of Kosovo, which culminated in the creation of the celebrated Kosovo cycle of epic songs, is useful, though not insightful.

The last chapter, "A Legend's Legacy," is a panagyric to Serbian nationalism and the "ethos of Kosovo." True, some refined Serbs may see this ethos as the "revolutionary spirit of justice, humanity . . . respect for the rights of all other peoples." (p. 142) But how can a person as aware of the Serbian realities as Emmert is not realize that in the past two hundred years the "ethos of Kosovo" has been understood by Serbs as inspiration to "cleanse" Serbia, Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Montenegro of Muslims? After all, did Njegoš, whom Emmert quotes approvingly as the most faithful expounder of the ethos of Kosovo, not celebrate in his Mountain Wreath the "cleansing" of Montenegro of Muslim Slavs?

On June 28, 1989, about two million Serbs came to the site of the battle of Kosovo to demand that Yugoslav authorities help them realize the "ethos of Kosovo." The civilized world was horrified because the Serbian elites had by then defined this "ethos" as "cleansing" that Albanian province of its native Muslim population and settling the "hallowed" ground with Serbs. Since then the world has witnessed the practical application of the ethos of Kosovo by Serbian warriors at Vukovar, Dubrovnik, Sarajevo and at other towns and villages for the former Yugoslavia marked for ethnic cleansing by Serbia's nationalists.

A few minor errors slipped through. The Macedonian city of Ber is called Bera in English, Veroia in modern Greek; Vladislav Jagelovic is better known as Wladyslaw Jagiello. Like most modern historians, our author also does not seem to distinguish between Rascia and Serbia, for he arbitrarily writes "Serbia" and "Serbs" where the sources have "Rascia" and "Rasciani." This should be avoided. King Sigismund of Hungary did not call Lazar "Prince of Serbia" (p. 44), but "knezis de Rascia" (note 5, p. 174), because the kings of Hungary were the legitimate kings of "Serbia." We should not wonder why some contemporary writers quoted by Emmert regarded the battle of Kosovo in 1939 as a Hungarian victory. It was won by the Bosnian ban Tvrtko whose realm belonged de jure to the crown of St. Stephen.

Jacques Bacic

New York City


No character has appeared more often in movies than Dracula. Indeed, the infamous "Prince of Darkness" of the silver screen has become a symbol of evil for the twentieth century. But this is Bram Stocker's evil prince and not a historical entity; for although Stocker based his fictional character on a historical fifteenth-century Walachia ruler, Vlad III Dracula, who was known for his violence and evil, he later did not suck blood from the necks of his victims, did not avoid light or garlic, or need a stake driven through the heart to die.

Vlad III Dracula lived in a turbulent time on a contested piece of land. Within seventeen years of his birth, ca. 1431, the Ottoman Turks had be-
gun to cross Asia Minor into Eastern Europe. Although Constantinople was yet to fall, already by 1448 the Turks had begun to occupy lands previously held by the Christian kingdom of Hungary. Dracula was to play a role, however minor, in this continuing struggle between the Hungarians and the Turks, between Christianity and Islam.

Dracula’s reign as voivode of Wallachia mirrored the turbulence of his time. He ruled three times, in 1448, 1456-62 and 1476. Sometimes he was supported by the Turks and at other times he opposed them; sometimes he was allied with Hungary and at other times he fought against her. He was nearly always embroiled in warfare, both against outside usurpers and against his own somewhat rebellious subjects. In this Dracula was not unique to the late middle ages. Nor was he unique in using impaling as his major form of execution. Still it was his obsession with this form of execution which gave Vlad III Dracula his infamous sobriquet, Vlad Tepes (Vlad the Impaler). Anyone who displeased him could be impaled: men, women and children, Hungarian Christians and Turkish Moslems. However, one group was particularly singled out for this punishment: Saxon merchants working in Transylvania and Wallachia.

Despite Dracula’s favored form of punishment, modern historians seem split over the issue of his inherent evil. Robert W. Seton-Watson has argued that Dracula was a psychotic despot, but Romanian historians Stefan Andreescu and Nicolae Stoicescu have presented an image of him as a Romanian national hero. Matei Cazacu’s book, L’histoire du Prince Dracula, turns the table somewhat on this dispute. Cazacu concerns himself not with the modern debate but with a similar fifteenth-century dispute concerning Dracula’s evil. This too was split into two opposing camps with contemporary German writers anticipating Seton-Watson’s argument by emphasizing Dracula’s evil and Russian writers, like their modern Romanian counterparts, recognizing his national heroism.

Cazacu also provides critical editions of all these accounts. For this alone Cazacu should be applauded. Although all have appeared in print before, many of these texts are difficult to obtain, and some have never appeared in a critical edition. Cazacu’s editorial practices are flawless. Moreover, all medieval German and Russian text have been provided with a facing page translation (into French) which makes them more widely accessible. (However, as is customary in this and other medieval text series, the few Latin texts edited here are left without translation.)

Cazacu has gone to great lengths not only to provide these texts in a single volume, but also to prove that the two separate historiographical traditions mentioned above did exist. It is here that the Cazacu falters a bit. His rather lengthy, highly technical explanation of this is more confusing than helpful. As well, several questions arise which never seem to be answered, nor does there appear to be a guideline behind the division of these texts. Certainly the German accounts of Dracula’s life emphasize the number of impalings performed at his command, but this is not an unusual emphasis considering the tabloid-like attitude that pervaded German historical works of the fifteenth century. Nor do these accounts differ markedly from the single Russian Skazanie provided by Cazacu as the archetype of the Russian historiographical tradition. Finally, a commentary on Dracula written by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II)