

teritorială), municipiul și regiunea. De reținut este faptul că, deși nu a devenit lege, acest proiect a servit ca bază viitoarelor legiferări din domeniul administrativ.

Deosebit de interesantă este secțiunea dedicată arhiviștilor ardeleni, care aduce în atenția publicului interesat nume precum Károly Benkő, István Biás Jun, Ioachim Miloia, Ioan I. Rafiroiu, Liviu Moldovan, Dumitru Crișan sau Viorel Grama, care s-au remarcat de-a lungul activității lor prin contribuțiile aduse la punerea în valoare a patrimoniului istoric și cultural românesc, ghidându-se după principiul că un stat modern, democratic și puternic își are rădăcinile într-o istoriografie solidă, riguroasă și complexă.

Prin toate materialele pe care le conține, *Anuarul Arhivelor Mureșene* este un instrument științific de informare, dovadă că arhivele stau la baza disciplinelor științifice importante, dar și a dezvoltării gândirii și civilizației, un real sprijin în cunoașterea trecutului care este foarte important pentru prezent, așa cum este și pentru viitor.

Dorina Litră

## The State of Editing of the Venetian Chronicles. Around some Recent Editions

From the 11<sup>th</sup> century onwards, Venetian historiography became cognizant of the emergence of a new literary genre known by the name of chronicle<sup>1</sup>. This is in fact a natural phenomenon, given that, according to Marco Foscarini, “*non v'è ormai si può dire castello, non che città d'Italia, che non abbia alla luce qualche sua istoria particolare, antica o recente*”<sup>2</sup>. The Venetian chronicles<sup>3</sup> have often exercised attraction, raising questions and

---

<sup>1</sup> As N. Iorga, *Les commencements de Venise*. “Académie Roumaine. Bulletin de la section historique” 18 (1931). p. 101-143 (104), argued: “*il n'y a pas de chronique de Venise plus ancienne comme rédaction que le XI-e siècle, et, avant, le XI-e siècle, il n'y a absolument rien que ce qui a pu passer dans les compilations ultérieures, sans rien conserver du caractère contemporain.*” On the other hand, Marco Foscarini, *Della Letteratura Veneziana ed altri scritti intorno ad essa* (introd. by Ugo Stefanutti), [Bologna 1976] [reprinted of Venice 1854] [first ed.: 1752], p. 119 expressed his conviction that the oldest chronicles were lost, thus keeping the door opened to other possibilities to write chronicles prior to the 11<sup>th</sup> century; also *Ibidem*. p. 128 and note 2, refers to the alleged chronicle of the patriarch Fortunatus of Grado, according to a testimony of Bernardo Trevisan: see also *Ibidem* referring to other two alleged 11<sup>th</sup> century chronicles potentially attributed to the abbot Zeno of San Nicolò di Lido (cf. *Ibidem*. p. 123 note 4 and 124 note 1).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Ibidem*. p. 226 note 3. On a different occasion, in *Ibidem*. p. 152, Foscarini shows that in matters of publishing these chronicles, the Italians were not as zealous compared with the Germans or the Frenchmen. “*benché fossero stati i primi a diradare le tenebre delle età barbariche*”.

<sup>3</sup> I therefore use the term **chronicle** in the narrow sense of the word, which automatically discards the diaristic content of writings. Let us return to what I mentioned above: what I am actually seeking is not the evidence, not the historical fact itself, not the fact that the author might be contemporary with certain events and implicitly their eye witness, but the political mythology, the construction of certain myths in relation with an event or another, as well as their evolution. I am pursuing the **representation** and not the **perception**. From this perspective, the dissociation between **chronicles** and **diaries** becomes conclusive (see Dorit Raines, *Alle origini dell'archivio politico del patriato: la cronaca «di consultazione» veneziana nei secoli XIV-XV*, “Archivio Veneto”, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 150 (1998), p. 5-57 (33-36). As a remarkable recent study on the Venetian diaristic writings, I should mention Christiane Neerfeld's thesis «Historia per forma di diaria». *La cronachistica veneziana*

offering work approaches from the most diverse. Yet, this attraction was backed by a feeling of helplessness due to both the immense number of Venetian chronicles and the vastness of codices and issues addressed. Besides, the existence of a great deal of copies and especially compilations carried out over centuries has always encumbered the access to originals and led to restraints in the scope of investigation.

