

Recording the history of the “Cretan War” (1645-1669): an overview*

Tassos A. Kaplanis
University of Cyprus

The present paper originates in my research on Ioakeim Kyprios's *Book called Struggle*, i.e. *Battle of the Turks against the most venerable and most illustrious Grand Ruler and Prince of the most illustrious City of Venice*.¹ Ioakeim's *Struggle* was the subject of my Cambridge PhD dissertation² and the critical edition of the text, which is currently in its final stage of preparation, is expected to appear in 2009 in the publication series of the Cyprus Research Centre (Nicosia). Ioakeim's text attracted scholarly attention in the 20th century, because it was thought that it could potentially serve as a historical source for the Ottoman-Venetian conflict of the years 1645-1669 over the predominantly Greek-populated island of Crete;³ its presentation as a vernacular Greek

* I would like to express my gratitude to the supervisor of my PhD dissertation at the University of Cambridge, Prof. David Holton, for his invaluable help in the preparation of this study; my due thanks also to Dr Paul Ries of the same University, to my historian friend in Italy Panos Stamatellos and to my wife, Athina Valdramidou, who all read a more or less final draft of it and made useful suggestions. I am always indebted to Prof. Emmanuel Kriaras for encouraging me to undertake the task of editing *Struggle* and for facilitating my research in all possible ways.

¹ The original title is “Βιβλίον ονομαζόμενον Πάλη, ήγουν μάχη των Τουρκών μετά του ευσεβεστάτου και εκλαμπροτάτου μεγάλου αυθεντός και πριντσίπου της λαμπροτάτης Βενετίας”. All translations of quotes and italicizations, unless otherwise stated, are mine.

² Kaplanis 2003.

³ This is the main point of Tomadakis (1947), who was the first to bring *Struggle* to the attention of the scholarly public – except, of course, for the entry in Litzica 1909 (= the catalogue of Greek manuscripts of the

history of the “Cretan War” by Emmanuel Kriaras (1962) reinforced the expectations concerning the historical information it could provide and, despite some, rather biased, objections that have been expressed,⁴ one should regard these expectations as being still valid.⁵ Given all this, it would be sensible, if not highly desirable, for the modern editor of *Struggle* to scrutinize its relation to the events of the “Cretan War” in order to evaluate the information it provides. A history of the “Cretan War” – and I mean a history that would make extensive use of available sources and that would concentrate on dates, events and “great” political figures – could have been used to control the accuracy of this information, had it been written. But it has not. Relevant scholarship – for all the general progress it has shown in the past thirty-five years – concerning the study of the “Cretan War” presents certain deficiencies and the analysis I will provide here simply aims to demonstrate why any discussion on the “Cretan War”, at the present stage of research, could be nothing but introductory.

Ottoman-Venetian wars began in the 15th century as a result of the Ottoman expansion into the Balkan peninsula.⁶ This expan-

Romanian Academy in Bucharest, where the autograph manuscript of *Struggle* is preserved to the present day).

⁴ In a later publication, Tomadakis rejected the historical value of *Struggle* on the assumption that Ioakeim could not have been contemporary to the events of the “Cretan War” (see Tomadakis 1976: 41, n. 47); we now know that Ioakeim was contemporary to the events he described in *Struggle* (see Kaplanis 2005: 44-5; cf. Mavromatis 2005: 76).

⁵ *Struggle* is regarded as a historical source that needs to be critically edited in Vincent 1970: 241, Vlassopoulou 2000: 15 and n. 16, and Kitromilides 2002: 40 and n. 26.

⁶ The first encounter of the navies of the two powers took place in Kallipolis (May 1416) and resulted in success for the Venetians. The first full-scale war between Venice and the Ottomans was that of the years 1423-1430 and concerned the Ottoman conquest of Thessaloniki (March 1430) and Ottoman suzerainty over Thrace and Macedonia (see, conveniently, Shaw 1976: 47-9). Greek scholarship usually counts only those wars after the siege of Constantinople (May 1453) and considers the war of the years 1463-1479 – which was, indeed, the first large-scale/quasi-crusade operation of the Europeans against the Ottoman expansion into the Balkans – as the “first” Venetian-Turkish war (see e.g. Vakalopoulos 1968: 18-58).

sion, whether into the Balkans and the Aegean islands or into the Eastern Mediterranean basin, was taking place at the expense of Venetian colonization and trade and, because of this obvious clash of interests, the two powers were often dragged into wars. The so-called "Candian" or "Cretan War" of the years 1645-1669 was neither the first nor the last of such wars;⁷ it was, however, the longest and, consequently, one of the most costly for both sides.⁸ Its length, cost and casualties⁹ can certainly explain the war's significance for its protagonists, i.e. the Ottomans, the Venetians and the Greeks, while, in parallel, the involvement of some European princes and political leaders of the time, mainly during the last phase of the war, would be a good enough reason to explain the interest that the war presented for, say, the King of France, the Habsburg monarchy and its allies or for Papal Rome.¹⁰

⁷ "The Venetians were forced to face the Ottomans in seven hard wars (1463-1479, 1499-1503, 1537-1540, 1570-1573, 1645-1669, 1684-1699, 1715-1718)" (Chasiotis 2001: 187).

⁸ This assumption is based mainly on the side-effects of the war, which can easily be traced in the trade of the period, for instance (see Faroqui 2000, esp. 510-19; her analysis is mainly based on Carter 1972, esp. 385-405, but, unfortunately, not on a monograph, which, nevertheless, needs to be undertaken in the future; for earlier wars see Mallett and Hale 1984). Some particular issues, such as the costs of ship-building, have been studied separately, in works dealing with the activities of arsenals: for the Ottoman Arsenal see Bostan 1992 (cf. Faroqui 2000: 461-5 for an account in English); for the Venetian *Arsenale* see Concina 1988 and for other Venetian arsenals in the Levant see Rossi 1998. However, given the present stage of both Ottoman and Venetian studies, it might be wiser to accept Shaw's vague comment that the fact "that both sides were able to carry on so long indicates that [...] both still had considerable wealth at their command" (Shaw 1976: 202) rather than subscribing to Vakalopoulos's assumption that "the high cost of this war has led both powers to financial decline" (see Vakalopoulos 1968: 525), no matter how probable it may seem.

⁹ The matter of casualties is a complex one, since, as often happens in cases like this, each side makes its own estimations and these estimations are usually contradictory. Vakalopoulos discusses the problem and offers some numbers that need to be treated with caution (Vakalopoulos 1968: 525).

¹⁰ Although generally reluctant to join Venice against the Ottomans and to listen to her continuous appeals, European princes did get involved in

But the significance attributed to this war by its contemporaries all over Europe – and I do not just mean monarchs, their courts and military officials – cannot be simply justified on the basis of the involvement of some members of the European nobility.

The war and, especially, the siege of the city of Candia and the resistance of its inhabitants “became the talk of Europe”, as John Julius Norwich appositely remarks,¹¹ and the bulk of sources, written in many European languages and preserved to the present day in many archives and libraries, is the most significant manifestation of this interest of the European general public.¹² These sources include a great deal of official and semi-official correspondence and appeals, bureaucratic documents, diplomatic reports, military diaries, but also more popularized and, in many cases, more widely circulated informative pamphlets, panegyric poems, travellers’ accounts and historiographical works. Some attempts to gather them in bibliographical catalogues were undertaken already in the 19th and early 20th centuries, especially by specialists in Venetian history, such as Emanuelle A. Cicogna and Giuseppe Gerola.¹³ There have also been attempts to edit some of

the “Cretan War” at some point, for better or worse: it has been argued that probably the worst enemy the Venetians faced during this war were not the Turks but their allies, whose assistance, “on the comparatively rare occasions when it was given at all, was grudging, half-hearted, inadequate or self-seeking” (Norwich 1983: 557).

¹¹ Norwich 1983: 552.

¹² I would still be hesitant about describing the “Cretan War” as “a historic event of *universal* importance” (Tomadakis 1976: 35), because such a phrasing indicates a myopic identification of the world with Europe. That is why I insist on the European dimension of the war’s impact, although a broader Eurasian interest cannot be excluded, given the Ottoman involvement. Nevertheless, apart from the Ottoman sources, I have no knowledge of other Asian texts that would allow me to expand the war’s dimensions to the Middle or the Far East.

¹³ A milestone in Venetian bibliography was Cicogna’s *Saggio di Bibliografia Veneziana* (Cicogna 1847; for the “Cretan War” see pp. 134-7 and 275-6) which retains its value not only for the richness of its information but for the extra reason that Cicogna’s archive and library, including nearly all the works he consulted for the composition of his *Bibliografia*, have been preserved and may be found today in the Library of the Museo Civico Correr in Venice. The bibliographical listings

them, but as Manoussos Manoussakas pointed out in his extremely useful "Brief review of researches on Venetian Crete",¹⁴ "even today both the volume and the importance of the unedited and unexplored material, in comparison with that edited, is such, that we may well say that the latter is truly nothing but a drop in the ocean". Manoussakas's article was published in 1971 and although a few more drops have been added to this ocean since,¹⁵ one still needs to subscribe to his pessimistic conclusion that "the time for the composition of an accurate history of Crete has not arrived yet".¹⁶ Unfortunately, the same observation is also valid for historical syntheses with a much more limited scope, such as the "Cretan War".¹⁷

provided in Gerola 1905-32 and Kretschmayr 1934 and – for archival material – in Bernardy 1902 and Dujčev 1935 are still worth consulting.

