constitutes a glaring gap. I write as one who was chastised by a leading historian of intelligence for writing a history of the Cold War with only incidental reference to this topic. Research over the last three decades has shown that intelligence was integral to policy-making and the management as well as in some cases the manufacturing of crises. This is not just a matter of high-profile figures such as Harold Philby and the like but of routine practices on both sides. Should there be a second edition of this book, this gap should surely be filled.

Third, in the justifiable welcome for the proliferation of new sources, there is a slighting in one or two instances of valuable earlier publications. In his otherwise excellent piece on how to use the FRUS series, M. Todd Bennett chooses to highlight two documents which have long been well catered for in existing teaching materials. One is George Kennan's 1946 *Long Telegram*, which he (along with several other contributors) recommends placing alongside its Soviet equivalent, the *Novikov Telegram*, which is available at the CWIHP. In fact both telegrams, along with the comparable document by the First Secretary in the British Embassy in Moscow, Frank Roberts, have been available since 1993 in an excellent publication, *Origins of the Cold War: The Novikov, Kennan, and Roberts "Long Telegrams" of 1946*, edited by Kenneth Jensen. As it happens, Roberts' document is in some respects more astute and thoughtful than Kennan's, besides which it offers a useful and relatively detached perspective on the central divide between the US and the Soviet Union. My point in referring to this publication is not to suggest that we need look no further on these particular topics. Far from it, but it is to point out that selection is more problematic than ever with the vast increase in the volume of sources. All the more reason to exploit acts of selection by earlier historians while seizing the opportunities offered by new sources.

The above reservations aside, there is little doubt that this book will be welcomed by teachers, not least for its references to a huge range of internet and visual sources. *The Manchurian Candidate* and *Dr. Strangelove*, among a number of other high-profile films, have long been used in the classroom, but this book will arm teachers with numerous new possibilities for recreating the atmosphere of the Cold War for students. Used sensitively, such sources can pose the central questions with peculiar educational force. Many of the contributors to this book discuss in detail their methods of balancing the new opportunities offered by new sources against the capacities of students to absorb them. Many ingenious strategies for presenting material are proposed, including ways of navigating through the sources and of contextualizing documents which on their own will mean little or nothing to students new to the topic. In the process, teachers are offering their own principles of selection and encouraging students do likewise. This collection of essays brings new clarity and force to the injunction that information is nothing if it does not become knowledge. If teaching is essentially the tool for making this transition, then this book must be warmly recommended for its ambition and achievement.

Richard Crockatt
University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

The Ottoman Conquest of the Balkans: Interpretations and Research Debates. Ed. Oliver Jens Schmitt. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2016. 289pp. Notes. Index. Tables. Maps. €65.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.22

The stereotype in Balkan studies is that Ottoman conquest meant an immediate plunge into decline and barbarism, while the corresponding stereotype in Ottoman

CrossMark
https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.22 Published online by Cambridge University Press

studies is that conquest drew the Balkans into a multilayered and prosperous civilization which they unfortunately failed to appreciate. One purpose of this collection of articles is to counter such views. Another is to bring theoretical and interpretive coherence to a mass of detailed research by Balkanists, Byzantinists, Ottomanists, Mediterraneanists, and national(ist) historians. A third is to make their work comparative; the ten contributors and one editor find in the field of Late Antique/Early Medieval studies a useful framework for studying the fall of one civilization at the hands of another. The fall of Rome provides competing models, a long history of detailed study, and comparative suggestions for numerous lines of investigation. This volume is conceived as a preliminary step, as a new approach to an old topic. The editor provides from Ottoman history a menu of issues with which to begin, including the role of religion in the conquest, the practice of accommodation as an integrating tool (and the debate between theories of continuity and rupture), and the demographic consequences of the conquest. The editor also criticizes the lack of cross-reading of sources and the disciplinary pride that keeps scholars penned in separate corners of the field, while pointing out obstacles facing them, such as problems of sources, languages, and the modern politics of the region. He proposes a massive research program encompassing the entire Balkan region and sets forth big questions that could lead to new interpretations of Ottoman conquest.

The subsequent chapters focus on raising new questions rather than reaching new answers. Maurus Reinkowski's chapter introduces the larger context of Islamic conquest and Islamization in order to overcome the exceptionalism that afflicts Ottoman studies. He is interested in the role of violence in contrasting models of religious warfare and peaceful expansion, and compares the conquest of the Balkans with that of the Arab lands as a fruitful way to raise new questions. A comparison with the early Islamic conquests might speak more directly to the *gazi* question. A chapter by Tony Filiposki considers non-Ottoman contributions to Ottoman conquest, particularly the Byzantine Empire and its relationships with the Turks, the Slavic kingdoms, and the western Christians. Such issues are widely cited in western historiography, which tends to lump all the Balkan countries together, but in the Balkan context they can be useful in springing local histories out of their national boxes.

