

calls into question the common periodisation of European history that sees the sectarian conflict triggered by the Reformation as ending after the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. The Hungarian rebellions involved communal violence as vicious as anything in the more familiar religious wars of the early seventeenth century. One crucial difference is that, due to the geographic proximity, many Lutherans and Calvinists in Hungary saw the Muslim Sultan as a potential saviour, believing that Ottoman conquest was the best guarantee of religious freedom. Many had experienced Ottoman rule directly, as rebels fled into Ottoman territory to escape Habsburg reprisals and were protected by the local Ottoman governors.

It is clear from Michels's account that Hungarian rebels, who were in close contact with the Ottoman governors of Buda, Eger and Uyvar, and had emissaries at the court of the Grand Vizier, firmly believed that Ahmed Köprülü supported their cause and was intending to invade Habsburg Hungary. The rebels of 1672 were in fact supported by a limited number of Ottoman troops from the border provinces, and lobbied intensively for a full-scale Ottoman invasion. It is less clear whether Köprülü was sincere in his encouragement of their rebellion, since the support required to ensure its success never materialised. Were Ottoman pashas in Hungary, with their own territorial ambitions, over-egging Köprülü's commitment? Was Köprülü more interested in keeping Habsburg Hungary in a constant state of disorder than in a campaign of expansion? Or was he, as Michels argues, committed to invading and only held back by becoming bogged down in the Polish war? The Ottomans clearly had intelligence, from Hungarian rebels and their own spies, about the weak state of Habsburg defences, which lends support to Michels's thesis. But ultimately this question cannot be decisively answered, as Michels concedes in his conclusion, without evidence of the Ottoman government's decision-making from the archives in Istanbul. Although Michels frames his account around this question, I do not think the tentative answer is crucial in an assessment of the book's contribution. In my opinion, its significance lies in its detailed account of local Hungarian politics, and of the numerous cross-border contacts and relationships. It provides a fascinating new perspective on Ottoman–Habsburg rivalry by demonstrating the important role that these local actors played in driving conflict between the two great empires of central and eastern Europe.

JAMES E. BALDWIN

Royal Holloway, University of London, UK

<https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cead134>

*Commercial Cosmopolitanism? Cross-Cultural Objects, Spaces, and Institutions in the Early Modern World*, ed. Felicia Gottmann (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021; pp. 278. £120).

This collection of essays comes on the heels of over three decades of robust debates in the humanities and social sciences about the pertinence of 'cosmopolitanism' as an analytical category to describe intellectual but also economic phenomena unfolding within and beyond Europe. Carving its space in a crowded field, it spotlights "'lived" or "practical" cosmopolitanism', which the editor, Felicia Gottmann, defines as 'the ability to adopt, adapt, and operate

across two or more different cultural cores or “vernaculars” simultaneously’ (p. 1). Thematically, the volume focuses on long-distance trade. Chronologically, it covers the period from around 1500 until 1850, when European colonialism and imperialism became dominant forces across the world and ‘imposed a much more uniform regime of trade regulations as well as extra-legal status for non-Europeans’ (p. 1). Geographically, the contributing authors illuminate a striking variety of cases, ranging from East and South East Asia to Spanish America, from Russia to Zanzibar, from India to Canada.

In each case, the lure of profit provided merchants from one community with the incentive to venture into commercial alliances with outsiders to the said community. The institutional, organisational and material mechanisms that sustained these cross-cultural exchanges are analysed. Different authors, however, put forth different arguments to explain what allowed such exchanges to flourish, at least temporarily. The result is a stimulating and informative but methodologically eclectic set of case-studies. Having reached the end of the volume, the reader is more knowledgeable about specific instances of cross-cultural trade but not necessarily clearer about the suitability of ‘commercial cosmopolitanism’ as a tool of comparative analysis. The particularities of each case trump the possibility of moving beyond the general, if apt, conclusion that cross-cultural trade was everywhere, but it took many forms, often ran out of steam, and never eliminated conflict or power asymmetries.