Undoubtedly, not even the wide scale investigation undertaken by Antonio Carile<sup>4</sup> could exhaust the entire range of codices providing matter related to the Venetian chronicles. A. Carile assumes that there are approximately 1,000 such codices altogether<sup>5</sup>,

---

*contemporanea a cavallo tra il Quattro e il Cinquecento*. Venice 2006. See also the observations of M. Foscarini, *op. cit.*, p. 192 on the typology of these *Diarii*. For other incidental considerations on the chronicles/diaries balance, see Șerban Marin, in *Addenda et Corrigenda*. "Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie" 23 (2005), p. 320-326 (320-322 in particular), which is in fact a review of Eugen Denize, *Ștefan cel Mare în I Diarii lui Marino Sanudo*. "Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie" 22 (2004), p. 137-151. Certainly, the case of E. Denize is not singular, as a broader sense of the term "chronicle" is also used by Hellmut Wohl. *The Aesthetics of Italian Renaissance Art. A Reconsideration of Style*, [Cambridge] 1999, p. 51, who, speaking of the literary style of the Venetian chronicles, makes reference to *De origine, situ et magistratibus urbis Venetae* of the same Sanudo, or by Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650: The Structure of Power*, 2002, p. 276, who mentions Domenico Malipiero's Venetian **chronicle**, but in fact refers to the **annals** attributed to the latter. Also Freddy Thiriet, *Les chroniques vénitienes de la Marcienne et leur importance pour l'histoire de la Roumanie gréco-vénitienne*, "Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, publiés par l'École Française de Rome", 1954, p. 241-292 (242), introduces the diary of Domenico Malipiero when listing the published chronicles. For the chronicles/diaries balance, see also Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 16-17.

Meanwhile, it is not my intention to unravel the debate around the difference between **chronicle** and **history**, given that I consider the so-called "transition" from chronicle to history as relative. For example, the argument of Antonio Carile. *La cronachistica veneziana (secoli XIII-XVI) di fronte alla spartizione della Romania nel 1204*. Florența 1969, p. 203, that the work of Paolo Ramusio the Young would represent the transition from chronicle to history seems to be rather metaphorical. For the difficulties related to separating the chronicles from histories in the Venetian historiography, see also Aug. Prost, *Les chroniques vénitienes*, "Revue des questions historiques" 31 (1882), p. 512-555 (513), who relies on the transition from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 16<sup>th</sup> century as a separation point between chroniclers and historians, without taking into account that chronicles will still be written in the following centuries. For these matters, see James Condamine, *La composition française*. Lyon 1898, p. 107-108; Bernard Guenée, *Histoires, annales, chroniques. Essai sur les genres historiques au Moyen Âge*. "Annales. Economies. Sociétés. Civilisations" 28 (1973), p. 997-1016. Idem, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval*. Paris 1980, in particular pp. 203-207, but also the scepticism manifested by Kate J. P. Lowe. *Nuns' Chronicles and Convent Culture in Renaissance and Counter-Reformation Italy*. Cambridge 2003, p. 7 towards the dissociation between "chronicle" and "history".

<sup>4</sup> A. Carile, *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Idem, *Note di cronachistica veneziana: Piero Giustinian e Nicolò Trevisan*. "Studi Veneziani" 9 (1967), p. 103-125 (104): "Nessuno ha calcolato il numero dei codici, [...], ma non sarà arrischiato fissare attorno a 1000 la consistenza dei codici di cronache, anonime o d'autore."; see also Idem, *Aspetti della cronachistica veneziana nei secoli XIII e XIV*, in *La Storiografia veneziana cit.*, p. 75-126 (81); Frederic C. Lane, review of A. Carile. *La cronachistica cit.* and of *La storiografia veneziana fino al secolo XVI. Aspetti e problemi* (ed. by Agostino Pertusi). Florence 1970, in "Speculum" 47 (1972), 2, p. 292-298 (293), p. 292; Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago-London 1981, p. 62; Guillaume Saint-Guillain, *Les conquérants de l'Archipel. L'empire latin de Constantinople, Venise et les premiers seigneurs des Cyclades*, in

while Eric Cochrane stresses that “almost no two copies of what purports to be the same chronicle are exactly alike”<sup>6</sup>. This is an observation that I agree with. On the other side, the American scholar states that “it is not surprising, therefore, that the similarities among these many chronicles are far more striking than their differences”<sup>7</sup>. Carile himself speaks about “*mostruosità filologica che è questa trama ininterrotta di trascrizioni, completamenti, aggiornamenti, in una moltiplicazione di testi irriducibili all’unità di una forma archetipa*”<sup>8</sup>.