¹⁴ Manoussakas 1971: 294. It needs to be mentioned here that Manoussakas, remarkably, does not quote Cicogna 1847 (see previous note). Apart from Manoussakas's review, of similar importance are the critical bibliographical notes in Eickhoff 1991: 470-86.

¹⁵ Among the various works that have appeared since 1971, the most important in their general scope are Panagiotakis 1988, Holton 1991 and Maltezos 1993, all rich in bibliographical references; ample material of all sorts may be found in the volumes of specialized conferences, such as *Venezia e Creta* (Ortalli 1998) or the published proceedings of the Conferences of Cretan Studies (the most recent being Detorakis and Kalokairinos 2004); for Greek literature in Venetian Crete and more recent editorial developments one may consult Manoussakas 1998, a notable follow-up to his 1971 article; finally, Ekkekakis's bibliographical compilation (Ekkekakis 1990 and 1991), though limited, is welcome as a step in the right direction.

¹⁶ Manoussakas 1971: 293. In fact, this was Xanthoudidis's point in his *Επίτομος Ιστορία Κρήτης* (Xanthoudidis 1909: γ'-δ') and it is rather ironical that I am obliged to subscribe to it nearly a century later.

¹⁷ There is no modern history of the "Cretan War" as such; however, some accounts of the war have been provided in the past in works with more general scope and objectives, such as the *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού* (Vakalopoulos 1968), the *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* (Chasiotis 1974), *Venezia e i Turchi* (Preto 1975) and *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi* (Eickhoff 1991); notably, none of these works is available in English (Vakalopoulos 1976 is a concise edition, not a full translation of Vakalopoulos 1968); for a brief account in English see Greene 2000: 13-22; more details are provided in Norwich 1983: 542-60 and, particularly, Setton 1991: 104-243 (the latter ignores/neglects most of the accounts

Although, as indicated earlier, some bibliographical listings of the main sources of the war have been compiled and could well serve as a starting point for future research, one needs to bear in mind that they are still far from being complete: uncatalogued works still come to light – and even more may be expected to be found when serious research is undertaken – while, on the other hand, there are also cases of important catalogued texts which have been long neglected and largely ignored. I will provide some examples: a few years ago, i.e. in May 2002, at the 2nd European Conference of Modern Greek Studies, Kostas Papadakis, librarian at the University Library of Rethymno, presented an unknown vernacular Greek poem entitled *The brave deeds of Lazaro Mocenigo* written by the author of *Evgena*, Teodoro Montselese.¹⁸ The original title is: *Ανδραγαθίαν [sic] του εκλαμπροτάτου και ανδρειοτάτου Λαζάρου Μητζηνίγου, έτι δε και τα όσα εσυνέβησαν αναμεταξύ την γαληνοτάτην και χριστιανικοτάτην αυθεντίας [sic] των κλεινών Ενετιών κατά του Ισμαήλ επί της προστασίας του εκλαμπροτάτου καπετάν γενεράλε Λορέντζου Μαρτζέλλου έως την προστασίαν του καπετάν γενεράλε Λαζάρου Μητζηνίγου. Προς τους αυτυχάνοντας [= εν-] τω παρόντι ποιήματι πάσαν χαράν και ευφροσύνην παρά Θεού. Ποιηθείσα υπό του κυρού Θεοδώρου Μοντζελέξε λεγόμενος [sic] Λούστρος Τζακύνθιος. Ενετίησιν, παρά Ανδρέα τω Ιουλιανώ, αχλζζ' [1697].*¹⁹ Unfortunately, for

mentioned above, but makes extensive use of archival material and sources that the aforementioned scholars have not used, such as Mormoris's *Historia della guerra di Candia*).

¹⁸ For Montselese, who was previously only known to us as the author of *Evgena*, see Vitti and Spadaro 1995: 13-15.

¹⁹ The koppa in the publication date is most probably a typographical error: it looks to me like an inverted nu, facing to the left instead of the right, most probably placed in this way in the composing stick/forme by a careless typesetter. If this is the case, the date of publication should be corrected to αχνζζ' [1657], which would actually conform both to the contents (account of events of 1656) and the genre of the poem (panegyric pamphlet). I have consulted the digital copy of the book that may be found in the invaluable "Anemi" of the Library of the University of Crete (<http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/>), for which see, conveniently, the presentation of A. Politis 2006.

reasons unknown to me, Papadakis’s paper was not included in the publication of the proceedings of the Conference, but Papadakis in his presentation stated that he came across this book while working on the catalogue of the Library of the Educational Association of Adrianople. The poem consists of 1,044 fifteen-syllable rhymed verses, refers to events directly related to the “Cretan War” and has a pro-Venetian point of view, expressing optimism for the outcome of the war. Notably, this is not the only Greek source of the “Cretan War” of which we have very limited knowledge. During a research trip in Romania in March 2000, I discovered another vernacular Greek history of the “Cretan War” in prose; it is entitled *Diegesis of the island of Crete* (*Διήγησις του νησιού της Κρήτης*) and it is a brief historical account of the war as seen by the Turks, included in a work that deals with the reigns of several Ottoman Sultans up to 1672. The work appears to be a translation from Turkish into Greek – translated by Matthaïos of Chios and “edited” (that is, corrected and copied) by Michael Vyzantios, in 1704 – and has been preserved in Greek manuscript 970 of the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest.²⁰ The exact title is *Ιστορικόν των εξ αρχής βασιλέων Τουρκών, μεταφρασθέν εις γρακικήν διάλεκτον από το τουρκικόν δι’ επιταγής του υψηλοτάτου και εκλαμπροτάτου ημών αυθέντου και ηγεμόνος πάσης Ουγγροβλαχίας, κυρίου κυρίου Ιωάννου Κωνσταντίνου Βασαράβα βοεβόνδα, δι’ υπαγορεύσεως του Μπεκτάς ντιβάν-εφέντη, εξηγήσεως τε του μεγάλου πορτάρη κυρ Ματθαίου του Χίου και διορθώσεως και επιμελείας του Μιχαήλ Βυζαντίου, εν έτει αψδ’ [1704] (BAR, ms. gr. 970, f. 5).*²¹ I believe that the work

²⁰ For a description of the manuscript see Camariano 1940: 70-1. The text of the *Διήγησις* covers ff. 70^v-77. I have in my possession a microfilm of the text and I intend to edit it in due course.

²¹ Karathanassis, in his book on Greek scholars in Wallachia, provides some information on Vyzantios’s activity as a copyist (Karathanassis 2000: 150-1). However, he presents Vyzantios as the translator of the book (Karathanassis 2000: 151), although elsewhere he attributes it to Matthaïos of Chios (Karathanassis 2000: 174, n. 8). The text itself leaves little doubt about who did what.

did not attract scholarly attention, because it was considered irrelevant to the events of the “Cretan War”, on account of its title.

Similar is the case of an Italian work, the *Compendio dell' Historie Generali de' Turchi* of the French historiographer Di Verdier, translated into Italian by a certain Ferdinando De' Servi and published in Venice in 1662.²² The work, again because of its title, I think, did not attract scholarly attention in the 20th century and, thus, it has not been observed that it is accompanied by a version of the well known – but not at all studied – *Historia dell' ultima guerra tra' Venetiani e Turchi* of Girolamo Brusoni (first edition in Venice: Curti, 1673, second edition in Bologna: Recaldini, 1676).²³ Girolamo Brusoni was one of the most prolific Italian authors of the 17th century and the history of the “Cretan War” was one of his favourite subjects: he works on it again and again in literally dozens of historiographical compositions, all printed between 1656 and 1680. Unfortunately, as far as I know, there is no monograph on Brusoni; the only recent attempt to reconstruct his life and works is the homonymous article in the

²² I have consulted the copy of the Library of the Museo Civico Correr in Venice (coll. G1015). The exact title is: “*Compendio dell' Historie Generali de' Turchi. Con tutto quel ch'è successo di più memorabile sotto il Regno di XXIII. Imperatori, cominciando da Ottomano primo fino à Mahomet IV. di questo nome hoggi regnante. Raccolto con diligenza dal Signore di Verdier, historiografo di Francia, e tradotto dal francese da Ferdinando De' Servi, Fiorentino. Aggiuntovi nuovamente la Continuatione de' Successi e Guerre seguite tra la Potentissima Casa Ottomana e la Serenissima Republica di Venetia dall'anno 1647 fino al 1662. Con li somarii à ciascuna vita, e una tavola copiosa delle cose più notabili contenute nell'opera. Parte Prima, Venetia, Presso Gio. Battista Scalvinono, MDCLXII [1662].*”

²³ Cicogna, who in many cases appears to have a better knowledge of the texts than his 20th-century counterparts, was aware of this fact and in his entry for Brusoni's book he actually mentions: “A p. 201, del Compendio delle Historie generali de' Turchi del signor di Verdier tradotte dal De Servi (Venetia, 1662, in 4.) vi è: *Continuatione de' successi della guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia, dall'anno 1647, fino al 1662, tratta dall' Istoria del sig. Girolamo Brusoni?*” (Cicogna 1847: 135; italicizations are his).

Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani,²⁴ the most important and relevant information of which I summarize here. The *Storia delle guerre d'Italia dal 1635 al 1655*, printed in Venice in 1656, signals Brusoni's first engagement in the writing of the history of the “Cretan War”.²⁵ This *Storia*, with Brusoni's successive additions (including many updates on the situation in Crete and the Aegean), was reprinted in Venice in 1657, 1661, 1664 (no extant copy), 1667 (with the definitive title *Historia d'Italia*), 1676 and, finally, in Turin in 1680. It would be no exaggeration to say that this is one of the most important sources of the “Cretan War”: not only was Brusoni contemporary with the events and collected, almost obsessively, first-hand information (official records, reports, etc.), he also felt obliged to include them in his work as evidence. Inevitably, this resulted in a work that is almost unreadable – in its final edition (Turin 1680) it runs to 1,100 pages in folio, is divided into 46 books and includes hundreds of direct quotations of sources. Nevertheless, this can by no means justify the unfortunate fact that it is so largely neglected today.²⁶ Apart from this *Historia d'Italia*, there is at least one more notable example of a major historiographical work of his where the events of the “Cretan War” are dealt with and that is the *Istorie universali d'Europa* (first edition in Venice, 1657, re-elaborated and reprinted in 1663), while the infamous *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra' Venetiani e Turchi* – the only historiographical work of Brusoni known to scholars of Venice and Venetian Crete²⁷ – is

²⁴ De Caro 1972, esp. pp. 719-20 for his historiographical work and a bibliography.

²⁵ The volume is a collaborative work, i.e. a compilation of histories by Ziliolo, Birago, Bisaccioni and Brusoni; Brusoni's part deals mainly with the events of the “Cretan War”.

²⁶ It is significant that in the recent *Repertorio di Storiografia Veneziana* (Zordan 1998) there is no entry for Brusoni (either *of* or *on* his works).

²⁷ Although not even mentioned in Zordan 1998 (see previous note), this text is included in all bibliographical compilations, both old (see note 13 above) and more recent (Ekkekakis 1991: 49); Manoussakas, in his review, points to it explicitly (Manoussakas 1971: 250), Preto 1975 and Eickhoff 1991 are aware of it (it is impossible to say to what extent they

nothing but an extract from the *Istorie universali* and the *Historia d'Italia*, re-elaborated and, in its second edition (Bologna 1676), enriched with more first-hand information.

The version included in the *Compendio dell'Historie Generali de' Turchi*, which was the starting point of this Brusonian digression, is an interesting one. On the title page of the book it appears as *Continuatione de' Successi e Guerre seguite tra la Potentissima Casa Ottomana e la Serenissima Republica di Venetia dall'anno 1647 fino al 1662*,²⁸ while on p. 201 the title is *Continuatione de' Successi della Guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia dall'anno 1647 fino al 1662, tratti dalle Istorie del Signor Girolamo Brusoni, divisi in tre libri*. A first observation would be that the invariable part of the title, i.e. *Continuatione de' Successi*, not only confirms that a version of the text was available before 1662 (we have already seen that versions of both the *Storie delle guerre* and the *Istorie universali* were available before that date), but also allows some scope for the hypothesis that it was separately published under the possible title *Successi della Guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia* to which the version printed in the *Compendio* is a sequel (*Continuatione*).²⁹ The vague indication “*tratti dalle Istorie del Signor Girolamo Brusoni*” does not necessarily exclude this possibility;³⁰ however, neither does it tell much about the authorship of the version, i.e. it is not clear if it is simply another elaboration by Brusoni himself or if it belongs to the

have used it), whereas Setton 1991 makes sparing use of it; however, they all ignore the history of the text, which is presented here.

²⁸ For the full title see note 22 above.

²⁹ Unfortunately, Brusoni's minor historiographical works have not been studied at all and the version under discussion was not known to De Caro (1972).

³⁰ Brusoni, in general, dealt freely with his compositions; he often compiled and published as new books works that had previously appeared in other books and/or under different titles (for some literary examples see De Caro 1972: 715-17), while, other times, he extracted parts from his books and published them separately, as in the case of the *Historia dell'ultima guerra* that we have already seen.

otherwise unknown Florentine translator, Ferdinando De' Servi.³¹ The case is a good deal more complicated,³² but given Brusoni's revising historiographical habits, it is very likely that the text of the *Continuazione* comes from his pen – and this is, most probably, what Cicogna also had in mind when he tacitly corrected in his bibliographical catalogue the "tratti" of the inner title into "tratta" (which refers to the *Continuazione*, not to the *Successi*).³³

Whatever the case might be with the *Continuazione*, Brusoni's various *Storie* presented above – most of them written and published during the "Cretan War" – make him, most probably, as important a historian of the war as Andrea Valier(o),³⁴ whose

³¹ The De' Servi are a well-known noble family of Florence, already appearing in the "Libro d'oro" in 1457; however, I have not managed to find any information on this Ferdinando (he is not included in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, unlike other members of the family).

³² In the Library of the Museo Civico Correr in Venice the *Compendio* may be also found in manuscript form (cod. Cicogna 657-8), without the *Continuazione* and with a different dedication, less elaborated tables and, in parts, with a considerably different text too. All this indicates that the work was subject to an extensive revision before its printing, but of course the question still remains by whom. The dedication (excluded from the edition) to the Venetian Ambassador to the Court of the King of France and well-known author, Giovanni Sagredo, in cod. Cicogna 658 (which, despite its number, includes the first part of the work) is signed by Di Verdier himself and on f. 1 of the manuscript, at the end of the title, we find the note: "Trasportato dal Francesco da me". Could this mean that the translator was Di Verdier?

³³ For Cicogna's text see note 23 above.

³⁴ The original Venetian form of his name is Valier, but he is better known as Valiero. He was a patrician from an old Venetian family – which counted among its members two *Dogi*, two cardinals and many high-ranking officials of the *Repubblica* – and had a "brilliant but not exceptional career" (Eickhoff 1991: 81), which, nevertheless, included many military, diplomatic and political offices: he served in the navy as a captain of a squadron and a captain of a ship in 1646 and 1647 under the commands of Tommaso Morosini and Tommaso Contarini respectively, and he became later *Avogador di Comun*, *Provveditor General* of the Ionian islands (during the "Cretan War") and Senator (Eickhoff reconstructs his life and offices in detail; see Eickhoff 1991: 80-2). Ten years after the end of the "Cretan War", Valiero published in Venice his

Historia della guerra di Candia is unanimously considered to be the most authoritative narrative of its time on the subject. Valiero's *Historia* indeed offers, in some cases, the official testimony of an eyewitness and co-protagonist in the theatre of the war,³⁵ but it was written and published long after the war was over (1679). From this point of view, his "eyewitness testimony" is not only based on memory, but it also falls, quite inevitably, into the trap of hindsight: he already knew so much more about what happened afterwards. Furthermore, Valiero was an insider: an aristocrat in direct contact with the powerful of the day and so actively involved in the war that he cannot actually have any claim to "objectivity". The value of his *Historia* is that it indeed expresses an official Venetian point of view, but as an *a posteriori* apology rather than as a contemporary account. The real *gazzettiere* of the war in the 1650s and 1660s, at least,³⁶ was Brusoni. It is his historiographical work that records events as they are progressing and, more importantly perhaps, it is his work that must have been more widely read, given the fact that Brusoni had already been a well-established and popular author since the

own account of it (Valiero 1679), which is also based on his personal experiences.

³⁵ For his involvement in the war see previous note.

³⁶ It is very possible that Brusoni started working on the subject much earlier, possibly from the beginning of the war. In a letter dated 1.2.1676 and sent by *padre* Arcangelo da Salto to the *marchesse di San Tomasso*, minister of Savoy, it is actually mentioned that "il mestiere del Brusoni *da quaranta anni indietro* era stato di tenere corrispondenze e *comporre storie* ed altri libri" (De Caro 1972: 718; my emphasis). Although the time indication ("da quaranta anni") is vague and not to be taken literally, still it allows us to believe that Brusoni's historiographical activity dates from before the 1650s, even though there are no *Storie* of his preserved from the previous decades. In any case, for the first years of the "Cretan War" there are other contemporary accounts available, such as Gonzaga's report (1647; see Papadia 1976) or Vellaio 1647 and Anticano 1647 (Sertonaco Anticano is Antonio Santacroce and it was again Cicogna who realized this first (Cicogna 1847: 134): "Hanno molto fantasticato per trovare il vero autore di questo libro, e chi disse essere *Girolamo Brusoni*, chi *Casimiro Frescot*, chi *Girolamo Michieli dalla Brazza*; ma pare che sia *Antonio Santacroce* purissimo anagramma di *Sertonaco Anticano*").

1640s.³⁷ His *Storie* with their successive reprints – under various titles and with different contents – between 1656 and 1680 may have served as a source for the composition of *any* history of the "Cretan War" written in this period, Greek or otherwise. And this actually sets the problem of contemporary sources and the relations between them on a totally different and, unfortunately, completely unexplored basis.

