

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 theoriticae 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-

lations between the Ottoman Turks and the peoples of Southeastern Europe whom they subjugated.

Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, the great Austrian orientalist, was one of the first Europeans to call attention to the first volume of Hodja Husein's *Beda' i' ul-veka'i'* [Marvellous Events], which is now preserved in the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. It deals with the early history of the Arabs and the life of Mohammed and of the Caliphs down to the time of Genghis Khan. The second volume somehow went astray and remained unknown until 1950, when it was discovered in the manuscript collection of the Leningrad section of the Oriental Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. It is this manuscript which is reproduced in the present edition.

Information about the life of Hodja Husein is scanty. Like many Ottoman chroniclers he was of Balkan origins, having been born in Sarajevo, the son of the librarian of the Husrev Pasha mosque. He received a classical education at the Sultan's court in Istanbul. In 1636, at the behest of Murad IV, he translated from Arabic into Turkish the work of Ahmed Yusuf al-Karamani entitled, *Ahbar ul-düvel* [Information about States], which contains the history of the Prophet and the Caliphs. In the same year Husein was appointed *reis ul-Kuttab*, or Chancellor of the Imperial Divan, a post which he held for twelve years. During this time, about 1644, he completed the first volume of *Beda' i' ul-veka' i'* and the second volume about 1650, shortly before his death at the age of over eighty.

The Leningrad manuscript traces the history of the Ottoman Empire from the period of Osman's emirate at the end of the thirteenth century down to the death of Sultan Selim in 1520. Adhering faithfully to the traditions of Ottoman chroniclers, Husein uses the reigns of the various Sultans as a framework for his narrative. This he divides into two parts of unequal lengths. In the first part he deals with the reigns of Osman (1288-1326), Orkhan (1326-62), Murad I (1362-89), Bayezid I (1389-1402), Mohammed I (1402-21), and Murad II (1421-51); in the second part, twice as long as the first, he describes in much greater detail the reigns of Mohammed II (1451-81), Bayezid II (1481-20). He relates almost day by day the most important political, economic, and, to some extent, cultural events in Istanbul and the provinces. At the beginning of each chapter or section, he describes the personal qualities and accomplishments of the Sultan, the members of his family, and the political and economic conditions obtaining in the neighboring countries and the nature of their relations with the Ot-

toman Empire. He concludes each section with a discussion of the lives and deeds of the most important of the *ulema*, of the vizirs, and of other public officials. His treatment of them is generally laudatory, but he does not hesitate to criticize flagrant examples of corruption of even the highest officials. His attitude toward the Christian *rayah* of the Balkans is usually one of disdain, but sometimes he defends him against gross injustices committed by Turkish officials if only for the reason that the *rayah* is a source of wealth to the imperial treasury.

As is true of medieval Ottoman historiography generally, Husein concerns himself primarily with political and military events. Nevertheless, he provides much interesting information on social and economic life. He describes, for example, the division of conquered territories into fiefs, the organization of the Ottoman armed forces, and the economic situation in neighboring countries and the circumstances of their subjugation. He sometimes supplements his narrative with lengthy excerpts from official documents to which he, as *reis ul-Kuttab*, had easy access. One of the most interesting of these is a law of Mohammed II 1479 containing a table of ranks for the Ottoman administrative hierarchy. Husein also drew extensively from the works of his Ottoman, Persian, and Arabic predecessors: Ashik Pasha Zade (died after 1484), Idris Bitlisi (died 1520), Mehmed Neshri (died 1520), and Hodja Saduddin (died 1599). He himself, however, went into more detail than most of them, so that, as A.S. Tveritina observes, his, of all the Turkish chronicles composed in the seventeenth century, is the fullest source for the history of the Ottoman Empire.

Husein's work is of particular interest to specialists in the history of Southeastern Europe. Most of his attention is focused on the conquest of the area by the warriors of Islam.

He describes in detail the advance of the Turks into Bulgaria beginning with the capture of Zagora and Plovdiv in the early 1360's through the final destruction of that country's independence in 1393. At the same time, the Serbian kingdom suffered increasingly heavy Turkish attacks. Husein describes Murad I's campaign in 1375-76 which forced the Serbian Prince to pay tribute. He then deals at length with the preparations of both sides for the Battle of Kossovo Plain and the Turkish victory (1389). Turkish raids into Bosnia and Herzegovina now increased in size and frequency and obliged the rulers of these lands to become tributaries of the Sultan; Husein gives 1463 as the date of the final conquest of both.

