

ambizioso progetto secondo il quale Brâncoveanu avesse riunito sotto il suo governo la Valacchia e la Moldavia, mentre un suo genero, generale austriaco, fosse salito sul trono della Transilvania, ci fa ricordare l'intenzione attribuita (prima del 1683) al principe Giorgio Duca. Dunque, il modello di Michele il Bravo non era dimenticato. Che Costantino Cantacuzeno abbia conosciuto tramite Marsigli le idee di Vitezović sulla storia del „Illirico”, provincia che gli Asburghi si riservavano, giustifica le audaci rivendicazioni di „Ridolfo” Cantacuzeno. Insomma, niente è nuovo e nessun pensiero muore senza essere ereditato. Anche l'annessione della Bosnia manifesta la continuità della politica imperiale da Leopoldo I a Francesco Giuseppe.

Andrei Pippidi

Costin FENEȘAN, Cristina FENEȘAN, *Transilvania între Habsburgi și Poarta Otomană la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea (Documente din arhiva Cancelariei de Stat de la Viena) / Siebenbürgen zwischen Habsburg und der Pforte um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts (Dokumente aus dem Archiv der Wiener Staatskanzlei)*, Timișoara, Cosmopolitan ART, 2013, 460 p.

Two of our colleagues who spent their lives, the husband, by editing documents and, the wife, in oriental studies, have united their forces: their work is a list and analysis of state papers and spy reports in Turkish, Latin, Italian, German and Hungarian, concerning negotiations between Vienna and Constantinople, before the formation of the principality of Transylvania. It was a new tributary state, dependent of the Ottoman Empire, but creating a buffer in front of the Habsburg territories, in the middle of the already domesticated Wallachia and Moldavia and leaning with its back against Ottoman Hungary. This interdependence was elaborated between the treaties of Oradea (1538) and Speyer (1567). It originated from the great Turkish victory of Mohács and the failed siege of Vienna. We have thus a contribution to

European history in the mid-sixteenth century. The abstracts of documents give all the required information, with relevant quotations. The originals are translated into Romanian only from Turkish and Hungarian. There is much of varied interest in these documents preserved in Vienna in the fund *Turcica*.

The vintage begins in 1522 when the janissaries sent to Wallachia imposed as prince Vladislav III. We learn from this account that he, who had spent years in Constantinople as merchant, was fluent in Turkish, Hungarian and „the Saxon language”; he was supported by Mehmet-pasha of Nikopol and by the *ban* (Pîrvu II Craiovescu). His reign lasted, with interruptions, till 1525, and he was the son of Dan IV (see my *Despre „Dan voievod”*, in SMIM, XXXI, 2013). Another new document describes the 1534 travel of Cornelius Schepper and Hieronymus Laski from Belgrade to Bratislava (they returned from their mission to the Porte). In 1538, a well-known Habsburg agent, Johann Pastor informs about the Ottoman campaign in Moldavia, where the Bulgarians and Wallachians participated too. After Petru Rareș was deposed, a discernible trend existed between his successor Stephen and the king of Poland, through whose guarantee the leading Moldavian boyar Petru Vartic will be sent by him to Vienna to negotiate without any knowledge of the Turks. We shall find the same experienced diplomat to offer to the Habsburgs in 1547 the contribution of Moldavia to the needed anti-ottoman war. Most of the following documents concern the relations of the Turks with Giorgio Martinuzzi, the regent of Hungary. Their interests met in their adversity to Ferdinand of Habsburg, and the sultan declared: “The land of Transylvania is my land, like all the others countries under my protection” (in 1550). The same feelings were expressed by the grand vizir Mehmet Sokolli when menacing with the next military intervention in Transylvania (it is interesting that he asked the recipient of this letter to answer him in Serbian, his own maternal language, in order to prevent spying). No less than forty documents regard the events of the year 1552. One of them, on November 5, was written from Bucharest to Johannes Bengner, the judge of Brașov, requiring the extradition of the Wallachian refugees. Prince Mircea the Shepherd, who obviously inspired that letter, warned that

the families of those people, left at home, could expect the punishment deserved by their fathers and husbands. Later, in 1558, we shall hear about such a Romanian boyar who had fled to Transylvania, „con il tesoro che ha portato di Valachia”. The epistolary dialogue is continuing with the Porte, including an intervention from the French ambassador to Constantinople, who acted as an ally of the Ottoman Empire. Other diplomats present at the Porte as Ferdinand’s representatives were Gian Maria Malvezzi and the most reputed Busbecq.

The records communicated in this volume have been recently used in Cristina Feneşan’s standard work *Constituirea principatului autonom al Transilvaniei*, Bucureşti, 1997.

Andrei Pippidi

Konrad PETROVSZKY, *Geschichte schreiben im osmanischen Südosteuropa. Eine Kulturgeschichte orthodoxer Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden, Harassowitz Verlag, 2014, 272 p.

One needs courage to write on this subject, almost eighty years after Babinger. There is however a fundamental difference: while the great Osmanologist looked at the Ottoman Historiography, written for Turks, the author of this book dares to embrace the whole Balkan world with its Orthodox Christian chroniclers and historians, be they Greeks or Romanians, and he takes also into consideration the regions inhabited by Serbian- and Bulgarian- speakers. Apart from vernacular languages, this endeavour requires the aptitude of reading Latin, ancient Greek and Old Slavonic sources. As seen from the West, this cluster of cultural provinces was the *Turcograecia* of Crusius or Kigalas, on the fringe of Europe. The research must extend itself outside the Balkans, for instance towards Venice, where there were copyists of Greek manuscripts and editors who published Greek books. In the 19th century, the same role of external beacons will be played by Vienna and, slightly later, by Odessa, but Petrovszky’s investigation, starting at the Ottoman conquest, is deliberately limited to the early modern times. Nevertheless, the traditional style and vision that characterized the 16th–18th centuries will continue for a while in parallel with the Western historiography created by a different education whose spreading in the South-East was slow.

As any PhD thesis, this one begins with a synthetic chapter (in this case over the general situation of the Ottoman Europe 1500–1700), but this outline is clear and sound. Then, the background examined in the second chapter is the circulation of knowledge, a valuable example of a trend which has been developing recently. It grows from elementary teaching at home (reading and writing, on evidence from Synadinos) to independent wandering teachers and schools created for the élite, as, with interruptions, in the Romanian Principalities and in Genoese Chios. Wallachia saw the action of Şerban Cantacuzino and of Constantin Brâncoveanu to found the Princely Academy, which was imitated in Moldavia. In the late seventeenth century the transmission of culture took the form of sending students abroad, mostly to catholic centres of Italy that welcomed Greeks (a Wallachian line to an Oxford college did not last). Catholic missionaries gathered pupils in Bulgaria and Albania.

The author’s observations on the dynamic of manuscript copying in orthodox monasteries are excellent and they are completed with evidence about book-collecting. When printing penetrates in South-Eastern Europe it is mostly based on orthodox religion, but this means of communication will contribute to the development of historical culture.

A question that previously stimulated the intellectual debate in Romania is how to explain the scarcity of Moldavian and Wallachian documents at comparison with the activity of Central-European chancelleries (here, of course, we should except the case of Ragusa). The simplest explanations are poverty and enormous losses caused by wars, fires or natural calamities. Oral culture preserved popular tradition in Albanian and in Ottoman Turkish, also in Greek until Fauriel and in Serbian until Karagić, and this was determinant for epic, but literature needs to respect style and this is possible only in written form. As long as history did not mean more than lists of ancestors or kings, it could be