ROMANO-TURCICA

I

2003

ISIS
ISTANBUL

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0001

ROMANO - TURCICA I

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0003

© 2003 Les Editions Isis

Publié par
Les Éditions Isis
Şemsibey Sokak 10
Beylerbeyi, 34676 Istanbul
Tel.: 0216 321 38 51
Fax.: 0216 321 86 66
e-mail: isis@tnn.net
www.theisispress.com

ISBN: 975-428-255-2

Romano-Turcica
publication of the Center for Turkish Studies, Faculty of History, University of Bucharest
publication du Centre des études turques, Faculte d'histoire, Université de Bucarest
Bdul Elisabeta 4-12, Bucharest, Romania.
Honorary Director: Prof. Halil İnalcık
Director: Prof. Mihai Maxim
Editorial board: Giuseppe Cossuto, Armand Goşu, Irina Hritcu, Sinan Kuneralp, Eugen Nicolae
Editorial Secretary: Silvana Rachieru

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0004

ROMANO - TURCICA

I

2003

ISIS
ISTANBUL

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0005

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek
Halle
Zweigbibl.
Ha 1
Vorderer Orient

SZA 802

Table of Contents

Foreword by Halil İNALCIK 9
Avant-propos par Mihai MAXIM 11

I. ECONOMY AND SOCIETY 13

Dariusz KOLODZIEJCZYK, *The Segedin Treaty Rediscovered* 15
Anthony GREENWOOD, *Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: An Overview* 25
Cristina FENEŞAN, *Quelques institutions administratives roumaines de l'eyalet de Temeşvar (seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle)* 41
M. Mehdi ILHAN, *Varna at the End of the Sixteenth Century: Timar-holdings and Population* 51
Mihai MAXIM, *Tuna-i 'Amire. L'organisation finanacière et miyitaire du Danube ottoman aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles à la lumière de documents ottomans inédits* 75
Viorel PANAITE, *The Re'ayas of Tributary-Protected Principalities (the 16th-18th Centuries)* 83
Liviu MAXIM, *L'échelle danubienne de Turnu (Holovnik, Kule) à la lumière de nouveaux documents ottomans* 117
Bogdan MURGESCU, *Some Considerations on Romanian Historiography about Ottoman-Romanian Commercial Relations* 127

II. NUMISMATICS 141

Ana NICULIŢĂ, Eugen NICOLAE, *Le trésor de Bratuşeni, département d'Edirnef, République de Moldavie (XVI^e siècle)* 143
Aurel VÂLCU et Ana DICU, *Un trésor monétaire des XVII^e-XIX^e siècles découvert à Buzău* 153

III. ROMANIAN-OTTOMAN INTERFERENCES IN THE MODERN ERA 167

Armand GOŞU, *The Political Elite in the Danubian Principalities Between the Sublime Porte and Russia at the Beginning of the 19th Century. Case study: The Moruzi Brothers* 169
Ali Fuat ÖRENÇ, *Mösyö Yunan Gika'nın Sisam Beyliği dönemi vesikaları* 187

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0007

Silvana RACHIERU, *Legislation of Independent Romania in the Ottoman Perception (1878-1888)* 207
Stelian DUMITRESCU, *The Muslim-Turkish Community in Dobroudja within the Romanian State (1900-1918): the Administrative Framework According to the Romanian Archives* 220

IV. IN MEMORIAM 233

Cornelia PAPACOSTEA-DANIELOPOLU, *Nicoară Beldiceanu: ses études à Istanbul. La correspondance adressée au Prof. Victor Papacostea (14 oct. 1946-28 sept. 1948)* 235
Dan PRODAN, *Nicoară Beldiceanu sur Franz Babinger* 249
Georgeta ANGHEL, *Mihail Guboğlu (1911-1989)* 259
Viorel PANAITE, *Ion Matei (1921-1996)* 263
Georgeta ANGHEL, *Valeriu Veliman (1947-1999)* 267

V. BOOK REVIEWS 271

Tahsin GEMIL, *Românii şi otomanii. Secolele XIV-XVI,* Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 1991, 231 p. (Călin FELEZEU) 273
Zeki KUNERALP, *Les débuts de la soviétisation de la Roumanie: Août 1944-août 1945. Témoignage d'un diplomate turc,* Les Éditions Isis, Istanbul, 1991, 45 p. (Mihai MAXIM) 276
Mihai MAXIM, *Ţările Române şi Înalta Poartă. Cadrul juridic al relaţiilor româno-otomane în evul mediu* , Editura Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1993, 300 p. (Călin FELEZEU) 282
Mehmet Ali EKREM, *Din istoria Turcilor Dobrogeni,* Editura Kriterion, Bucureşti, 1994, 225 p. (Stelian DUMITRESCU) 285
Tahsin GEMIL (coordinator), *Originea Tătarilor. Locul lor în România şi în lumea turcă. Lucrările Simpozionului Internaţional,* Editura Kriterion, 1997, 371 p. (Stelian DUMITRESCU) 287
Cornelia CĂLIN BODEA, *Românii şi Otomanii în folclorul românesc,* Editura Kriterion, Bucureşti, 1998, 249 p. 291
Mihai MAXIM, *L'Empire ottoman au Nord du Danube et l'autonomie des Principautés Roumaines au XVI^e siècle. Etudes et documents,* Les Editions Isis, Istanbul, 1999, 273 p. (Irina HRIŢCU) 296
Sinan KUNERALP, *Son Dönem Osmanlı Erkan ve Ricali (1839-1922). Prosopografik Rehber* 1839-1922, Isis, 1999, 127 p. (Mihai MAXIM) 303

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0008

Veniamin CIOBANU, *Europe and the Porte. New Documents on the Eastern Question. Swedish Diplomatic Reports, 1795-1797* (vol. I); *1797-1799* (vol. II), The Center for Romanian Studies, Iaşi-Oxford-Portland, 2001, vol. I, 396 p., vol. II, 291 p. (Giuseppe COSSUTO) 304
Mihai MAXIM, *Romano-Ottomanica. Essays & Documents from the Turkish Archives,* The Isis Press, Istanbul, 2001, 213 p. (Silvana RACHIERU) 306
Giampiero Bellingeri, *Turco-Veneta*, Edizioni Isis, Istanbul, 2003, 463 p. (Mihai MAXIM) 308
La Collezione Tonizza nel Museo della Chiesa Nuova di Assisi. Le Monete Partiche, Sasanide e Islamiche. A cura di Maria Vittoria FONTANA , Istituto Italiano di Numismatica , Roma, 2001, 119 p. + 1 portrait + XV planches (Aurel VÎLCU) 310

VI. DOCTORAL THESES 313

Viorel PANAITE, *Peace, War and Trade in Islam. The Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Law of Nations* (abstract) 315
Adrian TERTECEL, *The Black Sea in Russo-Ottoman Relations at the End of the 17th Century and the Beginning of the 18th Century* (abstract) 325
List of contributors 331

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0009

FOREWORD

It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to introduce *Romano-Turcica,* a new scholarly review in which the results of the researches on relations and historical co-existence of the Turkish and Romanian peoples will be made available to the international audience.

While the Lower Danubian region became a corridor of the Turkic peoples coming from Central Asia and the northern Black Sea steppe into the Balkans from the sixth to the thirteenth centuries the Ottoman Turks reached the region from the south to annex it into their long-enduring empire in the fourteenth century. In fact for long centuries the history of the Lower Danubian basin had been a joint history for the Turkic and Romanian peoples. Now it is time to encourage research through original sources, in particular in the Ottoman archives so that presentations of the past will be modified by more balanced pictures, in a wider perspective. Under the skilful direction of Professor Mihai Maxim *Romano-Turcica* will, we are confident, realise this scholarly goal.

Halil İnalcık

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0011

AVANT-PROPOS

C'est une longue histoire que celle de l'apparition de ce premier numéro de la ROMANO-TURCICA, la nouvelle publication du Centre d'études turques et ottomanes de l'Université de Bucarest, Faculté d'Histoire. C'est la continuatrice de la publication CAIETELE LABORATORULUI DE STUDII OTOMANE (Cahiers du laboratoire d'études ottomanes), édités par le Laboratoire (devenu ultérieurement Centre) d'études ottomanes, fondé en 1985, ayant comme objectif déclaré l'étude des relations roumano-ottomanes dans une perspective comparatiste et interdisciplinaire.

Les premières contributions pour la ROMANO-TURCICA ont été reçues depuis longtemps. Mais les difficiles années de transition en Roumanie ainsi que des problèmes financiers et techniques ont retardé son apparition, dont l'idée a été immédiatement soutenue avec enthousiasme par M. le Prof. Halil İnalcık, le doyen de l'osmanistique mondiale et l'inspirateur de la nouvelle école roumaine de turcologie, qui a bien voulu accepter le patronage spirituel de notre nouvelle publication

C'est aussi grâce à M. Sinan Kuneralp, à sa générosité et son attachement aux études des relations turco-roumaines, que finalement — *elhamdülilllah*! — cette apparation a été possible.

Il faut donc remercier chaleureusement tous les deux. Il faut aussi remercier tous les collaborateurs, collègues et amis qui ont contribué à la naissance de cette nouvelle publication.

À cause de l'incertitude de la position de la ROMANO-TURCICA, quelques études (y compris une importante contribution signée par le Prof. Halil İnalcık lui-même) malheureusement ont été, entretemps, valorisées dans les pages d'autres publications. Mais désormais, nous espérons entrer définitivement dans un rythme normal et régulier.

Je ne voudrais pas présenter ici le contenu de la revue et d'en faire des commentaires. Que le lecteur se fasse lui-même une idée sur ce contenu, donc sur l'intérêt et l'utilité de notre revue. Je voudrais seulement mettre en évidence notre devoir, d'avoir dans la ROMANO-TURCICA une diversité de matériaux, y compris des sources d'archives, et d'opinions. Nous invitons donc nos collègues turcs, roumains et d'autres pays d'y collaborer et de contribuer à l'accomplissement de ce *desideratum*, pour le progrès de la recherche scientifique.

Ces contributions peuvent été rédigées dans les langues de circulation internationale ainsi qu'en turc.

Bonne chance à la ROMANO-TURCICA
İyi Şanslar!
Mihai Maxim
Venise, le 3 mars 2003

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0013

I. ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0015

THE SEGEDIN TREATY REDISCOVERED*

Dariusz KOLODZIEJCZYK

It would be hard to find a mediaeval topic, which has involved so many discussions and emotions, as the supposed-to-be Segedin treaty of 1444, which had preceded the crusade of Wladyslaw Warnenczyk. I am not going to remind here the discussion, which started already in the very year of the battle of Varna, and in the last 200 years involved many distinguished scholars from various countries. A turning point in this discussion was reached in 1937, when a Romanian scholar, Francis Pall, found or reminded rather the existence of the letters left by the Italian humanist, Ciriaco Pizzicolli.[1] These letters brought invaluable material considering the negotiations between the Christian rulers and the Ottomans, which took place in Edirne in June 1444. From that point on it was impossible to deny the existence of at least a draft of a treaty, which was to be accepted by the sultan and by the king.

Even then, however, Oskar Halecki tried to diminish the importance of the Edirne negotiations by stating that the treaty was never accepted by the Hungarian and Polish king.[2] His intelligently constructed arguments convinced even Franz Babinger, who in his article dated 1950 tended to accept Halecki's thesis.[3] However, in 1952 Jan Dabrowski published a detailed study of all sources accessible in those times, concerning the supposed-to-be treaty.[4] Though acknowledging deficiencies of primary evidence, Dabrowski resolved that the treaty both existed and was ratified by the Hungarian king. His arguments, repeated in the Polish reedition of this study, were generally

---

* This text was presented at the conferences in Varna (June 1994), Leipzig (October 1994), and Poznan (November 1994). I would like to express my gratitude to the scholars, who discussed its working copy with me, especially to Barbara Flemming, Aleksander Gieysztor and Serban Papacostea.

[1] F. Pall, *Ciriaco d'Ancona e la Crociata contro i Turchi*. Valenii de Munte, 1937.

[2] O. Halecki, *The Crusade of Varna. A Discussion of Controversial Problems*. New York, 1943, p. 52.

[3] F. Babinger, "Von Amurath zu Amurath. Vor- und Nachspiel der Schlacht bei Varna 1444", *Oriens* 3 (1950) p. es p. p. 239.

[4] J. Dabrowski, "L'Année 1444", *Bulletin International de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres, Classe de Philologie - Classe d'Histoire et de Philosophie* No suppl. 6 (1951) Cracow 1952; Polish reedition : "Rok 1444". *Spór o traktat szegedynski,* Wroclaw-Warsaw-Cracow, *1966.*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0017

accepted by the scholars, who later studied various problems concerning the year 1444, to mention only Bistra Cvetkova in her monograph on Varna[1] and Edward Potkowski.[2]

A few years earlier, in 1949 an invaluable Turkish chronicle source, *Gazavât-i Sultân Murâd,* was found in an Anatolian village, and published in 1978 by Halil İnalcık and Mevlûd Oğuz.[3] Though its existence was known to both Cvetkova and Potkowski, they partly overlooked this source's contribution to the "treaty discussion". On the other side, the Turkish and Greek historians working on *Gazavât* text were not so much obsessed with the problem of a broken oath by Wladyslaw Warnenczyk as their East-European colleagues.

To begin our point let us remind a few leading arguments of Jan Dabrowski:

1) Pizzicolli was not a merely humanist, but a Papal agent very well acquainted with the methods of obtaining secret materials. The documents found in his papers apparently originated not from the Hungarian but from the Ottoman chancery.

2) The treaty of 1444 was in fact concluded not on 1 August in Segedin, but on 12 June in Edirne. The king had only to swear it in presence of an Ottoman envoy, Baltaoğlu Süleyman.[4]

Dabrowski supposed also that the original copy of the treaty kept in the Hungarian Royal Chancery was apparently destroyed after the renewal of the war. For the lost treaty conditions he tried to search in the contemporary chronicles by Dlugosz and Thuróczy, and especially in the letter from the Polish Royal Council to the King issued on 26 August 1444 in Piotrków.[5] In

---

[1] Biastra Cvetkova, *Pametna bitka na narodite (Evropejskijat jugoiztok i osmanskoto zavoevanie-kraja na XIV i parvata polovina na XV v.)* Varna, 1979, p. 288.

[2] "Krzywoprzysiezca Wladyslaw" *w opinii potomnych, Kwartalnik Historlczny,* 92 (1985) p. 511-531, es p. p. 531-532.

[3] *Gazavât-i Sultân Murâd b. Mehemmed Hân. Izladi ve Varna Savaşları (1443-1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavâtnâme.* Tıpkıbaşı ve Türk Harflerile Metin, Notlar ve bir Lûgatce ile Yayınlayanlar Halil İnalcık, Mevlûd Oguz, Ankara, 1978. See also the article by H. İnalcık, "Byzantium and the Origins of the Crisis of 1444 under the Light of Turkish Sources." in *Actes du XIIe Congrès International d'Études Byzantines, Ochride 10-16 Septembre 1961.* II. Beograd, 1964 p. 159-163.

[4] "*Rok 1444*"... cit p. 16-17 and 25-26.

[5] *Ibidem,* p. 64.

this article I will try to argue that the very text of the treaty is very well known to us for at least 50 years.

If we reconsider the theses of Dabrowski, a logical argument has to be drawn : the treaty itself must have been written down and ratified by the sultan already on or before 12 June in Edirne and given to the Hungarian envoy Stoyka Gisdanich. If so, why such an accomplished diplomat as Ciriaco Pizzicolli, who apparently corrupted somebody in the Ottoman chancery, did not obtain the text of the treaty? Instead, in his documents one finds two redactions of the Latin translation of the letter of Sultan Murad to the King, dated 12 June 1444.[1] I will try to prove that this letter is in fact the lost treaty of Segedin (or of Edirne rather).

In order to judge whether the letter in question is a treaty one must ask: what is the treaty? How should an Ottoman treaty look like? Since the number of scholars prepared for both linguistic and historical analysis of Ottoman documents is very limited, the study of Ottoman diplomatics is still much behind the Western one. It concerns particularly the early Ottoman period. Very few early Ottoman chancery documents survived into our times, mostly in later copies or foreign translations. In the 15th century the Ottoman chancery, which had inherited a lot from the Selcukid one, adopted also certain Byzantine and Italian models. Thus, among the original documents issued in that time in Edirne we find both Persian, Turkish-Ottoman, Greek, and Italian ones. The form of document was at a stage of development. Thus, many early Ottoman treaties were very letter-like.[2] Even much later, in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries it happened often that the European interpreters provided their translations of Ottoman treaties with titles and divided them into articles, while the Ottoman original texts were more simple and compact. Curiously enough, the first commercial privilege issued for English merchants by Sultan Murad III began with the words : *Anletar vilayetinin kraliçesi olan Elzabet hükm ki* — "the command to Elzabet, who is the queen of the domain

[1] Published in O. Halecki, *op. cit.*, p. 88-90. For the earlier publications of these documents see p. 79-82.

[2] In his detailed study of Ottoman-Venetian diplomatics Hans Theunissen classifies the early Ottoman international treaties into two categories: "commercial" ones concluded with Ragusa (Dubrovnik) and Venice, usually containing numerous clauses and privileges in *dispositio*; and much more simple "political" ones, concluded with Hungary, Poland and the Habsburgs, where the conditions for peace appeared only in *expositio-narratio* (H. Theunissen, *Ottoman-Venetian diplomatics: the 'ahd-names. The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of Political-Commercial Instruments together with an Annotated Edition of a Corpus of Relevant Documents*, unpublished doct. diss., Utrecht, 1991, p. 238).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0019

of England." Thus the English Queen was treated in the very same way as an Ottoman subject. Of course, the Latin translation of that letter was much more sophisticated and conformed to the European norms.[1]

A very important Ottoman word is *'ahd* meaning originally "oath" or "promise". Though not always used, this word reflected the Ottoman attitude towards the treaty. The ruler had to promise or swear that he or she would honour the recently concluded peace. Thus the Ottoman treaties were usually called *'ahdname*s though the Europeans preferred the term *capitulations*.[2]

I think that at this stage we can try to analyse both the form and contents of the Sultanic letter from 12 June 1444. From the two redactions left by Pizzicolli and published by Pall and Halecki I have chosen the second one from the Biblioteca Nationale di Firenze, which though ornamented with Latin stylistic additions, seems to be a more precise rendition of the lost original. Judging by the singular form attributed to the addressee (*Tue* and not *Vestrae* —Ott. *Eflâk)*, this copy seems to be a translation from Ottoman-Turkish.

The first original Polish-Ottoman treaty preserved in the Polish Central Archives originates from 1489. It is provided with an imperial *tughra* although written in Latin. Since there is no doubt that this document is an original and is a treaty, let us compare it with the text left by Pizzicolli:

The letter of Murad II to the Hungarian and Polish king Wladyslaw Warnenczyk issued on 12 June 1444 (as quoted by Ciriaco Pizzicolli):[3]	The treaty of Bajezid II with the Polish king Kazimierz Jagiellonczyk from 1489 (orig. in Warsaw-AGAD, Dz. tur.):[4]
intitulatio	*intitulatio*
Amorath beg. Sultan, Mehmet beg magni olim regnatoris Asie filius, magnus Asie rex Thracumque et Macedonum potentissimus imperator	Sultan Bayesith Dei gratia asie, Grecie etc. Imperator Maximus

[1] See Susan Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey 1578-1582. A documentary study of the first Anglo-Ottoman relations*. London, 1977, pp. 49-54 and 211-214.

[2] See the article *İmtiâzât* by H. İnalcık in *EI*[2] (New Edition) (Leyden-London, 1960) and the above-mentioned study by H. Theunissen.

[3] O. Halecki, *op. cit.*, p. 88-90 ; see also Fr. Pall, *op. cit.*, p. 49-50.

[4] Archiwum Glówne Akt Dawnych (Warsaw), AKW, Dz. turecki, teczka 4, nr 6. For its description see *Osciennych w latach 1455-1672* Warsaw, 1959 p. 22-23.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0020

inscriptio
Precellentissimo principi Ladislao, Pannonie Polonieque serenissimo regi…

inscriptio
Illustissimus et Excellentissimus D. Chazimiro Rex polonie

expositio-narratio
(mentioning the Royal envoy and his credencials)
Sthoyka, fidelem Celsitudinis Tuae hominem, nuntum oratoremque legatum egregium, lubenter vidimus…

expositio-narratio
(mentioning the Royal envoy and his credencials)
Spectaculem et generosum Nicolaum Firlei Dambrowycha in suum oratorem: ad confirmandam amicitiam et pacem que inter nos est. Venit igitur ad presentiam nostram dictus Orator…

dispositio
(decision to close the peace for 10 years)
Que omnia lubens Regie Tue Fraternitatis gratia concedere *hoc pacto* decrevimus
(and again) …hoc pacto firma rataque esse decrevimus

dispositio
(decision to renew the peace for 2 years)
Quod *a die hodierno* usque ad duos annos inter nos et prefatum Illustrissimum Regem sit pax firma

sanctio
(Sultan's oath)
…Tuo coram oratore Sthoyka iuravimus, pacem ipsam firmam, veram, bonam, atque tranquillam, absque dolo vel fraude firma rataque esse decrevimus
mentioning the Sultan's envoy sent in order to take the oath from the king
…mittimus nostrum hunc fidelem, nobilem et perstrenuum virum Solimanbegh, et eius in conspect Tue Serenitati placeat, Regio Tuo iurare, absque ullo dolo vel fraude, quod a b hodierno die ad guturum usque decimum temporis annum, bonam, stabilem tranquillamque invicem pacme nobiscum habebitis atque eam constanter inviolabiliterque observabitis.

sanctio
(Sultan's promise to keep the peace as long as the king does not violate it)
Sed sit pax et amicitia firma inter utramque partem, Jurantes per Deum: quod donec predictus Rex observabit dictam fidem sua^{m} et pacem: nec ab ipso fiat aliquod contrarium. Nos etiam, debeamus observare pacem nostram et fidem: nec fiet a nobis alliquod contra fidem et pacem predictam

datatio and locatio
Datum Hadr[ianupoli], nostro de more, XII Iunii MCCCCXLIIII°.

datatio and locatio
Ex Constlis XXII Martij Anno Jesus MCCCCLXXXVIIII

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0021

I think that the conclusion is obvious. If the document from 1489 is called a treaty, and also the *Catalogue of Turkish Documents* by Zygmunt Abrahamowicz leaves no doubt about it, the text known from Pizzicolli's rendition is also a treaty. The strongest argument can be found in the text itself. The expression *hoc pacto* found twice in the text concerns nothing else, but this very document. There was no other treaty document issued by Murad in Edirne on 12 June 1444.

Though the formal analysis of the document in question seems to confirm our thesis, it is no less important to control its political contents. Since all the scholars who have dealt with this treaty have considered the document left by Pizzicolli merely a letter, they searched for the treaty conditions in every other place but not in this document. Dabrowski tried to re-establish the peace conditions on the basis of three sources: the chronicles of Dlugosz and Thuróczy, and the letter from the Royal Council to the King dated 26 August 1444 in Piotrków. Since both the chronicles are much later it was this letter that was considered a basic source. Now, let us compare the peace conditions given in the document registered by Pizzicolli with those mentioned in the letter from the Royal Council:

Tab. II. the 1444 Peace Conditions As Quoted in Various Sources:
A. 12 June 1444: Sultan's letter or treaty rendered by Pizzicolli
B. 26 August 1444: letter from the Royal Council in Piotrków to the King[1]
C. The chronicle of Dlugosz[2]

	A	B	C
1) Restitution of the Serbian possessions of George Brankovich and freeing his sons	X	X (Golubac mentioned)	X (Golubac not mentioned)
2) Vlad Dracul remains an Ottoman tributary, though being released from the duty of making personal appearances at the court of the Sultan	X	—	—

[1] *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti collectus opera Augusti Sokolowski*, I, 1, Cracow, 1876, p. 140-144 (no. 125).

[2] *Ioarriz Dlugossii... Historiae Polonicae Libri XII*, Cracow, 1877, vol. 4, p. 703. In the much less detailed chronicle by Thuróczy only the first "Serbian" article of the treaty is mentioned, see: Johannes de Turocz, *Chronica Hungarorum, I Textus* ed. E Galántai et J. Tristó, Budapest, 1985, p. 250.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0022

3) Ottoman evacuation of Albania (sic!)	—	X	—[1]
4) The payment of 100,000 florins to the King by the Sultan	—	X	—
5) Sultan obliged to furnish auxiliary troops of 25,000 men for the King's military expeditions	—	X	—

Even notwithstanding the striking correlation between the Ottoman letter and the Polish chronicle of Dlugosz, it is incredible to consider how easily so many scholars swallowed the obvious nonsenses contained in the letter from Piotrków. Not to mention the supposed Ottoman evacuation of Albania (to whom? to the Hungarian King?), nobody asked, how could possibly the Ottoman sultan collect 100,000 golden florins in order to send it to Buda? Two hundred years later, after the price revolution and after the lost campaign and war of 1672, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had to pay a tribute of only 22,000 florins, and even this sum was considered unrealistic. The second question: if the sultan was to send 25.000 soldiers to the king, how big was the whole Ottoman army in the mid-fifteenth century ? Thus, as we see, also the examination of the contents proves the authenticity of the Ottoman document and … the reliability of Dlugosz.

There is one more condition in the document rendered by Pizzicolli. In the fragment concerning future relations between the sultan and the Wallachian voyvoda Vlad Dracul it is stated that deserters and refugees should be handed over on the basis of reciprocity.[2] This condition belongs to the most characteristic elements of every Ottoman treaty. Whether with Persia, or Russia, or even with distant England, the Ottomans always tried to include such a paragraph into the treaty. And here we have it!

The only doubt, which can be raised, is: why is Glubac not mentioned in the treaty? The plausible explanation is that the Ottomans did not wait to go into details in the very text of the treaty. It was also comfortable not to

[1]The Polish chronicle is unclear in this place. Indeed, the Turkish envoy as quoted by Hugosz was to offer Albania to the king (*Albania e perpetuo tibi cedat),* but a few lines below the chronicler precised that the territory in question was only a part of Albania, probably some area bordering Serbia (*tota Dascia et pars Albaiae).*

[2]"(…) si qui nostratum homines suis quibusque in locis aufugerint, ad nos quam primum illos remittere debeat, quemadmodum et nos fugientes nostras ad partes sous quoscumque homines reddere constituimus."

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0023

mention this fortress in case of eventual future disputes. The sultan's approval of restitution of both Semendre and Golubac is recorded in the *Gazavât*[1] and it really occurred later, although in much changed political conditions. It is likely, that a detailed list of all places to be returned to Brankovich was appended to the treaty or given directly to the Ottoman envoy, Baltaoğlu Süleyman, who was to receive the royal oath and then to supervise the restitution of Serbian castles.

We are arriving at the end of this matter. If the treaty was concluded or issued indeed in Edirne on 12 June, what happened then in Segedin on 1 August? More than five hundred years ago Dlugosz wrote that the king had confirmed and sworn the treaty, but the words of the Polish chronicler were questioned both in the 15th as in the 20th century.[2] I think it is a proper time to look for an ultimate solution in the above mentioned chronicle *Gazavât-i Sultân Murâd*. The anonymous Ottoman chronicle wrote, that after arriving to the king's palace the Ottoman envoy Baltaoğlu Süleyman met the king, Yanko Hunyadi and the Serbian Despot. Then we find the sentence : *Bu melâ'hinler üçü ghaliz yeminler idüb ve 'ahdnameler yazılub Baltaoğlu virdiler* — "All the three cursed ones swore the hard oaths and wrote the *'ahdname*; [then they] gave it to Baltaoğlu Süleyman."[3] I think that there is no need to question any more the very fact of ratification of the treaty by the Hungarian-Polish king. Unfortunately we do not have the document itself. But we can get a quite precise idea about how it looked like. To the most rare and precious oriental manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris belongs the earliest Ottoman chancery manual compiled by Yahya bin Mehmed el-Kâtib from the year 1479. There one finds a copy of a *nâme-i sevgend* or *sevgendname*, that is an "oath letter".[4] The document was issued in 1444 in Konya by the bey of Karaman, İbrahim. As we know in this year sultan Murad concluded two treaties: first with the king of Hungary, and for the second one we miss the Ottoman document but we have the oath letter issued by İbrahim bey.[5] This quite a short document begins with a statement:

---

[1] *Gazavât-i Sultân Murâd*, p. 32 (Tur. Güercinlik is a translation of Golubac, lit. "pigeon house").

[2] See Dlugosz, *op. cit.*, p. 704 and O. Halecki, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[3] *Gazavât* ..., p. 35.

[4] *Menahicü'l-İnşa. The Earliest Ottoman Chancery Manual by Yahya bin Behmed el-Kâtib from the 15th Century*, Text in Facsimile with Introduction and Index by Şinasi Tekin, Rouxbury, Mass., 1971, p. 23-24 (Ottoman text), 31-32 (English translation), 134-136 (facsimile).

[5] A full list of preserved documents and copies issued during the reign of Murad II was published by Barbara Flemming in "The Reign of Murad II : a Survey" (I) *Anatolica*, 20 (1994), 249-267, esp. p. 261 (the letter of Murad II quoted with an incorrect date 12 July instead 12 June 1444).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0024

"I swear by God and by the Holy Qur'an that I shall not show any hostility, I shall not cause to show hostility, I shall not become partner of those and shall not help those who are enemies. I shall prevent as far as I am able those who wish to act with hostility toward Murat Beg's and his son Mehmed Beg's personal honour, lives, friends, countries, districts, cities, fortresses, towns, boundaries..."[1]

It is worth noting that this document does not contain more precise conditions of the peace. Apparently these conditions were already included in the treaty document issued earlier by the Ottoman sultan.

Since the Ottoman words *'ahd* and *sevgend* have the same meaning, we can assume that the document issued in Segedin by Wladyslaw Warnenczyk and called *'ahdname* in *Gazavât* was very similar to the *sevgendname* issued by the bey of Karaman. Obviously the royal oath was not made upon the Holy Qur'an, but upon the Bible, that is *tuo vestratumque religionis more* as required in the Sultan's letter from the 12 June.

The later story is well known. A few days later, influenced by the pressure of the Papal legate Cesarini and by the news about the departure of the Christian fleet, the king nullified his oath. George Brankovich decided to conclude a separate treaty with the Ottomans while the Crusaders departed from Hungary to meet their fate at Varna.

To end, what is characteristic in this early stage of Ottoman-European diplomatic relations is that the Islamic rulers regarded their Western counterparts as equal or almost equal partners. At this early stage the Ottoman sultans found also suitable to marry Christian princesses. Murad's marriage with Brankovich's daughter Mara is a good example. This attitude was changed, however, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 and the conquest of the Holy Cities of Jerusalem, Mecca, and Medina which followed in 1516-1517. Through these conquests the Ottoman sultans of were considered equal with the great *Padişah Sahib-Kıran*. The Ottoman treaties in those times were considered unilateral privileges issued on request by the almighty Padişah. The Ottomans did not require any more ratification of treaties by the European rulers, as well as they did not require ratification of orders from their own subjects. This led to misunderstandings, since the

[1] *Menahicü'l-İnşa...*, p. 31.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0025

Europeans obviously did not accept this attitude. For instance when the Polish-Ottoman treaty of Bucac was concluded in 1672, from the Ottoman legal point of view the act of imperial benevolence was not subject to any further discussion. When the Polish diet did not ratify the treaty and the war broke again, the Ottomans considered it as a treacherous break of the peace already concluded.

This attitude was changed again after the series of military losses in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, when the form of treaties had to conform itself with the real, changing equilibrium of power. The turning point was the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca of 1774, when the Ottomans were forced to treat the Russian Tsar as an equal partner.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0026

ISTANBUL'S MEAT PROVISIONING: AN OVERVIEW*

Antony GREENWOOD

Meat was second only to grain in the importance ascribed by Ottoman authorities to its arrival in sufficient quantities on the Istanbul market. If it has not attracted scholarly attention the way grain has, it is partly because, unlike grain, the mutton that fed Istanbul was not easily diverted to distant Western markets. With the exception of the Polish market for Moldavian sheep, there is little evidence of a significant demand from outside the Empire on the sheep supply that normally fed Istanbul. As a result Istanbul's meat provisioning was an internal Ottoman affair with relatively little connection to outside market forces.[1] If, however, the struggle over the control of the sheep supply was waged largely within the Empire, it was no less intense than that over grain, and warranted regulatory measures similar to those employed in the grain trade and that of other basic food stuffs. For this reason alone, the study of Istanbul's provisioning in meat must be considered an essential component of any attempt to define Ottoman provisioning concerns and their place within the Ottoman economic mentality.

What makes Istanbul's meat provisioning particularly worthy of study, however, is the creation in the 16th century of a complex and highly regulated system of registering rural producers to supply a certain quota of sheep to Istanbul every year. This was going far beyond the regulatory measures taken to coerce the market in grains; it was the incorporation of provisioning measures for the city into the classification of extraordinary services imposed by the state known as the *avarız*. Meat was not the only raw material the supply of which the state attempted to guarantee through the imposition of a service status on certain of its subjects, but, perhaps because of the size of the demand and the nature of the commodity, the shape taken by the system for

---

*This is part of chapter two of my doctoral dissertation *Istanbul's meat provisioning: a study of the celepkeşan system,* prepared under the supervision of prof. Halil İnalcık and submitted to the University of Chicago in 1988.

[1]This was not true, of course, for livestock in the border regions, such as the cattle of Hungary, which were outside the pull of the Istanbul market, or of sheep products, such as wool and hides, for which there was significant external demand. The demand for the latter, however, could be satisfied after the sheep were slaughtered for their meat, and did not lead to large scale smuggling of live sheep out of the Empire.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0027

supplying meat was unique. This system was a product of classical Ottoman administrative development and survived the economic and social crises of the turn of the 17th century only in very changed form.

My focus in this study will be on this 16th century system of provisioning Istanbul in meat. It must be emphasised that this is not a comprehensive study of Istanbul's meat supply; it is only a study of Ottoman provisioning practice in this regard. There are important aspects of the supply that it hardly covers. Most importantly, it does not deal with the beginning of the supply chain. All aspects of livestock breeding and pasturage in the producing areas, in particular the organisation of pastoral nomadism and its relations with the Ottoman state, are outside of the concerns of this study. Similarly, taxation on livestock is only dealt with in so far as it is directly concerned with feeding the city. The focus of this study is on the middle part of the chain, and specifically on the concerns of the authorities that the linkages in the middle of the chain were maintained: that sufficient livestock moved from the hands of the producer to the urban slaughterhouses. I have tried to show that the efforts of the Ottoman authorities in this regard were systematic and to provide specific detail on how this was worked out.

This provisioning administration, which I will call the *celepkeşan* system, is interesting in itself, as a method of provisioning a capital city through the complete subordination of the rural producer to the urban consumer. It provides us with a test of the "command" economy, of the degree to which in the 16th century the Ottoman authorities were successful in orienting the sheep supply to Istanbul in spite of the economic disadvantage this brought the producer. It is worthy of study as an example which illuminates Ottoman administrative and fiscal practices, in particular by showing us how a particular tax came into existence and evolved. Finally it gives us a new vantage point from which to investigate the nature of the *avarız*, and the change in character of Ottoman fiscal policy from the 16th to the 17th centuries.

*
* *

My purpose in this study is to provide a brief overview of the principal factors involved in the sheep provisioning of the city of Istanbul over the two and a half centuries from 1550 to 1800. This will establish a framework which will make possible a better understanding of the specific nature of the *celepkeşan* system.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0028

It will not be my goal here to try to establish real per capital meat consumption or deal with questions of diet. This is out of the question with the sources available to me. I will deal only with sheep, in doing which I am following the proclivities of the Ottoman diet.[1] For fresh meat, the Ottomans ate mutton and lamb far more than beef or chicken. This remained true well into this century.[2] Beef consumption, a large part of which was in dried form, especially as *pastırma,* was not insignificant, but it was not esteemed a critical part of the diet, and therefore the problems of its supply did not engender the administrative concern that the sheep supply did.[3] Chicken and game birds held a place of importance on the palace menu, but, perhaps for reasons of price, were less significant as part of common fare. With fish the situation is reversed: they are almost never found in the palace kitchen accounts, but we know from foreign traveller's accounts and the records of taxes on fishing nets in the Bosphorus that there was an active fishing sector and a market in dried fish. We can assume that this market was dominated by the Greek populace living along the shores of the Bosphorus; all accounts tell us that the Turks were not as much given to eating fish.

A review of modern and historic references to the sheep consumption of Istanbul reveals quickly the difficulty of trying to establish with any certainty even the most general of figures.[4] An apt illustration of the disparity to be

---

[1]Goat consumption is inextricably mixed with sheep in most Ottoman documentation. The two were sold by the same butchers, although care was to be taken not to mix the meats, and treated as the same category of meat. Beef and chicken, on the other hand, each had their own butchers. In general the authorities tried to ensure that Istanbul was supplied only with the more prized sheep, going so far as to order to the provinces to eat goat and that all sheep be sent to the city. Where I have run across figures distinguishing between sheep and goats, the proportion of goat has been small, generally less than ten percent. For the purpose of simplicity I shall only be referring to sheep in my text, but it should be understood that, especially in times of scarcity, this may also have included a certain proportion of goats.

[2]The earliest Istanbul slaughterhouse statistics, from 1923, show the slaughter of 16.8 times more head of sheep and goats than of cattle. By weight, more than two thirds of the slaughterhouse output was mutton or goat. Only since the 1950's has this proportion begun to change, beef production reaching approximately 44 percent by weight in 1977. See O. N. Ergin, "İstanbul'un iaşesi 2: İstanbul'un bir senelik et sarfiyatı ve Kara Ağaç Mezbahası", in *Şehir Emaneti Mecmuası* 1 (1340) r, p. 76, and A. Kılıçoğlu, *Research on Livestock, Meat and meat Products,* Istanbul 1980, 96.

[3]The only evidence of attempts to establish an annual quota for cattle supplies comes from the late 16th century and concern the Principalities. In 1566 the Voyvoda of Moldavia was ordered to furnish 1,000 head of cattle to the city per month, see *Mühimme Defterleri (MD)* 5, no. 1245. By the early 1590's this sum is reported to have climbed to 27,000 head per year. For further discussion, see M. Maxim, "XVI. asrın ikinci yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na karşı iktisadî ve malî mükellefiyetleri hakkında bazı düşünceler", in *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Tebliğler* Ankara 1973 II, p. 561, and M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, "Quelques donnés sur le ravitaillement de Constantinople du XVI^{e} siècle", in Les Actes du 1er Congrès des études sud-est européennes, AIÉSEE, Sofia, 1969, p. 669.

[4]For an introduction to the different methodologies of modern historians of food and nutrition, see the collection of articles in (R. Forster and Ranum, eds.), *Food and Drink in History*, selections from the Annales: *Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, (V) Baltimore 1979.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0029

found in the secondary sources is revealed in Braudel's major works. In one he mentions a figure of consumption close to seven million sheep per year for 1674; in the other he speaks of an average consumption of one third to one whole sheep per year per head over the 17th and 18th centuries. Even if we are generous enough to estimate that Istanbul's population averaged 700,000 over this period, the second figure gives us an annual consumption of at best 700,000 sheep a year, or a mere one tenth of the first.[1]

This degree of disparity, which is evident in the Ottoman as well as the European secondary sources, is such as to render the attempt to find some crude consensus among them impossible. There is little to be gained, therefore, in spending time with a thorough review of all secondary references to the subject. Unfortunately, Ottoman documentary sources are not of a nature to lead us much closer to the reality.[2] At best they can help us establish a tentative set of limits. I will confine myself here to pointing out certain relevant figures from primary sources, and to determining what limits can be established with reasonable certainty.

As a first step, it might be appropriate to look for constraints from the demand side of the equation. Enough research has been done on the question of the population of Istanbul to allow us to propose a rapidly increasing population in the period 1450-1600, and a stability, with fluctuations, from then until 1800.[3] Already by the end of the Conqueror's reign the population,

---

[1]The first figure is to be found in F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, rev. 2nd. New York, 1972, I, p. 350-351. The second comes from *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century, I, The Structures of Everyday Life*, New York, 1981, p. 201. Braudel claims to have based both these statements on the book by R. Mantran, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle*, Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul, no. 12 Paris, 1962, p. 181 and 196. While, as will be shown later, this work does contain some inaccuracies in its discussion of the meat supply; it is nevertheless not clear to me how Braudel came up with the second figure.

[2]The best starting point for an investigation of meat consumption is slaughterhouse statistics. I have found no complete slaughterhouse figures for Istanbul from before the third decade of this century. The lack of centralized slaughtering facilites before 1923 makes it unlikely that complete records will be found from an earlier period. Nevertheless, extensive records of sales taxes, *bac-ı pay-ı ağnam*, and slaughtering taxes, *serçin derçin*, do exist from the late 16th century on. Unfortunately the revenue from these taxes were sold as part of a larger tax-farm, the records of which do not differentiate between the different components of the tax farm's income. One cannot determine how much of the income of the tax farm comes from sheep sales or slaughter and how much from other livestock and from fines. This makes an estimate of sheep numbers based on tax farm income impossible. In any case one would have to assume a significant amount of sale and slaughter escaped recording. Even in this century, slaughterhouse-produced meat only accounts for sixty to seventy-five percent of urban fresh-meat consumption in Turkey. See A. Kılıçoğlu, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

[3]The literature on this subject is extensive, if not conclusive. For a recent summation of research on this question, see the article on *Istanbul* in the *EI*^{2} by H. İnalcık. The frequently-repeated estimates of a population peak of a million or more at the turn of the 17th century seem greatly inflated.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0030

including palace personnel, *kapıkulu* troops and other state-dependants, has been estimated at between 70,000 and 175,000. Of these, the state-dependants totalled at best 15,000. In the next century the total population, including the three dependent suburbs of Eyüp, Galata and Üsküdar, climbed to somewhere between 400,000 and 700,000 and probably never exceeded this level until the third decade of this century. For Istanbul proper, 400,000 persons must be considered an absolute maximum for the two and a half centuries under consideration.

The growth in the state-dependent population can be traced with more exactness. By the beginning of the reign of Süleyman the total of this population had reached close to 25,000. By the end of the century it was in the range of 80,000 to 100,000, the greater part of this increase occurring in the second half of the century.[1] It probably never exceeded this upper limit thereafter, and may have dipped considerably in certain periods, as a result of efforts to bring under control the unlicensed swelling of the Janissary corps.

In so far as Istanbul meat consumption is concerned, the state-dependent population can be broken down principally into those groups which were fed from the various palace kitchens (Topkapı, the old palace, Galata Saray, and, from the mid-16th century on, İbrahim Paşa Saray), and those supplied by the Janissary butchers (*yeniçeri et meydanı*).[2] The number of persons dependent on the palace kitchens can only be approximated. It included all members of the inner service, and some of the outer service, but not, notably, the Sipahis of the Porte or the Janissaries. At the end of the 16th century, the Topkapı kitchens alone fed about 5000 persons per day.[3] The total number fed from the four palace kitchens on an average day may well have reached as high as ten thousand individuals by the end of the 16th century.

---

[1] Virtually all of the state-dependent population was a member of either the inner or outer service of the Ottoman Palace. For a thorough discussion of the components of these two "services", and figures for the number of people in each component group in the years 1480, 1527, 1568, 1609 and 1670, see the article *Ghulâm* in the *EI*[2] by H. İnalcık, and p. 83 of İnalcık's *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600,* London 1973.

[2] Not all of the state-dependent population was stationed in Istanbul. Most of the *sipahi*s of the Porte and increasingly large numbers of Janissaries were located outside of the city and were obviously not dependent on these kitchens. The number of state dependents who must be figured into Istanbul consumption statistics is therefore considerably less than the total number of state dependents mentioned above.

[3] İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı devletinin saray teşkilatı,* 2nd ed. Ankara, 1984, p. 379.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0031

The Janissary butchers supplied only the Istanbul-based Janissaries, whose exact numbers are known at certain dates. These numbers could fluctuate considerably during the course of a year depending on campaign circumstances. The following can be considered highs, when the main body of the army was not on campaign. In 1527, there were 7,886, in 1567 there were 12,798, in 1582/83 there were 18,905, in 1595 there were upwards of 25,000, in 1609 there were 37,627, and in 1670 there were 39,470.[1] The rise in Janissary numbers reached a peak in the three decades between 1580 and 1610 and then levelled off; in the 17th and 18th centuries their numbers seem to have exceeded this, and then to have been brought down again. It is worth noting that although there was certainly an increase in the number of mouths fed by the palace kitchens during the 16th century, it was not on the scale of the rise in the number of Janissaries, who increased in number by at least five times. Together, the butchers for the Janissaries and the Palaces may have supplied meat for as many as 15,000 persons in the first decades of the 16th century, and as many as 50,000 to 60,000 persons by the beginning of the 17th century.

What figures we have for mutton consumption parallel the rise in dependent population. Between 1489-90 and 1669-70 the annual sheep consumption of the Topkapı kitchens rose from 16,379 to circa 99,120 as shown in Table 1. Ninety-nine thousand appears to have been the maximum level Topkapı palace consumption reached; for the rest of the 17th-18th centuries palace consumption was slightly less, varying between 72,000 and 96,000 sheep.[2] When the other palaces are included, total palace consumption

---

[1] Ö. L. Barkan, "The Price Revolution of the Sixteenth Century: A Turning Point in the History of the Near East", trans. J. McCarthy, *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies,* 6, 1975, p. 20; *idem,* "1079-1080 (1669-1670) mâlî yılına âit bir Osmanlı bütçesi ve ek'leri" *İktisat Fakültesi mecmuası,* 17 Oct.-July, 1955-1956, p. 215-216 and 262-266; *EI*[2] s.v. *Ghulâm,* by H. İnalcık; and Klaus Röhrborn, "Untersuchungen zur osmanischen Verwaltungsgeschichte," *Studien zur Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients,* (ed. Bertold Spuler), vol. 5 Berlin 1973, p. 78. For a listing of diverse estimates of Janissary numbers down to their dissolution in 1826, see İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı devleti teşkilatından kapıkulu ocakları,* 2nd ed., 2 vols. Ankara, 1984, I. p. 611-620.

[2] I have found no 16th century estimates for palace consumption. Seventeenth century travelers' estimates of Topkapı palace consumption include Baudier (1632): 200 sheep and 100 lambs a day, or 106,200 per year, and Tavernier (1675): 500 sheep a day, or 177,000 a year. Both are quoted in eremya Çelebi Kömürciyan, *İstanbul tarihi,* trans. and ed. H. D. Andreasyan, Istanbul, 1952, p. 122-123. A mid-seventeenth century Ottoman descriptive source mentions 300 sheep per day, or, as Baudier, 106,200 sheep per year. See the manuscript entitled *Kavanin-i Osmaniyye der rabıta-yı asitane,* Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Y 74, 3. The total of 216,000 from 1674 quoted by R. Mantran *op. cit.,* from the Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Turcs, supplément 1201, includes all the palaces. The comparable official figure (from Barkan's *1079-80 yılı bütçesi*) for 1669/70 would be approximately 129,953 shee p.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0032

from the early 17th century on probably varied in the range of 100,000 to 150,000 sheep.[1]

Table 1.--Sheep Consumption of the Topkapı Kitchens

DATE	1489/90	1569/70	1573/74	1595	1669/70
SHEEP	16,379	34,429	38,226	70,000	99,120

Sources: The figures for 1489/90, 1569/70 and 1573/74 are from Ö. L. Barkan "Istanbul Saraylarına âit Muhasebe Defterleri", *Belgeler,* 13, (1970), p. 99, 104, 145-146; for 1595 from *MD* 73, no. 660 and for 1669/70 from Barkan, *1079-80 Yılı Bütçesi,* 295. The figure for 1595 is not a realised consumption figure; it is the amount foreseen in the drivers' contract. The figure for 1669 -1670 is converted from *okka*s of mutton at ten *okka*s per sheep. All figures are based on a 354 day year.

Janissary consumption in the 16th century is difficult to document. In 1585, when total Janissary numbers were in the vicinity of 20,000 the Janissary butchers in Istanbul sold around 51,000 sheep.[2] In the 17th and 18th centuries the number of sheep supplied to the Janissary butchers varied from 70,000 to 100,000 per year. This was perhaps only half the amount that would have been required to produce the daily ration of 50-60 *dirhem*s (160 to 190 grams) of mutton per Janissary mentioned by certain foreign observers.[3] It may be that the fifty *dirhem*s per day diet was simply not realised, but more likely this difference stems from the fact that for a good part of most years many of the Janissaries were not in Istanbul.

---

[1]Not surprisingly, this implies a tremendous *per capita* mutton consumption for the dependents of the palace kitchens. If we assume an average of 15,000 people were fed an average of 125,000 sheep per year, this makes an average annual per capita lamb or mutton consumption of 107 kilos. The nature of palace, and even food for the carnivores in the "lion house" (*arslanhane*), is such as to make this figure difficult to interpret. It is probably not unreasonably high, however. Certain elements of the palace population were allotted much more than this. The daily mutton ration of the young trainees in Galata Saray in 1602/03 was 150 *dirhem*s (480 gm.), which is the equivalent of 175 kilos a year. This was almost three fourths again as high as the above average; the average ration (80 dh. or 256 gm. per day) of the students at the *imaret* of the Fatih Mosque in 1490 was just less than this, at some 93 kilos per year. For Galata Saray see Ö. L. Barkan, "İstanbul saraylarına âit muhasebe defterleri", *Belgeler.* 13 1979, p. 166; for the Fatih [İmaret] see *İdem,* "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda imâret sitelerin kuruluş ve işleyiş tarzına âit araştırmalar", *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası,* 23, 1962-1963, p. 274-276.

[2]This is an extrapolation from sales of 23,500 sheep in five and a half months. See MD 58, no. 903. This document has been published in A. Refik, *Onuncu asr-ı hicrîde İstanbul hayatı,* Istanbul, 133, p. 142-143.

[3]See Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* London, 1668; reprint ed., Westmead, England 1972, p. 192; and Luigi Marsigli, *Stato militare dell'Imperio Ottomano,* Amsterdam 1732, p. 68. At 50 *dirhem*s per day over a 365 day year, it would have taken some 180,000 average sized sheep to feed the 39,470 registered Janissaries in Istanbul in 1670.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0033

These estimates give us a rough indication that total state-dependent mutton consumption in Istanbul may have averaged some 40,000-50,000 sheep in the first quarter of the 16th century, some 90-100,000 sheep in the third quarter, and some 140,000-170,000 at the beginning of the 17th century. From the accounts of the *Kasapbaşı* we know more exactly the figures for the period between 1670 and 1800. Total state-dependent consumption in this period varied between 182,000 and 222,000 until 1776; then in the last quarter of the 18th century it climbed past the 300,000 mark.[1]

If we accept the assumption that per-head popular mutton consumption would not have averaged more than the per-head consumption of the privileged state-dependent population, then these figures for state-dependent consumption allow us to establish a very rough maximum limit for the total mutton consumption of Istanbul in the 17th and 18th centuries. If we assume a minimum state-dependent population of 50,000 and a maximum greater Istanbul population of 700,000 then the state-dependent population was at the very least one fourteenth of the total population. If state-dependent population consumption averaged 200,000 sheep per year, then an absolute maximum consumption for the total population would be 2,800,000 sheep per year. If we accept as more realistic a total population of 400,000, this implies a maximum consumption of some 1,600,000 sheep. This allows us to dismiss as unrealistic some of the considerably higher estimates provided by foreign and Ottoman observers.[2]

To my mind the most reasonable assessment of total sheep consumption is that offered by the *Kavanin-i Osmaniyye* from the mid-17th century. The author says that 6,000 sheep were brought to Istanbul a day, but

---

[1] Estimates of this total by Ottoman authors are as far apart as 490 sheep per day, or 178,850 per 365 day year (*Kavanin-i Osmaniyye*, 3), and 11,000 sheep per day, or 4,105,000 per 365 day year (Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, Istanbul, 1314, I, p. 562). Both estimates are from the mid-17th century.

