

These are the main results of Bettarini's research and pivotal topics of his book. But like any good historical analysis, Bettarini's work holds a mirror in which much of today is vividly reflected. The book essentially focuses on the Pratoese back in the fifteenth century, but calls for re-examination of the well-wrought formula of Dubrovnik's economic success: 'yes' to foreign capital, but not in every line of economy; 'yes' to the opportunities for foreign businessmen, but never to the harm of the domestic market; 'yes' to new technologies from abroad, but only if they offered knowledge that could later be applied for one's own benefit. Bettarini's book reveals how insightful and determined the framers of the Ragusan economic policy actually were, and on the other hand, how business-minded and bold were Luca di Cecco, the Marcovaldi and Ringhiadori brothers, Benedetto Schieri and all their compatriots and fellow-partners when they decided to seek their fortune in no other place but Dubrovnik. Lastly, Dubrovnik here features at its best, as a city of opportunities, a community in which the Tuscans settled in quest of better life.

As the author underlines in his conclusion, the protagonist of this story is, in true fact, the man of *Quattrocento*, versatile and flexible in making personal choices and business shifts between production and trade, between entrepreneurship and state service. He is versed in classical literature—an interest often shared with the like-minded in the new environment—but equally so in modern manufacture technologies or double-entry bookkeeping. He is a polite, lettered and well-read collocator. His mental frame is broad, he is open to novelty and follows the developments other than his own. He could be from Prato but just as well from Dubrovnik, and is ready to pursue his fortune wherever it takes. One cannot but notice that some of the author's characteristics are discernible in this portrayal. Broad interests, profound learning, refinement in style, as well as mobility in search of new challenges (between his native Prato, Florence, Paris and Reading)—all this is reflected in Bettarini's biography and his approach to work.

Dubrovnik archives and Dubrovnik themes continue to attract foreign scholars, from the great Braudel to the modest I. Mahnken and many others, up to the youngest generation of recently accomplished historians. Foreign historiography on Ragusan topics over the last ten years has not always been up to the standard, and much of it lags well behind Croatian historical production. Yet Bettarini's book contains not a single trace of bias or obscurity we often frown upon when reading studies on Dubrovnik written by our foreign colleagues. Bettarini experiences Dubrovnik from the inside, and that is because he entered it by sifting a myriad of documents of the Dubrovnik archives that safely guided him through Ragusan reality: society, people, localities.

Nella Lonza

*The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Gábor Kármán, Lovro Kunčević. Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2013. Pages x + 448.

An international conference 'European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries in Comparative Perspective', organised within the project *Ottoman Orient and East Central Europe: Comparative Studies in the Perceptions and Interactions in the Border Zones* by the Institute for Historical Sciences in Dubrovnik of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts (CASA) and Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropa (GWZO) from Leipzig, was held in Dubrovnik from 22 to 23 May 2009. The representatives of these institutions—Lovro Kunčević and Gábor Kármán—have taken upon themselves the task to edit the material presented at the conference, expanded by most recent contributions of the Bucharest and Budapest experts.

Contributing to this volume are the experts specialised in the history of Crimean Khanate, Dubrovnik Republic, Transylvania, Moldavia, Wallachia and Cossack Republic. By bringing together well-known experts from the fringes of the once Ottoman Empire, the conference aimed to provide a multifaceted interpretation and a comparative overview of the relations between the Ottoman Empire and its tributary states. Until recently, the status of the tributary states has been mainly treated within the context of regional and national historiographies, but due to the language barrier the bulk has remained inaccessible to broader readership. European syntheses on the administrative division of the Ottoman Empire contain but a random mention of the tributary states and their legal status. Therefore, this volume is the first in-depth assessment of the complex relations between the Empire and the tributary states, the importance of which has been recognised by the Brill Publishing House.

This volume includes twelve essays, subdivided into three sections which cover the main aspects of the relations between the Ottoman Empire and its tributaries: *The Legal Status of Ottoman Tributaries*, *The Diplomacy of the Tributary States in the Ottoman System*, and *Military Cooperation between the Ottoman Empire and its Tributaries*. The fourth and concluding section (*Instead of a Conclusion: on the Compositeness of the Empire*) includes two articles which contribute to a better understanding of the status of the autonomous enclaves of the Ottoman Empire, pointing to the heterogeneous and complex aspects of the tributary status. The volume is supplemented by the notes on contributors (pp. 433-438), as well as index of personal (pp. 439-445) and place names (pp. 446-449).