Faced with the vastness of this material, the historian or the philologist finds himself suddenly in the situation of not being capable to grasp it all and thus opts for a more convenient solution, such as selecting a few chronicles representative for the scope of his research<sup>9</sup>. A comparative study covering all the chronicles is highly improbable, whereas the scholar who addresses to the Venetian chronicles phenomenon on the whole is lost early on his way, perhaps when classifying the chronicles and codices upon different criteria<sup>10</sup>. Such is the case of Antonio Carile<sup>11</sup>, who happened to be criticised<sup>12</sup> for having classified the chronicles based on one single event criterion: *Partitio Romaniae*<sup>13</sup>. These

---

*Quarta crociata. Venezia-Bisanzio-Impero latino* (ed. by Gherardo Ortalli & Giorgio Ravegnani & Peter Schreiner), I. Venice 2006, p. 125-237 (134). During the debates on the occasion of the international workshop organized at Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani on May 7-8, 2014 (entitled *The Transition from the Byzantine to the Ottoman Era in the Romania in the Mirror of Venetian Chronicles*), the distinguished scholar reconsidered this figure to 2,000 codices all around the world. The tremendous number of Venetian chronicles gave way to observations by other scholars starting with Antonio Rossi, *Sulla Cronaca Altinate. Commentario*, in *Chronicon Venetum quod Altinate nuncupatur e bibliotheca Patriarchalis Seminarii nunc primum editum ...*, “Archivio Storico Italiano” 8 (1845), p. 1-228 (3); however, it has only A. Prost, Fr. Thiriet, R. J. Loenertz, and ultimately A. Carile been endeavoured to propose, more or less successfully, general studies on this colossal material. A. Carile is currently coordinating an on-line project meant to gather all the Venetian chronicles and called *Progetto cronache veneziane e ravennati (secoli VI-XIX)* [= <http://137.204.185.153:8080/Cronachistica/home/index.jsp>]. The project was launched in 2003.

<sup>6</sup> E. Cochrane, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> A. Carile, *Aspetti della cronachistica* cit., p. 81.

<sup>9</sup> See Fr. Thiriet, *op. cit.*; A. Carile, *Le origini di Venezia nelle più antiche cronache veneziane*, in *Memoria Antoniadis*, Venice 1974, p. 27-40; etc.

<sup>10</sup> Consider the rhetorical questions of F. C. Lane, loc. cit., p. 293: “How is a modern scholar with a particular subject in mind to decide which among the thousand manuscripts he should study? How can he tell which copied which?”. These questions remain unanswered.

<sup>11</sup> A. Carile, *La cronachistica veneziana* cit.

<sup>12</sup> Silvana Collodo, *Note sulla cronachistica veneziana. A proposito di un recente volume*, “Archivio Veneto”, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 91 (1970), p. 13-30; Girolamo Arnaldi & Lidia Capo, *I cronisti di Venezia e della Marca Trevigiana*, in *Storia della cultura veneta, 2: Il Trecento*, Vicenza 1976, p. 272-307 (301 ff.).

<sup>13</sup> In matters of rejecting these critiques, beyond the manifest anti-Collodo and pro-Carile stances taken by Nicola Flocchini, review of A. Carile, *La cronachistica veneziana* cit., in “Studi Veneziani” 14 (1972), p. 385-396 (*passim*), and the positive comments of F. C. Lane, *The enlargement of the great council of Venice*, in *Florilegium Historiale. Essays presented to Wallace K. Ferguson* (ed. by J. G. Rowe & W. H. Stockdale), [Toronto] 1971, p. 236-274 (261 note 2), who appreciates “his [emphasis mine, Carile’s] Herculean labour”, I should highlight the interrogation mark raised by G. Saint-Guillain, *Les conquérants* cit., p. 135, who asks himself rhetorically “*mais était-il pensable de procéder autrement, sauf à se noyer totalement?*” when referring to the exclusive use of the chronicles by Carile for the *Partitio Romaniae* episode. In essence, the French scholar operates the

observations strictly related to methodology can be supplemented by certain obvious inaccuracies linked with the inconsistent dating of a great number of codices. Moreover, within the presentation of genealogical codices, some later codices are placed before others dated from a previous century.