An article by Mariya Kiprovska seeks to counter the ferocious modern image of the Turks by investigating the incorporation of Balkan military forces into the Ottoman army. Ottoman military registers show that the Ottomans adopted administrative methods from the conquered regions and incorporated their military personnel in large numbers. Although one of these incorporated elites (Skanderbeg) notoriously rebelled, most became Muslims and climbed the Ottoman career ladder. A chapter by Grigor Boykov examines the demographic consequences of conquest in Bulgaria. Unlike the more purely historiographical chapters, this one presents new research, finding from a study of over 200 Ottoman tax registers that the Bulgarian population, far from experiencing demographic crisis as a result of the Ottoman conquest, probably numbered about 550,000 in the fifteenth century and 1,110,000 in the sixteenth, falling off only in the seventeenth century due to climate change and conversion to Islam.

A sophisticated article on conversion by Tijana Krstić reconsiders methods, theories, and terminology for dealing with this fraught subject. She recommends considering conversion outside the frameworks of the nation-state, demography, and its socioeconomic consequences. Conversion needs to be investigated as a cultural and religious issue, an interdisciplinary topic, and with the use of new sources.

Andrei Pippidi's article on Wallachia separates the "facts" of conquest from the interpretations placed on them by historians. Conquest history in this region is conceptualized as the relationship between two entities, Wallachia and Moldavia,

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.22 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and their attempts to avoid being swallowed up by the Ottomans (or the Russians). Interpretation begins with the emergence of a national/Christian myth in the mid-nineteenth century, and from there Pippidi explains the changes in historiography over time that have recently made it possible to challenge the old framework of the territorial state in favor of a region of competition among princes, some with outside support from the Ottomans, and the flexible incorporation of the Wallachians into the Ottoman economic system. In the case of Moldavia, the article by Ştefan S. Gorovei and Maria Magdalena Szekely seeks to pinpoint the inception of the Ottoman-Moldavian relationship. Despite the political rhetoric of centuries, new sources permit the conclusion that the Moldavians were not ever subjects of the Ottoman Empire, but its tributaries; there was no Ottoman conquest of Moldavia.

The next chapter, by Dubravko Lovrenović, examines the Ottoman conquest of Bosnia through Franciscan chronicles and historiography. The stereotype holds that Bosnia fell due to its betrayal by the Bogomil ("Manichean") population. Such stories arose centuries after the fact and represented the conquest as sudden, violent, and accompanied by demands for total conversion. The early twentieth century saw the introduction of the idea that the different groups of Christians (and Muslims?), rather than excoriating and betraying each other, might engage in dialogue. The war in Bosnia in the 1990s, however, revived old antagonisms, and the 530th anniversary of the fall of Bosnia occasioned widespread feelings of national tragedy. The final chapter, by Ovidiu Cristea, steps outside the Balkan and Ottoman context to look at the role of Venice. Although Venetian sources came from outside, their view was disturbed by distance, prejudice, and deliberate Ottoman disinformation. Changes in Venetian priorities, which favored the Terraferma, and in Ottoman priorities, focusing on control of the Black Sea and the Aegean, saved Venice from being overwhelmed by Ottoman strength.

No conclusion is provided to this series of studies, since they are seen as a first step toward conclusions that can only be reached through difficult rethinking and research. Together, however, they raise worthwhile questions and inspire new efforts. It is a stimulating book, one that should be taken seriously by everyone concerned with "the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans."

Linda T. Darling
University of Arizona

Transylvania in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century. The Rise of the Congregational System. By Tudor Salagean. East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450, Vol. 37. Brill: Leiden, 2016. vi, 292 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Maps. $162.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.23

The legacies of nineteenth-century Transylvanian historiography, namely the national division of the heterogeneous past, bequeathed numerous controversies. Romanian, Transylvanian Saxon, and Hungarian narratives construed the image of early medieval Transylvanian polity and the place of its composite population often in antagonistic terms. A case in point has been the "individual" or "separate" status of the province in the Medieval Hungarian Kingdom between the tenth and thirteenth centuries. Hungarian historians considered regional tendencies as symptoms of the weakness of the Kingdom in the wake of invasion from the pagan southeast. Romanian historiography saw in the same tendencies the promise of Transylvanian autonomy, a stepping stone towards future unification.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.22 Published online by Cambridge University Press