

society reaches toward capitalism the resulting agrarian disruption increases the chances of social banditry while the completion of the transition to capitalism destroys the environment on which the social bandit depends. Generally he is anything but a revolutionary and rather than seeking drastic change instinctively favors the traditional order, complete with most of its inequities, so long as they are kept within reason. However, he may join in revolution as part of the resistance of the whole of the old order to an external or novel threat or during one of those millennial periods when people are carried away by visions of a life better than any they have known. Yet even in these cases the traditional roots are seen in the behavior expected of the bandit; though of the people, he must also be above them. In manner and dress there must be that touch of elegance that suggests superiority and leads naturally to rumors of noble ties. But in belief the bandit usually mirrors the peasantry from which he came. Thus, notes Hobsbawm, the anti-semitism of the central and eastern European peasants was found, with few exceptions, among the bandits of these areas—the Balkans being one of the exceptions. As a man of the people the bandit easily returns to the people and actually never leaves them. To survive he must maintain contact with settled communities and the frequency of merchant-bandit chiefs supports this.

The readers of this journal will probably find their greatest reward in the chapter titled, «Haiduks». Hobsbawm's admiration of this group shows as he typifies them as «the highest form of primitive banditry, the one which comes closest to being a permanent and conscious focus for peasant insurrection» (p. 62). For the Haiduk, the Klepht, the Cossack, was a national bandit always there to counter the Turk, the Bulgar, the Basurman. Theft was wrong but surely there was no crime in robbing a Turk. And so when the nation as a whole acted, the bandit, already armed, mobile, and organized, naturally acted with it.

The value of this short book lies not only in its ready applicability to Balkan History but also in the insights it provides to a global reality. From Brazil to Bombay, Sardinia to Shantung, the bandit has had an impact and Hobsbawm's convincing and witty text will help to understand it. Furthermore, the illustrations, a gallery of excessively armed and fiercely mustachioed men, are alone worth the price of the book.

Ithaca College, Conn.

JOHN R. PAVIA JR.

Franz Babinger, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*, Bd. II, München, Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1966, pp. vi + 310 + 72 plates [Südosteuropa-Schriften, 8. Band].

This is the second of what is now to be a three-volume selection of writings on Southeastern Europe and the Levant from Professor Franz Babinger's astounding contribution to Ottoman-Turkish studies. Like the first book, which was reviewed in these pages in 1966 (VII, No. 2), the present collection of twenty-eight articles and treatises has also been edited by Professors H. J. Kissling (*Turkish studies*) and A. Schmaus (*Balkan Studies*) of the University of Munich. So far as I know, the projected third volume of this laudable enterprise has not yet been published.

While the first book contained selections from Babinger's works in the fields of Islamic religion and Ottoman-Turkish history, the present one includes some of his representative writings on Ottoman-Turkish historiography, Ottoman foreign relations, diplomatics, cultural geography, monetary developments and Ottoman trade relations with other nations. Rather than merely list all the writings in these categories, I have chosen for consideration a number of the notable articles, which, I trust, will interest readers of this journal.

One of Babinger's major contributions to the study of Ottoman history (and that of the Balkans) in this book is his forty-eight page (pp. 263-310) treatise «Der Quellenwert der Berichte über den Entsatz von Belgrad am 21./22. Juli 1456», written in commemoration of the 500 anniversary of the successful defense of Belgrade by heterogeneous, untrained and ill-equipped bands of Christian crusaders, under the ostensible leadership of the Franciscan Giovanni da Capestrano, against the technically-powerful armed forces of Mehmed II, the haughty Conqueror of Constantinople only three years earlier. Babinger here presents: a) a scholarly comparative evaluation of the credibility of the existing literature on the defense of that «mighty Christian bulwark», which not only saved Hungary and Germany, but frustrated Mehmed's ambition of conquering the western world for the Ottoman Empire and Islam; and b) a critical examination of the largely partisan Christian sources that have become available on the question of leadership (John Hunyadi vs. da Capestrano) in this famous victorious battle, and of the Byzantine historians and Ottoman chroniclers, as well as of the authoritative Christian sources on the events that had transpired on the Ottoman side during the siege and disastrous retreat.