Given the importance of Brusoni's work, which I hope is now obvious, one can only wonder what could possibly have been the reasons for so much neglect. Of course, his *Storie* do not constitute a straightforward case as regards textual criticism and research: too many versions, under often misleading titles, must have made it impossible for scholars to trace them. Moreover, the existence of his *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra' Venetiani e Turchi*, which was separately published twice, could easily lead any logical person to the assumption that this must have been the author's only contribution to the subject – which is not the case, as we have seen. On the other hand, the discovery of Valiero's "definitive" version of the history of the "Cretan War" by 19th-century scholars has not helped much. Valiero may have been a successful state official of fairly high rank, but a popular author he was not.³⁸ Even his famous account of the "Cretan War" was printed only once, in 1679. But this was but an insignificant detail for the 19th century: at a time of exaltation of nationalism and conservatism, the odds were overwhelmingly in favour of the

³⁷ For his romances, *novelle*, etc. see De Caro 1972: 712-18. Among many popular works of his, I mention here the romance *Le turbolenze delle vestali* (written in 1641-2 and printed in 1658 under the title *Degli amori tragici*), for which De Caro notes: "Il romanzo ebbe infatti una singolare fortuna, circolando a lungo manoscritto – certo la cosa non era casuale – in Italia e "di là dai monti", come affermava lo stesso Brusoni; quando passò finalmente alle stampe moltiplicò naturalmente i suoi lettori" (De Caro 1972: 714). This romance, together with other reasons, cost Brusoni a spell in prison in 1644.

³⁸ Following the trend of the *Seicento* and the ideal of the *gentiluomo* of the time, Valiero composed patriotic *canzoni*, sonnets and odes (Eickhoff 1991: 81), but there is no evidence that he ever managed to go beyond the mediocrity of a stylistic classicism and thus reach wider audiences.

patriotic spirit of the Venetian aristocrat Valiero and, thus, not only was his authority invented, but also his book was reprinted³⁹ and – thanks to this 19th-century reprint, which made it much more accessible to research – has remained over-estimated up to the present day. The non-Venetian-born and, most probably, non-aristocrat Brusoni, who had been a declared and practising libertine – a distinguished member of the *Accademia degli Incogniti* and the closest friend of Ferrante Pallavicino⁴⁰ – and had written against the moralism of the *pedanti*, against the tyranny of princes and, perhaps worst of all, against the hypocrisy of Christian morals and the Counter-Reformation oppression of his time,⁴¹ did not really stand a chance in the 19th century. But it is exactly these qualities of his works that would make his case so interesting today.

The example of Brusoni, presented here in broad brush strokes, illustrates clearly the deficiencies of relevant scholarship; it shows how little has been done and how much still needs to be done at all levels of research – because, it will surely be agreed, it is one thing to search for and locate the existing sources of the “Cretan War”, quite another to read and evaluate them⁴² and yet

³⁹ Valiero 1859.

⁴⁰ The libertine and nihilist Pallavicino was captured by the ecclesiastical authorities at Avignon, tortured and decapitated in March 1644. Brusoni, after his friend’s tragic death, wrote his biography (*La Vita di Ferrante Pallavicino*, Venezia 1651) and retreated from his libertinism, most probably, scared – or, even, threatened – that he might have the same fate.

⁴¹ De Caro 1972, esp. pp. 712-15 provides a detailed analysis of all this, including examples from many of Brusoni’s fictional works.

⁴² Misevaluation of sources is a common phenomenon (the Valiero-Brusoni case that we have just seen is by no means the only one). A recent example relates to a German edition printed in Frankfurt (Serlin, 1669), which is a compilation/translation from mainly Venetian sources. This edition has been presented as “A rare edition about the Cretan War” (Pretselakis 2000), despite the fact that there were many similar editions in German and many of them have been preserved to the present day. The author of the article was aware of the fact that just in Frankfurt in the years 1668-9 four such editions were printed (Pretselakis 2000: 219, n. 3), but he still presents the edition in question as a “rare” and “unique”

another to provide a coherent narrative of the war and/or to discuss the disagreements of the sources (which certainly exist⁴³) – let alone to edit the most important of them.⁴⁴ Brusoni's case proves that all stages of research – including the most basic one (that of locating existing sources) – are still far from satisfactory and, clearly, undertaking any of the tasks described earlier, in an effort to fill in the gaps for the purposes of my Cambridge PhD dissertation or even for the edition of Ioakeim's *Struggle* would have far exceeded their scope, objectives and limitations. If this is a disadvantage of my research, however, it is no less a reflection of the shortcomings of relevant scholarship in general.

As one might expect, these shortcomings are not only restricted to the "descriptive" part of the "Cretan War" (sources and their evaluation, discussion of their disagreements, etc.), but they also extend to its "explanatory" part (exegetical frameworks and applicable theories). There are various interpretative tools that could have been used – not necessarily only to offer explanations or answers, but even to raise questions and provoke discussions – and the fact that research has not yet embarked in this direction, does not, of course, exclude the possibility of its doing so in the

one. What exactly it is that constitutes the "rarity" and "uniqueness" of this source remains unclear, at least to me.

⁴³ One famous example concerns the story of the Maltese Sultana, which supposedly gave the Ottomans the excuse for the war and of which both contemporary sources and later scholarship provide considerably different versions. On the issue see, among others, the articles of Vincent (1970), Tomadakis (1976) and, more recently, Gryntakis (1991); cf. Setton 1991: 110-27; impressively enough, they all make use of different sources.

⁴⁴ It seems that Italian scholarship, in particular, has long given up on the issue: the matter of modern editions of 16th-/17th-century sources seems to be, bluntly, out of the question and what most Italian scholars do nowadays is to provide their readers with the exact location of the rare editions they use (including the infamous *collocazione*), in order to facilitate researchers who might be willing to go to the trouble of checking these sources for themselves. Of course, the preserved material from the 16th and 17th centuries is so much as to prohibit easy solutions: it would, indeed, be pointless, if not practically impossible, to prepare modern editions of all these sources. Having said that, not editing *any* of them is quite a different – and, in my view, unacceptable – matter.

future nor does it annul the validity of approaches of this kind. I will provide here some examples, which must be viewed as possible directions for future research rather than anything else. As stated earlier,⁴⁵ the bulk of surviving sources of the “Cretan War” testifies to the interest of the European public of its time in the subject. On a political level, the involvement of some European princes/powers in the war could explain the interest that the war presented for them, but one still needs to explore the reasons that forced them to get involved in it in the first place. Undoubtedly, an approach like this would have to take into account a complex set of factors (economic, religious, ideological, etc.), but, most of all, I think, it would require a good knowledge of the European political scene of the 17th century,⁴⁶ since in many cases it seems that it was mostly the European states’ political antagonisms – both internal and external – that led the time’s decision-making.⁴⁷

Having said that, one should not neglect the fact that war – that is any war in general – is a phenomenon which profoundly affects all aspects of human and social life (demography, the economy, daily and family life, ideologies, culture, etc.) and a reduction just to its political dimensions would fail to offer a proper explanation both for the phenomenon itself and, more importantly, for its impact. And the impact of the “Cretan War” was so immense as to lead at least one scholar, E. Eickhoff, to describe it as the “backbone of the narrative” of the European 17th century. His observations deserve more attention, because they

⁴⁵ See p. 94 above.

⁴⁶ It would be excessive to provide here even a basic bibliography on the matter; the reader is referred, most conveniently, to the relevant volume of the *Cambridge Modern History*.

⁴⁷ The Habsburg monarchy would be a good example (and it has been discussed at length in J. Stoye’s classic *The Siege of Vienna* (Stoye 1964); for more recent accounts see, most conveniently, Bérenger 1994, esp. pp. 289-337 and Ingraio 1994, esp. pp. 53-104); however, all European states, not to mention the Ottomans, operated in a similar way.

epitomize in a brilliant way the perception of the war by its contemporaries (I quote from the Italian edition):⁴⁸

Gli uomini dell'epoca scorsero nei drammatici scontri dell'Egeo altrettanti fatti di importanza secolare che provocarono un profluvio di incisioni e di opuscoli fin nella Germania settentrionale. E l'ultimo triennale assedio della capitale cretese, dal 1667 al 1669, per il quale il Re Sole, il Papa e numerosi principi italiani e tedeschi mandarono contingenti di soccorso, fu considerato nel Seicento *l'assedio* per antonomasia [...]. Perciò gli eventi dell'Egeo non saranno considerati come una serie di episodi marginali, costituiranno invece il nerbo del racconto.

What needs to be underlined here is that, according to Eickhoff, the importance of the war for the Europeans was mainly based on the fact that "they would see in the dramatic battles of the Aegean many other things of secular importance", i.e. they would relate the war's events to their own experiences and fears. This line of thinking may lead to a comprehensive interpretation of the European interest in the war and even of the war itself, provided that we do not miss two major points. The first one is that the "Cretan War" not only broke out at a time – the decade of the 1640s – which has been described by some modern historians as the core of the "general crisis of the 17th century",⁴⁹ but was, indeed, part of it. The second point is that for Europeans, Easterners and Westerners alike, the war was also part of a broader subject-matter which could be classified under the general rubric "Europe and the Turks". I will briefly elaborate on both points.