Delineating the boundaries of this collective inquiry, Gottmann states clearly that the volume is not concerned with ‘the philosophical ideal of world citizenship or the intellectual recognition of a shared humanity’. Its focus is ‘rather the lived experience of cosmopolitanism across the world’ (p. 2). Several chapters cast doubt on the wisdom of drawing a sharp line between the history of ideas and economic history. Michael Talbot’s study of the commercial treaties signed between European nations and the Ottoman Regency of Algiers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries does not confront the problem openly but lays it out in plain sight. As Talbot shows, the legal and day-to-day terms that governed French and English trade with North Africa responded not only to pragmatic needs but also to European cultural constructs that affirmed the inferiority of Ottoman Muslims, namely, the notions of ‘civilisation’ and ‘Orientalism’—notions that arguably inspire the chapter’s title, ‘The Limits of Cosmopolitanism’. A greater willingness to embrace the challenges of combining discourse analysis with economic history would have been welcome. After all, these challenges mobilise some of today’s most vibrant scholarly debates and belong squarely to the histories and theories of capitalism.

Predictably, violence is ubiquitous in the stories recounted across this volume. One particular form of violence is highlighted in the introduction and peppers most chapters but remains under-conceptualised: smuggling. Smuggling often entails physical violence and always involves a violation of the law. Gottmann maintains that ‘the perhaps most cosmopolitan of all commercial activities in the period was smuggling’ (p. 6). Behind this seemingly bland assertion lies an incredible intellectual provocation. The provocation stems from the fact that contraband tests the validity of the two prevalent explanatory models used (in this volume as elsewhere) to account for how merchants co-operated across legal and cultural boundaries. Some scholars emphasise routines and reciprocity; others stress the enforcement power of fair

and independent institutions. Neither model applies easily to the conduct of contraband; both thus demand updating.

The volume index includes a total of fourteen entries for ‘contraband’ and ‘smuggling’. Regrettably, none of the authors fleshes out how the modalities according to which contraband occurred illuminate the notion of cosmopolitanism beyond the simple fact that smuggling traversed state boundaries policed by military forces. How did smugglers calculate risk in the absence of viable legal recourse? What kind of implicit understanding and tit-for-tat led groups of smugglers to rely on one another more than once? Could contraband foster the kind of mutual appreciation that we often associate with cosmopolitanism? These are not questions that the volume addresses. Very much as in her previous monograph (*Global Trade, Smuggling, and the Making of Economic Liberalism: Asian Textiles in France 1680–1760* [2016; rev. ante, cxxxiii (2017), pp. 1599–1601]), Gottmann treats contraband as a defiance to mercantilism, of both the European and East Asian varieties. She writes here: ‘Illicit traders sailed through the wide gap between actual commercial practice and the official rhetoric of “closed systems” that insisted on administered and centrally controlled trade’ (p. 6). Contributors to this collection of essays espouse this view, which may also reflect the editorial line of the book series, ‘Political Economies of Capitalism, 1600–1850’, in which the volume appears. But precisely what happened in the ‘wide gap’ spotted by Gottmann is what remains to be examined. Hopefully, her provocative insight about the cosmopolitan nature of contraband will inspire future research that will move beyond considerations of political economy. Others may wish to probe the nexus of cultural attitudes and organisational forces that allowed strangers and enemies to forge alliances capable of subverting dominant institutions. In this and other respects, we can interpret the question mark in the volume’s title as an invitation to pursue issues relating to commercial cosmopolitanism further.

FRANCESCA TRIVELLATO<sup>®</sup>

<https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cead132>

*Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ, USA*

*Memory and the Dissolution of the Monasteries in Early Modern England*, by Harriet Lyon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022; pp. xv + 286. £75).

The dissolution of the monasteries, Harriet Lyon argues in this stimulating new work, was a more complex and contested event than the government of Henry VIII, its Tudor historians, and the archives that mediate the surviving correspondence between Thomas Cromwell and his commissioners to historians today would have us believe. Through detailed engagement with a range of sources across multiple genres—histories, chronicles, topographies, legal depositions, local traditions, poetry and oral history—Lyon pieces together the official narrative of dissolution and shows how, over time, writers from across the confessional spectrum sought variously to contest, augment and also to reinforce the government message, thereby revealing that ‘the dissolution was so much more than the efficient and painless land transfer of Henrician propaganda’ (p. 249). Lyon draws attention to marginalised voices, and uses the evidence of these dialogues and debates to re-orient posterity’s