Another substantial writing in this area is «Die türkischen Quellen Dimitrie Kantemir's». In it, the author examines closely the Rev. Nicholas Tindal's English translation of Cantemir's (d. 1723) *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1734), of which the original Latin text (completed in Jassy in 1717) has not been published. Cantemir states that in his account of the early history of the empire he had used his Ottoman sources almost verbatim; but as regards his own time (i.e., 1673-1711), he had based the account partly on his experiences and impressions, and partly on information supplied him by personages with «intimate knowledge of state secrets». His history of the latter period may therefore be considered an important source material on its own. But Babinger, with the unusual knowledge of Ottoman historians (see his *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*, 1927), in scrutinizing Cantemir's Ottoman sources, points out that an astonishing number of them are indeterminable. He offers three possible explanations for this strange fact: «Entweder hat D. Kantemir diese Quellen frei erfunden, also geflunkert, oder er hat sie in den Jahren der russischen Verbannung ungenau nach dem morschen Gedächtnis angeführt, also Verwechslungen begangen oder aber wir haben es in der Tat mit lauter, bis zur Gegenwart der doch, zumal in den beiden letzten Jahrzehnten, rührigen osmanischen Geschichtsforschung entgangenen Werken zu tun, deren Auffindung oder doch wenigstens genaue Bestimmung dann mehr als wünschenswert wäre». And he adds, «Von der Klärung dieser Frage hängt D. Kantemir's Glaubwürdigkeit als Geschichtsschreiber und der Wert seines Werkes in entscheidendem Ausmass ab» (pp. 148-149).

An important and highly interesting historical essay touching the life and reign of the Conqueror of Constantinople is «Ja'qub-Pascha, ein Leibarzt Mehmed's II.- Leben und Schicksale des Maestro Jacopo aus Gaeta». On the basis of archival and other authoritative evidence, Babinger describes: a) the medical and diplomatic activities of Maestro Jacopo di Gaeta, the Jewish physician, who for thirty years had enjoyed the unshakable confidence of the Sultan, was appointed to high official positions and ended his life as Ja'qub-Paça, an unique achievement for a Jew at that time; and b) how the Signoria of Venice had attempted to win him over to a conspiracy to murder the Sultan, and thereby remove «the embittered enemy of Venice and the whole of Christendom». Although this brutal enterprise never materialized, Babinger states unequivocally that Maestro Jacopo «sich zeitweilig wenigstens mit dem Gedanken trug, den Western von der ständigen Bedrohung durch den Weltenstürmer Mehmed II. zu befreien...» Jacopo di Gaeta was murdered by the mutineering and plundering Janizaries on the death of Mehmed II.

In the field of Ottoman foreign relations there are two valuable contributions: i) «Die älteste türkische Urkunde des deutsch-osmanischen Staatsverkehrs», (in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek zu München), in which Babinger deals with Ibrahim-Paça's (Süleyman the Magnificent's all-powerful Grand Vizier) letter to Ferdinand I of Habsburg Austria, dated 17 November 1530. In this letter, Ibrahim-Paça rejected the King's request for Ottoman recognition of his claims to the Hungarian crown on the ground that Hungary was Ottoman conquered territory and as such was already granted to Janosh Krâl King John Szapolya), and that the revocation of this imperial grant was unthinkable. Babinger provides details on the diplomatics of the document, a transcription of the text and a translation. But what Babinger failed to make clear (see pp. 231-232) is that the document was the usual accompanying letter of the grand viziers to imperial *names* — the Sultan had indeed written to Ferdinand I under the same date — as is evident from the many similar documents in the Polish *Katalog dokumentów tureckich. Dokumenty do dziejów Polski i krajów ościennych w latach 1453-1672*, by Z. Abrahamowicz (Warszawa, 1956), beginning with document No. 36, «Wielki wezyr Ibrahim pasza do króla Zygmunta I» (Aleppo, 25 February-6 March, 1534), which has the same content as the Sultan's letter to the King (No. 35). It may be mentioned that Süleyman's first letter (in the *Katalog*, No. 19) and the treaty which he granted to the Polish King (No. 20) are both in the Turkish language and of 18 October 1525. The first Ottoman treaty granted to Poland (No. 3) is composed in Latin and is dated 22 March 1489.

And ii) «Qara Mustafa-Paschas Esseger Sendschreiben an den Markgrafen Herman von Baden». It concerns the Grand Vizier's harsh rejection of the request by the «Präsident des Hofkriegsrates» for continuing peaceful relations between the two powers, written at Esseg (srbr. Osijek, hung. Eszék) during the unsuccessful march on Vienna in 1683. Babinger gives the history of the document and describes the ceremonial in which the letter was used in breaking relations with Vienna. He also presents a commentary on the diplomatics of the text, a transcription, and two extant Italian translations. These two articles are important for the study of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics.