The "general crisis of the 17th century" has been a major issue for European historiography since the 1950s,⁵⁰ and the fact

⁴⁸ Eickhoff 1991: 16; the Italian edition is based on the 2nd revised German edition, which was not available to me.

⁴⁹ By Trevor-Roper (1965: 68), for example.

⁵⁰ From the rich literature on the subject one may consult the various contributions in the collective volumes Aston 1965 and Parker and Smith 1997; cf. Goldstone 1991. For an analysis of the historiography of the "general crisis" see the illuminating "Introduction" of the editors in

that the “Cretan War” was part of it was known to modern European scholarship from at least the 1970s,⁵¹ but too little, if any, attention was paid to it. On the other hand, the “general crisis” has been regarded as such an important issue as to become not only the hallmark of the 17th century, but even, according to N. Steensgaard, “a synonym for what historians concerned with other centuries call ‘history’”.⁵² This does not mean, however, that scholarship has reached an agreement on what the specific elements constituting this crisis were; on the contrary, historians are only agreed about its existence, not about its character. However, there are four main different senses of the term (1. a general economic crisis, 2. a general political crisis, 3. a crisis in the development of capitalism and 4. a crisis comprising all aspects of human life⁵³) and all four could find some application to the cases of both the Ottoman Empire and Venice – within and outside the context of the “Cretan War” –,⁵⁴ but also to the early modern Greek society of the Venetian-colonized island of Crete. If I choose to concentrate here on the “‘multi-causal’, but ultimately ‘neo-Malthusian’”⁵⁵ “demographic/structural” model that Jack Goldstone provided in his 1991 book *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*, a model which forms a different mode of interpretation of the “general crisis” from the four ones

Parker and Smith 1997: 1-31; cf. Rabb 1975: 3-34 and Crummey 1998: 156-69.

⁵¹ Crete appears as an “area affected by war” in the map of the “general crisis” provided in Parker and Smith 1978: 5 (with the wrong dating “1645-1664”, which is repeated in the second edition; see Parker and Smith 1997: 5).

⁵² Steensgaard 1997: 33.

⁵³ For a detailed analysis, including a critical review of previous elaborations on these four senses by various scholars, see Steensgaard 1997.

⁵⁴ Goldstone (1991: 349-415) has already attempted a similar approach for the Ottoman Empire, in relation to the *celali* revolts, and Faroqhi’s observations seem to recognize both the validity and the importance of such approaches (Faroqhi 2000: 469-70). In Venice’s case, republicanism’s “crisis” has indeed been discussed (see various contributions in the recent “revisionist” volume Martin and Romano 2000), but not necessarily as being part of the “general crisis of the 17th century”.

⁵⁵ According to Crummey’s apt critique (1998: 156).

described earlier, it is because I find its similarities with the Cretan case striking.

Goldstone bases his explanatory model on two major premises:⁵⁶ the first one is that, in the early 17th century, the population of the major agrarian societies of the world rose steadily to unprecedented levels. The second is that "agrarian states of this period were not equipped to deal with the impact of the steady growth of population". This resulted in rising prices (increased demand "in excess of the productivity gains of the land"), which, in turn, resulted in rising taxes, since revenues from taxation were necessary in order for the state to meet its rapidly increasing military expenses too. "Yet attempts to increase state revenues met resistance from the elites and the populace and thus rarely succeeded in offsetting spiraling expenses. As a result most major states in the seventeenth century were rapidly raising taxes but were still headed for fiscal crisis." As the inflation rate was rising steadily and the taxation system was proving too inflexible to meet rapidly changing conditions, state bankruptcy was becoming just a matter of time. In parallel, "elites were seeking to secure their own relative position. Population growth increased the number of aspirants for elite positions, and their demands were difficult to satisfy given the fiscal strains of the state. Elites thus were riven by increasing rivalry and factionalism", which, in combination with their resistance to state demands, resulted in elite groups that were restless and difficult to control. Population growth also led to "urban migration and falling real wages". Thus, next to the rural groups, exhausted by taxation and oppression, one should also expect to find starving young urban workers, all prone to violence and rebellion. According to Goldstone's model, when all these three parameters (state bankruptcy, uncontrollable rival elite groups and "high potential for mobilizing popular groups", e.g. a discontented young populace, both rural and urban) occur simultaneously, they may be expected to cause "state break-

⁵⁶ I summarize here his own description (Goldstone 1991: 24-5; quotations refer to these pages).

down” in the form of regional and national rebellions or, even, revolutions.⁵⁷

In Crete, just before the “Cretan War”, there was no revolution, but in all other respects Goldstone’s model applies very well. The demographic change, which is the ultimate cause of all causes in Goldstone’s model, was there: according to Trivan’s census of the year 1644,⁵⁸ the population of the island was 287,165 people (136,423 women and 150,742 men). This figure represents an increase of 38.06% in comparison with that of 1589 (208,000 inhabitants⁵⁹) and an increase of 47.69% in comparison with the Kastrofylakas census of 1582-4 (194,341 inhabitants⁶⁰). Whether there was, indeed, an increase in taxation in the same period is something that requires *ad hoc* research, but the extensive restoration works on the island’s fortifications that the *provveditor general* Andrea Corner had undertaken just before the war, mainly in 1645,⁶¹ make it seem more than likely. As for rival elite groups and factional fighting, that is something that one should expect to find on the island in any period of the Venetian occupation, or even later,⁶² whereas the discontent of the rural

⁵⁷ Goldstone’s theory is mostly a theory of revolutions and that is why his case studies are not restricted to the 17th century, but also include the French Revolution.

⁵⁸ Manoussakas 1949: 59.

⁵⁹ According to Z. Mocenigo (see Vlassopoulou 2000: 182, where there is also a table of censuses from 1571 up to 1644, along with information about others, preceding and following these dates).

⁶⁰ Xirouchakis 1934: 45.

⁶¹ For details on Corner’s attempts and his “ever-increasing expenses” see Setton 1991: 120-1.

⁶² McKee 2000: 151-67, reports many incidents from the 13th and, mainly, the 14th century. For “dangerous and insubordinate families” – as reported in Venetian sources – and their involvement in all later major revolts see Manoussakas 1960 (15th century) and Papadia-Lala 1983 (early 16th century; cf. Ploumidis 1974). For the revolt of 1571 and the situation on the island until the outbreak of the “Cretan War” see Vakalopoulos 1968: 297-328 and 474-83. Finally, it would not be irrelevant to mention that the Venetian “heritage” of *vendetta* has survived in Crete up to the present day.

populace has been recorded in contemporary sources.⁶³ Of course, the whole point in Goldstone's "demographic/ structural" theory is to check the impact of demographic trends on economic, political and social institutions and for this, undoubtedly, a much more detailed analysis than the very sketchy one provided here would be required. Even so, it seems to me that his model, as described above, could be used to explain well-known – but insufficiently studied – phenomena, such as the lack of resistance or even collaboration of the Greek population of the island with the Turks against the Venetians.⁶⁴ Following Goldstone's model, one may argue that if revolution did not come in Venetian Crete in the mid-1640s, it is most probably because the Turks came first. But, of course, this is only a hypothesis.⁶⁵

⁶³ It is very clear, for example, in the report edited in Sakellariou 1939: 146-52; for other references see Vakalopoulos 1968: 486. It needs to be added here that Vakalopoulos's analysis for the pre-war period (see previous note) proves not only that factions were as active as ever in the late 16th-early 17th centuries, but also, and more importantly perhaps, that popular discontent too, both rural and urban, had increased in the same period.

⁶⁴ That the Greek rural population "hardly raised a finger to oppose the Turks when they landed west of Canea in late June 1645" (Setton 1991: 107) is well-known. Vakalopoulos, based on contemporary reports, both Venetian and Greek, claims that this reaction (or rather non-reaction) of the natives was due to the hope "that they would change the old conquerors with new, milder ones" (Vakalopoulos 1968: 486) and Vlassopoulou gives an account of recorded Turkish promises that things would indeed be so (Vlassopoulou 2000: 171-4). Many incidents and general accusations of active collaboration of the Greeks with the Turks during the whole course of the war are reported in many sources and, what is more interesting, they refer not only to the rural, but also to the (non-patrician) urban population; if the latter has been exemplified in the person of Andreas Barozzi, the "grand traitor of Candia" (Stavriniadis 1947), because of his betrayal's decisive significance for the war's conclusion, it was by no means the only one (the few examples of treachery given by Bounialis and recorded in Vlassopoulou 2000: 169-71 could easily be extended from other sources).

⁶⁵ To my knowledge, Greek scholarship has never embarked on a similar approach; a very vague analysis of the revolutionary phenomenon in Greek lands under Venetian occupation – which ignores both Goldstone's model and the theory of the "general crisis of the 17th century" – may be found in Leontsinis 1995 (with basic Greek bibliography).

