

Freie Universität Berlin



Sonderforschungsbereich 980

**EPISTEME IN
BEWEGUNG**

WORKING PAPER NO. 4

Nikolas Pissis

Dimitrie Cantemir, the Monarchia
Borealis and the Petrine Instauration

Sonderforschungsbereich 980
Episteme in Bewegung.
Wissenstransfer von der Alten
Welt bis in die Frühe Neuzeit

Collaborative Research Centre
Episteme in Motion. Transfer of
Knowledge from the Ancient World
to the Early Modern Period

Berlin 2015
ISSN 2199-2878

SFB Episteme – Working Papers

Die Working Papers werden herausgegeben von dem an der Freien Universität Berlin angesiedelten Sonderforschungsbereich 980 *Episteme in Bewegung. Wissenstransfer von der Alten Welt bis in die Frühe Neuzeit* und sind auf der Website des SFB sowie dem Dokumentenserver der Freien Universität Berlin kostenfrei abrufbar:

www.sfb-episteme.de und **<http://edocs.fu-berlin.de>**

Die Veröffentlichung erfolgt nach Begutachtung durch den SFB-Vorstand. Mit Zusendung des Typoskripts überträgt die Autorin/der Autor dem Sonderforschungsbereich ein nichtexklusives Nutzungsrecht zur dauerhaften Hinterlegung des Dokuments auf der Website des SFB 980 sowie dem Dokumentenserver der Freien Universität. Die Wahrung von Sperrfristen sowie von Urheber- und Verwertungsrechten Dritter obliegt den Autorinnen und Autoren.

Die Veröffentlichung eines Beitrages als Preprint in den Working Papers ist kein Ausschlussgrund für eine anschließende Publikation in einem anderen Format. Das Urheberrecht verbleibt grundsätzlich bei den Autor/innen.

Zitationsangabe für diesen Beitrag:

Pissis, Nikolas: Dimitrie Cantemir, the Monarchia Borealis and the Petrine Instauration, Working Paper des SFB 980 *Episteme in Bewegung*, No. 4/2015, Freie Universität Berlin

Stable URL online: http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_series_00000000238

Working Paper ISSN 2199 – 2878 (Internet)

Diese Publikation wurde gefördert von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

Sonderforschungsbereich 980
„Episteme in Bewegung“
Freie Universität Berlin
Schwendenerstraße 8
D – 14195 Berlin
Tel: +49 (0)30 838-503 49 / -590 24
Email: info@sfb-episteme.de

DFG Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft

Nikolas Pissis

Dimitrie Cantemir, the Monarchia Borealis and the Petrine Instauration

For a history of knowledge in Early Modern Europe that would highlight the ambiguities of cultural contexts and of transfer processes rather than clear-cut intellectual profiles and cultural units or linear scenarios of change, Dimitrie Cantemir (1673-1723) constitutes an exemplary case.¹ What makes Cantemir an exceptional figure is not merely his mastery of multiple languages or the breadth of his encyclopaedic knowledge, ranging from history, geography and linguistics, Islamic religion, logics and physics, to architecture or the theory and practice of Ottoman music – to name but some of his fields of interest – but rather his multiple faces, the many personas of his biography: beyzāde Kantemiroğlu, the insider to the Istanbul milieu of dignitaries, ambassadors and dragomans, the pupil of Greek ecclesiastics and Ottoman court musicians, Demetrius Cantemirius the Moldavian prince, the exile, the revered authority on the Orient, the member of the Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, the Senator of the Russian Empire.² His sharing of Ottoman elite culture in conjunction with his political choices as well as the studies on his Moldavian homeland, which have qualified him as a precursor of Romanian national ideology, pose the problem of his multiple identities and their modern interpretations.³ A thorough examination of his scholarly work and his models and sources would have to deal with the multiple temporalities of his intellectual endeavours, the modalities of knowledge transfer performed, the adaptations and rearrangements of knowledge in different or rather changing contexts. As for his Russian years, in which he composed his major works, Cantemir's experience of Peter the Great's reign, one of those extraordinary periods of rapid change par excellence that were already perceived and described by their contemporaries in terms of cultural break and revolution,⁴ calls for an assessment of Cantemir's own engagement in and perception of the

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the workshop "Dimitrie Cantemir. Transferring Knowledge, Shaping Identities" organized between 27.-28.06. 2014 by the research project C06: Transfer und Überlagerung. Wissenskonfigurationen in der Zeit der griechischen homines novi im Osmanischen Reich (1641–1730) in the context of the SFB 980: Episteme in Motion, funded by the DFG (German Research Foundation). The term "Petrine Instauration" refers to the recent monograph of Collis 2012a.

² For Cantemir's biography and oeuvre see: Lemny 2009; Leezenberg 2012; Feodorov 2012-2014.

³ Faroqhi 2003, 96-101.

⁴ See for instance the description of the Petrine reforms by Israel 2006, 295-309. The most thorough and sophisticated account of this view is the trilogy of James Cracraft (1988, 1997, 2004); see also the summary of his arguments in his concise: Cracraft 2003; cf. Zernack 1986. For the growing revisionist tendency that stresses the continuities on either side the "Petrine Divide" see e.g. Martin 2010; Ostrowski 2010 and Waugh 2001, especially for his emphasis on the enduring role of religion in Petrine Russia.

Petrine reforms.⁵ As a contribution to this set of questions, the present paper will consider the short Latin treatise Cantemir dedicated to Peter in 1714, the *Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio*.⁶ It will concentrate on problems of knowledge transfer, on the multiple layers of Cantemir's argumentation, and especially on some hitherto unnoticed or uncommented aspects concerning the sources of the text, in an attempt to situate it more convincingly in the context of Cantemir's own intellectual outlook and of the cultural landscape of Petrine Russia.

After spending several years in Istanbul either as a hostage of the sultan on behalf of his father, prince Constantine (r. 1687-1693) or as a representative of his brother prince Antioch (r. 1695-1700, 1705-1707), Dimitrie Cantemir was appointed prince (hospodar) of Moldavia by the sultan in 1710. Ironically enough, he was chosen to replace his rival Nikolaos Mavrocordatos because he was thought more competent and trustworthy to command the Ottoman vassal principality in view of the envisaged war with Russia. However, not unlike other candidates to the princely thrones before him that had grown up in Istanbul in a similar social setting,⁷ soon after his enthronement, Cantemir gave up Ottoman loyalty, opting for an alliance with Peter the Great that was realised at the Russian Pruth campaign in the summer of 1711. After Peter's humiliating defeat, Cantemir had to flee his throne following the retreating Russian army and was granted the promised refuge in Russia, a promise the tsar kept by refusing to deliver him to the Ottomans during peace negotiations. Cantemir would spend the last stage of his life in Russia, at first in Kharkovo, later in Moscow and St. Petersburg, years that were marked by the establishment of his reputation, but also by the experience of exile with all its attendant difficulties including illusory hopes of return, nostalgia for the world left behind and an uneasy relation to his imperial host and patron.

In his political orientation to Russia as a Moldavian prince and in his switch of allegiance in 1711, regardless of his concrete motives,⁸ Cantemir followed not only a path paved by his predecessors on the Danubian principalities' thrones, but also a trend among Ottoman Christians. For more than half a century, a growing sentiment of attraction or devotion towards the rising Orthodox Power of the North had been influential among broad strata of the Orthodox population in the Ottoman Empire, both the elites and broader social groups.⁹ In constant tension with the principle of loyalty to the Ottoman Porte, several political projects were envisioned by ecclesiastical and secular elite groups, active players in

⁵ Panaitescu 1926; Semenova 2000; Lemny 2009, 105-125.

⁶ There exist two editions of the Latin text: Sulea-Firu 1963; Lozovan 1983.

⁷ Păun 2013, 213-215.

⁸ Pippidi 1980, 192-198; Lemny 2009, 95-103.

⁹ The phenomenon was termed the "Russian expectation" by Kitromilides 2013 [1978], 117-139.

the field of foreign policy, and were promoted through their networks at the Russian court: projects involving Russia and the Principalities and their role as part of a Christian Crusader alliance against the Ottoman Empire.¹⁰ In support of this political-diplomatic activity, the enhanced position of the Russian Tsar and his symbolic image as the leader of the Orthodox world was cultivated by ecclesiastical scholars of the Eastern Church actively engaged in these projects. Men of letters such as Gavriil Vlassios, Athanasios Patellaros, Gerasimos Vlachos, Paisios Ligaridis, Sophronios Lichudis or the interpreter Nicolae Spathar, dedicated panegyric or exhortative works either to the Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, to tsarevna Sophia Alekseevna or her half-brother Peter I, using a time-honoured political-theological language to conceptualize and legitimize Russia's historical destiny and its place in the universal plan of Divine Providence: Russia, either as the legitimate heir to the Eastern Roman Empire, supposedly the fourth and last in the Danielic scheme, or as God's messianic instrument for its restoration and renovation from an eschatological perspective.¹¹ This imperial-messianic discourse drew on the current European stream of "imperial humanism" associated since the early 16th century with the imperial revival and the vision of "universal monarchy",¹² but mainly on models of Byzantine political theology as re-imagined and reformulated in the context of the 17th century in a process that included aspects of an Orthodox imperial "invention of tradition". This was a discourse comparable to but distinct from the notorious theory of "Moscow the Third Rome", which had at any rate never ascended to an official ideology in Russia herself.¹³ Apart from their role in representing Russia among fellow Orthodox as well as to shaping imperial ideology in Russia, it is important to keep in mind that these texts, far from being restricted to the conventional flattery of the ruler and its functional importance for patronage relations at the court, were also means for rival lobbyist networks, "pressure groups", to promote certain political agendas. Advising and admonishing the Orthodox emperor to fulfil his duties or his supposed divine mission could lend ideological support to concrete goals and serve as a reminder or even as a subtle form of critique.

Cantemir was familiar with this symbolic imagery and its uses, which were common in the ecclesiastical and intellectual milieu of the Phanar, the Patriarchate and the Principalities. His *Panegyricum* of 1714 is a case in point, if we consider Dimitrie Cantemir

¹⁰ Kraft 1995, 56-103; Chentsova 2010, 190-262; Pippidi 2011; Păun 2013.

¹¹ Chesnokova 2011, 159-202.

¹² Bosbach 1986; Dandeleit 2014.

