

allen, die sich mit slawischen Studien befassen, ein höchst brauchbares Hilfsmittel in die Hand gegeben hat, das diese zweifellos mit Freude und Dankbarkeit aufgenommen haben.

Institut für Balkan-Studien

ANTON-EMIL N. TACHIAOS

Γεωργίου Τ. Ζώρα, *Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων Σουλτάνων* (κατὰ τὸν Βαβερινὸν Ἑλληνικὸν Κώδικα 111). Athens: Spoudastêrion Byzantinês kai Neollênikês Philologias, 1958. Pr. 385. 9 plates.

The publication of a critical edition of the text with commentary, notes, tables of names, and glossary of the Codex Barberinus Graecus 111 is an important event in the history of post-Byzantine and Ottoman historical studies. This codex, whose provenience, title, author, and date are unknown, has been used by a number of scholars (most notably Greek) and has been known in brief descriptions by Gyula Moravcsik (*Πρακτικὰ Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* V, 1930, 447-449); Spyridon Lambros (*Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* V, 1908, 454-455); and Professor Seymour Ricci ("Liste sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliotheca Barberina", *Revue des Bibliothèques* 1907, pp. 81-125). Professor George T. Zoras of the Universities of Athens and Rome was moved to publish this critical edition because it has significant interest for scholars in Greek, Turkish, Hungarian, and Balkan history. The exact chronological limits of *Chronicle concerning the Turkish Sultans* are not fixed, but that it does belong to the 16th century seems a certainty. The extant manuscript begins with the reign of Murat I and extends to the reign of Selim (1513). Ten pages have been lost previous to what is the beginning of the extant manuscript. Professor Zoras suspects that the original chronicle began with the reigns of Osman I (1289-1326), Suleiman and Urchan, perhaps with a general introduction and discussion of the sources utilized preceding it, followed by the history of the reign of Murat I of which only the section beginning with the revolution of the two princes, Saous the Turk and Andronicos the Greek (son of John V) and their blinding. Professor Zoras believes that the chronological exposition of events began in 1289, embraced the entire reign of Selim I, and extended until 1519, and perhaps was continued for a few years beyond this. What has been preserved in the Codex Barberinus Graecus 111 is coverage of the reigns of nine sultans, namely, those of Murat I, Bayiazit I, Suleiman I, Musa, Mohammed I, Murat II, Mohammed II, Bayiazit II, and Selim I.

The MS as preserved contains no divisions, no paragraphing, no punctuation, an overwhelming abundance of incorrect spellings and wrong accents, indiscriminate joining together of words, and phonetic orthography. On the positive side, it is written in an incipient demotic idiom and is always thoroughly and clearly legible and easily comprehensible. Another hand has on one page (11r) added the title *Historia Imperatorum Turcarum* and the note *cod[ex] mutilus 280 bis*, which would seem to indicate an older and different numbering of the codex.

Professor Zoras has very neatly arranged this codex for us with a well-ordered text and criticus apparatus (17-144); a commentary (147-303) that examines critically the specific narrative of the unknown chronographer, relying heavily in his rectifications on Joseph von Hammer's *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches* (in the modern Greek translation of Constantine S. Krokidas, Athens, 1870) and also the works of other scholars; a section on general information about the author and his work (307-342), including the problem of the title, dating, and authorship of the *Chronicle*, the scribe and language of the work, and the original sources, which are shown to be the Athenian Laonicos Chalcocondyles for the Ottoman origins; anti-Turkish Catholic Leonardus of Chios for the fall of Constantinople; for the second half of the 15th century and the early part of the 16th Chalcocondyles plus Guazzo, Giovio, *The Chronicks of the Fall of Negrepont*, the *Fatti di Solimano*, and some other contemporary sources. This *Chronicle of the Sultans* thus provides a parallel source to the works of the historians Ducas, Sphrantzes, Chalcocondyles, Critoboulos, the *Ekthesis Chroniké*, and the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Dorotheos*. The table of parallel passages in the original sources from which the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* drew (343-345) and the glossary of names (347-383) are invaluable tools for using this book, and Professor Zoras is to be warmly commended for including them.