Finally, as regards the connection of the “Cretan War” with the general subject-matter “Europe and the Turks”, it may indeed appear to be obvious, and one may also claim that the fact that the interest of contemporaries in the war was amalgamated with their interest in the Turks themselves is at least understandable, if not quite to be expected. However, it has not been previously observed that this amalgam has produced “mixed” works, such as the *Compendio dell’Historie Generali de’ Turchi*, which was accompanied by the *Continuatione de’ Successi della Guerra di Candia*, or the *Ιστορικών των εξ αρχής βασιλέων Τουρκών*, which included the *Διήγησις του νησίου της Κρήτης*.⁶⁶ The realization of this fact opens up new horizons, since it may turn research in the unexplored direction of a totally different category of texts, namely, those broadly dealing with “images of the Turk” rather than with the “Cretan War” as such. Texts of the kind, even when not directly related to the “Cretan War”, may prove very useful for the examination of the delicate matter of the formation of identities and stereotypes – and a more detailed analysis, emphasizing the “image of the Turk” as exemplified in Ioakeim’s text, with the use of the theoretical tools of *imagologie*,⁶⁷ has already been provided elsewhere.⁶⁸ As one may expect, however, the subject “images of the Turk” in early modern European literature is very broad; even if we restricted it to its Greek and Italian dimensions – which are the most relevant in our case – we would still find literally dozens of texts that could be used for its proper definition,⁶⁹ texts that have never been touched upon either by this

⁶⁶ Both cases have already been examined; for the *Compendio* see pp. 98-101 and for the *Ιστορικών* see pp. 97-8 above.

⁶⁷ As defined in Pageaux 1989 and Abatzopoulou 1998.

⁶⁸ See Kaplanis 2004.

⁶⁹ The cases of both the *Compendio* and the *Ιστορικών* (see note 66 above) are, most probably, marginal as regards the formation of the image of the Turk – especially if we take into account other texts, much more influential and widely disseminated in the 16th and 17th centuries, such as the works of Francesco Sansovino, Guglielmo Postello and Giovanni Sagredo. Sansovino’s *Gli Annali Turcheschi overo Vite de’ Principi della Casa Othomana* (Venezia 1573), a very famous work of the 16th century – for a Greek text which draws heavily upon it see

or by any other research. And if the state of research concerning the sources of the “Cretan War” is still far from satisfactory, as regards the “image of the Turk” in European literature it is simply embryonic⁷⁰ – the analysis I provided recently mainly aimed to contribute to the theoretical stage of the subject’s development.⁷¹

When, in 1870, Ipsilantis wrote that “αν αυτός ο πόλεμος [i.e. the “Cretan War”] ακολουθούσεν επί των πάλαι ποιητών, ήθελεν γυμνάσει τους καλάμους όλων των τότε συγγραφέων, και ο Παρνασσός ήθελεν εύρει ύλην μεγαλυτέραν από της του εν Τρωάδι πολέμου”,⁷² he probably did not realize how close to the actual facts he was. Indeed, the volume of existing material which is related, in one way or another, to the “Cretan War” is immense and it seems that its vastness, instead of attracting scholarly attention, has actually discouraged scholars from dealing with it. This paper has suggested that there is still a lot that needs to be

Zachariadou 1960 – was re-elaborated in the 17th century by *Conte Maiolino Bisaccioni* and was published in Venice (Combi & La Noù., 1654) under the title *Historia universale dell'origine, guerre et imperio de Turchi* (for a bibliography see Kaklamanis 2001, 124, note 51); Guillaume Postel or Guglielmo Postello, as he was better known in Venetian literary circles, was one of the most famous “orientalists” of his time and also one of the most prolific French authors of the 16th century (on his life and works see Kuntz 1981; on his orientalism in connection with his Venetian experience see Kuntz 1987; on his *République des Turcs* (Poitiers: Marnef, 1560) and his “historical imagination” see Bailbe 1988 and Dubois 1988 respectively); Giovanni Sagredo, to whom the manuscript version of the *Compendio* was dedicated (see note 32 above), was the author of the *Memorie istoriche de' Monarchi Ottomani* (Venezia 1673), a work that modern scholars (e.g. Eickhoff 1991) still consult – along with the works of Rycout and Cantemir – due to the absence of a modern, reliable history of the Ottoman empire. For more texts see next note.

⁷⁰ References to Italian material may be found in Benzoni 1985, Preto 1985 and Soykut 2001 (no matter how rich these references may seem, esp. in Preto 1985, none of these works could actually have claims to completeness – let alone to sufficient analysis of the subject). For a collection of German sources and an analysis emphasizing “exoticism/eroticism” see Kleinlogel 1989.

⁷¹ See Kaplanis 2004 – this analysis will be expanded in my forthcoming edition of *Struggle*.

⁷² Ipsilantis 1870: 163.

done at all levels of research – location, evaluation and edition of sources, production of coherent narratives by the use of new exegetical frameworks and applicable theories. Nonetheless and notwithstanding the difficulties, I do believe that historical syntheses concerning the “Cretan War” may – and should – be attempted in the future. In order to overcome the problem of the seemingly endless material, it would be wise to agree in advance on the necessarily limited viewpoint of such syntheses: they need to concentrate on the history of the “Cretan War” from, say, the Venetian and/or, more generally, Italian,⁷³ French, German, Ottoman, Slavic, English, Dutch or Greek⁷⁴ point of view. The benefits of this “national” perspective that I am proposing – which by no means should be understood as suggesting or indicating

⁷³ Clearly, the bulk of the Venetian sources would require an independent research project focusing on archival material – and, most probably, limited to periods of the war (e.g. 1645-1650, 1651-1666, 1667-1669), whereas Italian historiographical works of the time, both Venetian and otherwise, may be the subject of another independent study.

⁷⁴ Although unedited Greek texts do exist (see pp. 96-8 above; note also the various pamphlets like the one mentioned in Alexiou and Aposkiti 1995: 95, for which no specialized research has been undertaken so far, and the texts mentioned in Mavromatis 2005: 81-2), most major histories of the “Cretan War” in Greek – with the exception of Ioakeim’s *Struggle* – are available in 20th-century editions. More specifically, Bounialis’s *Διήγησις* (Venice: Giuliani, 1681) has been recently edited by S. Alexiou and M. Aposkiti (1995) – philologically speaking, this edition is not entirely satisfactory (for reasons I explain in Kaplanis 2002: 212), but it is certainly more easily accessible than those of Xirouchakis (1908) and Nenedakis (1979). Diakrousis’s *Διήγησις* (Venice, 1667 – no extant copy; Venice: Mortale(?), 1679) is available only in Xirouchakis’s edition (1908) and needs to be re-edited. Kaklamanis (2005: 242) points out this need; his paper also argues, convincingly, that Diakrousis’s historical value is limited, because for the description of the war events he “borrows” almost exclusively the descriptions of Achelis in *The Siege of Malta* (Pernot 1910). Other texts, such as the (archaistic) composition of Pikros and the lament of Palladas are also available in 20th-century reprints/editions (Mavroidi 1984 and Petrou-Mesogeitis 1939 respectively). In general, the editorial state of Greek sources should be considered satisfactory, especially if we take into account the state of other sources (see note 44 above).

“national homogeneity” – are evident: not only does it bring the vastness of the preserved material to more manageable dimensions, but it also requires researchers to have a specialized palaeographical training and a good knowledge of only *one*, not all, of these languages. Anything else, it seems to me, would be wishful thinking and has so far produced very little. Ideally, approaches like these will lead to a better evaluation of the sources and, eventually, to the edition of the most important of them. From this point of view, after the completion of my research and the publication of Ioakeim’s *Struggle*, scholars who would like to explore the “Cretan War” from a Greek point of view will be in the advantageous position of having most of the Greek sources available in recent – and, thus, easily accessible – editions.

References

- Abatzopoulou, F. (1998). *Ο Άλλος εν διωγμῷ. Η εικόνα του Εβραίου στη λογοτεχνία. Ζητήματα ιστορίας και μυθοπλασίας*. Athens: Themelio
- Alexiou, S. and Aposkiti, M. (eds.) (1995). *Μαρίνου Τζάνε Μπουνιαλή του Ρεθυμναίου “Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος” (1645-1669)*. Athens: Stigma
- Anticano, S. (1647). *Frammenti storici della guerra di Candia: Invasione del Regno; [P]resa di Canea; Successi di terra; Presa di Retimo; Morte del gener[al] Corn[er]; Successi di mare; Morte del capitan delle navi Morosini*. Bologna
- Argyriou, A. (ed.) (2004). *Η Ελλάδα των νησιών από τη Φραγκοκρατία ως σήμερα. Πρακτικά του Β΄ Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ρέθυμνο, 10-12 Μαΐου 2002)*. 2 vols. Athens: Ellinika Grammata
- Aston, T. (ed.) (1965). *Crisis in Europe 1560-1660. Essays from “Past and Present”*, with an introduction by C. Hill. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Bailbe, J. (1988). “Postel conteur dans ‘La République des Turcs’”, in: Kuntz 1988, pp. 45-63
- Benzoni, G. (1985). “Il ‘farsi Turco’ ossia l’ombra del rinnegato”, in: Pirovano 1985, pp. 91-133