¹³ The rejection of the older stereotypes is commonplace among Russianists but not the case outside the field. See for various aspects the articles of Hösch 1978; Nitsche 1991; Rowland 1996; Poe 2001; Ostrowski 2007 and the extensive treatment of the issue by Sinitsyna 1998.

as its actual and sole author (it was addressed in Greek by Serban, the seven-year old son of Dimitrie to Peter himself in Moscow, on Easter Sunday, in March 1714 and printed on the tsar's order soon thereafter).¹⁴ The oration draws on this stock of inherited images and applies patterns of biblical analogy and in some instances of genuine typology, in a somewhat excessive manner: the Resurrection of Christ and his victory over the Devil are linked to the envisioned and predicted victory of Peter over the Ottomans; the redemption of the sinful sons of Adam from Death with the liberation of the Eastern Church and the Orthodox folk i.e. the New Israel; the time of Peter (*usque ad dies Magni Petri / έως εις ταις ημέραις του Πέτρου*) as the time of fulfilment in analogy to the Salvation plan of Divine Economy.¹⁵ Beneath the Greek manuscript text, a drawing of the globe is placed, bearing the Latin inscription *Ab Arctico omnia fluunt ad Antarcticum*, accompanied by a footnote ascribing this view to the Pythagoreans as opposed to Aristotle. This proves to be the only direct link to *Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio*.

While there are reasons to assume that the two texts, apparently delivered at the same occasion to the tsar, are complementary in their character, it is only at a first glance that *Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio*¹⁶ seems to adhere to the same legacy as the *Panegyricum*. As was the case with earlier texts theorizing on Russia's historical mission and its representation, Cantemir chooses as a starting point the traditional notion of the sequence of the Four Empires from the Book of Daniel. His opening argument is grounded on the assertion that while numerous interpreters have extensively addressed the identification of the Four Empires (chapters 2 and 7 of the Book of Daniel, Cantemir refers only to the latter

¹⁴ Lozovan 1981: edition of the Greek and Latin texts and a facsimile of the Greek ms; Cernovodeanu 2001: edition of the Greek, Latin and Russian texts. A collaboration of Serban's Greek teacher Anastasios Kontoeides in the formulation of the Greek text is presumed by Cernovodeanu. One could, though, imagine his involvement going further than that. The text was favorably commented upon in the *Acta Eruditorum* (XI, 1974, 536), see Cernovodeanu 1974. Ghost-writing of panegyric speeches was usual practice in Petrine Russia. E.g. on Peter's return from Western Europe in 1717 Feofan Prokopovich composed a greeting text centered around the notion of the "common good" in the name of the two-year old tsarevich Peter Petrovich: Hughes 2000, 400. On panegyric literature of the Petrine age see Grebeniuk 1979.

¹⁵ The admittedly peculiar labeling of the oration as a "panegyric holocaust" (*πανηγυρικό ολοκάτωμα / panegyricum holocaustum*) has been interpreted as an encrypted accusation of Cantemir against the tsar, who had violated the agreement of 1711 and "sacrificed" Moldavia for his own interests. (Lozovan 1975/76, 481-482; Lozovan 1981, 14-15; repeated by Cernovodeanu 2001, 111-2, 135). It seems, though, that the context of this interpretation (a Romanian émigré denouncing Soviet imperialism) was decisive. Besides, Cantemir may have borrowed the term from Jan Baptist van Helmont's *Ortus Medicinae* (Amsterdam 1648) or his *Opera omnia* (Frankfurt 1682), where a preface called "Holocaustum vernaculum" (addressed, to be sure, to God rather than a monarch) is placed before the actual preface by the author's son Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont. Cantemir had extensively excerpted van Helmont's *Opera Omnia* under the title *Ioannis Baptistae Van Helmont physices universalis doctrina et christianae fidei congrua et necessaria philosophia*.

¹⁶ Since the text refers to World Empires rather than Monarchies (unlike a political treatise on forms of government) and since "physica" carries Aristotelian and physiological-medical connotations, an accurate translation would possibly be "A Survey of Empires in the light of Natural Philosophy". For different options see Guboglu 1960, 133; Djuvara 1974, 70-71; Georgescu 1986, 578.

without quotes), they have not been able to identify the *Monarchia Aquilonica* or *Monarchia Borealis*, the Empire of the North, introduced in the 11th chapter of the Book of Daniel. They have only agreed on its mystical, spiritual and ultimately unintelligible quality. Its genuine incarnation in history is thus still open. On the other hand, there is an impressive coincidence with certain non-Christian traditions, since both Jewish and Arab wise men have predicted that the future mighty empire would come from the North.¹⁷ It is a sign that God may reveal the Truth and the mystical content of the Scripture through unconscious or ignorant mediators. This implies, however, that in order to avoid admitting that the Scripture contains empty names (if the succession of empires is already accomplished without the appearance of the Northern Empire) or to avoid adhering to the non-Christian prophecies simply out of superstition (*pro meris superstitionibus*), it is necessary to turn to an alternative approach, leaving aside biblical exegesis.

Cantemir's own approach is explicitly presented as drawn from Aristotelian physiology and cosmology (citing *De Caelo* and implicitly referring to *De Generatione et Corruptione*). He evokes on the one hand the notion of divine light (*at ipso in nobis latitante divino lumine, duce clarescit*) that is inherent to the human mind as reason and that enables the recognition of true principles and on the other hand the value of observation and experience. Both reason and experience (*ratio et experientia*) teach the following lesson: All natural, particular entities follow a permanent, immutable natural course that goes through the phases of birth, growth, transformation, decline and death. The degeneration of one entity signifies the generation of the next. This circular motion is the necessary natural order of things (*ordo naturalis necessarius et ininterruptus*), a natural law (*lex naturae, norma naturae*) and an infallible axiom (*infallibile axioma*). "God and nature do nothing in vain" (*Nihil enim Deus et natura novit, aut facit frustra, id est sine ordine*) in the famous definition of Aristotelian teleology.¹⁸ Empires are such natural entities, since they are particular (*particularia*). Only God and his

¹⁷ In the case of Islamic tradition, Cantemir specifies this by referring to the so-called "Beniasfar" (turk. Beniasfer, arab. Banu al-Aşfar) meaning the "Sons of the Yellow-one". This was a central motive of Islamic apocalypticism that formed the counterpart or rather the mirror image to the "Blond people" (ξανθά γένη, ξανθόν γένος) of Byzantine and post-Byzantine oracular tradition. In the Islamic versions this designation of an apocalyptic foe destined to attack and temporally (re)conquer Constantinople was assigned to the Byzantines and later to the Crusaders. In the Ottoman Empire from the early 17th century, it was increasingly applied to the Russians, coinciding with the Christian versions, albeit with opposite associations. Cantemir prefers, though, the inaccurate translation as "Sons of the Expeditions". He went on to explain this in his *System of the Mohammedan Religion*: the term refers to the Sons of the Yellow-one when taken as a singular form and to the Sons of the Expeditions when taken as a plural form; the Ottomans call them "Sikalab", which mean "Slavs": Căndea 1987, 112-129, 244; Căndea 1993; Bîrsan 2004, 65-70. From the extensive literature on the "Beniasfer" see: Goldziher 1960; Yerasimos 1990, 187-199; Fierro 1993, 175-176; Fleischer 2007, 56. For their association with the Russians: Lebedeva 1968, 104-105; Poumarède 2004, 135.

¹⁸ *De Caelo* 271a, 33.

reign are universal and eternal. Accordingly they follow a cyclical evolution (*motus circularis*) that unfolds on two levels: The first is the internal life span of empires and the second an external cyclical movement in geographical terms, as both natural philosophy and experience instruct. Instead of the traditional identification of the Four Empires as the Assyrian, the Median-Persian, the Greek (Alexander and his successors) and the Roman, Cantemir follows the “natural philosophers” (*philosophi physici*), opting for a sequence along the four cardinals: From the Orient (the origin of man and cosmic movement, according to both the Genesis and Aristotle)¹⁹ via the South and the West to the North. This primarily features, among other peoples, the Persians (for the *Monarchia Orientalia*), the Greeks (for the South, *Meridionalia*) and the Latins (for the *Occidentalia*). Since in the North (*Monarchia Aquilonica, Borealis*) neither the Scythians and Goths nor any other people in history were able to prevail over the whole region, it is evident that the Russians are the first to make a serious claim there. And since the Occidental Empire and its successor states are showing signs of senility, it is becoming obvious that it will soon be the turn of the North. In Cantemir’s Aristotelian language, the Ottoman Empire constitutes an abortive entity, a freak (*monstrum horrendum*), a deviation from the normal course, an abnormal creature whose existence is temporarily permitted by nature and whose sole function is to delay and hinder the rise of the natural and legitimate power of the North.²⁰ Its removal is a natural necessity and the precondition for the rise of Russia. For Cantemir this is a more reasonable and natural explanation of the course and succession of empires (*rationabiliter et physice declarata*), proved by the solid evidence of reason and experience. He insists that he confines himself to this positive evidence without speculating on future, uncertain things, since both the Scripture and Aristotle prohibit such speculation. But the fact that this natural explanation confirms the wording of the Scripture is a further proof of the Justice of God and the Prudence of Nature (*Justus Deus, prudens natura*).

The closing passages of the treatise are presented as conclusions drawn by still unnamed natural philosophers, clothed in an apocalyptically pregnant language: The time is at hand, motion is hastening to its end; it has been accelerated (*tempora in propinquis sunt*). The Northern Empire is promised to be the last stage of history, a millennial utopia of peace, justice and happiness until the end of days, when it will finally experience the advent of the Lord, as prophesied in Daniel’s final passages. The completion of the cycle towards the

¹⁹ Gen 1 and 2; De Caelo 285b, 16-19.