With regard to the Albanians, Husein mentions the first Turkish raid

against them as having taken place in 1383, as a result of which "much booty and many prisoners were taken." He describes the education of Skanderbeg at the Sultan's court, his accession to power upon the death of his father, and his subsequent "betrayal" of the Turks. He concludes the narrative of the Albanians' struggle against the armies of Mohammed II with the siege and capture of Scutari in 1478.

Husein provides much interesting information concerning the history of the Rumanian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. The first mention of Wallachian-Turkish contact is a battle along the Maritsa River in 1365 in which a Wallachian contingent fought with the Slavs against the Turks. In 1389, Moldavian as well as Wallachian troops participated in the Battle of Kossovo Plain on the side of the Serbs. As "punishment" Bayezid I undertook a campaign against Prince Mircea "the Old" of Wallachia and obliged him in 1391 to pay tribute in return for peace. Mircea's subsequent involvement in the struggle over the Ottoman throne following the capture of Bayezid by Timur at the Battle of Ankara in 1402 is described in great detail. Mircea supported Musa, who lost out to his brother Mohammed I, and, as a consequence, had to suffer new invasions of his territory. The rest of the century was taken up with efforts of the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia to parry new Ottoman thrusts. The most successful was Stephen the Great, Moldavia's greatest prince (1457-1504). His exploits against vastly superior Turkish forces frequently draws grudging admiration from Husein who rarely has a good word for the foes of Islam. In the end with his resources exhausted, even Stephen was obliged to come to terms with the Turks. The last important mention Husein makes concerning Turkish relations with the Rumanian principalities is the presence in Istanbul of ambassadors from Moldavia and Wallachia laden with gifts for the new Sultan Selim I.

Husein's interest in Greece is limited to a description of its conquest. He begins with the raids on the environs of Salonika in 1382-83 and the capture of the city in 1393, and concludes with the expulsion of the Venetians from the Morea and numerous Aegean islands by the end of the fifteenth century.

Husein displays much interest in the relations between the Sultans and the Byzantine Emperors. In 1394, Bayezid I commenced the first siege of Constantinople. After a brief interruption caused by the advance of "Frankish" crusaders and their allies down the Danube to Nicopolis in 1396, he finally obliged Emperor Manuel II to agree to the formation of a Muslim community and the construction of a mosque

within the city walls. After the disaster at Ankara in 1402, the Byzantines drove the Muslims out of Constantinople and destroyed their mosque. During the period of strife over the succession to the Ottoman throne (1402-13), Manuel II supported Mohammed against Musa and even loaned him ships with which to transport his soldiers from Asia to Europe, where his rival's strength was concentrated. The Byzantines vitiated whatever gratitude they may thus have earned by "conspiring" with European powers against the Turks. Husein gives a minute description of the unsuccessful efforts of Emperor Constantine XI to dissuade the Sultan from besieging Constantinople and of the final siege and capture of the city. Following this, he recounts the history of the city from its earliest times, its appearance at the time of its fall, and Mohammed's efforts to rebuild and repopulate it. As for his sources, he does not cite Byzantine works directly, but the extensive knowledge of Byzantine history which he displays suggests that he was familiar with Byzantine sources, perhaps through the intermediary of Idris Bitlisi, upon whose writings he largely based his own account.

The present edition of volume II of *Beda'i ul-veka'i* consists of 1034 facsimiles of text, an enlightening introduction by A.S. Tveritina which evaluates the importance and the originality of the work, a useful summary of the contents of each chapter by I.A. Petrosian, and an index of names and places mentioned in the text.

As Husein's work receives the attention from specialist which it deserves, it will provide new insights into the early history of the Ottoman Empire and of the countries of Southeastern Europe which formed a part of it.

Wake Forest College
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

KEITH HITCHINS

Gligor Stanojević, *Crna Gora Pred Stvaranje Države 1773-1796*. [Montenegro Before the Formation of the State 1773-1796] Historical Institute in Belgrade. Special edition. Vol. 12. Beograd 1962, p. 355.

The strongly accented tribe-structure of the Montenegrin society calls for parallel historical, social and ethnological studies of the process of the formation of the modern state in Montenegro. Besides the existing pre-war literature (VI. Djordjević, D. Vuksan, M. Dragović), quite a number of historians today are dealing with the same problem (V. Čubrilović, P. Popović, B. Pavićević, G. Stanojević, T. Nikčević).