Considering the great number of chronicles, it may be argued that their investigation is still at an incipient stage, notwithstanding several urges mainly from Fr. Thiriet<sup>14</sup>, Aug. Prost<sup>15</sup>, and A. Carile<sup>16</sup> to edit some of them. To a great extent, the reasons must lie in the obstacles and difficulties presented earlier.

The result of this reality was that even their editing could not enjoy the attention they deserved. In this context, I should point out that until now only the chronicles written by known authors were reserved the right of publication. Among these, the histories by Flavio Biondo<sup>17</sup>, Marcantonio Sabellico<sup>18</sup>, or Bernardo Giustiniano<sup>19</sup> – belonging to the so-called “major historiography” – were printed as early as the 15<sup>th</sup> century, i. e. the century when they were written. The same is the case with Pietro Marcello, Pietro Giustiniano, Francesco Sansovino, G. N. Doglioni, Paolo Morosini, A. M. Vianoli, Giacomo Diedo<sup>20</sup>. Also, the works of Biondo and Sabellico enjoyed many re-editings, either in the Latin original or translated into Italian<sup>21</sup>.

Anyhow, the Venetian chronicles editing was resumed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. First and foremost, it is about the issue of the corpus of L. A. Muratori, which included the chronicles of Dandolo, Caresini, Sanudo and Navagero<sup>22</sup>, but also about the chronicle of

same way when dealing with the particular episode related to the conquest of the Cyclades by the Venetians, but his references to the Venetian chronicles are incomparably fewer than Carile's.

<sup>14</sup> Fr. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 290: “[...] *Il est donc souhaitable de voir publier ces témoins avisés de leur temps [...]*”, reiterated in *Idem, La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge. Le développement de l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Paris 1959. p. 17.

<sup>15</sup> Aug. Prost, *op. cit.*: *Idem, Les chroniques vénitiennes. Second mémoire*. “Revue des questions historiques” 34 (1883). p. 199-224.

<sup>16</sup> A. Carile. *La cronachistica veneziana cit.*

<sup>17</sup> Flavio Biondo, *De origine et gestis Venetorum*. Verona 1481.

<sup>18</sup> Marcantonio Sabellico, *Rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita*. Venice 1487.

<sup>19</sup> Bernardo Giustiniano, *De origine urbis Venetiarum, rebusque ejus ad quadringentesimum usque annum gestis historia*. Venice 1492.

<sup>20</sup> *Petri Marcelli de Vitis Principum et gestis Venetorum Compendium*, Venice 1502; *Petri Justiniani patritii Veneti Aloysii f. Rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita historia*. Venice 1560; Francesco Sansovino, *Venetia, città nobilissima et singolare*. Venice 1581; G. N. Doglioni, *Historia Venetiana scritta brevemente da (...) delle cose successe dalla prima foundation di Venetia sino al'anni di Christo MDXCVII*, Venice 1598; Paolo Morosini, *Historia della Città, e Repubblica di Venetia*, Venice 1637; Alessandro Maria Vianoli, *Historia Veneta*, 2 volumes. Venice 1680. 1684; *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia dalla sua fondazione sino l'anno 1747*. 4 volumes. Venice 1751.

<sup>21</sup> For Biondo's editions. see Ş. Marin, *Flavio Biondo's Venetian History and the Debatable Beginnings of the 'Public Historiography' in Venice*. “Revista Istorică”, new series. 25 (2014). 1-2. p. 101-121 (102). For Sabellico's ones, see *Idem, Marcantonio Sabellico's Rerum Venetarum and "the Definitive History of Venice"*. *The Beginnings of the Official Historiography in Venice?*. “Revista Arhivelor. Archives Review” 90 (2013). 1-2. p. 134-173 (134-136).

<sup>22</sup> Andreae Danduli venetorum ducis, *Chronicon Venetum a pontificatu sancti Marci ad annum usque MCCCXXXIX*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. 12 (ed. by Lodovico Antonio Muratori). Milan 1728, p. 1-524; *Marini Saruti Leonardi filii Patricii Veneti De Origine Urbis Venetae et vita omnium Ducum feliciter incipit*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 22 (ed. by L. A. Muratori). Milan 1733. p. 399-1252; *Storia*

Lorenzo de' Monaci published by Flaminio Corner<sup>23</sup> and the first edition of the work that is now ascribed to Giovanni Diacono<sup>24</sup>.