²⁰ “*Ita his persimillima considerari potest saeva Othomanorum Monarchia. Quae ut abortivus et exlex naturae foetus, Genuini, naturalis, et legitimi filii, atque succesoris, hoc est Borealis Monarchia, in Monarchatum, aliquantisper, retardavit progressum, et naturalem debitamque crescentiam.*”

millennial goal is indicated, however, by a progressive rather than a declining experience. It is accompanied by the increase of human knowledge, a sign attesting to the imminent millennium. The time is at hand when the deepest secrets of nature (*arcana naturae*) will be illuminated, the hidden truth at last revealed. The advent of Wisdom, the Mother of Sciences (*Mater Scientiarum*) will inaugurate a revelation in the literal sense of the word. In these terms the encomium of the ruler, the head of the Northern Empire, as comprising all kingly virtues is inscribed in the vision as yet another sign of the unfolding state of perfection. This vision is illustrated with the standard leitmotif of Christian eschatology and imperial ideology, the words of Jesus in the Gospel of John: there will be one fold and one shepherd (*erit unum ovile and unus pastor*, Jo 10, 16). Cantemir concludes the treatise after modestly having “admitted” not to be an expert in natural philosophy and thus simultaneously having slightly detached himself from those conclusions,²¹ by stating his own standpoint, quoting Gregor of Nazianz: “he be the best diviner who knows how to guess shrewdly”.²²

The first issue to be addressed is the use of Biblicism²³ in form of the Danielic scheme of the Four Empires in Cantemir’s argumentation. The intense exegetical debate among Lutheran, Calvinist and Catholic interpreters in the previous two centuries had revived the scheme, provided it with more sophisticated and historically sensitive interpretations, but also finally and inevitably shaken its credibility and its predominance as the ultimate framework of universal history.²⁴ However, if by 1714 it was no longer the standard, authoritative guide it used to be, it was still a common and respectable theory and it is introduced as such by Cantemir in the opening passage of his treatise. His own reading diverges, though, in more than one way from the interpretative consensus, starting with the positive interpretation of the *Monarchia Aquilonica*. In Cantemir’s time, one did not have to be deeply acquainted with biblical exegesis and its complex debates to be aware of the fact that the struggle between the Kings of the South and the North (Dan 11) stood for the wars between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Diadoch kingdoms and that the mighty King of the North, an evil figure in any case,

²¹ “*Nec enim sum tantae, in Naturali philosophia, foelicitatis, qui naturales necessitates, ut prodigia, et miracula, audacter praedicem sive venditare possim. Verum tamen, supra hoc examine, illi qui me, in hac professione innumeris parasangis superant, quid senserint, in propatulo exponere, nec taedebit, nec pudebit forte. Ex supra adlatis naturalibus praemissis, huiusce modi conclusionem, adulationis inscii proferunt. (...) Haec Physicae ascultatores, Expectatissime Monarcha ex physicis principiis praemittunt, et ex his praemissis talem dant conclusionem. Ego autem cum S. Theologo Gregorio stabo. Qui dicit, Bonum coniectorem, Bonum esse vatem.*”

²² From Gregor’s second invective against Emperor Julian (not indicated by Cantemir): *εἴπερ μάντις ἄριστος, ὅστις εἰκάζειν οἶδε καλῶς*: PG 35, 692; English translation by King 1888, 105.

²³ On Biblicism as a political language see Pečar and Trampedach 2007.

²⁴ Goetz 1958; Seifert 1990; Koch 1997; Bracht-du Toit 2007.

represented the worst persecutor of the Jews, the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The exegetical controversy since Late Antiquity actually concerned the question of whether this referred just to the historical Antiochus, to the future Antichrist himself, or to Antiochus as the forerunner or the figure (typos) of the Antichrist.²⁵ Indeed, in his footnotes Cantemir quotes rather selectively from the pertinent passages, in order to avoid inconvenient allusions. Nevertheless, this selective reading was facilitated by Cantemir's second divergent interpretation, the circular succession of the Four Empires. The notion of a geographical succession from East to West had been common since late antiquity. In the early modern imperial propaganda of Spain, Portugal, France and England, but also in later visions of American destiny,²⁶ it was repeatedly evoked and applied to different contexts. But a circular movement in space and time beginning in the East and concluding in the North also implied in the context of the Danielic prophecy an alternative identification to the usual Christian reading, one that deprived the Roman Empire and its heirs of their eschatological significance and function. Such an alternative enumeration had indeed been proposed and disseminated in Protestant Europe together with the favourable interpretation of the Danielic King of the North and his victories over the King of the South as foretelling the triumph of Reformation over Papacy. Particular popularity was achieved in the context of the Rosicrucian phenomenon by the pseudo-Paracelsian Protestant prophecy of the "Midnight Lion", which was associated during the Thirty Years' War with Frederick V Elector of the Palatinate, the unlucky "Winter King" of Bohemia, and especially with Gustav Adolf, King of Sweden, who both adopted the theme in their propaganda.²⁷ Cantemir could have borrowed the scheme that privileged the coming Northern Empire from the millenarian encyclopaedist Johann Heinrich Alsted's *Thesaurus Chronologiae* (1624), which contains an almost identical interpretation (but for the attribution of the Second, the Southern Empire to both Persians and Greeks and the link of the "Monarchia Borealis" to the "Midnight Lion").²⁸ It was, however, not Alsted, who inspired Cantemir, as will be outlined below.

The use of Aristotelian terms and concepts seems at the same time both simpler and more complicated. Students of Cantemir do not ascribe to him a particular Aristotelian expertise.²⁹

²⁵ Collins 1993, 117-121, 376-394; Kratz 2001.

²⁶ Delgado 2003; Koch 2003.

²⁷ Akermann 1998, 125-172; Gilly 2002b. On the wider context see Trevor-Ropper 1998. The association of Midnight with the North (Septentrio) followed the scheme that associated Oriens to East and morning, Meridies to South and midday and Occidens to West and evening.

²⁸ See Hotson 2000b, 57-60. Alsted himself had promoted the positive reinterpretation of the King of the North taken from Conrad Graser and his *Historia Antichristi* (Leiden 1608). On Alsted see Hotson 2000a, Schmidt-Biggemann 2007, 141-165; Groh 2010, 491-509.

²⁹ Bădărău 1964, 394-410 (French summary); Lemny 2009, 77-81.

He is said to have retained since his training in Istanbul an ambivalent attitude towards the *Princeps Philosophorum*, an ambivalence that was probably determined by his admiration for Jan Baptist van Helmont (1579-1644) and his polemically anti-Aristotelian version of natural philosophy in the wake of the Paracelsian tradition.³⁰ Experience and experiment, the terms repeatedly evoked by Cantemir in this context, were key concepts for the Paracelsians and especially for van Helmont's "chemical philosophy". They were embedded in a vision of mystical and experimental pursuit of knowledge with the aim of revealing the divine order of nature and re-establishing natural philosophy and medicine on a Christian foundation, "reading the Bible as a work of natural science"³¹, in a similar way to Cantemir's exposition. At the same time, invocations of experience and experiment were, characteristically enough, common to both scholars classified as Aristotelian and anti-Aristotelian.³² Given that Cantemir's organicist argument is confined to stereotypes of Aristotelian teleology³³ (he apparently cites a paraphrase from a commentary instead of the original Aristotelian text),³⁴ and that his expressed goal was to show the Biblical truth confirmed in the light of both Reason and Experience, it is fair to assume that we are dealing with a typical use of early modern "eclectic Aristotelianism"³⁵, a configuration of knowledge able to embrace in a wider synthesis not only Christian belief, but also elements of Neo-Platonism and Hermeticism.

If the circular course of universal history was hardly an original notion, the organicist analogy between states and living entities destined to experience growth and decay was fairly conventional. The decline topos - "monarchies are mortal like men"³⁶ - runs through the mass of historical and political writing since Roman antiquity and certainly did not cease to be

³⁰ On van Helmont see, Debus 1977, II 295-379; Browne 1979; Pagel 1982; Heinecke 1995; Schütt 2000, 468-479. Cantemir acknowledged in his *History of the Ottoman Empire* that Meletios Mitrou had introduced him to van Helmont's thought: "Besides these, there flourished at Constantinople Meletius Archbishop first of Arta, and afterwards of Athens, a Man skilled in all Parts of Learning, but chiefly studious of the Helmontian Principles (or rather those of Thales) which he also explain'd to me for the space of eight Months": *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire (...)* written originally in Latin by Demetrius Cantemir, late Prince of Moldavia. Translated into English from the Author's Manuscript by N. Tindal..., London 1734, p.99. On van Helmont's influence on Cantemir see: Gramma and Ifimovic 1998; Afloroaei 2011.

³¹ Heinecke 1995, 72; cf. Newman and Principe 2002, 56-91.

³² On the meanings of experience in this context see Schütt 2000, 473-478 and more generally Dear 2006. Cf. the comment of Leinkauf 2009, 272 n. 345: „Die Berufung auf experimentelle Erfahrung war ein Topos der frühneuzeitlichen Schulphilosophie, die damit die Gültigkeit der aristotelischen Theorie in ihren Kommentaren zur Physik oder der *parva naturalia* durch Faktenbezug herausstreichen wollte (...) ebenso aber auch der kritischen, gegen Aristoteles oder gegen die medizinischen Schulen des Hippokrates gerichteten paracelsischen Naturphilosophie“. For Alsted's use of Aristotelian terms see Hotson 2000a, 73-82.

³³ Johnson 2006.

³⁴ Lozovan 1983, 5-6 identified the citation from *De Caelo* as derived from the Latin translation of Averroes and proposed that Cantemir used the Venetian edition of 1572, vol. V containing *De Caelo* and *De Generatione et Corruptione* alongside Averroes' Commentaries.

³⁵ Schmitt 1983; 89-109.

³⁶ Sanchez de Moncada (1619) as cited by Burke 1976, 144.

evoked, even as a metaphor, in the 18th century.³⁷ It would probably be a mistake, however, to judge Cantemir's essay in terms of innovation and originality. His creativity lies rather in the selection and rearrangement of seemingly disparate elements and their moulding into a new configuration suitable to his argumentative purpose. Transfers of epistemic notions from the field of physiology to that of political history belonged to the inventory of models available. Whether Cantemir was aware, as he probably was, of the Ottoman discourse on imperial decline that linked medical concepts to the state of the Empire and whether traces of this are discernible in his essay, is hard to answer.³⁸ In any case, his argument comfortably suited the intellectual climate of Petrine Russia, if one considers that about the same time (May 1714) the tsar is reported to have compared, in an often-cited variation on the *Translatio studii*-theme, the expected arrival of the sciences in Russia with the circulation of blood in the human body.³⁹

Be that as it may, the argumentative shift from political theology to political physiology had quite a number of implications compared to previous references to the Danielic scheme in the representation of Russia's historical mission. Firstly, there is an explicit negation of the notion of a truly universal world monarchy as the earthly equivalent of God's reign, as had been constantly proclaimed in imperial propaganda since Charles V, and as was rhetorically recalled, time and again, by the panegyrists of Aleksei and Peter. Cantemir knows only partial, geographically-confined empires. In fact, nature prevented the formation of such a universal, world-embracing power more than once by giving rise to opponents such as the Parthians in the case of the Roman Empire, opponents that marked the natural limits of each empire. Secondly and more strikingly, there is no proper place for Byzantium, the Eastern Roman Empire or for any notion of Russia as its successor, since the Third Empire is confined to the Occident.⁴⁰ Nor are there any evocations of Roman grandeur as in the triumphal

³⁷ For the intriguing question of to what extent metaphors were taken as correspondences or whether the correspondences should be ultimately understood as a rationalization of the human need for metaphors and analogies, see Burke 1976, 144. In Cantemir's case, the analogy has in any case an explanatory value.