[2] As usual, Evliya Çelebi's estimate (see previous footnote reference) of 13,870,000 sheep per year is outrageously high. Alexandrescu Dersca-Bulgaru's assumption of 4,200,000 sheep must also be too high (See her "Sur le ravitaillement d'Istanbul au XVIème siècle en relation avec les Principautés Roumaines", *Revue d'Histoire Maghrebine*, 31-39 1983, p. 72.) More problematic are the figures quoted by R. Mantran *op. cit.*, p. 196 from the Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Turcs, supplément 1201, of 3,965,760 sheep and 2,877,400 lambs in 1672. Even with a maximum population of 700,000, this implies mutton and lamb consumption in the range of 100 kg per capita per year. This would be very high for total meat consumption by any standards, even for medieval Europe, and it does not include beef, chicken, sausage or dried meat forms, all of which were of lesser importance than mutton but cannot be dismissed. This document is a puzzle as it is found alone, without context, and with no mention of the source for these figures. Yet, as Braudel noted, the figures are too exact to have been concocted.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0034

that in times of scarcity, 2,000 sheep would suffice.[1] This would result in consumption of 2,190,000 sheep in a good year and 758,000 sheep in a bad year. It is not clear if state-dependent consumption was included in this. Consumption in an average year, if we assume five months of relative shortage (*müzayaka*) from December through April, would be 1,586,000 sheep, to which one might have to add state-dependent consumption of 200,000. If we assume, disregarding the state-dependent population, a total population of 350,000 to 400,000, the available mutton supply would come to some 50 to 58 kg *per capita*.[2]

More detailed and reliable Ottoman estimates are to be found from the late 18th and early 19th century. None of them are as complete as one might desire, but they do provide us with an idea of the totals assumed by the Ottoman officials charged with these matters. Perhaps the most convincing of these covers only a nine month period, in which time it was predicted that the city population would need 550,000 head of sheep. This would make 735,000 sheep over twelve months. In addition an extra 300,000 sheep would be needed if the Sultan and army were in residence. This made a total of 1,035,000 sheep.[3]

---

[1] *Kavanin-i Osmaniyye*, 3: "İstanbul şehrine yevmiyye altı bin koyun sürülür, ama müzayaka eyyamında iki bin koyun kifayet eder." The distinction between the norm and times of scarcity adds greatly to the persuasiveness of this estimate. The fluctuation between times of plenty and times of scarcity is essential to understanding the differing circumstances to which any pre-modern urban (or rural) population was subject. Even in the case of Istanbul, where one of the principal concerns of the state authorities was to prevent food and raw material shortages, scarcity of the foodstuff or another was a constantly reoccurring phenomenon from at least the middle of the 16th century on. In the second half of the 16th century Istanbul meat shortages appear to have been chronic. For a list of grain shortages between 1578 and 1637, see Güçer, *Hububat Meselesi*, 8-9.

[2] This is as high or higher than the total meat supply *per capita* in other "privileged" cities of Europe, such as Rome, where this figure dropped from 38.3 to 21.5 kg. in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries, or Paris, where it averaged between 51 and 65 kg. from the mid 18th to the mid-19th centuries. See J. Revel, "A Capital City's Privileges: Food Supplies in Early-Modern Rome", trans. E. Forster and Patricia Ranum, in *Food and Drink in History*, eds. R. Forster and O. Ranum, Baltimore, 1979, p. 43 and F. Braudel, *Structures of Everyday Life*, p. 196.

[3] See *Cevdet Belediye* (Cev. Bel) 650, which is addressed by an unspecified author to *Benim Efendim*; from the tone it would appear to have been written by the Grand Vizier to the Sultan in response to a demand for information about the city's sheep supply. The document is undated but by correlating the lunar months mentioned with the seasons described, it can be dated most likely to either 1776-80 or to 1808-1812. Other examples of this type of summary of the sheep supply situation exist from this period. For other explanations by the Grand Vizier to the Sultan see *Hatt-ı Hümayun* (HH) 16582 (1795-96) and 54602 (1788-89). See also Cev. Bel. 4670 (n.d.). For discussions between the butchers, the *Kasapbaşı* and the *Kadı*, see *Şer'iyye Sicilleri* (SS) 201, pp. 25b, 56b, and 253. SS 201, p. 25b, dated Dec. 1788, provides a total similar to the above, stating that 230,000 sheep would be sufficient to feed the city's inhabitants for the 105 days of winter. This was without the state-dependent allotments. At that rate 800,000 sheep would have fed the populace in a year, without the palace and the army.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0035

The first modern statistics on Istanbul meat consumption show levels which are even more conservative than the above estimates. In each year between 1920-22, at the twenty-two licensed private slaughterhouses in Istanbul, a total of between 548,265 and 609,125 head of livestock were slaughtered. In 1923, the opening year of operation of the first Istanbul municipal slaughterhouse, a total of 509,805 sheep, lambs and goats (and 32,286 head of beef) were slaughtered.[1] To these must certainly be added livestock slaughtered illicitly. If today's estimate of 25-40 percent illicit slaughtering is used, this brings sheep consumption up to between 625,000 and 700,000 per year. This was with a population of five hundred to six hundred thousand.[2] Certainly the early 1920's were not times of plenty for Istanbul and a higher per capita meat consumption two and three centuries earlier is not unlikely. On the other hand, Istanbul's population may have averaged somewhat less that 500,000 to 600,000 in the period from 1550,1800. It seems to me reasonable, therefore, to posit as a lower limit for the period 1550 to 1800 something in the range of Osman Nuri's early twentieth century figures of 500,000 to 700,000 sheep.[3]

We are left with a range of 500,000 to 2,800,000 sheep a year. These are extreme limits, especially the upper one. It is probably safe to take as a working estimate a range which trims a lot more off the top than the bottom. Recognising that the sheep supply could fluctuate dramatically, I would propose, along the lines of the three to one ratio found in the *Kavanin-i Osmaniyye*, a real maximum of 1,800,000 and a minimum of 600,000 sheep per year over the period of investigation

---

[1] O. N. Ergin, *op. cit.*, p. 76-77.

[2] *Ibidem*, p. 76. The official figure was close to one million, but Osman Nuri argues this was impossible; revised figures from a few years later do bring it down closer to seven hundred thousand. Making no allowance for illicit slaughtering, but using very high average carcass weights (derived from weight-based transport tariffs), O. N. Ergin determined annual total fresh beef and mutton consumption at 26 kilos *per capita*, of which mutton constituted approximately 18 kilos. Since then consumption in Istanbul has risen steadily, but probably not as fast as population growth. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find contemporary statistics for the city's consumption. Turkish urban consumption (settlements over 10,000) of all meat products has been estimated to have risen from 23.5 to 25.3 kg. per head over the period 1960-1980. Rural consumption has remained drastically lower, bringing the estimated national average down to 16,95 kg. in 1980. See A. Kılıçoğlu, p. 40-47.

[3] The only estimate that I have run across lower than this is that of Ahmet Refik who states that consumption was something more than 200,000 sheep in the last days of Süleyman I. This is probably based on the figures found in numerous sheep orders in the *Mühimmes*, a good number of which he published, and none of which specifically mentions more than 300,000 sheep in a year (*MD* 48, no. 695 and *MD* 53, no. 294). There is no reason to believe, however, that any of the figures in these orders cover the city's entire sheep supply. as I show in the next chapter, the total number of registered *rumeli celepkeşan* sheep alone was much higher than 200,000, and Istanbul received sheep from other areas as well. This figure is therefore unreasonably low. See Refik, "İstanbul'un usul-ü iaşesi," *cit.*, 28.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0036

The geographical location of the city allows a convenient division of the sheep supply area into two parts, the Anatolian and the Balkan peninsulas. This division was particularly distinct for livestock, as opposed to other food products, because it was "walked" to the market rather than shipped. At all times down to the end of the 18th century, and probably in most of the 19th century, the Balkan peninsula, Ottoman Rumelia, supplied the great majority of sheep for the city. This was partly the result of geography, and partly the result of the fact that early Ottoman expansion and consolidation was in the Balkans not in Anatolia. The rolling plains of Thrace provided easier access to the city from the Balkans, and more convenient pasturage areas for fattening the sheep and for wintering them after the long drive from their place of origin. Moreover, the Bosphorus itself provided an obstacle, though certainly not an insuperable one, to sheep coming from Anatolia.[1]

The authorities involved in regulating the city's mutton supply looked first to the Balkans. Only when the Balkan supply fell short they turned to the Anatolian plateau. In the 16th century it seems that attempts to induce the arrival of sheep from central and eastern Anatolia were responses to situations of scarcity, usually brought about by political and military developments in Rumelia. By the 18th century, however, it had become clear that the needs of the city population were such as to demand a substantial annual input of sheep from the Anatolian plateau as well. Nevertheless for the palace and the state-dependent population the authorities continued to use a supply system which relied entirely on sheep from the Balkans until the end of the 18th century.

The Balkan supply area is conveniently divided in two by the geographical and political border formed by the Danube. Sheep from south of the Danube, from Thrace, Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thessaly, formed the core of the city's supply. This core area must have supplied the city from the time of its conquest.

---

[1]One might also argue that there was a larger marketable surplus to be taped in the Balkans than in Anatolia, or at least in Western Anatolia. As support for this notion one can point to a multitude of evidence for the attractiveness of the Anatolian market for Rumelian sheep. This shows up largely in the transport of sheep across the Dardanelles to supply the Aegean area. This was officially licensed at times for Bursa and Manisa, but in general was banned as depriving İstanbul of its supply. I have never, however, run across the reverse that is the transport of sheep from Anatolia to Rumeli (other than Istanbul) On sheep licensed to cross from Rumeli to Anatolia, see M. Akdağ, *Türkiye'nin iktisadî ve içtimaî tarihi,* 2 vols. İstanbul, 1974), 1: 201, 227-228 (42,000, 10,000, 113,000, 80,000 and 5,000 sheep for Bursa in 1479, 1485, 1511, 1512 and 1516 respectively); Istanbul, Atatürk Kütüphanesi, Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları, K. 122, p. 262 (80,000 sheep for Bursa in 1577-1578); *MD* 61, no. 102 and *MD* 64, no. 362 (3,500 sheep for the *imarets* of Manisa in 1586 and 12,000 in 1588). On illicit crossing, see *MD* 74, nos. 450 & 468, and *MD* 78, no. 114 from the turn of the 16th century, and Cev. Bel. 1613 - 7161 and Cev. İkt. 172 & 311 from the turn of the 18th century.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0037

The Romanian Principalities to the north of the Danube began to be tapped at the latest during the third decade of the 16th century.[1] The timing of this phenomenon can be related to the increased demands on the sub-Danubian sheep supply imposed by Süleyman's campaigns in Hungary. These cut severely into the traditional sources of the city's supply. An important factor was Süleyman's campaign against Petru Rareş in 1538 which put Moldavia under strict Ottoman control.[2] As early as January-February of 1544 the Voyvodas of Wallachia and Moldavia were each ordered to procure 100,000 sheep and send them to Istanbul for sale.[3] Scattered evidence in the *Mühimme*s indicates that by the end of the 1560's at the latest sheep from the Principalities had became an essential part of the city's annual sheep supply. In conjunction with increasing demands for sheep there were also demands for cattle. The numbers of sheep sent rose over the next forty years. In 1579 the Voyvoda of Moldavia reported that 180,000 sheep had crossed the Danube at Isaccea on the way to Istanbul, and in 1584 the number of sheep said to be purchased annually in Moldavia for the Istanbul market was put at around 300,000.[4]

To a large extent the sheep from the Principalities were procured at the demand of the Ottoman authorities. From the very beginning a system of registration was instituted to ensure that the sheep actually made it to Istanbul. Local authorities were asked to keep registers of the number of sheep

---

[1]Transylvania remained outside of the city's pull. It was never subject to the same control as the other two Principalities, and unlike them its economic orientation remained largely westward and northward throughout the Ottoman period. What evidence we have of Ottoman interest in Transylvania livestock concerns cattle more than sheep, and does not affect the city's provisioning.

[2]The history of Ottoman-Romanian relations in the 16th century has been explored in detail by Romanian historians. A great deal of data on the flow of money and foodstuffs to Istanbul has been unearthed. Much of this can be tracked in the *Mühimme*s but there is also a substantial body of contemporary documentation published in Romanian which I have not been able to utilize. For an English introduction to the subject (to be used with caution) see P. Sugar, *Southeastern Europe Under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804*, Seattle and London, 1977, p. 113-142, and C. M. Kortepeter, "Ottoman Imperial Policy and the Economy of the Black Sea Region in the 16th Century," *JAOS*, 86, 1966, p. 86-113. For the connection with Istanbul's provisioning, see Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Sur le ravitaillement d'Istanbul," *cit.*, 73-80; *Idem*, "Quelques données sur le ravitaillement d'Istanbul," 661-672; N. Beldiceanu, "La crise monétaire Ottomane au XVI^{e} siècle et son influence sur les Principautés Roumaines", *Südost Forschungen, 16* 1957, p. 70-86; M. Maxim *XVI. asrın ikinci yarısında Eflak-Buğdan*, 2 553-566; *Idem*, "L'Autonomie de la Moldavie et de la Valachie dans les actes officiels de la Porte, au cours de la seconde moitié du XVI^{e} siècle", *RESCE*, 15, 1977, p. 207-232; and *Idem*, " Les pays Roumains et les relations Habsbourg-Ottomanes dans la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle", in *Habsburgische-Osmanische Beziehungen*, ed. A. Tietze, Vienna, 1985, 91-105.

[3]Topkapı Saray *(TKS)* Archives, E. 12321, nos. 326 & 536. These orders were sent immediately following the completion of the Estergon campaign, and renewed the next year. Mircea, the Voyvoda of Wallachia for much of the next ten years was even nicknamed the "shepherd" (Ciobanul) on account of the number of sheep he sent south to Istanbul. See *İA* s.v. *eflak*, by A. Decei.

[4]*MD* 39, no. 157 and *MD* 53, no. 294.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0038

purchased for the Istanbul market, the date they were sent and who they were sent with.[1] In the 1560's prohibitions were placed on the export of all livestock to the north or west of the Principalities. This forced the supply towards Istanbul. From the period 1578-1594 there is copious evidence of a policy of forced sale at prices fixed by the Ottomans.[2]

The difficult question of how best to interpret the nature of Ottoman economic demands upon the Principalities has been dealt with by Mihai Maxim. Although in theory vassal status (*haraçgüzar*) gave the Principalities a territorial and administrative inviolability, in practice they were increasingly drawn into the Ottoman economic sphere of influence in the 16th century and their economy integrated with the Empire's. Most importantly, this integration went even so far as to include *de facto* penetration of aspects of the Ottoman fiscal system. Although the individual Rumanian *reaya* was not held legally responsible by the Ottomans for the same taxes and other obligations as the *reaya* south of the Danube, the Principalities as a whole, through their Voyvodas, were held responsible for furnishing many of the same things. During the reign of Murat III (1574-1595), Ottoman demands on the principalities reached a high point, going so far as to include collection of various forms of *avarız*.[3] In this connection we see in the last quarter of the century the extension to the Principalities of purchases by individuals responsible through the *celepkeşan* system for collecting sheep south of the Danube. The authorities tried to ensure that purchasers from the South did not infringe upon the supply from the principalities, but they were not completely successful.[4] In the years 1593-4, when the *celepkeşan* system south of the

---

[1] *TKS* 12321, no. 536; *MD* 35, no. 158; *MD* 40, o. 233; and *MD* 43, no. 52.

[2] An interesting order to the Moldavian Voyvoda Iancu Sasul in 1579 relates the plea of the Moldavian *reaya* who said that they had always lived by raising cattle and sheep and selling them to Hungary and Poland. If this was forbidden and if they were forced to sell at fixed price (*narh*) to Istanbul, they said they would suffer and not be able to pay their tribute. "Umumen Boğdan reayası gelip, bizim maişetimiz koyun ve sığır ve ziraat ile [dir] aher yerden ticaret ve kar u kesp eylemeyiz... Eğer birden ve aniden koyun ve sığır satmak men olunur ise bize gayet müzayaka lâzım gelir... ve vilayetimizde et ve ekmek ilâ hazel-an narh ile satılmış değildir; her kanda ucuzlar ise edasına iktidarımız olmaz, hâlimiz mukadder olur." See *MD* 39, no. 157. For other orders concerning forced sale at fixed prices, see *MD* 39, no. 148; *MD* 42, nos. 971 and 972, *MD* 48, no. 923, and Maxim, "L'autonomie de la Moldavie," 216-220.

[3] See M. Maxim, "XVI. asrın ikinci yarısında Eflak-Buğdan," *cit.*, p. 553-566, and *Idem*, "L'Autonomie de la Moldavie," *cit.*, p. 216-222.

[4] See *MD* 42, no. 389 and *MD* 43, no. 52 (to the *Kad* of Silistre): "... Kadılığınızdaki sürücülere muhkem tenbih eyliyesiz ki heyli miktar Dobruca koyunu getirip ... Eflak koyununun hücceti Boğdan ve Eflak koyunu ile karışmak kanun değildir. Şöyleki vilayetinizin celeplerinin sürücülerinden bir sürücü hüccet ihraç için Dobruca koyunu alıvermeyip Boğdan ve Eflak koyunu getirip, size âit olduğundan maada, getiren..." In addition there were a few cases of the forced conscription of persons of wealth to be butchers in Istanbul. Maxim lists five orders on

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0039

Danube began to be re-structured, and Istanbul butchers were given the right to collect registered sheep themselves, we find that included in their quotas were the rights to collect sheep from particular *kadılık*s in the two Principalities as well.[1]

This issue is complicated by the connection between Ottoman sheep purchases in the Principalities and the extensive borrowing of money on the Istanbul market by candidates for appointment as Voyvoda. Among the more eager creditors of the Voyvodas were the city's sheep merchants, who could then seek their repayment in the form of sheep valued at the official low price promulgated by the Ottoman authorities. Due to the exorbitant amounts borrowed and the increasing financial crisis, problems with repayment of these loans became especially acute in the period 1579-1594. Since it directly affected the city's meat supplies, the Ottoman authorities were drawn into the creditors' efforts to get repayment.[2]

The pressure built up in the Principalities came to a head with the revolt of Michael the Brave in 1594. Supplies from both Principalities were cut off for at least six years. With the constant drain on the core provinces of war provisioning caused by the Ottoman-Habsburg conflict, and the beginning of the *Celalî* unrest in Anatolia, Istanbul faced a drastic shortage of meat at the turn of the century. This situation has quite rightly been pointed to by Rumanian historians as proof of the degree of the city's dependence on Rumanian sheep.

The patterns governing commercial relations between Istanbul and the Principalities set in the course of the 16th century remained in place until the early 19th century. Purchases at fixed low prices remained in force for the agents of the *Kasapbaşı*, the appointed official responsible for the needs of the

---

[1] *MD* 67, no. 513 and *MD* 71, no. 342.

[2] A typical repayment order begins (*MD* 55, no. 329): "Bundan akdem voyvoda olduğunda mahruse-yi İstanbul'un yazılı celep taifesinden koyun vermek şartıyle bazısından karz akçe alıp hâlâ verdikleri karz akçeye bedel koyun gelip istediklerinde vermeyip teallül eylediğin ilân olundu." The *Mühimme*s contain extensive information on this subject which deserves further investigation. In particular, on the refusal of the Moldavian voyvoda, Iancu Sasul, to honor his debts at the rates being offered, see *MD* 42, nos. 593, 594, 897, 971, and 972; *MD* 46, nos. 212, 267 and 619; *MD* 47, nos. 483, 512 and 515. The amount owed to livestock merchant creditors in Istanbul is referred to variously as 4.5 mililon and 7.5 million *akçe*s, in return for which repayment with 24,000 head of cattle and 100,000 head of sheep was considered insufficient. A further blow to the city's supply came when, because of the monetary instability of the period, Ottoman merchant-capitalists preferred to exchange their *akçe*s for European silver pieces rather than for the Rumanian sheep the city had come to depend on. See *MD* 53, no. 294.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0040

city's state-dependent population. A greater part of the trade was controlled by a new Ottoman merchant-financier class, now entrenched in the Principalities as well as in Istanbul, that governed the trade in all foodstuffs to the city. A critical factor in their dominion continued to be the financial leverage they held over those appointed as Voyvodas. Not until the aftermath of the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-74 were attempts made to control the abuses that prevailed in the system of purchases for Istanbul's provisioning. Controls focused on the licensing of the Ottoman merchants involved in this trade and ensuring that just market prices prevailed. Just how effective these measures were, however, is not clear. Effective liberation from the domination of the Istanbul market only seems to have come with the political independence brought by the treaty of Edirne in 1829.[1]

Sheep from the Principalities were every bit as vital to the city at the turn of the 19th century as they had been at the turn of the 17th. Although I lack figures for the intervening century and a half, there is no reason to believe that this was not the case all through this period.[2] In 1755-56, for example, an order to the Voyvoda of Wallachia stressed that the sheep, goats and cattle of that region were a staple part of the meat diet of the population of Istanbul, that no interference in their supply would be allowed, and that the authorities would ensure that conditions of payment would be such that the trade would be worthwhile for producers and middlemen.[3] In the fall of 1777 and 1788, totals of 240,000 and 230,000 sheep respectively were expected from the two provinces combined. These sheep were to form the basis of the city's winter supply. Over half were expected to arrive between the first of August and Nov. 7 (*Ruz-ı Kasım*); the rest were to arrive shortly thereafter and be put in winter pasturage near the city to help tide the city through to early spring.[4] In October 1818 just before the Feast of the Sacrifice (*Kurban Bayramı*), a survey of the sheep stocks in the vicinity of the city showed that of a total of

---

[1]Marie M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, *Sur le régime des ressortissants Ottomans en Moldavie (1711-1829)*, 5-6, 1967, p. 160-177.

[2]Scattered data does exist throughout this period for purchases by the *Kasapbaşı* for the state-dependent population. The quantities involved, however, are limited by comparison with the late 16th century. The highest figure I have run across is 60,000 sheep, and that was over a two year period in 163-75. See Kamil Kepeci (KK) 3971.

[3]See Cev. bel. 4820. This was a year of scarcity of all food supplies in the city, perhaps because of a drought. See A. Şerif, "Istanbul'da su müzayakası - 1169 senesine âit bir kaç vesika", *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası*, 38. June 1332, p. 65-73; and *Idem*, "İstanbul'da me'kulat müzayakası - 1169 senesine âit bazı vesaik," *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası*, 40, September 1332, p. 193-204.

[4]These estimates were produced by the *Kasapbaşı* and the Representatives (*Kethuda*) of the Principalities in response to questioning by the Grand Vizier. Wallachia was to supply two thirds of the total. In 1777, 100,000 sheep from Wallachia and 50,000 from Moldavia were to arrive between August 1st and Nov. 7, and 60,000 and 30,000 respectively were to arrive immediately thereafter. See SS 1/201, 253 (a+b) ahd 25 (b).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0041

147,000 sheep brought for slaughter, forty-two percent were from the Principalities, 49,000 from Wallachia and 14,000 from Moldavia.[1]

The conditions governing the city's trade with Anatolian sheep suppliers were very different from those with its suppliers to the north. Since Anatolia was not considered the core supply area, no attempt was made to restrict suppliers only to dealing with Istanbul or to enforce a system of below-market prices. Trade with the large-scale sheep-breeding pastoral groups of Central and Eastern Anatolia appears to have fluctuated largely according to market conditions. For the most part, the maintenance of artificially low prices in Istanbul served to keep the Anatolian supply down. The large towns and cities of Western Anatolia, especially Bursa, were often a more attractive market then the capital city. Sheep from the tribal groups in the East, from as far afield as the Iranian border and the north Syrian plane, were sent westward annually to be marketed, but under normal conditions few of them made it as far as Istanbul.[2]

[1] *HH* 29683.

[2] Suraiya Faroqhi, in *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia,* Cambridge, 1984, p. 223-228, has described the routes taken by nomads bringing sheep northwest towards Istanbul from Central, Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia. Even when ordered to be taken to Istanbul, a majority of the sheep seem to have been siphoned off to the large urban markets along the way.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0042

QUELQUES INSTITUTIONS ADMINISTRATIVES ROUMAINES DE L'EYALET DE TEMEŞVAR (SECONDE MOITIÉ DU XVI^{e} SIÈCLE)

Cristina FENEŞAN

Il n'est pas étonnant que les ottomanisants aient témoigné un intérêt particulier aux problèmes posés par l'organisation et l'administration de l'Empire ottoman. C'est un aspect fondamental de l'histoire de chaque État et, surtout, d'un empire bien organisé comme celui fondé par Osman.

Rappelons d'abord les travaux d'Uzunçarşılı,[1] de Gökbilgin,[2] d'İnalcık,[3] d'Orhonlu,[4] de Metin Kunt[5] sur les institutions qui ont assuré le fonctionnement du mécanisme administratif central et provincial ottoman. N'oublions pas que les recherches portant sur les particularités de la domination ottomane dans l'Europe du Sud-Est ont stimulé aussi l'intérêt pour l'étude de l'administration locale et pour ses institutions.[6]

D'autre part, elles ont fait ressortir les différentes formes d'autonomie, ainsi que le statut particulier, dont jouissaient certaines populations et, surtout, les communautés des Roumains des Balkans. Or, la question des Valaques (*Eflâq*) balkaniques fait, par suite des études dues aux historiens

---

[1] İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı devleti teşkilâtında kapukulu ocakları,* Ankara, 1943-1944; *idem, Osmanlı Devletinin saray teşkilâtı,* Ankara 1945; *idem, Osmanlı Devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilâtı,* Ankara, 1948.

[2] T. Gökbilgin, "Kanuni Sultan Süleyman devri başlarında Rumeli eyaleti livaları, şehir ve kasabaları", *Belleten* 78, 1956, 20 p. 247-294, *idem, Osmanlı Müesseseleri teşkilâtı ve medeniyeti tarihine genel bir bakış,* Istanbul, 1977.

[3] H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age. 1300-1600,* Londres, 1973.

[4] C. Orhonlu, *Osmanlı Imparatorluğunda derbend teşkilâtı,* Istanbul, 1967.

[5] M. Kunt, *Sancaktan eyalet'te. 1550-1650 arasında Osmanlı ümerası ve il idaresi,* Istanbul, 1978; idem, *The Sultan's Servants. The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government 1550-1650,* New York, 1983 et aussi le compte-rendu de R. A. Abu-el-Haj, *OA* 7-8, Istanbul 1988, p. 221,245.

[6] H. Kresevljakovic, "Muteselimi i njihov djelokrug", *RNDBH* 1957, 3; B. Djurdjev, "O knezovima pod turskom upravom", *JC*, 1, 1948; *idem*, "Turska vlast u Crnog Gori u XVI i XVII vijek"u, Sarajevo, 1953; G. Galabov, H. Duda, *Die Protokolbücher des Kadiamtes Sofia,* München, 1960; A. Suceska, "Die örtlichen Vermaltungsorgane des Osmanischen Reiches bis Ende des 17. Jh.", *Z. B*, 2, 1962, 1, p. 153-181; *idem*, "Ayani. Prilog izucavanju lokalne vlesti u nasim zemljama za vrijeme Turska," Sarajevo, 1965; M. Vasic, "Martolosi u jugoslovenskim zemljama pod turskom vladavinom," Sarajevo, 1967; E. Grozdanova, "Das Kadiamt und die Selbstverwaltung der bulgarischen Gemeinden im 15. bis 18. Jh.", *ÉH*, 7, 1975, p. 147-159; B. A. Cvetkova, *Les institutions ottomanes en Europe,* Wiesbaden, 1978.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0043

roumains[1] et aux historiens de l'ancienne Yougoslavie,[2] l'objet d'un riche dossier. La plupart des études mentionnées a prouvé la survivance des structures administratives et militaires coutumières, antérieures à la conquête ottomane. Les mêmes études ont démontré, à la fois, le rôle et la force, que l'administration ottomane avait reconnue à la tradition pré-ottomane et à la situation antérieure à l'annexion des contrées balkaniques. On a apporté des contributions sur les institutions capables d'assurer, par la voie d'adaptation, l'intégration des différentes communautés roumaines dans le mécanisme administratif de l'Empire ottoman. Enfin, la survivance de certaines structures administratives des Valaques balkaniques,[3] telles que *knez primiciers* ou districts autonomes, qui se retrouvent également au nord du Danube, nous a incité à étudier ce problème pour savoir s'il se posait aussi pour les Roumains de l'*eyalet* de Temeşvar, fondé en 1552.

La question nous semble justifiée, vu que dans ce cas la Porte a commencé, en 1553, le recensement et l'enquête sur l'organisation du Banat[4] avant de passer à l'implantation de sa propre administration. Nous pourrions élargir ainsi nos connaissances sur l'administration de l'*eyalet* de Temeşvar, qui étaient limitées, jusqu'à présent, à l'instauration des autorités ottomanes

---

[1]Voir les études de N. Beldiceanu, "La région de Timok-Morava dans les documents de Mehmed II et Selim I", *RER*, 3-4, 1957, p. 111-129; *idem*, "Sur les Valaques des Balkans slaves à l'époque ottomane (1450-1550)", *REI*, 1966, p. 83-132; *idem*, "Les Valaques de Bosnie à la fin du XVe siècle et leurs institutions" *Turcica*, 7, 1975, p. 124-134; N. Beldiceanu, I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "Quatres actes de Mehmed II concernant les Valaques des Balkans slaves", *SOF, 24,* 1965, p. 103-118; N. Beldiceaunu, I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, P. S. Năsturel, "Les recensements ottomans effectués en 1477, 1519 et 1533 dans les provinces de Zvornik et de Herzégovine", *Turcica*, 20, 1988, p. 159-174; N. Beldiceanu, "Les Roumains des Balkans dans les sources ottomanes", dans *Société européennes,* 8, *Études roumaines et aroumaines* sous la rédaction de P. H. Stahl, Paris-Bucarest, 1990, p. 11-19. Voir aussi M. Berindeii, A. Berthier, M. Martin, G. Veinstein, "Code de lois de Murad III concernant la province de Smederevo", *SOF* 30, 1972, p. 140-154; M. Berindei, M. Kalus-Martin, G. Veinstein, "Actes de Murad III sur la région de Vidin et remarques sur les qanun ottomans", *SOF*, 35, 1976, p. 11-60; A. Tanaşoca, "Autonomia vlahilor din Imperiul otoman în secolele XV-XVII," *RY*, 8, 1981, p. 1513-1526.

[2]B. Djurdjev, "Nesto o vlaskim staresinania pod turskom upravom", *GZM,* 52 (1940) 1941, p. 49-67; *idem,* "O knezovima pod turskom upravom", *JC*, 1-2 (1948) 1949, p. 132-166; *idem.* "Ispisi iz deftera za Branicevo iz XV veka 1467,1468". *JG*, 3-4, 1951, p. 93-99; D. Bojanic, "Vlasi u severnoj Srbij ni njehovi prvi kanuni", *JC*, 18, 1971, p. 255-269; *idem*, "Turski zakoni i zakonski propisi iz XV i XVI veka za Smederevsku. Kusevacku i Vidinsku oblast", Beograd, 1974.

[3]Pour l'institution des *knez* voir A. Suceska, *Die örtlichen...*, p. 168-169; N. Beldiceanu, *Sur les Valaques de Bosnie...*, p. 124-125; N. Beldiceanu, I. Beldiceanu-Steiher, P. S. Năsturel, *Les recensements ottomane...*, p. 168. B. A. Cvetkova, *Les institutions ottomanes...*, p. 62-63. Pour l'institution du primicier (primikür) voir N. Beldiceanu, *Sur les valaques...*, p. 109-110; idem, *Les valaques de Bosnie...*, p. 164, 169; N. Beldiceanu, I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, P. S. Năsturel, *Les recensements ottomans...*, p. 164-168.

[4]Ö. L. Barkan, "Les grands recensements de la population et du territoire de l'Empire Ottoman et les registres impériaux de statistique", *TÜTFM*, t. 1, 1940, 4, p. 172; J. Matuz, *Die Steuerkonskription des Sandschaks Stuhlweissenburg aus den Jahren 1563 bis 1565, islamwissenschaftliche Quellen und Texte aus deutschen Bibliotheken,* III, Bamberg, 1986, p. 2-3.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0044

dans la ville de Timişoara en 1552.[1] À plus forte raison, les données sur le *sandjak* de Temeşvar comprises dans le *kanunname* promulgué en 1554[2] et dans le *defter-i mufassal* n° 579 dressé en 1579[3] nous ont persuadé de la nécessité d'une telle étude comparée. Ce sont, en effet, des données complémentaires du point de vue de leur contenu et de leur chronologie. Elles nous indiquent, au premier abord, la promptitude avec laquelle les autorités de l'*eyalet* de Temeşvar ont assimilé des institutions et des structures administratives fondamentales, qui existaient avant la conquête de 1552.

Nous disposons ainsi de preuves irréfutables pour soutenir non seulement un fonctionnement ininterrompu des institutions des *knez* et des *primiciers (primikür)* du temps des dominations hongroise, ottomane et autrichienne au Banat mais aussi de la survivance de quelques districts roumains (*districtus volahase*) : Manaştur (Monostor), Fîrdea (Tverd), Şudea (Sufya) de l'ancien comté de Timiş.

Des amples références faites par le *kanunname* de 1554 aux *knez* et aux *primiciers* il ressort que les autorités ottomanes ont eu les mêmes raisons et le même intérêt que les anciennes autorités hongroises de les maintenir et de confirmer leurs privilèges. L'exemption d'impôts et de contributions, dont ils ont joui du temps du roi Jean Zápolya et du gouvernement du comte de Timiş Pierre Petrovici, avait offert au législateur ottoman le précédent juridique nécessaire à la renouveler.[4] Les *knez* du *sandjaq* de Temeşvar étaient exempts, ainsi qu'ils le furent auparavant (1516) ceux du *liva* de Smederevo, du *kharadj,* de l'*ispendje*, de la dîme (*öşr*) sur les céréales et sur le moût, du droit

[1] Cr. Feneşan, "Un aspect méconnu de la fondation de l'eyalet de Timişoara: l'instauration des autorités ottomanes à Timişoara en 1552", *RESEE,* 27, 1989, 1-2, p. 73-79.

[2] V. Veliman, *Documente turco-osmane privind vilaietul (eialetul) Timişoara, RA*, 47, 1985, 4, p. 418-422.

[3] T. Halasi-Kun, "The Rumanians of Districtus Volahales Tverd", *AO* 6, 1980, p. 115-132; *idem*, "The Rumanians of Districti Volahales Monostor and Suya", *AO* 8, 1983, p. 251-306; *idem*, "Serbians and Rumanians in Ottoman Southeastern Hungary: Detta", dans *The Mutual Effects of the Islamic and Judeo-Christian Worlds: The East European Pattern,* New York 1979, p. 113-127; idem, "Krasso-County and the Ottoman Nahiyes: Bogca Kiroşova-Bitilnik and Semlit," *AO*, 10, 1985, p. 103-131; 11, 1986, p. 71-120.

[4] V. Veliman, *op. cit.,* p. 419, 422; voir aussi A. Sceska, *Die örtlichen Verwaltungsordunge...*, p. 167-169; pour l'institution des *knez* au Banat jusqu'à l'époque ottomane voir Fr. Pesty, *A szörény hajdani oláh kerületek,* Bupadesta, 1876; Gh. Vinulescu, "Privilegiile românilor din cele 8 districte banatene", dans *Fratilor Alexandru şi Ion I. Lapedatu la împlinirea vârstei de 60 de ani,* Bucureşti, 1936, p. 869-876; M. Holban, "Marturii asupra rolului cnezilor de pe marile domenii din Banat în a doua jumatate a secolului al XIV-lea", *Studii de Istorie Medie,* 2, 1957, p. 407-418; *idem,* "Deposedari şi judecati în Banat pe vremea Angevinilor şi ilustrarea lor prin procesul Voya (1361,1378)", *SMIM*, 5, 1962, p. 57-128.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0045

sur les moutons *(adet-i agnem)*.[1] Il le sera plus tard (1586) aussi le cas du *knez* du *liva* de Vidin.[2]

En échange de ces privilèges, les *knez* assuraient d'abord la police à l'intérieur de leurs communes (*nevahi*), qui réunissaient plusieurs villages. Dans les *livas* qui ne se trouvaient pas aux frontières de l'Empire ottoman (voir les *livas* de Vidin, Braniçevo, Smederevo) ils étaient chargés de la perception des amendes.[3]

À l'encontre de ce cas, le *kanunname* de 1554 rendait les *knez* directement responsables du redressement économique et de la prospérité du *sandjaq* de Temeşvar.[4] Les *knez* s'en portaient ainsi garants puisqu'ils devaient retrouver les raïas, qui s'étaient enfui des villages placés sous leur autorité et les ramener en leurs lieux d'origine. Il ne serait certainement pas dépourvu d'intérêt de citer aussi le cas du *knez* Paul, qui a été chargé par l'ordre impérial du 15 janvier 1566, de coloniser des raïas sur deux propriétés désertes appartenant au *khass* du beglerbeg de Temeşvar.[5] Suivant la coutume de la garde des défilés (*derbent*), le *knez* Paul devait défendre journellement ces propriétés dévastées par les brigands avec l'aide de dix hommes armés.

D'après les brèves références du *kanunname,* les *knez* avaient aussi des attributions d'ordre fiscal plus limitées par rapport aux obligations qu'ils devaient remplir jusqu'à la veille de la conquête ottomane. C'est ainsi qu'au début du XVI[e] siècle, dans le district roumain de Şudea appartenant au comté de Timiş, les *knez* de la catégorie des *knez* communs ou des juges de village devaient lever les dîmes et les impôts et les faire porter au château-fort.[6] Toutefois les attributions reconnues aux *knez* par les autorités ottomanes prouvent qu'ils ont gardé une double qualité, propre aux juges de village appartenant aux domaines de la noblesse. Vers la fin du XVI[e] siècle (1376-1389), les *knez* se sont trouvés dans une position équivoque. Ils devaient être,

---

[1] Voir *922/1516 tarihli Semendire Eflâkleri kanunnamesi,* ed., A. Akgündüz, *Osmanlı kanunnameleri ve hukuki, tahlilleri,* III, Istanbul 1991, p. 459: *Ve Semendire eflâkleri dahi harâç ve ispenç ve öşür ve hadet-i agnâm ve resm-i arus ve sayir rüsûmdan nesne vermezler.*

[2] Voir le règlement des *knez* et des *primikür* du *liva* de Vidin, ed. M. Berindei, M. Kalus-Martin, G. Veinstein, *Actes de Murad III...,* p. 57.

[3] A. Akgündüz, *op cit.,* p. 459: ve *sancakbegine verilen cürm ü cinâyetin öşrini, ber karan-î sâbik knezler alurlar;* en ce qui concerne les knez de Smederevo: *ve bunların cerâyiminin dahi öşrini knezler alub.*

[4] V Veliman, *op. cit.,* p. 419, 422.

[5] I. Karacson, *Török-Magyar ollevéltár 1533-1789,* Budapest, 1914, doc. no. 90, p. 80-81.

[6] I. Potaki, *Domeniul Hunedoara la începutul secolului al XVI-lea. Studiu şi documente,* Bucureşti, 1973 p. LXXI.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0046

à la fois, les représentants du propriétaire du domaine et, en tant que juges de village, les défenseurs des intérêts des paysans.[1] Vu que les nobles s'efforçaient à les réduire au servage, leur fonction de juge tant convoitée est devenue au XVI^e siècle une lourde servitude.[2]

À l'encontre d'autres documents concernant les Valaques balkaniques,[3] le *kanunname* du sandjaq de Temeşvar fait état du rôle militaire particulier, que les différentes catégories de *knez* ont joué dans la défense du Banat de Timişoara compris dans le *partes inferiores regni hungariae*. Il s'agit des *knez* nobiliaires (*knezii nobiles*) ou royaux et des *knez* des forteresses appelés aussi hussards (*knezii sive huzarones)*, qui étaient chargés de repousser les attaques ottomanes.[4] Ils devaient une "épée" au roi non seulement pour l'octroi de propriétés et de possessions mais aussi pour la conservation de leurs anciennes libertés et de leur autonomie administrative.[5]

L'importance d'ordre stratégique, que les Ottomans ont attribué au Banat au cours de leur expansion vers L'Europe centrale, explique aussi la reconnaissance du rôle militaire particulier des *knez* dans le sandjaq de Temeşvar. Le *kanunname* se réfère aux *knez* nobiliaires ainsi qu'aux *knez* des forteresses qu'ils appellent hussards.[6] Tout comme du temps du roi Jean Zápolya ils devaient, en cas d'expédition, prendre part à la défense de l'*eyalet* et joindre l'armée ottomane avec leur cheval, leur armure, leur bouclier, avec leur lance et avec toutes leurs armes.[7]

Pourtant, le *kanunname* n'a pas reconnu, à bon droit, leurs anciennes attributions judiciaires puisqu'il avait comme but de consolider l'administration ottomane, et, par conséquent, le rôle des *qadi*s au Banat. Le

---

[1] *Ibidem,* voir aussi I. Hategan, "Rezistenţa conezilor bă nă teni fatăt de politica de feudalizare în secolul al XIV-lea", *Banatica*, 6, 1981, p. 217; St. Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei,* I, Cluj, 1972, p. 217.

[2] D. Prodan, "Judele satului iobăgesc în Transilvania în secolele 17 şi 18", AJJC, 1961, p. 219. I. Pataki, *op. cit.,* p. LXXI.

[3] M. Berindei, A. Berthier, M. Martin, G. Veinstein, *Code de loi de Murad III,* p. 154; M. Berindei, M. Kalus-Martin, G. Veinstein, *Actes de Murad III, p. 56-58*; A. Akgündüz, *op. cit.*, vol., 2, p. 407-409, 491-494, vol. 3 p. 457-461.

[4] I. Pataki, *op. cit.,* p. LXIX; Cr. Feneşan, "Un proces de proprietate în districtul românesc Bârzav la mijlocul secolului al XV-lea", *SCJC*, Caransebeş, 1979, p. 292.

[5] I. Hategan, "Cnezi români în lupta antiotomana. Cnezi banateni şi hunedoreni în luptele lui Iancu de Hunedroara. Atestări documentare", Sargetia, 14, 1979, p. 225.

[6] V. Veliman, *op. cit.,* p. 4190 "ve vilâyet-i lesfûrde olan kâfir atlusi *husâr* dimekle meşhurlardır".

[7] *Ibidem:* "ve yahuz liva-i mezbure begi vâli olan begler bir cânibe sefer itdikde ki mezkürler dahi atı, donı ve gunder ve kalkanı ve sâir âlât-i harblariyle sefer hizmetin idüb mâ-dâm ki hizmetlerinde ki kusûrları olmıya...".

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0047

qadi était ainsi, d'après les *kanunname*s promulgués en 1554 pour les *sandjaq*s de Temeşvar et de Lipova, l'unique autorité ottomane, qui pouvait condamner les coupables à des amendes.[1] L'attitude du législateur ottoman diffère visiblement à cet égard de celle que les représentants de l'administration autrichienne ont adopté au cours de l'instauration de leur pouvoir dans cette région. C'est aussi l'explication du fonctionnement d'un siège de justice du *knez* assisté par un vice administrateur impérial (*Unterverwalter*) qui devait, en 1719, résoudre un conflit de possession.[2]

En outre, nous pouvons déceler, grâce au *kanunname* cité, la différence, qui existait entre la charge de *knez* et celle de *primicier (primikür)* dans le *sandjaq* de Temeşvar. "Les chefs des villages se trouvant dans le liva mentionné sont connus sous le nom de *primiciers (ve livâ-i merkumde vâki' olan kurâ kethudaları ki primikür dimekle ma'rufdur)*.[3] Ils avaient des attributions similaires à celles que les *knez* devaient accomplir. Il n'y avait pas de grandes différences entre leurs attributions et les devoirs inscrits dans les règlements concernant les *primiciers* de la région de Smederevo[4] ou les *knez* et les *primiciers* du *liva* de Vidin.[5] C'est ainsi que les *primiciers* aidaient à la perception des revenus de l'État (*mâi-i pâdişahi*), à la défense de la province et aussi à la garde contre les brigands et les bandits (*hâydud ve harami*). En cas de campagne militaire impériale *(sefer-i hümâyun)*, ils s'engageaient, à l'encontre des *primiciers* de la région de Smederevo, à joindre la cavalerie ottomane avec leur équipement complet (cheval, armure, bouclier, lance et d'autres armes).[6]

En échange de leur service, les *primiciers* jouissaient de la même exemption d'impôts et de contributions, reconnue non seulement aux *knez* du sandjaq de Temeşvar et à ceux du *liva* de Vidin,[7] mais aussi aux *primiciers* de la région de Smederevo.[8]

---

[1]Voir V. Veliman, *op. cit.*, p. 418 et Cr. Feneşan," Instaurarea dominatiei otomane în tinutul Lipovei în lumina codului de legi (kanun-name) din 1554", *SCJC*, Caransebeş, 1979, p. 335: "ve cerimleri hükm-i kadî lâhik olundukdan sonra".

[2]Voir Cr. Feneşan, "Mărturii despre cnezii banateni la începuturile stăpanirii austriece", *AJJA* Cluj Napoca, 21, 1978, p. 381.

[3]V. Veliman, *op. cit.*, p. 419, 422.

[4]M. Berindei, A. Berthier, M. Martin, G. Veinstein, *Code de lois...*, p. 154.

[5]M. Berindei, M. Kalus-Martin, G. Veinstein, *Actes de Murad...*, p. 56-57.

[6]V. Veliman, *op. cit.*, p. 419-422.

[7]M. Berindei, M. Kalus-Martin, G. Veinsten, *Actes de Murad...*, p. 57.

[8]M. Berindei, A. Berthier, M. Martin, G. Veinstein, *Code de lois...*, p. 154, 146-147.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0048

Nous disposons aussi d'une source unique, qui atteste, par ailleurs la continuité d'une institution administrative importante, présente chez toute population roumaine jouissant d'un statut particulier. D'après les recherches de N. Beldiceanu, chez les Valaques balkaniques la fonction des *primiciers* avait eu une origine plutôt byzantine que romaine.[1] Des mêmes recherches il ressort aussi que les sources roumaines éditées ne font pas état de la charge de *primicier* au nord du Danube.[2] Toutefois, nous sommes maintenant en état de prouver le contraire. L'inscription romaine du IV^e^ s. après J.-C. découverte sur une brique trouvée à Gornea, dans le Banat, prouve l'existence de cette institution jusqu'à l'époque ottomane. Cette inscription est jusqu'à présent le seul texte de proportions plus étendues écrit en latin avec des lettres italiques, après la retraite des autorités romaines de l'ancienne province de Dacie : "Rogo et peto *primicere* tunc puellam Bariam teretrum perdis" (Je te prie et je te conjure *primicier*, parce que tu détruis de plus en plus, mon trésor, l'esclave Baria)".[3] On ne peut pas, malheureusement, préciser ni la qualité, ni la fonction exacte du *primicier*, mentionné dans l'inscription de Gornea. Il pouvait être soit un gradé, soit un fonctionnaire chargé des travaux de fortification, qui commandait une partie de la cavalerie (*equites*). Dans le milieu, qui nous intéresse, la fonction de *primicier* devait revêtir un caractère militaire qu'il a gardé aussi à l'époque ottomane.[4]

D'autre part, la survivance et le développement des institutions citées ne doivent pas être considérés comme la seule voie par laquelle les autorités ottomanes ont assuré l'intégration des communautés roumaines dans le système administratif local du *sandjaq* de Temeşvar. Les recherches faites par T. Halasi-Kun sur le *defter-i mufassal* n° 579 de 1579 du *sandjaq* de Temeşvar prouvent l'adoption dans la forme du *nahiye*[5] de quelques *districtus volahales* : Fhirdea (Tverd), Şudea (Sugya) et Manaştur (Monostor) dans le comté de Timiş à la veille de la conquête ottomane. N'oublions pas que les états du royaume de Hongrie eussent essayé, en vain, leur suppression en 1518.[6] Cependant les autorités ont renoncé à cette décision par suite de la résistance acharnée faite par les communautés roumaines, qui ont défendu ainsi leurs

---

[1] N. Beldiceanu, *Les Valaques de Bosnie...*, p. 129.

[2] *Ibidem*; *idem, Les Roumains des Balkans...*, p. 16.

[3] Voir N. Gudea, I. Dragomir, "Caramida romana cu text cusiv din secolul al IV-lea descoperita la Gornea", *Banatica*, 3, Reşita, 1975, p. 107.

[4] *Ibidem*, p. 108; voir aussi V. Veliman *op. cit.*, p. 149, 422.

[5] Pour l'équivalance comté=*nahiye* voir T. Halasi-Kun, *Haram county and the Ottoman Modava Nahiyesi, AO, 9*, 1984, p. 27; pour la survivance des districtes volahales voir, *idem, The Rumanians of Districtus Volahalia Tverd...*, p. 121; *idem, The Rumanians of Districti Volahalis Monostor...* p. 279; *idem*, Serbians and Rumanians..., *p. 113.*

[6] Voir Şt. Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei*, IV, Cluj-Napoca, 1989, p. 55-56.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0049

anciens privilèges. Selon une nouvelle décision on devait annexer les trois districts au comté de Timiş sous condition de prouver leur ancienne appartenance au comté.[1]

Les raisons de cette adoption semblent être plutôt d'ordre géographie et pragmatique. Les districts mentionnés ne se trouvaient pas dans une région de frontière, exposée aux ravages de la guerre. On ne devait pas, par conséquent, leur modifier les confins ni par des raisons d'ordre stratégique, ni par suite d'une expansion. De plus, ces districts roumains étaient sis sur le cours supérieur de la rivière de Bega et de ses affluents.

Le district de Fhirdea nommé par le *mufassal* Ferdiya ou Furdya[2] comprenait les villages du bassin supérieur et moyen de la rivière de Gladna, affluent de la Bega tandis que les villages du district de Manaştur se trouvaient sur les bords de la Bega et sur la rive droite de ses affluents. À l'ouest de cette région et au nord de la rivière de Bega était sis le district de Şudea.[3] Dans ce cas, on peut parler d'une continuité non seulement ethnique et toponymique mais aussi d'ordre administratif.

La comparaison des données fournies par le *mufassal* n° 579 avec celles renfermées par d'autres sources prouvent l'identité, du point de vue administratif, des nahiyes de Monostor, Şudiya et Ferdiya avec les trois districts roumains du même nom de l'époque préottomane.[4] L'absence de toute référence au *adet-i Eflâk* ou au *Eflâk kanunu*[5] n'exclut pas la survivance de facto des *districtus volahales* en tant que structures administratives roumaines maintenues par la royauté hongroise en vertu de leurs raisons stratégiques.[6] Les districts en cause appartenaient à la catégorie des districts non privilégiés,

---

[1] *Ibidem,* p. 55.

