

(viz. հոր իւրոյ) is replaced by *եկան Գեսեմի երկիրը* 'went to the land of Gësem'. Firstly, the final Armenian character in the third word should be erased (to give *երկիրը*). The question then arises as to what form of Armenian this might be. The quotation, from Genesis 46:28, corresponds exactly to the 1896 edition of the Modern Eastern Armenian Bible (Ararat dialect)—in a 1955 British reprint of the Vienna Bible we have: *Գեսեմի երկիրը եկան*. Surely it would have been more appropriate to quote from Old Armenian, and in that case the citation would read: *եկն լերկիրն Գեսեմ*.

At the top of p. 24 the Greek phrase has lost its preposition (viz. ἐπι), whilst the sigma on the genitive case of the definite article has been shifted from the correct end-sigma letter-shape 'ς' to the non-word-final form 'σ'.

The Abashidze who heads the region of Ach'ara as mentioned on p. 289 has the first name Aslan (not Levan); the English index (p. 311) should be emended accordingly, whilst this individual lacks an entry in the Georgian index (p. 317).

Whereas the poet T'ariel Ch'ant'uria's willingness to engage in the distasteful nationalist polemics into which all too many members of the so-called intelligentsia became so enthusiastically embroiled from the late 1980s is noted on p. 277, Rayfield misses an opportunity to discuss a further aspect of Murman Lebanidze's 'patriotism' and 'humanity' (p. 276). I refer to a poem in the organ of the Writers' Union, 'Literary Georgia', of May 1999, which possibly appeared too late for inclusion in this revision. It queried the right of Georgian's unwritten sister-language, Mingrelian, to exist (at least in literary guise) alongside Georgian. So objectionable was this sentiment deemed in certain quarters (and quite properly too) that Lebanidze's books were publicly burned in the Mingrelian capital, Zugdidi.

The author sums up his understandably still prevalent pessimism thus: 'Corrupt government, a ruined economy, and an intelligentsia depleted by emigration still augur poorly for a revival of Georgian literature'.

GEORGE HEWITT

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY: *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Volume 7. *The Cossack age to 1625*. Translated by Bohdan Struminski. Edited by Serhii Plokhy, Consulting Editor, and Frank E. Sysyn, Editor-in-Chief, with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasiczynk. Ivi, 548 pp., 2 maps. Edmonton and Toronto: Candian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1999. \$119.95.

First published in 1909, the volume under review is the seventh of ten comprising the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and was largely written during the turbulent pre-Revolutionary years by the historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky, one of the leading intellectual figures of the

Ukrainian national movement and first president of Ukraine. Hrushevsky's uncompleted *History* was an unashamed and conscious statement of the history of a Ukraine independent of Russian claims to its past. It has been of huge influence ever since; the volumes dealing with the Cossacks (VII and subsequent) are the standard work in the field and the starting point for present-day research.

Why consider a work on the Ukrainian Cossacks in *BSOAS*? The answer is simple: the Ottoman steppe frontier to the north of the Black Sea has been neglected by historians to the extent that it rates barely a mention in most modern texts on Ottoman history. Yet it was the Cossack inhabitants of this region who from the sixteenth century disrupted the Ottoman *mare nostrum* which had been created by Sultan Mehmed II, and forced the Ottoman government both to react to their sudden and damaging raids on the Black Sea shores and to formulate a policy to deal with this rude ending to a century of calm.

The present volume takes the story of the Ukrainian Cossacks up to 1625, a date with greater resonance for their relations with Poland-Lithuania than with the Ottomans, for it marks their suppression following the battle of Kurukove. In that year, however, the Cossacks sailed to Trabzon on the north-east Anatolian coast and wrought great destruction on the city and its environs. Hrushevsky's more overt passages on the Cossack role in forging the Ukrainian nation may be of limited concern to the Ottomanist or other non-specialist readers. However, his exhaustive account of their origins and relations with the states of the region—Muscovy, Tatar Crimea, Poland-Lithuania, Moldavia and, of course, the Ottomans—furnish an unrivalled source-based narrative of a 'forgotten frontier'.

When the story of the Cossacks begins, in the mid-fifteenth century, they were a barely identifiable group—'free, fearsome and warlike'—living in the south-eastern steppelands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which stretched from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea. These lands were constantly raided by the Crimean Tatars, primarily for slaves for the Ottoman slave market; the Tatars had, since 1475, been Ottoman vassals. The Cossacks retaliated and gradually acquired a persona coherent and independent enough to irritate the Ottomans and cause Poland-Lithuania to disavow them. Ottoman control of the steppes was achieved through the agency of the Crimean Tatars; direct control of the northern Black Sea littoral consisted in a handful of distantly-spaced, vulnerable forts. By the mid-sixteenth century the outlines of future 'great power' conflict were discernible, as the Ottomans and Poland-Lithuania alternately incited, restrained, and were impotent to restrain, their respective clients—Tatars and Cossacks—from attacking one another's territories.