³⁸ Fleischer 1983; Hagen-Menchinger 2014. Harun Küçük presented this subject in the aforementioned workshop (see note 1) with a paper entitled: "*I told you I was sick: Political Physiology and Ottoman Political Thought, 1650-1732*".

³⁹ Wittram 1964, II 217-218. Wittram associated the use of the metaphor (to the extent, that it can be really attributed to Peter) to the influence of a letter of Leibnitz from 16. January 1712 and to the knowledge on blood circulation, Peter had acquired in Holland.

⁴⁰ Pippidi 2013, 119. In this stance towards Byzantium Cantemir is comparable to his rival, Nikolaos Mavrokordatos, *ibidem*, 126-127. An affinity between the Northern and the Southern Empire is attested, since both are situated in a central position and endowed with a destiny to expand in both eastern and western directions. But no sense of heritage whatsoever is derived from this: "*ad instar Centralis illius Graecae Monarchiae (quia Borealis quoque pars respectu Orientis et Occidentis, Centralis et media est) se se extendere atque porrigere necesse erat*". The absence of any allusion to "Third Rome" is not really surprising. In fact, the

processions that celebrated Peter's victories.⁴¹ There is no notion of an imperial renovation and restoration. Accordingly, there is no place for Orthodoxy as a legitimizing value, no place for God's chosen people, whether this be Israel or the Christian New Israel; and there is no salvation narrative of sin, punishment and redemption. Nor is there a place for the Antichrist, the Little Horn of the Danielic prophecy, the role attributed as a rule, for instance also by Ligaridis and Spathar, to the Ottomans. The description of the Ottoman Empire as a freak in terms of Aristotelian teleology⁴² is reminiscent of monster imagery, e.g. in confessional propaganda,⁴³ but it is simultaneously tailored to the taste of the addressee, who displayed a personal fascination for monster births and "freaks of nature".⁴⁴ Cantemir thus preferred not to reproduce the dreadful devilish image of the Ottoman Empire as he had done in the *Panegyricum*, and presented its decay not as a pious expectation, but as a natural necessity. In other words, the images and symbols are naturalized and the logic of the course of history internalized and reformulated as a philosophy of history that has been seen as providing the missing theoretical underpinning to Cantemir's *Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire* or in his original Latin title *Incrementorum et Decrementorum Aulae Othomanicae...libri tres*.⁴⁵

It does not, then, come as a surprise, that Cantemir's argumentation has been read as a theoretically-informed rejection of the traditional, metaphysical framework in favour of a modern, secular one, defined by natural law and natural science and akin to the philosophy of history of the so-called Early Enlightenment.⁴⁶ The invocation of "experience" has been particularly misleading in this context. As a corrective to this view, it is useful to note the

surprise of Georgescu 1986, 576 and 587, is telling for the long-lasting predominance of this historiographical cliché.

⁴¹ Wortman 1995, 42-78; cf. the critical comments of Bushkovitch 2008.

⁴² Johnson 2006, 198-199.

⁴³ Daston and Park 1998, 173-253.

⁴⁴ Hughes 2000, 257-260, 316, 368-369: "To the educated modern taste one of Peter's most unattractive traits was his unflinching fascination with freaks". Collis 2012a, 448 calls it "intense, and some would say morbid, curiosity in monstrous deformities and hybrid births". The tsar's interest was connected to the development of his cabinet of curiosities. As early as 1704 he issued orders that all "infants born as monsters" should be reported to the authorities. A part of them was included after a chemical preparation in his *Kunstkammer*. It was 1714 that the collection was moved from Mosow to St. Petersburg and henceforth actively enriched and expanded. In a later order of 1718 Peter explained that such monsters are not born from the action of devil, since there is only one Creator, but are instead the results of natural causes, e.g. fear experienced by the mother during her pregnancy. See Lewitter 1988, 66; Collis 2012a, 453 and Anemone 2000, 592 who notices a "paradoxical and eclectic mixture of modern (scientific) and traditional (religious) reasoning that is characteristic of the Baroque culture of Petrine Russia". The tsar's interest was shared by his chief ideologist, Feofan Prokopovich, who argued in his *Natural Philosophy* (1708) in similar terms to Cantemir, that God permitted such births in order not to distort nature. Collis 2012a, 322-325.

⁴⁵ Guboglu 1960, 133; Djuvara 1974, 81; Pippidi 1997, 16; Petrovsky 2014, 64-166. As Andrei Pippidi (1997, 11-12) has shown, the application of the scheme to the Ottoman Empire (*De augmento, progressu et decrementu Imperii Turcarum*) goes back to the late 16th century and René de Lusinge. As in Cantemir's case the invocation of such an immutable historical law was not without wishful thinking.

⁴⁶ Zub 1980; Georgescu 1986, 575.

objections of Neagu Djuvara in the most insightful close reading of the treatise available. In his approach, there are no grounds for presenting Cantemir as an enlightened sceptic or a secular thinker leaving “mentalité théologique” behind him, even less as a “génie universelle”. However, his portrayal of Cantemir as being firmly adherent to Byzantine orthodoxy, only superficially touched by western thought, less westernized than the scholars of the previous generation, like Constantin Cantacuzino, Alexandros Mavrokordatos or Nicolae Spathar, and at best a belated humanist of the sort of the late Byzantine scholars of the 15th century, may be an equally distorting viewpoint.⁴⁷

Before turning to the final section of *Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio* and its source, it would be useful to attempt to ascertain Cantemir's possible intentions in composing it. This work was handed to the tsar, in all probability together with the *Panegyricum* (both written in Cantemir's hand), in March 1714, during what was the first public appearance of the Moldavian ex-prince in St. Petersburg, as a kind of a *carte de visite* for the monarch. The fact that the *Panegyricum* was picked for immediate publication does not necessarily entail that Peter must have disliked the *Examinatio*. In fact, one can imagine that it better matched his personal taste. As early as 1697, the practically minded tsar had urged his officials “not to write theology”⁴⁸ as he put it, when referring to his titles in state documents. Likewise, Peter felt uncomfortable, to say the least, with a discourse that associated his Russia with the Byzantine Empire and its political legacy.⁴⁹ When Baron Petr Shafirov, his counsellor, assured the anxious Habsburg diplomats during negotiations in 1711 that the Tsar had no intention to acquire the Oriental Empire, stating that Peter would actually prefer to become an admiral of one of the European powers, rather than to rule in Asiatic lands, this was not necessarily eyewash.⁵⁰ With this in mind, Cantemir skilfully managed on the one hand to prove his quality as a competent and capable ideologist of Russian imperial power and on the other hand to promote his own agenda, the dream of a revenge and the return to the Moldavian throne for him and his dynasty, by reminding the Tsar of the Ottoman front and reformulating the anti-Ottoman program in different terms than the usual ones, as an objective, natural necessity and precondition for Russia's rise. At the same time, he was justifying his own choice of 1711 to exit Ottoman order. Even if one assumes the rather weak possibility that the text was designed to be printed and published, it would appear to be a clever justification of Russia's ambitions in a language understood by European audiences,

⁴⁷ Djuvara 1974, esp. 82-84.

⁴⁸ Whittaker 1992, 83.

⁴⁹ Hughes 2000, 334.

⁵⁰ Wittram 1964, II 252.

one of the most urgent needs of Petrine propaganda being to enhance the image and raise the prestige of Russia abroad.⁵¹

At this point, it is time to consider the closing passages and the fervently articulated expectation of an imminent illumination and revelation of hidden knowledge to be experienced in the days of the Northern Empire. This is language and imagery that recalls the so-called “progressive millenarianism” of the 17th century.⁵² The experienced increase of human knowledge understood in terms of an apocalyptic promise to grasp the universal laws of both history and nature, to finally gain insight into the ultimate plan of the universe and the mysteries of God’s creation according to the Danielic prophecy (Dan 12:4), is a vision commonly associated with Francis Bacon’s “Great Instauration”, the “Rosicrucian Manifestos” and later variants of “Universal Reform” from Alsted and Comenius to radical Pietism.⁵³ The imagery employed points especially to the Rosicrucian environment⁵⁴ and it is in this current of thought that we can expect to find Cantemir's sources. Indeed, both the visionary passage and the reinterpretation of Daniel’s scheme of the Four Empires prove to be an almost verbatim reproduction (Cantemir places his own comments in brackets; see Appendix) of an influential prophecy written and published roughly a century earlier by the Polish alchemist Michael Sendivogius (Michał Sędziwój, 1566-1636).⁵⁵ Sendivogius, a key figure of the wider Rosicrucian movement who had gained a legendary reputation as one of the most distinguished alchemists of his time, had been active at the courts of Emperor Rudolf II (r. 1576-1612) and the Polish king Sigismund III (r. 1587-1632). In addition, he seems to have acted as a double diplomatic agent for both monarchs. Sendivogius’ reinterpretation of the Danielic prophecy and his expectation of the imminent coming of the *Monarchia Borealis*, which had brought him the nickname “Heliocantharus Borealis”, were first published in the preface to his *Tractatus de sulphure* in 1616,⁵⁶ where he promised to expand on the theme in an upcoming book on *Harmony*, a promise never realised. However, the text was widely disseminated, quoted and reprinted in the course of the 17th and the 18th centuries either in alchemical collections containing the whole treatise like the *Musaeum Hermeticum* (1677) or the *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa* (1702), or more often outside its alchemical context.

⁵¹ Pirimäe 2007.

⁵² Poppkin 1995.

⁵³ Webster 2002; Schmidt-Biggemann 2007; Gilly 2002a; Groh 2010; Tilton 2015.