[2] T. Halasi-Kun, *The Rumanians of Districtus Volahalis Tverd...,* p. 123; v. Achim, "Districtele medievale româneşti de pe valea superioara a Begheiului", *AJJE* Cluj-Napoca, 30, 1990-1991, p. 28.

[3] T. Halasi-kun, *The Rumanians of Districti Volahales Monostor...,* p. 279; pour la comparaison voir aussi I. Paeki, *op. cit.,* p. XLVII, v. Achim, *op. cit.,* p. 28-29.

[4] T. Halasi-Kun, *Haram County,* p. 29; *idem, The Rumanians of Districti Volahales Monostor...,* p. 252, 253; *idem; Serbians and Rumanians...,* p. 125.

[5] Pour l'*adet-i Eflâk*, c'est-à-dire le *jus valachicum* voir N. Beldiceanu, "Les valachica dans un kanunname du sultan Selim I", *dans Proceedings of the twenty-second congress of Orientalist.* Istanbul, 1951, Leiden, 1957, p. 377-388; Val. Al. Georgescu, *Jus valachicum dans Istoria dreptului românesc,* I, Bucarest, 1980, p. 172-182; L, Marcu, *Le jus valachicum et le statut personnel des valaques balkaniques au Moyen-âgê* dans *Recherches sur l'histoire des institutions et du droit,* Bucarest, 1981, p. 127-134; A. Tanaşoca, *Autonomia vlahilor...,* p. 1513-1517.

[6] Cr. Feneşan, "Districtul românesc Mehadia la sfârşitul secolului al XIv-lea", *Banatica,* 5, 1979, p. 265,275; V. Achim, *O institutie românească în Banatul medieval: adunarile obşteşti din districte,* RI, 41, 1988, 2, p. 191-203; pour les districts roumains non privilégiés voir I. Vuia, *Districtus Walachorum. Cercurile româneşti banatene. Cele din Timiş reconstituite pentru prima oara,* Timişoara, 1929, p. 42-49; Z. Pâclişanu, *Vechile districte româneşti de peste munti.* Revista Istorica Româna, 13, 1943, 2, p. 21-25; St. Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei,* IV, Cluj-Napoca, 1984, p. 40-68.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0050

dont les actes du XV^e siècle font mention.[1] En 1440, les frères Hundayi étaient récompensés avec la possession des trois districts pour des hauts faits d'armes dans la lutte contre les Ottomans.[2] Le fait qu'on ne mentionne pas l'*adet-i Eflâk* est compensé par la liste complète des habitants roumains de ces districts.[3]

Pour conclure, rappelons que les institutions et les structures administratives mises en question démontrent, d'abord, la tendance des autorités ottomanes d'assimiler des formes administratives pré-ottomanes. Elles prouvent, ensuite, le rôle joué par ces formes dans l'administration locale ottomane. On peut surprendre, ainsi, la profondeur des changements d'ordre administratif subis par le Banat de Timişoara, qui avait appartenu jusqu'en 1552 aux *partes inferiores regni Hungariae*.

Le maintien des institutions et des structures administratives pré-ottomanes a assuré une certaine continuité dans l'administration locale ottomane. C'est aussi la voie par laquelle les autorités ottomanes ont réussi à intégrer, dans un système administratif homogène, toute une série de régions et une mosaïque de populations.

Liste des abréviations

AIIC - Anuarul Institutului de istorie Cluj
AIIAC - Cluj-Napoca Institutului de I İstorie si Archelogie Cluj-Napoca
AO - Archivum Ottomanicum
EH - Études Historiques (Sofia)
GZM - Glasnuk Zemaliskog Muzeja (Sarayevo)
IC- Istoriski casopis (Belgrad)
IG - Istoriski Glasnik (Belgrad)
İUİFK - Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası (Istanbul)
OA - Osmanlı Araştırmaları (Istanbul)
RA - Revista Arhivelor
RÉI- Revue des Études Islamiques
RÉR - Revue des Études Roumaines
RESEE - Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes
RI- Revista de *I*storie

[1] V. Motogna, "contributii la istoria Românilor banateni în evul mediu. Districtele româneşti în Banatul de alta data", dans Studii Istorice, I, Timişoara, 1944, p. 17; idem, *Banatul românesc în cele dintâi veacuri ale stapanirii ungureşti, ibidem,* p. 298; V. Achim, *op. cit.*, p. 28, 32.
[2] I. Pataki, *op. cit.*, p. XIV.
[3] T. Halasi-Kun, *The Rumanians of Districtus Volahalis Tverd...*, p. 122; *idem, Serbians and Rumanians...*, p. 114.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0051

RNDBH - Radovi Naucmog Drustur Bosna i Hercegovina
SCIC - Studii si Communicări de Istorie-Caransebeş
SMIM - Studii si Materiale de Istorie
SOF - Südost Forschungen
ZB - Zeitschrift für Balkanologie

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0052

VARNA AT THE END OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY: TIMAR-HOLDINGS AND POPULATION

M. Mehdi İLHAN

INTRODUCTION

Varna, a city of export with a fortress, is situated on the Black Sea coast, at a place where the river Djevna (Devna) pours into the sea. It is also the centre of a province carrying the same name. This province lies to the south of the Dobrudja. In ancient times on its present location there was a Miletos colony named Odessos founded in 585 B.C. In fact the Greeks had not only settled in Odessos, (Varna), but also in Bizone (near Kavarna), Kalliakra (Galata, Geligra or Kelgira) and Kruni (Balçık). Varna was also an important town during the Roman period. It derives its name from the river Djevna which was actually called Varna until 679 A.D. The city of Varna also has a fortress to stand the attacks both from the Black Sea and from land. The fortress is situated on the northern coast of a bay (inlet) made up of two capes. On the northern cape there is another place of settlement called Galata (Kaliacré, Kalliakra). The area between Kalliakra and Varna was marshy at least at the time of the famous battle of 1444 that took place in 1444 between the Ottoman forces under Murad II and the Hungarians.[1]

Murad I's campaign against Şişman (Ivan), the king of Bulgaria in 1376, had ended in payment of a tribute. However, Şişman rebelled after the battle of Ploshnik in 1388. Therefore, Murad sent Çandarlı Halil Hayreddin's elder son Ali Pasha with 30,000 men against him. Prevadi, Şumnu, Preslav, Madera and Timova were occupied. The Turkish conquests continued with that of Silistra and the southern part of Dobrudja. In fact it was the conquest of Varna that actually took place. The conquest was carried out in 1393 and Varna became a Turkish town and a citadel.[2]

Mircea cel Bătrân, the Romanian *voyvoda*, was in possession of Dobrudja from 1389 to 1394. Bayezid defeated him in 1394 and occupied the land on this side of the Danube. However, Mircea prince of Wallachia, retook

---

[1] M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, S.V. "Varna", *İA*, Istanbul 1986.
[2] *Ibid.*, İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, S.V.. "Ali Paşa, Çandarlızade", *İA.*, Istanbul 1978.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0053

all these places back after the battle of Ankara in 1402. He also conquered Kili from the Genoese.[1] Mircea acted against the Ottomans at every chance he got. His support of Şeyh Bedreddin in Dobrudja and Deli Orman finally roused the Ottoman anger. Therefore, Sultan Mehmed I undertook a campaign against Mircea. This campaign resulted in the reconquest of Dobrudja which remained in the hands of the Ottomans for 460 years from 1419 to 1877.[2] The Ottomans used Dobrudja as a base to bring the other side of the Danube under their control. Moldavia was invaded in 1476 during Mehmed II's reign. Sultan Bayezid II during his campaign of 1484 to Wallachia conquered Kili and Akkerman, the northern part of Dobrudja.[3] He had grand mosques as well as many other monuments built in Kili and Akkerman and a mosque and *zaviye* of Sarı Saltuk erected in Babadağ during this expedition. He also gave many endowments to the *zaviye*. According to some sources, however, the tomb of Sarı Saltuk was built by Mengli Giray.[4]

Dobrudja, soon after the conquest of 1419 was put under the Beylerbeğilik of Rumeli. Murad III (1574-1595), as part of his administrative reforms, divided the country into large *eyalet*s (provinces) with many *sancak*s. A new *eyalet*, the northern fringes of which ran along the river Dniester, was established in 1593 to put halt to Cossack raids. This *eyalet*, which included Dobrudja, comprised the *sancak*s of Bender, Akkerman, Kili, and Silistre.[5] Sultan Murad must have also issued a decree for a census to be carried out in this large *eyalet*. Indeed, a detailed (*mufassal*) cadastral register of Silistre (Ankara *TKGM*, Kuyûd-i Kadîme Archive, *Tahrir Defter* No. 86). The *nahiye* of Varna, therefore, most probably was also established by Sultan Murad III. I would like to give an outline of the registers that cover this large *eyalet* before I precede giving a detailed study of the *nahiye* of Varna.

There are nineteen cadastral registers of Silistre preserved in Başbakanlık Archives of Istanbul dating from 924 A.H./1518 A.D. to 992 A.H./1584 A.D. and only one *timar* register of Varna dated 949 A.H./1542 AD.[6] However it is very likely that the *nahiye* of Varna was included in the registers of Silistre. In fact they should be considered as one register in two volumes, despite the differences in their dates. Also the volume numbers put

[1] M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, *op. cit*, *İA*; H. İnalcık, S.V. "Dobrudja",

[2] A. Decei, S.V "Dobrudja", *İslam Ansiklopedisi,* Istanbul 1977.

[3] H. İnalcık, "Dobrudja",. For more details on conquests of Kili and Akkerman see Hoca Sadettin Efendi, *Tacü't-tevarih,* vol. III., ed. İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, Eskişehir 1992, pp. 238-240.

[4] A. Decei, *op. cit.*, H. İnalcık, *op. cit.* According to "Saltukname" of Kenan Paşa, the governor of Özi, Sarı Saltuk, a contemporary of Hacı Bektaş, had migrated from Anatolia to Dobrudja.

[5] A. Decei, *op. cit.* TKM Kuyûd-i Kadîme Archive, *Tapu Tahrir Defteri* No. 83.

[6] See *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi,* Ankara 1992, pp. 215 and 219.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0054

on the covers should be reverse. The *mufassal* register 5, vol. 27 No. 86 dates from Mehmed III's (1595-1603) reign and covers the *nahiye*s of Varna (9B), Prevadi (89B), Yanbolu (166B), Nevahi-i Yanbolu (200B), Ahyolu (213B), Ruskasri (232B), Karinabad (251B) and Aydos (274B). The *mufassal* register (vol. 1) No. 83 was also carried out during Mehmed III's reign but is dated 1006 A.H./1597-98 A.D. Since this one has a *kanunname* (fols. 2a-18a) and a *tuğra* it would mean this one is actually the first volume while the register No. 86 is the second volume of the detailed cadastre of the province of Silistre. It should also be pointed out that the register No. 86 should also bear the date 1006 A.H. The *mufassal* register No. 83 covers the *kaza*s of Akkirman (IB), Cankirman (31B), Kili (34B), Bender (49B), Brăila (62B), Silistre (72B), Hârşova (195B) and Tekfurgölü (292B). The *evkaf* register No. 561 also dates from Mehmed III's reign and most probably should bear the same date as its villages that were not included in the *mufassal* register are to be found in this volume. This would at the same time mean that they were already *vakıf*s at the time of registration. This *vakıf* register covers the *nahiye*s of Akkerman (4B), Silistre (43B, 305A, 310B), Hârşova (64A, 311B), Varna (76A, 111A, 305A, 307B, 312A), Tekfurgölü (125B), Prevadi (140A, 303B), Ruskasrı (180B, 306B), Karinabad (187B), Aydos (209A, 305B), Ahyolu (256B, 307A) and Yanbolu (280A). The *icmal* (synoptic) register No. 222 dates from Murad III's reign (1574-1595) which might mean that either an *icmal* register was drawn out before the *mufassal* (detailed) census took place or it is the synopsis of a previous register perhaps that of 992 A.H./1584 A.D.[1] However my conviction is that it is a synopsis of the former, since the figures given for incomes of almost all the villages recorded in the *icmal* correspond exactly to those of the former. The other two register are *derdest defter*s (n. 378 and 427) in which the various guards of the *nahiye*s of Silistre, Varna, Hârşova, Prevadi, Tekfurgölü, Karinabad, Aydos, Ruskasrı, Yanbolu and Ahyolu are recorded. The records of guards are to be found also in the *icmal* (synoptic) register No. 222 mentioned above. There are also six villages of Varna recorded as of "Evkaf-i Muhammed Beğ ibn-i Ahmed Paşa" in the *vakıf* register of Siroz No. 577 on folio 174a. I have made use of *mufassal* (detailed), *vakıf* (endowment) and *icmal* (synoptic) registers for this paper.[2]

---

[1] In one of my articles I have worked out from *Mühimme Defter*s that a detailed census was carried out in Silistre from 1582 to 1584. See M. M. İlhan, "The Process of Ottoman Cadastral Surveys during the Second Half of Sixteenth Century: a Study Based on the Documents from *Mühimme Defter*s", AIIAAX XXIV/1, 1987, pp. 17-25.

[2] For these and other registers preserved in Ankara Tapu Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü Kuyûd-i Kadîme Archives a catalogue prepared by Aslıhan Doğu (*Tapu Kadastro Kuyûd-i Kadîm Arşivi Mufassal, Icmal, Evkaf ve Derdest Defterlerinin Toplu Kataloğu*, an under-graduate dissertation submitted to Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, Ankara 1993) should be consulted at the archives mentioned.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0055

A survey for the registration of Silistre province most probably started sometime in 1593 or perhaps 1594 and ended in 1598 as explained above. The survey for Varna most probably took place sometime between these dates and perhaps lasted less than five years. However it is possible to claim that the registration of the whole province could not have taken place in less than four years. It is most probably due to this survey as well as to external danger that might have risen due to this survey that a decree was issued almost the same year (December 1594) for the *beğ*s and *sipahi*s of the provinces of Akkerman, Silistre, Kili, Bender and Niğbolu to stay in their *sancak*s and not to go on campaigns. In fact some new officials were sent to the province under the command of Mustafa Paşa, the beğlerbeyi of Maraş, Çavuşbaşı Mustafa Ağa and Sadr-nişin Ferhad Paşa. Even Piri Kethuda, the *sancak beyi* of Silistre, who was on a campaign at the time, was dismissed from his post and Çavuşbaşı Serdar Mustafa Ağa was appointed in his stead. The appointment appears to have been made after Mustafa Ağa had left the Port, perhaps out of fear that the former beğ Piri Kethuda might not be able to get back to his *sancak* on time.[1]

REVENUES AND FIEF HOLDINGS IN VARNA[2]

Administratively Varna was under the *sancak* of Silistre. In the *vakıf* register it is referred to as "Nahiye-i Varna". The administrative centre of this *nahiye* was the town of Varna itself. Apart from Varna it had four other big towns, most probably *nahiye* centres under the jurisdiction of Varna although specifically they are not pointed out as such in the register. These were Balçık, Kavarna, Kaliakra and Bazarcık (Hacıoğlu Bazarcığı). However, we can infer from the register that Balçık and Bazarcık were *nahiye* centres since in the register they are specifically referred to as "Kasaba-i..." (meaning *Town of...*). Kavarna, however, is referred to as "Karye-i..." (meaning *Village of...*). Varna and Kaliakra had citadels ("Kal'a-i"). A fair (*panayir*) was held at Hacıoğlu Bazarcığı on the 15th of May every year.

The detailed register of the *nahiye* of Varna is covered between the pages 9-177 (folios 9b-89b) of the register No. 86. According to this register there were, apart from 64 recorded in the *vakıf* register, 260 places of settlements in the *nahiye* of Varna. That means there were altogether 324 places of settlement in the *nahiye*. The total income from the *nahiye* of

[1] See Selaniki Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selaniki (971-1003/1563-1595)*, edited Mehmet İpşirli, Istanbul 1989, p. 423.

[2] I have not given any references in this section due to the fact that whatever is said can be traced through the tables in the appendix.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0056

Varna was, 1,625,477 *akçe*s of which 638,551 *akçe*s went to the *vakıf* as it is clear from the *vakıf* register. The maximum income, according to the detailed register, was 32,666 *akçe*s from Balçık while the minimum was 55 *akçe*s from the *zaviye* of Pirhan Baba. However the highest income with 236,472 *akçe*s was from the town of Varna itself as recorded in the *vakıf* register. The total income of 986,926 *akçe*s recorded in the *mufassal* register which does not correspond to that of *icmal* (synoptic) register was entirely of *ze'amet* and *timar* type and came only from 213 villages of not only Varna but of some other *nahiye*s from fifteen villages and went to Mustafa kethuda who was a kethuda of Hidir Paşa and *müteferrika* of the Sultan's court. The minimum income was 804 *akçe*s from the village Osman Kuyusu and went to Hidir b. Tanduk. It appears that those who were in the service of the Imperial court were *ze'amet* holders with relatively high incomes while the others were *timar* holders with incomes varying roughly between 1,000 to 6,000 *akçe*s. There are no clues to work out the place of origin of these *ze'amet* and *timar* holders.

The villages of Nalbendoğlu Pınarı, Bedr Kuyusu, Etmek 'Ömer, Kerane, Sabile, Kila'i Sinan Kuyusu, Ishak, Söğüdcük, and Kavarna with relatively high incomes were of Imperial *Hass* (*Hass-i Hümâyûn*). The income from the town of Balçık and the citadel of Kaliakra also went to the Imperial *Hass*. The Imperial Hass is specifically pointed out until the page 39 of the *mufassal* (detailed) register. Accordingly our calculation shows that the total income for Imperial Hass amounted to 183,468 *akçe*s from a total of 26 places of settlement. The highest income with 32,666 *akçe*s was from the village of Kovarna while the lowest with 590 *akçe*s was from the village of "Mahalle-i (*sic*) Musa Beğ der nezd-i Karye-i Mustafa Fakih". Perhaps Musa Beğ was a quarter with ten households near the village of Mustafa Fakih and therefore had low income. The average income from the villages of Imperial Hass was about 4,000 *akçe*s while the average from all villages of *timar* and *ze'amet* holdings was 3,000 *akçe*s. considering the rest of the villages recorded after page 39 as *ze'amet* and *timar* holdings. I have calculated that their total income was 799,824 *akçe*s. The highest income with 30,000 *akçe*s was from the village of "Süleyman Cema'at-i Kara Hamza" while the lowest with only 55 *akçe*s from the *zaviye* of Pirhan Baba which in fact was a *vakıf*. A village with the lowest income for *timar* holdings was Habib İlyas Yurdi with only 349 *akçe*s.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0057

According to the register the main *vakıf*s were those of Sultan Selim Han, Davud Paşa, two *zaviye*s and Ismehan Sultan. The total income for these *vakıf*s amounted to 638,551 *akçe*s from a total of 64 places of settlements. The highest income with 236,472 *akçe*s was from the town of Varna and the lowest the *mezre'a*s of Muhammed Kısa and Ermeni with only 50 *akçe*s each.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE REVENUES OF THE *NAHIYE* OF VARNA

It is clear that the Imperial Hass got the lowest share of the income as compared to the others. However, proportionally, both the Imperial Hass and the *vakıf*s were better off and they had the income from most productive places such as big towns and harbours.

As I have already mentioned most of the revenues of the *nahiye* came from the big towns. This was most probably due not only to their proportionally high population but also to the trade that took place in their markets as well as the merchant ships that anchored at their harbours. However the main sources of revenue were in any case agricultural goods. Wheat, barley, rye, millet, lentils were the main crops grown in the area. Gardens, orchards and vineyards as well as wines were all taxed. Taxes were put on animals, particularly pigs and beehives. The Muslim inhabitants paid *resm-i çift* at 22 *akçe*s per *çift* and the non-Muslims paid *ispenç* at 25 *akçe*s per married man and 12 *akçe*s per adult male. The tax put on mills was mostly 60 *akçe*s per *dolab-bab*. The tax on wheat and lentils was 7 *akçe*s per kile while on barley and millet it was 4 *akçe*s per kile. The vineyards were taxed at 12 *akçe*s per *dönüm*.

The *müselleman* (sappers) who were charged with guarding the citadels such as that of Kaliakra and Varna or serving at the harbours such as that of Balçık were exempt from *'avarız-ı divaniyye* (extraordinary taxes) but had to pay their tithes (*öşür*) and other taxes. *Derbendci*s who were stationed at certain passes and charged with repairing roads and bridges were likewise exempt from *'avarız-ı divaniyye* (i.e. village of Yörük Kalkalı). The *zaviye*s (i.e. the *zaviye* of Pirhan Baba) were also exempt from *'avarız-ı divaniyye*.

The citadels of Varna and Kaliakra according to the *icmal* register had certain officials called *mustahfazan* who had *timar* holdings with incomes arranged according to their ranks. These were *dizdar* (commander), *kethuda*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0058

(deputy), *imam* and *bevvab* (doorman). The total income for these officials including the *çakırcıyan* and *sahinciyan* was 44,300 *akçe*s from 16 villages. The *kethuda* of Varna received 4,000 *akçe*s and its *imam* 1,457 *akçe*s.

The revenues and their distribution to the fief-holders in Varna is a reflection of Ottoman administrative system in the area. However, more information is needed from many other registers in order to make any conclusions. But it may be inferred from what is said that the Ottomans tried to keep a balance in administering an area through the *timar*-system.

POPULATION OF VARNA

The *mufassal* (detailed) registers of course are good sources for working out the population of an area as well as deriving information on social conditions of the inhabitants. In the register of Varna the households (*hane*) and bachelors (*mücerred*) are recorded following the names of the villages and in the cases of towns the names of the quarters. The first entries in the villages are usually names of important personalities and in the towns the names of either an *imam, hatip* or a *kethuda* for Muslim quarters and the names of the priests for Christian quarters. The names of Muslim quarters were mostly derived from the names of mosques while those of Christians from the names of priests. In Christians quarters the first entries sometimes were the same as the names of the quarters (i.e. quarters of Papa Manol, Kiryakoz Papa, and Manasi in Varna; quarters of Niko or Yako, Karagöz, and Keryo or Kerlo in Balçık). We can infer from this fact that the Ottomans actually named the quarters at the time of registration. This practice appears to have been adopted by the locals as well. This case also was applicable to the Muslim quarters so long as the founder of the mosque or his son was alive (i.e. in the town of Bazarcık the first entry was Süleyman *al-imam* for the quarter of Mescid-i Süleyman Havace, and Muslihi'd-din v. Hacı Nasuh for the quarter of Mescid-i Hacı Nasuh). We find such practice in some other registers as well. The registers of Şehrizol and Erbil in the case of villages and that of Basra and Amid in the case of quarters are good examples of such practice.[1] As already implied the quarters were divided into Muslim and non-Muslim. Further distinction was those of Copts and *cema'at*s such as *müselleman,*

[1]TKGM Kuyûd-i Kadîme Archive, *Basra Defteri,* No. 94, v. 51a ve 15b-32b; Compare Başbakanlık Archive, *Basra Defteri,* No. 282, s. 38-67. Nineteen quarters were called as such: Havace Fudaly; Hasan v. Meziyet; Biaret Heyyayi; Şükrü'l-lah v. Hayru'l-lah; Hacı Muhammed; Re'is Halil; Hamid v. Hüseyin; Seyyid 'Ali Kevvaz; Bezzaz v. 'Ali; Hilal v. Süleyman; Sa'd v. Kutami; Muhammed v. Sultan; 'Anber v. Hüseyin; Ramazan v. Celal Hannak; Salim v. Farah; Hamis v. Seyf; Satiyan be-ismi-i Nasr Sati; Ferah v. 'Ali Berdu.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0059

derziyan and *etmekçiyan*. The villages could also be distinguished as Muslim or non-Muslim through either their names or the names of *hane* (household) and *mücerred* (bachelor) entries. Given all this information it was possible to work out the population of the *nahiye*. In working out the population, I have followed Ö. L. Barkan's method of multiplying the *hane* (household) with 5 and adding *mücerred* (bachelors) to the figure found. I did not take into account 10% *'askeri* (soldiers) for I believe the figure was not that high and that the figures for *mücerred*s (bachelors) were unusually high throughout the *nahiye*. There were even cases such as in the quarters of Gazi Baba and Mescid-i Hacı Bayram in the town of Bazarcık where the number of *mücerred*s was higher than that of *hane*s. The total population of the *nahiye* of Varna including all the villages and towns recorded both in the *mufassal* and *vakıf* register was 53,655. Of these 35,802 were recorded in the *mufassal* and 17,853 in the *vakıf* register. According to the *vakıf* register 677 of these population were *perakende* (scattered or had abandoned their original places). According to the *mufassal* register 31,746 were Muslims and 4,056 were non-Muslims and according to the *vakıf* register 7,945 were Muslims and 9,908 were non-Muslims. Therefore, 39,691 of the total population of the *nahiye* of Varna were Muslims while 13,964 were non-Muslims. 74% were Muslims and 26% were non-Muslims.

The population that lived in towns, citadels and relatively big villages (Varna, Balçık, Bazarcık, Kavarna, Keliakra, Söğüdcük and Ekerne) were 14,757 which means 28% of the total population. The remaining 72% were living in villages. The number of Muslims living in the towns and relatively big settlements were 7,722 while the Christians were 7,035.

It is clear that the population of Muslims was higher than those of non-Muslims both in villages and big settlements. Both Muslims and Christians were living side by side particularly in towns. Therefore there must have been a cultural exchange particularly through trade.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0060

Table 1

POPULATION OF THE *NAHIYE* OF VARNA ACCORDING TO THE *MUFASSAL* REGISTER[1]

Town-Village	Quarter	Rel.	Page	Popu.	Hane	Müc.	Income
Abudul'lah	x	Ms.	121	112	21	7	2838
Agçe Pınarı	x	Ms.	155	27	5	2	1500
Agar Kuyusu	x	Ms.	97	57	11	2	1363
Agar Oğulları	x	Ms.	102	146	28	6	6000
Agaroğlu kuyusu	x	Ms.	96	118	22	8	4680
Ak Hamza, Mz.	x	Ms.	175				315
Ak Pınar	x	Ms.	157	6	1	1	1390
Ak Pınar	Gebr	Ch.	157	65	13		
Ak Pınar	x	Ch.	176	220	44		1200
Akıncı Kuyusu	x	Ms.	34	99	18	9	1400
Alaceket	x	Ms.	107	95	17	10	4400
Alaed'dinlu Küçük	x	Ms.	77	72	13	7	3850
Ali Beg. Cm.	x	Ms.	98	38	7	3	2496
Ali Halife	x	Ms.	94	235	42	25	4000
Ali Kuyusu	x	Ms.	137	10	2		1000
Alice	x	Ms.	80	190	35	15	3000
Alice	x	Ms.	148	155	28	15	3000
Alice Kuyusu	x	Ms.	111	110	20	10	6990
Arguz Kuyusu	x	Ms.	81	102	19	7	2110
Armağan Kuyusu	x	Ms.	112	42	8	2	1000
Armağanoğlu Kuyusu	x	Ms.	108	69	13	4	4000
Armudlu	x	Ms.	126	76	14	6	6000
Arnavud Kuyusu	x	Ms.	120	139	26	9	4162
Arnavud Kuyusu	x	Ms.	167	87	16	7	1200
Artık Ali	x	Ms.	101	64	12	4	2541
Aşık Yurdu	x	Ms.	126	68	13	3	1000
Aşık Yurdu	x	Ch.	126	10	2		
Asiyab, 11 bab in total	x	Ms.	167				645
Atiyesi Fakih	x	Ms.	129	41	8	1	4000
Aydın Halan, Mz.	x	Ms.	151	63	12	3	1296
Ayu Ormanı	x	Ms.	114	208	38	18	8000
Ayu Ormanı	x	Ms.	119	141	26	11	6850
Aziz Bey Köyü	x	Ms.	48	18	3	3	1238

[1]This table is made up from TKGM Kuyûd-i Kadîme Archive, *Tahrir Defter* No. 86 The abbreviations used in these tables are as follows: C.: Cami'-i; Cm.: Cema'at-i; Ch.: Christians; Mh.: Mahalle-i; Msc.: Mescid-i; Mz.: Mezre'a-i; Müc.: Mücerred; Ms.: Muslims; Popul.: Population; Rel.: Religion; v.: veled-i;

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0061

Börklüce Döllüğü	x	Ms.	61	107	20	7	1200
Büyük Özköynük	x	Ms.	123	105	16	25	3101
Bahsayiş Pınarı	x	Ms.	147	79	15	4	3216
Balçık	x	Ms.	13				30000
Balçık	Cami'i'Atik	Ms.	13	594	106	64	
Balçık	Niko v. Yako	Ch.	14	313	57	28	
Balçık	Karagöz v. Piro	Ch.	15	184	31	29	
Balçık	Keryo	Ms.	15	10	2		
Balçık	Keryo	Ch.	15	27	5	2	
Balçık	Karaca Halib	Ms.	16	108	19	13	
Balçık	Kara Mahmud	Ms.	16	160	27	25	
Balçık	Turgud	Ms.	16	139	24	19	
Balçık	Hacı Hamza	Ms.	17	156	28	16	
Balçık	Uzun Piri	Ms.	17	96	17	11	
Balçık	Hacı Murad, C.	Ms.	17	168	29	23	
Balçık	Hacı Bali	Ms.	18	83	15	8	
Balçık	Köse Turgud, Msc.	Ms.	18	140	25	15	
Balçık	Receb Halife	Ms.	18	177	30	27	
Balçık	Uzun Hamza	Ms.	19	232	39	37	
Balçık	Kerdeli	Ms.	20	182	34	12	
Balçık	Baluhiyan	Ms.	20	150	30		
Balçık	Baluhiyan	Ms.	21	25	4	5	
Balçık	Cema'at-i gargarıcı	Ms.	21	30	6		
Balçık	Cema'at-i gargarıcı	Ch.	21	30	6		
Balçık	Cema'at-i derziyan	Ms.	21	20	4		
Balçık	Cema'at-i derziyan	Ch.	21	30	6		
Balçık	Cema'at-i etmekçiyan	Ch.	21	115	23		
Balçık, karye	x	Ms.	22	77	14	7	2267
Bali Fakih Kargalik	x	Ms.	53	229	42	19	6984
Balkırce Iskender	x	Ms.	89	132	24	12	1900
Balluca cm. Sarı Venderx		Ms.	104	182	33	17	4419
Bas Elmalu	x	Ms.	146	159	29	14	4000
Baş Pınar	x	Ms.	140	80	14	10	3677
Basri Kuyusu	x	Ms.	147	53	10	3	4715
Bazarcık	x	Ms.	62				20000
Bazarcık	Cami'-i'Atik	Ms.	62	416	73	51	
Bazarcık	Gazi Baba	Ms.	63	527	85	102	
Bazarcık	Hacı Bayram, Msc.	Ms.	64	153	25	28	
Bazarcık	Ömer Havace	Ms.	65	115	20	15	
Bazarcık	Hacı Kara Ali, Msc.	Ms.	65	135	23	20	
Bazarcık	Hacı Süleyman, Msc.	Ms.	65	60	11	5	
Bazarcık	Hacı Hamza, Msc.	Ms.	66	119	22	9	
Bazarcık	Karlı, Msc.	Ms.	66	172	31	17	

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0062

Bazarcık	Koçeri	Ms.	66	327	56	47	
Bazarcık	Hacı Suca', Msc.	Ms.	67	63	11	8	
Bazarcık	Süleyman Havace, Msc.	Ms.	67	168	31	13	
Bazarcık	Cedid Cami'	Ms.	68	119	18	29	
Bazarcık	Hacı Yusuf, Küçük	Ms.	68	154	22	44	
Bazarcık	Hacı Nasuh, Msc.	Ms.	69	122	20	22	
Bazarcık	Koyunlu Hatun, Msc.	Ms.	69	135	24	15	
Bazarcık	Cedid Hacı Bayram, C.	Ms.	70	83	15	8	
Bazarcık	Gebran	Ch.	70	83	14	13	
Bazarcık	Kibtiyan	Ms.	70	54	9	9	
Bazarlı kuyusu	x	Ms.	102	54	10	4	4223
Bedr Kuyusu	x	Ms.	9	120	22	10	7976
Begandi? Kuyusu	x	Ms.	132	89	16	9	6678
Bektaş Kuyusu	x	Ms.	75	85	15	10	1900
Beni Kayyum, Cm.	x	Ms.	129	171	32	11	6000
Birce	x	Ms.	87	195	35	20	5000
Bogdan Yusuf	x	Ms.	116	124	23	9	1950
Burhan	x	Ms.	143	111	20	11	2725
Cökelü Üç Orman	x	Ms.	124	107	20	7	3500
Cökelü Üç Orman	x	Ch.	124	10	2		
Calab Virdi, Mz.	x	Ms.	168				300
Calan Musa	x	Ms.	32	88	16	8	3020
Cavlı Aşık	x	Ms.	145	90	17	5	3462
Cayir-i Gölcük	x	Ms.	57	164	29	19	2018
Celud Kuyusu	x	Ms.	155	96	19	1	2000
Celik Nasuh	x	Ms.	137	80	15	5	4000
Cirak Kuyusu	x	Ms.	51	32	6	2	2520
Ciran Köyü	x	Ms.	124	140	24	20	6000
Coban İsa	x	Ms.	136	44	8	4	3000
Çoban Kuyusu	x	Ms.	83	132	24	12	3850
Coral Kuyusu	x	Ms.	35	173	32	13	2100
Curun-i Bazergan	x	Ms.	50	92	17	7	2058
Düdükçü kuyusu	x	Ms.	131	177	32	17	6000
Düdükçü Oğlu	x	Ms.	119	71	14	1	1500
Demürcü Hıdır Kuyusu	x	Ms.	154	60	11	5	1000
Demürcü Organcı Hasan	x	Ms.	45	161	30	11	3328
Deveci Kuyusu	x	Ms.	125	116	21	11	5000
Divane 'ali Pınarı, Mh.	x	Ms.	148	27	5	2	866
Divane Atiye Beyi	x	Ms.	118	91	17	6	6000
Divane Ine beg	x	Ms.	163	16	3	1	299
Divane Ishak Kuyusu	x	Ms.	153	44	8	4	3500
Don Basan, Mz.	x	x	117				200
Esranik	x	Ms.	171	33	6	3	2020

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0063

Etmek 'Ömer	x	Ms.	23	226	41	21	6991
Etmekçiyan, Müsellem	x	Ms.	168	6			2575
Evder Fakih Kuyusu, Mz.	x	Ms.	173	6	1	1	1400
Fatin Kuyusu	x	Ms.	60	82	15	7	3700
Göçbegi	x	Ms.	100	49	9	4	1523
Göynük Pınarı	x	Ms.	165	116	23	1	500
Dündoğdu	x	Ms.	168	153	28	13	2784
Gav Kuyusu	x	Ms.	109	159	30	9	5300
Gavs Bazergan	x	Ms.	171	16	3	1	760
Geyik Ormanı	x	Ms.	52	219	38	29	4689
Goymak	x	Ms.	137	69	13	4	2986
Hüseyin Dede	x	Ms.	118	46	9	1	2290
Habib Ilyas Yurdu	x	Ms.	98	11	2	1	349
Hacı 'Ali, Cm.	x	Ms.	173	123	22	13	6000
Hacı Enbiya	x	Ms.	149	72	13	7	3500
Hacı Sarıklar	x	Ms.	134	51	9	6	5000
Hacı Sinan Kuyusu	x	Ms.	159	94	8	4	5474
Hakfen	x	Ms.	31	292	52	32	3471
Halife Pınarı	x	Ms.	60	58	11	3	1028
Hamralu	x	Ms.	92	98	17	13	1618
Harami Pınarı	x	Ms.	138	66	12	6	754
Harbud Kuyusu	x	Ms.	76	48	9	3	1000
Hasköy	x	Ms.	162	151	31	4	3300
Hasad	x	Ms.	33	124	23	9	1600
Hasance	x	Ms.	121	71	13	6	599
Hatima Halife	x	Ms.	29	122	22	12	5872
Hatun	x	Ms.	80	102	19	7	2000
Herekle Geçidi	x	Ms.	74	12	2	2	5000
Herekle Geçidi	x	Ch.	74	352	64	32	
Hidir Kuyusu	x	Ms.	150	77	14	7	4097
Hoskadem Kuyusu	x	Ms.	93	148	28	8	2200
İdris Kuyusu	x	Ms.	91	43	8	3	560
İlbegi	x	Ms.	164	136	25	11	2425
İlbegi Kuyusu	x	Ms.	55				4478
İlbegi Kuyusu	Tulca	Ms.	55	78	13	13	
İlbegi Kuyusu	Nuh Tulca	Ms.	55	108	19	13	
İlbegi Kuyusu	Osman Kuyusu	Ms.	55	84	16	4	
İlbegi Sanesi	x	Ms.	86	39	7	4	1522
İlyas Fakih	x	Ms.	144	149	28	9	4500
İsa kuyusu	x	Ms.	85	70	13	5	2020
İshak	x	Ms.	32	118	22	8	5500
Köçekli Kuyusu	x	Ms.	111	85	16	5	5000
Köse Sinan Kuyusu	x	Ms.	161	157	28	17	6000

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0064

Köskabad	x	Ms.	47	105	19	10	2291
Küçük 'Alisi	x	Ms.	156	164	30	14	5000
Küçük Ahmed Kuyusu	x	Ms.	59	28	5	3	2000
Küçük Ahmed Kuyusu	x	Ms.	95	103	19	8	5000
Küçük Ahmed kuyusu	Sinan Fakih	Ms.	95	96	17	11	
Küçük Hamza	x	Ms.	139	310	56	30	7000
Küçük Mahmud	x	Ms.	137	43	8	3	3000
Küçük Orkunik	x	Ms.	25	142	26	12	3634
Kürzlu Kuyusu	x	Ms.	133	99	18	9	5500
Kaçak-i Büzürk	x	Ms.	107	208	39	13	7800
Kaba Sakal	x	Ms.	130	65	21	5	5062
Kaba Sakal Oğulları	x	Ms.	130	72	14	2	3168
Kabaklu	x	Ch.	176	170	34		1500
Kalfalar Kuyusu	x	Ms.	161	22	4	2	874
Kara 'Isa Kuyusu	x	Ms.	150	79	14	9	3000
Kara...	x	Ms.	85	109	21	4	2523
Kara Ağaç	x	Ms.	56	154	28	14	1348
Kara Ali	x	Ms.	135	122	22	12	4000
Kara Balı Kuyusu	x	Ms.	49	184	32	24	5043
Kara Baslu	x	Ms.	168	208	36	28	4000
Kara Bazergan	x	Ms.	51	80	15	5	2283
Kara Hüseyin Kuyusu	x	Ms.	152	113	21	8	1541
Kara Murad Kuyusu	x	Ms.	47	38	7	3	2970
Kara Mustafa	x	Ms.	131	28	5	3	1000
Kara Pınarı	x	Ms.	170	61	11	6	2400
Kara Yahsi	x	Ms.	52	90	16	10	2372
Kara Yazıcı, Mz.	x	Ms.	145	40	7	5	2000
Kara Yusuf	x	Ms.	134	119	22	9	5000
Karaca 'Ömer Kuyusu	x	Ms.	84	305	58	15	7335
Karaca Ali kuyusu	x	Ms.	97	59	11	4	3000
Karaca Ilyas Kuyusu	x	Ms.	128	98	19	3	2000
Karagöz	x	Ms.	36	201	36	21	1410
Karagöz	Hacı Baba	Ms.	37	33	6	3	
Karınca Kuyusu	x	Ms.	115	116	22	6	6070
Kasım Baba	x	Ms.	144	114	12	4	1400
Kelikra, Kal'a-i	x	Ms.	26				12110
Kelikra, Kal'a-i	Cema'at-i Müselleman	Ch.	26	348	62	38	
Kelikra, Kal'a-i	Cema'at-i Himayegan	Ch.	27	12	3	3	
Kelikra, Kal'a-i	Kibtiyan	Ms.	27	9	3		
Kelikra, Kal'a-i	Cema'at-i Torciyan	Ch.	27	140	27	5	
Kerane	x	Ms.	25	107	20	7	4300
Kerate	x	Ms.	174	68	13	3	4500
Keremü'd-din, Cm.	x	Ms.	73	164	30	14	5000

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0065

Kevkeb-i Hacıoğlu	x	Ms.	30	201	37	16	6795
Kila'i Sinan	x	Ms.	29	159	29	14	6000
Kilinççi, Mz.	x	Ms.	168				650
Kızılca Danişmend	x	Ms.	130	92	17	7	5000
Kızlarca	x	Ms.	59	38	7	3	1234
Koç Hayre'd-din kuyusu	x	Ms.	117	218	41	13	8500
Kavarna	x	Ms.	10				32666
Kavarna	Niko	Ch.	10	132	23	17	
Kavarna	Balcu	Ch.	10	297	53	32	
Kavarna	Arabuhan	Ch.	11	196	35	21	
Kavarna	Dimitri v. Yakob	Ch.	12	251	45	26	
Kavarna	Cema'at-i Kibtiyan	Ms.	12	17	3	2	
Kavarna	Çiftlik-i muhammed	x	12	22			
Koyunlu Kemal	x	Ms.	92	323	60	23	5422
Koyunlu Kemal	Gebran, Cm.	Ch.	93				3276
Kozakçı	x	Ms.	36	108	21	3	1400
Kulecik Pınarı	x	Ms.	168	58	11	3	3000
Kumluca-i Müsellem	x	Ms.	157	58	11	3	1910
Kumluca-i Müsellem	Süleyman Paşa, Cm.	Ms.	157	33	6	3	
Kuruca Kuyu	x	Ms.	99	320	59	25	7000
Mümin kuyusu	x	Ms.	154	102	19	7	2400
Münhal Beğ	x	Ms.	76	254	46	24	9000
Mürsel Kuyusu	x	Ms.	171	131	24	11	3165
Mürsel, Cm.	x	Ms.	78	192	36	12	5000
Müslim Ilyas	x	Ms.	58	124	22	14	1752
Makarri araklin?	x	Ms.	141	125	23	10	7220
Malkoç Halis	x	Ms.	50	116	21	11	2313
Mezre'a-i Yörük	x	Ms.	90	12	2	2	3205
Mezre'a-i Yörük	x	Ch.	90	160	31	5	
Mh. Musa Beğ	x	Ms.	38	52	10	2	590
Mumcin	x	Ms.	140	185	33	20	3700
Musa Beğ Hisarlık	x	Ms.	44	136	24	16	4450
Musa Beğ Hisarlık	Kara Kuyusu	Ms.	44	164	25	14	
Mustafa Fakih, Cm.	x	Ms.	174	70	13	5	4500
Na'lbendoğlu Pınarı	x	Ms.	9	141	26	11	4288
Nebi Kuyusu	x	Ms.	127	130	24	10	4000
Nur 'Ali Kuyusu	x	Ms.	172	51	9	6	1908
Obacı Hasan kuyusu	x	Ms.	160	57	10	7	1731
Ömer Gazi kuyusu	x	Ms.	46	36	7	1	1000
Onova Kuyusu	x	Ms.	46	53	10	3	1283
Örenler	x	Ms.	160	48	9	3	2000
Ormancı Behlul	x	Ms.	158	27	5	2	1000
Orta Pınarı	x	x	61				873

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0066

Oruç Fakih Kuyu	x	Ms.	140	41	8	1	3700
Orz Kuyusu	x	Ms.	104	85	17	5	4500
Osman Kuyusu	x	Ms.	153	21	4	1	804
Osman, Mh.	x	Ms.	122	113	21	8	1000
Otçi Kulağı	x	Ms.	34	76	14	6	1099
Papas kuyusu	x	Ms.	56	190	36	10	3625
Papaslık	x	Ms.	33	61	11	6	1900
Paşa Bali Kuyusu	x	Ms.	133	126	23	11	6000
Prutluca Hidir	x	Ms.	172	39	7	4	3050
Rahman Kuyusu	x	Ms.	86	27	5	2	1200
Rusad	x	Ms.	37	104	19	9	2489
Rusad	Kara bazarlu	Ms.	37	192	35	17	
Söğüdcük	x	Ms.	23				21985
Söğüdcük	Al-balu	Ms.	23	208	38	18	
Söğüdcük	Haymeyagan	Ms.	23	41	8	1	
Söğüdcük	Kibtiyan	Ms.	23	47	8	7	
Söğüdcük	x	Ms.	87	242	45	17	5000
Süleyman Cm. Kara Hamza	x	Ms.	71	205	37	20	30000
Süleyman Fakih	x	Ms.	82	131	22	21	1500
Sabile	x	Ms.	27	165	31	10	13740
Safer Fakih Kuyusu	x	Ms.	113	64	12	4	2494
Safer Fakih, Cm.	x	Ms.	49	66	12	6	1358
Sah Kuli Çökeli	x	Ms.	113	150	27	15	6916
Sahbanlu	x	Ms.	75	108	20	8	5500
Sal Öyük	x	Ms.	123	57	11	2	2402
Salif Turgud Kuyusu	x	Ms.	95	37	7	2	1200
Sarı Göllü Kuyusu	x	Ms.	105	32	6	2	1717
Sarı Göllü	x	Ms.	103	138	24	18	2589
Sarı Koca	x	Ms.	118	62	11	7	7210
Sarı Mahmud, Mz.	x	Ms.	151	98	18	8	1704
Sarı Mustafa Kuyusu	x	Ms.	175	10	2		500
Sarı Nasuh Kuyusu	x	Ms.	158	17	3	2	2000
Saru Meşe	x	Ms.	72	177	32	17	8000
Semer Kuyusu?	x	Ms.	48	160	30	10	2614
Seydi 'Ali Fakih Kuyusu	x	Ms.	152	30	6		2500
Seydi 'Ali, Mz.	x	Ms.	142	148	26	18	4500
Seydi Ahmed	x	Ms.	153	56	10	6	1600
Seydi Havace	x	Ms.	112	200	38	10	5999
Seydi Havace	x	Ch.	112	15	3		
Seyyid Selim kuyusu	x	Ms.	175	16	3	1	620
Sigirdluca	x	Ms.	100	128	22	18	4000
Solinc	x	Ch.	42	891	162	81	12700

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0067

Suluca	x	Ms.	106	43	8	3	1283
Sulucak Pınarı	x	Ms.	103	89	16	9	2210
Tarla Bası, Mz.	x	Ms.	136	28	5	3	1000
Tatarlu	x	Ms.	142	105	19	10	3537
Timur Fakih	x	x	97				2500
Timuroğlu	x	Ms.	166	54	8	14	1500
Timuroğlu Bebean Kuyusu	x	Ms.	106	181	34	11	5495
Tirhalalu ahmed	x	Ms.	165	38	7	3	2000
Togan Ermeni Pınarı	x	Ms.	79	124	24	4	3000
Togan Kuyusu	x	Ms.	148	73	14	3	3134
Toganlık	x	Ms.	39	249	45	24	5000
Toganogli kuyusu	x	Ms.	160	68	12	8	3000
Tohtamis	x	Ms.	78	185	35	10	4000
Tokuz Ağaç	x	Ms.	159	93	17	8	6000
Torak?	x	Ms.	165	170	31	15	4500
Toy Kuyusu	x	Ms.	72	34	6	4	5425
Tohtamis	x	Ms.	78	185	35	10	4000
Tokuz Ağaç	x	Ms.	159	93	17	8	6000
Torak?	x	Ms.	165	170	31	15	4500
Toy Kuyusu	x	Ms.	72	34	6	4	5425
Toy Kuyusu	Süleyman Paşa, raiyet-i	Ms.	72	33	6	3	
Turhan Kuyusu	x	Ms.	98	95	18	5	3269
Turhan Sofi Kuyusu	x	Ms.	81	84	16	4	2516
Turmus Kuyusu	x	Ms.	168	139	25	14	4000
Turna Köyü	x	Ms.	114	146	27	11	3500
Uç Kuyu	x	Ms.	57	124	23	9	1897
Uç Ormanı	x	Ms.	110	159	30	9	4250
Uç Ormanı	Gafas	Ms.	110	125	24	5	
Umas, Mh.	x	Ms.	90	82	14	12	1500
Ulas, Mh.	x	Ch.	90	5	1		
Uzun Ibrahim	x	Ms.	36	74	14	4	2499
Uzun Ishak	x	Ms.	88	80	15	5	5000
Uzun Umur Kuyusu	x	Ms.	101	65	12	5	2000
Uzun Yusuf	x	Ms.	135	78	14	8	5200
Uzun Yusuf	x	Ms.	145	110	20	10	3337
Valelu	x	Ms.	54	95	18	5	1058
Yarak Tatar, Mz.	x	Ms.	168				754
Yazıcı Kuyusu	x	Ms.	168	211	38	21	6000
Yenice	x	Ms.	163	139	25	14	2682
Yenice Köy	x	Ms.	83	159	30	9	2100
Yenice Toganoğlu Kuyusu	x	Ms.	128	97	18	7	4000
Yetim Veli Kuyusu	x	Ms.	126	58	11	3	5000
Zaviye-i Pirhan Baba	x	Ms.	168	4			55
Zaviye-i Sah Kuli Baba	x	Ms.	164	51	8	11	1034
Zeynel Kuyusu	x	Ms.	89	49	9	4	2010
				35824	6513	3222	986926

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0068

Table 2

*VAKIF*S OF THE *NAHIYE* OF VARNA:
(POPULATION OF VARNA AND ITS VILLAGES ACCORDING TO THE *VAKIF* REGISTER)[1]

Town-Village	Quarter	Rel.	Page	Popul.	Hane	Müc.	Income
EVKAF-I SULTAN SELİM HAN							
Abdi Köyü		Ms.	94B	32	5	7	807
Ak Pınar		Ms.	94a	78	13	13	786
Ali Kılınç Baba, Yörük		Ms.	90a	32	6	2	842
Babluca-i Küçük		Ms.	103b	72	12	12	4714
Bali Subaşı		Ms.	89b	163	27	28	2197
Bas Hisarlık		Ms.	96b	41	7	6	4385
Cagalalik		Ch.	87b	297	50	47	7542
Çakırcı		Ms.	85a	107	19	12	6039
Çukur-ek		Ms.	96a	39	7	4	847
Davudoğlu, Mezre'a-i	Küçük 'Ali	Ms.	93a	248	43	33	3147
Davudoğlu Mezre'a-i	Turhan	Ms.	93a	29	5	4	3147
Derviş Bevvab		Ms.	88b	109	17	24	7681
Derviş Bevvab		Ch.	88b	211	37	26	
Diraganc		Ms.	90b	219	37	34	8512
Du'l-Kadir Kuyusu		Ms.	96b	74	14	44207	
Ekerne Müslimanan		Ms.	99a	74	12	14	49287
Ekerne Manol		Ch.	99b.	156	17	21	
Ekerne Layo		Ch.	99b	109	20	9	
Ekerne Yivan		Ch.	99b.	225	39	30	
Ekerne ?		Ch.	101a	206	38	16	
Eskinci		Ch.	91a	285	49	40	10255
Galata Da'ari, Papa		Ch.	97b	479	90	29	64869
Galata Da'o, Papa		Ch.	97b	479	90	29	64869
Galata Da'o, Papa		Ch.	98a	924	164	104	
Hacı Kuyusu		Ms.	101a	176	32	16	9606
Isa Kuyusu		Ms.	84a	428	75	53	15254
Ispanor? Kesis		Ch.	87a	129	21	24	3037
Ispanor? Kesis[2]		Ch.	87b	3			200
Kürekçi Sinan	Ebu Derda Kuyusu	Ms.	104b	161	28	21	6863
Kaluniye	Hüseyin	Ms.	104a	194	31	39	10820
Kaluniye		Ch.	104a	22	4	2	