- Bérenger, J. (1994). *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1273-1700*, translated by C. A. Simpson. London and New York: Longman
- Bernardy, A. A. (1902). *Venezia e il Turco nella seconda metà del secolo XVII, con documenti inediti*. Florence: Civelli
- Bostan, I. (1992). *Osmanlı Bahriye Teşkilâtı: XVII. Yüzyılda Tersâne-i Âmire*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi
- Brunel, P. and Chevrel, Y. (eds.) (1989). *Précis de littérature comparée*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
- Brusoni, G. (1673). *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra' Veneziani e Turchi di Girolamo Brusoni nella quale si contengono i successi delle passate guerre nei Regni di Candia e Dalmazia dall'anno 1644 fino al 1671*. Venice: Curti
- Camariano, N. (1940). *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești, II*. Bucharest: Biblioteca Academiei Române
- Carter, F. W. (1972). *Dubrovnik (Ragusa): A classic City-State*, London and New York: Seminar Press
- Chasiotis, I. M. (1974). "Ο κρητικός πόλεμος (1645-1669) και η εποποιΐα της πολιορκίας του Χάνδακος (1648-1669)", in: Vakalopoulos et al. 1974, pp. 334-50
- Chasiotis, I. M. (2001). *Μεταξύ οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης. Ο ελληνικός κόσμος στα χρόνια της τουρκοκρατίας*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press
- Cicogna, E. A. (1847). *Saggio di bibliografia veneziana*. Venice: Merlo
- Concina, E. (1988). *L'Arsenale della Repubblica di Venezia*. Milan: Electa
- Crummey, R. O. (1998). "Muscovy and the 'General crisis of the seventeenth century'", *Journal of Early Modern History* 2/2, 156-80
- Danışman, Z. (1964-9). *Ravzat el-Hüseyn fi Hulâsat Ahbar el-Hâfîkayn (Târihi Naîmâ)*. 5 vols. Istanbul: Zuhuri Danişman Yayınınevi
- De Caro, G. (1972). "Brusoni, Girolamo", in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 14. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, pp. 712-20
- Detorakis, Th. and Kalokairinos, A. (eds.) (2004). *Πεπραγμένα Θ' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Ελούντα, 1-6 Οκτωβρίου 2001. Τόμοι Β1/Β2: Βυζαντινή και μεσαιωνική περίοδος*. Irakleio: Etairia Kritikon Istorikon Meleton

- Detorakis, Th. and Papadaki-Oekland, S. (eds.) (2000). *Πεπραγμένα Η' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Ηράκλειο, 9-14 Σεπτεμβρίου 1996. Τόμος Β2: Βυζαντινή και μεσαιωνική περίοδος*. Irakleio: Etairia Kritikon Istorikon Meleton
- Dubois, C.-G. (1988). "L'imagination historique chez Guillaume Postel (autour de l'expérience vénitienne: 1547-1552)", in: Kuntz 1988, pp. 65-80
- Dujčev, I. (1935). *Avvisi di Ragusa. Documenti sull'Impero Turco nel sec. XVII e sulla guerra di Candia* [Orientalia Christiana Analecta 101]. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum
- Dujčev, I. (1968). "La guerra di Candia e gli avvenimenti balcanici del secolo XVII", *Πεπραγμένα του Β' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Τόμος Γ'. Τμήμα μεσαιωνολογικόν*, Athens: Filologikos Syllogos "O Chrysostomos", pp. 60-9
- Eickhoff, E. (1991). *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi. Bufera nel sud-est Europeo 1645-1700*, with the collaboration of R. Eickhoff, translated from the German by A. Audisio. Milan: Rusconi
- Eideneier, H., Moennig, U. and Toufexis, N., (eds.) (2001). *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημόσιας γραμματείας. Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi IVA, Αμβούργο 28-31.1.1999*. Irakleio: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis
- Ekkekakis, G. P. (1990). *Τα κρητικά βιβλία. Ένα πρώτο σχέδιασμα κρητικής βιβλιογραφίας. Β' 1864-1913*. Rethymno: Typospoudi
- Ekkekakis, G. P. (1991). *Τα κρητικά βιβλία. Σχέδιασμα κρητικής βιβλιογραφίας. Α' 1499-1863*. Rethymno: Grafotechniki Kritis
- Faroqui, S. (2000). "Crisis and change 1590-1699", in: İnalcık and Quataert 2000/2, pp. 411-636
- Gerola, G. (1905-32). *Monumenti veneti nell'isola di Creta*. 4 vols. Venice: Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti
- Goldstone, J. A. (1991). *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press
- Greene, M. (2000). *A shared world. Christians and Muslims in the early modern Mediterranean*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Gryntakis, G. (1991). "Η αφορμή του κρητικού πολέμου (1645-1669)", *Κρητολογικά Γράμματα* 1/3-4, 191-3

- Holton, D. (ed.) (1991). *Literature and society in Renaissance Crete*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- İnalçık, H. and Quataert, D. (eds.) (2000). *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire*. 2 vols. (Vol. 1: 1300-1600, vol. 2: 1600-1914.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ingrao, C. (1994). *The Habsburg Monarchy 1618-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ipsilantis, A. C. (1870). *Εκκλησιαστικών και πολιτικών των εις δώδεκα βιβλίων Η', Θ' και Ι', ήτοι Τα μετά την Άλωσιν, 1453-1789, Α. Κ. Υψηλάντου. Εκ χειρογράφου ανεκδότου της ιεράς μονής του Σινά. Εκδιδόντος Γ. Αφθονίδου*. Istanbul: Vrettos
- Jeffreys, E. and Jeffreys, M. (eds.) (2005). *Neograeca Medii Aevi V. Αναδρομικά και Προδρομικά. Approaches to texts in Early Modern Greek*. Oxford
- Kaklamanis, S. (2001). “Από το χειρόγραφο στο έντυπο: το παιχνίδι των γραφών. Τα ιδιαίτερα εκδοτικά προβλήματα κειμένων που έχουν παραδοθεί σε χειρόγραφο και έντυπη μορφή”, in: Eideneier, Moennig and Toufexis 2001, pp. 101-86
- Kaklamanis, S. (2005). “Ο Άνθμος Διακρούσης αναγνώστης της *Μάλτας πολιτορκίας* του Αντωνίου Αχέλη”, in: Jeffreys and Jeffreys 2005, pp. 241-57
- Kaplanis, T. A. (2002). “Εκδόσεις κειμένων της νεοελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας και μονοτονικό σύστημα”, *Κονδυλοφόρος* 1, 205-35
- Kaplanis, T. A. (2003). “Ioakeim Kyprios’ *Struggle* (mid-17th century). A study of the text with an edition of selected passages”. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge
- Kaplanis, T. A. (2004). “Κατασκευάζοντας την εικόνα του Εαυτού και του Άλλου: η περίπτωση της Πάλης του Ιωακείμ Κύπριου”, in: Argyriou 2004, 1, pp. 129-50
- Kaplanis, T. A. (2005). “Towards a critical edition of Ioakeim Kyprios’ *Struggle*”, in: Jeffreys and Jeffreys 2005, pp. 33-46
- Kapsalis, D. (ed.) (2005). *Candia/Creta/Κρήτη. Ο χώρος και ο χρόνος, 16ος-18ος αιώνας*. Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis
- Karathanassis, A. E. (2000). *Οι Έλληνες λόγιοι στη Βλαχία (1670-1714). Συμβολή στη μελέτη της ελληνικής πνευματικής κίνησης στις παρα-*

- δουνάβιες ηγεμονίες κατά την προφαναριωτική περίοδο. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis
- Kitromilides, P. (2002). *Κυπριακή λογοισόνη (1571-1878). Προσωπογραφική θεώρηση*. Nicosia: Kentro Epistimonikon Erevnon Kyprou
- Kleinlogel, C. (1989). *Exotik-Erotik. Zur Geschichte des Türkenbildes in der deutschen Literatur der frühen Neuzeit (1453-1800)*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang
- Kretschmayr, H. (1934). *Geschichte von Venedig*. Vol. 3. Stuttgart: Perthes
- Kriaras, E. (1962). "Ιωακείμ ο Κύπριος και το ποίημά του για τον τουρκοβενετικό πόλεμο του 1645-1669", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 15-16/2, 399-405
- Kuntz, M. L. (1981). *Guillaume Postel. Prophet of the Restitution of All Things. His life and thought*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff
- Kuntz, M. L. (1987). "L'orientalismo di Guglielmo Postello e Venezia", in: Lanciotti 1987, pp. 207-27
- Kuntz, M. L. (ed.) (1988). *Postello, Venezia e il suo mondo*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki
- Lanciotti, L. (ed.) (1987). *Venezia e l'Oriente*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki
- Leontsinis, G. N. (1995). "Επαναστατικό φαινόμενο και ιδεολογία στην Κρήτη, την Κύπρο και τα Ιόνια νησιά κατά τη βενετική περίοδο", *Πεπραγμένα Ζ' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Τόμος Β2: Τμήμα βυζαντινών και μέσων χρόνων*. Rethymno, pp. 423-31
- Litzica, C. (1909). *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești*. Bucharest: Biblioteca Academiei Române
- Mallett, M. E. and Hale, J. R. (1984). *The military organization of a Renaissance state: Venice, c. 1400-1617*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Maltezos, C. (ed.) (1993). *Venetiae quasi alterum Byzantium. Όψεις της ιστορίας του βενετοκρατούμενου ελληνισμού. Αρχαιικά τεκμήρια*. Athens: Elliniko Institutou Vyzantinon kai Metavyzantinon Spoudontis Venetias
- Manoussakas, M. (1949). "Η παρά Τριβαν απογραφή της Κρήτης (1644) και ο δήθεν κατάλογος των κρητικών οίκων Κερκύρας", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 3, 35-59