⁵⁴ Apart from the general spirit, certain notions evoked by Cantemir such as the infallible axioms of natural philosophy or their accord with the Scripture, also the concept of the *Quarta Monarchia*, appear in the Rosicrucian *Fama Fraternitatis* from 1614. See van der Koj 1998, 78, 96, 98. Cf. Edighoffer 2002.

⁵⁵ Evans 1977, 211-212; Prinke 1990; 1999; 2010; Figala 1998.

⁵⁶ *Tractatus de Sulphure, Altero Naturae Principio, ab authore eo, qui et primum conscripsit principium*, Cologne 1616 (preface) A4^f-A4^v (see Appendix); English translation of the passage in Prinke 1999, 183-184. On the treatise see Kahn 2006.

Whether Alsted, who was apparently in contact with Sendivogius – in 1611 he had written a Latin epigram for the reediting of the latter’s *De lapide Philosophorum* – had first inspired Sendivogius to this scheme is uncertain.⁵⁷ But his aforementioned quotation of the passage concerning the Danielic Succession in his *Thesaurus Chronologiae* (1624) was picked up in his even more influential *Diatribes de milles annis apocalypticis* (1627), where he acknowledged his source, placing Sendivogius next to Paracelsus and the “Midnight Lion” prophecy. In any case, it was due to the mediation of Alsted that the concept of the *Monarchia Borealis* was spread effectively in much of Protestant Europe; its mobility, however, transcended confessional boundaries.⁵⁸ Sendivogius himself, who is linked with the early modern Polish “Sarmatian ideology” must have coined the prophecy of the *Monarchia Borealis* and its messianic head as pointing to Sigismund III or his heir, prince Władysław IV (r. 1632-1648). In the context of the Polish Vasa branch aspirations to the Swedish throne and the Muscovite “Time of Troubles”, it was envisioned that Władysław would rule over an unforeseen Northern Empire including Poland-Lithuania, Sweden and Muscovy. It is not impossible, though, that Sendivogius had been initiated in the Rosicrucian fervour during his stay in Marburg and Heidelberg in 1615-1616 and shared the expectations related to Frederick V of the Palatinate.⁵⁹ Given that Sendivogius’ alchemical speculation is closely related to van Helmont’s⁶⁰ and since Cantemir quotes extensively and carefully, it would make sense if Cantemir possessed a work containing Sendivogius’ tractate.⁶¹ If he had studied more than the preface this would also explain the enigmatic figure contained in the *Panegyricum* regarding the general flow from Arctic to Antarctic. The principle of a *vis magnetica* that causes the

⁵⁷ See Kahn 2006, 201-202 for the argument in favor of such an interpretation as critically opposed to Hotson 2000b, 55-66. On the other hand, Sendivogius was already called “Heliocantharus Borealis” in 1609 by Oswald Croll, if this was indeed an allusion to the *Monarchia Borealis*-theory, as Prinke 1999, 184 explains it.

⁵⁸ “In placing Sendivogius’ conception of the fourth, northern monarchy on his ‘Speculum mundi’, Alsted helped to reformulate an idea circulating amongst Paracelsians, Rosicrucians, alchemists, and astrologers, to broadcast it to all corners of Europe and in doing so to help transform it from a marginal occult tradition into the most celebrated and respectable piece of international Protestant propaganda produced in the seventeenth century”, Hotson 2000b, 61. The alchemist Johann Franck, professor of pharmacology at the University of Uppsala propagated Sendivogius’ prophecy in 1645 applying it to Sweden: Akerman 2014. John Fletcher, the translator of Sendivogius in English (*A new light on alchymie*, London 1650) quoted his prophecy in his own *Art of distillation* (London 1651): „I am of the same mind with Sendivogius that the fourth monarchy which is northern is dawning, in which (as the ancient philosophers did divine) all arts and sciences shall flourish, and greater and more things shall be discovered than in the three former. These monarchies the philosophers reckon not according to the more potent, but according to the corners of the world. Whereof the northern is the last and, indeed, is no other than the Golden Age in which all tyranny, oppression, envy and covetousness shall cease, when there shall be one prince and one people abounding with love and mercy, and flourishing in peace, which day i earnestly expect.” cited after Prinke 1999, 153.

⁵⁹ Rafał Prinke has suggested the possibility that Sendivogius functioned as a model for the fictive figure of Christian Rosenkreutz. Prinke 1990.

⁶⁰ On Sendivogius’ theories see Szydło 1993 and 1996; Porto 2001; Kahn 2006. On the affinity to van Helmont see Debus 1964 and esp. Oldroyd 1974.

⁶¹ Unfortunately no catalogue of Cantemir’s successively dispersed libraries exists: Lemny 2012.

perpetual circular flow of water from one pole to the other is found in *Tractatus de Sulphure*.⁶² The question of the source of inspiration for the *Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio* would then be almost settled. A different question would be what purpose it was intended to fulfil in a treatise addressed to the Russian tsar and why Cantemir neither openly espouses its views, nor identifies these “philosophi physici”.⁶³

It is a well-attested position that Peter the Great’s ambitious reform project and the imperial ideology employed for its legitimization are not adequately described as mere expressions of enlightened secularism and rationalism.⁶⁴ Only recently, though, have scholars demonstrated the degree to which – next to Biblicism as a flexible political language – facets of hermetic natural philosophy, especially alchemical knowledge and imagery, helped symbolically shape the vision of conceptualized and implemented reform.⁶⁵ In particular, the notion of an instauration of knowledge in Russia was supported and reinforced by European partners and advisors of Peter’s reformist project, during and after Peter’s Grand Embassy (1697-1698), including Scottish Jacobites, English millenarians and German Pietists.⁶⁶ Some of the closest foreign servitors and favourites of the tsar placed in pivotal positions for his reformist project were deeply engaged in various forms of hermetic pursuits enjoying the tsar’s full support.⁶⁷ Moreover, Peter himself displayed a fervent curiosity for alchemical experimentation, astrological prognostication and such “eccentric” preoccupations as the “freaks of nature” of his *Kunstkammer* or the pursuit of infinite motion, the *perpetuum mobile*, a curiosity that should not be seen as contradictory to either his pragmatism or his moralism.⁶⁸ It seems, too, that in his public representation Peter consciously promoted the image of a divinely ordained, messianic ruler, destined to rule over a transformation of providential significance. All this

⁶² *Tractatus de Sulphure*, 12-13; see Kahn 2006, 206-7. The movement is actually described as a flow from Antarctic to Arctic rather than the other way around. But Cantemir apparently understood the Antarctic as representing the North: e.g. “*His tandem Aquilonicam monarchiam, eamque universe Antartico Orbi praevalituram passim praedicat (...) hanc Borealem in ultimo circuli puncto et septemtrionali vertice esse affirmant. Quam peculiari quassi nomine Polarem et Antarticam Monarchiam nuncupant*”. The allusion to Aristotle’s rejection of this Pythagorean principle refers again to *De Caelo*, II,2. See Lang 2007, 186-187.

⁶³ In both Sendivogius’ own *Tractatus* as in later quotations the idea of a circular course of the World Empires is ascribed to “philosophi”. It is apparently Cantemir who adds the attribute “physici”; see Appendix.

⁶⁴ Dixon 1999, 180, 193-4; Hughes 2000, 292-3.

⁶⁵ Collis 2011; 2012a; 2012b and 2014; Zitser 2004. For different approaches to the place of hermetic and alchemical knowledge in Early Modern Europe see Trepp 2001; Alt and Wels 2010; Ebeling 2015.

⁶⁶ Leibnitz shared the providential projections to Peter’s reforms. In 1697 he had proposed that the alchemist and cabbalist Fransiscus Mercurius van Helmont (Jan Baptist’s son) would be an ideal mentor for Peter, but for his old age. Collis 2012a, 409-417. On F. M. van Helmont see Schmidt-Biggemann 2013, 1-51.

⁶⁷ Collis focuses on four such figures, the Scottish Jacobites James Bruce and Robert Erskine and the Ukrainian prelates Stefan Iavorskii and Feofan Prokopovich, based on the testimony of their activity, their writings and their libraries, but emphasizes that they are perceived as “illustrative examples of a wider phenomenon and not merely as the sole purveyors of a limited trend at the Petrine court”. Collis 2012a, 33.

⁶⁸ Collis 2012a, chapters 5 and 6. Cf. Cracraft 2003, 25-26; Wittram 1952; Lewitter 1988; Hughes 2000, 357-389.

formed part of the wider Petrine transfer project looking west, but demonstrates the ambivalence of this process in contrast to a plain understanding of westernization as equal to modernization, secularization and rationalization.

Cantemir's own mindset and intellectual background provided several links to this cultural climate, from his Helmontian training and the links to Halle Pietists, his own projects in search of the *perpetuum mobile* (an *arcanum naturae* par excellence), or even a speculative attachment to Masonic circles already back in Istanbul.⁶⁹ The contemporary work of such central figures of Petrine Russia as Feofan Prokopovich or Stefan Iavorskii displays close parallels to Cantemir's mode of argumentation.⁷⁰ He thus possibly sought to recommend himself as equally informed and competent, an advisor capable of accommodating a wide range of ideological needs across the whole discursive spectrum. He relegated the more conventional praise of the *Panegyricum* to the public oration of his son, reserving the elaborate argumentation of *Examinatio* for the private memorandum to Peter. The fact that he did not name Sendivogius as the "philosophus physicus" referred to, may simply be explained by the anonymous publication of the latter's work.⁷¹ However, irrespective of trends and predilections at the Petrine court, such an alchemical source did not cease to be a risky affair, especially for a foreigner in search of a secure and influential position. Cantemir handled the hazardous knowledge with care, embedding it into a complex setting of arguments, disguising its provenance and detaching himself from ultimate responsibility for it, an approach reminiscent of contemporary uses of what Martin Mulsow called "precarious knowledge".⁷² In this view, if the reference to the Book of Daniel seems to involve a "caution sacrée",⁷³ the appeal to Aristotelian authority served as a guarantee or even as a pretension of stability with the purpose of facilitating and legitimizing his argument. Alongside Gregorius of Nazianz, these are the only sources quoted or explicitly named and referred to. Cantemir accomplished his task in transferring and rearranging distinct elements into a synthesis that enabled diverse readings and fitted the experience of a new personal and historical situation. He paid tribute to

⁶⁹ Lozovan 1975, 80; Lozovan 1980, 8. See also Herzog 2010, 302-303 on Masonic activity in Istanbul as early as 1702. For the masonic influence at the Petrine court, at least in terms of heraldic symbolism with obvious Masonic overtones, see Collis 2009; Zitser 2009. For later developments in Russia see Faggionato 2005.