This editing process would be taken again into consideration around the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, along with the initiative of *Archivio Storico Italiano*<sup>25</sup> and continued either through the agency of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* collection<sup>26</sup> or by Rinaldo Fulin and Giovanni Monticolo<sup>27</sup>.

During the next one hundred years, the publishing of the Venetian chronicles registered is rather sporadic. Beside the new edition of Muratorian corpus – that included four Venetian chronicles<sup>28</sup> –, one could conclude that the number of published chronicles is no more than four<sup>29</sup>. On the other hand, this long period of scarce activity also corresponds to the one in which A. Carile published his fundamental work about the Venetian chronicles, in 1969.

All of the cases above refer to those chronicles published entirely. One could add here those that had been published only partially<sup>30</sup>.

*della Repubblica Veneziana scritta da Andrea Navagero patrizio veneto*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 23 (ed. by L. A. Muratori), Milan 1733, p. 923-1216.

<sup>23</sup> *Laurentii de Monacis Cretae Cancellari Chronica de rebus venetis ab U. C. ad Annum MCCCLIV, sive ad conjurationem ducis Faledro* (ed. by Flaminio Corner), Venice 1758.

<sup>24</sup> *Chronicon venetum omnium quae circumferuntur vetustissimum et Johanni ...* (ed. by Girolamo Francesco Zanetti), Venice 1765.

<sup>25</sup> *La cronaca veneta detta Altinate di autore anonimo in latino* (ed. by Antonio Rossi), "Archivio Storico Italiano" 8 (1845), p. 20-22, 41-61, 81-103, 116-129, 152-184, 192-198, 204-216, 220-228; maistre Martin da Canal, *La Cronique des Veniciens* (ed. by Filippo-Luigi Polidori, transl. by Giovanni Galvani), "Archivio Storico Italiano" 8 (1845), p. 268-707; *Cronichon Venetum vulgo Altinate quod prius editum an. MDCCCXLV iuxta codicem Patriarch. Veneti Seminarii demuo prodit ex ms. codice Reg. Bibliothecae Dresdensis* (ed. by L. Polidori), "Archivio Storico Italiano" 5 (1847), appendix, p. 12-128.

<sup>26</sup> *Iohannis Diaconi chronicon Venetum usque ad a. 1008* (ed. by Hans Georg Pertz), in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, 7, Hannover 1846, p. 4-38, but especially *Chronicon Venetum quod vulgo dicitur Altinate. Annales Venetici breves*, and *Historia Ducum Veneticorum* (all three of them ed. by H. Simonsfeld), in *Monumenta Germaniae Historiae. Scriptores*, 14, Hannover 1883.

<sup>27</sup> *La Cronaca di Raffaino Caresini tradotta in volgare veneziano nel secolo XIV* (ed. by Rinaldo Fulin), Rome 1877; *Cronache veneziane antichissime* (ed. by Giovanni Monticolo), I, Rome 1890. See also *Annales Veneti. Saec. XII* (ed. by H. V. Sauerland), "Nuovo Archivio Veneto" 7 (1894), I, p. 5-8.

<sup>28</sup> *Andreae Danduli Duci Veneticorum Chronica per extensium descripta aa. 46-1280 d. C.*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 12 (ed. by Ester Pastorello), Bologna 1923, p. 5-327; *Raphayni de Caresinis Cancellarii Venetiarum, Chronica, aa. 1343-1388*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 12, part II (ed. by E. Pastorello), Bologna 1923; *Andreae Danduli, Chronica brevis*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 12, part I (ed. by E. Pastorello), Bologna 1938, p. 351-373.

<sup>29</sup> *Origo Civitatem Italiae seu Veneticorum (Chronicon Altinate et Chronicon Gradense)* (ed. by R. Cessi), Rome 1933; *Historia vulgo Petro Iustiniano Iustiniani filio adiudicata* (ed. by Roberto Cessi & Fanny Bennato), Venice 1964; Martino da Canal, *Les estoires de Venise. Cronaca veneziana in lingua francese dalle origini al 1275* (ed. by Alberto Limentani), Florence 1972; *Cronaca veneziana di Giovanni diacono* (ed. by Mario De Biasi), 2 volumes, 1986, 1988.