[1]This table is made up from TKGM Kuyud-i Kadime Archive *Vakıf Defter No.* 561.
[2]Only 3 priests recorded.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0069

Kara Muhammed Kuyusu		Ms.	93b	102	17	17	1772
Karagöz Kuyusu		Ms.	106a	223	40	23	1937
Karınca, Mezre'a-i		Ms.	91b	201	34	31	4775
Kavaklı Pınarı		Ms.	96a	87	15	12	2161
Keremü'd-din Yunus Köy		Ms.	105b	102	19	7	4518
Kılınç Baba		Ms.	89a	138	23	23	3807
Kılınççı Kuyusu		Ms.	105a	155	26	25	9361
Kisrenc		Ch.	86a	524	89	79	
Kisrenc?		Ms.	86a	12	2	2	19595
Kızılcıklı Lurdu		Ms.	106b	111	20	11	1000
Kızılcıklu Yurdu	Cm. Yörükan	Ms.	106b	102	19	7	
Kurubca		Ms.	101a	92	17	7	4631
Lagi? Sinan		Ms.	88a	142	25	17	10412
Mz. Ermeni		Ms.	106a				50
Mz. Hacı Sinan Kuyusu		Ms.	106a				100
Mz. Muhammed Kisa		Ms.	106a				50
Nasre'd-din		Ms.	102a	15	3		1150
Orta Kuyu		Ms.	97a	207	38	17	10065
Paşa Deresi	Malkoç	Ms.	95b	143	24	23	4909
Paşa Deresi	Bazarlı	Ms.	95b	89	17	4	
Savsak Pınarı		Ms.	94a	52	9	7	2087
Sinanoğlu Kuyusu		Ms.	102b	42	8	2	2535
Uveys Beğ Kuyusu		Ms.	101b	118	20	18	5198
Varna		76b					236472
Varna	Cami'-i 'atik	Ms.	76b	157	27	22	
Varna	Bedru'l-lah, Cami'-i	Ms.	76b	194	34	24	
Varna	Ali Çelebi, Mescid-i	Ms.	77a	162	28	22	
Varna	Hacı Çelebi, Mescid-i	Ms.	77a	163	28	23	
Varna	Abdu'r-rahman..., Cami'-i	Ms.	77a	518	9	53	
Varna	Ala'd-din, Mescid-iİ	Ms.	78A	230	42	20	
Varna	Danyel, Papa	Ch.	78A	627	107	92	
Varna	Manol, Papa	Ch.	79a	649	112	89	
Varna	Kiryakoz Papa	Ch.	79b	498	94	28	
Varna	Papa Kiryako	Ch.	80a	318	58	28	
Varna	Papa Andoni	Ch.	80b	137	23	22	
Varna	Anastas	Ch.	80b	283	50	33	
Varna	Manol Papa,	Ch.	81a	471	84	51	
Varna	Manasi	Ch.	81b	233	44	13	
Varna	Da'ar v. Yani	Ch.	82a	103	18	13	
Varna	İstepan, Papa	Ch.	82a	150	27	15	
Varna	Hidreyil?	Ch.	82a	458	80	58	
Varna	Yorgi, Papa	Ch.	82b	49	9	4	
Varna	Haymenegan-i	Ch.	83a	80	16		

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0070

Varna	Haymenegan	Ms.	83a	66	13	1	
Varna	Haymenegan	Ch.	83a	26	5	1	
Varna	Kibtiyan	Ms.	83a	11	2	1	
Varna	Müselleman	Ms.	83a	115	23	2	
Varna	Müselleman	Ch.	83b	248	43	33	
Varna	Kazancıyan?	Ch.	83b	29	5	4	
Varne-i	Büzürk	Ms.	85b	17	3	2	16344
Varne-i	Büzürk	Ch.	85b	293	49	48	
Ya'kub Sofi		Ms.	107a	39	7	4	719
Ya'kub Sofi	Gebran	Ch.	107a	117	22	7	
Yassı Bası		Ms.	92a	115	21	10	1996
Yenice		Ms.	85a	145	27	10	6511
Yeniceoğlu		Ms.	92b	106	18	16	1689
Yılanlık		Ms.	104b	195	32	35	8661
Yugari Kamçi Suyu	Buğdan	Ms.	94b	6	1	1	10120
Yugari Kamçı Suyu	Buğdan	Ch.	94b	152	27	17	
Yugarı Kamçı Suyu	Manor Adol	Ch.	95a	167	29	22	
Yunus Köy	Resulce	Ms.	103a	49	9	4	8320
Yunus Köy	Yunusca	Ms.	103a	64	12	4	
Yunus Köy	Mürselce	Ms.	103a	40	7	5	
Yunus Köy	Keremü'd-din	Ms.	102a	84	15	9	
EVKAF-I DAVUD PAŞA							
Küçük Kazanca		Ch.	108a	263	47	28	7636
Karpudlu			108b				812
Müflis Cm. Müslimanan		Ms.	109a	117	22	7	8476
Müflis Cm. Gebran		Ch.	109a	302	57	27	
Mes'ud Virani		Ms.	108a	86	15	11	3946
AKYAZILU BABA,	Zaviye-i Dervişan		Ms.	110a	50	10	220
Akyazılu Baba, Zaviye-i	Cm. Kibtiyan	Ms.	110a	15	315		
Mz. Devre Başan			110a				200
Mz. Yurdgancı			110a				100
SARI SALTIK BABA,	Zaviye-i		Ms.	110b	35	7	635
Sarı Saltık Baba, Zaviye-i	Meremetçiyan	Ch.	110b	15	3		
Sarı Saltık Baba, Zaviye-i	Dervişan	Ms.	110b	20	4		
EVKAF-I ISTEMEHAN							
SULTAN							
Çukurova		Ch.	112b	252	47	17	1689
Çukurova	Cm. Kibtiyan	Ch.	112b	26	5	1	
Kumluca		Ch.	112a	202	36	22	1603
Kuyucak		Ch.	111a	676	125	51	800
EVKAFHA DER							
NEFS-I VARNA		116b					

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0071

Abdu'r-rahman Efendi el-Kadi, Vakf-i C.							
Ala'ad-din Halife, Vakf-i Msc.							
Bazarcık, Cami'-i							
Bedere'd-din, Vakf-i C.							
Cami-'-i 'Atik, Vakf-i							
Cami'-i 'Atik-i Hacı Tur 'Avd, Vakf-i							
Cami'-i Cedid							
Cemal Halife, Vakf-i Msc.							
Çeşme-i Hac der Balçık, Vakf-i							
Derzi Bazergan, Vakf-i Msc.							
EVKAF-I MUTASARRIFE-I							
NAHIYE-I BAZARCIK			117a-123b				
Gazi Baba, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Hacı İbrahim, Vakf-i Msc.							
Hacı Bali, Vakf-i Cami'-i							
Hacı Bayram, Mescid-i							
Hacı Mahmud, Vakf-i Msc. & Mu'allimhane							
Hacı Muhammed, Vakf-i Msc.							
Hacı Murad, Vakf-i C. Cedid							
Hacı Resul, Vakf-i Mekteb-i							
Hacı Suca', Mescid-i							
Hacı Turenci, Mescid-i							
Hod, Mescid-i ve Mektebi							
Kara 'Ali, Mescid-i							
Kara Hacı, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Karlı Beğ, Mescid-i							
Kuçeri, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Msc. Seydi Ahmed, Vakf-i							
Piri Paşa, Vakf-i							
Reeb Kissa, Vakf-i Msc. & Mekteb							
Sefer, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Seydi Muhammed, Vakf-i Msc. & Mekteb-i[1]							
Tur Gavz, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Tur Kul, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Ture Hatun binti Hamza, Vakf-i							
Uzun Piri, Vakf-i Mescid-i							
Yusuf, Vakf-i Mescid-i							

[1]Full name is "Seydi Muhammed Çelebi Ebi Seydi Halil Efendi el-Kadi"

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0072

TETIMME-I RE'AYA-YI							
EVKAF KI PERATENDE.[1]		203b					
Abdi Köy		Ms.	308a	5	1		
Ali Kıssa		Ms.	312a	15	3		
Balıkçı Bazarlı		Ms.	305a	5	1		
Bokluca		Ms.	308b	39	7	2	
Cühud Kuyusu		Ms.	308b	52	9	7	
Cukur-ek, Vakf-i SSH.[2]		Ms.	305a	10	2		
Dervis Yavan		Ms.	305a	16	3	1	
Ebu Orhani		Ms.	312a	5	1		
Küçük 'Ali, Vakf-i SSH		Ms.	308a	55	10	5	
Küçük Hamza		Ms.	312a	5	1		
Kalgal kuyusu		Ms.	312b	5	1		
Kara Hamed, Vakf-i SSH	Yörigan	Ms.	308a	17	5	3	
Karaca Ilyas Kuyusu		Ch.	312a	6	1	1	
Karlıoğulları		Ms.	308b	15	3		
Kavkalı Pınarı, Vakf-i SSH.		Ms.	305a	16	3	1	
Kirlarca		Ms.	308b	5	1		
Koca Hayre'd-din		Ms.	308b	5	1		
Kuyucuk Pınarı, Vakf-i SSH		Ms.	308a	5	1		
Mustafa Kissa cema'ati		Ms.	312a	16	3	1	
Mz. Evhad Kuyusu		Ms.	312b	11	2	1	
Mz. Karınca., Vakf,i SSH.		Ms.	307b	72	14	2	
Pınar Başı		Ms.	308a	50	10		
Sarı Göllü		Ms.	308a	12	2	2	
Seydi Ahmed		Ms.	312a	23	4	3	
Timurcu Hasan		Ms.	305a	12	2	2	
Togan		Ms.	312a	39	7	4	
Turna Gölü		Ms.	308a	11	2	1	
Valcuklu..		Ms.	308b	106	20	6	
Valelu		Ms.	308b	5	1		
Yegane Mir		Ms.	308a	50	9	5	

[1]There are also six villages recorded in *Tahrir Defteri No*. 577 (fols. 174a; TKGM) as of "Evkaf-i Muhammed Beg İbn-i Ahmed Paşa" (fol. 167a). They are as follows: Ayu Ormanı, Hane: 2; Balluca, Hane: 1; Sarı Göllü, Hane: 1; Tokçalar, Hane: 2; Karlı Beğ, Hane: 5; Bahtiyar, Hane: 9.

[2]SSH: Sultan Selim Han.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0073

Table 3

FIEF HOLDINGS OF VARNA ACCORDING TO THE *İCMAL* REGISTER

Timar Holder[1]	Type	Type	Folio	Nvil.	Income
?	Ze'amet		35b	7	18423
? b. 'Ali			41a	2	6000
? b. Oruç			43a	1	3610
Abdu'l-kerim			49a	5[2]	7100
Ahmed Ze'amet	Çavush	37b	6	8800	
Ahmed b.'Abdu'l-lah	Ze'amet		38b	2	6000
Ali Ze'amet	Çavush	35a	7	33269	
Ali	serasker	38b	3	9799	
Ali b.?		45a	1	3000	
Ali b. Hasan			**47b**	**1**	**3000**
Ali b. Hasan			47b	1	3000
Ali b. Sinan		Kethuda	41b	1	5422
Ashik Tug			48b	1	1300
Bektash b. Hüsrev			43a	1	3700
Ca'fer b. Bali			45b	1	3000
Cerkes Yusuf			39a	4	7011
Divane 'Ali			42b	1	4000
Divane 'Ali			45a	1	3000
Divane Yagmur			44a	1	3300
Günduz Tug b. Hasan Tug			47b	1	2541
Gazi		44b	2	3000	
Hüsam b. Behram			42a	1	4548
Hüseyin	Ze'amet	Müteferrika	35a	7	12670[3]
Hüseyin			45b	1	3000
Hüseyin b. 'Abdul'l-lah			40a	2	8000
Hüseyin b. Mustafa			41b	2	6000
Hüseyin Kurd			42b	3	3955
Hacı 'Ömer[4]	Ze'amet	Emin	35b	7	16899
Halil b. Muhammed			44a	1	4462
Hasan		40a	1	8500	
Hasan	Çavush	40b	1	8000	

[1]This table is made up from TKGM Kuyûd-i Kadîme Archive *Icmal Tahrir Defter* No. 222 Abbreviations used in these tables are as follows: Nvil.: Number of villages; Kh.: *Kethuda;* Mt.: *Müteferrika;*

[2]+ 2 *mezre'as.*

[3]The figure here is much more than this. The actual figure is torn off.

[4]This person is "emin-i defter-i sabik ber katiban-i defter-i Hakani"

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0074

Hasan		44b	1	3100	
Hasan b. Ibrahim			40a	2	7570
Hasan b. Sha'ban			46a	1	3000
Hasn b. Shah Veli			47a	1	3000
Hasan b. Varaka			42b	2	4000
Hidir b. Tanduk			48b	1	804
İbrahim			40b	2	7500
İbrahim b. Mustafa			43b	2	3500
Köymen			46a	1	3000
Karben b. Hidir			43a	2	3740
Kanber b. Tureshan			46b	1	3000
Kara b. 'Abdi			41b	1	6000
Karaman b. Tur bali Tug			48a	1	2500
Kasim		42a	1	4097	
Kilinç b. Aydin			46b	1	3000
Kilinc		47a	1	3000	
Kurd b. 'Ahmed			43b	1	3500
Kurd b. İbrahim			44b	2	3000
Mahmud[1]			39a	2	6000
Mahmud			49a	4	10000
Memi b. Toprak			45b	1	3000
Muhammed	Ze'amet	Katib	37a	6	14500
Muhammed		merdum-i	38b	4	11730
Muhammed		Çavush	40b	3	7527
Muhammed			41a	2	6000
Muhammed b. Memi	Ze'amet		37b	3	7500
Muhammed b. Mustafa	Ze'amet		37a	2	10000
Murad	Çavush	49a	1	7000	
Murtaza b. Muhammed		Çavush	38b	2	9550
Mustafa	Ze'amet	tezkere?	38a	1	2087
Mustafa	Ze'amet	Kh ? Mt.	36b	15	72500
Mustafa b. Divane Veli			39b	1	4000
Mustafa b. Muhammed	Ze'amet		35b	6[2]	15000
Mustafa b. Yunus	Timar	Çavush	38a	3	12678
Mustafa Hidir			39b	2	6000
Mustafa, Katib		shakird	42a	3	5037
Osman		45a	1	3000	
Pervi b. 'Abdu'l-lah			39b	1	6000
Perviz 'Abdu'l-lah	Ze'amet	merdum-i	37a	2	11495

[1]The former timar holder was most probably İlyas whose name is crossed out and Mahmud written instead with a different hand.

[2]+ 1 *mezra'a.*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0075

Piri	Ze'amet	Kethuda	35a	14	48425
Piri b. Süleyman			39a	2	6000
Piyale b. 'Abdu'l-lah			47a	1	3000
Ramazan Tug b. Döger			48a	1	1413
Ridvan			46a	2	3000
Süleyman Emir			46a	1	3000
Sefer b. Hamdi, Katib	Ze'amet	Şakird	37b	2	7000
Seydi 'Ali			48a	2	2416
Sha'ban b. Yusuf			47b	2	2500
Sinan	Ze'amet	Çavuş	36b	18	56100
Tur Bali b. 'Ali			41a	1	4000
Velid b. Münhaç Tug			48a	1	1541
Yusuf			44a	1	3215
Yusuf b. 'Aziz			43b	1	3500
				213	654334

Table 4

GUARDS OF VARNA ACCORDING TO THE *DERDEST* REGISTER[1]

Timar Holder's Name	Official Title	Page	Holding's name	Income	Tl. Income[2]
MUSTAFAHFAZAN-I KAL'A-L VARNA					
Mustafa b. Aydın	Dizdar[3]	131b	Nacı 'ali, Cm.	6000	4000
Mahmud	Kethuda	131b	Gavs Pınarı Bazergan	760	
Mahmud			Isa Yörük Pınarı	1240	2000
Ramazan	Imam	131b	Dibr-i Beg Paşa Begine	1257	
Ramazan			Divane Ramazan Yurdu	200	1457
Ali b. Muhammed	Bevvab	132a	Kasım Baba	1400	1400
MUSTAHFAZAN-I KAL'A-I KELIKRA					
Uncu Hasan	Dizdar	132b	Burunluca Hidir	3050	3050
...?[4]	Kethuda		Ala Kelb	4400	1600
?[5]	Imam	133a	Ala Kelb		1400
?	Bevvab	133a	Ala Kelb		1400
ÇAKIRCIYAN		109b	Turmus Kuyusu	4000	8000
		109b	Kara Baslu	4000	
ŞAHİNCİYAN		110a	Kara Pınar	2400	19993
		110a	İbrayil?	2020	
		110a	Mürsel Kuyusu	3165	
		110a	Kor 'Ali Kuyusu	1908	
		110a	Narenci Kurse?	6000	
		110a	Mustafa Kissa Cema'ati	4500	

[1]This table is made up from TKGM "Derdest Defter which is included in the *icmal defter No.* 222".

[2]Implies the job he does in the citadel, i.e. "dizdar-i kal'a"

[3]This income indicates the income for the *timar* holder rather than the income for the village(s). Therefore it will be less than income for the villages when it is a shared holding and sometimes just the total of the incomes for the villages.

[4]Torn off. Therefore could not read.

[5]Holder's name is not recorded.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0076

TUNA-İ'AMİRE. L'ORGANISATION FINANCIÈRE ET MILITAIRE DU DANUBE OTTOMAN AUX XVI^{e} ET XVII^{e} SIÈCLES À LA LUMIÈRE DE DOCUMENTS OTTOMANS INÉDITS

Mihai MAXIM

Quant et comment le Danube devint un fleuve ottoman?

Les Ottomans attachèrent toujours une grande importance à la domination des principales voies de communications tant terrestres que fluviales. Le grand historien roumain N. Iorga définit cette politique comme une *dromocratie* (du grec *dromos*, voie et *kratia*, pouvoir)[1]. Et c'est dans cette perspective que la maîtrise du Danube, une des plus importantes voies fluviales d'Europe fut pour les Ottomans une préoccupation essentielle. Ayant conquis en 1393 le royaume bulgare de Tirnovo et en 1396 celui de Vidin, les Ottomans accédèrent ainsi par le nord au Danube. Les principales places-fortes du Danube inférieur, Giurgiu/*Yerköği*, Turnu/*Holovnik* ou *Kule*, etc., tombèrent entre leur main dès 1419-20. La flotte ottomane occupa brièvement la forteresse de Chilia/*Kili*, important centre commercial moldave à l'embouchure du Danube. Par la même occasion, ils lancèrent des assauts vers la place-forte moldave de Cetatea Albă (*Akkerman*) située sur la Mer Noire à l'embouchure du Dniestr (*Turla*), ce qui met clairement en évidence la connection Danube-mer Noire dans l'optique ottomane. Avec la conquête en 1453 de Constantinople, l'expansion ottomane en direction du Danube et en mer Noire entra dans une nouvelle phase. Dès 1455, Caffa (*Kefe*), important port et emporium génois de la presqu'île criméenne tomba sous la domination ottomane. L'année suivante, la tentative de Mehmed II de conquérir la forteresse de Belgrade —porte de l'Europe et du royaume de Hongrie— se solda par un échec à la suite de la résistance des coalisés européens commandés par le voïévode de Transylvanie, le Roumain Iancu de Hunedoara (*Yankul* des sources ottomanes). Malgré ce déboire, en 1484, Bâyezid II conquit définitivement les places-fortes stratégiques de Kili et d'Akkerman. Cette campagne se signale notamment par une excellente coordination entre les forces navales et terrestres. L'apport de la flotte avec sa puissance de feu et son

[1] Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, *Nicolae Iorga, a Romanian Historian of the Ottoman Empire*, Bucharest, 1972, pp. 77, 92.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0077

soutien logistique fut considérable. Ainsi l'année 1484 qui vit la capture de Kili et d'Akkerman est une date-clé dans le processus qui mènera à la transformation de la mer Noire, facteur primordial pour la sureté et l'approvisionnement de la capitale ottomane, en un lac ottoman. Entretemps d'autres ports importants du littoral de la mer Noire tombèrent sous la souveraineté ottomane : Amastris (1460), Trébizonde et Sinop (1461), Balaklava et Azov/*Azak* (1473), Copa et Anapa (1479). En outre, les bouches du Danube — et en conséquence, la "Voie moldave", importante source de revenu — étaient aussi sous contrôle ottoman. De cette manière, la Dobroudja, de marche qu'elle était, devint une province intérieure. La principauté de Moldavie, qui jouait le rôle d'une muraille de défense pour les royaumes de Pologne et de Hongrie, n'eut d'autre choix que d'accepter la souveraineté ottomane. La Valachie, elle, l'avait déjà fait après la perte de ses forteresses danubiennes. D'autre part, la prise de Kili et d'Akkerman joua un rôle primordial, ainsi que le souligna l'historien allemand Kissling, dans le développement de la puissance navale ottomane car les chantiers navals trouvèrent dans les forêts moldaves un bois de charpente d'excellente qualité[1]. Mehmed II était convaincu que la domination ottomane ne serait affermie tant que les places-fortes de Kili et d'Akkerman et celle de Belgrade demeureraient en la possession des chrétiens[2]. En 1484, le premier objectif fut atteint, et le second en 1521 avec la prise du Belgrade sur le Danube par Süleyman I. En 1526, le même Süleyman en écrasant à la bataille de Mohács l'élite de l'armée hongroise, réduit le royaume de Hongrie à la situation d'un État tributaire. En 1529, il dut renoncer toujours sur le Danube à investir la capitale de la Maison d'Autriche, Vienne, en raison de la saison avancée et du manque de canons de grand calibre, et il rebroussa chemin vers Istanbul.

En 1540-41, Bude (*Budun, Budin*), la capitale du royaume de Hongrie sur le moyen Danube, fut conquise par les Ottomans. Ceux-ci s'étaient auparavant emparé (en 1538-1540) du plus important port moldave du Danube inférieur, Brăila (*Ibrail*). Ainsi *ils contrôlaient de Bude à la mer Noire tout le cours du Danube qui devint en conséquence, dès le milieu du 16e siècle, un fleuve ottoman*. En outre, suite à la campagne de Moldavie de Süleyman I en 1538, le sud-est de cette principauté vassale (en turc *Bucak*) qui comprenait l'important fort de Tighina (*Bender*) sur le Dinestr, a été annexé par les Ottomans et c'est ainsi que la cavalerie tartare de Crimée eut à sa disposition un corridor s'étendant de Bahçesaray à Bude. De cette manière, la

[1] H. J. Kissling, "Betrachtung über die Flottenpolitik Sultan Bâyezids II. 1481-1512", *Saeculum*, XX/I, 1969.

[2] *Zapiski Janyčara napisany Konstantinom Mihajlovičem iz Ostrovitzy*, vvedenie, perevod i kommentarij A. I. Rogova, Moskva, 1978, p. 88.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0078

voie fluviale du Danube fut renforcée par la voie militaire terrestre des Tartares. Comme l'indique le Prof. İnalcık, *c'est à la suite de l'annexion du Bucak, donc de la Bessarabie méridionale, que la mer Noire est devenu un lac ottoman*[1]. *A peu près au même moment donc, c'est-à dire vers le milieu du 16e siècle, le Danube devient un fleuve ottoman et la mer Noire un lac ottoman, preuve s'il en faut de l'unité de la politique ottomane sous ce rapport.*

L'organisation financière du Danube ottoman

Le Danube fut dès le moyen-âge la voie fluviale la plus importante d'Europe reliant l'Europe centrale aux Balkans et au delà à la mer Noire et à la Méditerranée. De nombreuses voies routières très fréquentées débouchaient sur le Danube. Le *Orta kol* des sources ottomanes — le *Czarski drum* des Balkaniques — reliant Istanbul, Sofia, Nish, Belgrade, Bude et Vienne longeait le Danube à trois reprises, à Vienne, Bude et Belgrade, ce qui met d'avantage en évidence l'importance névralgique pour les Ottomans de ces deux dernières villes. Et sur le Bas-Danube, les voies des Carpathes (Sibiu/Hermanstadt-Danube, Braşov/Kronstadt-Danube), la route moldave et la route tartare accédaient toutes au Danube. En outre, les régions au nord et au sud du Danube entretenaient des rapports commerciaux suivis et fréquents utilisant le Danube comme moyen de transport pour les marchandises. Un document ottoman daté du 15 avril 1520 confirme que 70-80 navires venaient chaque année de divers ports de la mer Noire tels que Trébizonde, Caffa, Sinop, Samsun et Istanbul, à Brăila, la plus importante ville portuaire de Valachie sur le Danube[2].

Tous les revenus douaniers des échelles du Danube ottoman étaient collectés par l'Etat, selon des circonscriptions, comme à l'époque byzantine[3]. Le *defterdarlık du Danube* fut créé à cette fin en 1583. Cette nouvelle institution, qui était le quatrième *defterdarlık* de l'Empire, percevait tous les impôts et revenus de tout genre des échelles du Danube et des régions

[1] H. İnalcık, *Imperiul otoman. Epoca clasica 1300-1600,* édition Mihai Maxim, Bucarest, 1996 pp. 273-274.

[2] Beldiceanu-Steinherr et N. Beldiceanu, "Actes du règne de Selim I concernant quelques échelles danubiennes de Valachie, de Bulgarie et de Dobroudja", *Südostforschungen,* XXIII, 1964, pp. 105-107.

[3] Pour le Bas-Danube, voir, par exemple, Anca Popescu, "Circumscriptii vamale otomane in zona Pontului stang si a Dunarii de Jos", dans: *National si universal in istoria romanilor. Studii oferite prof. dr. Serban Papacostea cu ocazia implinirii a 70 de ani,* Bucuresti, 1998, pp. 312-325.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0079

avoisinantes de Vidin à la mer Noire et de Varna à Özü (Ochakov)[1], comme l'indiquent des documents pour l'année 991/1583[2]. La date de création de ce *defterdarlık* telle qu'elle apparaît dans les chroniques est donc fausse[3]. Selon des documents récemment découverts, la première fonction du *defterdarlık* était de financer les garnisons ottomanes de la région, c'est-à-dire d'assurer le paiement des soldes (*mevâcib*), des fournitures (*iaşe*) et d'autres dépenses de la flotte du Danube (*donanma-yi Tuna)*. En outre, il devait expédier à la capitale annuellement 80-90 mesures (*yük)* d'*akçe*, c'est-à-dire 66-75.000 pièces d'or (en 1590[4]), ou 100 mesures (en 1592[5]). Les achats pour les besoins du Palais impérial[6] effectués dans le cadre du système d'*ocaklık*, par exemple, le sel, le miel etc., achetés sur les revenus du tribut moldo-valaque, étaient contrôlés par le *defterdarlık* du Danube qui fournissait également le cheptel ovin, d'une importance vitale pour l'approvisionnement de la capitale (100.000 têtes en 1583)[7].

Après la menace suscitée par l'irruption des Cosaques vers la fin du 16e siècle et plus particulièrement après la révolte des Principautés roumaines (de Transylvanie, de Moldavie et de Valachie) de 1594-1598, *le beylerbeyilik de Silistre fut créé peu près avant le 17 Şaban 1007/15 mars 1599*[8], donc bien avant la date de fondation admise jusqu'à présent. Ce *beylerbeyilik*, d'une grande importance stratégique, sera réservé habituellement à des titulaires du rang de vizir. Le *hükm* du 6 Rebiülevvel 1010/4 octobre 1601, destiné à Ali Paşa, l'enjoint de bien veiller sur la Moldavie et la Valachie[9]. Au fur et à mesure de l'approche du danger cosaque, le centre du *beylerbeyilik* est transféré de Silistre à Babadağ et de là à Özü. C'est pour cette raison que les documents ottomans mentionnent indistinctement le *beylerbeyilik* de Silistre et celui d'Özü. Mais il est indiscutable qu'il ne s'agit que d'un même et seul

---

[1] M. Maxim, *Tuna-i 'Amire/The Imperial Danube*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, sous presse.

[2] Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Istanbul (BOA), *Mühimme Defteri*, cilt 51, hkm 146, 14 Recep 991/3 août 1583 ; cilt 52, hkm 320, 28 Şevval 991/14 novembre 1583 ; *Maliyeden Müdevver Defterler* no 6148, p. 147 26 Zilkade 991/11 décembre 1583, etc.

[3] *Tarih-i Selânikî*, (haz.) Mehmet İpşirli, Istanbul, 1989 p. 183. BOA Mühimme Defteri, cilt 67, hkm 125, p. 47 20 Safer 999/18 décembre 1590; Mihai Maxim, "Documente turceşti privind kazaua Giurgiului în secolul XVI", dans: *Ilfov-File de istorie*, Bucarest, 1978, p. 190.

[4] BOA, *Maliyeden Defter*, no 6910, p. 4, 6 Rebiülâhır 1001/11 décembre 1592.

[5] Voir Arif Bilgin, *Osmanlı Sarayının İaşesi (1489-1650)*, thèse de l'Université de Marmara, Istanbul, 2000.

[6] BOA, *Mühimme Defteri*, cilt 52, hkm 146, p. 127, 28 Şevval 991/14 novembre 1583.

[7] BOA, *fonds A.NŞT (Bâb-ı Asafî. Nişancı Tahvil Kalemi)*, defter no 1161, p. 14: on y trouve la première réference à *Silistre Beylerbeyisi Ahmed Paşa* dans un *hükm* datant du 17 *Şaban 1007*/15 mars 1599. L'historien Selâniki Mustafa Efendi, qui fut un contemporain, mentionne dans sa chronique le beylerbeyi de Silistre Ahmed Paşa sous la date de evvâil-i Şaban 1007/27 février-8 mars 1599.

[8] Cf. *Tarih Selânikî*, p. 797.

[9] "*Boğdan ve Eflâk canibine göz kulak tutup*". BOA, fonds *A.DVN*. dosya 11/59.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0080

beylerbeyilik et non de deux comme l'affirment certains chercheurs. Par la suite, le *defterdarlık* du Danube sera progressivement transféré à Özü et deviendra *le defterdarlık du Danube et d'Özü. Le defterdarlık du Danube ne fut donc pas supprimé en 1627-1628*, mais il a subi une mutation sous un autre nom et en un autre centre[1].

Organisation militaire du Danube

Ainsi que nous avons pu le constater, les Ottomans attachèrent une grande importance au Danube. Pour sa défence fut créée la capitainerie du Danube (*Tuna Kapudanlığı*), ou plutôt, trois capitaineries, respectivement à Budin (Bude), Semendire/Smederevo (en fait Belgrade), et Hirsova (Danube inférieur). Le titre de *mirliva-i Tuna* est accordé à chaque *kapudan*. Particulièrement intéressant est le sancak "pour la défense du Danube de Hırsova à la mer Noire", mentionné en 1602[2]. Cela signifie qu'au moins aux 15e et 16e siècles, il n'y avait pas un commandement central sur le Danube ottoman. Les capitaineries mentionnées ci-dessus dépendaient des *beylerbeyilik* régionaux : celui de Bude du *beylerbeyilik* du même nom, celui de Semendire (Belgrade) soit du *beylerbeyilik* de Rumeli soit pour le secteur des Portes de fer (Demir Kapı/Portile de Fier) de celui de Temeşvar (Timişoara) et celui du Danube inférieur du *beylerbeyilik* de Silistre-Özü. D'autre part, les voïévodes de Moldavie et de Valachie étaient responsables de la sécurité du tronçon s'étendant des Portes de fer à la mer Noire. Un *ferman* du 7 Cemaziülâhır 1027/ 1er juin 1618 ordonne au voïévode de Moldavie d'empêcher les brigands (*haydud eşkiyası)* de traverser le Danube[3]. De même, selon un autre document daté de evasıt-ı Zilkade 1108/1-10 juin 1697, le voïévode de Valachie reçut des instructions pour protéger les navires de commerce descendant le Danube entre les Portes de fer et *Orşova* (*Irşova*) contre les incursions des bandits[4]. Les brigands en question et les Cosaques se cantonnaient plus particulièrement dans les marais des bouches du Danube.

---

[1]Pour l'opinion contraire,voir, par exemple, V. Ostapchuk, *The Ottoman Black Sea Frontier and the Relations of the Porte with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Muscovy, 1622-1628*, thèse de l'Université de Harvard, 1989, pp. 256-257, par ailleurs une excellente thèse.

[2]BOA, fonds *A.DVN*, 13/ 41, evâhır-ı Rebiülâhır 1011/ 7-16.10.1602.

[3]BOA, *Mühimme Defteri*, cilt 82, hkm. 228; *82 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (1026-1027/ 1617-1618), özet, transkripsyon, indeks ve tıpkıbasım*, Ankara, 2000, p. 151.

[4]BOA, *Mühimme Defteri*, cilt 112, p. 17 ; T. Gemil, *Relatiile Tarilor Romane cu Poarta otomana in documente turcesti 1601-1712*, Bucarest, 1984, doc. 216, pp. 444-445.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0081

L'importance militaire du Danube pour les Ottomans est incontestable. Lors des campagnes contre les Autrichiens, les Hongrois, les Transylvaniens, les Valaques, les Moldaves, les Polonais et les Cosaques, le fleuve servait à acheminer les troupes, l'artillerie, l'approvisionnement et les fournitures militaires car le transport fluvial était plus rapide et plus sûr que la voie terrestre. L'ambassadeur impérial Busbecq, lors de son voyage de Vienne à Constantinople en 1554-1555, a suivi la route danubienne Bude-Belgrade, "qui est plus sure et plus rapide", car, explique-t-il, la voie terrestre, spécialement avec beaucoup de bagages, qui attirent l'attention et la tentation des *haydut* dure "au moins 12 jours", tandis que, par le Danube, le voyage dure "seulement 5 jours"[1].

La flotte ottomane du Danube

Lors de l'expédition contre Hunyadi (*Yankul*) en 1442, les Ottomans maintenaient en permanence 80-100 bâtiments de guerre légers sur le Danube et une soixantaine à Gelibolu.[2] Nous ne possédons aucune autre donnée sur la flotte du Danube en dehors de ces chiffres avancés par İnalcık. Par contre nous pouvons déterminer le nombre des bâtiments de la flotte impériale stationnés temporairement sur le Danube. Par exemple, en 1595, lors de la révolte du voïévode de Valachie Mihai Viteazul, 10 gallères (*kadırga*) avec des canons et de l'artillerie furent envoyées sur le Danube via Varna, précédant le départ le 27 avril du grand-vizir et serdar-ı ekrem Ferhat Paşa, chargé de réprimer cette rebellion.[3] De même, le 18 juillet, sept gallères chargées aussi de canons et de munitions furent expédiées vers le Danube avec le nouveau grand-vizir et serdar-ı ekrem Koca Sinan Paşa. Elles atteignirent Rusçuk un mois après, le 19 août.[4]

Il semblerait donc que le nombre et la classe des batiments changeaient en fonction des besoins des campagnes entreprises par les armées ottomanes.

Le 28 Cemaziülâhır 975/30 décembre 1567, le *kapudan paşa* reçut l'ordre de préparer 100 navires. Le printemps suivant (1568), on lui demanda le compte des batiments se trouvant dans les ports et arsenaux et le nombre

---

[1] Busbecq, *Türk Mektupları (Lettres turques)*, trad. par Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, Ankara, 1939, p. 24.
[2] H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age 1300-1600*, New York-Washington, 1973, p. 21.
[3] İsmail Hami Danişmend, *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*, Istanbul, 1972, vol. 3, p. 145.
[4] Ibid., pp. 148, 151.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0082

de galériens dont on pouvait disposer car 50-60 navires devaient prendre la mer pour assurer une mission de protection des côtes[1]. Selon Giustinian, le baile de Venise à Istanbul (1620-1627), la flotte ottomane en Méditerannée comptait 60 unités, celle de la mer Noire 20[2]. Cette dernière source ne donne malheureusement pas d'information sur la flotte du Danube.

Les batiments du Danube appartenaient aux mêmes catégories que ceux des autres flottes ottomanes appareillants sur les autres mers et fleuves : *kadırga* (italien galera), *baştarde* (italien bastarde), *kalyon, kaleyte* (italien galeotta), *şayka* (barca)[3]. Pour les exemples nous aurons recours à des sources documentaires.

Selon le médecin de Mehmed II, l'Italien Angiolello, les Ottomans utilisèrent des grandes *şayka* pour le passage du Danube (1475). Chacune de ces grandes *şayka* ancrées à Silistre, Vidin et d'autres ports du Danube pouvait embarquer jusqu'à 14 chevaux[4].

Busbecq a fait son voyage de 1554 de Bude à Belgrade à bord d'un bateau de commerce tiré par 24 rameurs.

L'Espagnol Galan donne pour la hauteur d'une *şayka* du Danube la taille d'un homme et demi, pour sa largeur la taille de deux hommes et pour sa longueur la taille de quatre hommes, ce qui fait respectivement 1,80, 2,70 et 3,60 m.[5] Les *şayka* doivent leur renommée particulièrement aux corsaires cosaques qui lancèrent dès la fin du 16e siècle des raids vers la Moldavie et ensuite menacèrent les ports ottomans, attaquant en 1613 le port de Sinop et mettant en danger l'accès maritime de Constantinople. İbrahim Paşa qui reçut la mission de protéger les côtes de la mer Noire et le Danube contre ces razzias réussit à venir à bout des corsaires cosaques, libérant les prisonniers et reprenant le butin capturé à Sinop.[6]

En 1595, durant la campagne de Valachie, 70 *şayka* furent utilisées pour la construction du pont Rusçuk- Giurgiu[7].

---

[1]BOA, *Mühimme Defteri,* cilt 7, hkm 634 ; *7 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (975-976/1567-1569), özet, transkripsyon, indeks ve tıpkıbasım,* Ankara 1998 pp. 311-312.
[2]Archivio di Stato di Venezia, *Collegio V (Secreta), Relazioni,* Busta 6, pp. 132-133.
[3]Voir M. Sertoğlu, *Resimli Osmanlı Tarihi Ansiklopedisi,* Istanbul, 1958 pp. 34-35, 158, 160, 123, etc.
[4]*Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, I, Bucarest 1968, p. 133.
[5]*ibidem*, III, Bucarest 1971, p. 527.
[6]Ahmet Gündüz, "Osmanlı-Kazak münasebetleri, 1613-1774", *Türk Dünyası Tarih Kültür Dergisi,* No 190 (Ekim 2002) pp. 24-25.
[7]*Călători străini despre Ţările Române*, III, Bucarest 1971, p. 527.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0083

Toujours en 1595, à l'occasion de la conquête par les Ottomans de Yanık (Györ, Raab) le 20 Zilkade 1003/27 juillet 1595, l'historien Mustafa Selâniki rapporte dans sa chronique que 10 grandes *kadırga,* 600 *şayka* et bateaux en pin figuraient au nombre du butin[1]. Nous savons que les *kadırga* — les plus grands batiments de la flotte ottomane — comptaient 25 sièges assis et 49 rames, maniées chacune par 4-5 rameurs[2]. Il n'y avait aucune différence à cette époque entre les navires ottomans et ceux des flottes européennes. L'écard devait se creuser à partir du 17e siècle à la faveur des Européens.

Les *kalyon* (galion/caravella) pouvaient embarquer jusqu'à 200 hommes et 60-120 bouches à feu[3]. Les *baştarda* comptaient de 26 à 32 paires de rames avec 5-7 rameurs par rame[4].

Les rameurs étaient recrutés surtout dans la région danubienne, et outre les provinces ottomanes la principauté tributaire de Valachie devait aussi en fournir, comme, par exemple, en 1543, 1545, 1559[5]. Pour la campagne de Szigetvar de 1565/1566 il fut exigé 2,400 rameurs valaques(distribués par 12 à chacun des 200 navires nouveaux construits à Nikopol et Vidin)[6]. Conformément aux documents ottomans de 1543, ces rameurs,utilisés pour "la flotte du Danube (*donanma-yı Tuna)*", furent payés en monnaies d'or[7]. En outre, la Valachie, mais aussi la Moldavie contribuaient avec de l'argent,du bois de construction, du chanvre, du suif, aux besoins de la flotte ottomane[8].

Les chantiers navals et les arsenaux sur le Danube aux 16 et 17e siècles restent à être étudiés en détail. Les documents ottomans indiquent clairement l'existence de chantiers navals dans les principales échelles du Danube, comme, par exemple, à Vidin, Rusçuk et Nikopol *(Niğbolu)*[9].

Cet article ne vise qu'à être une introduction à l'historique du Danube ottoman et à celle de la flotte fluviale. Une étude détaillée sera le résultat de recherches approfondies dans les archives ottomanes.

---

[1] *Tarih-i Selâniki,* éd. M. İpşirli, p. 398.

[2] M. Sertoğlu, *op. cit.,* p. 158.

[3] *Ibidem,* p. 160.

[4] *Ibidem,* p. 34.

[5] Mihai Maxim, "Obligaţiile militare, in muncâ şi de transport ale Ţărilor Române fată de Poarta in a doua jumatate a veacului XVI", *Analele Universitatii Bucuresti,* XXVIII, 1979, p. 105.

[6] BOA, *Mühimme Defteri,* cilt 5, hkm. 592, p. 231. M. Maxim, *op. cit.,* p. 105.

[7] BOA, fonds *D.BRZ* no.20.614, p. 101; *Kepeci* no. 1765, p. 7 b.

[8] Mihai Maxim, "XVI. asrın ikinci yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğuna karşı iktisadi ve mali mükellefiyetleri hakkında bazı düşünceler" (Quelques considérations sur les obligations économiques et financières de la Moldavie et de la Valachie envers l'Empire ottoman dans la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle), dans *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi Bildirileri,* Ankara, 1973, vol. 2, p. 562; idem, "Obligaţiile militare…", p. 105.

[9] BOA, *Mühimme Defteri,* cilt 5, hkm. 592, p. 231; M. Maxim, "Obligatiile militare…", p. 105, etc.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0084

THE RE'AYAS OF TRIBUTARY-PROTECTED PRINCIPALITIES (THE 16th-18th CENTURY)

Viorel PANAITE

LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TERMINOLOGY

TREATY-PEOPLE (*MU'AHID*)

The non-Muslims who had taken an oath of loyalty and agreed to pay tribute to the sultan were legally called *ehl-i 'ahd* or *mu'ahidîn*, a notion derived from the Arab word *'ahd*, which implied engagement, agreement, convention, oath, etc. In Ottoman sources the Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians were called *mu'ahidîn*, translated frequently also "signatories of a covenant or beneficiaries of engagement", considering they had several times concluded "engagements" with the sultans. Initially, that is in the fifteenth century, the term *mu'ahid* was applied only to the hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia. Then, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was extended like the *haracgüzar* notion to all inhabitants of the two Danubian principalities, as well as to the prince and people of Transylvania.[1] This Ottoman official view remained still valid in the eighteenth century, and the best example is the legal opinion (*fetva*) of 1717 issued by the *şeyhülislam* Ebu-İşak Kara İsmail Na'im Efendi (1716-1718) during the Ottoman-Habsburg war of 1716-1719; accordingly the Wallachians were still considered among the "infidels who are beneficiaries of an engagement with Muslims" (*keferesi ehl-i İslam ile mu'ahidhin olan*).[2]

According to the *şeri'at*, there were two categories of "treaty-people": *müste'min*s, i.e. tolerated and protected non-Muslim foreigners, and *zimmi*s, i.e. non-Muslim Ottoman subjects.[3]

---

[1] Halil İnalcık, "Boğdan," *EI-2*, I, 1290-1; Maxim, *TRÎP*, 143-68; Viorel Panaite, "Relaţiile româno-otomane în terminologia juridică musulmană," *CLSO* (Bucureşti), 1, 1990, 31-6. *Mu'ahidîn* means also "contractual parts" (Kelekian, *DTF*, 1189).

[2] Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 24 (*fetvâ* included in a *hüküm* of *evâil Cemazi ül-evvel* 1129 / 13-22 April 1717).

[3] Morabia, *Gihad*, 290.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0085

NON-MUSLIM SUBJECTS AND PROTECTED PEOPLES (RE'AYAS AND ZİMMİS)

Ottomanists or not, historians and jurists have constantly dealt with the *zimmi* status in the Ottoman Empire,[1] i.e. the position of the Greek-Orthodox,[2] Jewish[3] and Armenian[4] communities under Ottoman rule, including that of monasteries (for example, Saint Catherine of Sinai, Saint John Prodromos of Serres etc.).[5] There are also studies which analysed the *millet* system from the outlook of minorities status and Turkish nationalism.[6]

---

[1]Gibb, Bowen, *Islamic Society,* I/2, 207,/2; K. Binswanger, *Untersuchungen zum Status der Nichtmuslime in Osmanischen Reich des 16. Jahrhunderts. Mit einer neudefinition des Begriffes "Dimma",* München, 1977; Y. Ercan, "Türkiye'de XV-XVI. yüzyıllarda Gayrımüslimlerin Hukuki, İçtimai ve İktisadi Durumu", *Belleten,* XLVII, 188, 1983, 1119-49; R. C. Jennings, "Zimmis" (Non-Muslims) in early 17th Century Ottoman Juridical Record. The Sharia Court of Anatolian Kayseri", *JESHO*, 21, 3, 1978, 225-93; Youssef Courbage, Philippe Fargues, *Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Islam arabe et turc,* Paris, 1992. In this respect, the work edited in 1982 by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, which gathered studies written by outstanding specialists, became a reference book (*Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*. Vol. 1 *The Central Lands,* New York, London, 1982, C. E. Bosworth, "The Concept of *Dhimma in Early Islam*" 37-51; İ. Metin Kunt, "Transformation of Zimmi into Askerî", 55-67; B. Braude, "Foundation Myths of the *Millet* System," 69-88.

[2]Theodore H. Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination,* Brussels, 1952; N. J. Pantazopoulos, *Church and Law in the Balkan Peninsula during the Ottoman Rule,* Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki, 1967; Josef Kabrda, "Les documents turcs relatifs aux droits fiscaux des métropolites orthodoxes en Bulgarie au XVIII[e] siècle." *Archiv Orientální* (Praha), 26/1, 1958, 59-80; Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity,* Cambridge, 1968; J. Kabrda, *Le système fiscal de l'Église Orthodoxe dans l'Empire Ottoman,* Brno, 1969; Süreyya Şahin, *Fener Patrikhânesi ve Türkiye,* Istanbul, 1980; S. Sidarouss, *Les patriarchats dans l'Empire Ottoman et spécialement en Egypte,* Paris, 1906; H. İnalcık, "The Status of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch under the Ottomans." *Turcica,* XXI-XXIII, 1991, 407-36.

[3]Joseph R. Hacker, "Ottoman Policy toward the Jews and Jewish Attitudes towards the Ottomans during the Fifteenth Century", in *Christians and Jews,* 117-26; Mark A. Epstein, "The Leadership of the Ottoman Jews in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries." in *Christians and Jews,* 101-15; Aryeh Shmuelevitz, *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire in the late Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Centuries. Administrative, Economic, Legal and Social Relations as Reflected in the Reponsa,* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984.

[4]Kevork B. Bargakjian, "The Rise of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople." in *Christians and Jews,* 89-100.

[5]Nicolas Oikonomides, *Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane."SF,* XXXV, 1976, 1-10; Zdenka Veselá-Prenosilova, "A propos de la protection exercée par le gouvernement ottoman sur le Monastère de Ste. Catherine au Sinai et de leurs employés." in *Rapports, co-rapports, communications tchécoslovaques pour le IVe congrès de l'Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Europen,* (Separatum), Prague, 1979, 477-85. *Documents issued by sultans for this convent* were publiched by Klaus Schwarz, *Osmanische sultansurkunden des Sinai-Klosters in türkischer Sprache,* Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970. For a comparison with the predecessors' policy towards the Sinai Convent, see S. M. Stern, "Two Ayyubid Decrees from Sinai." in *Documents from Islamic Chanceries,* ed. S. M. Stern, Cambridge, Mss., 1965, pp. 10-25; E. Khedoori, *Charters of Privileges granted by the Fatimids and Mamluks to St. Catherine's Monastery of Tur Sinai (ca. 500 to 900),* Dissertation, University of Manchester, 1958. For Saint John Prodromos of Serres, see I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La prise de Serres et le firman de 1372 en faveur du Monastère de Saint-Jean-Prodrome." *Acta Historica. Societas Academica Dacoromana* (Munich), IV, 1965, 15-24; E. A. Zachariadou, "Early Ottoman Documents of the Prodromos Monastery (Serres)." *SF.* XXVIII, 1969, 1-12.

[6]A. Rechid, "Les droits minoritaires en Turquie dans le passé et le présent." *Revue générale de droit international public,* 1935; Kemal Karpat, *An Inquiry into the Social Foundations of Nationalism in the Ottoman State: from Social Estates to Classes, from Millets to Nations,* Princeton University, 1973; M. Grignaschi, "L'Impero Ottomano e la minoranze religiose", in *Studi in onore di Francesco Gabrieli nel suo ottantesimo compleano,* Roma, 1984, 411-22.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0086

In Islamic law, the relationship between the Muslim community and non-Muslim individuals or communities to which it extended its tolerance and protection was conceived as regulated by a pact or contract called *zimmet*, which means in Arabian "obligation, forgiveness, privilege, protection" etc. If a *harbî* people had accepted to pay tribute and to obey the Muslim ruler, receiving protection for lives and property, and the right to practice their own religion, from a legal point of view they became *ehl-i zimmet or zimmis*, i.e. "people of pact" or "protected peoples".[1] As a rule, the Muslim jurists recorded six absolutely "necessary" obligations, and six "desirable" ones which had to be observed by non-Muslim subjects for enjoying the Muslims' protection and keeping the "protected peoples" status.[2] Actually, only *cizye* paying could be considered a positive obligation, added to the earliest status, the other five trying to cancel any hostile behaviour towards Muslims in view of a future common life which would presume a mutual tolerance. In the contracts concluded in early Islam with non-Muslim communities was regularly stipulated that Muslim rulers would grant protection over the non-Muslims' life, faith and properties, which theoretically had to be defended against any aggression.[3] The safekeeping of tributaries was put firstly into practice by forbidding to kill, plunder and seize them. "Saved are you by protection of Allah, since you have spared your blood by *cizye* paying" stipulated the '*ahd* concluded by Khalid ibn al-Walhid with the chief of certain Arabian tribes in 12 H. / 633 AD. Moreover, the protection of the *zimmis*' goods imply an absolute ownership of the personal estate. Also, the real estate (lands, in particular) could be left to the afresh protected peoples, either as properties or in possession. "Obey our authority and we shall also leave your

---

[1]From studies concerning the *zimmî* status in classical Islam, see: A. Fattal, *Le statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam*. Beyrouth. 1958; A. S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and their Non-muslims Subjets. A Critical Study of the Covenant of 'Umar*, Plymouth & London, 1970; B. Ye'or, *Le dhimmi. Profil de l'opprimé en Orient et en Afrique du Nord depuis la conquête arabe*, Paris, 1980; Bernard Lewis, "L'Islam et les non-Musulmans", *Annales*, 35, 3-4, 1980, 784-99. More recently: Wolfgang Kallfelz, *Nichtmuslimische Untertannen im Islam: Grundlge, Ideologie und Praxis der Politik frühislamischer Herrscher gegenüber ihren nichtmuslimischen Untertanen mit besonderem Blick auf die Dynastie der Abbasiden (749-1248)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995; Maxim, *TRÎP*, 169-96.

