

part relies on published material without reference to the Russian context. These omissions, however, are more likely to annoy the scholar, for whom this book is obviously not intended but who will nevertheless find it useful if inadequate. Finally two errors call for correction: the writer of the letter to Count J. H. Flemming, Baron Manteuffel, was not "advisor to the king in Prussia" (p. 109) but the Saxon envoy accredited to Frederick I; Chaadaev was not declared insane "for his scorn of the Muscovite past" but rather for having decried the Russia of his own day.

L. R. LEWITTER
University of Cambridge

MUBADELE—AN OTTOMAN-RUSSIAN EXCHANGE OF AMBASSADORS. Annotated and translated by *Norman Itzkowitz* and *Max Mote*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970. x, 261 pp. \$11.50.

The simultaneous command of Turkic and Slavic languages is still rare, as desirable as they both are for the historian of Eastern Europe and necessary as a knowledge of Russian is for the Turkologist. Thus in the present volume two specialists have collaborated to publish in translation the dispatches of the Turkish ambassador 'Abd ül-Kerim (1775–76) to Catherine II of Russia and of the Russian ambassador, Prince Nikolai Vasilievich Repnin, to Sultan 'Abd ül-Ĥamid I in the same years. Both had been involved in the conclusion of the peace of Küçük Qainarğa (Küçük Kaynarca) and had had to deal with the sultan, the one about war prisoners, the other about the position of the Crimea vis-à-vis Russia, neither with very striking success.

Of the two diaries the Russian one is more or less a succession of dates and external experiences. It was published by the Russian Academy immediately after it was composed and is rather more an indication of the Russian self-image than an assessment of Turkish relations from the Russian viewpoint. It seems to me that the Turkish report is more informative, referring to many aspects of Russian public and cultural life and recording many interesting observations without seeking in any way to flaunt their worth. The report was not intended for publication and at the time of its composition had to bear the scrutiny of a series of court officials. It was only published in 1898 by Ahmed Ğevdet Paşa, from a version different from the one Itzkowitz uses. The latter compares both texts and refrains from undertaking republication of the Turkish text of Ğevdet Paşa. In the introduction the situation of Turkey in 1768–76 is sketched in some detail, and, following available evidence, the travel routes from both embassies and others of the same period, the supplies with their costs, and the relevant diplomatic customs are described.

Besides an index the work contains a very useful if not complete prosopography with geographical and technical references, as well as an extensive and careful bibliography. The book is a useful contribution to the history of Russo-Turkish relations, which have still been not at all definitively studied, and a testimony of an harmonious and in its way exemplary collaboration of two scholars in a field that is for linguistic reasons especially difficult.

BERTOLD SPULER
Hamburg