

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 16<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> 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

transmitted without a scribe, but literacy became necessary when a chronicle supposed the narration for a political reason and, also, impressiveness in order to convince. Petrovszky fairly remarks the problem of the Hellenic culture with its distancing between the popular language being alive in folklore and the scholarly archaism of the Byzantines and the Greek humanists. The quoted letter, by Kallinikos II in 1700, expressed the reluctance of the Great Church to tolerate any translation of religious works into vulgar Greek.

In the next chapter we find the distinction between *chronographia* (popular) and *istoria* (cultivated), besides *skazania*, which is Slavonic and Serbian, or *Letopis/ Slavonic*, equivalent with *letopiseș* in Romanian). After an account of the Slavo-Romanian chronicles, comes a selection of their basic themes: the Agarenoi (Turks), the Basileus (sultan) and God's punishment (the Ottoman tyranny). Peter Schreiner provides guidance on the short Greek chronicles of the sixteenth century, but, for the Romanian ones, of greater length, it is a pity that two eminent historians have not been read: M. Berza and Paul Cernovodeanu. Of particular value is the attention paid to Cantemir and to Ienăchiță Văcărescu as counterparts of Ottoman historiography. Much stress is put on the portraits of sultans (p. 160, „Lajos” in Hungarian is not Ladislaus, but Louis). Very telling is also the analysis of three works: the memoirs of

Matthew of Myra, those of Synadinos and the hagiographic writings of Paisios I, Patriarch of Peć. Further, the author studies the historical discourse of the Moldavian chroniclers Grigore Ureche and Miron Costin: it is interpreted as literature of crisis, because of the tendency to dramatize (Neculce should have been added in the same family). As witnesses of their times, they added a new theme to the traditional ones: the good government, a hardly accessible ideal of stability.

The brave attempt to measure and compare the early modern historical culture in South-Eastern Europe, proclaimed as it is since the title of this book, has much to command respect and to provoke thought.

*Andrei Pippidi*

PAUL DIN ALEP, *Jurnal de călătorie în Moldova și Valahia*, étude introductive, édition du manuscrit arabe, traduction en roumain, notes et index (onomastique et toponymique) par Ioana FEODOROV, avec un avant-propos de Răzvan Theodorescu, Bucarest – Braïla, Éditions de l'Académie Roumaine – Éditions Istros du Musée de Braïla, 2014, 619 p.

Après un très concis Avant-propos dû à Răzvan Theodorescu (p. 5–6), membre de l'Académie Roumaine, le livre débute par une vaste étude introductive sur la personnalité du voyageur, ainsi que sur son précieux Journal de voyage en Moldavie et Valachie (p. 7–85), dans le Pays des Cosaques et en Russie, dont seulement la description du voyage effectué en Moldavie et en Valachie voit ici la lumière de l'imprimerie.

Pour faciliter au lecteur la comparaison avec les traductions antérieures du même texte (anglaise de F. C. Belfour, 1820–1836, russe de G. A. Murkos, 1896–1898, française de V. Radu, 1930, et roumaine de Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, 1976, dans le VI<sup>e</sup> volume des *Călători străini despre Țările Române*), Ioana Feodorov a inséré certains fragments en traduction parallèle avec la sienne, qui est cette dernière (p. 87–107). Suivent la Transcription des caractères arabes en roumain respectée par cette traduction (p. 109), une autre liste des Abréviations générales (p. 111), celle des nombreuses Sigles concernant la Bibliographie principale (p. 112–122), puis une plus riche Bibliographie secondaire citée (p. 123–143). La partie essentielle du livre consiste dans la nouvelle traduction roumaine du texte arabe de cette relation de voyage (p. 147–436), traduction munie de 1212 notes placées au-bas de la page, suivie par l'édition du texte arabe (p. 439–596).

Ce n'est pas seulement l'étude introductive, mais surtout cette nouvelle traduction du texte arabe qui convainc le lecteur de l'utilité et de la nécessité de cette récente édition. Bien sûr, un arabiste ferait une démonstration mieux argumentée que celle que nous pouvons faire ici. Tout