[2]According to Majid Khadduri, *zimmîs* had necessarily: to pay the *cizye*, which was the most important obligation stipulated in the tributary-protection covenant (*'ahd üz-zimmet*); not to attack the religion of Islam nor show any disrespect to Muslim practices; not to revile or show any disrespect to the prophet Muhammad or to the Qur'ân; not to injure the life or the property of a Muslim; to not marry a Muslim woman or to enter into sexual connection with her. It was desirable: not to sell wine or practice usury, and not to drink wine and eat pork in public; to wear distinctive clothing; not to ride on horseback or carry weapons, but only on donkeys and mules; not to have higher houses than Muslim ones, preferably lower; not to ring their church bells loudly, and not to raise their voices loudly in prayer; not to bury their dead nearby Muslim quarters, and not to weep over dead loudly (Khadduri, *War and peace*, 195-7; Laoust, *Ibn Taimiya*, 270; Maxim, *TRÎP*, 171-2).

[3]Hamidullah, *Documents*, doc. 267 (on Heliopolis).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0087

lands to you..." promised Khalid ibn al-Walîd to the Persian inhabitants.[1] That tolerant attitude would be recorded and theorised in end eighth- early ninth century law treatises. The exchange between protection and *cizye* paying became a principle of Islamic law. "A *zimmi* is like a Muslim in everything which relates to the prohibition of hurting him — al Fazzali said —, for Islamic law protects his honour just as it protects his life and property; he, unlike the *harbî*, must therefore not be slandered."[2]

In the same way, all non-Muslims who had submitted themselves to the authority of Ottoman state and paid taxes, said R. C. Jennings, who studied the case of the Ottoman Cyprus — were as a consequence — entitled to stay in the house of Islam, guaranteeing them security for their person and their belongings, freedom to practice their religion, and defence against enemies.[3] In other words, Christians, Jews, Armenians and other non-Muslims living within the house of Islam, i.e. the Ottoman Empire, are permitted to keep their religion and institutions, upon the condition of paying the poll-tax (*cizye*) and the land-tax (*haraç*). Even though the Ottoman behaviour towards non-Muslim subjects was quite tolerant in comparison with Western countries and Iran, yet, taking into consideration more religious interdiction, obligation to wear different garments, or the inequality before the *kadı*, one concluded the *zimmi* from the territories under Ottoman direct administration were still regarded as a "second-class or inferior subjects."[4] Attempts to modernise the condition of non-Muslim subjects took place during the nineteenth century, especially in the Tanzimat period, when the doctrine of equality between Muslims and Christians is developed by Christian communities, the Ottoman politicians and the Western powers.[5] Let us notice this view was applied also in relation with the inhabitants of Wallachia and

---

[1]Hamidullah, *Documents*, doc. 221; Lewis, *Islam*, I, 228. In Ottoman legal view, the "subjects and inhabitants" of the tributary principalities had the right, confirmed by seventeenth and eighteenth-century *fermâns*, too, "to possess and hold their properties and lands" (Mehmet, *Documente turc.*, I, doc. 260: *fermân* of August 1761, issued by Mustafa III for the Ottoman authorities in Vidin and Ocakow).

[2]Lazarus-Yafeh, *al-Ghazzali*, 442.

[3]Jennings, *Ottoman Cyprus*, 132.

[4]Coles, *Ottoman Impact*, 54; Lazarus-Yafeh, *al-Gazzali*, 442; Fattal, *Non-musulmans*, 169; Ayverdî, *Istanbul mahalleleri*, 79, h. 89; Maxim, *TRÎP*, 182-3. For nineteenth century modernization, see Davidson, "Christian-Muslim Equality," 113; Carter V. Findley, "The Acid Test of Ottomanism: The Acceptance of Non-Muslims in the Late Ottoman bureaucracy," in *Christians and Jews*, 339-68; Steven Rosenthal, "Minorities and municipal Reform in Istanbul. 1850-1870." in *Christians and Jews*, 369-86; Enver Ziya Karal, "Non-Muslims Representatives in the First Constitutional Assembly. 1876-1877," in *Christians and Jews*, 387-400. There are opinions according to which the non-muslim subjects should be included among the "citizens" of *umma* (Tarazi, "Statut personnel," 354-77: Ch. IV. *La notion de citoyenneté et de sujétion dans la théorie du droit public musulman*; Davidson, "Christian-Muslim Equality," 113; Özel, *İslam Hukuku*, 210-1).

[5]Maxim, *CTO*, 134-6; Davison, "Christian-Muslim Equality," 113-4.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0088

Moldavia, during a visit in Silistre town in the spring of 1827, Mahmud II (1808-1839) affirming that all his subjects had the same rights and obligations, no matter their faith.[1]

In Ottoman legal records, e.g. *kitab as-siyar, fetva, hüccet* etc., the non-Muslim subjects groups were almost without exception called simply *zimmis*.[2] Although, from a legal point of view, any non-Muslim subject of the sultan was termed *zimmi*, due to the fact that the Christians represented the majority of non-Muslim subjects the word *zimmi* was particularly translated by "Christian". Let us note that there were also other terms used in narrative or official sources for calling Christians, e.g. *İsevî* ("pertaining to Jesus"), *Nasrani* or, later, *Hıristiyanî* ("pertaining to Christianity").[3] Popularly and even in official documents, *zimmis* may have sometimes been referred to as infidels (*kefere)*, but coming to make the difference between the non-Muslim Ottoman subjects and other enemy infidels (*harbî kefere)* who kept on living in the house of war.[4] The other distinctions, e.g. Greek (*Yunani*), Armenian (*Ermeni*), Maronite (*Süryani)*, Jew or Hebrew (*Yahudi, İbranî*) by which were often identified other *zimmi*s and minorities, had significance in regard to administrative organisation but not for legal rights.

During the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries, the *zimmis* constituted the non-Muslim part of "tax-paying subjects" of the Ottoman Empire. The Arabian term *re'aya* (sing. *ra'ayet*) was given several translations: "people subjected to a sovereign", "taxpaying subjects of the Ottoman Empire", "non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire" or only "Christian subjects".[5] Yet, there was imposed the opinion according to which in the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries the *re'aya* designating the tax-paying rural population, were made

---

[1] Nesselrode gives an account of the audience of the Moldo-Wallachian voivodes, Mihail Sturza and Alexandru Ghica, who were received by Mahmud II in Silistre on 27 April 1837 (Hurmuzaki, *Documente,* Supl. I/5, doc. CCLXXX: text of 21 may 1837).

[2] See Halebhi, *Mülteka*, II, 559-628; Mevkufato, *şerh*, I, 328-48; *Fetva-yi Yahyâ Efendi,* Süleymaniye kütüphanesi (SK), Hamidiye 601, 2. 21b-25b: on *zimmîs*. This is also Ronald Jenning's conclusion, who, analyzing the juridical documents in the court of Lefkoşa, Cyprus, affirmed that the name Greek Orthodox (Rum) was never used (Jennings, *Ottoman Cyprus,* 132).

[3] *Redhouse,* 480, 548, 868. According to Cantemir "All Christians are named *İsevî,* by the Historians and in letters, by way of compliment, said the Prince of Moldavia... and also *Nasrani, Nazarenes,* as *Yunani* is given to the *Greeks*, and İbrani to the Jews or *Hebrews*" (Cantemir, *Othman History,* 50, No. 7).

[4] Thus, in the fifteenth to seventeenth century *kânûnnâmes,* the non-Muslim subjects were frequently called "tribute-payers" (*harhacgüzars*), "infidels who are not from the house of war" (*kefere ki dâr ül-harb'dan olmıyan*) etc. (Anhegger, İnalcık, *Kanunnâme,* doc. 53, 55, 56; Biegman, *Ragusa, 124-5: in a* fermân *of 1582).*

[5] On the notion *re'âyâ*, see: Aleksandar Matkovski, "La signification historique des expressions "raia" et "beraia," in *Islam in Balkans,* 55-8; Itzkowitz, *Ottoman Empire,* 59; Mehmet, "Kanunnâme," 137; Maxim, "Teritorii româneşti," I, 806-7; *Redhouse,* 951.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0089

up both of Muslim subjects (*müsülman re'ayası*) and of non-Muslim ones (*kafir re'ayası*).[1] The religious criterion that best defined the two categories was outlined by the *cizye* paying, levied only from the non-Muslim Ottoman subjects (*kafir re'ayası* or *zimmis)*. Let us add that according to the hierarchy of the social categories of the Ottoman Empire, the *re'aya*, which in Arabian means also "flock" and "population", occupied the fourth place, after the "men of the sword" (*asker*), the "men of the book" (*ulema*) and the "men of the plume" (*bureaucrats*).

Since Süleyman Kanunî's reign, the principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania began to be considered in Ottoman official view as parts of the "Well-protected Dominions" (*Memalik-i mahrûsa*), i.e. parts of the Ottoman Empire, and from Islamic legal point of view as territories within the house of Islam (*darülislam*), constituting a section called "realm of tributary protection" (*darüzzimmet*). Consequently, the new kind of protection guaranteed to the Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians originated in the sovereign-subjects relationship. This change was stressed first of all by the terminology used in Ottoman official sources, the inhabitants of the tributary principalities being more and more frequently assimilated to the sultan's subjects from the South of the Danube. The phrase which can be read in a 1017/1608 document, i.e. "the subjects of Moldavia are on the whole the same as the subjects of my Well-protected Dominions" (*bi'l-cümle Boğdan re'ayası sa'ir gibi Memalik-i mahrûsam re'ayası gibi olub*), became a standard one, applied also to the Wallachians, Transylvanians or Ragusans. Thus, in the same way, it was affirmed that the "inhabitants of Dubrovnik are my tax-payer subjects just like other subjects" (*Dubrovniklü sa'ir re'aya gibi haracgüzar re'ayalarımdır*). Actual, it was about a special category of *re'aya*, that is the tribute-payer subjects (haracgüzar olan re'aya), which included — since the first part of the sixteenth century — both the subjects from territories under the Ottoman direct administration and those who lived in autonomous region and states, like Ragusa and the tributary principalities from the north of the Danube.[2]

The non-Muslim "tribute-payer *re'ayas"*, including the Wallachians, Moldavians, Transylvanians, as well as the Ragusans, were considered *zimmis,* according to Islamic legal tradition taken over by Ottomans. As a result, in official documents one can meet constantly the phrase "*zimmi* named x" for

[1] Opinion adopted also by Ö. L. Barkan, H. İnalcık, N. Beldiceanu, J. Kabrda (Matrovski, "Raia-beraia", 55-8); Itzkowitz, *Ottoman Empire,* 59; Mehmet, "Kanunnâme," 137.

[2] Gemil, *Documente turc.,* doc. 14: a chancery record of 1012/1604 referring to the Wallachian subjects, doc. 32; Biegman, "Ragusan Spying," 238.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0090

terming inhabitants of the tributary principalities travelling to the South of the Danube.[1] Being attributed the legal quality of *zimmi*, they were assimilated, as a rule, to the Ottoman subjects of the right side of the Danube and distinguished from the peoples of the neighbouring Christian states (considered *harbî*, according to Hanefi view). In this respect, the Ottoman official view was clearly outlined in an "after 1672" order by which Mehmed IV (1648-1687) reminded Ottoman authorities of the Istanbul-Trnovo route and of the Western shore of the Black Sea that "it is not my imperial permission the <Wallachian population> be treated like the Polish one", resorting to the statement "the Wallachian population is not an enemy one; it is the same as the population of my other Well-protected Dominions" (*Eflak re'ayası harbî değildir sa'ir Memalik-i mahrûsamda olan re'aya gibidir*).[2]

The strongest evidence is offered by some legal opinions (*fetvas*) — unpublished yet — issued by the mufti Ali Efendi Akkermanlı (d. 1621) who was present and worked also in the Ottoman territories from the North-West of the Black Sea. In some of them he defined the Moldavians as being *re'aya* and protected peoples *(ehlüzzimet)*.[3]

The Ottoman sources did not use only a legal-religious terminology, but also a political-administrative one. All Ottoman documents registering the transit from an Ottoman province to another insisted on the identification of individuals. When they enter neighbouring *sancak*s, a special case being the crossing of the Danube,[4] the Wallachians and Moldavians, but also by naming their "country" (*vilayet*), where they were living,[5] or by specifying the prince's name.[6] The denomination "Moldavian," "Wallachian" and "Transylvanian," formed by adding the suffixes - *lu*, - *lü* to the name of their

---

[1]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 16 5q *Simû nâm zimmhi, Fuluran nâm zimmî, Yanku nâm zimmî,* in *tezkeres* of 1604-1607, 93 5a *hüküm* of 1630-1631.

[2]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 155.

[3]*Fetâva-yi Akkirmânî Maa Üskûbî* (Sk, Hkm. 405, f. 90b); *Fetâva-yi 'Alî Akkermânî* (TKSMK, A 842).

[4]For instance, in the 1604-1607 paying receipts (*tezkere*) of the tax for crossing the Danube the term *zimmî* was used but accompanied by the specification of "place of residence". A merchant (*tüccar*) was identified as "a person named Iacov who is one of the inhabitants of Moldavia" (*Boğdan sâkinlerinden Yakov nâm kimesne). Sâkin* meant actually "resident" (Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 16).

[5]"The subjects of the principality of Transylvania" (*Erdel memleketinin re'âyâsı*) who travelled to Lipova (then, an Ottoman town), in a 1678-1679 document; "the subjects of Wallachia" (*Eflâk re'âyâsından olub*), in a document of 1107/1696 (Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 161, 213); "among the subjects of Wallachia who are transiting from the principality of Wallachia to Nikopol" *(vilâyet-i Eflâk'dan Nikbolı tarafına mürûr iden Eflâk re'âyâsından*), in a *hüküm* of 1129/1717 (Veliman, *Documente turc,* doc. 29)

[6]In 1967/1559 Süleyman Kanunî asked the *kadı* of Rusçuk to forbid the Ottoman clerks to trouble the "men" of the "Walalchian voivode", Petru the Younger (Mehmet, *Documente turc.*, I, doc. 41).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0091

countries of origin, were quite frequent, e.g. *Boğdanlı* from *Boğdan, Eflaklu* from *Eflak, Erdellü* from *Erdel.*[1]

PROTECTION OF TRIBUTE-PAYER SUBJECTS

As a result of the *zimmi* position, since Süleyman Kanunî's reign the Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians enjoyed basically similar rights as any other subjects of the empire, in regard of their life, liberty, possessions and religion, opposed as a rule to the enemies (*harbî*) status.[2]

PROHIBITION TO BE ENSLAVED

One of the consequences of the peace agreements between the Balkan princes and the Ottomans consisted in cancelling the pillaging raids (*akın*) and, according to a medieval customary practice, in a partial ransom of captives. Similarly, the fifteenth and early sixteenth century protection granted by sultans to the Wallachian and Moldavian hospodars implied firstly a temporary cancellation of the Ottoman right to plunder and seize territories still included into the house of war. A sequence of information concerns the relations between Wallachia and the Porte during the first half of the fifteenth century. Thus, the immediate result of the "peace" concluded by Alexandru I Aldea with Murad II in 1432 was the setting free of his formerly seized subjects. As a matter of fact he related constantly this achievement ("I had released 3,000 of my captives"[3]), invoking it at the same time as an argument intended to support the necessity of engagements with the "Turk infidels", of which he was in return accused by Christians, i.e. the inhabitants of Brasov. According to a late Wallachian chronicler, after the reconciliation of Vlad the Evil with the same sultan, a similar method was applied: "and thus the Turks also liberated all the Wallachians that they had seized before,"[4] those being

---

[1]These terms had the role to identify the Wallachian, Moldavian or Transylvanian subjects and were synonymous with the "Wallachian subjects", the "Moldavian subjects" or the "Transylvanian subjects." (Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 44: a *hüküm* of 1078/1609; doc. 213: a *hüküm* of 1107/1696). This was, as a matter of fact, the terminology used in the *'ahdnâmes* by which the foreign merchants were granted the right to trade in the Ottoman territories: *Lehlü* ("the Pole"), *Venediklü* (*"the Venetian"*), *İngilterelü* ("the Englishman), *Françelü* ("the Frenchman") etc. In a *hüküm* of 1056/1646 issed by İbrahim I were mentioned "those from Poles and Moldavians" (*Lehlü ve Boğdanlulardan*) (Gemil, *documente turc.*, doc. 119).

[2]Analyzing Dubrovnik's case, N. H. Biegman spoke on *Rights of Ragusans resulting from Ottoman citizenship* (Biegman, *Ragusa*, 63-9).

[3]*DRH*, D, I, doc. 197.

[4]*Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, 64.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0092

captives taken as a result of precedent razzias ordered by Murad II and led by Firuzbeyoğlu Mehmed bey.[1] The inhabitants' protection had to be insured also whenever the Ottoman troops crossed the Wallachian territories, being a result of the temporarily establishing of "protectorate" relations between voïvodes and sultans. As a reason it was often invoked that robbery and enslavement had to be directed only against the house of war, not against the tributary states. Thus, in 841/1437-1438, the Ottoman army crossed the territory of Wallachia without plundering it because the Wallachian voïvode (Vlad the Evil) "was tributary (*haracgüzar*) and had pledge with the sultan", and besides the expedition had been aimed to the "Hungarian country".[2] Later, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, a Wallachian dignitary made two meaningful comparisons referring to his country, which enjoyed in his time Ottoman protection and was not still plundered by Turks. To emphasise this advantageous situation, he (on his name Jupan Mogoş *spatarul*) took two reference points: on the one hand, a preceding period — with no strict temporal determination — when the Wallachian territory was subject to regular Ottoman razzias, and on the other hand the early sixteenth century legal status of Hungary and Transylvania: "I tell you this: when the Turks came and trampled us under foot and plundered us, as they do now to you, but do not still plunder us..."[3]

The prohibition to plunder and seize the inhabitants of the tributary principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia was stated also in sixteenth-eighteenth century Ottoman documents, as well as those of Transylvania during 1541-1699. Yet, in that period, other legal arguments than in the fifteenth century were invoked, allusion being made constantly to the necessity of protecting the tax-payers: "but from *re'aya*s and *berayas* and from among those who started the fight <with Islam>, a lot were made captives — wrote Selim II to Devlet Giray I in 982/1574 —, <such that> nobody remained to toil the land and to pay tribute". The sultan's care was based on reasons more pragmatic than the building of ideal relations between sovereign and subjects, reasons which he unhesitatingly stated in the same record: "The people of the *Boğdan vilayeti* pay us tribute and most of the well-guarded Istanbul comes from them, <this is why> our greatest desire is that <the country> be inhabited and prosperous".

---

[1] Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, and Neşri, *Tarih*, in *Cronici turc. I*, 86, 118.

[2] İdris Bitlisi, *Heşt behişt*, in *Cronici turc. I*, 167.

[3] Jupân Mogoş Sparatul to Didea of Sad and Comşa, as well as to the inhabitants of Sad and Cesnadia (Tocilescu, *534 documente*, doc. 441: letter from the first part of the sixteenth century).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0093

The *şeri'at* stipulated expressly that the tribute-payers and protected-peoples may not be enslaved by Muslims. Frequently, the Ottoman documents alluded to the above-mentioned rule as one can find in the above-mentioned *nişan-ı hümayûn* of 982/1574, enacted by Selim II to the Crimean Khan : "killing and captive making from among the subjects who pay tribute is against the holy law (*şeri'-i şerif*)."[1] In support of this idea, let us quote one of the legal opinions issued by the mufti Ali Efendi Akkermanlı (d. 1621), relating directly to the legal status of protected pepolse (*zimmi*) applied also to the Moldavians as well as to the Wallachians and Transylvanians beginnning with Süleyman Kanunî's reign:

> "Question: A Moldavian captive belonging to Zeyd became willingly a Muslim. When all seized captives, including the above mentioned one, were set at liberty by imperial order, saying «they are subjects and protected peoples», it is able to set at liberty and take from Zeyd's hand the Muslim captives, too? The answer: It is possible. The protected peoples are free..." (Mesele: *Zeydin yedinde bir Boğdan esir rızasıyla müslüman oldukdan sonra mezkûr ile sebi olunan cümle esirleri re'aya ve zimmileridir deyü emr-i padişâhî ile ıtlak etdüklerinde Zeydin müslüman olan esirlerini dahi yedinden alub ıtlaka kadır olurlar mı?* El-cevab*: Olurlar ru'osa Zeydin mülki olmamışdır ehl-i zimmet ahrardır...*).[2]

The interdiction to plunder and seize the protected-peoples (*zimmi*) can be deduced, too, from the stipulations included in sixteenth-seventeenth century imperial charters and diplomas granted to the tribute-payer rulers of south-eastern Europe, i.e. Wallachia, Moldavia, Transylvania, as well as Ragusa, which generally prohibited any Ottoman aggressions. Moreover, the sultan issued often *fermans* concerning this topic, N. H. Biegman quoting in this regard Selim II's order enforcing the Ragusans' immunity from being sold as slaves in other parts of the empire.[3]

The legal aspects of plundering are well outlined by sources which relate uprisings of the Wallachian and Moldavian hospodars and population, in this case the distinction between good subjects and anarchical ones being strongly stressed. The latter could be captured just like the inhabitants of the house of war, but the former could not be seized and pillaged due to their condition of "tribute payer subjects" (*cizyegüzar re'ayalar*). For instance, during the 1716-1718 Ottoman-Habsburg war, a severe punishment was

---

[1] Maxim, *CTO*, doc. 10.
[2] *Fetâva-yi Akkirmânî Maa Üskûbî*, SK, Hkm. 405, f. 90b; *Fetvâ-yi 'Alî Âkkermânî*, TKSMK, A 842.
[3] Biegman, *Ragusa*, 64-5.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0094

promised by the sultan to Ottoman officials of the Danube area who would allow that Wallachian and Moldavian subjects be deprived of their liberty and brought to the south of the river as captives (*esirler*). In return the Ottoman soldiers were allowed to carry to the south of the Danube captives taken from among "the uprising infidels" (*isyan üzere olen kefereden)* or "German prisoners" (*Nemçe esirleri*) seized from Transylvania which was a province of the enemy, i.e. the Habsburg Empire. To prevent any abuse, the Ottoman soldiers had to present papers (*senedler*) providing the origin of prisoners, documents enacted by the Wallachian and Moldavian voïvodes, too. So, only when protected peoples (*zimmi*) and tribute payers (*haracgüzar*) "broke the oath and spit out their revolt", allied or not with enemies of the Sublime Porte, it was legal that they and their families "be captured and made slaves" and their "goods and effects and animals" be plundered. Such attitude was most often validated also by authorised legal opinions (*fetva*), similar to that issued in 1717 by the *şeyhülislam* Ebu-İşak Kara İsmail Na'im Efendi (1716-1718), during the Ottoman-Habsburg war.[1]

The above-quoted records, enacted precisely to remind the prohibition of killing and capturing the protected non-Muslim subjects, proved also that practice was quite different than theory. During the putting down of the uprising of the hospodar Ioan in the summer of 1574, the Tartars made prisoners both from among those "who revolted and provoked disorder and fought the people of Islam" and from among the "re'*ayas* who minded their own businesses... and paid tribute". Selim II tried, but apparently without success, to impose to the Tartars the well-known rule of *şeri'at* which stipulated release of obedient tributaries and protected peoples, as well as a *hüküm* by which the sultan had already ordered that the rebels be ransomed only by their Moldavian relatives and only a price of 1,000 *akçe*s each.[2] Although my first aim was to stress the theoretical elements, one could not disregard the actuality, because the historical sources, especially of the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries register also the abuses which occurred when Ottoman troops crossed the tributary principalities. Here is only one case from so many instances. In 1632-1633, Alexandru Illiaş sent an *arzuhal* to Murad IV and complained about "oppression" and even "enslaving" (*esir itmişlerdir*) of the Moldavian subjects (*re'aya*) by the Tartars of Bucak. As these abuses had occurred during the crossing of the Moldavian territory to "the Kazah country", the hospodar asked the sultan to enact an order for changing the Tartars' route: "that they march along other side of the Dnestr river and not

[1] Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 24, 30, 164, 168.
[2] Maxim, *CTO*, doc. 10.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0095

enter the territory of the Moldavian country" (*Boğdan vilayetin içinden murûn ve ubhur etmemeleri*). Whenever and wherever was militarily possible, the Ottoman central authorities re-established or changed the direction of advancement of the Ottoman (or Tartar) troops. In the above-mentioned case, the claim being well founded, the sultan wrote a note on the Alexandru Iliaş's petition which certified that "firm order was issued" (*müekked-ı hükm buyuruldu*) for restricting in future the crossing of Moldavia by Tartars.[1]

PRINCIPLE OF TAX-PAYER PROTECTION

Considering that wealth was produced by subjects, the Ottoman state's politics towards the *re'aya*s was guided by the principle of "tax-payer protection", fully reflected in chancery documents. Let us note that the Ottoman official records registered not only an abstract principle but also an obvious reality of Ottoman society.[2] As the collective tribute, just like the other obligations to the Porte, had at the basis the taxes paid by subjects, the above-mentioned principle would be extended to the inhabitants of the tributary principalities, too. As a result, the sultan's orders lay stress more and more frequently on the voïvodes' duty to make efforts for the "peace and security of the subjects", the "welfare and contentment of the *re'aya*s," and the "defence and protection of the *re'aya*s."[3] The Moldo-Wallachian and Transylvanian subjects had to be protected even if the prince was going to be changed with another one by a military expedition.[4] To cause prejudices to the tribute-payer subjects (*haracgüzar olan re'ayası*) would be contrary to the *şeri'at* and *kanun*.[5] Thus, referring to the Wallachian subjects, a chancery note of 1012/1604 included also — like many other Ottoman records — the following statement : "An order was decided to be enacted that nobody do any harm to the tribute paying subjects, contrary to the Islamic holy law (*haracgüzar olan re'ayayı hilaf-ı şer'î şerif rica olunmuştur*).[6] To express the

---

[1]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 97.

[2]Decei, *Im p. otoman*, 393; Maxim, "Teritorii românești," I, 806-7.

[3]Maxim, *CTO*, doc. 14; Mehmet, *Documente turc.*, I, doc. 35, 291.

[4]On 12 July 1613, the *sancakbeyi* of Nikbolu, Macaroğlu Ali paşa wrote to the dignitaries of Braşov about the forthcoming expedition for Gabriel Báthory's changing, but assured them that — according to the *padişah*'s will — no subject will be harmed: "His Majesty's will, the *padişah*, is that nobody touches what belongs to you, takes any money and ... and troubles his *re'âyâ*s and *berâya*s." (Guboğlu, "Arhive. Braşov," 242).

[5]The most frequent argument invoked by sultans in this respect consisted in the similitude of their juridical condition with that of other Ottoman tax-payer subjects: "and, the Moldavian subjects are in all like the subjects of my Well-protected Dominions" (*bi'l cümle Boğdan re'âyâsı gibi olub*), stated Ahmed I in a 1017/1608 order (Gemil, *documente turc.*, doc. 32).

[6]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 14. In other document: *hilâf-ı şer'î ve kânhûna muhalif.*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0096

principle of tribute-payers protection and stop the abuses committed against Moldo-Wallachian subjects, seventeenth and eighteenth century *hükümes* used several standard phrases. Let us quote two of them. In 1607/168, Ahmed I stated "there is no imperial permission of mine that interference and violation be perpetrated <against the inhabitants of Moldavia> (*dahl ü tecavüz olunduğuna rıza-i hümayûnum yokdur*).[1] Similarly, in an 1719 order to the hospodar Nicolae Mavrocordat of Wallachia, Ahmed III emphasised that "the Wallachian subjects had to enjoy protection and defence and, there being no imperial permission of mine that the above-mentioned subjects be thus ever abused and oppressed, my great noble desire is that they enjoy the tranquillity and peacefulness of mind under my shelter of my imperial justice and power."[2]

PROTECTION OF PROPERTIES AND POSSESSIONS

To demand protection was regarded by local voïvodes, boyars, clergymen, and representatives (*kapu-kethüdaları*) as a legitimate claim, the abuses made by Ottoman officials and subjects from the neighbouring *sancak*s being promptly reported to the sultan or grand vizier.[3] The most frequent protests concerned the occupation by force of lands belonging to the Wallachian, Moldavian or Transylvanian subjects.[4] When the Tartars violated the territory of Moldavia, both in 1609 and in 1632-1633, the voïvodes asked the sultans to renew the order which prohibited the crossing of the Dnestr.[5] In the same way, violations committed by Turks at the Transylvanian boundaries were regarded by George Rákoczy I, in July 1634, as being "contrary to the state of peace," and accordingly he complained to the Ottoman court.[6]

Sixteenth-eighteenth century documents prove abundantly that the Ottoman central authorities had in view, as a rule, the restriction of any violence committed particularly by local officials and subjects from

---

[1]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 32 (Ahmed I's *hüküm* of 10 *Şaban* 1017 / 19 November 1608), doc. 68 *hüküm* of 1617: *re'âyâ ve berâyâ zulm ve ta'addîye olunduğuna rızâ-yı hümâyûnum yokdur*). See also: Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 37. See also doc. 81, doc. 127 (Mahmud I's *hüküm* of 1149/1737: *memâlik-i mahrûsemin ve sükkân ve kuttânı olan re'âyâ ve berâyâsının himâyet ü sınâyetleri aksâ-yı murâd-ı hümâyûnum olduğuna*), doc. 130.

[2]*Hüküm* issued by Ahmed III to Nicolae Mavrocordat in 1131 *evâhir-i Cemazi'levvel* / 1719 April 11-20 (Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 37: *ve re'âyâ-yı mesfhureye ber-vechle zulm ve ta'addîye kat'et rızâ-yı hümâyhunum olmıyub himâyet ve zîr-i sâye-i mu'âdelet maye-yi pâdişâhânemde refâh-ı bâl ile âsûde-i hâl olmaları aksâ-yı murâd-ı hümayûnum olmağla*).

[3]Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 56, 57, 67, 74, 117, 118, 121, 133, 140, 145, 148 etc.

[4]Maxim, "Statutul politico-juridic," 108-9.

[5]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 49, 97.

[6]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 99.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0097

neighbouring provinces (*beylerbeyıs, kadıs, nazırs* etc.) against the properties and possessions of inhabitants from the principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania.[1] For instance, in the fall of 1714, as a result of notifying by petition (*arzuhal*) of the transgressions perpetrated by the *nazır* of Brăila (*İbrail)* "against certain places within the distinct and settled frontier of the country of Wallachia", Ahmed III issued a *hüküm* to the Danubian *kadıs* for reminding them that those actions were considered abuses contrary to custom and previous orders.[2]

Religious Protection

Several records, e.g. the covenants (*'ahd*), which survived from the time of the Prophet Muhammad and the first four Sunnite caliphs uniformly lay stress on freedom and protection of religious cults guaranteed to those non-Muslim communities that had accepted the "political summon", i.e. the *cizye* paying. Yet, here I shall firstly refer to the *'ahd* granted by Muhammad in 632 to the Christians of Najran, a model invoked in the subsequent legal texts, and included in the Muslim diplomatics textbook: "God's protection and the Prophet's guarantee... spread over the Najran and its neighbourhood, that is over their assets, their persons, their religious cult practices..., over their families, their sacred temples and over everything that belongs to them, root or branch".[3] This tolerant practice applied during the great Arab conquests would be the codified Islamic law treatises in the end of the eighth to the mid-ninth century, looking for justifying this somehow unexpected actuality, an astonishment revealed directly by the question "how come that the prince of Muslims leave churches, synagogues and crosses of the non-Muslims intact?," the Hanefi jurist Abu Yusuf Ya'kub dedicated a special chapter to this topic, stating from the beginning that religious protection had been one of the conditions formulated by infidels to accept the *cizye* paying. Only in this way, peace could be concluded.[4]

---

[1]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 49, 62, 99: Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 16, 43, 110.

[2]Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 16. In a 1744 record, the principle of protection of the Wallachian territory was stated again: "...the distinct and settled confines of the Wallachian *vilayet* should not have suffered any interference and violation from others..." (Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 110).

[3]Hamidullah, *Documents*, doc. 80. It will be included also by al-Kalkaşandî in his textbook. See, also, Hamidullah, *Documents,* doc. 80, 262 (in the Umar's *'ahd* granted to the inhabitants of Ludd); Maxim, "Capitulatiile," 42.

[4]Abu Yusuf, *Kitâb,* 213-230.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0098

The religious toleration was outlined not only during the Arab caliphate, but also in the process of the Ottoman expansion, practised obviously on different levels and with distinct characteristics, depending on historical circumstances. In the Balkan peninsula, on the south of Danube, the non-Muslim communities were allowed to keep their religious edifices, theoretically without permission to build new churches, but only to restore the old ones. Of course, as many historians have already emphasised, it is necessary to not exaggerate this religious toleration, considering that the Ottoman non-Muslim subjects could not have churches in the vicinity of a mosque and had to refrain from using belles worshipping their God loudly.[1] At the same time, in this area newly established Muslim communities built mosques, which in Islamic legal view undoubtedly marked that these territories entered in the house of Islam and symbolised an Islamic-Ottoman conquest. Much later, in the nineteenth century, Edgar Quinet synthesised this practice: "...wherever the Muslims lay hands on a territory, on a kingdom they began by praising their God and Muhammad for their victory, and this great invoice of ownership has been marked on earth by their sacred foundations in Spain, Attica, Morea, Byzantium, Asia Minor, Serbia, Bulgaria. There is no Muslim conquest without this mark".[2]

On the north of the Danube there is another reality, striking to the eye, which was underlined by sixteenth-nineteenth century voyagers and can be easyly also observed today. No mosque was build during the Ottoman domination in Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania, as well as in other tributary provinces of the empire. Thus, European travellers who, no matter their reasons, arrived in the three countries were eager to point out the protection that the religious Orthodox church enjoyed at the north of the Danube, including its architectural component, as compared to the territories south of the Danube. In a French record of 19 August 1686, describing Jassy, the author did not skip over the fact that it had, among other beautiful buildings, "twenty-eight very beautiful churches or convents; that served as a refuge for the whole population and that the Turks, on purpose, never ravaged."[3] At mid-nineteenth century, the French scholar Edgar Quinet continued his above-mentioned pleading which concerns the autonomy of the Danubian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia invoking as an essential

[1] Yet, Géza Dávid emphasized that "These restrictions, however, were felt mainly by Christians and Jews in Istanbul and certain other urban areas; the rural populations were almost untouched by them." (Géza Dávid, "Administration," 75).

[2] Edgar Quinet, *Românii. Reorganizarea provinciilor dunărene,* in *Opere alese,* II, Bucureşti, 1983; Maxim, Panaite, "Pax Ottomanica," 13-4.

[3] "Auxquels les Turcs et les Tartares par politique n'ont jamais touché" (Hurmuzaki, *Documente,* XVI, doc. CCLXXXII (Bethume's letter to Croissy).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0099

argument precisely the religious architecture on their territories: "By an extraordinary exception that is striking to the eye, the Muslims, as soon as they reached this country, denied themselves the right to build a single mosque. From the beginnings till nowadays they have kept their word. What demonstration could there be more convincing for the fact that the Romanian territory is not and has never been marked by the seal of conquest, than that its autonomy and sovereignty have been respected."[1]

From the nineteenth century outlook these affirmations were exaggerated whether one relates to the previous centuries, due to the fact that there was no word promised to be kept by the Ottomans in this respect in the reserved imperial charter and diplomas granted to the Moldo-Wallachian hospodars. Considering the missing of fifteenth-early sixteenth century official documents stipulating on long term the religious protection on the North of the Danube, that is in the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, I am obliged to resort to other sources. First, there the investiture *berat*s granted to the Transylvanian princes which included also stipulations concerning religious autonomy. Thus, in the imperial diploma of July 1614, issued for confirming Prince Gabriel Bethlen to the throne of Transylvania, Ahmed I formally guaranteed the protection of "the rite and order and rules and faith, as well as usages practised among them from ancient times" (*kadimü'l-eyyamdan süregeldikleri ayın ve kaide ve töre ve dinlerin ve aralarında carî olan 'adetlerin tagyîr ve tebdîl etmeyüb*).[2] On the other hand, the practical aspects of the religious protection in Wallachia and Moldavia, which can be called religious autonomy, are revealed by numerous seventeenth and eighteenth-century Ottoman *fermans*. According to them, the administrative and fiscal problems of the local Orthodox church were to be solved without interfering of Ottoman authorities and the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople (*rûm patrikatı tarafından dahi dahl olunub*). This tradition were clearly confirmed by Ahmed I in an order of 1617 sent to the hospodar Radu Mihnea of Moldavia, a document which renewed — as a matter of fact — other preceding orders (*mikaddema emrim dahi verilmekle*).[3] Also, the high clergy had to be an autochtonous one, as an ancient custom (*öteden berü*) invoked in official documents said. Confronting with the Greek clergy "invasion", the voïvode Constantin Mavrocordat asked that this tradition be re-established, and the sultan Osman III issued an *hüküm* in 1755 in this respect.[4]

---

[1]Quinet, *Românii*, 363; Maxim, Panaite, "Pax Ottomanica," 13-4.
[2]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 61.
[3]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 68.
[4]More precisely on *evâhir-i Şaban* 1168 / 2-10 June 1755 (Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 127).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0100

It is to be noticed that the local boyars were frightened that the religious large protection, specific to the self-government status, would have ceased as soon as the local princes would be replaced with Muslim-Turkish governors: "But we fear — confessed the Wallachian boyars in exile in a petition addressed on 25 July 1604 to the prince of Transylvania — that if this be on the Turks' content, they will be appoint there <in Wallachia - o.n> another ruler, a Turk among them, who shares their belief and law, and who will spoil the beautiful Christian churches and monasteries and transform them in <mosques>."[1] Later, in eighteenth century apocryphal "Agreements granted and reinforced by the emperor" (in Romanian, *Legăturile celi primite şî întărite* de *împăraatul*), which were called improperly "capitulations" and made up on the basis of traditions, the Moldavian boyars, as well as the Wallachians in similar texts, also included certain clauses regarding the protection of religious cult by the Ottomans.[2]

WALLACHIAN, MOLDAVIAN AND TRANSYLVANIAN SUBJECTS TO NEIGHBOURING *SANCAK*S

There are several studies on the position of the Ottomans (be they Muslims or non-Muslims) natives of territories from the right side of the Danube, when they travelled to and lived in the tributary principalities from the north of the Danube,[3] but very few pages have been written so far on the regime applied to the inhabitants of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania, who could belong to different ethnic groups, in territories under direct Ottoman administration.[4] From the perspective of the Ottoman legal view the following question arise: what legal position had the inhabitants of the tributary principalities during their travels through or their temporary stay in

---

[1]"*Dar noi ne temem că dacă va fi pe placul turcilor lucrul, vor pune acolo alt Domn, turcesc, dintre dânşii, care e de credinta ca şi de legea lor, care vor strica frumoasele biserici creştineşti şi mânăstirile şi le vor face să fie ale lor*".

[2]"The Christian faith that is valid in Moldavia shall never be violated or spoiled and the churches shall be free as before". Besides, "the Turks shall not be allowed to purchase estates in Moldavia, or settle, or build mosques by any reasons at all" (Giurescu, *Capitulaţiile,* 475). For critical observations upon these texts, see Giurescu, *Capitulaţiile,* 473-504.

[3]Most studies are centred on the eighteenth century. See: M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Despre regimul supuşilor otomani din Ţara Românească în veacul al XVIII-leau." *St. Rdl,* XIV, 1, 1961, 87-113; M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Sur le régime des ressortissants ottomans en Moldavie (1711-1829)." *SAO,* V-VI, 1967, 143-82; R. Mircea, "Sur les circonstances dans lesquelles les Turcs sont restés en Valachie jusqu'au début du XVIIe siècle." *RESEE,* V, 1-2, 1967, 77-86; M. A. Mehmet, "Despre dreptul de proprietate al supuşilor otomani în Moldova şi Ţara Românească în sec. XVII-XVIII," *Cercetări istorice* (serie nouă), Iaşi, III, 1972, 65-81; M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Sur le mariage entre les Turcs ottomans et les Roumains (XVIe s.-XIXe s.)," *Recherches sur l'histoire des institutions et du droit* (Bucureşti), 6, 1981, 15-7.

[4]Ion Matei, "Românii din Imperiul Otoman. Probleme generale." *CICSEE,* III, 1986, 141-9.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0101

neighbouring Ottoman provinces (*sancak)* or in the great Ottoman cities? A clearer image can be obtained by comparison with the legal condition of the foreign merchants coming from Western states to the empire (*müste'min*s) or with the position of other protected peoples (*zimmi*s), and by analogy with the Ragusans' status, as well as with the condition of the Moldo-Wallachians and Transylvanians in Christian neighbouring states.[1]

During the fifteenth and the first part of the sixteenth centuries, the presence of Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians tribute-payers (*haracgüzarlar*) in territories under Ottoman direct administration was occasioned by various circumstances, e.g. trade, transportation, diplomatic mission etc. The trade, even if mostly limited to a "regional" one, was the most important reason for Wallachians and Moldavians to travel to the South of the Danube.[2] Many fifteenth-century documents — some of them being published by Grigore Tocilescu — outline an image of the Wallachian merchants as intermediaries between the "Turkish" merchants and the Transylvanian ones,[3] in the following century the commercial exchanges between the North and the South of the Danube intensifying.[4] Also, numerous sources — like the series of documents published by Nicolae Iorga — prove long-standing commercial relations between the Moldavian centres, especially the towns of Kili and Akkirman occupied by the Ottomans since 1484, and the Greek, Armenian and Jewish merchants of Constantinople.[5]

MÜSTE'MİNS

It is easy to prove that the inhabitants of Wallachia and Moldavia were in the Ottoman legal view infidels (*küffar, kefere*) and covenant-peoples (*mu'ahidîn*), but more difficult to answer clearly what were the Wallachians

---

[1]It is worthy to recall hospodar Vasile Lupu's opinion (1634-1653); accordingly the Moldavian merchants in Poland had the status of "foreigners" and, in this situation, they could ask for protection only to the voivode of Moldavia (Letter to the commander of Krakow of 22 July 1642, in Hurmuzaki, *Documente,* Supl. II/2, doc. CCLXXXIV).

[2]In this respect, İdris Bitlisi, referring retroactively to second half of fourteenth-first half of fifteenth century Gallipoli affirmed: "The merchants and caravans of the Arab and Persian cities, as well as of the countries of Rumeli and Hungary and Wallachia and Moldavia, and of Czech and Polish ones pass through the above-mentioned straits" (İdris Bitlisi, *Heşt Behişt*, in *Cronici turc. I,* 152).

[3]Tocilescu, *534 Documente,* doc. 95, 139. In the first part of the fifteenth century, in Brăilla (İbrail) town on the Danube came merchants from the lands of the infidels, i.e. Ottoman territories (Schiltberger, *Travels*, 38). See, also, I. Bogdan, *Documente privitoare la relatiile Tării Româneşti cu braşovul în secolele XV şi XVI,* col. I, Bucureşti, 1905, passim.

[4]In 1533, merchants from Pitesti, Argeş and Râmnic are mentioned by sources as trading in the Balkans, to the south of the Danube, from where they came back with oriental merchandise. They paid custom duties "at the Vidin passageway" (*DRH*, B, I, 147).

[5]N. Iorga, "Acte privitoare la comerţul românesc cu Lembergul," *Studii i documente,* XXIII, bucureşti, 1913, 328-99, 410-54.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Halle Zweigbibl. Ha 1 Vorderer Orient

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0102

and Moldavians when travelling to Ottoman territories up to the mid-sixteenth century, This dilemma arises even from Halil İnalcık's study. Analysing the late fifteenth-century and early sixteenth-century customs registers of the Keffe and Akkirman towns which mentioned also some "Franks" (*efrençiyan*)[1] from Kios and Moldavia (at that time, tributaries to the Porte) among merchants of different religious and nationalities, Halil İnalcık wondered whether these ones were assimilated by the Ottoman authorities to the foreign merchants coming from the house of war and regretted that he could not draw a firm conclusion.[2]

The condition of foreigners (*müste'min*) in Islamic law have been already studied by specialists, sometimes being compared for a better understanding with the *zimmi* status or with that of strangers in Christendom.[3] As concerns the foreigner condition in the Ottoman state, most historians and jurists analysed it as a particular case, i.e. the *Capitulatory* regime, having at our disposal — as a result — an impressive number of works.[4]

---

[1]In fifteenth and sixteenth-century *kânûnnâmes*, *hüküms* and custom registers, the terms *firenk*, *efrenç* (p. *efrençiyan*), *frenk kâfirleri* were used for naming merchants coming to the empire from European countries (Anhegger, İnalcık, *Kanunnâme, doc. 53, 54;* Cvetkova, *Villes balkaniques, 68;* Lewis *Middle East,* 30; Cl. Cahen, "Crusade," *EI-2*, II, 65; Sousa, *Capitulatory Regime,* 57, No. 43; Nora Şeni, "Finances ottomanes et figures levantines." in *L'accession de la Turquie à la civilisation industrielle: Facteurs internes et externes,* Actes du Colloque d'Istanbul 2-4 déc. 1985, publié par J. Thobie, J. L. Bacqué-Grammont, Istanbul, 1987, 14.

[2]"On can justifiably wonder whether there were really any foreign traders" (İnalcık, "Black Sea," 100).

[3]D'Ohsson, *Tableau,* V, 37-44; J. Hatschek, *Der Musta'min. Ein Beitrag zum internationalen privat und Völkerrecht das Islamischen Gesetzes,* Berlin, 1920; C. Cardahi, "La conception et la pratique du droit international privé dans l'islam (étude juridique et historique)," *ADIRC*, 60, II, 1937, 511-650; C. Cardahi, "Conflict of Law." in *Law in the Middle East.* Vol. I. *Origin and Development of Islamic Law,* edited by M. Khadduri and H. J. Liebesny, Washington, 1955, 334-48; A. Abel, "Le statut légal des étrangers dans l'Islam," *Recueil de la Société Jean Bodin,* IX, 1957. See, also: P. Arminjon, "Droit international privé et droit interne, principalement dans les pays de l'Islam," *Clunet*, 1912, 698-786, 1025-46 and 1913, 34-43, 435-43, 812-23; Salah el-Dine Tarazi, "La solution des problèmes de statut personnel dans le droit des pays arabes et africains." *ADIRC,* 159, I, 1978, 348-463. se, also: O. Rossi, "La posizione giuridica degli infideli nella respublica christiana e nell'Islam." in *Atti del Primo Convegno Nazionale di Studii Giuridico-Comparitivi,* Rome, 1953, 625-55.

[4]J. C. A. Gavillot, *Essai sur les droits des Européens en Turquie et en Egypte. Les Capitulations et la réforme judiciaire,* Paris, 1875. F. Ray, *La protection diplomatique et consulaire dans les échelles du Levant et de Barbarie,* Paris, 1899; A. d'Avril, "Protection des Chrétiens dans le Levant." *RHD,* XIV, 1900, 534-653 and XV, 1901, 69-87; P. Arminjon, *Etrangers et protégés dans l'Empire Ottoman* Tome premier*: Nationalité, protection, indigénat, condition juridique des individus et des personnes morales,* Paris, 1903; A. Schopoff, *Les réformes et la protection des chrétiens en Turquie (1673-1904),* Paris, 1904; G. Pélissié du Rausas, *Le régime des capitulations dans l'Empire Ottoman,* Vol. I-II, 1e édition, Paris, 1902-1905 (deuxième edition, 1910-1911); P. M. Brown, *Foreigners in Turkey. Their Juridical Status,* Princeton, 1914; I. A. Amar, *Les capitulations en Turquie, dans le Levant et en Extrême-Orient,* Genève, 1922; H. Abi-Chahla, *L'Extinction des capitulations en Turquie et dans les régions arabes,* Paris, 1924; M. Essad, *Du régime des capitulations ottomanes, leur caractère juridique d'après l'histoire et les textes,* Istanbul, 1928; A. Rechid, "La condition des étrangers dans la République de Turquie," *RdC,* 46, IV, 1933, 169-227; F. Abelous, *L'évolution de la Turquie dans ses rapports avec les étrangers,* Paris, 1928; N. Sousa, *The Capitulatory Regime of Turkey. Its History, Origin and Nature,* Baltimore, 1933; D. D. Deltcheff, *Le régime des Capitulations en Bulgarie — leur suppression,* Sofia, 1934; H. J. Liebesny, "The Development of Western Judicial Privileges." in *Law in the Middle East,* ed. by M. Hadduri and H. J. Liebesny, Washington, 1955, 309-33; H. İnalcık, "İmtiyâzât," EI-2, III, 1971, 1207-25 (with J. Wansborough).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0103

The foreigners' legal position in Ottoman territories was defined in the *şeri'at*, all Islamic law treaties including a chapter on this topic (*bab al-müste'min*).[1] Particularly, its condition was established and protected by peace and commerce treaties[2] and customary rules. According to Islamic law the life and property of an inhabitant of enemy territories (*harbî*) venturing into Muslim lands were completely unprotected, unless he was given a temporary safe-conduct (*aman*). As I have already shown, general *aman*s for Western merchants, i.e. permission for access and guarantee of safety, were automatically included in the *'ahdname*s *(Capitulations)* granted to their sovereigns.[3] In legal texts the defining of foreigners is clearer than in administrative and diplomatic documents. In a distinct chapter of his work devoted to foreigners and entitled *Bab-ı ahkam al-müste'min,* İbrahim al-Halebî (d. 1549) stated that "Any enemy who enters with safe-conduct into our territories is called *müste'min*" (*Her harbî ki bizim daımıza aman ile dahil ola ana müste'min derler*).[4] In the legal opinions (*fetva*) issued by the *şeyhülislam* or simple muftis, the foreigner was similarly defined: "Zeyd enemy who <comes> from house of war and enters into house of Islam with

[1]Hüsrev, *Dürer,* I, 205-10; Halebî, *mülteka,* I, 336-8; *defter-i sukuk* (Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi (TKSMK) K. 778); *Siyâsete müte'allik fetvâlar (Fetvâs* concerning politics) (TKSMK- H. 1650). Considering the rules of *şeri'at*, one can say that the foreign merchants had a "special status". On "special status" in private international law, see I. P. Filipescu, *Drept international privat,* Bucureşti, 1991, 198-203; Grigore Geamanu, *Drept international public,* I, Bucureşti, 1981, 385-6.

[2]In accordance with certain Ottoman documents (*nâme-i hümâyûn, 'ahdnâme*), the merchants coming from Christian states (e.g. France, Venice, England, Poland, Holland) enjoyed the same commercial privileges in the Ottoman Empire. For instance, in Murad III's letter to Queen Elizabeth I of England (1558-1603) of 8 *Cemaziülevvel* 988 / 21 June 1580 was mentioned: "just as the merchants of Poland and France and Venice come and go, the merchants of your domain also shall bring wares to our Well-protected Dominions and take away wares" (*Leh ve Fırançe ve Venedik bazergânları gelüb gittdüği üzere sizin vilayetiniziin bazergânlar dahi Memâlik-i Mahrûsamıza metâ' getürüb ve metâ' alub gidüb)* (Skilliter, *Harborne,* 247; Uzunçarşılı, "Türk-Ingiliz," 616-7). The comparison with the Polish merchants' position is found also in the 'ahdnâme granted by Mehmed III to the same Queen in 1601 (Feridun, *Münşe'at*, II, 382). So, one can say they had the "most favoured nation clause" regime. For details concerning the "most-favoured nation clause regime", see Filipescu, *Drept,* 198-203; Geamanu, *Drept,* I, 385-6. At the same time, one must emphasize that the treaties concluded between the Porte and Venice, Hungary, Austria, Russia were different from the *'ahdnâme*s given to Western states (France, England, Holland). Free access and commerce, safety of person and merchandise, individual responsibility were granted by sultans to merchants coming from the neighbouring states, provided that the Ottoman ones have the same rights in the mentioned states, too. One can say consequently, they had a "mutual" regime.

