

which can often affect English foreign policy. Hence, although this book has no direct bearing on Balkan history, it well repays study by Balkan historians since it gives valuable clues to the formulation of British Balkan policy.

Dr. Shannon ends his detailed study with the meeting of the National Conference on the Eastern Question in December 1876, from which time the agitation rapidly subsided. He then explains that neither the agitation itself nor questions of foreign policy generally affected to any great extent the electoral issues of 1880. In the meantime Disraeli and Salisbury had conducted British policy and had left their mark upon the Treaty of Berlin of 1878, having refused to be stampeded by vociferous and hostile opinion. Into all this it is not Dr. Shannon's purpose to enter. His interest is directed mainly to the Irish problem, to which, in terms of Gladstone, the *Bulgarian Horrors* forms a background.

Students of Balkan history would be interested to know what, if any, was the long-term effect of the agitation of 1876 upon British opinion and policy. Quite clearly by the end of the century, and particularly in the first few years of this century, when the Macedonian question assumed serious dimensions, there was a pronounced tendency in England to accept uncritically Bulgarian propaganda. It is possible that memories of the *Bulgarian Horrors* lingered. On the other hand the agitation of 1902-3 (which continued for some time after that date) may have been a fresh manifestation of the English conscience and therefore similar to the agitation of 1876. What is needed to answer these questions is a study of such good quality as this monograph of Dr. Shannon's.

Birkbeck College
University of London

DOUGLAS DAKIN

Carte românească de învățătură. 1646. Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, București, 1961, 431 pages. (Volume VI in the "Collection of Sources of Old Rumanian Law").

This work is a critical edition of the first official law code of Moldavia. It was published in Iași in 1646 at the behest of Vasile Lupu, Prince of Moldavia from 1634 to 1653. The compiler and translator was the Logofăt Eustratie, a secretary in the Prince's chancellery who possessed a knowledge of Byzantine law and of classical languages.

As the editors point out in an admirable introductory essay (pp. 5-27), Vasile Lupu, in ordering the compilation of an official law code, wished to achieve two main objectives: first, the strengthening of the authority of the central government at the expense of the land-owning boiers, and second, the better regulation of the economic life of the principality.

As far as the first was concerned, the code extended the competence of the prince's courts and provided severe penalties for failing to obey the prince's commands or for obstructing the work of his officials. It offered concessions and special protection to merchants and artisans in an apparent effort on the part of the prince to win their support against the boiers, who represented the chief threat to his program of centralization. The publication of the *Carte* in Rumanian rather than in Slavonic, which had been the language of the prince's chancellery since the foundation of the principality in the fourteenth century, was designed to satisfy the new social classes who wished to extend the use of the spoken language in government and the church. By championing the use of Rumanian, Vasile Lupu hoped that it would serve as an instrument of centralization.

In the first half of the seventeenth century the economy of Moldavia experienced a rapid expansion. Commerce and craft industry were developing apace, and the code provided special encouragements to both. The Moldavian economy was still mainly agrarian in character and the most notable development was the increase in the production of grain for the domestic and foreign markets. The boiers, wishing to take advantage of the new opportunities to acquire wealth, increased their own holdings at the expense of the peasants and took measures to assure themselves of an adequate labor force. The *Carte* sanctioned the prohibition, which Vasile Lupu's predecessors had introduced, against the free movement of the peasants from one estate to another. The code, in general, consecrated the peasant's inferior status *vis-à-vis* the boier. For example, the peasant was punished more severely than the boier for the same crime.

The *Carte* consisted of three sections: eleven chapters concerning farming and the relations between landowner and peasant and between peasant and peasant; five chapters of "imperial laws concerning theft"; and 78 chapters concerning a whole series of crimes from murder and rape to counterfeiting and bigamy. In various chapters were included matters of civil law—inheritance, marriage and divorce - and of canon law—the regulation of the clergy and monasteries.

The two main sources of the *Carte* are the Byzantine Farmer's Law and the repertory of criminal law published by the Italian jurist Prosper Farinaccius (1544-1618), entitled *Praxis et theoricæ criminalis* (Venice, 1607-1621). The first eleven chapters of the *Carte* are a translation of the Byzantine Farmer's Law. The remaining chapters are based upon Farinaccius's work, which Eustratie used in the form of an extract, probably in Greek, and to which he added elements of Byzantine law.

As Gh. Cronț has pointed out in his study, "Dreptul bizantin în Tărilor Române. Pravila Moldovei din 1646" (Byzantine Law in the Rumanian Lands. The Law Code of Moldavia of 1646), *Studii*, XI (1958), pp. 33-59, Byzantine law found wide acceptance in both Moldavia and Wallachia because it corresponded to their social and economic needs at that moment in their development. The princes of both countries favored the introduction of Roman-Byzantine law because it strengthened the power of the central government at the expense of feudal authority and local customary law.

The *Carte românească de învățătură* was not intended to replace the other Byzantine codes and manuals which circulated in manuscript in Moldavia. As was true of Byzantine practice, it was designed to serve as a guide and textbook for jurists rather than as a set of fixed rules.

Appended to the present edition of the *Carte* are pertinent excerpts from the Byzantine Farmer's Law, from Greek manuscripts in the Biblioteca Academiei R.P.R. in Bucharest which Eustratie used, and from *Praxis et theoreticæ criminalis*. There is also a valuable bibliography of works dealing with old Rumanian law, a useful subject index, and a glossary of special terms and words current in the seventeenth century but now no longer in use.

Wake Forest College
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

KEITH HITCHINS

Hodja Husein, *Beda' i' ul-veka' i'* [*Udivitel'nye sobytiia*] Edited by A. S. Tveritina with an annotated table of contents by I.A. Petrosian. 2 volumes, Moscow, 1961, Part I, 75-399 pages; part II, pages 401-1116.

The present work represents an important contribution to our knowledge of medieval Ottoman history and, in particular, of the re-