In the field of diplomatics, there is Babinger's fundamental «Die grossherrliche Tughra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des osmanischen Urkundenwesens». In this essay, the author traces the origin and development of the *tuğra*, the complicated monogram-like emblem of the Ottoman sultans (different for each monarch), which appears at the head of every imperial document, and which alone gave to it legality and power. Although others (in western Asia and Egypt) had used *tuğras*, Babinger points out that «In der Tat sind es die Osmanen gewesen die der Tughra jenes ausgeprägte Ansehen gaben...» and that «...in späteren Zeiten die Züge der osmanischen Tughra immer verwickelter wurden, ganz gewiss, um die Nachahmung möglichst zu erschweren» (pp. 105-106). The death penalty was decreed for forging a *tuğra*. Originally painted in black or blue ink, the *tuğras* evolved into highly artistic, richly colorful miniature paintings (especially in the so-called «Tulip-period», see Abb. 16-56) for which, in the 17th century and later, special *tuğra*-painters (*Tuğrakeş*) were employed. However, writing (in 1925) on the historicity of earliest Ottoman *tuğras*, Babinger stated that he had been unable to verify J. von Hammer's report of Orhan (1324-1359) *tuğras*. Since then two such *tuğras* have in fact come to light, one on a document issued by Orhan in 1324 and the other in 1348 (Paul Wittek, «Notes sur la tughra ottomane», *Byzantion*, 18 (1948), pp. 311-34). As the Ottoman Turks had used only paper for the composition of documents, knowledge of the provenance of the paper, as evidenced by watermarks, is essential in the study of diplomatics. Hence the importance of Babinger's two articles, «Papierhandel und Papierbereitung in der Levante» (with 11 reproductions of watermarks) and «Appunti sulle cartiere e sull' importazione di carta nell' Impero Ottomano specialmente da Venezia». Thow shey that Ot-

toman-Turkey imported the paper from abroad, especially from Venice, France and Austria.

Some of the other significant articles include: i) «Ein Auslandsbrief des Kaisers Johannes VIII. vom Jahre 1447», written in collaboration with Franz Dölger, the eminent Byzantinist at the University of Munich. Composed in a rather «vulgar» Greek and addressed to Sarudsha-Paşa (a Greek by birth), a confidant of Murad II, it discloses the fragile and dangerous Ottoman-Byzantine relations of the time. The authors provide the historical facts underlying the text and a translation of it, and a commentary on the diplomatics (Byzantine) of this writing - which belongs to the category of imperial «foreign letters». ii) «Ein marokkanisches Staatsschreiben an den Freistaat Ragusa vom Jahre 1194/1780», in which Babinger deals with the history of this rare document in Ragusa's (= Dubrovnik) little known relations with Marocco, and provides a transcription of the text, a translation, as well as a brief discussion of its diplomatics (Maroccan). And finally, iii) «Ewlija Tschelebi's Reisewege in Albanien». In this thirty-eight pages long article, Babinger has collected translated, and carefully annotated all textual references to Albania (in 1670) in that untiring traveler's multi-volume *Seyâhatnâme*. Ewliya Tschelebi had a parently wandered through Albania a number of times, and his observations on the political and cultural conditions in that country are of greatest value, as they bring to light the somewhat dark chapter of Albania's history during Ottoman rule. «Für die Kunde der Balkanhalbinsel im 17. Jahrhundert», says Babinger, «bedeutet Ewlijas Wanderbuch also ohne Zweifel eine der wichtigsten Quellen, deren planmässige Ausbeutung mancherlei Fragen der Kulturgeschichte, der Volks- und Länderkunde jener wenig erschlossenen Zeiten klären und gewiss zu den reizvollsten Aufgaben der Südosteuropa-Forschung zählen dürfte».

The editors have placed us in their debt for recovering here many of Babinger's significant writings, which were previously scattered in various journals. And we commend the publisher for the layout and presentation of the book that are most pleasing to the eye!

Brooklyn, N.Y.

ARTHUR LEON HORNIKER

Stanford J. Shaw, *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Selim III 1789-1807* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. xiii + 535. [Harvard Middle Eastern Studies 15].

Having written a number of articles on the military and other reforms of Selim III (1789-1807), it was to be expected that Professor Stanford J. Shaw would sooner or later give us a full account of the reforms enacted by this sultan and of the consequent disaster that befell him. Indeed, in his voluminous work here under consideration, Shaw has attempted to record in exhaustive and sometime exhausting detail: the aims and fortunes of Selim's various reform undertakings against the backdrop of the wars with his arch-enemies Austria and Russia, and later with France, and of the internal anarchy, revolts and disintegration of the empire. To execute this substantial study the author has not only incorporated previous European research but has also utilized Ottoman and modern Turkish sources, as well as supplemented all this by «original research in all source materials from [Selim's] reign remaining in the Ottoman archives and libraries». His *apparatus criticus*, comprising reference works, collections of documents, archival materials (both Turkish and European), Ottoman chronicles, general histories, and special studies and reports, covers twenty-one pages of the book. Yet despite the extensive research and overwhelming density of detail, Shaw's text has serious deficiencies, some of which will be considered below, as well as a surprising evaluation