the Ottoman Empire and a Christian nation. It took place in 1665 for the specific purpose of ratifying the treaty of Vasvár between the Sublime Porte and the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Such exchange became known in Ottoman parlance as *mubadele*, from the elaborate ceremony of exchange in which the ambassadors changed places across the frontier. The celebrated Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall has provided us with an account of this exchange based on Ottoman and western sources. He has translated from the Turkish the *sefaretname* (report) of "Mohammed Pascha" (= Kara Mehmed Pascha), who was sent to Vienna with the ratification document. This report describes for the first time the complicated ritual of *mubadele* in which Mehmed Pasha exchanged places with the Imperial ambassador Graf Walter von Leslie.¹ Hammer has also discussed extensively this

1. *Sefaretname* means account of travel. It was thus a report on the journey and

exchange and the mission of the two ambassadors in his *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*.²

The treaty of Karlowitz which forever destroyed the conquering power of the Ottomans in Europe and marked the beginning of reciprocal diplomacy between the Porte and the European powers formalized the exchange of ambassadors in connection with ratification of treaties. But as Hammer points out the ceremony of exchange in 1665 "ist die Mustervorschrift geblieben nach derer Vorgänge das Ceremoniel der in den folgenden fünf und siebenzig Jahren bis heute noch Statt gefundenen drei Grossbothschaften des Carlowitzer Passarowitzer und Belgrader Friedens geregelt ward."³ And he has provided details on these exchanges in his *Geschichte* and elsewhere.⁴

The exchange of ambassadors between the Ottoman Empire and Russia after the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca of 1774—the topic of the book under review—is another account of the generally little known subject of *mubadele*. As such it is a welcome addition to its limited literature. However it is surprising to this reviewer at least that in an investigation of a special area such as this the authors—Professor Norman

on observations prepared by the secretary of the mission for the sultan and the top officials of the empire. While the best of these reports do not compare with those of the Imperial ambassadors to Vienna or of the Venetian ambassadors to the Doge, yet they provided the Porte with important political military and other intelligence, as well as with information on technical and moral achievements in the Christian world. Hammer's translation of Kara Mehmed Pasha's report, "Türkische Gesandtschaftsberichte. I. Gesandtschaftsbericht des im Jahre 1665 nach Wien gesandten Bothschafers Mohammed Pascha aus dem I. B. der Reichsgeschichte Raschids S. 31," is in *Archiv für Historie, Geographie, Staats und Kriegskunst*. XIII (1822), Nos. 48-49, pp. 237-259 ("Archiv"). Many reports have been translated into European languages. Franz Taeschner discusses the subject and gives a list of translated reports in his "Die geographische Literatur der Osmanen," in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. N. F. Bd. I. (Bd. 76), 1922, pp. 31-80.

2. Bd. VI, pp. 164-172. ("*Geschichte*").

3. *Ibid.* p. 172.

4. On the exchange of ambassadors after the treaty of Karlowitz, *Geschichte*, Bd. VII pp. 13-22; after the treaty of Passarowitz (1718), Joseph von Hammer, "Türkische Gesandtschaften. II. Reisebericht des Grossbothschafters Ibrahim Pascha nach dem Passarowitzer Frieden im Jahre 1719," in *Archiv*, XIII, Nos. 51-52, pp. 273-278 and Nos. 63-64, pp. 341-344. It includes Hammer's translation of Ibrahim Pascha's *sefaretnama* and the report of the Imperial ambassador Graf von Wirmond. See also *Geschichte*, Bd. VII, pp. 245-254; after the treaty of Belgrade, *Geschichte*, Bd. VII, pp. 540-544; and Bd. VIII, pp. 8-16, where the Ottoman-Russian exchange is also briefly discussed; see, note 5 below,

Itzkowitz who teaches history of the Ottoman Empire at Princeton University and Professor Max Mote of the University of Alberta, a specialist on Russia— have not deemed it important to refer to the historical record of this subject in Ottoman-Russian relations. (Regretably also there is no evidence of familiarity with the literature cited above and in the notes). And yet Russia's first direct contact with the Porte dated back to 1495, and there had been exchanges of ambassadors between the two states prior to Küçük Kaynarca.⁵ A survey of the earlier exchanges would have been of great interest to scholars and would have enhanced the value of the book.