⁷⁰ For instance in Prokopovich's Natural Philosophy (1709) or the apocalyptically charged sermons of Stefan Iavorskii, who compared Peter to the stone (gr. *petra*) of the Danielic Prophecy (Dan 2: 34) that crushed the Swedish Colossus at the Battle of Poltava (1709): Collis 2012a, 219-270, 296-338; Collis 2014.

⁷¹ Sendivogius published all his works anonymously using anagrams of his name or the pseudonym Cosmopolita.

⁷² Mulsow 2012, 16-17.

⁷³ Djuvara 1974, 77.

the “conformisme de courtisan”⁷⁴, but combined this with a suggestive wink to the perceptive tsar.

⁷⁴ Pippidi 1980, 213.

Appendix

<p>Dimitrie Cantemir, <i>Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio</i></p> <p>...Iam etiam illa tempora adveniunt (progrediente nempe continuo naturalis actionis cursu) in quibus multa naturæ arcana (hoc est contingentia antequam fierent, mortalibus minime præcognita) revelabuntur: Iam illa quarta Monarchia Borealis incipere (hoc est acrescere) debet: Iam tempora in propinquis sunt (observata nempe naturæ circulari motu, et mutationis modo). Mater scientiarum veniet et maiora elucidabuntur quam in his tribus præteritis Monarchiis facta. (Quia ni fallor naturalis motus ad perfectionem circuli properat). Quoniam hanc Monarchiam (ut veteres divinarunt) plantavit Deus per unum ex Principibus omnibus virtutibus ditatum. Quem fortasse nobis iam tempora produxerunt. (Presso videlicet sub profundo silentio proprio nomine, nomina enim non essentialia sed accidentalia sunt). Habemus inquit in hac Boreali parte boreali Principem Sapientissimum ac bellicosissimum (o divina pronia quis tandem sit ille). Quem nullus Monarcharum humanitate et pietate excellit. (Utrum sit, de quo nos speramus!) In hac Boreali Monarchia, Deus omnium rerum conditor maiora arcana sine dubio in rerum natura elucidabit, quam illis temporibus ubi aut Paganorum, aut Tyrannorum sedes fuit. Verum tamen has Monarchias Philosophi, cum secundum mundi cardines constituent, hanc Borealem, in ultimo circuli puncto et septentrionali vertice esse affirmant. Quam peculiari quassi nomine, Polarem et Antarcticam Monarchiam, nuncupant: in cuius felici Dominio, bona ante multa sæcula a divino Psalmista præcatanta, corrispondere, augurantur. Misericordia et pax obviabunt ibi, Pax et Justitia osculabuntur, Veritas de Terra orietur, et justitia de Coelo propisciet et erim unum ovile et unus pastor. Johan. C. 10, v. 16.</p>	<p>[Michael Sendivogius] <i>Tractatus de sulphure</i></p> <p>...Iam etiam illa tempora adveniunt in quibus arcana multa naturæ revelabuntur: Iam illa Monarchia quarta Borealis incipere habet: Iam tempora appropinquant; mater scientiarum veniet; maiora elucidabuntur quam in his tribus præteritis Monarchiis factum est. Quoniam hanc Monarchiam (ut veteres divinarunt) plantabit Deus per unum ex Principibus omnibus virtutibus ditatum, quem fortasse nobis iam tempora produxerunt. Habemus enim in hac parte boreali Principem Sapientissimum ac bellicosissimum, quem nullus Monarcharum victoriis superat, humanitate ac pietate nullus excellit. In hac Monarchia Boreali Deus omnium conditor rerum maiora arcana sine dubio in natura elucidabit quam illis temporibus ubi aut Paganorum aut Tyrannorum Principum sedes fuit. Sed has Monarchias Philosophi non secundum potentiores, sed secundum Cardines mundi numerant: Inprimis Orientalem; postea Meridionalem; jam vero Occidentalem habent; & ultimam Septentrionalem in hac parte Boreali expectant: de quibus in Harmonia dabitur. In hac Septentrionali attractiva polari Monarchia, ut Psalmista ait: Misericordia & veritas obviabunt sibi; pax & justitia osculabuntur; Veritas de terra orietur, & Iustitia de coelo prospiciet. Unum ovile, & unus pastor. Scientiæ multæ sine invidia, quod & ego cum desiderio expecto</p>
--	---

Cantemir's first mention of the Danielic scheme above reads as follows:

Quam ob rem, Physici philosophi, hasce totius Orbis Monarchias, non secundum numerum, αὐτοκρατορικῶς dominantium: sed secundum quatuor mundi cardines, omnes omnium monarchiarum gentes ambientes, numerant. Orientalem nempe, Meridionalem, Occidentalem et Borealem.

Cantemir's additions (placed mostly in brackets) apparently aim to stress the link of the apocalyptic expectation to the cyclical natural course described above. In his adaptation, he leaves no doubt that the *Monarchia Boralis* has already arisen and that it will soon grow. Its messianic ruler is not expected in the future; he is already reigning (*plantabit* is modified into *plantavit*). Cantemir further omits the ruler's numerous victories (*quem nullus Monarcarum victoriis superat*), which possibly represents a tactful choice, with the recent unsuccessful Pruth campaign (1711) in mind. Finally, Cantemir indicates the evangelical verse (Jo. 10:16) as an exception in the main text rather than in a footnote. This may be an internal indication that he copied Sendivogius' text from a later collection and not from the original *Tractatus*. It is printed in this form, e.g. in Nathan Aubigne de la Fosse, *Bibliotheca chemica contracta*, Geneva 1673, p. 96; *Musaeum hermeticum reformatum et amplificatum*, Frankfurt 1677, p. 604; Jean Jacques Manget, *Bibliotheca chemica curiosa*, Geneva 1702, vol. II, p. 480.

Bibliography

- Afloroaei, Ștefan (2011): Cantemir et le scenario moderne de la métaphysique, in: *Travaux de Symposium International : Le Livre. La Roumanie. L'Europe, Troisième édition, 20 à 24 Septembre 2010*, vol. IV: *Latinité orientale*, Bucharest, pp. 18-41.
- Åkerman, Susanna (1998): *Rose Cross over the Baltic: The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe*, Leiden.
- Åkerman, Susanna (2014): Sendivogius in Sweden: Elias Artista and the *Fratres roris costi*, in: *Aries* 14, pp. 62-72.
- Alt, Peter-André and Wels, Volkhard (2010): Einleitung, in: Idem (eds.) *Konzepte des Hermetismus in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Göttingen, pp. 7-22.
- Anemone, Anthony (2000): The Monsters of Peter the Great: The Culture of the St. Petersburg Kunstkamera in the Eighteenth Century, in: *The Slavic and East European Journal* 44, pp. 583-602.
- Bădărău, Dan (1964): *Filozofia lui Dimitrie Cantemir*, Bucharest.
- Bîrsan, Cristina (2004): *Dimitrie Cantemir and the Islamic World*, Istanbul.
- Bosbach, Franz (1986): *Monarchia Universalis. Ein politischer Leitbegriff der frühen Neuzeit*, Göttingen 1986.
- Bracht, Katharina and du Toit, David S., (eds.) (2007): *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam. Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*, Berlin-New York.
- Browne, Alice (1979): J. B. van Helmont's Attack on Aristotle, in: *Annals of Science* 36 (1979), pp. 575-591.
- Burke, Peter (1976): Tradition and Experience: The Idea of Decline from Bruni to Gibbon, in: *Daedalus*, 105, pp. 137-152.
- Bushkovitch, Pau (2008): The Roman Empire in the Era of Peter the Great, in: Ch. S. Dunning e.a. (eds.), *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom Revisited: Essays in Russian History and Culture in Honor of Robert O. Crummey*, Bloomington, pp. 155-172.
- Cândeia, Virgil (1993): Présage et Eschatologie dans l'oeuvre de Démètre Cantémir, in: *Bulletin de l'Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-est Européen* 19-23, pp. 73-78.
- Cândeia, Virgil, (ed.) (1987): *Dimitrie Cantemir, Sistemul sau Întocmirea Religiei Muhammedane*, [Opere complete VIII, vol. 2], Bucharest.
- Cernovodeanu, Paul (1974): Les Oeuvres de Démètre Cantemir présentées par „Acta Eruditorum“ de Leipzig (1714-1738), in: *Revue des Etudes Sud-est Européennes* 12 pp. 537-550.
- Cernovodeanu, Paul (2001): Dimitrie Cantemir: Panegiricul lui Petri cel Mare (1714), in: *Archaeus* 5, pp. 105-137.
- Chentsova, Vera G. (2010): *Ikona Iverskoi Bogomateri. (Ocherki istorii otnoshenii Grecheskoi Tserkvi s Rossiei v seredine XVII v. po dokumentam RGADA)*, Moscow.
- Chesnokova, Nadezhda P. (2011): *Khristianskii Vostok i Rossiia. Politicheskoe i kul'turnoe vzaimodeistvie v seredine XVII veka*, Moscow.
- Collins, John Joseph (1993): *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Minneapolis.
- Collis, Robert (2009): Hewing the Rough Stone: Masonic Influence in Peter the Great's Russia, 1689-1725, in: A. Önnerfors, R. Collis (eds.), *Freemasonry and Fraternalism in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, Sheffield, pp. 33-61.
- Collis, Rober (2011): Using the Stars: Astrology at the Court of Peter the Great, in: N. Champion (ed.), *Astrologies. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Sophia Centre Conference*, Bristol, pp. 125-150.
- Collis, Robert (2012a): *The Petrine Instauration. Religion, Esotericism and Science at the Court of Peter the Great, 1689-1725*, Leiden-Boston.
- Collis, Robert (2012b): Andrei Vinius (1641-1716) and Interest in Western Esotericism in Early Modern Russia, in: *Aries* 12, pp. 191-220.
- Collis, Robert (2014): Merkavah Mysticism and Visions of Power in Early Eighteenth-Century Russia: The New Year Panegyrics of Stefan Javorskij, 1703-1706, in: *Russian Literature* 55, 74-109.
- Cracraft, James (1988): *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture*, Chicago-London.
- Cracraft, James (1997): *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery*, Chicago-London.