[3]The main articles of these treaties, concerning trade and merchants can be summarized as follows: safe access by land and sea; safety of their persons and properties; the property of the deceased merchants must not be seized; freedom and security of their trade; custom dues are to be levied at the ordinary rates; responsibility for debts and crimes shall be individual only and not collective (Viorel Panaite, "Regimul negustorilor străini în *'ahdnâmeler* otomane," I, *Sud-Estul şi contextul European. Buletin,* Institutul de Studii Sud-est Europene, Bucureşti, II, 1994, 100-14; III, 1995, 105-12)

[4]Halebî, *Mülteka,* 336-8.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0104

safe-conduct" (*Zeyd harbî dar-i Harb'dan amanla dar-ı İslam'a çıkub*).[1] In return, in the fifteenth to the seventeenth century official documents, like orders, law-codes, treaties, etc., the concept of *müste'min*s was seldom used for calling foreign merchants, being replaced by similar but ambiguous idioms. Here are two examples from *kanunname*s: "infidel who was not tribute-payer" (*haracgüzar olmayan kafir*) in 1476; and "infidels (*kafirler*) who come from Venice and other countries" in 1484.[2] In the following centuries, for denoting foreign merchants phrases specific to *şeri'at*, were used e.g. "infidels who come from the house of war" in 1586, "infidels of the house of war" (*darülharb keferesi*) in 1650, "the merchants' group who comes from the countries of infidels" (*kefere vilayetlerinden gelen tüccar tayfesi)* in 1734, or "the merchants of the house of war" (*darülharb tüccarı*) in 1750-1751.[3] With rare exceptions no European nation, group, or even individual is mentioned in the Ottoman documents without the term "infidel," either as a substantive or an adjective. One of this exceptions was the *'ahdname*s which did not abundantly use a legal terminology. For instance, in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Ottoman-Polish charters, the terms *kafir, kefere* or *kufr* (unbelief) were used three or four times, and especially in the articles concerning conversion of Polish captives to Islam.[4] Sometimes in both official documents and historical writings it becomes necessary to distinguish between the different states or nations of Christendom. Because the Europeans coming to the Ottoman Empire saw themselves as Englishmen, Frenchmen, Venetians, Germans, Poles, etc., — said Bernard Lewis —, the Ottomans started also to see them as different groups, but with a territorial and political identity, not with an ethnic or national one.[5] Accordingly, the foreign merchants were not called with imprecise legal concepts (*kafir, harbî*), but especially — as I have already mentioned above — with political terms, i.e. the name of their states: *Lehlü* (the Poles), *Venediklü* (the Venetians), *İngilterelü* (the Englishmen), *Françalu* (the Frenchmen), *Nederlandalu* (the

---

[1]Bianchi, "Fetvas," 180-1. *Zeyd* was one of the generic names used in *fetvâs* for calling men (Uzunçarşılı, *İlmiye Teşkilatı,* 200-4).

[2]Anhegger, İnalcık, *Kanunnâme,* doc. 53 ("the Frankishman who was not tribute-payer" / *haracgüzar olmayan Firenk*), doc. 56; Berindei, Klaus-Martin, Veinstein, "Actes. Vidin," 54.

[3]Barkan, *Kanunnâme,* doc. XCIII; Veliman, *Documente turc.,* doc. 73, 122, 150.

[4]Since the *'ahdnâme* of 1577, a new article was included in the Ottoman-Polish treaties concerning: "Armenians and other infidels who live under the <Polish> king's rule" (*kralın eli altında olub ermeni ve sayr kefere*) (AGD, AKW - Tureckie, k. 71, t. 260, no. 486).

[5]The European is different — affirmed Bernard Lewis —, "but not because he belongs to another nation, is subject to another ruler, lives in another place, or speaks another language. He is different because he follows another religion" (Lewis, *Muslim Discovery,* 173).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0105

Dutchmen) and so on. Let us quote, as an example, the "most-favoured nation clause" included in the *'ahdname* of 1612 granted to Holland: "The points written and registered in the capitulation granted to the Frenchmen and the Englishmen are also established in favour of the Dutchmen."[1] The foreigner were looked in opposite with non-Muslim subjects (called *zimmi*s or *haracgüzar kafirler*), because he still remained an enemy (*harbî*),[2] in this regard the Hanefi jurist aş-Şaybani stating that a *müste'min* "does not enjoy the *zimmi* status because he is an enemy person."[3] In comparison with a non-Muslim subject, the foreigner might only temporarily dwell in Ottoman territories, i.e. less than one year, in this period being excepted from poll-tax paying, but if he would remain longer than one year in *darülislam*, he became a *zimmi*. This rule of *şeri'at* was not observed in Ottoman practice, the foreign merchants receiving by a clause included in *'ahdnames (Capitulations)* the privilege to remain an unlimited time in the Ottoman Empire without paying *cizye* and become the sultan's protected subject.[4]

Considering the lack of any commercial stipulations from the fifteenth to the early sixteenth century engagements between the Porte and the hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia, one can induce to believe that in this area commerce followed customary practices more than in other cases. Yet, one should take into account that one of the first Ottoman documents whose role was to regulate early Ottoman-Moldavianrelations is at the same time a safe-conduct granted to the Moldavian merchants. This is "the imperial order" (*nişan-ı hümayûn hükmü*) enacted on 5 *Receb* 860 / 9 June 1456 as an immediate result of the peace concluded between Mehmed II and Petru Aron. I

---

[1]Groot, *OEDT*, 242-256 (*ve Franca ve İngilterelülere verilen 'ahdnâme-yi hümâyûn mestur ve mükayyed olan hususlar Nederlandaluların hakkında dahı mukarrer olub*). Also, it must be emphasized that the articles of peace and commerce treaties concerned "Venetian merchant" (*Venediklü bâzergânı; Venediklü'den bir bâzergân*), "the French goods, merchandise and ships" (*Françelülerin kendü malları ve sayr esbabla gelüb gidüb kalyonlar ve sayr gemileri)*, "the Frenchmen and those from places under their rule" *(Françelü ve ana tabi yerlerden...)*, "those who are from Dutch countries" (*Nederlanda vilayetlerinden olanların*) (Şakiroğlu, "1521," 398-9; Gökbilgin, "Belgeler I, "126; Feridun, *Münşe'at*, II, 401, 402 (*'ahdnâme* of 1604); Groot, *OEDT*, 239-45).

[2]Evidence in early seventeenth-century *'ahdnâmes*, e.g. 1604 to France, 1612 to the Dutch republic (Şakiroğlu, "1521," 398; Gökbilgin, "belgeler I," 126; Feridun, *müşe'at*, II, 402).

[3]Khadduri, *Shaybanî's Siyar*, 173.

[4]Gökbilgin, "Belgeler I," 126 (*'ahdname* of 1540 for Venice); Feridun, *Münşe'at*, II, 384 (*'ahdname* of 1601 for England), 403 (*'ahdname* of 1604 for France). In the Ottoman-Polish treaties there was not a similar article because, in any case, the merchants' travelling and sejourn in the Ottoman territories could not practically last for more than one year. For details concerning trade and merchants in the Ottoman-Polish treaties, see Viorel Panaite, "Comerţ şi negustori în tratatele osmano-polone. Un studiu de caz: 1607," *CLSO*, 2, 1993, 29-48; Viorel Panaite, "Trade and merchants in the XVI[h] Century Ottoman-Polish Treaties," *RESEE*, XXXII, 3-4, 1994, 259-76.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0106

must point out the tight connection made by sultan Mehmed II between the establishment of peaceful relations and the guarantee of commercial activities. The 1456 document was published and commented several times, but not each time it was correctly defined.[1] It can easily be seen that the record itself is simply a short "order" (*hüküm*) directed to Ottoman officials, i.e. *sancakbeyi*s, *bey*s, *sübaşı*s, *kadı*s etc., with whom the merchants coming from Moldavia, from Akkerman in particular, might have got in touch. I suppose that several copies of this document might have been issued and sent directly to other merchants of the White Fortress (Akkerman), for showing them to the above-mentioned authorities, if it would be necessary to prove their legal position. This document, which can be called a collective *aman* from the perspective of the Islamic law, had as beneficiaries "the merchants of his countries <of the Moldavian voïvode and> of White Fortress" (*anun vilayetlerinden Akkerman'dan olan bazerganlar*). The 1456 document concisely included the three rights granted commonly to any foreign merchants groups in that epoch, i.e., freedom to enter, circulate and leave the Ottoman territories; freedom to trade; and protection of the merchants' life, liberty and merchandise. Here is its most relevant excerpt:

> "In the present situation, having reconciled with Petru voïvode, the *bey* of Moldavia..., <I> put an end to our enmity and ordered that the merchants from his countries <and> from White Fortress should come by ship; <and> selling and buying to and from the inhabitants of Edirne, Bursa and Istanbul, they should trade. <And> none of my *bey*s and *sübaşı*s and *sipahi*s and slaves should damage and harm their soul, head and goods, when coming and when leaving" (*Şimdiki halde... Boğdan ile beyi Pitri voyvoda ile barışıklık idüb aradan düşmanlığı götürdüm ve buyurdum ki anun vilayetlerinden Akkerman'dan olan bazerganlar gemiler ile geleler; Edirne'de ve Bursa'da ve Istanbul'da halkla muamele ve mubaya'a idüb bazerganlık ideler. Gelmekde ve gitmekde benüm beylerümden ve sübaşılarumdan ve sipahilerümden ve kullarumdan hiç birisi bunlarun canına ve başına ve malına zarar ve ziyan getürmiye*).[2]

The confirmation of the commercial privileges granted to the Moldavian merchants must yet be regarded and considered in a wider context, that of the re-establishment of commercial activities after the conquest of Constantinople (1453) between the Ottoman territories of the Balkan

---

[1]The scholars' opinions are different and contradictory. Mihail Guboğlu appreciated that the *hüküm* of 1456 was "a privilege, a Capitulation" (*imtiyaz, Kapitülasyon*) granted to the merchants of Akkirman. He rejected Mustafa A. Mehmet's statement, who affirmed that that document was an *'ahdnâme* (Guboğlu, "1368-1456," 841).

[2]AGAD, Warsaw, t. 2, no. 3; DANIC, mf. Poland, r. 1, fr. 119, 243. Published editions: Kraelitz, *Osmanischen Urkunden,* 44-66, f. 1; Mehmet, *Documente turc.,* doc. 2; Guboglu, *Paleografia,* doc. 3 and facs 3.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0107

peninsula and the north-western seaside of the Black Sea.[1] As concerns the Moldavian merchants as "covenant-people," the 1456 document reinstated in new conditions the already existing trade relations between Moldavia and the area around the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits before 1453.[2] Unfortunately, this *hüküm* is one of the few fifteenth century documents that speak, be it summarily, of the legal condition of Wallachians and Moldavians in territories under direct Ottoman administration. Let us notice, in a comparative view, that fifteenth-early sixteenth century Ottoman *'ahdname*s *(privilegia)* granted to Ragusa,[3] included stipulations by which its merchants were guaranteed rights specific to the *müste'min*s: freedom to enter, circulate within and leave the Ottoman territories; protection of their life, liberty and goods; in case of death, their goods were not confiscated but it was going to be handed in to the legal inheritors. Moreover, the *haracgüzar* merchants were granted "privileges" which not even the subjects from neighbouring Christian states benefited, such as smaller custom duties, and freedom to buy prohibited wares.[4]

In sixteenth-eighteenth century sources one can find constantly references to Wallachian, Moldavian and Transylvanian traders, local dignitaries, envoys, couriers, permanent agents *(kapu-kethudaları)*, who — for a shorter or longer interval — travelled and stayed in neighbouring *sancak*s or in Ottoman great cities.[5] Since Süleyman Kanunî's reign, in their quality of *zimmi*s, the Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians could freely travel in the Ottoman Empire. Confronting with several abuses committed against their *haracgüzarlar* of the north of the Danube and denounced by *'arz*s, the Porte regularly ordered to its officials to protect their life, liberty and goods. Here are only two examples. In 967/1559, Süleyman Kanunî asked the Rusçuk *kadı* to forbid the Ottoman clerks of the South of the Danube to oppress the "men" of the voïvode, Petru the Younger of Wallachia (1559-1568), or to damage his belongings.[6] Then, in a *hüküm* of 1609 directed to the *nazır* of Isaccea, Ahmed I made a general statement

---

[1] Georgieva, "Commerce," 41.

[2] In 1452, merchandise of Moldavian traders had been registered in Constantinople and Pera (Iorga, *Acte şi fragmente*, III, 31).

[3] The 1430, 1442 and 1458 "privileges" (*privilegia*) (Bojovic, "Dubrovnik I," doc. 2 (1430), doc. 4 (1442), doc. 6 (1458). The 1512-1513 *'ahdname (Bursa Şer'iye sicilleri*, A, 20, sh. 387/b; Dalsar, "Dubrovnik," 410-4; Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri*, III, 385-7).

[4] Biegman, *Ragusa*, 69-73.

[5] Gemil *Documente turc.*, doc. 119 (document of 1646), doc. 213 (*boyâr oğulları ve hizmetkârları*, in 1696); Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 61 (document of 1728).

[6] Mehmet, *Documente turc.*, I, doc. 41.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0108

concerning the protection of his Moldavian *haracgüzarlar*: "When the Moldavian crosses <the Danube> from one side to another and on other occasions you shall not allow that he be troubled..."[1]

The tendency to commit abuses on the Wallachian, Moldavian and Transylvanian tribute-payers in Ottoman neighbouring districts would survive despite frequent sultanal interdictions. In these conditions, even the voïvodes who travel to or leave Istanbul were provided with a safe-conduct, in fact a *hüküm* sent to the Ottoman officials on his way, by which their protection was required. A significant example is Osman II's order of June 1618 sent to "İskender paşa, as well as to the dignitaries and *kadı*s of the right side" (*sag kolda*)", regarding the former hospodar Alexandru Iliaş of Wallachia (1616-1618): "When <this order> reaches you, according to my command, you shall make sure that the above mentioned <Alexandru> and his wife and his father-in-law and his servants and his other men, together with his cattle and goods, arrive safely and completely from one of you to another (*emn ü salim bir-birinize ulaşdırub*), so that you may send them to my Porte of Happiness."[2]

According to Daniel S. Goffman, the *maktu'* system's primary purpose was to create good will in the local conquered population and to grant them some sort of autonomy, but then the *maktu'* system often was applied especially in order to insure the collection of a fixed amount of money or so that a community could escape the abuses of *cizye* collectors, financial abuses which may be found generally within the Ottoman provinces, including the Danubian regions.[3] During the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries, the most frequent abuses committed on the Wallachian, Moldavian and Transylvanian subjects when they travelled outside their countries, denounced by their voïvodes to the Porte,[4] and firmly prohibited by the sultans, consisted of "poll-tax imposition" *(haraç talebiyle, cizye talebiyle)*[5] in the Danube crossing places, on the route to Istanbul, e.g., Kili, Braila, Giurgiu, Turnu,

---

[1]Document of *Muharrem* 1078 / april 1609 (Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 44).

[2]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 73.

[3]It was an usage of the Porte to issue orders for eradicating tax abuses by doing away with regular payments of a fixed sum (*maktu'*) and substituting a household tax. Daniel S. Goffman has published documents which describe incidents of tax abuses within the Ottoman provinces of Damascus, Tripoli and Aleppo, but suggests that other areas within the provinces may suffer from similar inequities (Gibb, Bowen, *Islamic Society*, I/2, 256; Goffman, "Maktu' System," 81-90).

[4]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 213 (*'arz-u hal* of 1696 written by Wallachian agents, called in Ottoman *Eflhak kapukethudaları*); Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 61 (*'arz-u hal* of 1728 wrote by Wallachians agents, called in Ottoman *Boğdan kapukethudaları*).

[5]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 119 (of 1646), 213 5of 1696); Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 140 (of 1759); Mehmet, "Condica," doc. 5 (of 1792).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0109

Silistre, Rusçuk, Nikopol etc., and generally in neighbouring *sancak*s. If many times the "*cizye* impositions" remained at the level of claims, yet there are enough cases in which it was put into practice. And these, I suppose, only were the iceberg top. Thus in 1717, the Nikopol *cizyedar* imposed "under the name of poll-tax (*cizye namiyle*) 4-5 *guruş* from each of the Wallachian subjects who cross <the Danube> from Wallachia to Nikopol."[1] Moreover, sometimes they wanted to legitimate their abuse, like the Burgas tax collector in 1728, who held a cavalry man "chained and incarcerated him, and gave him, by force and under constraint, a poll-tax paper (*cizye kağıdı verüb*)".[2] As a result of the tribute-payer voïvodes' petitions, the sultans ordered constantly to the *kadı*s, as well as to other officials of the above-mentioned places, and incriminated first of all the Ottoman clerks charged with poll-tax levying (*cizyedar*).[3] Moreover, at mid-eighteenth century, the Wallachians' exemption from *cizye* paying in the south of the Danube was considered a customary practice. In this regard, in 1759, Mustafa III also invoked custom, besides the previous orders: "It shall be done such that Wallachia's subjects shall not be harmed in any way by *cizye* imposition, in opposition to the high orders and the old custom..."[4] This practice was not unusual, due to the fact that the Ottoman chancery issued in the whole empire official orders (*hüküm*) to reinforce the exemption from *cizye* paying of any Ottoman subject who had already paid poll-tax in his district. As I have already shown, in the Ottoman official view the Wallachian subjects, as well as the Moldavian and Transylvanian ones, paid the poll-tax to their voïvode,[5] who delivered it to the Porte under the form of a "collective tribute" (*ve Eflak cizyesi maktu' olmakla*).[6] At the same time, let us emphasise a record in which the Moldavians were not compared to the *zimmi*s from the right side of the Danube, but were mentioned together with *müste'min* merchants coming from Poland. In this respect, in 1646, İbrahim I asked the Kili *kadı* to put into practice a previous financial disposition (issued in 1052/1642-1643) referring to the Moldavian and Polish merchants' exemption from the poll-tax paying: "you shall not, from now on, allow anybody to trouble with poll-tax impositions those Poles and Moldavians who... come to Kili port for trading" (*Leh'lü ve Boğdan'lılardan Kili iskelesine... ticaret içün gelüb haraç*

---

[1] Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 29.

[2] Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 61.

[3] Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 213 (*cizyedâr olanlar* in 1696); Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 29, 61, 140 (the Nikopol *cizyedâr* in 1717, the *Bergos cizyedâr* in 1728, the Silistre, Giurgiu, Rusçuk and Braila *cizyedâr*s in 1759). On *cizyedâr*, see Sertoğlu, *ROTA*, 60-1.

[4] Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 140.

[5] "the *harâc* is paid to their voivode" (Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 119; *hüküm* of 24 *Şevval* 1056 / 3 December 1646).

[6] *Fermân* of 10 *Zilkade* 1107 / 11 June 1696 Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 213).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0110

talebiyle rencîde itdirmeyüb).[1] The content of the above-quoted *hüküms* reminds us of the stipulation of several *'ahdnames* granted to the Christian states, regarding the foreigner's right to stay in Ottoman territories.[2] Without indicating a deadline for *müste'mins'* coming back in their origin country, the *'ahdnames* registered only their privilege of exemption from the poll-tax payment: "from those who settled and are engaging in trade in our Well-protected Dominions... poll-tax shall not be asked" *(Memalik-i mahrûsamızda mütemekkin olanlar... rencberlik edenler anlardan haraç taleb olunmıya)*.[3] It is necessary to point out that the peace and commerce treaties concluded between the Porte and neighbouring states, e.g. Hungary, Poland, the Habsbourg Empire, did not usually make any special reference to the exemption from the *cizye* paying. And the Polish *'ahdnames* are illustrative in this respect.

Also, certain fiscal exemptions which were granted for wares purchased in Ottoman territories on behalf of tributary princes are to be noticed. Moreover, Ahmed I's *ferman* of 1016/1608 proves the existence of a habit in this respect: "my order was issued so that steps should be taken as before" (*olageldüği üzere amel olunmak*).[4]

The right to purchase real estates or to erect buildings in territories under the Ottoman rule was denied to foreigners. According to the *şeri'at*, a *müste'min* who became the "owner" of a piece of land within the house of Islam had to pay both land-duty (*haraç*) and poll-tax (*cizye*), and therefore became a non-Muslim subject of the empire (*zimmi*).[5] The information referring to the Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians' legal right to have estates in neighbouring *sancak* is contradictory. Anyway, regardless of the voïvodes' being denied or allowed to own such estates, there would always appear the dilemma whether this right was or not "contrary to the noble holy law" (*hilaf-ı şer-î şerife*), being usually necessary the issue of legal opinions (*fetva*). In this respect, it is known that the hospodar Petru the Younger of Wallachia owned houses in Rusçuk in 1559,[6] and in 1644 the voïvode Vasile Lupu of Moldavia needed a *fetva* only for building a fountain (*çeşme*) in

---

[1]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 119 (*hüküm* of 24 şevval 1056 / 3 December 1646).

[2]For the Venetian case, see: Gökbilgin, "Belgeler I," 126; Şakiroğlu, "1521," 398.

[3]Feridun, *Münşe'at*, II, 384 (*'ahdnâme* of 1601 to England), 403 (*'ahdnâme* of 1604 to France); Groot, *OEDR*, 241 (*'ahdnâme* of 1612 to Holland).

[4]Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 28. This kind of fiscal exemption was a frequent practice, applied also in south-eastern Europe (Tocilescu, *534 documente*, doc. 96), and reminds us of the similar "privilege" guaranteed to the Western merchants.

[5]D'Ohsson, *Tableau*, V, 38.

[6]Mehmet, *Documente turc.*, I, doc. 41.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0111

Varna.[1] In the same year, Matei Basarab was also asking for an authorisation to build a public bath in Giurgiu,[2] probably on the vacant space bought in 1644 from a local Muslim, Abbas Çelebi, a sale confirmed by legal sentence (*ilam*) by Mustafa, *molla* of Giurgiu, and Ahmed Hüsein, *kadı* of Rusçuk.[3] But, in 1154/1741 Mahmud I ordered the authorities of Silistre, i.e. the *naib* and *mütessellim*, to destroy the buildings erected there by the hospodar Constantin Mavrocordat of Wallachia, previously the sultan himself having obtained a demolition *fetva* from the *şeyhülislam*.[4] An argument for our discussion is to be found in the above mentioned document, according to which the exemption from *cizye* paying was cancelled both for the Polish merchants and the Moldavian ones when they should buy real estates, lands in particular: "from now on, you shall not allow anyone to trouble with poll-tax impositions the Poles and Moldavians who... come to Kili for trading and not for taking lands in their possession" (*Leh'lü ve Boğdan'lılardan Kili iskelesine... ticaret içün gelüb toprak tasarruf etmedikçe... haraç talebiyle rencîde etdirmeyüb).*[5] In other words, only the quality of owners could transform the foreigners in *zimmi*s. The fact that the inhabitants of the tributary principalities were forbidden to own estates in Ottoman neighbouring *sancak*s placed them closer to the *müste'min* condition, similar to that of the Polish merchants. The above-mentioned cases on the Wallachian and Moldavian princes' "properties" at the south of the Danube could be considered exceptions that need, as a matter of fact, to be legitimated by *fetva*s.

The above-presented data provide the same touch of ambiguity, specific also — as a matter of fact — to other aspects concerning the legal status of the tributary principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania. an ambiguity that manifested also at the level of legal theory, though at a lower degree, as well as at the level of Ottoman official records. On the one hand, Ottoman legal practice did not perform a clear delimitation between *müstemin*s and *zimmi*s, like the Islamic law promoted,[6] in this regard V. L. Ménage quoting from *'ahdname*s granted to Venice, where the sultans stated that "all infidels form one community" (*cümle kefere millet vahide).*[7] The only striking difference, in certain specialists' opinion, was the foreigners'

---

[1] Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 115.
[2] Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 114.
[3] Document of *evâ'il Zilhicce* 1053 / 10-20 February 1644 (Guboglu, *Paleografia,* doc. 20).
[4] Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 99.
[5] *Hüküm* of 24 *Şevval* 1056 / 3 december 1646 Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 119).
[6] *Shaybânî's Siyar,* 173; Özel, *İslam Hukuku,* 207-11.
[7] In the *'ahdnâme*s granted to Venice by Bayezid II and Selim I in 1503 and 1513 (Şakiroğlu, "1503," 1559-69; Gökbilgin, "Belgeler II," 47-50; Ménage, "Capitulation," 378).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0112

exemption from *cizye* payment.[1] On the other hand, as concerns the inhabitants of the three principalities from the north of the Danube, the ambiguity between *müste'min* and *zimmi* was also stressed by the attribute "intermediary" which characterised generally the *haracgüzar* status. Consequently, the *zimmi* position from the tributary principalities was situated at the limit between the *zimmi*s' usual status and the *müste'min*s. So, I should conclude that in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries the Wallachians and Moldavians' condition outside their countries was closer to the status of foreigners (*müste'min*), and then since Süleyman Kanunî's reign (1520-1566), the Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians' legal position became more as that of the ordinary *zimmi*s. That means they were allowed — like other tributaries of south-eastern Europe, e.g. Ragusans,[2] or inhabitants of the islands of Naxos,[3] Chios and Andros[4] —, to circulate freely; to be protected in their life, liberty and goods; to inherit the goods of relatives; to pay smaller custom duties; to buy freely wares[5] prohibited to the *müste'min* merchants.[6]

ABBREVIATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu Yusuf, *Kitâb* = Abou Yousuf Ya'koub, *Le livre de l'impôt foncier (Kitâb al-kharâdj)*, traduit et annoté par E. Fagnan, Paris, 1921.

Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri, 1-9* = A. Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukukî Tahlilleri. 1-5. kitap*, Fey Vakfı, Istanbul, 1990-1995.

---

[1] Skilliter, *Harborne*, 1-2; tarazi, "Statut," 389.

[2] The *'ahdnâme* of 1575 (Biegman, *Ragusa*, 48-59); *Dubrovnik Ahkâm Defteri*, 1013-1028/1604-1618) (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA), *Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri*, 13).

[3] The 1564 and 1565 *'ahdnâmes* which came to establish the status of the Naxos island and of its dependent islands, Santorin and Paros, towards the Porte (Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, III, 2, 102-3; Safvet, "Nakşe Dukalığı, Kiklâd Adaları." *TOEM*, IV, 1329, 1446-8).

[4] The *'ahdnâme* granted to the Andros island in 946/1539, that is just a piece of a series of "lettres de privilège du sultan" by which the status of Cycladic islands was regulated in the first half of the sixteenth century (R. Saulger, *Histoire nouvelle des anciens ducs et autres souverains de l'Archipel*, Paris, 1698, 349-51, cf. Slot, *Archipaelagus Turbatus*, II, 76-7).

[5] All these rights in relation to commercial activities characterized in part the *zimmî* status of Ragusan tribute-payers (Biegman, *Ragusa*, 69-73).

[6] For the subject of this study, see also: Viorel Panaite, *The Otttoman Law of War and Peace. The Ottoman Empire and Tribute Payers*, East European Monographs, No. DLXII, distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 2000, 406-45; Viorel Panaite, *Limbajul politico-juridic in Islamul otoman. Dictionar de termeni şi expresii*. I. *Războiul, pacea, comerţul (The Political-Legal Language in the Ottoman Islam. Dictionary of Terms and Expressions*, I. *War, peace, Trade)*, Tipografia Universităţii din Bucureşti, 1998, passim; Viorel Panaite, *Pace, război şi comert in Islam. Ţările române şi dreptul otoman al popoarelor. Secolele XV-XVII (Peace, War and Trade in Islam. The Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Law of Nations. 15th-17th century)*. Ed. All, Bucureşti, 1997, 395-408; Viorel Panaite, "The Status of the *Kharâj-güzarlar*. A Case Study: Wallachians Moldavians and Transylvanians in the 15th to 17th centuries." In: *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*. 4 volumes, ed. Kemal Çiçek, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, 2000, vol. I. *Politics*, 227-38.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0113

Anhegger, İnalcık, *Kanunname* = R. Anhegger, H. İnalcık, *Kanunname-i Sultanî ber muceb-i örf-i Osmanî,* Ankara, 1956.

Ayverdî, *Istanbul Mahalleleri* = E. H. Ayverdî, *Fatih devri sonlarında Istanbul Mahalleleri, Şehrin iskânı ve nüfusu,* Ankara, 1958.

Berindei, Kalus-Martin, Veinstein, "Actes. Vidin" = M. Berindei, M. Kalus-Martin, G. Veinstein, "Actes de Murad III sur la région de Vidin et remarques sur les qânun ottomans." *Südost-Forschungen* (München), XXXV, 1976, 11-68.

Bianchi, "Fetvas" = M. Bianchi, "Recueil des Fetvas, écrit en turc et en arabe, par Hafiz Mohammed ben Ahmad ben Elcheich Moustafa Elkedousy." *Journal Asiatique* (Paris), IV, 1824, 171-85.

Biegman, "Ragusan Spying" = N. H. Biegman, "Ragusan Spying for the Ottoman Empire. Some 16th Century Documents from the State Archive at Dubrovnik." *Belleten*, XXVII, 106, 1963, 237-255.

Biegman, *Ragusa* = N. H. Biegman, *The Turco-Ragusan Relationship. According to the Firmans of Murad III (1575-1595) Extant in the State Archives of Dubrovnik,* Mouton, The Hague-Paris, 1967.

Bojovi, "Dubrovnik I" = B. I. Bojovic, "Dubrovnik et les Ottomans (1430-1472) 20 actes de Murad II et de Mehmed II en médio-serbe". *Turcica,* XIX, 1987, 119-73.

Cantemir, *Othman History* = Demetrius Cantemir, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire*. Part I. *Containing the Growth of the Ottoman Empire from the Reign of Othman the Founder, to the Reign of Mahomet IV. That is from the year 1300, to the Siege of Vienna, in 1683*. Translated into English, from the Author's own Manuscript, by N. Tindal, M. A., Vicar of Great Waltham in Essex, London, MDCCXXXIV, 1-272. Part II. *The History of the Decay of the Othman Empire from the Reign of Mahomet IV, to the Reign of Ahmed III. Being the history of the author's own times.* Written Originally in Latin, By..., late Prince of Moldavia. Translated by N. Tindal, London, MDCCXXXV, 273-454.

Christians and Jews = *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioninng of a Plural Socitey*. Vol. I: *The Central Lands,* edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York, London, 1982.

Coles, *Ottoman Impact* = P. Coles, *The Ottoman Impact on Europe,* London, 1968.

Cronici turc. I Cronici turceşti privind Ţările române. Extrase. Vol. I. *Sec. XV - mijlocul sec.* XVII, ed. Mihail Guboğlu and Mustafa Mehmet, Bucureşti, 1966.

Cvetkova, "Villes balkaniques" = B. A. Cvetkova, "Vie économique des villes et ports balkaniques aux XV^{e} et XVI^{e} siècles." *Revue des Études Islamiques* (Paris), XXXVIII,, 1970, 267-356.

D'Ohsson, *Tableau* = Ignace Mouradgea d'Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman,* vol. I-VII, Paris, 1784-1824.

Dalsar, "Dubrovnik" = F. Dalsar, "Selim I'in Dubrovnik Cumhuriyeti ile yaptığı muahede." *Tarih Vesikaları* (Istanbul) V, cilt II, 12, 1943, 410-4.

Dávid, "Administration" = Géza Dávid, "Administration in Ottoman Empire." In: *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age. The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*. Edited by Metin Kunt and Christine Woodhead, London and New York, 1995, 71-90.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0114

Davison, "Christian-Muslim Equality" = R. H. Davison, "Turkish Attitudes Concerning Christian-Muslim Equality in the Nineteenth Century," *American Historical Review*, 59, 4, 1954, 844-864 (reprinted in R. H. Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History. The Impact of the West*, Saqi Books, no date, 112-132).

Decei, *Imp. otoman* = A. Decei, *Istoria Imperiului otoman până la 1656*, Bucureşti, 1978.

DRH, B = Documenta Romanie Historica. B. Ţara Românească, Vol. I *(1247-1500)*, Bucureşti, 1966.

DRH, D = Documenta Romaniae Historica. D. Relaţiile între Ţările Române, Vol. I, Bucureşti, 1977.

Fattal, *Non-musulmans* = A. Fattal, *Le statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam*, Beyrouth, 1958.

Feridun, *Münşe'at* = Ahmed Feridun Bey, *Mecmu'a-ı Münşe'at es-Selâtin*, I-II, Istanbul, 1264-1265 / 1848-1849.

Gemil, *Documente turc.* = T. Gemil, *Relaţiile Ţărilor române cu Poarta otomană în documente turceşti. 1601-1712*, Bucureşti, 1984.

Genealogia Cantacuzinilor = Mihail Cantacuzino banul, *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, publicată şi adnotată de N. Iorga, Bucureşti, 1902.

Georgieva, "Commerce" = C. Georgieva, "Les rapports de commerce entre l'Empire Ottoman et la Pologne et les terres bulgares au XVIe siècle." *Bulgarian Historical Review* (Sofia), 3, 1978, 38-49.

Gibb, Bowen, *Islamic Society* = Hamilton Gibb and Harold Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West. A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Muslim culture in the Near East*, Volume One: *Islamic Society in the Eighteenth Century*, Parts I-II, Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto.

Giurescu, *Capitulaţiile* = C. Giurescu, *Capitulaţiile Moldovei cu Poarta Otomană*, Buçureşti, 1908 (reprinted in C. Giurescu, *Studii de istorie*, Bucureşti, 1993, 473-504).

Goffman, "Maktu' System" = Daniel S. Goffman, "The *Maktu'* System and the Jewish Community of Sixteenth-Century Safed: A Study of two Documents from the Ottoman Archives." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* (Istanbul), III, 1982, 81-90.

Gökbilgin, "Belgeler I" = M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "Venedik devlet arşivindeki vesikalar külliyatında Kanunî Sultan devri belgeleri". *Belgeler*, C. I., 1964, Sayı 2, 119-20.

Gökbilgin, "Belgeler II" = M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "Venedik devlet arşivindeki Türkçe belgeler kolleksiyonu ve bizimle ilgili diğer belgeler." *Belgeler*, C. V-VIII, 1968-71, Sayı 9-12, 1-151.

Groot, *OEDR* = A. H. de Groot, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic. A History of the Earliest Diplomatic Relations. 1610-1630*, Leiden-Istanbul, 1978.

Guboğlu, "1368-1456" = M. Guboğlu, "Osmanlılarla Romen ülkeleri arasındaki ilk devir ilişkileri (1368-1456) hakkında belirtmeler ve doğrultmalar." *IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi'nden ayrıbasım*, Ankara, 1988, 829-43.

Guboğlu, "Arhive Braşov" = M. Guboğlu, "Şapte documente turceşti din arhivele Braşovului privind relaţiile Transilvaniei cu Poarta Otomana] la începutul secolului al XVII-lea." *Revista Arhivelor* (Buçureşti), VIII, 1, 1965, 213-56.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0115

Guboğlu, *Paleografia* = M. Guboglu, *Paleografia şi diplomatica turco-osmană. Studiu şi album*, Bucureşti, 1958.

Halebî, *Mülteka* = İbrahim Halebî, *Şerh-i Mülteka el-Ebûr (Mevkufat)*, tercüme ve açıklamalar Nedim Yılmaz, Cild 1-4, Istanbul, 1993 (especially, Cild 2, 559-628).

Hamidullah, *Documents* = M. Hamidullah, *Documents sur la diplomatie musulmane à l'époque du Prophète et des khalifes orthodoxes*, Paris, 1935.

Hurmuzaki, *Documente* = *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor culese de Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki*, Bucureşti, VIII, (1376-1650) 1894; XVI; Supl. I/5, (1822-1838), 1894; II/2, (1601-1640), 1895.

Hüsrev, *Dürer* = Molla Hüsrev, *Dürer ül-hukkâm fî şerh gürer ül-ahkâm*, I, Kostantiniye, 1258 / 1842-1843, 205-10 (*kitâb al-cihâd, fals fi al-cizye, bâb al-müste'min*).

İnalcık, "Black Sea" = H. İnalcık, "The Question of the Closing of the Black Sea under the Ottomans." *Arheion Pontou*, 35, 1979, 74-110.

Iorga, *Acte şi fragmante* = N. Iorga, *Acte şi fragmente cu privire la Istoria Românilor*, III, Bucureşti, 1897.

Itzkowitz, *Ottoman Empire* = N. Itzkowitz, *Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition*, Chicago and London, 1980.

Kélékian, *DTF* = D. Kélékian, *Dictionnaire turc-français*, Éditeur-Imprimeur: Mihran, Constantinople, 1911.

Khadduri, *War and Peace* = M. Khadduri, *War and peace in the Law of Islam*, Richmond, Virginia, USA, 1955.

Kraelitz, *Osmanischen Urkunden* = Fr. Kraelitz, "Osmanischen Urkunden in türkischer Sprache aus der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts," *Akademie des Wissenschaften in Wien, philosoph.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*, 197 Bd 3 Abh., Wien, 1921, 44-6, f. 1.

Laoust, *Ibn Taimîya* = H. Laoust, *Contribution à l'étude de la méthodologie canonique de Takî-d-dîn Ahmad B. Taimîya*, Le Caire, 1939.

Lazarus-Yafeh, *al-Ghazzali* = H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *Studies in al-Ghazzali*, Jerusalem, 1975.

Lewis, *Middle East* = B. Lewis, *The Middle East and the West*, Bloomington, 1964.

Lewis, *Muslim Discovery* = B. Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, New York, London, 1982.

Maxim, "Capitulaţiile" = M. Maxim, "Din istoria relaţiilor româno-otomane-"Capitulaţiile". *Analele Istorie* (Bucureşti), XXVIII, 6, 1982, 34-68.

Maxim, TRÎP= M. Maxim, *Tările Române si Înalta Poărtă. Cadarul juridic al relatiilor româno-otomane în evul mediu*, Editura Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1993.

Maxim, "Statut politico-juridic" = M. Maxim, "Statutul politico-juridic al Ţărilor Române in evul mediu." (off-print), Universitatea din Bucureşti, 1983, 105-26.

Maxim, "Teritorii româneşti" = M. Maxim, "Teritorii româneşti sub administraţie otomană în secolul al XVI-lea (I)." *Rdl*, 8, 1983, 802-17, and (II), *Revista de istorie* (Bucureşti), 9, 1983, 879-90.

Maxim, *CTO* = M. Maxim, Culegere de texte otomane, Editura Universităţii, Bucureşti, 1974.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0116

Maxim, Panaite, "Pax Ottomanica" = M. Maxim et Viorel Panaite, "Pax ottomanica et les Pays Roumains." Part I in *Analele Universităţii Bucureşti. Istorie*, XXV, 1986, 11-8; Part II, in XXXVI, 1987, 94-9.

Mehmet, "Kanunnâme" = M. A. Mehmet, "De certains aspects de la société ottomane à la lumière de la législation (Kanunnâme) du sultan Mahomed II (1451-1481)," *Studia et Acta Orientalia* (Bucharest), vol. II, 1960, 127-60.

Mehmet, "Condica" = M. A. Mehmet, "O condică domnească din a doua jumătate a veacului al XVIII-lea, scrisă în limba turcă, privind Ţara Românească." *Revista Arhivelor*, 2, 1958, 248-60.

Mehmet, *Documente turc. I* = M. A. Mehmet, *Documente turceşti privind istoria României. vol. I (1455-1774)*, Bucureşti, 1976.

Ménage, "Capitulation" = V. L. Ménage, "The English Capitulation of 1580. A Review Article." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Nov. 1980, 373-83.

Mevkufati, *Şerh* = Mehmed Mevkufati, *Şerh-i Mülteka el-Ebûr*, Cild I-II, Kostantiniye, 1254/1838-1839.

Morabia, *ğihad* = A. Morabia, *La notion de ğihad dans l'Islam médiéval (des origines à al-Gazali)*, thèse présentée devant l'Université de Paris IV, 1975.

Özel, *İslam Hukuku* = A. Özel, *İslam Hukukunda Ülke Kavramı. Dar ül-Islam. Dar ül-harb*, Istanbul, 1988.

Panaite, *Ottoman Empire and Tribute Payers* = Viorel Panaite, *The Ottoman Law of War and Peace, the Ottoman Empire and Tribute Payers*, East European Monographs, No. DLXII, distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 2000.

Panaite, *Limbajul politico-juridic* = Viorel Panaite, *Limbajul politico-juridic în Islamul otoman. Dicţionar de termeni şi expresii. I. Războiul, pacea, comerţul (The Political-Legal Language in the Ottoman Islam. Dictionary of Terms and Expressions. I. War, Peace, Trade)*, Tipografia Universităţii din Bucureşti, 1998.

Panaite, *Pace, război şi comert în Islam* = Viorel Panaite, *Pace, război şi comerţ în Islam. Ţările române şi dreptul otoman al popoarelor. Secolele XV-XVII (Peace, War and Trade in Islam. The Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Law of Nations. 15th-17th Century)*, Ed. All, Bucureşti, 1997.

Panaite, "*Kharâj-güzarlar*" = Viorel Panaite, "The Status of the *Kharâj-güzarlar*. A Case Study: Wallachians, Moldavians and Transylvanians in the 15th to 17th Centuries." In: *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*. 4 volumes, ed. Kemal Çiçek, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, 2000, vol. I. *Politics*, 227-38.

Redhouse = *Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük / New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, 12th ed., Istanbul, 1991.

Schiltberger, *Travels* = *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, 1396-1427*. Translated by J. Buchan Telfer. With Notes by P. Bruun. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1879 (Reprint of the Edition London 1879. In *The Islamic World in foreign Travel Accounts*. 38. 1995. Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0117

Sertoğlu, *ROTA* = M. Sertoğlu, *Resimli Osmanlı Tarihi Ansiklopedisi,* Istanbul, 1958.

Shaybani' Siyar = The Islamic Law of Nations. Shaybani's Siyar, translated with an introduction, notes and appendices by M. Khadduri, Baltimore, Maryland, 1966.

Skilliter, *Harborne* = S. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey. 1578-1582. A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations,* London, Oxford University Press, 1977.

Slot, *Archipelagus Turbatus* = B. J. Slot, *Archipelagus Turbatus. Les Cyclades entre colonisation latine et occupation ottomane. c. 1500-1718,* Tome, I-II, Nederlands Historish- Archaeologisch Institut tee Istanbul, 1982.

Sousa, *Capitulatory Regime* = N. Sousa, *The Capitulatory Regime of Turkey. Its History, Origin and Nature,* Baltimore, 1933.

Şakiroğlu, "1503" = M. H. Şakiroğlu, "1503 tarihli Türk-Venedik andlaşması." In: *VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi,* III. cilt'ten ayrıbasım, TTK Basımevi, Ankara, 1983, 1559-69.

Şakiroğlu, "1521" = M. H. Şakiroğlu, "1521 tarihli Osmanlı-Venedik andlaşmasının asıl metni." *IÜEF. Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* (Istanbul), 12, 981-1982, 387-403.

Tarazi, "Statut" = Salah el-dine Tarazi, "La solution des problèmes de statut personnel dans le droit des pays arabes et africains." *Recueil des Cours* (Paris), 159, I, 1978, 348-463.

Tocilescu, *534 documente* = Gr. G. Tocilescu, *534 documente istorice salvo-române din Ţară Românească şi Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul. 1346-1603,* Bucureşti, 1931.

Uzunçarşılı, "Türk-İngiliz" = İ. H. Uzunçarşılı "On dokuzuncu asır başlarına kadar Türk-İngiliz münasebetlerine dair vesikalar." *Belleten,* XIII, 51, 1949, 615-622.

Uzunçarşılı, *İlmiye Teşkilatı* = İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin ilmiye teşkilâtı,* Ankara, 1965.

Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi* = İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi,* I-IV cilt, Ankara, 1947-1959.

Veliman, *Documente turc.* = V. Veliman, *Relaţiile româno-otomane. (1711-1821). Documente turceşti,* Bucureşti, 1984.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0118

L'ÉCHELLE ET LA FORTERESSE DANUBIENNE DE TURNU (HOLOVNIK, KULE) À LA LUMIÈRE DES NOUVEAUX DOCUMENTS OTTOMANS

Liviu MAXIM

Les Archives de la Présidence du Conseil de la République de Turquie (T.C. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi) d'Istanbul, les anciennes archives du Grand Vizirat, comprennent, conformément aux dernières estimations, au moins 150 millions de documents (plus précisement: d'unités archivistiques), dont seulement 40 millions ont été catalogués[1] jusqu'en 1995. Parmi les grandes collections de ces archives se trouvent les Mühimme Defterleri (Registres des affaires importantes), qui comptent 266 volumes de documents concernant les années 1553-1905[2]. Considérés comme des "procès-verbaux" par certains historiens, des "brouillons" par des autres ou même des "résumés" des ordres (*ahkâm)* impériaux déjà élaborés par une troisième catégorie des Ottomanisants[3], ces documents concernant les "affaires importantes" (*mühimme)* de l'État ottoman s'occupaient, en réalité, de tout ce qui intéressait, d'une manière ou de l'autre, la personne de l'empereur (*padişah)* son État, ses dignitaires, sa capitale, ses chevaux, ses faucons, etc. L'importance exceptionnelle de cette collection pour l'histoire ottomane et des relations roumano-ottomanes a été mise en évidence pour la première fois dans l'historiographie mondiale par le grand historien roumain de l'Empire ottoman, Nicolae Iorga,en 1900[4].

---

[1] İsmail Binark (à l'époque Directeur Général des Archives d'État de Turquie), *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Kataloğları* (Le guide des catalogues des Archives Ottomanes près de la Présidence du Conseil), Ankara, 1999, pp. III et XX.

[2] *Ibidem,* p. 190.

[3] Voir la discussion chez Mihai Maxim, *Documente noi despre războiul moldo-otoman din 1574 (Documents nouveaux sur la guerre moldave-ottomane de 1574),* dans le volume *Din lupta poporului român pentru independentă (Pages de la lutte du peuple roumain pour l'indépendence),* coord.: Ioan Scurtu, Bucureşti, 1977, pp. 66-71; voir aussi Mihai Maxim, *Ţările Române şi Inalta Poartă (*Les Principautés Roumaines et la Sublime Porte), Bucureşti, 1993, p. 103, note 9.

[4] N. Iorga, *Documente şi cercetări asupra istoriei financiare şi economice a Principatelor Române (Nouveaux documents sur l'histoire économique et financière des Principautés Roumaines),* Bucureşti, 1900, p. 174.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0119

Dans cette collection remarquable, au volume 2, se trouve un ordre (*hüküm)* adressé le 5 Şevvâl 963/ 12 Juillet, 1556 au *kadı* (juge et maire) de Nikopol (*Niğbolu).* Mais voila le texte de ce document (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Istanbul, Mühimme Defteri, vol. 2, p.126, ordre 1267):

" (Yev)m el-selâse
Fî 5 Şevval 963
.....
.....
(Hüküm) 1267
(1) Niğbolı kâdısı mektüb gönderüb Niğbolı ve Holovnik halkından cemm-i gafır (2) gelüb nehr-i Tuna'nın öte yakasında vâkî' olan Holovnik nâm (3) kasabada bâzâr durmak lâzım ve mühimdir şöyle ki hafta bâzârı (4) durmak emr olunursa Niğbolı ve Holovnik iskelelerine küllî nef'i olûr (5) bâzâra ihtiyâc vârdır didiklerin arz eylemeğiñ buyuruldı".

Traduction:

" Le troisième jour (de la semaine) (mardi)[1]
Le 5 Şevvâl 963 (12.VIII.1556)
.....
.....[2]
Puisque le *kadı* de Nikopol a envoyé une lettre (au Seuil de Félicité) et a informé que de très nombreux (*cemm-i gafır)* habitants de Nikopol et de Turnu (*Holovnik)* se sont venus (devant le *kadı*) et ont dit qu'il est nécessaire et important de fonder une foire (*bâzâr durmak)* dans la bourgade (*kasaba),* nommée *Holovnik* qui se trouve de l'autre côté du Danube (*nehr-i Tuna)* [et ont dit que] si on ordonne de fonder une foire hebdomadaire (*hafta bâzârı),* [cette mesure] apportera aux échelles de Nikopol et de Turnu un très grand profit (*küllî nef'i)* et qu'il y a [donc] besoin de [cette] foire, [par conséquent] on a ordonné (*buyuruldı)* [d'approuver la fondation de la foire sollicitée]. "

La lecture de ce document nous conduit à quelques conclusions.

1. L'échelle (*iskele)* et la bourgade *(kasaba)* de Turnu, situées sur la rive gauche du Danube, dépendaient en 1556, du point de vue administratif, du *kadı* de Nikopol, ville située sur la rive droite du Danube.

[1]Selon *Tarih Çevirme Kılavuzu* / Guide de transformation des dates historiques, éd. Yücel Dağlı- Cumhure Üçer, Ankara, IV. Cilt, 1997, p. 133, il s'agit de *Çarşamba* (mercredi), ce qui, cependant, signifie "le quatrième jour" (à partie de dimanche). Signalons pour le XVI[e] siècle une autre inadvertance: le 20 Safer 950/25.V.1543 ne correspondait pas au vendredi (*Cuma),* selon le guide cité (p. 104), mais au jeudi (*el-hamis*= le cinquième jour"), conformément au doc. de BOA, fonds *Kepeci,* no.1765 (*Ruznâmçe Defteri),* p. 5 bis.
[2]Ici sont placés deux ordres adressés au *beylerbeyi* de Damas (*Şam).*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0120

Un registre de récensement (*Tahrir Defteri*) de 976/1568 fait mention de 11 *kaza* appartenant au *sancakbeyilik* de Nikopol (*liva-i Niğbolı*), du *beylerbeyilik* de Roumélie, mais parmi ces *kaza* nous ne trouvons pas une unité administrative subordonnée à un *kadı* de *Holovnik* [1]. L'inexistence d'un *kaza* de Turnu est aussi confirmée par un autre registre ottoman, à savoir un *defter* du "Secrétariat des moutons" de la Chancellerie *Mevkûfat (Mevkûfat Kalemi Gânem Kitâbeti)*, de l'année 1021-1022 A.H./ 1612-1613 A.D., qui passe en revue touts les (15) *kaza* de la *liva-i Niğbolı*, sujets à l'impôt des moutons (*adet-i ağnâm*)[2], mais qui ne fait pas mention d'un *kaza-i Holovnik*. Nous trouvons la même situation un siècle plus tard dans un registre de 1126/1714 consacré à l'impôt de "l'approvisionnement" (*bedel-i nüzül*) du *sancak* de Nikopol: parmi les 14 *kaza* enregistrés ne figure aucun *kaza-i Holovnik* ou *kaza-i Kule*[3].

Donc aux XVI[e]- XVII[e] siècles, Turnu n'était pas un *kaza*, mais un *niyâbet*, circonscription d'un *nâib*, substitut d'un *kadı*. Ce fait est confirmé au milieu du XVII[e] siècle par Evliya Çelebî : "Quoique situé sur les terres de la Valachie, < Turnu > fait partie du sancak de Nikopol, étant un niyâbet" [4].