Following the editors' acknowledgements (p. ix) and introduction (pp. 1-9), opening the section on *The Legal Status of Ottoman Tributaries* is an essay entitled »The Legal and Political Status of Wallachia and Moldavia in Relation to the Ottoman Porte« (pp. 9-42) by Viorel Panaite, professor of the University of Bucharest. The author analyses the changes in the political status of Wallachia and Moldavia in relation to the Ottoman Porte

throughout the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries as reflected in legal terminology essential for the understanding of the main features of the tributary status. In a manner of an Ottoman *fetva* (judicial opinion), the article starts by posing three questions to which simple yes-no answers are given in the conclusion. Resolute answers to the questions 'Did the Ottomans conquer Moldavia and Wallachia?', 'Were Wallachia and Moldavia within the borders of the Ottoman Empire?', and 'Were there any long-term treaties between the Ottoman Empire and the two Danubian principalities?' depart from the 'nationalistic myths' (pp. 20, 36) of Romanian historiography which Panaite criticises. On the basis of the Ottoman sources, Panaite claims that Moldavia and Wallachia were included in the territories of Dar-ül İslam ('House of Islam') from the military campaign of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent (1538-1541), and that their legal and political status was defined by the '*ahdnames*, the validity of which corresponded to the term of the sultanate.

The essay entitled »Sovereignty and Subordination in Crimean–Ottoman Relations (Sixteenth–Eighteenth centuries)« (pp. 43-66) by Natalia Królikowska of the University in Warsaw discusses the autonomy and subordination of the Crimean khan towards the Ottoman sultan in legal, diplomatic, military and financial issues. The attributes of khan's authority, passed down from the famous Genghis Khan, were limited by the Ottoman sultan, notably after the second half of the seventeenth century. The author emphasises that the Crimean khan still preserved authority in four main political areas: Friday prayers performed in the ruler's name, collection of poll-tax and tribute, a share in the spoils of war, and penal policy.

Based on a significant number of international treaties and agreements, Teréz Oborni's essay »Between Vienna and Constantinople: Notes on the Legal Status of the Principality of Transylvania« (pp. 67-90) highlights Transylvania's constant struggle to balance between the Kingdom of Hungary on one side and the Ottoman Empire on the other. Through treaties, Transylvania managed to maintain a special status and good relations with both empires. In order to illustrate

Transylvania's delicate position, the author describes successful stratagems and methods employed by Transylvanian envoys to convince the Porte that their negotiations with the Viennese government were of trivial nature.

Unlike Viorel Panaite, who views the conquered territories of Moldavia and Wallachia as part of the Ottoman Empire, Lovro Kunčević comes forward with a more flexible approach to the position of the Dubrovnik Republic in relation to the Ottoman Empire. His essay entitled »Janus-faced Sovereignty: The International Status of the Ragusan Republic in the Early Modern Period« (pp. 91-122) draws attention to a twofold understanding of the Ragusan tributary status, which largely corresponded to the changing legal and international status of early modern polities. Kunčević underlines that the Ottomans considered the Republic as territory under the supreme rule of the sultan, but tolerated Ragusan proclamations of independence that were of vital importance to Dubrovnik's intermediary role between the Empire and the Western Christendom. Thus the dependence of the Empire on the Ragusan commercial and intelligence ties with the West provided a solid ground for Dubrovnik's independence. Unlike most tributaries, Dubrovnik enjoyed a privileged status, the confirmation of which Kunčević finds in the Ragusan *'ahdname* which, though vaguely in parts, defines Dubrovnik's political status and formulates a number of privileges the Ragusans exercised throughout the Ottoman Empire. The tributary status of the Dubrovnik Republic went beyond the framework of classical Islamic law and pointed to the commonly mentioned Ottoman pragmatism.

The section on the legal status of the tributary states rounds off with an essay »Cossack Ukraine In and Out of Ottoman Orbit, 1648–1681« (pp. 123-154) by Victor Ostapchuk of the University of Toronto. Based on legal documents, the author analyses the political efforts and 'navigation' of the Ukraine hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky between the Muscovite and Ottoman empires. The 'polyvassalage' of Cossack Ukraine contributes to a deeper understanding of the political power balance in the Black Sea region, and a striking

similarity with the relations Transylvania had with the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, as described in the essay by Teréz Oborni.

The second theme section under the title *The Diplomacy of the Tributary States in the Ottoman System* opens with Gábor Kármán, University of Leipzig, and his discussion on »Sovereignty and Representation: Tributary States in the Seventeenth Century Diplomatic System of the Ottoman Empire« (pp. 155-186), examining the position of the tributary states with regard to the level of diplomatic representation at the Porte, their accommodation at the Empire's capital, and diplomatic ceremony accompanying the official visit to the sultan. By drawing a parallel between the diplomatic status of the tributary states (Transylvania in particular) and independent states (such as France and England), Gábor Kármán concludes that there was a notable difference between them, especially regarding the audiences before the sultan. On the other hand, however, there is little discernible difference in the diplomatic ceremony staged for the tributary states, Transylvania and the Dubrovnik Republic enjoying equal diplomatic prestige.

The reasons underlying the favourable diplomatic position of the Dubrovnik Republic in relation to the Ottoman Empire are presented in an essay »Diplomatic Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Dubrovnik« (pp. 187-208) by Vesna Miović of the Institute for Historical Sciences of the CASA in Dubrovnik. One of the reasons why the Ottomans looked favourably upon Dubrovnik was that it acted as an intelligence source on the political developments in the West which the Ragusan tribute envoys dispatched to the Porte. A well-developed intelligence network consisting of official representatives such as consuls and dragomans kept the Republic updated, but also unofficial confidential persons, most often merchants and mariners. Through historical episodes the author has masterly reconstructed the Republic's double espionage by revealing the diplomatic manoeuvres to which the Ragusans often resorted in order to avoid undesirable consequences in balancing between the East and West.