- Cracraft, James (2003): *The Revolution of Peter the Great*, Cambridge Mass.-London.
- Cracraft, James (2004): *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*, Cambridge Mass.-London.
- Dandele, Thomas James (2014): *The Renaissance of Empire in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge.
- Daston, Lorraine and Park, Katharine (1998): *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150-1750*, New York 1998.
- Dear, Peter (2006): The Meanings of Experience, in: K. Park and L. Daston (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Science*, vol. 3: *Early Modern Science*, Cambridge, pp. 106-131.
- Debus, Allen G. (1964): The Paracelsian Aerial Niter, in: *Isis* 55, pp. 43-61.
- Debus, Allen G. (1977): *The Chemical Philosophy. Paracelsian Science and Medicine in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2 vols. New York.
- Delgado, Mariano (2003): Der Traum von der Universalmonarchie. Zur Danielrezeption in den iberischen Kulturen nach 1492, in: Idem (ed.), *Europa, Tausendjähriges Reich und Neue Welt. Zwei Jahrtausende Geschichte und Utopie in der Rezeption des Danielbuches*, Stuttgart, pp. 252-304.
- Dixon Simon (1999): *The Modernisation of Russia 1676-1825*, Cambridge.
- Djuvara, Neagu M. (1974): Démétrius Cantémir philosophe de l'histoire, in: *Revue des Études Roumaines* 13/14, pp. 65-90.
- Ebeling, Florian (2015): Alchemical Hermeticism, in: Ch. Partridge (ed.), *The Occult World*, Abingdon-New York 2015, pp. 74-91.
- Edighoffer, Roland (2002): Die Manifeste der Rosenkreuzer, in: *Rosenkreuz als europäisches Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert*, Amsterdam, pp. 158-175.
- Evans R. J. W. (1997): *Rudolf II and his World. A Study in Intellectual History, 1576-1612*, London².
- Faggionato, Raffaella (2005): *A Rosicrucian Utopia un Eighteenth-Century Russia: The Masonic Circle of N. I. Novikov*, Dordrecht.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya (2003²): *Kultur und Alltag im Osmanischen Reich. Vom Mittelalter bis zum Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Munich.
- Feodorov, Ioana (2012-2014): Dimitrie Cantemir, in: K. Fleet e.a., (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Islam*³, Leiden – Boston, pp. 47-56.
- Fierro, Maribel (1993): Al-Aşfar, in: *Studia Islamica* 77, 169-181.
- Figala, Karin (1998): Michael Sendivogius, in: Cl. Priesner and K. Figala (eds.) *Alchemie. Lexikon einer hermetischen Wissenschaft*, Munich, 332-334.
- Fleischer, Cornell (1983): Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism, and 'Ibn Khaldûnism' in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Letters, in: *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 18, pp. 198-220.
- Fleischer, Cornell (2007): Shadows of Shadows: Prophecy in Politics in 1530s Istanbul, in: *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 13, 51-62.
- Gilly, Carlos (2002a): Die Rosenkreuzer als europäisches Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert, in: *Rosenkreuz als europäisches Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert*, Amsterdam, pp. 19-56.
- Gilly, Carlos (2002b): Der ‚Löwe vom Mitternacht‘, der ‚Adler‘ und der ‚Endchrist‘: Die politische, religiöse und chiliastische Publizistik in den Flugschriften, illustrierten Flugblättern und Volksliedern des Dreißigjährigen Kriegs, in: *Rosenkreuz als europäisches Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert*, Amsterdam 2002, pp. 234-268. [English version: The ‚Midnight Lion‘, the ‚Eagle‘ and the ‚Antichrist‘: Political, religious and chiliastic propaganda in the pamphlets, illustrated broadsheets and ballads of the Thirty Years War, in: *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 80 (2000), pp. 46-77.]
- Georgescu, Valentin Al. (1986) : *La Translatio Imperii selon le Panegyricum et la Monarchiarum physica examinatio (1714) de Demetre Cantemir Prince de Moldavie. De la prophétie de Daniel à la philosophie naturelle de l'histoire*”, in: *Popoli e Spazio Romano tra diritto e profezia*, [Da Roma alla terza Roma, 3], Naples, pp. 573-593.
- Goez, Werner (1958): *Translatio Imperii. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen.
- Goldziher, Ignác (1960): Aşfar, in: *Encyclopedia of Islam*², vol. 1, Leiden-London, 687-688.
- Gamma, Sebastiana and Iftimovic, Radu (1998): The Echo of J. B. Van Helmont's Conception about ARCHEI in the Works of the Romanian Prince Dimitrie Cantemir (1673-1723), in: *H επισημονική σκέψη στον ελληνικό χώρο, 18^{ος}-19^{ος} αι.*, Athens, pp. 115-119.
- Grebeniuk, V. P. (ed.) (1979): *Panegiricheskaia literatura Petrovskogo vremeni*, Moscow.

- Groh, Dieter (2010): *Göttliche Weltökonomie. Perspektiven der Wissenschaftlichen Revolution vom 15. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*, Berlin.
- Guboglu, Mihail (1960): Dimitrie Cantemir – Orientaliste, in: *Studia et acta orientalia* 3, pp. 129-167.
- Hagen, Gottfried and Menchinger, Ethan L. (2014): Ottoman Historical Thought, in: P. Duara e.a. (eds.), *A Companion to Global Historical Thought*, Chichester, pp. 92-106.
- Heinecke, Berthold (1995): The Mysticism and Science of Johann Baptista van Helmont (1579- 1644), in: *Ambix* 42, pp. 65-78.
- Herzog, Christoph (2010): Aufklärung und Osmanisches Reich. Annäherung an ein historiographisches Problem, in: W. Hardtwig (ed.), *Die Aufklärung und ihre Weltwirkung* [Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft 23], Göttingen, pp. 291-321.
- Hösch, Edgar (1978): Zur Rezeption der Rom-Idee im Russland des 16. Jahrhunderts, in: *Forschungen zur Osteuropäischen Geschichte* 25, pp. 136-145.
- Hotson, Howard (2000a): *Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588-1638) between Renaissance, Reformation and Universal Reform*, Oxford.
- Hotson, Howard (2000b): *Paradise Postponed. Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism*, Dordrecht.
- Hughes, Lindsey (2000): *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, New Haven-London.
- Israel, Jonathan (2006): *Enlightenment Contested. Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1650-1752*, Oxford 2006.
- Johnson, Monte Ransome (2006): *Aristotle on Teleology*, Oxford.
- Kahn, Didier (2006): Le *Tractatus de Sulphure* de Michael Sendivogius (1616), une alchimie entre philosophie naturelle et mystique, in : Cl. Thomasset (ed.), *L'écriture du texte scientifique. Des origines de la langue française au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 193-221.
- King, Charles William (1988): *Julian the emperor, containing Gregory Nazianzen's two Invectives and Libanius' Monody with Julian's extant theosophical works*, London 1988.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis M. (2013): *Enlightenment and Revolution. The Making of Modern Greece*, Cambridge Mass [1978].
- Koch, Klaus (1997): *Europa, Rom und der Kaiser vor dem Hintergrund von zwei Jahrtausenden Rezeption des Buches Daniel*, [Berichte aus den Sitzungen der Joachim Jungius-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften E. V., Hamburg 15 (1997) Heft 1], Hamburg 1997.
- Koch, Klaus (2003): Europabewußtsein und Danielrezeption zwischen 1648 und 1848, in: M. Delgado, (ed.), *Europa, Tausendjähriges Reich und Neue Welt. Zwei Jahrtausende Geschichte und Utopie in der Rezeption des Danielbuches*, Stuttgart, pp. 326-384.
- Kraft, Ekkehard (1995): *Moskaus griechisches Jahrhundert. Russisch-griechische Beziehungen und metabyzantinischer Einfluß 1619-1694*, [Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa 43] Stuttgart.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. (2001): The Visions of Daniel, in: J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne, vol. 1, pp. 91-113.
- Lang, Helen S. (2007): *The Order of Nature in Aristotle's Physics. Place and the Elements*, Cambridge.
- Lebedeva, I. N. (1968): *Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki i ikh russkie i vostochnye perevody*, [Palestinskij Sbornik 18 (81)], Leningrad.
- Leinkauf, Thomas (2009²): *Mundus combinatus. Studien zur barocken Universalwissenschaft am Beispiel Athanasius Kirchers SJ (1602-1680)*, Berlin.
- Leezenberg, Michiel (2012): The Oriental Origins of Orientalism. The Case of Dimitrie Cantemir, in: R. Bod e.a. (eds.), *The Making of the Humanities*, vol. II: *From Early Modern to Modern Disciplines*, Amsterdam, pp. 243-263.
- Lemny, Stefan (2009): *Les Cantemir. L'aventure européenne d'une famille princière au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris.
- Lemny, Stefan (2012): Cantemir: bibliothèques réelles, bibliothèques imaginaires, in: *Actes de Symposium International : Le Livre. La Roumanie. L'Europe, Quatrième édition, 20 -23 Septembre 2011*, vol. I: *Histoire et civilisation du livre*, Bucharest, pp. 169-178.
- Lewitter, L. R. (1988): Peter the Great's Attitude towards Religion: From Traditional Piety to Rational Theology, in: R. P. Bartlett e.a. (eds.), *Russia and the World of the Eighteenth Century*, Columbus Ohio, pp. 62-77.