Because of difficult language problems, the volume is the result of a collaborative effort of the authors who have translated and annotated the reports of the Ottoman ambassador Abdülkerim to Catherine II of Russia and of the Russian ambassador Prince Nikolai Vasil'owitch Repnin to Sultan Abdülhamid I in the years 1775-76. Their mission is placed in the historical context of the conflict between the two countries, which is discussed briefly in the introductory section of the book. It followed the conclusion of the treaty which terminated a long and disastrous war for the Ottoman Empire. Because of Russia's adamant rejection of third power mediation the treaty was strictly bilateral and far more disastrous for the empire than that of Karlowitz. For the first time it was forced to cede Muslim territory —the Khanate of Crimea, which had been under its suzerainty for more than three hundred years—to an infidel Christian power. While the treaty granted "independence" to Crimea and Russia's access to the Black Sea, subsequent to events proved it to be a step toward Russia's total annexation of the territory in 1783.⁶ But as Itzkowitz correctly points out, "The treaty of Küçük

5. After the Ottoman-Russian treaty of Belgrade, for example. In summary form, article 14 of the treaty reads: "Ebenso soll dieser Friede durch gegenseitig abzusendende ausserordentliche Gesandtschaften in noch näher zu bestimmender Zeit bestätigt werden; sie sind gleich denen der begünstigten Mächte zu empfangen und zu unterhalten, und zum Zeichen dauernder Freundschaft zwischen beiden Mächten mit angemessenen Geschenken zu versehen." And article 15, dealing with the ratification states: "Die Auswechselung der Ratifikationen hat, unter Vermittelung des dazu bevollmächtigten Vertreters des Allerchristlichen Königs, binnen 3 Monaten stattzufinden . . ." Ratification took place in Constantinople, Dec. 28, 1739, and in St. Petersburg, Feb. 1740. Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisen, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa*. Bd. V. pp. 800-801, and pp. 806-807.

6. For a recent evaluation of the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, which fills gaps in the book under review, as well as a fine scholarly study, based on Russian and

Kaynarca was the jolt that awakened the empire to the need of reform," and led "eventually to the *Tanzimat* reforms and beyond . . ."

The exchange of the ambassadors was provided for in article 27 of the treaty stating that "there shall be sent on both sides solemn and extraordinary Embassies with the Imperial ratifications signed, confirmatory of the Treaty of Peace . . ." And that "The Ambassadors shall be met on the frontiers in the same manner as are observed in the respective Embassies between the Ottoman Porte and the most respectable Powers." Finally, "there shall be mutually sent through the medium of the said Ambassadors presents which shall be proportionate to the dignity of their Imperial Majesties." The two reports not only throw light on how these stipulations were carried out but they also discuss the various outstanding matters with which each ambassador had to deal at the court to which he was sent.

Of the two reports, Abdülkerim's *sefaretname* is the more comprehensive and informative one. It describes in detail: the preparations for the mission, the journey to the frontier, the *mubadele* ceremony, the crossing into Russia and the reception at Catherine's court. The *mubadele* which here took place on the Dnestr River makes for interesting comparison with the exchanges of the Ottoman and Imperial ambassadors which were across land frontiers. The report provides illuminating observations on the political conditions in Russia (the Pugachev revolt and the celebration for victory over it), and on such cultural aspects of Russian life as the theater and the masquerade. It also contains intelligence information on Russian technology, craftsmanship and the arms industry. All this and more is presented in a rather sober manner, and constitutes an important contribution from the Ottoman view to the historical literature on Russia at that time.

The *sefaretname* was prepared by the secretary of the mission after its return from Russia and, of course, was meant only for the eyes of the sultan and of the top officials of the empire, particularly those concerned with foreign affairs. It was not meant for publication. Itzkowitz's argument, therefore, that the Ottoman government was not interested in disseminating this and other information on foreign matters which became available to it and that such information remained "the monopoly of a

Turkish sources, of the whole subject of Russia's relation to the Crimea, see Alan W. Fischer's *The Russian Annexation of the Crimea 1772-1783*. Cambridge University Press, 1970,

circumscribed group of people" is rather naive, for it implies that similar information was made readily available or was accessible to the peoples in the Christian world—an incredulous idea for an historian to hold. Is not Itzkowitz aware of the historical secrecy of archives everywhere? It is true that Repnin's report—a mere chronology of dates and recitation of ceremonies—was published by the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1777, but this was due to political considerations: "it was published," says Mote, "by the government as a tribute to the government." It was a "Festschrift" issued in celebration of Russia's victory over the Ottoman Empire and was intended to enhance Catherine's political prestige throughout her realm. Six hundred copies of the book were printed by the Academy at its own expense. How many Russians, apart from some of the ruling nobility, does Itzkowitz figure, knew of the published report or could even read it at the time it was issued?