On peut trouver la même situation au milieu du XVIII[e] siècle: par exemple, deux listes des *kaza* de Roumélie des années 1146/1733-1734 et 1153/ 1740-1741[5] de même qu'un "registre des *hâne* <soumises aux contributions> *avâriz* et *bedel-i nüzül* de la *liva-i Niğbolı* de l'an 1165" (20.I.1751- 7.XI.1752)[6] ne font pas mention, non plus, d'un *kaza-i Holovnik (kaza-i Kule)*. Seulement un registre *Hadariye, (Hazariye)*, consacré aux impôts appelés à ce titre et perçus au temps de paix, contient quelques *hüküm* (ordres) adressés cette fois "au *kadı* de *Kule*" (*Kule kadısına)* (evâhır-ı Receb 1189/ 17 -26.IX.1775)[7], "aux *kadı* de Nikopol et de *Kule*" (*Niğbolı ve Kule kadısına* <recte: *kadılarına*>) (evâhır-ı Receb 1190 / 5- 14.IX.1776)[8], "aux *kadı* de *Kule* et de Nikopol "(*Kule ve Niğbolı kadılarına)* (evâhır-ı

---

[1] Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (en abrégé : BOA), Istanbul, *Tahrir Defteri*, no 467 .
[2] BOA, Istanbul, fonds Kepeci, no. 3.996, pp. 2-3.
[3] BOA, Istanbul, fonds Maliyeden Müdevver Defterleri, no. 3.211, pp. 20-24 .
[4] Evliya Çelebî, *Seyahatnâme*, VII, p. 463; *Călători străini despre Ţările Române (*Voyageurs étrangers sur les Pays Roumains),VI, Bucarest, 1976, ed. Mustafa Ali Mehmed, p. 705.
[5] Ahmet Halaçoglu, "1740-1741 Yazma Esere Göre Rumeli Kazalarının Rütbeleri", dans *XII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*. Ankara: 12-16 Eylül 1994. *Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, III. Cilt, Ankara, 1999, s. 888.
[6] BOA, fonds *Kepeci, Defterdar Kapısı. Mevkûfat Kalemi*, no. 2.915, pp. 7- 8.
[7] BOA, *Hadariye Defteri*, no. 3, pp. 36- 37.
[8] Ibidem, pp. 55-57.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0121

Cemâziülâhır 1191/26.VII.- 4.VIII.1777)[1], "au *kadı* de *Kule (Kule kadısına)* (evâsıt- ı Şevvâl 1191/ 12-21.XI.1777)[2], etc[3].

Donc, conformément aux documents (inédits) des années 1775-1777, au moins au cours de ces années il existait un *kadı* de Turnu ou un *kadı* de Nikopol et de Turnu.

Mais, en 1785-1786, après la guerre ottomano-russe de 1768-1774, au cours de laquelle les Ottomans ont été vaincus et chassés de la forteresse de Turnu (*Kule*)[4], les réparations faites ici ont été supervisées par le *kadı* de la ville de Nikopol (*el-kadı el-medine-i Niğbolı*)[5]. En 1786 c'était toujours le même *kadı* de Nikopol qui s'addressait au voïévode de Valachie pour les affaires concernant la population de Nikopol *et de Turnu*[6]. Et d'autres réparations, faites en 1234/1818[7] et en 1236/ 1820[8] à l'ancienne <forteresse de> Turnu (*Kule-i atik)* et à la nouvelle <forteresse de> Turnu (*Kule-i cedid)*, après la guerre ottomano-russe de 1806- 1812, ont été supervisées, elles aussi, par le même *kadı* de Nikopol. En ce cas, la situation des années 1775-1777 doit être considérée comme exceptionnelle, comme une mesure administrative provisoire, due à la situation extraordinaire créée par la guerre. D'ailleurs, sur le plan militaire, durant la guerre, il y avait un commandant (gouverneur) militaire (*muhafız)* pour toutes les deux forteresses : par exemple, selon un *hüküm (*ordre impérial) de 1771, le titre du *vezir* El-hâc Ahmed Paşa était de "*muhafız* de Nikopol et de *Kulle*" (*Niğbolı ve Kulle muhafızı)*[9]. Il faut de même souligner que nous n'avons pas rencontré la dénomination officielle de *kaza-i Kule*, mais seulement le vocable *kadı* de Kule. Ce vocable pourrait être une simple erreur des secrétaires *(küttâb)* d'Istanbul (*errare humanum est*). Ce genre d'erreurs peut parfois se rencontrer dans les registres de la Porte, surtout dans *Mühimme Defterleri (*par exemple, *Boğdan voyvodası* au lieu de *Erdel voyvodası, Bağdad voyvodası* au lieu de *Boğdan voyvodası,* etc). Quant à notre sujet, même au XVI[e] siècle, en 1578, quand l'existence d'un *kaza-i*

---

[1]Ibidem, pp. 87-88.
[2]Ibidem, p. 95 .
[3]Ibidem, pp. 147 et 149 (*Kule kadısına)* et p. 196 (*Niğbolı ve Kule kadılarına).*
[4]George Ioan Lahovari, *Marele dictionar geografic al României,* vol. V, Bucureşti, 1902, pp. 664-665.
[5]BOA, fonds *D.BŞM.BNE (Bâb-ı Defterî. Baş Muhasebe. Bina Emini Kalemi/* La Porte <du grand > defterdar. La Chancellerie de l'intendant des constructions) no.16.039.
[6]*Catalogul documentelor turceşti,* éd. M. Guboglu, I, Bucureşti, 1960, p. 103, les docs. 384 et 385.
[7]BOA, Istanbul, fonds *D.BŞM.BNE,* no. 16.221.
[8]Ibidem, no.16.275.
[9]Valeriu Veliman, *Relatiile româno-otomane (1711-1821). Documente turceşti,* Bucureşti, 1984, doc. 170.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0122

Holovnik est absolument exclue, dans *Mühimme Defterleri* fut enregistré un ordre impérial *(hüküm)* adressé "aux *kadı* de Giurgiu (*Yergöği)* et de Turnu (*Holovnik)*"[1].

Mais dans ce cas l'erreur s'explique par le fait que l'ordre a été émis à la demande du voïévode de Valachie, Mihnea, qui protestait contre les abus des sujets ottomans "des *kaza* mentionnées" vis-à-vis des Valaques. Donc, les secrétaires ont reproduit *tale quale* les mots (et l'erreur) de Mihnea. Au XVIII[e] siècle et au début du XIX[e] siècle, le titre de *kadı* de Nikopol et de Kule peut lui- aussi suggérer l'existence d'un seul titulaire de la dignité de *kadı* (juge, maire et notaire) pour toutes les deux villes, de même que l'importance stratégique accrue de la forteresse située sur la rive gauche du Danube, suite des invasions russes.

En effet, en 1825 Es-Seyid Mehmed Efendi a été installé, selon ses propres paroles, comme "*kadı* de Nikopol et de Turnu"[2]. Mais en 1826 le nouveau titulaire annonçait lui-même sa nomination seulement comme "*kadı* de Nikopol"[3]. Enfin, en 1827 — deux ans avant le traité d'Edirne qui rétrocédera Turnu à la Valachie — Ahmed Paşa, *muhafız* ("défenseur", gouverneur militaire) de Nikopol, confirmait au prince-régnant de Valachie que "les villages des *hass* de Turnu (sont) dépendants du *kaza* de Nikopol"[4].

Par conséquent, on peut affirmer qu'à l'exception des années 1775-1777, quand les documents officiels ottomans font mention d'un "*kadı de Kule*" (mais nous ne savons pas s'il s'agissait d'un *kadı* indépendant ou d'un second titre du *kadı* de Nikopol, vue l'importance accrue de Turnu, suite aux guerres ottomano-russo-autrichiennes), tout le long de son existence sous l'administration ottomane Turnu a dépendu du *kadı* de la grande ville forteresse de l'autre côté du Danube, en tant que *niyâbet*. D'ailleurs, dans les relations entre les ports (et les forteresses)-jumelés du Bas-Danube (Braila-Măcin, Giurgiu- Russe, Nikopol-Turnu, Vidin-Calafat), c'est le seul cas où l'autorité d'un *kadı* ottoman a embrassé toutes les deux rives du grand fleuve. À notre avis, ce sont surtout les raisons militaires, mais aussi la grande disproportion entre les deux forteresses et localités, qui ont transformé Turnu dans une véritable annexe de Nikopol.

---

[1]BOA, Istanbul, *Mühimme Defteri,* vol. 35, p. 382, ordre 971 du 29 Ramazan 986/ 29.11.1578, remis au représentant de Valachie (*Eflâk kethüdası)* à la Porte le 5 Şevval 986/ 05.12.1578.
[2]*Catalogul documentelor turceşti,* I, p. 416, doc. 2074; voir aussi doc. 2078.
[3]Ibidem, p. 436, doc. 2172.
[4]Ibidem, p. 475, doc. 2366.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0123

2. La deuxième conclusion en marge du document est qu'à l'époque pour désigner Turnu on utilisait dans les documents officiels ottomans la dénomination slave *Holovnik*, provenant du bulgare médiéval *Holüvnik* = "tour", ayant comme racine le slave *hol/holm* = "altitude", "colline". Donc c'est *Holovnik* la lecture ottomane correcte de la dénomination de la forteresse et de la bourgade de Turnu, ce qui correspond aussi à la loi de l'harmonie vocalique de la langue turque, et non *Helonik, Hlonik* or *Holonik,* qu'on peut trouver dans les ouvrages turcs contemporains de même que dans les catalogues des Archives Ottomanes (BOA) d'Istanbul. Cette lecture présente une certaine similitude avec *Dobrevnik/ Dubrovnik* pour Raguse. C'était *Holovnik* qui était la dénomination officielle la plus répandue aux XVI[e][1]-XVII[e][2] siècles, dénomination que nous avons aussi rencontrée au début du XVIII[e] siècle[3].

En Europe, c'étaient *Cholownic* et *Nicopolis Minor* qui figuraient sur les cartes géographiques[4], noms utilisés aussi par les Roumains (en traduction: *Nicopolul Mic* ou *Nicopoia Micé*).

Parallèlement, on a commencé à utiliser le terme turc *Kule* (ou *Kulle*), dans le même sens de "la tour", qui doit être une traduction de *Holüvnik /Holovnik*. Nous avons rencontré pour la première fois ce terme, sous la forme *iskele-i Kulle,* dans un registre de la Chancellerie *Mevkûfat* de l'an 1003/1594- 1595, qui passe en revue les échelles (*iskelehâ)* et les stations de postes (*menâzil)* de la mer Noire et du Bas-Danube[5]. La forme *Kule* est aussi mentionnée par Evliya Çelebî, qui a vu personnellement cette forteresse avant 1666 et qui, de plus, donne une variante fantaisiste, à savoir la dénomination de *Çuval* ("grand sac"), provenant, selon le grand voyageur, de l'épisode de la fondation de cette "petite forteresse" (d'où le nom de *Kule*), en 747 (1344-1345) (?!), par Bayezid Ier, qui a ordonné que le lieu marécageux soit rempli "*avec cents milliers de sacs*" pleins de terre[6]. Graduellement la

---

[1]BOA, fonds *Maliyeden Müdevver Defterleri* (Registres financiers), nos. 1 (doc. de 922/1516) et 312 (doc. de 985/1577); *D.BRZ,* no. 20.618, p. 202, doc. de 1558; *Kepeci (Ruznâmçe Defteri),* no. 1866/4, p. 240, doc. de 1564, etc .

[2]BOA, fonds *D.BKL (Bâb-i Defteri. Büyük Kale Kalemi* /La Porte du <grand > defterdar. La Chancellerie des grandes forteresses), no. 32. 172, docs. de 1603; *Tahrir Defterleri* (Registres de recensement), nos. 771 et 775 de 1052-/1642, etc.

[3]BOA, *Maliyeden Müdevver Defteri,* no. 3533, pp. 120-121, doc. de 1119-1120 AH/ 1707-1708 AD.

[4]Par exemple, sur une carte allemande, de Nürenberg (*Norimbergae),* datée par P. P. Panaitescu en 1600-1650 (Gr. Florescu, *Cetatea Turnu (Turnu Măgurele),* Revista Istorică Romînă, 1945, vol. XV, fasc. IV, p. 461.

[5]BOA, fonds *Kepeci*, no. 2.555, pp. 11-12 (pagination nouvelle) ou 21-22 (pagination ancienne).

[6]Evliya Çelebî, *op. cit., loc.cit.*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0124

forme *Kule/Kulle* est devenue de plus en plus répandue et finalement a complètement éliminé l'ancien vocable *Holovnik*, conservé plutôt dans les *defter*, qui n'enregistraient pas la langue quotidienne, mais les formes anciennes, spécialement persanes, qui passaient *tale quale* d'un registre à l'autre. C'est remarquable que déjà à la fin du XVII^e siècle non seulement les sources ottomanes, documentaires[1] ou narratives[2], utilisaient le terme *Kule*, mais même le général autrichien Veterani, dans son rapport du 1^er octobre 1688, faisait la mention de Turnu sous la forme de *Kulla*[3]. Après les réparations de 1785-1786, mentionnées ci-dessus, nous rencontrons la dénomination (sous la forme du dual arabe) *Kuleteyin* (écrit aussi comme *Kulleteyin*), c'est-à-dire "les deux *Kule*", à savoir "*Kule* <la tour> ancienne" (*Kule-i 'atik)* et "*Kule* nouvelle" (*Kule-i cedid),* comme nous l'avons déjà vu pour l'an 1818[4]. De *Kule-i 'atik* et *Kule-i cedid* parlent aussi des documents turcs de 1828 [5], un an avant le traité d'Andrinople.

En conclusion, les Ottomans ont utilisé tant le nom de *Holovnik*, trouvé sur place et consigné dans les cartes européennes sous la forme de *Cholownic*, que la traduction turque de celui-ci, *Kule*. À partir de la fin du XVI^e siècle jusqu'au début du XVIII^e siècle, les deux noms ont cohabité, mais finalement le vocable turc s'est imposé sans conteste. Quant aux Roumains, ils ont utilisé les termes *Nicopolul Mic* ou *Nicopoia Micé* (*Nicopolis Minor)* et puis la traduction roumaine du turc *Kule*, à savoir *Turnu.*

3. La troisième conclusion en marge du document de 1556 est qu'à l'époque, Turnu n'était qu'une bourgade *(kasaba),* et non pas une ville *(şehir)* véritable. D'ailleurs, jusqu'au XIX^e siècle les Ottomans n'ont attribué le titre de *şehir* qu'aux grandes villes, comme Istanbul, Edirne, Bursa, Bağdad, Le Caire, etc. Au nord du Danube, même les villes-capitales de Bucarest (*Bükreş)* et Jassy (*Yaş)* étaient considérées des *kasaba*. Si pour certaines villes marchandes comme Chilia (*Kili),* Cetatea Albă (*Akkerman),* etc., annexées directement à l'Empire ottoman, on utilisait parfois dans les *Kanunnâme*

---

[1] Voir, par exemple, le *ferman* de Mustafa II du 9 décembre 1697, qui fait mention du "voïévode de *Kule"(Kule voyvodası)*, dans *Documente turceşti privind istoria României/* Documents turcs concernant l'histoire de la Roumanie, éd. M. Mehmed, I, Bucureşti, 1976, doc. 193, p. 197.

[2] Voir, par exemple, le récit du chroniqueur contemporain Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa sur le passage du sultan Mustafa II, le 13 octobre 1695, par *Kule,* où il a été reçu *par le kadı* de Nikopol, dans *Cronici turceşti despre Ţările Române /Chroniques turques sur les Pays Roumains, II,* éd. M. Guboglu, Bucureşti, 1974, p. 457.

[3] *Călători străini despre Ţările Române,* VII, Bucureşti, 1980, p. 476.

[4] BOA, fonds *D.BŞM.BNE,* no. 16.221.

[5] *Catalogul documentelor turceşti,* I, p. 486, no. 2423.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0125

(Codes de lois) du XVI^e siècle les termes *şehir (*ville) et *şehirlü* (citadin)[1], ce fait s'explique plutôt par le formulaire de ces règlements valable pour l'Empire tout entier.

Évidemment, comme petite ville (*kasaba)*, Turnu devait disposer déjà d'un marché (*bazar)* permanent, ce qui, selon Max Weber, est la condition *sine qua-non* d'une ville. À l'origine de ce marché permanent se trouve toujours la fondation d'une foire hebdomadaire dans un village économiquement bien développé et géographiquement bien placé. C'était, par exemple, le cas du village (*kariye)* Kartal, du *kaza* d'Isaccea (*İsakçı)*, en Dobroudja, qui en juillet 1682 recevait l'approbation "de fonder une foire (*bazâr)* une fois par semaine" (*haftada bir def'a bazâr durmak)*[2]. Donc, on peut voir, tant dans le cas du *kasaba* de Turnu que dans le cas du *kariye* de Kartal, la même formule juridique : "de fonder une foire (*bazâr)* par semaine" *haftada bir def'a bazâr durmak)*". Mais la différence économique est grande: le village de Kartal fondait pour la première fois une telle foire, tandis que Turnu fondait une foire hebdomadaire outre son marché permanent, une pratique très répandue, surtout dans les régions de frontière.

4. Donc, une quatrième conclusion s'impose: au milieu du XVI^e siècle l'échelle de Turnu était entrée dans une étape nouvelle de son développement, à savoir une étape d'essor économique, grace aux grands changements dans le destin du Danube, devenu après les annexions ottomanes de Belgrade (1521), de Bräila et du sud-est de la Moldavie (1538-1540), enfin de Bude (1540-1541), un fleuve ottoman, tandis qu'à la même époque (1538),[3] la mer Noire aussi était devenue un lac ottoman. Grâce à cette nouvelle conjoncture, concrétisée dans l'unification monétaire, législative et politique, les échanges commerciaux entre les régions danubiennes, entre les territoires du nord et du sud du Danube, ont connu un développement sans précedent[4].

---

[1]Voir, par exemple, A. Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Tahlileri,* 7. Cilt, Istanbul, 1994, p. 725 .

[2]Tahsin Gemil, *Relatiile Tărilor Române cu Poarta otomană în documente turceşti, 1601-1711,* Bucureşti, 1984, doc. 172.

[3]Halil İnalcık, *Imperiul otoman. Epoca clasică 1300-1600,* éd. Mihai Maxim, Bucureşti, 1996, pp. 273-274.

[4]Voir Bistra Cvetkova (Cvetkova), *Regimul schimbului economic dintre teritoriile de la nord şi sud de Dunăre în secolul al XVI-lea (Le régime de l'échange économique entre les territoires du Nord et du Sud du Danube au XVIe siècle),* dans *Relatii româno-bulgare de-a lungul veacurilor. Sec. XII-XIX. Studii. Bulgarische-Rumänische Verbindungen und Beziehungen im Lauffe der Jahrhunderte (13.-19. Jh.). Untersuchungen,* vol. I, Bucureşti, 1971, pp. 107-150; M. Dan, S. Goldenberg, *Le commerce balkano-levantin de la Transylvanie au cours de la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle et au début du XVIIe siècle,* dans Revue des études sud-est européennes, V, 1967, nos. 1-2, pp. 87-117.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0126

L'échelle de Turnu aussi a été entraînée dans ces échanges avec du sel[1], des chevaux, des bœufs, des vaches, des moutons, du grain, du vin, des "couteaux valaques" (en fait, de Braşov), etc., exportés au sud du Danube, de même qu'avec "des marchandises turques" (*res turcae, res turcales)*, comme des épices, des tissus, des objets d'habillement, des bijoux, des armes, etc., importées au nord du grand fleuve[2].

C'est dans ce contexte, qu'on doit comprendre l'affirmation des habitants de Nikopol et de Turnu qu' *"il est nécessaire et important de fonder une foire dans la bourgade nommée Holovnik, qui se trouve de l'autre côté du Danube"* et qu'une telle foire, dont *"il y a besoin"*, *"apportera aux échelles de Nikopol et de Turnu un très grand profit"*. C'est toujours dans ce contexte que la Porte, au nom du *padişah,* a décidé d'approuver la fondation à *Holovnik* de la foire hebdomadaire sollicitée.

[1]Mihai Maxim, *Ottoman Documents Concerning the Wallachian Salt in the Ports on the Lower Danube in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century,* RÉSEE, XXVI, 2/1988, pp. 235-237, 242-244.

[2]En fait, il s'agissait des marchandises traditionnelles. Cf. Radu Manolescu, *Sur la participation des marchands de la Péninsule Balkanique au commerce avec la Valachie et la Transylvanie, dans la première moitié du XVIe siècle*, RÉSEE, tome XIII, 1975, no 3, pp. 403-405. Voir aussi : A. Akgündüz, *Osmanli Kanunnameleri ve Tahlilleri,* 3. kitap, *(Yavuz devri),* Istanbul, 199, pp. 423-424 (*Der beyân-ı kanun-ı iskele-i Hlonik).*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0127

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON ROMANIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY ABOUT OTTOMAN-ROMANIAN COMMERCIAL RELATIONS

Bogdan MURGESCU

For more than five centuries trade with the Ottoman Empire was one of the main parts of Romanian external economic relations, so that it attracted a great deal of attention in Romanian historiography. Yet, for a long time concrete research was obscured by the debates whether there had been an Ottoman commercial monopoly over the Romanian Principalities. Taking into account the fact that much of the concrete research was made in order to strengthen the pros and cons in these debates, we think it is necessary first to present this historiographical background and only afterwards to analyse the Romanian contributions to a better knowledge of Ottoman-Romanian trade.

The Ottoman Commercial Monopoly on the Romanian Principalities (further OCM) is a modern concept.[1] When frustrated by the state of their trade with the Ottoman Empire, the Romanians before 1800 complained only about very specific issues and did not resort to general concepts. Even when a prince like Nicolae Caragea described the ways the Ottoman authorities hindered the normal sale of Romanian products and demanded that the trade should be free, in fact, when beginning to detail the measures to be taken, he asked that the transactions should be completed only at the frontier at an annually fixed price.[2] This meant mainly the achievement of an advantageous situation in respect to the economic partners and/or competitors. But hasn't it always been the same?[3]

---

[1]Here we summarize the more detailed analysis given in Romanian in Bogdan Murgescu, *Avatarurile unui concept: monopolul comercial otoman asupra Ţărilor Române*, "Revista istorică" (serie noua), I, 1990, nr. 9-10, p. 819-845.

[2]See the two French memoirs sent by the Walachian prince Nicolae Caragea to Bulgakov, the Russian Ambassador in Istanbul, in 1783, published in *Documente privind istoria României. Colectia Eudoxiu du Hurmuzaki* (further *Hurmuzaki*) (serie noua), I, Bucureşti, 1962, p. 205-211, 213-215.

[3]Cf. Anne-Marie Piuz, *Note sur l'acception ancienne de Free Trade (XVIe-XVIIe siècles)* in *Wirtschaftskräfte und Wirtschaftswege. IV. Übersee und allgemeine Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Hermann Kellenbens*, Stuttgart, 1978, p. 585-197.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0129

The idea that trade should normally be free of any restrictions spread in Western Europe in the second half of the 18th century. In Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe it was brought mainly by Western observers of local economic realities. The contact with such Westerners or with Western-educated Russians helped the Romanian boyars to put their concrete grievances in a more systematic framework. In the 1820s these boyars radicalised their protests on the state of the Romanian foreign trade, partly because they had growing expectations induced by their better education, and partly because their profits were affected by the downturn of European demand after the end of the Napoleonic Wars. Between 1821 and 1829 almost all Romanian political memoirs and projects demanded complete freedom of trade, which was to be achieved in 1829 through the Russian-Ottoman peace treaty of Adrianople. In this context the Romanian boyars began to use in their French texts the word "monopoly" in order to designate the Ottoman infringements upon free trade in their relationship with the Romanian Principalities. We have found this word first in a French memoir of Iordache Rosetti-Roznovanu from 1823,[1] and then in a text written in 1825 probably by Michael Sturdza[2] and in an anonymous memoir from 1827.[3] In all these texts the word has an unambiguously negative meaning: Michael Sturdza even writes "le poids de l'odieux monopole...", while the Wallachian boyar Barbu Ştirbei, without using the term "monopoly", considers the Ottoman commercial restrictions "le véritable cancer qui nous ronge et fait que toute prospérité est tarie à sa source".[4]

After 1829 the foreign trade of Wallachia and Moldavia was liberalised, so that the problem of the OCM quickly became obsolete. Therefore, even if the word "monopoly" began to be used in Romanian,[5] it was not associated with the history of Ottoman-Romanian commercial relations. Quite more, even if some of the economists and historians reminded that before 1829 Romanian trade had been hindered by the Ottomans, the liberally-minded ideologues from the middle of the 19th century tried to gain Ottoman support against Russia and also to argue that their demands for free trade were legitimated by historical evidence. Such a political use of history is evident in an official document adopted by the Moldavian treaty of 1588: "The Romanian Principalities always exerted their rights and were never subjected to the

[1] Vlad Georgescu, *Mémoires et projets de réforme dans les Principautés Roumaines, 1769-1831*, Bucureşti, 1970, pp. 117-118.
[2] *Hurmuzaki*, supl. I/IV, p. 90.
[3] Vlad Georgescu, *op. cit.*, p. 169.
[4] *Ibidem*, p. 162.
[5] Cf. *Dictionarul limbii române*, serie nouă, VI, Bucureşti, 1968, p. 847.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0130

Turkish commercial legislation, as it is proven by the many treaties they have concluded with other sovereign states uninterruptedly for many centuries".[1] We can safely conclude that from about 1830 to about 1880 political interests prevailed both among historians and among the public, and almost nobody was really interested about the past of Ottoman-Romanian trade.

During the last two decades of the 19th century this situation changed. Interest for economic matters grew thanks to the debates between the defenders of free trade and those of protectionism. Historians and economists tried to know better the history of Romanian trade and discovered the Western descriptions of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, especially the works of Raichevich and Peyssonnel, who described in detail the Ottoman abuses in the relationship with the Romanian Principalities. Therefore, one of the most authoritative Romanian economists of the late 19th century concluded that "the Porte had monopolised our export trade, so, willingly or not, we had to sell for Constantinople",[2] and his opinion was shared by most of the authors who wrote on this subject.

The concept of OCM was thus firmly established in the Romanian academic world, and it became a main part of a larger scheme of Romanian economic history: Moldavia and Wallachia had been quite prosperous before the Ottoman impact, the Ottoman domination and especially the OCM stopped this promising development and brought "Oriental" retardation, while the treaty of Adrianople restored freedom of trade, stimulated the relationship with the West and the "modernization" of the principalities.

Quite soon, the notion of OCM was questioned by the young historian Nicolae Iorga. Having a better knowledge of historical evidence and being in an iconoclastic mood which made him challenge also other prejudices of Romanian historiography and public mind, Iorga argued that it was impossible to impose an effective monopoly, that illegal trade flourished so that trade with Christian Europe remained impressive and that we must take into consideration the differences between various products. Iorga distinguished three periods in the Romanian-Ottoman relationship, and pleaded that up to the establishment of the Phanariot regime (1711 in Moldavia and 1716 in

[1] *Buletinul şedintelor Adunarii ad-hoc a Moldovei,* nr. 11/ 1857, p. 3; see also Paul Cernovodeanu, *Privilegiul comercial acordat negustorilor englezi în Moldova la 1588 şi răsunetul său politic în anii Unirii Principatelor,* "Revista de Istorie", 31, 1978, nr. 6, pp. 1045-1048.

[2] Petre S. Aurelian, *Schite asupra starii economice a României în secolul al XVIII-lea,* Bucureşti, 1882, p. 99.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0131

Wallachia) trade was quite fair; only after this moment did the Ottomans manage to turn the trade in their advantage, and only up to the end of the 18th century when the Russians forced them to limit their exigencies.[1] As we can see, Iorga did not contest the OCM concept, but he restricted its applicability only to some merchandise and only to the 18th century, and asked for more concrete research. In the following period Iorga published a great number of documents and a monograph on the history of Romanian trade,[2] as well as other studies on related topics. The same line of concreteness was followed by other historians at the beginning of the 20th century, especially by Ion I. Nistor,[3] but economic history was still not a prioritary field in the Romanian historical science, so that progress, although important, was not yet a breakthrough. Quite more, the preference for concreteness meant also that among non-specialists prevailed the conviction that there had really existed an OCM with disastrous effects on the Romanian economic development. In fact, we must admit neither Iorga, although much milder in tone and more circumstantial in affirmations, nor Nistor, did not dispute the idea that generally speaking the Ottoman economic impact on the Romanian Principalities had been rather unfavourable. Yet, their contributions are still valuable because they put together most of the European information on Romanian foreign trade, even if sometimes their information must be handled with great caution.[4]

During the inter-war period the most important contribution to the better knowledge of the Ottoman-Romanian trade was probably that of Gheorghe Brătianu. Although Ottoman history was not one of Brătianu's main fields of interest, he was attracted by the continuities between the Byzantine and Ottoman periods and by the role of Constantinople-Istanbul in the history of the Black Sea area.[5] Influenced by the economic experiences of World War

---

[1] N. Iorga, in *Hurmuzaki*, X, Bucureşti, p. XVI-XVII.

[2] Idem, *Istoria comerţului românesc*, Bucureşti, 1915, 1925.

[3] Ion Nistor, *Die auswärtigen Handelsbeziehungen der Moldau im XIV., XV. und XVI. Jahrhundert*, Gotha, 1911; idem, *Handel und Wandel in der Moldau bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Czernowitz, 1912.

[4] See for example the discussion on Nistor's information about Moldavian grain exports in Bogdan Murgescu, *Did Moldavia and Walachia Export Grains during the 16th Century?* in *Miscellanea in honorem Radu Manolescu emerito*. Ed. Zoe Petre & Stelian Brezeanu, Bucureşti, 1996, p. 190-199.

[5] Gheorghe Brătianu first published three distinct articles on the provisioning of Constantinople (*La question de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et ottomane*, "Byzantion", V, 1929-1930, nr. 1, p. 83-107; *Nouvelles contributions à l'étude de l'approvisionnement de Constantinople sous les Paléologues et les empereurs ottomans*, "Byzantion", VI, 1931, nr. 2, p. 641-656; *Une expérience d'économie dirigée : le monopole du blé à Byzance au XIe siècle*, "Byzantion", IX, 1934, nr. 2, p. 643-662), then merged them in a single one in his *Études byzantines d'histoire économique et sociale*, Paris 1938, pp. 127-181. Brătianu managed to give a final form to his monograph on the history of the Black Sea only up

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0132

I, of the Soviet Revolution and of the Great Depression, he committed himself in defending economic liberalism against state control. Brătianu drew heavily on the work of the German historian Walter Hahn[1] and on a late 18th century economic report of Wenzel von Brognard[2] and concluded that always when possible the masters of Constantinople tried to control tightly the trade of the countries around the Black Sea in order to provision the great metropolis on the Bosphorus. On the contrary, when the masters of Constantinople and the Straits were politically weak, they were forced to accept the intrusion of Mediterraneans and/or of Westerners into the Black Sea and the riverans profited from the increased international trade in this region. Brătianu argued that after late Byzantine weakness had allowed the Black Sea area to become an axis of international trade, the Ottomans managed to establish a stronger control and turned the Black Sea into a "Turkish lake", part of the "closed economy of the Ottoman Empire", which was a "forced state-economy" (translation of Hahn's "staatliche Zwangswirtschaft"). Insisting on the imperative of provisioning Istanbul, Brătianu focused his attention on the trade of foodstuffs and concluded that as long as the Ottomans were strong, i.e. during the 16th-18th centuries, the Romanian Principalities were subjected to the OCM. He also agreed to the general paradigm that the Ottoman domination was an economic disaster for the Romanian Principalities, which prospered only when being able to connect themselves to the Western economy.

Although Bratiănu urged for further studies on Romanian-Ottoman economic relations, he himself added little concrete information to the already known, and the blame put on the Ottoman period combined with the difficulty of access to Ottoman sources diverted most of his students from this subject.[3] These circumstances did not prevent the OCM theory to impose itself stronger than previously. Brătianu's prestige and influence helped this concept to be adopted by most professional historians and economists, who introduced it in encyclopaedias, academic treatises and schoolbooks. This diffusion was not

---

to 1484 (cf. the posthumous edition *La Mer Noire. Des origines à la conquête ottomane*, München, 1969), while his opinions about the Ottoman period were exposed in a more complete manner only in the lectures delivered at the University of Bucharest in 1942-1943, *Chestiunea Mării Negre*, II, especilaly p. 27-51 (typescript).

[1] Walter Hahn, *Die Verpflegung Konstantinpels durch staatliche Zwangswirtschaft nach türkischen Urkunden aus dem 16. Jahrhundert* (=Beihefte zu Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, VIII. Heft), Stuttgart, 1926.

[2] This report was published and commented by Brătianu's friend Gheron Netta, *Expansiunea economică a Austriei şi explorările ei orientale*, Bucureşti, 1931.

[3] A notable exception is Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca, who published an important article on this subject already in 1944: *A propos d'un firman du sultan Mustafa III*, "Balcania", VII, 1944, nr. 2, p. 363-392.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0133

hindered by Bratiănu's personal tragedy after the communist take-over, when he was arrested and died in prison. The OCM was not necessarily linked with Bratianu's work any more: Bratianu and his work could be placed under interdict, but the OCM was already a common "impersonal" concept and could be safely used by the Romanian "Marxist" historical science. In fact, the OCM fitted quite well into the Communist scheme of Romanian economic history, because it helped explain Romania's retardation in a capitalist development, it stressed the damaging role of foreign exploitation and it permitted to focus the light on the Russian contribution to liberating the Romanian Principalities from its effects.

More important was the fact that after World War II there developed several directions of concrete investigation about the Ottoman-Romanian trade.

First, most studies were focused on the Russian efforts to curb the OCM. Although many of them were politically biased, some of these studies helped to a better knowledge not only of the political circumstances, but also of the economic realities of the late 18th and early 19th century. These contributions due especially to Maria-Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru,[1] Traian Ionescu[2] and Alexandru Vianu,[3] allowed Andrei Oţetea[4] to synthesise our knowledge on this period, which is probably the best known in the whole history of Ottoman-Romanian trade.[5]

Other researchers tried to give a new start to inquiries already begun before the communist take-over. Characteristic are in this respect Maria-Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru and Mihai Berza, who both had worked with Brătianu in their youth.

---

[1] Idem, *Rolul hatişerifurilor de privilegii în limitarea obligaţiilor către Poartă*, "Studii. Revista de istorie", 11, 1958, nr. 6, p. 101-121; Idem, *Les rapports économiques de l'Empire ottoman avec les Principautés Roumaines et leur réglementation par les Khatt-i Şerif de Privilèges*, in *Économie et Sociétés dans l'Empire Ottoman (fin du XVIII^e-début du XX^e siècle)*, 1983, p. 317-326.

[2] Traian Ionescu, *Hatişeriful din 1802 şi începutul luptei pentru asigurarea pieţii interne a Principatelor dunărene*, "Studii şi articole de istorie", I, 1956, p. 37-38.

[3] Alexandru Vianu, *Aplicarea tratatului de la Kuciuk-Kairangi cu privire la Moldova şi Ţara Românească*, "Studii. Revistă de istorie", 13, 1960, nr. 5, p. 71-103; idem, *Pierderile suferite de Moldova în anii 1812-1816 la furniturile către Poartă, după datele Consulatului Rusiei din Iaşi*, "Romanoslavica", XI, 1965, p. 323-332.

[4] Andrei Oţetea's contributions and opinions are gathered in his remarkable book *Pătrunderea comerţului românesc în circuitul internaţional (în perioada de trecere de la feudalism la capitalism)*, Bucureşti, 1977.

[5] See also Florin Marinescu, *The Trade of Wallachia with the Ottoman Empire between 1791 and 1821*, "Balkan Studies", 22, 1981, nr. 2, p. 289-319.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0134

Maria-Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru tried to follow Brătianu's suggestion and to study the Ottoman mechanisms of provisioning Istanbul with grains and animal products.[1] Her research revealed not only some of the monopolist practices of the Ottoman authorities, but also the discontinuities and inconsistencies of Ottoman policies, i.e. their limited efficiency. Thus, although she begins by criticising firmly Nicolae Iorga, Maria-Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru finally comes closer to the position of Iorga than to that of Bratianu. A similar tendency can be observed at Paul Cernovodeanu, who, in a general article on Ottoman-Romanian economic relations, admitted that some monopolistic mechanisms had been established in the 16th century, but argued that up to the 18th century trade with the Ottoman Empire was beneficial to the Romanian Principalities, only after the accession of the Phanariots a definite deterioration being observed.[2]

Even more interesting is the evolution of Mihai Berza. In one of his first studies, he compared the fate of the Black Sea under the Ottomans with that of the Mediterranean after the Arab conquest (Pirenne's theory).[3] He developed this idea in a conference held in Rome in March 1938, where he argued that due to the connection with the Italian cities the Romanian Principalities were starting a capitalist development when the Ottoman conquest closed the Black Sea and blocked this evolution, causing the disappearance of the nascent native bourgeoisie, the enserfment of the free peasants and the internal domination of the nobility; thus, the Ottoman domination signified the establishment of a Romanian Middle Age. Mihai Berza's ideas were not entirely new in the Romanian historiography, but they were the most systematic construct of the theory that the Ottomans had caused Romania's divergence from a Western-type development. Yet, it is probable that the scrupulous Mihai Berza thought that his ideas needed further investigation, for he refrained from publishing this last part together with the rest of his conference.[4] After World War II this theory could not be exposed any more, because it associated too closely Romania's prosperity with the

[1] Maria-Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca, *A propos d'un firman...*; idem, *Contribution à l'étude de l'approvisionnement en blé de Constantinople au XVII^e siècle,* "Studia et Acta Orientalia", I, 1957, p. 13-37.

[2] Paul Cernovodeanu, *Les échange économiques dans l'évolution des relations roumano-turques (XV^e-XVIII^e siècles),* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XVI, 1978, nr. 1, p. 81-90. See also the chapter written by Paul Cernovodeaun in N. N. Constantinescu (ed.), *Romania's Economic History. From the Beginnings to World War II,* Bucureşti, 1994, p. 84 and 101.

[3] Mihai Berza, *Henri Pirenne şi originile evului mediu occidental,* "Convorbiri literare", LXXI, 1938, nr. 1-5, p. 1, note 1 (separatum).

[4] Idem, *Il commercio italiano nei Paesi Romeni alla fine del Medievo,* unpublished conference, whose manuscript was kindly provided to me by Prof. Andrei Pippidi; part of this conference was published as *La Mer Noire à la fin du Moyen Age,* "Balcania", IV, 1941, p. 409-435.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0135

contact to the West. In the late 1950s Mihai Berza was called to prepare the chapters on the Ottoman economic domination over the Romanian Principalities for the academic treaties of Romanian history.[1] Although most of his original work treated the financial aspects of Ottoman domination, Mihai Berza could not neglect the commercial relationship. Basically, Mihai Berza reinforced the conclusions of Gheorghe Brătianu on the negative consequences of the Ottoman domination: the closure of the Black Sea, the priority of provisioning Istanbul, the establishment of OCM already in the 16th century, although he accepted that the OCM became more oppressive during the 18th century. But Mihai Berza also introduced new insights in this general picture. First, he warned that OCM did not mean a total interdiction of trade with other countries. Then, he suggested that in order to maximise the economic profits from their political supremacy the Ottomans used a great variety of means, the OCM being just one of these various methods, so that it must be studied only in the general framework of the Ottoman exploitation of the Romanian Principalities. In this respect Mihai Berza mentioned the connection between the financial exigencies of the Porte, the growth of the fiscal burden and the low prices the Romanians were forced to accept because of their desperate need of money to pay their taxes. Another aspect which attracted Mihai Berza was the typology of OCM mechanisms: he distinguished 3 basic mechanisms: 1. state deliveries, which usually were not paid cash, but were discounted from the official tribute; 2. state supervision of private sales of Romanian merchandise on Ottoman markets; 3. the purchase of Romanian products by Ottoman merchants officially authorised to make trade in Wallachia and Moldavia.

Quite different was the position of Constantin C. Giurescu. In his youth he accepted willingly the conclusions of Bratianu regarding the existence of the OCM. Yet, in the 1970s he changed his opinion and argued that the Porte could not impose a real OCM and had to be satisfied only with a vague pre-emption right which did not change very much the market conditions. Constantin C. Giurescu even risked to estimate that transaction prices were not less than 80-90% of what should have been "normal" prices.[2]

---

[1] Mihai Berza, in *Istoria României*, vol. II, Bucureşti, 1962, p. 776-791, vol. III, 1964, p. 346-352.

[2] Constantin C. Giurescu, *Probleme controversate în istoriografia română*, Bucureşti, 1977, p. 98-121; see also our criticism to this estimate in Bogdan Murgescu, *Avatarurile...*, p. 839, note 115.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0136

This intervention did not stop the debates on the OCM, although it heralded a more circumstantiated attitude towards Ottoman-Romanian commercial relations. In fact, most specialists of Ottoman-Romanian relations and of the economic history of the 15th-18th centuries agreed that there had been no OCM in the strong sense and some of them tried to classify, to describe and to determine the relative scope and efficiency of the various practices the Ottomans sometimes used in order to restrict Wallachia's and Moldavia's freedom of trade. Here we must mention especially the important contribution of Mihai Maxim on the second half of the 16th century. Mihai Maxim's case is interesting not only because of his concrete contributions to our better knowledge of Ottoman-Romanian economic relations, but also from a historiographical point of view. He appealed to Giurescu's authority when arguing for a more balanced attitude towards the Ottoman empire, but developed the suggestions of Mihai Berza in his concrete research. With regard to the Ottoman commercial practices, Mihai Maxim distinguished between "normal' trade, special requests of certain products, first occasional, then on a yearly basis, export interdictions and—only for a short period— the exclusive reservation of certain products and certain areas for the provisioning of certain Ottoman institutions.[1] Quite on the contrary to this trend of professional research, in schoolbooks and in other general works, especially in studies dedicated only to the 19th-20th centuries, the idea that there had been a strong OCM up to 1829 remained virtually intact. Even more, after 1989 this non specialist stress on the OCM amplified as a result of the now freely expressed general opinion that Romania's prosperity depended always on her connection to the West, while the ties to the East, the Ottoman Empire included, always brought retardation and poverty. Needless to say that such unhistorical opinions are of no help to the professional historians.

Constantin C. Giurescu was less important for his concrete cognitive contributions[2] than for the fact that his scientific authority combined with the good political relations between Romania and Turkey and with Romania's gradual emancipation from the Marxist obsession with exploitation in determining a more serene attitude towards the history of Ottoman-Romanian relations. This new scientific and ideological climate which evolved since the late 1960s stimulated the development of Ottoman studies in Romania, a fact

---

[1] Mihai Maxim, *Regimul economic al dominatiei otomane în Moldava şi Ţara Românească în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVI-lea,* "Revista de istorie", 32, 1979 nr. 9, p. 1749-1758.

[2] From a longer list of such contributions we mention here only: Constantin C. Giurescu, *Les relations des pays roumains avec Trébizonde aux XVI^e^-XIX^e^ siècles,* "Revue roumaine d'histoire", XIII, 1974, nr. 2, p. 239-246; idem, *Contributions à l'histoire économique de l'Empire ottoman : l'importation du bois des pays roumains,* in *VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi,* II, Ankara, 1981, p. 1237-1240.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0137

which influenced also the research on the history of Ottoman-Romanian trade. Romanian historians began to have access to an increasing number of Ottoman documents,[1] which, added to their previous knowledge of Romanian and Western information, allowed significant progress in current research.

More progress was made during these last decades regarding the 16th century. First of all we must note the fact that most Romanian historians who currently use Ottoman documents focused their attention on this century. Research made by Romanian and foreign historians[2] brought to light the *kanuns* of the Ottoman ports on the Danube, which, together with other disparate documents,[3] contain valuable information on the general conditions of trade. Regarding the same general conditions of merchant activity, a new direction focused on the detailed study of the treaties concluded by the Porte with other states, especially with Poland.[4] The Ottoman-Romanian trade

---

[1]Among the most important Ottoman documents published by Romanian historians we must mention especially the volumes: Mihail Guboğlu, *Catalogul documentelor turceşti,* vol. I-II, Bucureşti, 1960, 1965; Mustafa Ali Mehmed, *Documente turceşti privind istoria României,* vol. I-III, Bucureşti, 1976-1986; Mihai Maxim, *Culegere de texte otomane. Fasc. I. Izvoare documentare şi juridice (sec. XV-XX)*, Bucureşti, 1974; Tahsin Gemil, *Relaţiile Ţărilor Române cu Poarta Otomană în documente turceşti (1601-1712),* Bucureşti, 1984; Valeriu Veliman, *Relaţiile româno-otomane (1711-1821). Documente turceşti,* Bucureşti, 1984. Needless to say that only some of the documents published in these volumes focus on commercial matters.

[2]One of the first historians to exploit these documents was a Romanian historian working in France, Nicoară Beldiceanu, together with his wife, Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr *(Acte du règne de Selim I concernant quelques échelles danubiennes de Valachie, de Bulgarie et de Dobrudja,* "Südost-Forschungen", XXIII, 1964, p. 91-115. Among those who enlarged these studies we mention especially Bistra Cvetkova, Gilles Veinstein, Mihnea Berindei and more recently the research in progress of Anca Popescu *(Un centre commercial du Bas-Danube ottoman au XVI^e siècle: Braila (Bra'il),* "Il Mar Nero", III, 1997/98, p. 209-257.

[3]See for example Anca Popescu, *Un document ottoman concernant le commerce au Bas-Danube,* "Revue roumaine d'histoire", XXXI, 1992, nr. 3-4, p. 331-338.

[4]Viorel Panaite, *Comerţ şi negustori în tratatele osmano-polone. Un studiu de caz: 1607,* "Caietele Laboratorului de Studii Otomane", 2, 1993, p. 29-48; idem, *Regimul negustorilor străini în "ahdnameler" otomane (sec. XV-XVII). O radiografie,* "Sud-estul şi contextul european. Buletin", II, 1994, p. 100-114, and III, 1995, p. 95-112; idem, *Trade and Merchants in the 16th Century Ottoman-Polish Treaties,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XXXII, 1994, nr. 3-4, p. 259-276; idem, *Pace, război şi comerţ în Islam. Ţările Române şi dreptul otoman al popoarelor (secolele XV-XVII),* Bucureşti, 1997, especially p. 239-275. It is noteworthy that Viorel Panaite continues a rich tradition of Romanian studies regarding the merchant jurisdiction, illustrated by Maria-Malitlda Alexandrescu-Dersca *(Despre regimul supuşilor otomani în Ţara Românească în veacul al XVIII-lea,* "Studii. Revistă de istorie" 14, 1961, nr. 1, p. 87-113; *Sur le régime des re1ssortissants ottomans en Moldavie (1711-1829),* "Studia et Acta Orientalia", V-VI, 1967, p. 43-182), Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu, *Le régime privilegié des marchands bulgares et grecs en Olténie pendant l'occupation autrichienne (1718-1739),* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", IV, 1966, nr. 3-4, p. 475-490; Ion-Radu Mircea *(Sur les circonstantes dans lesquelles les Turcs sont restés en Valachie jusqu'au début du XVII^e siècle,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", V, 1967, nr. 1-2, p. 77-86), Mihail Dan and Samuel Goldenberg *(Le commerce balkano-levantin de la Transylvanie au cours de la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle et au début du XVII^e siècle,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", V, 1967, nr. 1-2, p. 87-117), Mustafa A. Mehmed *(Despre dreptul de proprietate al supuşilor otomani în Moldova şi Ţara Românească în secolele XV-XVIII,* "Cercetări istorice" (serie nouă), III, 1972, p. 65-81), Radu Manolescu, *Sur la participation des marchands de la Péninsule balkanique au commerce avec la Valachie et la Transylvanie dans la première moitié du XVI^e siècle,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XIII, 1975, nr. 2, p. 403-415; Aurel Golimas *(Les Relations des marchands Lazes (Lajes) avec la Moldavie au Bas Moyen Age,* "Recherches sur l'histoire des institutions et du droit", 3, 1979, p. 77-96) and others.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0138

during the 16th century benefits also from good general presentations by Tahsin Gemil for the first part of the century[1] and by Mihai Maxim for the second half of it.[2] Still, much remains to be done with respect to the Ottoman documents which reflect the concrete functioning of the trade, especially the custom registers. Interestingly enough, the single one which has been studied until now is that of Tulcea for the years 1515-1517, analysed by the Hungarian historian János Hóvari.[3] As far as I know, a team guided by Gilles Veinstein prepares the publication of the customs of Akkerman from the late 15th century, while Anca Popescu has begun exploring the customs of Giurgiu and Hîrşova from the early 16th century. Needless to say how important data on the value and fluctuations would be, since we could compare them with the already known material from the Transylvanian towns of Braşov[4] and Sibiu,[5] which contain also details on the trade with the Ottoman Empire. Another insight into the volume of the traffic across the Danube might be brought by the information on the tax-farms of the Danubian ports[6] if we could work out a valid estimation method. Till further documentary evidence will be available, we can describe the general pattern of the traffic, with rapidly increasing Romanian exports to the Ottoman Empire and with lingering imports and long distance traffic. When it comes to figures, we have only very gross estimates for the exports of Wallachia to the Ottoman Empire in the last decades of the 16th century (before 1594): these seem to have reached a very impressive total value of about 400,000 gold coins per year, which means more than 1 gold piece of exports per Wallachian inhabitant.[7]

---

[1]Tahsin Gemil, *Românii şi otomanii în secolele XIV-XVI*, Bucureşti, 1991, p. 193-211.

[2]Mihai Maxim, *op. cit.*

[3]János Hóvari, *Customs Register of Tulca (Tulcea), 1515-1517*, "Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae", XXXVIII, 1984, nr. 1-2, p. 115-141.

[4]Radu Manolescu, *Comerţul Ţării Româneşti şi Moldovei cu Braşovul (Secolele XIV-XVI)*, Bucureşti, 1965.

[5]Idem, *Relaţiile comerciale ale Ţării Româneşti cu Sibiul la începutul veacului al XVI-lea*, "Analele Universităţii Bucureşti, Istorie", 5, 1956, p. 207-260; Samuel Goldenberg, *Der südhandel in den Zollrechnungen von Sibiu 'Hermannstadt) im 16. Jahrhundert*, "Revue des études sud-est européennes", II, 1964, nr. 3-4, p. 385-421.

[6]Murat Çizakça, *Tax-farming and Financial Decentralization in the Ottoman Economy, 1520-1697*, "The Journal of European Economic History", 22, 1993, nr. 2, especially p. 240-243.

[7]Bogdan Murgescu, *Plăţi externe, fiscalitate şi economie monetară în Ţara Românească la sfirşitul secolului al XVI-lea*, "Revista istorică" (serie nouă), IV, 1993, nr. 5-6, especially p. 462-467. See also my attempt to reconstruct the 16th century trade balances of the Romanian Principalities in idem, *Circulaţia monetară în Ţările Române în secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti, 1996, p. 241-264.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0139

Compared with the 16th century and with the period 1774-1829 other time spans are still less well known. For the 15th century we have important studies regarding long distance trade with Oriental merchandise[1] or trade conditions in Kilia and Akkerman after their Ottoman takeover in 1484,[2] but almost all other aspects still wait for detailed research. A similar situation occurred for the 17th-18th centuries. The Romanian historians have studied some important aspects, mainly using non-Ottoman evidence, but there still is very much to do in order to draw an accurate general picture of Ottoman-Romanian trade. Among the most important contributions of Romanian historians on the trade of the 17th-18th century we must mention the studies of Francisc Pap based on the customs of Cluj,[3] those of Lidia Demeny on the traffic through Turnu Roşu[4] and the monograph of Olga Cicanci on the trade of the Greek commercial companies.[5] Important studies were made on the Romanian trade after 1829, but, with the noteworthy exception of a monograph which appeared in 1970,[6] they focus more on the general maritime trade of the Romanian Principalities than on the direct relationship with the Ottoman Empire.[7] Despite these contributions, further research is needed especially in order to evaluate to what degree the Romanian grain export book was caused by the liberalisation of trade due to the peace treaty of Adrianople (1829) or by the upsurge of Western (and Mediterranean) demand. Such an

---

[1] Besides the studies of Marian Malowist and Zsigmond P. Pach, we must note the important article of Mihnea Berindei, *L'Empire ottoman et la "route moldave" avant la conquête de Chilia et de Cetatea-Alba (1484)*, first published in "Journal of Turkish Studies", 10, 1986, p. 47-71 and republished in "Revue roumaine d'histoire", XXX, 1991, p. 161-188.