<sup>30</sup> Leaving aside the many partial versions of the chronicles above, we only note here the partial editions of the following chronicles: the one ascribed to a certain Marco (due to A. Zon in 1845, to E. Simonsfeld in 1880 and 1881, G. Monticolo in 1900, A. Carile in 1969 and 1970, A. Limentani in 1972); the chronicle of Antonio Morosini (edited by G. Lefèvre-Pontalis in 1898-1902); the anonymous in M 2034 (H. Baron in 1968 and A. Carile in 1969); Pietro Delfino's work (R. Cessi and P. Sambin in 1943, A. Carile in 1969), the one written by Nicolò Gussoni and ascribed to Giorgio Delfino (G. M. Thomas in 1864 and 1868, A. Carile in 1969, J. Melville-Jones in 1972, R. Loenertz

All in all, the number of Venetian chronicles that had been published is rather scarce. Under these circumstances, the editing activity during the last 15 years is even more impressive. In this recent period, many chronicles have been published and it seems that a new trend is imposed, imposing the optimism that this activity would continue in the same rhythm. The research centre founded by A. Carile at Bologna and Ravenna made possible that three Venetian chronicles be edited<sup>31</sup>, while another one, *Centro di Studi Medioevali e Rinascimentali "Emmanuele Antonio Cicogna"* settled in Venice and led by Angela Caracciolo Aricò published other three<sup>32</sup>. On its turn, *Archivio del Litorale Adriatico* promotes English translation for the Venetian chronicles<sup>33</sup>. Beside them, one could note several independent endeavours<sup>34</sup>. Today, some other chronicles are under preparation<sup>35</sup>.

A first observation should be the priority given to the older chronicles, which is rather connected with the natural disposition of the historian to go to the origins. As it can be easily noticed, an inclination as such did not shun the editing of Venetian chronicles.

I should equally draw attention to the preference granted to the works written in Latin, and mainly to the complete editions. As a matter of fact, the only writings in the Venetian dialect that have managed so far to be taken into consideration are those of Antonio Morosini Nicolò Gussoni (considered as being written by Zorzi Dolfin), G. G. Caroldo, while Muratori's first edition included only and those ascribed to Andrea Navagero and Marino Sanudo. Among the non-Latin chronicles, one could add the one of Martin da Canal, written in Medieval French.

At the same time, one can note the preference for the chronicles considered to belong to a specific author. Such, after the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the activity of publishing have aimed at the complete editions of Giovanni Diacono – although, according to our opinion, this paternity is doubtful –, Martin da Canal, the two chronicles regarded as belonging to

in 1975), Giovanni Giacomo Caroldo (J. Chrysostomides in 1969. A. Carile in 1969, R. Loenertz in 1975), pseudo-Daniele Barbaro (A. Carile in 1969. R. Loenertz in 1975), along with the many families of chronicles in A. Carile's work in 1969.

<sup>31</sup> *Cronaca «A Latina»*. *Cronaca veneziana del 1343* (ed. by Caterina Negri de Montenegro), Spoleto 2004; *Il Codice Morosini. Il mondo vista da Venezia (1094-1433)* (ed. by Andrea Nanetti), Spoleto 2010; *Cronica di Venezia di Giovanni Tiepolo fu de Agostin patrizio Veneto*, 2 volumes (ed. by Emilio Aleo), Bologna 2012.

<sup>32</sup> The partial edition of Marin Sanudo il giovane. *Le vite dei Dogi 1423-1474*, 2 volumes (ed. by Angela Caracciolo Aricò), Venice 1999, 2004; Giorgio Dolfin, *Cronica dela nobil cità de Venetia et dela sua provintia et desretto, Origini-1458* (ed. by Angela Caracciolo Aricò), 2 volumes, Venice 2007, 2009; *Cronica di Venexia detta di Enrico Dandolo. Origini-1362* (ed. by Roberto Pesce), Venice 2010.

<sup>33</sup> By now, we note the English versions for the chronicles of Martino da Canal [Martin da Canal, *Les Estoires de Venise* (ed. by Laura K. Morreale), Padua 2009] and partially of Antonio Morosini [*The Morosini Codex* (ed. by Michele Pietro Ghezzi & John R. Melville-Jones & Andrea Rizzi), 3 volumes, Padua 1999, 2000, 2005]. This latter initiative was interrupted after the issue of Andrea Nanetti's edition of the same chronicle.

