

trade" (34). The Jochid Ulus controlled the northern branch of the Silk Road for a time, and the Ilkhanate controlled the southern branch as well as the northern branch of the spice route that ran through Persia. The khans of the Jochid Ulus, according to Ciocîltan, merely plugged into the Black Sea trade arrangement that the Polovtsy (Cumans) had utilized, whereas the Ilkhans diverted spice road trade away from Baghdad. The khanates' goals in the Black Sea, he argues, were cooperation with Genoese and Venetian thalassocracies and keeping the Bosphorus strait open. One could add maintaining friendly relations with Byzantium as a third goal.

Ciocîltan's relative isolation from the latest American and European research has led him to rely on older scholarly literature. As a result, he makes certain assertions that are no longer acceptable or should at least be qualified. For example, the European campaign may not have ended with the death of Qagan Ogodei in 1241, as Ciocîltan claims; recent scholarship has indicated that Batu and Subedei were already headed back to the western steppe when they received news of the qagan's death. His reliance on the late and heavily interpolated Nikon Chronicle for information about Rus'-Ulus of Jochi relations could have been mitigated by a greater familiarity with recent scholarship on Rus' chronicles. One reevaluation from the older literature that he could have used, however, is Owen Lattimore's observation in 1975 that it is unlikely, as is often stated, Yelü Chucai (or anyone else, for that matter) told Chingis Khan or his son Ogodei that you can conquer an empire on horseback but cannot rule it from horseback; that particular statement was a centuries-old trope in Chinese literature. In addition, the book uses the spelling "Tartar," despite John of Plano Carpini's clarification in his *Ystoria Mongalorum*, written in the mid-thirteenth century, that the spelling should be "Tatar."

Fortunately, none of these shortcomings vitiate Ciocîltan's accomplishment. In part because his dissertation is difficult to obtain and in part because his utilization of primary sources is extensive, this English translation of Ciocîltan's monograph is a welcome addition to the study of the Mongol-Tatars in the western Eurasian steppe area and to our appreciation of the importance of trade for the Mongol empire.

DONALD OSTROWSKI
Harvard University

Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth. Ed. Serhii Plokhy. Harvard Papers in Ukrainian Studies. Cambridge, Mass.: Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 2012. Distributed by Harvard University Press. xxviii, 703 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. Maps. \$29.95, paper.

The Battle of Poltava is often cited as the decisive battle of the Great Northern War between Sweden and the Russian empire and therefore as crucial to the geopolitical history of early modern Europe. More specifically, the Russian victory at Poltava is often seen as leading to the decline of Sweden as a Great Power and as a major setback to Ukrainian—and even Polish—independence. *Poltava 1709* is a cohesive yet wide-ranging collection of essays, most of which resulted from an international conference to commemorate the three-hundredth anniversary of the battle, held at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, in 2009. Twenty-six contributions from a wide variety of disciplines—art history, archeology, history, linguistics, literature, philology, and music—are organized into five parts: "The Road to Poltava," "The Battle and Its Aftermath," "The Making of the Myth," "Grappling with Mazepa," and "A Never-Ending Past."

Above all, this volume accentuates what fertile topics of research and discussion the Battle of Poltava and its participants, especially hetman Ivan Mazepa, remain. The contributions include significant reinterpretations, debates, and important new research; collectively, they offer a remarkably thorough and heretofore generally unavailable analysis of the battle and its meaning. Not infrequently, the different perspectives set an agenda for continuing scholarly activity. There is also considerable disagreement in a number of areas. Donald Ostrowski argues that the Russian army's advantage at Poltava rested largely in Peter I's introduction of dragoon forces to an already "modernized" army. Peter B. Brown, however, emphasizes the ways in which the Russian army of the early eighteenth century was the product of several centuries of gradual Europeanizing reforms. John LeDonne's article focuses on the role of Poltava in the transformation of Russia into a Eurasian power, while Robert I. Frost presents ongoing research suggesting that the battle did not lead the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth into a downward spiral of dependence on its Russian neighbor. Paul Bushkovitch compares Peter's treatment of the Baltic and Ukrainian territories in order to argue that the Russian empire was not systematically centralizing. Tatiana Tairova-Iakovleva offers new evidence of the ways in which the empire's restrictions on Ukrainian autonomy in and before 1709 brought Mazepa to support the Swedish king, and Zenon E. Kohut discusses the territorial reach of Ukraine's visions of itself, prior even to Mazepa.

The research this volume offers on Mazepa and Ukraine in his era is an important contribution. Officially, Russia commemorated Peter at Poltava and excoriated Mazepa in sermons and liturgy, sometimes with the ambiguous support of Ukrainian elites straining to demonstrate loyalty after having been associated with the hetman (as variously discussed in articles by Nadieszda Kizenko, Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Li-liya Berezhnaya, Elena N. Boeck, Tatiana Senkevitch, George G. Grabowicz, and Serhii Plokhy). These activities may not have generated a popular Russian attachment to Poltava, according to Alexander Kamenskii; however, western Europe and Ukraine accepted Mazepa as a popular and heroic figure, as addressed in the contributions from Alois Woldan, Ksenya Kiebunzinski, Andrii Bovgyria, and Taras Koznarsky. A particularly vibrant area of research is represented in the articles by Volodymyr Kovalenko, Michael S. Flier, Michael A. Moser, Volodymyr Mezentsev, and Olenka Z. Pevny which discuss how early eighteenth-century Ukraine represented an unusual culture, one that made avid use of western baroque styles and traditional Ukrainian ones, yet dealt, linguistically and otherwise, with a quite different Russian world. The implications of this for and in Russia were considerable but uneven. Finally, articles by Guido Hausmann and Kristian Gerner about the 2009 celebrations of the battle at Poltava make it clear that both the site and the event remain "a bone of contention" for both Russia and Ukraine (if not also for Sweden) in the present day.

A review of this length cannot do justice to the diversity of perspectives and variety of arguments offered by the individual essays in *Poltava 1709*. It seems likely that Polkhy's hope of "stimulat[ing] further research on the age of Poltava and the historical memories and myths to which it gave rise" (xxv) will be met. Suffice it to say that the quality of the research, the lively and readable discussions, and the overall cohesiveness of the contributions will make this a volume of interest to many. Several articles are lavishly illustrated; it is a shame that some of these images could not have been larger and in color, but this is likely a matter of cost. Instead, this is an affordable as well as a valuable compendium.

CAROL B. STEVENS
Colgate University