The efforts of the Cossack leader Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in the late 1550s to forge a defensive front of Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy against the Ottomans and Tatars ended with his execution in Istanbul. In 1568 the Cossacks were for the first time addressed directly by their master, the Lithuanian grand

duke; in the 1570s some few hundred were formed into a royal regiment in an effort better to control them. Government reforms aimed at using the Cossacks to police the borders involved the granting to them of rights and immunities which they would henceforth guard jealously. The reforms were ineffective in restraining the Cossacks from the 'harmful and wilful acts' which provoked Ottoman wrath and which were carried out in defiance of their Polish-Lithuanian overlords.

In keeping with his purpose of writing the national history of Ukraine and the Cossacks' key role therein, Hrushevsky emphasizes the internal organization of 'Cossackdom' and the place of the Cossacks in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as it became in 1569. What is of more immediate interest to the Ottomanist, however, are the detailed contemporary accounts describing the Cossack way of life and military practice which Hrushevsky quotes at length. Ottoman chroniclers, too, dwell on the latter in particular, displaying fascination with their maritime skills and the advantages which their guerrilla naval technique brought them in contest with the more conventional Ottoman seaborne forces. The Ukrainian Cossacks appeared on the northern coast of Anatolia for the first time in 1614 with an attack on the fortress of Sinop. Previously their raids had extended only as far south as the Bulgarian coast of the Black Sea. In 1624 a Cossack fleet famously raided the Bosphorus shore as far south as Istinye, some few miles from Istanbul *intra muros*. The Ottomans strengthened their Bosphorus defences and retaliated with expeditions across the Black Sea, which took a heavy toll of their resources.

The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth needed the Cossacks as the Ottomans needed the Tatars. Their crowning achievement in the period until 1625 was the Khotyn war of 1621, so momentous for Ottoman domestic politics, in which the Cossacks fielded an army as numerous as that of Poland. That their crucial role in the conflict was widely acknowledged by the Polish authorities did not ease their mutual relationship; by 1625 the Cossack bargaining position was, temporarily, as weak as it had ever been. Volume VIII of Hrushevsky's *History*, to be published in 2001, takes the story of the Ukrainian Cossacks up to the Khmelnytsky rebellion of 1648, a key date in their struggle to be independent of the great powers of the region, by which time the power constellation in the region was greatly altered.

The realization of this handsome volume is a major achievement. The scholarly apparatus accompanying Hrushevsky's text is exemplary and highly informative; the references are updated to provide the researcher with a state-of-the-art bibliography; the translation reads as though it had originally been written in English. This version of the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks as told from the perspective of the Slavic sources provides an authoritative and accessible backdrop to their own research for scholars of other states whose history is intertwined with that of the Cossacks—and for Ottomanists in particular. It will be of enormous value in providing a narrative framework for the many who are unfamiliar with Slavic languages. Ottomanists

will no longer have any excuse to plead ignorance of the complex history of the northern frontier.

CAROLINE FINKEL

NICOLAS VATIN: *Sultan Djem: un prince ottoman dans l'Europe du XV siècle d'après deux sources contemporaines: Vaki'at Sultan Cem, Oeuvres de Guillaume Caoursin* (Conseil Suprême d'Atatürk pour Culture, Langue et Histoires. Publications de la Société Turque d'Histoire, Série XVIII—No. 14). Ankara: Imprimerie de la Société Turque d'Histoire, 1997.

In this book Nicolas Vatin publishes two contemporary texts on Cem, the Turkish chronicle *Vaki'at-i Sultan Cem*, in facsimile, transcription and translation, and a translation of the memoirs of Guillaume Caoursin, vice-chancellor of the Hospitallers. The *Vaki'at*, critically edited here for the first time, is of considerable importance, being both a first-hand account of Cem written by one of his companions in exile, and an account of a journey in France and Italy made by an Ottoman at the end of the fifteenth century.

Vatin begins the book with a lengthy introduction to Cem's life, favouring the argument that Cem's mother was of Serb origin, and giving a chronological list of events from May 1481 to the handing over of Cem's body in May 1499, and its subsequent burial at Bursa. He gives a detailed investigation of the number of companions with Cem, and suggests that Cem left Rhodes with an entourage of fifty people, that he arrived at Rome with around twenty and that he died at Naples with around fifteen. Vatin also tries to identify these companions, giving a list of names mentioned in the various sources, and gives a chronology of Cem's stay in France. While there has been much argument over the cause of Cem's death, Vatin concludes that it was in all probability natural.

Vatin considers Cem's place in contemporary politics. While Cem's aim, the throne, was straightforward, Vatin questions whether in fact he had the means to attain it. In contrast to Bayezid, the head of a well-constituted party, backed up militarily and with religious support, Cem, his father's favourite according to tradition, which Vatin argues to be accurate, was backed by an incoherent coalition of heterogeneous factions with contradictory or opposing interests. Rather than being in command, Cem seems to have been an instrument for different parties.

He was also an ideal instrument for the disinified and squabbling European states which, in the face of growing Ottoman power, were dangerously incapable of defending themselves effectively, as well as for the Mamluk ruler Kaytbay. Possession of Cem brought both political and financial rewards. Politically, possession of the sultan's brother potentially