Furthermore, for Itzkowitz to charge the élite of Ottoman bureaucrats with "provincialism" and to suggest that it took "courage and fortitude" for Abdülkerim Pasha to venture into "the unknown world beyond the confines of the Ottoman domains" is to display not only lack of historical perspective but also of knowledge of the history of Ottoman political and commercial relations with Europe. These relations antedated Mehmed II's capture of Constantinople in 1453. Envoys from European courts were continually appearing at the High Porte and Ottoman missions were traveling all over Europe. The first Ottoman emissary was sent to Russia in 1524, some two hundred and fifty years before Abdülkerim's mission.⁷ Christian nations were trading in the markets of the Levant and Turkish goods were exported to Europe. And there are records of Turkish merchants traveling via Poland to Russia in the early decades of the 16th century.⁸ Moreover, the Porte had a well developed spy network in Europe, and numerous "renegades" flocked

7. See Hammer's incomplete "Verzeichniss der Gesandtschaften fünfzig europäischer, asiatischer und afrikanischer Mächte an die Pforte, und von dieser an dieselben, von der Gründung des osman. Reiches bis zum Frieden von Kainardsche, in alphabetischer Ordnung der Mächte," *Geschichte*, Bd. IX, pp. 303-334. For Russian missions to Istanbul, pp. 310-311, and for Ottoman missions to Russia, p. 331.

8. Z. Abrahamowicz, "Katalog dokumentów tureckich. Dokumenty do dziejów" *Polski i krajów ościennych w latach 1455-1672* (Warszawa, 1959), contains documents dealing with this subject, beginning with document No. 18, "Sultan Selim I to King Zygmunt I," dated November 25, 1519, in which he asks the King's protection of the sultan's subject traveling through Poland to Moscow.

to its service, bringing useful information on conditions beyond the frontiers. All this was undoubtedly known as well as visible to a bureaucrat of Abdülkerim's rank. Hence the Christian world was no terra incognita to him, as Itzkowitz claims. While there is no evidence that Abdülkerim had been to Europe before his appointment as extraordinary ambassador to Russia, it did not require greater "courage and fortitude" of him to venture outside his country than it required of a Christian ambassador to journey to the Ottoman Empire!

In addition to an index the book has a map and a list of places on the travel routes of the two ambassadors, a biographical dictionary and a glossary of Turkish and Russian terms, and an extensive bibliography.

Brooklyn, New York

ARTHUR LEON HORNIKER

Andrei Oțetea, *Tudor Vladimirescu și revoluția din 1821* (Tudor Vladimirescu and the Revolution of 1821). Bucharest: Editura Stiințifică, 1971.

The Revolution of 1821 in the Romanian Principalities has been one of the most crucial issues in Romanian historiography. For over a century Romanian historians of the "traditional school" had presented Tudor Vladimirescu's uprising as a spontaneous indigenous peasant movement, whose aims were different from those of the Greek revolt in the Romanian Principalities. While the goal of the *Philike Hetairia*, they contended, was the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire and the restoration of the Byzantine Empire of which the Romanian Principalities were to constitute an integral part, the prime objective of Vladimirescu's movement was the destruction of the Greek-Phanariote regime in the Principalities and the re-establishment of the native rulers, who were to remain under the suzerainty of the Porte.

With few exceptions, this interpretation has been firmly established in Romanian historiography. The challenge to the traditional school has come from Professor Andrei Oțetea. In his study of the 1821 revolution in the Principalities, which is based on an earlier work now considerably expanded and updated, the author departs drastically from the old theories and interprets the Romanian revolt as an integral part of the national liberation movements of the Balkan peoples against Ottoman