<sup>34</sup> Giovanni Diacono, *Historia Veneticorum* (ed. by Luigi Andrea Bertò), Bologna 1999; and two anonymous chronicles (*Historia Ducum Venetorum* and *Annales Venetici breves*), published in *Testi Storici Veneziani (XI-XIII secolo)* (ed. by L. A. Bertò), Padua 2000 [1999]; Giovanni Giacomo Caroldo, *Istoria veneziane*, 5 volumes (ed. by Șerban V. Marin), Bucharest 2008-2012.

<sup>35</sup> It is about the chronicle attributed to Marco (prepared by L. A. Bertò), the one written by Pietro Delfino (under the care of Chiara Frison) and the one ascribed to Daniele Barbaro (to be partially edited by Ș. Marin).

Doge Andrea Dandolo, Lorenzo de' Monaci, R. Caresini, Antonio Morosini, Zorzi Dolfin, G. G. Caroldo, Marino Sanudo. As for the anonymous chronicles, so far only those known by the names of *Altinate* chronicle, *Annales Venetici Breves*, *Historia Ducum Venetorum*, *Venetiarum Historia* and the chronicle attributed to Enrico Dandolo had a similar fate, and that was mainly due to their age – up to the 14<sup>th</sup> century. As for the anonymous chronicle attributed to A. Navagero, it was edited only because it was assumed that it belonged to the “official historiographer” bearing this name<sup>36</sup>.

Yet, in addition to the signed chronicles, a vital contribution to my investigation was brought by the anonymous chronicles subsequent to the 14<sup>th</sup> century. As Marco Foscarini, future Doge, observed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century: “*Ma le cronache di questa città rimasero senza nome, perchè gli uomini di essa non si presero cura di farle conoscere.*”<sup>37</sup> In essence, the unsigned chronicles give the author greater independence, in the sense that they enable the fantasy to liberate from any restraints and responsibilities. The historian should continuously intend to give equal chances to both the anonymous chronicles and those attributed to one author or another. In fact, nothing should lead to favouring the latter, granted that not few are the cases when their paternity is subject to misjudgement and, on their turn, they are ultimately transformed into anonymous writings.

Șerban V. Marin

## Apariții editoriale despre Casa Regală a României

Pentru partea a doua a anului 2013, semnalăm apariția editorială a două lucrări bazate pe documente de arhivă: Diana Mandache, *Regele Mihai. Album Istoric*, tipărit la Editura Litera și primul volum din lucrarea *Regele Carol I în rapoartele diplomatice austro-ungare 1877-1914* (studiu introductiv, traducerea, adaptarea și notele: Sorin Cristescu), apărut la Editura Paideia și care cuprinde perioada 1877-1896, precum și volumele în limba germană *Die Briefe König Karls I. Von Rumänien an seine Familie* (Herausgegeben von Sorin Cristescu), band I (1878-1888), band II (1888-1895), band III (1895-1912), de asemenea publicat de către Editura Paideia.

Diana Mandache, autoarea albumului despre regele Mihai, a folosit surse documentare și fotografice din fondurile Arhivelor Naționale, Arhivelor Ministerului Afacerilor Externe, Arhivelor Consiliului Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, Bibliotecii Naționale a României, Muzeului Național de Istorie a României și din colecții private. Albumul reunește imagini cu aspecte din viața celui care în decursul istoriei este cunoscut drept Regele Mihai al României, numit în copilărie, în familie, Miky, apoi Michael, iar mai târziu, de către Securitatea comunistă, Mihai de Hohenzollern, cu numele de cod Rex, Leon sau Străinul. Fotografii cunoscute, dar și inedite din toate perioadele vieții Regelui Mihai, alături de părinți, bunici, alte rude și apropiați, apoi cu propria familie acoperă diferite aspecte importante ale vieții și personalității acestuia: educația și anii de formare, ceremoniile și solemnitățile la care a participat în calitate de principe și de suveran al țării, modurile de petrecere a timpului liber și hobby-urile sale, dar și viața în exil.

<sup>36</sup> Actually, this latter was not published again in the new edition of Muratorian corpus!

<sup>37</sup> M. Foscarini, *op. cit.*, p. 153-154.