- Manoussakas, M. (1960). *Η εν Κρήτη συνωμοσία του Σήφη Βλαστού (1453-1454) και η νέα συνωμοτική κίνησης του 1460-1462*, Athens
- Manoussakas, M. (1968). “Προγραμματισμός για τη συστηματική έκδοση του Αρχείου του Δούκα της Κρήτης: ο πρώτος τόμος των ‘Missive e Responsive’”, *Πεπραγμένα του Β΄ Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου. Τόμος Γ΄. Τμήμα μεσαιωνολογικόν*, Athens: Filologikos Syllogos “Ο Chrysostomos”, pp. 163-72
- Manoussakas, M. (1971). “Σύντομος επισκόπησις των περί την βενετοκρατούμενην Κρήτην ερευνών”, *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 23, 245-308
- Manoussakas, M. (1998). “Cultura e letteratura greca nella Creta veneziana”, in: Ortalli 1998, pp. 443-58
- Martin, J. and Romano, D. (eds.) (2000). *Venice reconsidered. The history and civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Mavroidi, F. (ed.) (1984). *Κ. Ν. Σάθας, Ελληνικά Ανέκδοτα, τόμος Β΄, 1867*. Φωτομηχανική ανατύπωση με εισαγωγή και πίνακα της Φ. Μαυροειδή. Athens: Karavias
- Mavromatis, G. K. (2005). “Ο κρητικός πόλεμος (1645-1669) στη γραμματεία του 17ου αιώνα”, in: Kapsalis 2005, pp. 71-84
- McKee, S. (2000). *Uncommon Dominion. Venetian Crete and the myth of ethnic purity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Nenedakis, A. N. (ed.) (1979). *Μαρίνος Τζάνες Μπουνιαλής, “Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος” (1645-1669)*. Athens: Nenedakis
- Norwich, J. J. (1983). *A history of Venice*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Ortalli, G. (ed.) (1998). *Venezia e Creta. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi. Iraklion-Chania, 30 settembre–5 ottobre 1997*. Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti
- Pageaux, D.-H. (1989). “De l’imagerie culturelle à l’imaginaire”, in: Brunel and Chevrel 1989, pp. 133-61
- Panagiotakis, N. M. (ed.) (1988). *Κρήτη: Ιστορία και Πολιτισμός*. Vol. 2. Irakleio: Vikelaia Dimotiki Vivliothiki
- Papadia, A. (1976). “Εκθεση του Camillo Gonzaga για τα πρώτα χρόνια (1645-1647) του κρητικού πολέμου”, *Θησαυρίσματα* 13, 152-89
- Papadia-Lala, A. (1983). *Αγροτικές ταραχές και εξεγέρσεις στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη (1509-1528) – Η «επανάσταση» του Γεωργίου Γαδανολέου-Αυσογιώργη*. Doctoral thesis. Athens: Parousia

- Parker, G. and Smith, L. M. (eds.) (1978). *The general crisis of the seventeenth century*. London, Henley and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Parker, G. and Smith, L. M. (eds.) (1997). *The general crisis of the seventeenth century*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge
- Pernot, H. (1910). *P. Gentil de Vendosme et Antoine Achélis, Le Siège de Malte par les Turcs en 1565. Publié en français et en grec d'après les éditions de 1567 et de 1571*. Paris: Honoré Champion
- Petrou-Mesogeitis, C. (ed.) (1939). “Θρήνος της Κρήτης”, *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Κρητικών Σπουδών* 2, 348-54
- Pirovano, C. (ed.) (1985). *Venezia e i Turchi*. Milan: Electa
- Ploumidis, G. S. (1974). *Οι βενετοκρατούμενες ελληνικές χώρες μεταξύ του δευτέρου και του τρίτου τουρκοβενετικού πολέμου (1503-1537)*. Ioannina: Panepistimio Ioanninon
- Politis, A. (2006). “Το ψηφιακό ξετύλιγμα της «Ανέμης». Ο κόμβος του Πανεπιστημίου Κρήτης φωτίζει υποδειγματικά τη νεοελληνική ιστορία”, *Καθημερινή* (3.12.06)
- Preto, P. (1975). *Venezia e i Turchi*. Florence: Sansoni
- Preto, P. (1985). “Il mito del Turco nella letteratura veneziana”, in Pirovano 1985, pp. 134-43
- Pretselakis, G. E. (2000). “Μια σπάνια έκδοση για τον Κρητικό Πόλεμο (1645-1669)”, in: Detorakis and Papadaki-Oekland 2000, pp. 217-28
- Rabb, T. K. (1975). *The struggle for stability in Early Modern Europe*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press
- Rossi, F. (1998). “Rifornimenti marittimi agli arsenali veneziani del Levante”, in: Ortalli 1998, pp. 415-42
- Sakellariou, M. (1939). “Χειρόγραφος έκθεσις περί της πολιορκίας και αλώσεως των Χανίων υπό των Τούρκων (1645)”, *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 15, 141-76
- Setton, K. M. (1991). *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the seventeenth century*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society
- Shaw, S. (1976). *History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. Volume I: Empire of the Gazis: The rise and decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808*. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press

- Soykut, M. (2001). *Image of the "Turk" in Italy. A history of the "Other" in early modern Europe: 1453-1683* [Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 236]. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz
- Stavriniadis, N. (1947). "Ανδρέας Μπαρότσος. Ο προδότης του Μεγάλου Κάστρου", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 1, 393-430
- Steensgaard, N. (1997). "The seventeenth-century crisis", in: Parker and Smith 1997, pp. 32-56
- Stoye, J. (1964). *The Siege of Vienna*. London: Collins
- Tiepolo, M. F. (1998). "Le fonti documentarie di Candia nell'Archivio di Stato di Venezia", in: Ortalli 1998, pp. 43-71
- Tomadakis, N. B. (1947). "Συγγραφείς του «Κρητικού Πολέμου» (Μικρά προσθήκη εις Α' σ. 124)", *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 1, 618-19
- Tomadakis, N. B. (1976). "Συμβολή εις τους ναυτικούς όρους του ΙΖ' αιώνας και ιδία εις τους παρ' Αθανασίω Πικρώ και Μ. Τζάνε Μπουνιαλή και αι ονομασίαι των σκαφών παρ' αυτοίς", *Κρητολογία* 3, 5-46
- Trevor-Roper, H. R. (1965). "The general crisis of the seventeenth century", in: Aston 1965, pp. 59-95
- Vakalopoulos, A. E. (1968). *Ιστορία του νέου ελληνισμού. Γ'. Τουρκοκρατία 1453-1669. Οι αγώνες για την πίστη και την ελευθερία*. Thessaloniki: Sfakianakis
- Vakalopoulos, A. E. (1976). *The Greek Nation, 1453-1669. The cultural and economic background of modern Greek society*. Translated from the Greek by I. and P. Moles. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press
- Vakalopoulos, A. E. et al. (eds.) (1974). *Ιστορία του ελληνικού έθνους. Τόμος Ι'. Ο ελληνισμός υπό ξένη κυριαρχία (περίοδος 1453-1669). Τουρκοκρατία-Λατινοκρατία*. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon
- Valiero, A. (1679). *Historia della guerra di Candia*. Venice: Baglioni
- Valiero, A. (1859). *Storia della guerra di Candia*. Trieste: Coen
- Vellaio, N. (1647). *La guerra cretense*. Bologna: Zenero
- Vincent, A. (1970). "The Two Sultanas: The Cretan War (1645-1669) in South Slav heroic songs", *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12/2, 237-42
- Vitti, M. and Spadaro, G. (eds.) (1995). *Τραγωδία ονομαζομένη "Εγγένα" του κυρ Θεοδώρου Μοντσελέζε, 1646*. Athens: Odysseas

- Vlassopoulou, M. (2000). "Literary writing and the recording of history: A study of Marinós Tzanes Bounialis' 'The Cretan War' (17th Century)". Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge
- Xanthoudidis, S. (1909). *Επίτομος ιστορία Κρήτης από των αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι των καθ' ημάς*. Athens: Elliniki Ekdotiki Etaireia
- Xirouchakis, A. (ed.) (1908). *Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος (1645-1669) ή συλλογή των ελληνικών ποιημάτων Ανθίμου Διακρούση, Μαρίνου Ζάνε*. Trieste: Lloyd
- Xirouchakis, A. (1934). *Η βενετοκρατούμενη Ανατολή. Κρήτη και Επτάνησος*. Athens: Foinix
- Zachariadou, E. (1960). *Το "Χρονικό των Τούρκων σουλτάνων" (του Βαρβερινού ελληνικού κώδικα 111) και το ιταλικό του πρότυπο*. Thessaloniki: Etaireia Makedonikon Spoudon
- Zordan, G. (1998). *Repertorio di storiografia veneziana. Testi e studi*. Padova: Poligrafo