Though the *Chronicle* clearly indicates that its author does not belong to the "classical school" of writers of Greek and that his Latin is negligible, though he clearly does not possess encyclopedic knowledge and perhaps not even a first-hand knowledge of primary sources, his language and style are an authentic example of the developing demotic Greek language. His language seems to indicate an Ionian Islands provenience since he seems at home in 16th century Italian, yet he also possesses a working knowledge of Turkish terminology and uses words of Peloponnesian origin. Professor Zoras believes that the author is an inhabitant of Venice or a Venetian-held Greek land.<sup>1</sup> The author of the codex is most impressed with "the glory that was Byzantium" and is distressed at the waning of Byzantine civilization and power (for some of the specific attitudes represented, the reader is referred to Zoras' other book reviewed elsewhere in this issue, *The Capture of Constantinople*). The chronographer is particularly prejudiced against the Byzantine aristocracy, which he stigmatizes for not meeting the Turkish onslaught head on in a forceful and dedicated way. The dissolution of the Byzantine Empire he attributes to a number of causes, including the many sins of the people, incompetence of the last emperors, the half-heartedness of a great part of the inhabitants, the miserliness and egoism of the rich. Professor Zoras believes that the views

---

1. The problem of the sources has been now restudied in the very good treatise of E. A. Zachariadou, *Tò χρονικό τῶν Τούρκων Σουλτάνων* (Thessaloniki 1960).

of the anonymous author are not distinctively characteristic of this author but reflect the views of the originals from which they were drawn as well as traditional opinion.

The chronographer is characterized also by a sincere and firm reverence for the Christian religion and the Orthodox Faith and Church, oftentimes attributing the destruction of the Empire to divine punishment for the lack of faith and for the sins of the people. He conspicuously avoids discussions of church dogma. He is not concerned with the Uniates or their position, but is remarkable for his exceptional Western orientation: he is especially impressed by Venice and the Venetians. Recognizing and underlining the achievements of the West, he emphasizes the failure of the West to help the East and prevent the ensuing spread of Turkish power to the West.

With respect to the Turks the author stresses their deceitful, bloody, and savage politicking. He does not hesitate to point out the cruel misdeeds performed on the members of their own families for the sake of political power. In addition, he shows how brutally Turkish military might asserted itself against the Christian population, and he reviews painfully the Turkish institution of the Janissaries.

Though not unmarred by historical and other errors (which Professor Zoras is careful to point out), the author of the *Chronicle* was as objective as could be expected under the circumstances. Even though there are inaccuracies, confusions, and often incomplete statements in his text as we have it, it remains a valuable source for the study of the 16th century. We are in Professor Zoras' debt for making available this very useful, well-planned and carefully exacted edition of *The Chronicle concerning the Turkish Sultans*.

Colgate University  
Hamilton, New York

JOHN E. REXINE

Γεωργίου Γ. Ζώρα, *Περί τῆν Ἀλωσιν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*. Athens: Spoudastêrion Byzantinês kai Neoellênikês Philologias tou Panepistimiou Athenôn, 1959. Pp. 305.

This book is a collection of fourteen essays on subjects related to the periods before and after the capitulation of Constantinople and the period of Turkish occupation. All the essays have appeared in print elsewhere in one form or another and have now been published in one single volume for easy access and reference. None of the essays constitutes more than a preliminary introduction to the subjects involved and many of the articles repeat what the author has said in other articles. There has been no attempt to reorganize the essays in the form of a unified book but rather the articles are presented pretty much as they were originally published in various journals or books. Many of the articles are far from scholarly; much of what Professor Zoras has to say can be just as easily culled from reading the original documents