Similar to the Ragusans, the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia also maintained connections between the East and West, their role in the Ottoman system being investigated by Radu G. Păun, Romanian historian of the Centre d' Etudes des Mondes Russe, Caucasiens et Centre-européen in Paris. His essay »Enemies Within: Networks of Influence and the Military Revolts against the Ottoman Power (Moldavia and Wallachia, Sixteenth–Seventeenth Centuries)« (pp. 209-252) analyses the reasons and consequences of the revolts led by the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia against the Ottoman authority in the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. By over-viewing the biographies of the revolting princes within the context of anti-Ottoman movements in the West, the author concludes that the idea of a united Christendom did not die, as evidenced by the diplomatic activities of Gaspar Graziani, Moldavian prince of Croatian roots.

An analysis of a series of revolts raised by the Romanian principalities against Ottoman rule has been provided by Ovidiu Cristea of the Historical Institute Nicolae Jorga. His essay »The Friend of My Friend and the Enemy of My Enemy: Romanian Participation in Ottoman Campaigns« (pp. 253-274) opens the last section of the volume on *Military Cooperation between the Ottoman Empire and Its Tributaries*. By casting light on the size and efficiency of the troops of the Romanian principalities participating in the Ottoman campaigns, the author draws attention to the understudied topic of the military aid of the Romanian principalities to the imperial army, and sets new guidelines for the future research of the Romanian-Ottoman relations.

»The Military Co-operation of the Crimean Khanate with the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries« (pp. 275-300), by the Hungarian historian Marie Ivanics, addresses various aspects of military cooperation between the Crimean Khanate and Ottoman Empire from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. The author has reconstructed the structure, size, weapons, warfare and the efficiency of Crimean troops, which, due to their nomadic way of life, played an important role in the Ottoman military actions.

Similar trends in military cooperation between the Ottoman Empire and Transylvania have been described by János B. Szabó's »*Splendid Isolation? The Military Cooperation of Principality of Transylvania with the Ottoman Empire (1571-1688) in the Mirror of the Hungarian Historiography's Dilemmas*« (pp. 301-340). The author affords a survey of war operations on the territory of Hungary and Romanian principalities in which Transylvanian military troops took part as auxiliaries to the Ottoman army in compliance with the military obligations defined by the 'ahdnames. Szabó emphasises that Transylvanian princes were relatively successful in avoiding the obligation of sending the troops, and on several occasions also declined the Ottoman demands for military aid on the pretext of being engaged on other battlefields.

In his essay »The Defensive System of the Ragusan Republic (c. 1580–1620)« (pp. 341-374), on the basis of the Ragusan archival source *Guardie ed armamento*, Domagoj Madunić reconstructs the military power of the Dubrovnik Republic according to three determinants: armed forces at land and sea, fortifications and military infrastructure. The inventory data of the Republic's military system presented in table, chart and graph form show that the arsenals, forts and armouries were well supplied and properly manned. Frequent Uskok raids of the Ottoman territory from that of Dubrovnik during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries led to a serious deterioration in the Raguso-Ottoman relations, as result of which the Republic had to keep regular stocks of war supplies. Notwithstanding, in author's opinion the Republic did not owe its survival to military power which, in comparison with the neighbours, was quite modest, but to its remarkable geostrategic position and skilled diplomacy, to which the weak armed force served as a valid argument in the preservation of the Republic's neutrality.

The concluding section entitled *Instead of a Conclusion: on the 'Compositeness' of the Empire* contains two essays which from the viewpoint of numerous autonomous communities within the Ottoman Empire elucidate the 'compositeness' and constant shifts in the interpretation of the

tributary status. By dividing the tributary states into Muslim and Christian, in »The System of Autonomous Muslim and Christian Communities, Churches and States in the Ottoman Empire« (pp. 375-420) Sándor Papp of the Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Budapest discusses the specifics of their relations with the Ottoman Empire on the basis of the issued *'ahdnames* and various types of *berat*. By comparing a number of autonomous enclaves within the Ottoman Empire, the author concludes that the tributary system was not uniform, approaching the idea of the 'Ottoman Commonwealth'.

The essay entitled »What is Inside and What is Outside? Tributary States in Ottoman Politics« (pp. 421-432) by Dariusz Kołodziejczyk of the

University of Warsaw addresses the criteria that determine the status of tributary states by posing a controversial question: why were Venice and Poland-Lithuania, despite the tribute paid to the Porte, considered independent states outside the Ottoman Empire? (Table on p. 429)

In sum, this volume is a welcome novelty in the Ottoman studies, as the contributions complement each other and draw a broader canvas of the relations between the Sublime Porte and its peripheral satellites, each being granted a specific degree of self-government and autonomy in accordance with the geopolitical position and the interests of the Ottoman authorities.

Ruža Radoš