- Lozovan, Eugen (1975): 'La Lettre sur la Conscience' de D. Cantemir, in : *Revue des Etudes Roumaines* 15, pp. 67-84.
- Lozovan, Eugen (1975/76): D. Cantemir – Panégyriste de Pierre le Grand, in: *Buletinul Bibliotecii Române*, s. n. 5 (9), pp. 479-502.
- Lozovan, Eugen (1980): D. Cantemir avant les Lumières, in: *Romansk Instituts Duplikerede Småskrifter* 77, pp. 3-19.
- Lozovan, Eugen (1981): Le Panegyrique de Pierre le Grand, in : *Romansk Instituts Duplikerede Småskrifter* 92, pp. 3-51.
- Lozovan, Eugen (1983): D. Cantemir: *Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio*, in: *Romansk Instituts Duplikerede Småskrifter* 113, pp. 1-40.
- Martin, Russell E. (2010): The Petrine Divide and the Periodization of Early Modern Russian History, in: *Slavic Review* 69, pp. 410-425.
- Mulsow Martin (2012): *Prekäres Wissen. Eine andere Ideengeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit*, Berlin.
- Newman, William R. and Principe, Lawrence M. (2002): *Alchemy tried in the Fire. Starkey, Boyle and the fate of Helmontian Chymistry*, Chicago and London.
- Nitsche, Peter (1991): Moskau-das Dritte Rom?, in: *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 42, pp. 341-354.
- Oldroyd, D. R. (1974): Some Neo-Platonic and Stoic Influences on Mineralogy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, in: *Ambix* 21, pp. 128-156.
- Ostrowski, Donald (2007): 'Moscow the Third Rome' as Historical Ghost" in: S. Brooks (ed.), *Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261-1557). Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture*, New York, pp. 170-179.
- Ostrowski, Donald (2010): The End of Muscovy: The Case for circa 1800, in: *Slavic Review* 69, pp. 426-438.
- Pagel, Walter (1982): *Joan Baptista Van Helmont: Reformer of Science and Medicine*, Cambridge.
- Panaitescu, P. P. (1926): Le prince Démètre Cantemir et le mouvement intellectuel russe sous Pierre le Grand, in: *Revue des études slaves* 6, pp. 245-262.
- Păun, Radu G. (2013): Enemies within: Networks of Influence and the Military Revolts against the Ottoman Power (Moldavia and Wallachia, Sixteenth-Seventeenth Centuries), in: G. Kármán, (ed.), *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Leiden-Boston 2013, pp. 209-249.
- Pečar, Andreas and Trampedach, Kai (2007): Der ‚Bibilizismus‘ – eine politische Sprache der Vormoderne?“ in: Idem, (ed.), *Die Bibel als politisches Argument. Voraussetzungen und Folgen biblizistischer Herrschaftslegitimation in der Vormoderne* [Historische Zeitschrift, Beihefte N. F. 43], Munich, pp. 1-18.
- Petrovsky, Konrad (2014): *Geschichte schreiben im osmanischen Südosteuropa. Eine Kulturgeschichte orthodoxer Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden.
- Pirimäe, Pärtel (2007): Russia, the Turks and Europe: Legitimations of war and the Formation of European Identity in the Early Modern Period, in: *Journal of Early Modern History* 11 , pp. 63-86.
- Pippidi, Andrei (1980): Politique et histoire dans la proclamation de Démétrius Cantemir en 1711, in : Idem, *Hommes et idées du Sud-est européen a l'aube de l'âge moderne*, Bucharest-Paris, pp. 187-214.
- Pippidi Andrei (1997): La décadence de l'Empire Ottoman comme concept historique, de la Renaissance aux Lumières, in: *Revue des Etudes Sud-est Européennes* 35, pp. 5-19.
- Pippidi, Andrei (2011): Russia's Centripetal Policy and the Romanian Reactions or Aspirations, in: E. Siupiur, A. Pippidi, (eds.), *Les relations de la Russie avec les Roumains et avec le Sud-est de l'Europe du XVIIIe aux XXe siècles*, Bucharest, pp. 91-98.
- Pippidi, Andrei (2013): Byzance de Phanariotes, in: O. Delouis e.a. (eds.), *Héritages de Byzance en Europe du Sud-est a l'époque moderne et contemporaine*, Athens, pp.117-129.
- Poe, Marshall (2001): Moscow, the Third Rome: The Origins and Transformations of a 'Pivotal Moment', in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 49, pp. 412-429.
- Porto, Paulo Alves (2001): Michael Sendivogius on Nitre and the Preparation of the Philosophers' Stone, in: *Ambix* 48, pp. 1-16.
- Poumarède, Géraud (2004) : *Pour en finir avec la Croisade. Mythes et réalités de la lutte contre les Turcs aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*, Paris.

- Popkin, Richard (1995): "Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism" in: M. Bull (ed.), *Apocalypse Theory and the Ends of the World*, Oxford-Cambridge Mass., pp. 112-134.
- Prinke, Rafał T. (1990): Michael Sendivogius and Christian Rosenkreutz. The Unexpected Possibilities, in: *The Hermetic Journal* n.s. 2, pp. 72-98.
- Prinke, Rafał T. (1999): The Twelfth Adept. Michael Sendivogius in RudolFINE Prague, in: J. Matthews, P. White (eds.), *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment revisited*, New York, pp. 143-192.
- Prinke, Rafał T. (2010): Beyond Patronage: Michael Sendivogius and the Meanings of Success in Alchemy, in: M. López Pérez, D. Kahn and M. Rey Bueno (eds.), *Chymia: Science and Nature in Early Modern Europe*, Newcastle, pp. 175-231.
- Rowland, Daniel B. (1996): Moscow – The Third Rome or the New Israel? in: *Russian Review* 55, pp. 591-614.
- Schütt, Hans Werner (2000): *Auf der Suche nach dem Stein der Weisen. Die Geschichte der Alchemie*, Munich.
- Seifert, Arno (1990): *Der Rückzug der biblischen Prophetie von der Neueren Geschichte. Studien zur Geschichte der Reichstheologie des frühneuzeitlichen deutschen Protestantismus*, Cologne - Vienna.
- Semenova L. E. (2000): Nauchnaia deiatel'nost' Dimitriia Kantemira v Rossii, in: *Florilegium k 60-letiju B. N. Flori*, Moscow, pp. 296-310.
- Sinicyna N. V. (1998): *Tretii Rim. Istoki i evoliuciia russkoi srednevekovoi kontsepsii (XV-XVI vv.)*, Moscow.
- Schmidt-Biggemann, Wilhelm (2007): *Apokalypse und Philologie. Wissensgeschichten und Weltentwürfe der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by A. Hallacker and B. Bayer, Göttingen.
- Schmidt-Biggemann, Wilhelm (2013): *Geschichte der christlichen Kabbala*, vol. 3: 1660-1850, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.
- Schmitt, Charles B. (1983): *Aristotle and the Renaissance*, Cambridge Mass.-London.
- Sulea-Firu, I. (1963): O scrisoare inedită a lui D. Cantemir Monarchiarum Physica Examinatio, in: *Studii și cercetări de bibliologie* 5, pp. 267-276.
- Szydło, Zbigniew (1993): The Alchemy of Michael Sendivogius: His Central Nitre Theory, in: *Ambix* 40, pp. 129-146.
- Szydło, Zbigniew (1996): The Influence of the Central Nitre Theory of Michael Sendivogius on the Chemical Philosophy of the Seventeenth Century, in: *Ambix* 43, pp. 80-96.
- Tilton, Hereward (2015): The Rosicrucian Manifestos and Early Rosicrucianism, in: Ch. Partridge (ed.), *The Occult World*, Abingdon-New York 2015, pp. 128-144.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh (1998): Paracelsianism made Political, 1600-1650, in: O. P. Grell (ed.), *Paracelsus. The Man and his Reputation, his Ideas and their Transformation*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne, 119-133.
- Trepp, Anne-Charlott (2001): Hermetismus oder zur Pluralisierung von Religiositäts- und Wissensformen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Einleitende Bemerkungen, in: A.-C. Trepp and H. Lehmann (eds.), *Antike Weisheit und kulturelle Praxis. Hermetismus in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Göttingen, pp. 7-15.
- Van der Koj, Pleun (1998): *Fama Fraternitatis. Das Urmanifest der Rosenkreuzer Bruderschaft zum ersten Mal nach den zeitgenössischen Manuskripten*, Haarlem.
- Waugh, Daniel Clarke (2001): 'We have never been Modern': Approaches to the Study of Russia in the Age of Peter the Great, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 49, pp. 321-345.
- Webster, Charles (2002): *The Great Instauration. Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-1660*, Oxford a.o.².
- Whittaker, Cynthia (1992): The Reforming Tsar: The Redefinition of Autocratic Duty in Eighteenth-Century Russia, in: *Slavic Review* 51, pp. 77-98.
- Wittram, Reinhard (1952): Peters des Großen Verhältnis zur Religion und den Kirchen. Glaube, Vernunft, Leidenschaft, in: *Historische Zeitschrift* 173, pp. 261-296.
- Wittram, Reinhard (1964): *Peter I. Czar und Kaiser. Zur Geschichte Peters des Großen in seiner Zeit*, 2 vols, Göttingen.
- Wortman, Richard S. (1995): *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*, Princeton- New Jersey, vol. I.
- Yerasimos, Stéphane (1990): *Légendes d'Empire. La fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les traditions turques*, Paris.

- Zernack, Klaus (1986): Zum Epochencharakter der Peterzeit, in: Idem (ed.), *Handbuch zur Geschichte Russlands*, vol. 2: 1613-1856, *Vom Randstaat zur Hegemonialmacht*, Stuttgart, pp. 214-215.
- Zitser, Ernest (2004): *The Transfigured Kingdom: Sacred Parody and Charismatic Authority at the Court of Peter the Great*, Ithaca NY.
- Zitser, Ernest (2009): A Mason Tsar? Freemasonry and Fraternalism at the Court of Peter the Great, in: A. Önnersfors, R. Collis (eds.), *Freemasonry and Fraternalism in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, Sheffield, pp. 7-32.
- Zub, Alexandru (1980): Early-Enlightenment and Causality in Dimitrie Cantemir, in: P. Teodor (ed.), *Enlightenment and Romanian Society*, Cluj-Napoca, pp. 168-180.

Nikolas Pissis studied History in Athens, Tübingen and Munich. Since 2012 he has been Research Associate at the Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 980 at Freie Universität Berlin. He teaches Modern Greek History at the Institute for Greek and Latin Philology, Freie Universität Berlin. His publications include *Apokalyptik und Zeitwahrnehmung in griechischen Texten der osmanischen Zeit*, in: Andreas Helmedach, Markus Koller, Konrad Petrovsky, Stefan Rohdewald (eds.), *Das Osmanische Europa. Methoden und Perspektiven der Frühneuzeitforschung zu Südosteuropa*, Leipzig 2014, pp. 463-486; *Das „veränderte Russland“ und das griechische Gelehrtentum nach 1700*, in: M. Oikonomou, M. A. Stassinopoulou, I. Zelepos (eds.), *Griechische Dimensionen südosteuropäischer Kultur seit dem 18. Jahrhundert. Verortung, Bewegung, Grenzüberschreitung*, Wien 2011, pp. 155-168.

E-mail address: nikolas.pissis@fu-berlin.de