

cooperation of Transylvanian troops with the Porte, but also with Wallachia and Moldavia. Another parallel suggested is that of Ukraine, where the Cossacks participated to the wars between the Ottoman Empire and Poland for the steppe frontier on the North of the Black Sea until the conquest of Podolia. Victor Ostapchuk, whose description of the Ottoman policy on the right bank of the Dnieper deserves attention, should have multiplied the references to the relation of the Cossacks, before and after Khmelnitzky, with Moldavia. The only Christian ‘vassals’ of the sultan who are omitted here are the Caucasian states, Kartli and Kakhetia, though their development under the domination of the Porte was highly significant.

The connection of the Romanian Principalities with the Ottoman Empire is a field which Viorel Panaite has searched for many years. He argues again that Wallachia and Moldavia were finally conquered under the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent and that since then they were included in the sultan’s dominions. In my review of Panaite’s previous book (*Revue des études sud-est européennes*, LI, 2013, p. 435–436) there are some reservations which I maintain. I am ready only to agree that any long-term treaties regulating the conditions of allegiance did not exist. It is useless to collect the many statements of the Ottoman authorities which repeated that the two principalities belonged to the sultan; on the other side, the Romanian tradition of an informal autonomy did not disappear. Radu Păun’s article on the involvement of the Greeks from Constantinople in the anti-Ottoman actions of Wallachia and Moldavia is renewing the subject, it brings out evidence which had been neglected and its best part concerns the influence of prophecies that inspired such political decisions. Unlike most Romanian historians who praised the alliance between Stephen the Great and Vlad the Impaler, Ovidiu Cristea is right to show that, in 1462, the Moldavian attack on Kilia was helping Mehmet II.

When reading this outstanding work, one can only rejoice that so much has been done so far. Besides placing these para-Ottoman states in something like a constitutional setting, these comparative studies give a sense of coherence and integration.

Andrei Pippidi

Gábor KÁRMÁN, Radu G.PĂUN (eds.), *Europe and the „Ottoman World”. Exchanges and Conflicts (Sixteenth to Seventeenth Centuries)*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 2013, 261 p.

This always useful publishing house has printed a volume where ten studies are exploring various diplomatic and military aspects of Ottoman history. Most of them originated from a workshop organised by Radu G. Păun at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, in 2010. What brings them together is their orientation towards frontier regions of the Ottoman Empire (Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania, Ragusa, Herzegovina and Crimea) and also their focussing often on individual cases that illustrate the situation of the intermediary fringe close to Western Europe.

In chronological order, the first of these researches is consecrated to Michael the Brave’s campaigns. Ovidiu Cristea judiciously demonstrates that the Wallachian participation to ‘the Long War’, in spite of the tendency to raise its importance, played only the role of a second front in the wide fight between the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires which developed mostly on the territory of the former kingdom of Hungary. The author’s original contribution is to emphasize the need to pay an army of mercenaries as determinative factor of Michael’s policy. An episode in the career of a very picturesque character of French history, the Maréchal François de Bassompierre (1579–1646), serves to Marco Penzi to show how a young Lorraine nobleman could chose to join the imperial army before making his life at the Paris court. In Venetian documents we find Ali Pasha Čengić, a Turkish general of Bosnian origin, whose biography reconstructed by Domagoj Madunić discloses his position on the Dalmatian front, where he had a secret and well paid relation with the Republic. The existence of a network of espionage who supplied its services to Rome is revealed by Johann Petitjean, a specialist of the specific conditions of communication. The information gathered from Constantinople through

Ragusan *avvisi* reached the Papal *Segreteria di Stato*. Several samples of this correspondence, which was also directed to Spanish Naples, date since the first years after Lepanto. In the seventeenth century (1654–1666), between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Tatar Khanate there was an agreement which afforded an exchange of letters studied by Natalia Krolikowska. They concerned the mutual relations of the two states in the Ukraine. One of those messages, from Nuraddin Murad Giray, addressed to King John Casimir, is interpreted as a request to keep in Poland Gheorghe Ștefan, the former ruler of Moldavia, to prevent his relations with enemies (p. 117, n. 30). Though undated, the document is considered as written in 1663–1664. Actually, the access to Poland was refused to the Moldavian prince. It is likely that the letter was written in December 1660, when the same brother of the Khan asked the hetman Nicholas Prazmowski to receive Gheorghe Ștefan in Poland (see Ilie Corfus, *Pe urmele lui Moise Movilă și ale lui Gheorghe Ștefan*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Iași, XV, 1978, p. 303–304). According to Gábor Kármán, the appointment of Mihnea III (Mihail Radu) as prince of Wallachia in 1658 was facilitated by his connections with the Transylvanian envoys to Constantinople, with the Habsburg ambassadors, with the representative of the Swedish king to the Porte, as well as with two Ottoman high dignitaries, one of them being the confidential agent of the *valide* sultan. The network thus described is perfectly coherent. The issue of the origins of Mihnea is not discussed, but the stories told by contemporary chroniclers are indeed questionable.

Perhaps the best chapter of the volume is the one by Balász Sudár, that is deciphering the relationship between Gabriel Bethlen and the pasha of Bosnia who supported him to become prince of Transylvania: the conflicts within the Ottoman power groups in Hungary are punctiliously followed, from 1613 to 1621. At this level, political interests remain interwoven down the years. They are reflected by the involvement in the rivalry between pretenders to the thrones of Wallachia and Moldavia. The author is to be congratulated for the depth of understanding he manifests in this difficult enterprise. Liviu Pilat rewrites the history of Moldavia's strategy between the Ottoman Empire and the Roman Church in the second half of the fifteenth century, which means to say a good deal of what was already known about Stephen the Great.

A workmanlike and scholarly study by Radu G. Păun applies its analysis to the *relazioni* of the Venetian diplomats who, from their vantage point in Constantinople, looked at the Ottoman tributaries. They perceived the special condition of provinces which, though dependent, were not durably incorporated in the Empire. It is with regret that the reviewer must add a word about the last article, by Christine Vogel, on French accounts of the Ottoman ceremonies by Galland and Nointel. Dr Vogel's considerations on the conformity of texts to reality, which in this case she dares to contest, are totally unfounded.

Andrei Pippidi

Ovidiu CRISTEA, *Puterea cuvintelor. Știri și război în sec. XV–XVI* (La puissance des paroles. Nouvelles de guerre aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles), Târgoviște, Cetatea de Scaun, 2014, 330 p.

Les recherches menées depuis longtemps par Ovidiu Cristea sur la circulation de l'information et sur son influence politique à travers le cas roumain, placé dans une riche documentation qui s'étend entre l'Empire ottoman et Venise, viennent d'aboutir à un volume dont on doit remarquer la profondeur et la complexité. Il s'appuie surtout sur la correspondance envoyée de Valachie et de Moldavie vers les villes de Brașov et de Sibiu. Cette interdépendance est examinée avec des exemples détaillés des événements politiques, parce que la diffusion des nouvelles de l'Empire ottoman était assurée par les routes commerciales de Transylvanie. En même temps, on peut écouter les voix de Venise: les bailes étaient reliés à tout un réseau d'informateurs. Les navires qui arrivaient du Levant ou les voyageurs qui rentraient des Balkans apportaient des renseignements, soit au sujet du