[2] See for example Nicoară Beldiceanu, *Kilia et Cetatea Albă à travers les documents ottomans*, "Revue des études islamiques", XXXVI, 1968, nr. 2, p. 215-262; idem, *La Moldavie ottomane à la fin du XV^e siècle et au début du XVI^e siècle*, "Revue des études islamiques", XXXVII, 1969, nr. 2, p. 239-266; idem, *Ştiri otomane privind Moldova ponto-dunareană (1486-1520)*, Anuarul Institutului de istorie "A. D. Xenopol", XXIX, 1992, p. 85-117.

[3] See especially Francisc Pap, *Orientarea balcano-otomană şi mediteraneană în comerţul clujean (prima jumătate a sec. XVII)*, "Acta Musei Napocensis", 19, 1982, p. 93-103.

[4] Lidia A. Demény, *Le commerce de la Transylvanie avec les regions du sud du Danube effectué par la douane de Turnu-Roşu en 1685*, "Revue roumaine d'histoire", VII, 1968, nr. 5, p. 761-777.

[5] Olga Cicanci, *Companiile greceşti din Transilvania şi comerţul european în anii 1636-1746*, Bucureşti 1981.

[6] Vladimir Diculescu, Sava Iancovici, Cornelia Papacostea Danielopolu, Mircea N. Popa, *Relaţiile comerciale ale Ţării Româneşti cu Peninsula Balcanică (1829-1858)*, Bucureşti, 1970.

[7] Still, because much of this trade either was directed to the Ottoman market or was in transit through the Ottoman Empire we will mention here the monographs of the two main ports of the Romanian Principalities (Constantin C. Giurescu, *Istoricul oraşului Brăila din cele mai vechi timpuri pînă astăzi*, Bucureşti, 1968; Constantin Buşe, *Comerţul exterior prin Galaţi sub regimul de porto franco (1837-1893)*, Bucureşti, 1976) and the studies of Paul Cernovodeanu *(Relaţiile comerciale româno-engleze în contextul politicii orientale a Marii Britanii (1803-1878)*. Cluj, 1986) and Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu *(Le commerce balkaniques des ports danubiens et le progrès de la marine marchande française (1848-1859)*, "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XXIV, 1986, nr. 1, p. 17-26).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0140

analysis might also provide an answer to the question of whether there has really functioned an OCM before 1829.

Other studies, although confined to a certain chronological span, are focused more on a theme than on a period. The Romanian historians have investigated especially the trade in salt,[1] furs,[2] oxen[3] and grains,[4] while other merchandise, especially sheep and animal products, still wait for detailed research. Other contributions revealed some of the mechanisms which influenced trade: transport costs between Bucharest, Adrianople and Istanbul,[5] the military demand for foodstuffs, which distorted "normal" trade,[6] the discontinuities of by the contradiction between the financial interests of the Ottoman state and the various intervention demands of the Ottoman

---

[1]Aurora Ilieş, *Ştiri în legătură cu exploatarea sării în Ţara Românească pînă în veacul al XVIII-lea,* "Studii şi materiale de istorie medie", I, 1956, p. 155-197; idem, *Drumurile şi transportul sării în Ţara Românească (secolele XV-XIX),* "Studii şi materiale de istorie medie", VII, 1974, p. 223-242; Dinu C. Giurescu, *Obeksporte soli iz rumunskih gosudarstv na balkanskij poluostrov pri feodalizme,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", II, 1963, nr. 3-4, p. 421-462; Mihai Maxim, *Ottoman Documents concerning the Wallachian Salt in the Ports on the Lower danube in the Second Half of the Sixteenth century,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XXVI, 1988, nr. 2, p. 113-122; the same article has been republished with an Addenda in idem, *L'Empire Ottoman au Nord du Danube et l'autonomie des Principautés Roumaines au XVIe siècle. Études et documents,* Istanbul, 1999, 231-246; Maria-Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, *Le régime du sel valaque exporté dans L'Empire ottoman (XVI^e-XVIII^e siècles),* in *V. Milletlerarası Türkiye sosyal ve iktisat tarihi kongresi. Tebliğler. Istanbul 21-25 Ağustos 1989,* Ankara, 1990, p. 441-451; Bogdan Murgescu, *Câteva observaţii asupra exporturilor românesti de sare în ıpmeriul otoman* in the volume *Timpul istoriei. II. Profesorului Dinu C. Giurescu,* Bucureşti, 1998, p. 85-99.

[2]Mihnea Berindei, *Contribution à l'étude du commerce ottoman des fourrures moscovites. La route moldo-polonaise 1453-1700,* "Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique", XII, 1971, nr. 4, p. 393-409.

[3]Bogdan Murgescu, *Participarea Ţărilor Române la comerţul european cu vite în secolele XVI-XVIII. Regularităţi şi fluctuatii conjuncturale,* "Studii de istorie economică şi istoria gandirii economice", III, 1998, p. 101-122. An enlarged German version in idem, *Der Anteil der rumanischen Fürstentümer am europäischen Viehhandel vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert. Regelmäißgkeiten und konjunkturelle Schwankungen.* "Scripta Mercaturae", 33, 1999, H. 2, p. 61-91.

[4]Besides the important studies of Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca, already mentioned above (especially *Contribution à l'étude de l'approvisionnement en blé de Constantinople...),* see more recently also Bogdan Murgescu, *Did Moldavia and Walachia Export Grains...* While the last article argues that the grains coming from Wallachia and Moldavia represented only a relatively small part in the provisioning of Istanbul, another Romanian historian, Ştefan Andreescu, insists that they were "vitally important" *(Răscoala Ţărilor Române din 1594 şi chestiunea aprovisionării Constantinopolului,* "Revista istorică", VIII, nr. 9-10, p. 591-614); to my opinion, the arguments brought by Ştefan Andreescu come short to the point, and fail to take into account the real economic dimensions of Istanbul, the Ottoman Empire, and the Romanian Principalities in the 16th century.

[5]Bogdan Murgescu, *Cheltuielile de transport în epocile premoderne. Câteva date din Condica Vistieriei lui Constantin Brâncoveanu,* "Studii şi materiale de istorie medie", XI, 1992, p. 90-94.

[6]Mihai Maxim, *Les Pays Roumains et les relations Habsbourg-Ottomanes dans la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle,* in Andreas Tietze (ed.), *Habsburgisch-osmanische Beziehungen,* Wien, 1985, p. 98-100; Bogdan Murgescu, *The Ottoman Military Demand and the Romanian Market. A Case-Study: 1672,* "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XXV, 1987, nr. 4, p. 305-313.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0141

merchants,[1] the financial obligations to the Porte and the way they forced Wallachia and Moldavia to increase exports beyond what was economically rational in order to achieve an active trade balance which might equal the political outflow of money,[2] the debt nexus which tied the Romanian Principalities to money lenders in Istanbul.[3]

At the end of our scrutiny, we think it useful to suggest some priorities for future studies on the history of Ottoman-Romanian trade. First of all, the historians interested in this subject need to take advantage of the great progress made in Turkey in archive organisation and accessibility. The Ottoman documents recently made available to researchers will surely shed new light to the whole nexus of economic history, including trade. Second, we believe that Romanian historians must surpass the limits of bilateralism and study Ottoman-Romanian economic relations in the broader context of the Ottoman world-system where the Romanian principalities were at least for a time partially integrated. And, last but not least, we must study also the impact of western and central Europe on Ottoman-Romanian trade, since the Romanian Principalities were caught between the Ottoman and European world-economies. A first attempt has been made for the second half of the 17th century, when the European recession diminished demand for Romanian export items, especially for cattle, forcing the Romanian Principalities to depend more heavily on the Ottoman market.[4] Still, much similar research is to be done for other periods and for different kinds of merchandise.

All these directions of research will certainly need a great deal of international co-operation. This imperative is even greater because the regained political freedom and increasing scientific opportunities make the internal material and financial support to research projects look more meagre than ever before. But perhaps the political and economical co-operation area of the Black Sea will provide a new impetus to our common knowledge of our common economic past.

---

[1]Bogdan Murgescu, *Comerţ şi politică în relaţiile româno-otomane (secolele XVI-XVIII)*, "Revista Istorica" (serie noua), VIII, 1997, nr. 9-10, p. 573-590.

[2]This direction drawn by Mihai Berza has been developed more recently by Mihai Maxim, *Regimul economic...*, p. 1731-1765, and by Bogdan Murgescu, *Circulaţia monetară...*, especially p. 210-294; we must also add that the Romanian historians have given considerable attention to the study of the evolution of the Walachian and Moldavian payments to the Porte, a direction illustrated by the contributions of Mihai Berza, Mihail Guboğlu, Mustafa A. Mehmed, Tahsin Gemil, Valeriu Veliman and especially Mihai Maxim.

[3]Ioan Caproşu, *O istorie a Moldovei prin relaţiile de credit pînă la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea*, Iaşi, 1989; Irina Gavrilă, Bogdan Murgescu, *Credit şi creditori în timpul lui Constantin Brâncoveanu*, "Revista de istorie", 41, 1988, nr. 9, p. 861-876; Bogdan Murgescu, *Câteva observaţii pe marginea datoriilor domnilor Ţării Româneşti şi Moldovei în 1594*, "Revista Istorică" (serie nouă), VI, 1995, nr. 3-4, p. 243-253; idem, *Romanian Information regarding the Ottoman Capital Market. Prince Constantin Brâncoveanu's Debt-Repayments 1694-1703*, "Dünü ve Bugünüyle Toplum ve Ekonomi", 10, Temmuz 1997, p. 39-51.

[4]Bogdan Murgescu, *Impactul conjuncturii europene asupra comerţului românesc în a doua jumatate a secolului al XVII-lea*, "Revista de istorie", 41, 1988, nr. 5, p. 514-525 and nr. 6, p. 587-596.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0142

II. NUMISMATICS

LE TRÉSOR DE BRĂTUŞENI (SĂRATA ALBĂ), DÉP. D'EDINEŢ RÉP. DE MOLDAVIE (XVI^{e} SIÈCLE)*

Ana NICULIŢĂ
et Eugen NICOLAE

En 1957, à l'occasion de l'aménagement d'un étang (pendant les travaux de construction de la digue) dans le territoire du village de Sărata Albă — à présent Brătuşeni, dép. d'Edineţ, Rép. de Moldavie, on a découvert un petit trésor de monnaies et de bijoux en argent. Les pièces étaient enveloppées dans une toile entièrement pourrie. L'instituteur du village a informé de cette découverte l'Institut d'Histoire de l'Académie des Sciences de Moldavie et par conséquent G. Cebotarenko, collaborateur de l'Institut, s'est présenté à Sărata Albă pour vérifier l'information et récupérer les objets.[1] Le trésor a été intégré dans les collections du Musée d'Archéologie de l'Institut d'Archéologie de Chişinău en deux étapes: en 1972 — 9 monnaies (nos 1-9 de notre catalogue; inv. nos 401-409, acte no 2 du 8 février 1972), et en 1976 — quatre fragments d'une monnaie (no 10) et cinq boucles (inv. nos 1125-1129 et 1162, acte no 26 du 20 février 1976). On a signalé aussi une bague qui n'a pas été récupérée. Le Musée possède donc deux deniers hongrois, huit aspres ottomans (enregistrés comme monnaies tatares) et cinq boucles à monture sphérique et ornées de pyramides en petits grains. Tous ces objets ont été déjà publiés d'une manière générale et confuse. Les deux deniers hongrois figurent dans le riche répertoire dressé par A. A. Nudelman comme découvertes isolées de Fântâna Albă, dép. d'Edineţ.[2] Plus tard, en leur ajoutant des aspres criméens de Mengli Giray (ce sont les aspres ottomans) et les boucles, on a fabriqué le soi-disant trésor de Fântâna Albă daté au deuxième quart du XVI^{e} siècle.[3] Récemment, observant la présence des bijoux de même facture (surtout des boucles à la monture sphérique ou polyédrique, ornées de pyramides en petits grains), parfois identiques, dans des trouvailles s'échelonnant de la fin du XV^{e} siècle

*Communication présentée au Symposium dédié au 90ème anniversaire de la Société Numismatique Roumaine, Bucarest, 17-18 nov. 1993. Pendant que notre texte était sous presse, la littérature concernant certains aspects discutés s'est beaucoup enrichie et nous invitons les lecteurs à la suivre.

[1] Nous remercions G. Cebotarenko qui a eu l'amabilité de nous communiquer les données sur les conditions de la découverte.

[2] A. A. Nudelman, *Topografija kladov i nahodok ediniënyh monet,* Chişinău 1976, p. 136, no 15.

[3] P. P. Byrnja, A. A. Nudelman, T. F. Rjaboj, *Dva monetnovećevyh klada XVI i XVII vv.,* dans *Arheologićeskie issledovanija v Moldavii, 1985,* Chişinău, 1990, p. 242.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0145

jusqu'au troisième quart du XVIIe siècle, P. P. Bârnea, A. A. Nudelman et T. F. Rjaboj, ont fait un bilan à l'occasion de l'analyse de deux trésors: Sărata Nouă dép. de Făleşti, et Bălţata, dép. de Criuleni.[1] Cette contribution a amélioré la chronologie générale, mais les conclusions ont été viciées par de nouvelles confusions et par l'impossibilité de réévaluer la datation des anciennes découvertes. Ainsi, on a intégré par erreur les cinq boucles de Sărata Albă (déjà mentionnées à Fântâna Albă) dans le trésor de Sărata Nouă (monnaies polonaises, lituaniennes, hongroises et ottomanes), daté dans la deuxième décennie du XVI[e] siècle[2] (il s'ensuit que dans l'analyse les auteurs les ont comparées à elles-mêmes). Aussi, on devait préciser que les monnaies de Bălţata avaient été publiées (toujours sans détails),[3] les nouvelles données concernant seulement les bijoux et le vase qui avait abrité le dépôt. Il est utile de mentionner que tous les lots monétaires associés à des bijoux de cette catégorie ont été édités sans détails et que nous n'avons pas trouvé les monnaies de Sărata Nouă dans les collections de Chişinău (elles sont probablement restées dans la possession des habitants du village).

Nous allons présenter d'abord les monnaies de Brătuşeni et ensuite faire quelques remarques sur d'autres découvertes:

EMPIRE OTTOMAN

Selim I[er] 918-926 H (1512-1520)

Av. Sultan / Selim / şah / bin / Bayezid han. Srećković[4] A, Ölçer[5] A, Nicolae[6] III.

Atelier non précisé

1. AR 0,61 g; 8 x 11 mm. Rv. non précisé.

2. AR 0,64 g; 9 x 10 mm. Av. incus.

---

[1] *Ibidem,* p. 239-249.
[2] *Ibidem,* p. 239-242; erreur constaté par Ana Niculită, et confirmée par G. Cebotarenko.
[3] À confronter: *ibidem,* pp. 244-245 et A. A. Nudelman, *op. cit.,* p. 122-123, no 49.
[4] S. Srećkovic', *Osmanlijski novac kovan na tlu Jugoslavije,* Beograd, 1987.
[5] C. Ölçer, *Sultan Yavuz Selim şah bin Bayazıd han dönemi osmanlı sikkeleri 918-926 AH / 1512-1520 AD,* Istanbul, 1989.
[6] E. Nicolae, compte-rendu sur le volume de S. Srećković dans *Iaşi,* 25, 1988, 2, p. 555.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0146

Süleyman Ier 926-974 (1520-1566)

Kostantaniye

*/ Av. Sultan / Süleyman / bin * şah / Selim şah. Srećković A. /*

Rv. Azze nasrühü be duri / Kostantaniye / sene / 926; étoile au centre. Srećković I.

3. AR (0,69 g; 11 x 12 mm.

Üsküp

Av. Légende circulaire: (Sultan) Süleyman şah bin Selim han; étoile au centre. Srećković, émission jubilaire I.

Rv. Légende circulaire: Hullide mülkühü (duribe Üsk)üp (926); étoile au centre. Srećković VIII.

4. AR 0,65 g; 10 x 12 mm.

Mudava

Av. (Sultan) / Süleyman / (bi)n han / Selim. Srećković H.

Rv. (Azze) nasrühü / (duri)be / (Mu)dava / sene / 9(26). Cf.

Srećković II.

5. AR (0,54 g; 11 mm.

Selim II 974-982 H (1566-1574)

Belgrad

Av. Sultan / Selim / (bin Süleyman / han). Srećković A.

Rv. (Azze) nasrühü / (du)ribe / (Bel)grad / ... Cf. Srećković IIa.

6. AR (0,68 g; 9 x 10 mm.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0147

Novablrda

Av. Similaire. Srećković A.

Rv. Azze nasrühü / duribe / Novablrda / 974 / sene. Srećković IIa.

7. AR (0,69 g; 11 x 13 mm.

Üsküp

Av. Similaire, mais la finale de han appliquée en graphie usuelle à droite de *elif*, au même niveau que *bin*. Srećković -; cf. A.

8. AR (0,48 g; 11 x 13 mm.

HONGRIE

Mathias Corvin (1458-1490)

Kremnitz

9. AR (0,39 g; 15 mm. Pohl[1] 221-4, Mühlstein-Langsfelder, années 1479-1485.

Vladislas II (1490-1516)

Kremnitz

10. AR, fragments. Non précisé; cf. Pohl 241-2 / 253-3, Hans Thurzó, années 1500-1502 / 1511.

Les aspres de Selim I[er], les plus anciens dans ce dépôt, appartiennent au groupe situé au début du règne par S. Srećković et C. Ölçer et vers sa fin par les numismates roumains.[2] Leur position dans le trésor de Bătuşeni et dans la nécropole d'Enisala, dép. de Tulcea (Roumanie),[3] s'accorde mieux avec la

[1] A. Pohl, *Münzzeichen und Meisterzeichen auf Ungarischen Münzen des Mittelalters 1300 1540,* Graz-Budapest, 1982.
[2] Voir, E. Nicolae, *loc. cit.*
[3] M. Maxim, E. Nicolae, "*Monedele otomane descoperite în necropola medievală de la Enisala*", *Peuce,* 10, 1991, 1, p. 559, 560 et 569.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0148

datation à la fin du règne, qui est confirmée aussi par le lot d'aspres du trésor de Săseni, dép. de Călăraşi (Rép. de Moldavie),[1] dont les plus récents appartiennent aux deux autres groupes.[2] Chacun des trois groupes d'émissions de Süleyman I^er est représenté à Brătuşeni par un exemplaire. On doit remarquer celui frappé, probablement en 1566,[3] à Mudava (Moldova Veche, dép. de Caraş-Severin), le seul atelier monétaire ottoman situé en Roumanie. Les aspres de Mudava ont été signalés au Nord du Danube dans deux trésors: Radu Vodă comm. d'Izvoarele, dép. de Giurgiu[4] et Băleşti, comm. de Deleşti, dép. de Vaslui.[5] Dans les collections des Musées de Chişinău il y a encore deux: Oneşti et Leuşeni-Cărpineni, dép. de Hânceşti.[6] On peut constater que des cinq dépôts connus quatre ont été trouvés dans le territoire de la Moldavie médiévale et un en Valachie. Les trois aspres de Selim II, les plus récents dans l'accumulation de Brătuşeni, appartiennent au groupe A de S. Srećković; le droit de celui d'Üsküp (no 8) constitue une variante par la manière de l'application de la finale du mot han, particularité observée aussi dans le trésor de Radu Vodă cité plus haut.

En revenant aux bijoux, nous précisons que d'habitude ils sont nommés boucles de tempes dans la littérature soviétique et boucles d'oreilles dans la littérature roumaine. C'est surtout la massivité des certaines pièces qui pourrait s'opposer à les considérer comme boucles d'oreilles, mais on a observé aussi des exemplaires attaché à des chaînettes. C'est le cas d'un petit dépôt de bijoux de Saharna Veche, dép. de Rezina (Rép. de Moldavie), daté au XVII^e siècle.[7] Ses éditeurs apprécient que les boucles étaient utilisées comme pendentifs, idée inacceptable à cause de leur forme mais qui suggère une solution raisonnable, en concordance avec la mode des parures complexes comprenant des boucles et

[1] A. A. Nudelman, *op. cit.*, p. 96, 97, no 8 (on mentionne seulement des aspres de Bayezid II).

[2] Information inédite; on a repris l'étude des monnaies islamiques du trésor de Săseni dans l'intention de les publier avec plus de détails.

[3] E. Nicolae, "*Problèmes actuels de la numismatique ottomane en Roumanie*", *Caietele Laboratorului de studii otomane*, 2, 1993, p. 51.

[4] Idem, E. Păunescu, *Un tezaur din secolul al XVI-lea descoperit la Radu Vodă, comuna Izvoarele, judeţul Giurgiu*, SCN, 10 (1993), 1995, p. 109135.

[5] Les monnaies européennes de ce trésor ont été publiées par Constanţa Ştirbu et Ana-Maria Velter: *Tezaurul de la Băleşti, jud. Vaslui, şi importanţa lui istorică*, *CN*, 5, 1983, p. 97 127. Les aspres ottomans sont inédits; voir pour le moment E. Nicolae, "Hibridna aspra Sulejmana I," Numizmatićke vijesti, 34, 1992, 1/45, p. 62 63 (avec quelques erreurs rédactionnelles ou typographiques: photographies inversées, "point" dans la description du deuxième revers au lieu de "étoile" etc.).

[6] Information inédite (Raisa Tabuica, Ana Boldureanu şi E. Nicolae). Les trésors ont été signalés par A. A. Nudelman, *op. cit.*, p. 98, 99, nos 12 et 13.

[7] A. N. Levinskij, T. F. Rjaboj, "Starosaharnjanskij klad XVII v.", dans *Arheologičeskie issledovanija v Moldavii, 1986*, Chişinău, 1992, p. 248 254.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0149

des pendentifs qui encadraient le visage.[1] Il semble que les boucles étaient vraiment suspendues par des chaînettes à la coiffure mais elles pendaient seulement jusqu'à la hauteur des lobes des oreilles pour leur épargner de soutenir une pesanteur excessive. Ensuite elles étaient attachées aux lobes aussi et on pourrait donc considérer même des pièces très lourdes comme boucles d'oreilles. Pour le moment il est difficile de reconstituer la manière de porter tous ces bijoux qui sont d'une grande variété et c'est pour cela que nous préférons ici de les nommer simplement boucles. En ce qui concerne la chronologie, le dépôt de Brătuşeni nous offre un repère incontestable au troisième quart du XVI^e siècle, ce qui diminue le décalage par rapport au trésor de Bălţata (avec des bijoux presque identiques). Il est à observer en même temps que la datation de ce dernier vers la fin du premier quart du XVII^e siècle doit être confirmée. La structure de l'ensemble des monnaies de Bălţata (publiées sans détails) indiquerait un trésor enfoui à la fin du XVI^e siècle, tandis que deux des trois exemplaires justifiant la datation proposée par l'éditeur n'ont pas été récupérés. Une enquête sur les lieux de l'invention est nécessaire, les découvertes isolées de monnaies médiévales dans cette localité[2] suggérant la possibilité d'une contamination. Deux trésors sur lesquels se fondait dans le bilan antérieur l'acceptation de la présence de ces bijoux au XV^e siècle doivent être éliminés de la discussion: Fântâna Albă qui n'existe pas, comme nous l'avons démontré, et Sărata Nouă qui ne contient pas de bijoux.

Nous allons passer en revue d'autres découvertes, dont une partie ont été utilisées dans le même bilan, sans vérifier la solidité de leur datation: Suceava, Şifeşti (dép. de Vrancea), Olteni (comm. de Vârteşcoiu, dép. de Vancea), Cotu Morii (comm. de Popricani, dép. de Iaşi), en Roumanie, et Oneşti (dép. de Hânceşti) et Iagorlâc (dép. de Dubăsari), en Rép. de Moldavie.[3] Les boucles (à la monture polyédrique) récoltées en 1952 de la nécropole de Suceava (sur le plateau à proximité de la forteresse) ont été datées au XV^e siècle et au début du suivant dans un rapport préliminaire.[4] C'était en fait la datation de la nécropole dans son ensemble, fondée sur les monnaies, mais les découvertes sont restées inédites et nous sommes privés de repères sûrs. En ce qui concerne le trésor de Şifeşti (avec quatre boucles, dont deux à la monture sphérique, les autres "en corbeille", et dix boutons), on ne place plus son enfouissement en 1490-

[1] Cf. Al. Alexianu, *Mode şi veşminte din trecut*, Bucureşti, 1987, p. 87, 114 117, 195 197, 205, 208, 352, 355 357 etc.

[2] A. A. Nudelman, *op. cit.*, p. 145, nos 52 et 53.

[3] P. P. Byrnja, A. A. Nudelman, T. F. Rjaboj, *op. cit.*

[4] Collectif dirigé par B. Mitrea et I. Nestor, "*Şantierul Suceava, I. Platoul din faţa cetăţi, 4. Cimitirul*", *SCIV*, 4, 1953, 1ñ2, p. 356 364.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0150

1491,[1] mais vers la fin du règne de Bayezid II (1481-1512), peut-être en 1507, pendant le conflit de Radu le Grand de Valachie avec Bogdan III de Moldavie.[2] Son éditeur, qui à l'époque a proposé avec raison les années 1490-1491 en analysant les monnaies, avertissait qu'il n'avait pas trouvé des analogies au XVe siècle pour les bijoux, tandis que les boutons étaient identiques avec ceux figurant dans un portrait votif de l'épouse du prince Neagoe Basarab de Valachie (1512-1521).[3] Sur l'ancienne datation du trésor de Şifeşti s'appuyait celle de deux autres dépôts composés seulement de bijoux (similaires à ceux datés dernièrement par les monnaies dans la deuxième moitié du XVIe siècle): Olteni (deux boucles à la monture polyédrique et à pendentifs foliacés et une à la monture discoïde)[4] et Şendreni, dép. de Galaţi (14 objets dont trois boucles à la monture sphérique).[5] Le trésor de Cotu Morii (avec une boucle à la monture polyédrique et une à la monture sphérique) a été daté en 1523 en considérant les aspres de Süleyman Ier (restés inédits) comme ayant été frappés en 1520 (l'année de l'accession au pouvoir du sultan),[6] mais le réexamen des monnaies est susceptible d'indiquer un moment bien plus récent. Nous sommes maintenant assurés de la datation du trésor d'Oneşti (avec deux boucles à la monture sphérique) qui est contemporain à ceux de Brătuşeni et de Cândeşti, dép. de Vrancea (avec huit boucles)[7], et de Cărdesti, dép. de Urancea (avec huit bouches),[8] mais pour celui d'Iagorlâc, le plus récent (daté après 1659),[9] nous préférons attendre la publication. Pour le début du XVIIe siècle on doit mentionner les trésors de Purcari, dép. de Ştefan Vodă (avec deux boucles à la monture sphérique) et de Dezghingea, dép. de Comrat (avec deux boucles à la monture polyédrique), tous les deux signalés par A. A. Nudelman (d'après les notes d'inventaire de B. Mitrea - V. Canarache et B. Mitrea - C.

---

[1] C. Moisil, "*Monete şi podoabe de la sftrşitul veacului al XV-lea (Tezaurul din Şifeşti, jud. Putna)*", *BSNR*, 13, 1916, 27, p. 3 16 et la planche no I.

[2] Luana Popa, E. Nicolae, "*Un tezaur de aspri otomani de la începutul secolului al XVI-lea în colecţiile Muzeului Judeţean Braşov*," *BSNR*, 80-85 (1986 1991), 1992, p. 150-151.

[3] C. Moisil, *op. cit.*, p. 15 16.

[4] N. Constantinescu, Gh. Untaru, *Podoabe feudale descoperite la Olteni (R. Focşani)*, *SCIV*, 10, 1959, 2, p. 499505.

[5] I. T. Dragomir, *Vestigii milenare inedite Ón patrimoniul Muzeului judeean de istorie Galati ñ Colecţia Dr. Alexandru Nestor Măcelariu, Peuce, 9*, 1984, p. 181, 183 et 583-584.

[6] Eugenia Neamţu, "*Obiectele de podoaba*" *din tezaurul medieval de la Cotul Morii, Popricani (Iaşi)*", *ArhMold*, 1, 1961, p. 290, 291 (les monnaies ont été déterminées par Oct. Iliescu).

[7] La réexamination du trésor par Ana Boldureanu, Raisa Tabuica, E. Nicolae et V. Butnariu, a confirmé la datation proposée chez A. A. Nudelman, *op. cit.*, p. 98, 99, no 12.

[8] V. Bobi, "*Tezaurul medieval de monede şi podoabe descoperit la Cândeşti-Vrancea*", *Studii ŷi Comunicări* (Focşani), 3, 1980, p. 111126.

[9] Signalé par A. A. Nudelman, *op. cit.*, p. 118, no 40.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0151

Preda),[1] dont les plus récentes monnaies ont été frappées en 1601.[2] Au Sud du Danube on peut citer deux boucles à la monture polyédrique trouvées dans la tombe no 42 de la nécropole d'Enisala et datées au XVIe siècle à base de la présence dans l'inventaire d'un aspre attribué à Bayezid II.[3] En réalité, dans cette tombe (où ont été enterrées deux fillettes) on a trouvé un aspre de Murad III (1574-1595) et un autre de Murad IV (1623-1640)[4] Toujours à Enisala, dans la tombe noIX, on a récupéré une boucle à la monture "en corbeille"[5] analogue aux pièces de Şifeşti; elle a été datée aux XVe-XVIe siècles, mais nous rappelons que les plus anciennes inhumations de cette nécropole se placent vers la fin du règne de Selim Ier (1512-1520).[6] Les trouvailles de Şifeşti, Cotu Morii, Brătuşeni, Oneşti, Purcari, Dezghingea et Enisala, témoignent de l'existence de bijoux de ce genre au XVIe siècle et dans la première moitié du suivant, tandis que leur présence en dehors de cet intervalle devrait être reconsidérée. Toute discussion est condamnée en ce moment aux généralités et pour la faire progresser il faudra établir la typologie des objets en question et éditer les lots monétaires et les situations enregistrées dans les nécropoles.

En ce qui concerne la datation de l'enfouissement du dépôt de Brătuşeni et aussi de ceux d'Oneşti, Olteni, Cândeşti et Şendreni, nous proposons l'année 1574, pendant le conflit de Ioan Vodă de Moldavie avec les Ottomans. Cette année a été particulièrement tragique pour la Moldavie: combats très durs dans la zone méridionale, défaite foudroyante des Chrétiens (par trahison) et l'abandon du pays aux pillages des Tatars qui ont provoqué des dommages sans pareil.[7] C'est vrai que pour les deux dépôts formés seulement de bijoux on peut penser aussi à d'autres moments vers la fin du XVIe siècle. En suivant notre hypothèse nous remarquons que les lieux de leur invention sont situés dans le voisinage des champs de bataille: Cândeşti et Olteni — près de Jilişte

[1] *Idem*, "*Neizdannye monetnye klady XVI-XVII vv. iz Dnestrovsko-Prutskogo regiona*", dans *Srednevekovye pamjatniki Dnestrovsko-Prutskogo meûdurečja*, Chişinău, 1988, p. 148 149, no 6 (Purcari); *idem*, "*Klad zolotyh i serebrjanyh monet XVI-načala XVII v. iz Budûaka*," dans *Arheologičeskie issledovanija srednevekovyh pamjatnikov v Denstrovsko-Prutskom meûdureč*, Chişinău, 1985, p. 160, 175 (Dezghigea).

[2] Information inédite (E. Nicolae).

[3] Gh. Mănucu-Adameşteanu, "*Necropola medievală de la Enisala, Raport preliminar de săpătură (1997)*", *Peuce*, 8, 1980, p. 480, 482 et 485.

[4] M. Maxim, E. Nicolae, *op. cit.*, p. 564 565, nos 61 et 82.

[5] Gh. Mănucu-Adameşteanu, *Aspecte ale ritului şi ritualului în lumina descoperirilor din necropola medievală, de la Enisala, Peuce*, 9, 1984, p. 356 et 714.

[6] Opinion basée sur les découvertes monétaires, les seules publiées intégralement (cf. M. Maxim, E. Nicolae, *op. cit.*, p. 568 569).

[7] D.C. Giurescu, *Ion Vodă cel Viteaz*, Bucarest, 1974, p. 56-76.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0152

(défaite des Turcs et des Valaques par les Moldaves et les "Cosaques" polonais[1] en avril 1574), et Şendreni — près de Brăila (tête de pont de l'Empire Ottoman au Nord du fleuve; assiégée et incendiée en mai 1574 par les Moldaves et leurs alliés). Quant aux dépôts de Brătuşeni et d'Oneşti, leur enfouissement s'expliquerait par les terribles razzias des Tatars d'après la bataille de Roşcani (juin 1574).

[1] M. Berindei, "*Le problème des "Cosaques" dans la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle, À propos de la révolte de Ioan Vodă voïévode de Moldavie, Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, 13, 1972, 3, p. 338-367.

UN TRÉSOR MONÉTAIRE DES XVIII^e-XIX^e SIÈCLES DÉCOUVERT À BUZĂU[1]

Aurel VÂLCU et Ana DICU

Dans les collections du Musée Départemental de Buzău, aux numéros d'inventaire 6068 – 6110 se trouvent 43 monnaies en argent qui composent un trésor découvert à Buzău, dans le quartier Obor.

Malheureusement on n'a plus d'informations concernant les conditions de la découverte et on ne sait pas si on a récupéré toutes les pièces. Les anciennes notes, concernant l'entrée du trésor dans les collections du musée, ne furent retrouvées. Pour cela il faut nous contenter des brèves informations trouvées dans les inventaires. Pourtant le trésor a été signalé par Vasile Drâmboceanu et Ion Rusu dans un répertoire de découvertes monétaires du département de Buzău.[2] Ainsi nous avons pris connaissance que le petit dépôt monétaire a été découvert en 1970, étant composé de 43 monnaies et un bracelet en argent. Malheureusement, le bracelet n'a pas été identifié dans les collections du musée jusqu'à présent.

Le trésor est constitué de 42 monnaies ottomanes frappées aux XVIII^e-XIX^e siècles auxquelles s'ajoute une monnaie polonaise frappée au commencement du XVI^e siècle. Toutes les monnaies sont perforées ce qui prouve qu'elles ont été prises dans un collier. L'état avancée d'usure des pièces ottomanes a fait qu'un tiers soit daté d'après les années du règne du souverain qui les a fait frapper. 40 pièces sont des paras, frappés pour les sultans Mahmud I^er (3), Mustafa III (1) exemplaires et une pièce frappé au Caire pendant la rébellion d'Ali Bey, Abdülhamid I^er (16), Selim III (6) et Mahmud I^er (1). Deux monnaies n'ont pas pu être datées précisément en raison de leur état avancé d'usure. Une d'entre elles est certainement un *para* frappé dans la deuxième partie du XVIII^e, tandis que l'autre, très dégradée aussi, appartient plutôt aux émissions du XVII^e siècle. Les 40 monnaies ont été frappées dans

---

[1] Pour l'identification des monnaies on a utilisé les catalogues suivants: Nuri Pere, *Osmanlılarda madenî paralar*, Istanbul, 1968; Jem Sultan, *Coins of the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic*, Thousand Oaks, 1977 et Marian Gumowski, *Handbuch der polonischen Numismatik*, Graz, 1960.

[2] Vasile Drâmboceanu et Ion Rusu, *Contribuţii la repertoriul descoperirilor monetare de pe teritoriul judeţului Buzău*, BSNR, 70 – 74, 1976 – 1980, 1981, pp. 619 – 614.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0155

deux ateliers: Kostantiniye (22) et le Caire (18), les deux concentrant à peu près l'entière production monétaire du XVIII^e siècle. La présence d'une monnaie polonaise du XVI^e siècle dans un trésor dont la dernière pièce remonte à la première décade du XIX^e siècle constitue une surprise; en même temps elle met des problèmes quant à la persistance des pièces polonaises de 1/2 gros sur le marché monétaire de la Valachie. Une si grande différence chronologique entre la monnaie polonaise et le reste du trésor nous fait nous demander s'il ne s'agit pas d'une "contamination" du trésor. Pour éclaire ce dilemme on va analyser plusieurs dépôts monétaires qui ont la date post quem semblable proche à celle du trésor mis en question. Jusqu'à présent nous avons constaté la présence de quelques monnaies polonaises frappées au XVI^e siècle dans la structure de trois autres trésors: Roşu (1966) dép. d'Ilfov[1], Cărămidarii de Jos (Bucarest)[2] et Giurgiu (Place Oinacu).[3] Si dans le cas du trésor découvert à Giurgiu il y a des soupçons de "contamination", le trésor de Cărămidarii de Jos nous donne la certitude qu'il a été intégralement récupéré, sans ajouter des pièces étrangères au trésor. De même une importante observation s'impose: les monnaies découvertes à Roşu, Buzău (Obor) et Cărămidarii de Jos sont très usées par conséquent de leur circulation, puis elles ont le même poids et le même diamètre que les para. Vraisemblablement une partie des petites dénominations polonaises qui se trouvaient encore sur le marché monétaire de la Valachie étaient tellement usées qu'elles furent changées au même taux que les paras ottomans. Les possesseurs ne faisaient pas la différence entre les deux catégories monétaires.

Les pièces de 1/2 gros et un gros ont été frappées en grand nombre en Pologne au XVI^e siècle et ce n'est pas étonnant que des exemplaires isolé peuvent encore être trouvés en circulation vers les années 1800-1810. On constate, au XVII^e siècle la présence de plusieurs trésors qui contiennent des

[1] Elena Isăcescu dans "Creşterea colecţiilor", *Caiet Selectiv de Informare*, 19, 1967, p. 45 – 69.

[2] Maria Grigoruţă, "Tezaurul monetar de la Cărămidarii de Jos (sec. XVIII – XIX)", dans *Izvoare arheologice bucureştene*, 2, 1985, pp. 57 - 62. Sommairement publié avec des erreurs en qui concerne les émetteurs des monnaies déclarées au début illisibles se sont révélées datables au moins d'après le souverain. Parmi celles-ci a été identifié un gros polonais frappé par Sigismond III. Les autres 1372 monnaies sont des para ottomanes frappées au XVIII^e siècle et au commencement du XIX siècle. Le trésor est conservé au Musée d'Histoire et d'Art de la Ville de Bucarest. Les auteurs remerçient M Steluţa Gramaticu et M Liliana Hanganu qui ont eu la bienveillance de leur mettre à la disposition les monnaies en vue de l'étude.

[3] Il est conservé au Musée Departemental "Teohari Antonescu" de Giurgiu. Les auteurs remerçient M. Emil Păunescu pour l'amabilité de leur mettre à la disposition le trésor qui contient plusieurs monnaies polonaises de 1/2 gros et de 3 gros.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0156

pièces de 1/2 gros: Dragoslavele, dép. d'Argeş;[1] Ulmeni, dép. de Teleorman;[2] Târgovişte 1993;[3] Târgovişte 1925;[4], Verguleasa, dép. d'Olt;[5], Urziceni, dép. de Ialomiţa;[6] Bucarest, rue Baicului;[7] Pietrele, dép. de Giurgiu;[8] qui continuent aussi dans le siècle suivant. Des documents du XVIII[e] siècle font mention des gros polonais parmi les monnaies qui avaient encore cours légal. De même, dans le projet de la Chambre Aulique[9] du 18 juillet 1729 on trouve le gros changé au taux de 4 sous tandis que le para avait une valeur fluctuante entre 3 et 4 1/2 sous. Si jusqu'à présent on connaît seulement quatre trésors qui prouvent le maintient des petites monnaies polonaises dans la circulation, c'est probablement que leurs nombre va se multiplier quand on publiera plusieurs dépôts monétaires avec le post quem au début du XIX[e] siècle.

La valeur des monnaies découvertes à Buzău est de 43 paras (nous avons considéré que la pièce polonaise, très usée, était changée à parité du para ottoman; nous avons traité de la même manière la monnaie ottomane du XVII[e] siècle, non identifiée). En analysant les prix des années 1809-1812 nous prenons connaissance qu'on pouvait acheter avec 43 *para*s, un seau de vin ou deux *okka*s de laine.[10]

Année	*Produit*	*prix*
1809	1 vache	30 *lei*
1810	1 cheval	85 *lei*
1810	1 seau de vin	1 *leu* et 7 *para*s
1811	1 *okka* de pain	16 *lei* set 19 *para*s
1812	1 bœuf	50 *lei*
1812	1 *okka* de laine	20 *para*s

[1]Aurică Smaranda, Ştefan Trâmbaciu, "Trei tezaure monetare din secolele XV - XVII descoperite în zona oraşului Câmpulung - Muscel", *BSNR*, 70 - 74, 1976 - 1980, 1981, pp. 342 - 346.

[2]Ion Spiru, "Tezaurul monetar feudal de la Ulmeni - Teleorman," *BSNR*, 67 - 69, 1973-1975, 1976, pp. 171 - 173.

[3]Inédit. Nous tenons l'information de M[r] Valentin Drob, auquel on remercie pour sa bienveillance.

[4]Il est conservé au Musée National d'Histoire de Roumanie.

[5]Emil Persu, "Două tezaure feudale descoperite în localităţile Verguleasa, judeţul Olt şi Drăgăşani, judeţul Vâlcea", *Buridava*, 1, 1972, p. 340 - 384.

[6]Constanţa Ştirbu, Ana Maria Velter, Emil Păunescu, "Circulaţia talerilor în secolele XVI - XVII, în Tara Românească, problema falsurilor (tezaurul de la Urziceni, jud. Ialomiţa)", *CN*, 6, 1991, p. 162-182.

[7]Il est conservé au Musée National d' Histoire de Roumanie.

[8]Constanţa Ştirbu, Ana Maria Velter, "Tezaurul de la Pietrele," *Numismatica*, 1, 1996.

[9]Şerban Papacostea, *Oltenia sub stăpânire austriacă*. 1718 – 1739, Bucureşti, 1998, p. 12.

[10]Mircea N. Popa, *La circulation monétaire et l'évolution des prix en Valachie (1774-1831)*, Bucarest, 1978, pp. 217-293.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0157

Comme nous avons déjà précisé la majorité des monnaies du trésor sont des paras ottomans frappés dans les ateliers de Mısır et Kostantiniye. Pendant les règnes des sultans Mustafa III et Selim III, sur les monnaies frappées à Istanbul (Kostantiniye) le nom de la ville est remplacé par İslâmbol.

Les plus anciens paras du trésor datent du temps de Mahmud I^er (n^os. 2 - 4). Pour le moment, la datation de ces émissions se fait selon les années du règne du sultan; ce n'est qu'au temps de Mustafa III que la coutume d'imprimer l'année de la frappe a été instituée. Avant de continuer l'analyse des autres monnaies du trésor il faut faire quelques précisions en ce qui concerne les dénominations frappées pendant le règne du sultan Mahmud I^er. Sur les dénominations de haute ou de petite valeur sont frappés des sigles dont, probablement, le but était de contrôler la production monétaire. Malheureusement, jusqu'à présent on n'a pas réussi à percevoir le sens précis de ceux-ci. Évidemment, conformément à ces sigles on peut réaliser, au moins théoriquement, une meilleure datation des émissions monétaires de Mahmud I^er. Pour l'instant nous ne savons pas si des succès remarquables ont été remportés dans ce sens.[1] Outre les sigles, sur l'avers et sur le revers des dénominations ottomanes il y a aussi des ornements. Malheureusement, les monnaies du trésor mis en discussion sont trop usées pour entrer dans les détails.

Depuis le règne de Mustafa III, le para porte sur le revers l'année de la frappe qui remplace le système des sigles de Mahmud I^er. On peut considérer cette période comme une époque de transition de l'ancien système des sigles puisque il y a des monnaies qui portent sur le revers autant l'année du règne que le sigle. En ce qui concerne les petites dénominations (par exemple le para), les sigles seront maintenus une bonne partie du règne du sultan Mustafa III. Pour l'instant c'est impossible de préciser le moment où les sigles ont été définitivement retirés du circuit. C'est sûr que les sigles étaient encore employés au commencement du règne d'Abdülhamid I^er dans l'atelier de Mısır.[2] Une autre observation qui regarde les émissions monétaires de Mustafa III est l'existence des deux variantes de *tuğra: Mustafa han bin Ahmad al-Muzaffar Dai'ma* (type I) et *Mustafa bin Ahmad al-Muzaffar Dai'ma* (type II).[3]

---

[1] Jem Sultan a réuni divers sigles trouvés sur les dénominations ottomanes du XVIII^e siècle, mais le catalogue se contente seulement de leur presentation sans développer la recherche.

[2] *Cf.* Jem Sultan *op. cit.*, p. 270.

[3] Tevfik Seno Arda, "Sultan III. Mustafa dönemi Istanbul baskılı gümüş 10 paralar üzerinde bir inceleme", *Türk nümismatik derneği yayınları*, Bülten 14, Istanbul 1985, pp. 20-25.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0158

Dix paras frappés pour Mustafa III portent l'année de la frappe tandis que pour le reste des 14 on ne peut pas préciser, à cause de l'usure, si on a frappé l'année ou bien le sigle. Un problème spécial pose la monnaie n° 11, frappée toujours au nom du sultan Mustafa III, mais dans l'atelier du Caire, entre 1769 – 1771, quand survint, la révolte d'Ali Bey. À la place de l'année de la frappe, la monnaie porte le sigle n° 29 d'après Lachman,[1] qui marque les dénominations frappées en Égypte dans cette période. Jusqu'à présent nous ne connaissons pas, dans les trésors de la Valachie, l'existence d'une autre monnaie frappée au Caire dans les années de la rébellion d'Ali Bey. De tout évidence ça ne veut pas dire qu'il n'y a plus d'autres monnaies mais, malheureusement, on a publié peu de trésors monétaires du XVIII^e siècle, grand nombre furent seulement signalés ou publiés sans détails.[2]

C'est vrai que les petites dénominations (*aspre*s et *para*s) du XVIII^e siècle sont difficilement identifiées à cause du degré d'usure des monnaies. En général, les *paras* sont mal conservés, ce qui explique l'actuel stade de la recherche. Pour le XVIII^e siècle il y a des trésors formés exclusivement de paras et certains comptent des milliers de monnaies: Cărămidarii de Jos,[3] Colţa (Bucarest),[4] Băneasa (Bucarest),[5] Străuleşti (Bucarest).[6]

Un éclaircissement s'impose: ces quatre grands trésors ont été considérés, par erreur, composés seulement d'aspres. Au moins pour le trésor de Cărămidarii de Jos, dont la structure a été attentivement analysée, il s'agit sûrement de paras. La confusion vient du manque de différences significatives des deux dénominations; les différences métrologiques peuvent être déroutantes en raison de l'état de conservation. De retour à l'analyse de nos monnaies on peut observer (selon le catalogue) que la dixième année du règne du sultan Mustafa III est remplacée par l'an 80 de l'Hégire (1180). Ce nouveau système de numérotage sera gardé dans les ateliers d'Istanbul et du Caire jusqu'à la fin

---

[1]Samuel Lachman, "The initial letters on Ottoman coins of the eighteenth century", dans *The American Numismatic Society*, Museum notes, 19, 1974, p. 203.

[2]Jusqu'à present on connait seulement trois études qui s'occupent des monnaies ottomanes du XVIII^e siècle: Aurică Smaranda et Ştefan Trâmbaciu, "Un tezaur din secolul al XVIII^e – lea descoperit Câmpulung, jud. Argeş", *BSNR*, 77 – 79 (1983 – 1985), 1986, pp. 309 – 329; Corneliu Matache, "Un tezaur din vremea sultanului Abdulhamid I descoperit la Ciochina, jud. Ialomiţa", *SCN*, 12, 1998, pp. 185 – 189; Eugen Nicolae et Adrian Popescu, *Descoperiri monetare de la Dridu, jud. Ialomiţa*, BSNR, 88– 89, (1994 – 1995), 1998, pp. 291 – 296.

[3]Il est composé de: *paras* (1371 exemplaires), *aspres* (1 exemplaire) et 1/2 *grouche* (1 exemplaire), on va le publier prochaînement avec les détails nécessaires.

[4]Maria Grigoruţ, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 – 62.

[5]H. Dj. Siruni et P. I. Panait, "Tezaurul de la Gâşteşti şi unele probleme privind circulaţia akcelei pe teritorul oraşului Bucureşti şi în împrejurimi", *Materiale de istorie şi muzeografie*, 2, 1965, pp. 184 – 204.

[6]Il est conservé au Musée National d'Histoire de Roumanie.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0159

du règne de Mustafa III. Depuis le début du règne d'Abdülhamid I on reprend le système initial de numérotage pour les années du règne, jusqu'en 1200 de l'Hégire, sur les monnaies venant de paraître les trois derniers chiffres de l'année, c'est-à-dire 200, 201 et 203. Pendant le règne de Selim III le système de numérotage des années du règne est courant.

Dans le trésor mis en discussion une grande partie des paras appartiennent à Abdülhamid I^er. De même pour les monnaies frappées par Mustafa III, on remarque l'existence de deux types de *tuğra*[1]:

- Type I, *Abdül Hamid Han bin Ahmad al-Muzaffer Dai'ma*, mais le mot "han" est placé à l'intérieur du *tuğra* (qui n'est pas présent dans le trésor)

- Type II, similaire, mais le mot „han" est placé à gauche, où sur le type I est placé le nom du sultan (les monnaies n^os 19 - 32).

- De même pour les paras frappés par Selim III, il y a toujours deux variantes de *tuğra*.[2] Dans le trésor nous avons la variante: *Selim Han bin Mustafa al Muzaffer Dai'ma*, (type II, les monnaies n^os 35 - 40)

La plus récente monnaie du trésor, qui donne la date post quem, c'est un *para* frappé à Kostantiniye dans la 2^ème ou 3^ème année du règne du sultan Mahmud II, c'est-à-dire 1809 – 1810. On suppose que le trésor a été caché après cette date, dans les circonstances de la guerre russo–turque de 1806 – 1812. La région de Buzău tout comme la Valachie du nord-est, était dans cette période un couloir utilisé par les armées tsaristes. Plusieurs trésors découverts dans les départements de Vrancea et Brăila, dont ceux de Roşiori, dép. de Brăila,[3] Găvani, dép. de Brăila[4], et Cârligele, dép. de Vrancea[5] prouvent cette hypothèse.

À la fin du XVIII^e siècle et au commencement du XIX^e siècle la circulation monétaire au sud des Carpates était dominé par les émissions monétaires ottomanes aussi bien que par les monnaies autrichiennes et russes. Cette hiérarchie prouvée par les trésors monétaires est complétée par les

---

[1] *Cf.* Jem Sultan, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

[2] Samuel Lachman, "The silver coinage of Selim III," dans *The Numismatic Circular*, 84, 3, 1976, pp. 96-97.

[3] Ionel Cândea, "Descoperiri în judeţăul Brăila," *Istros*, 1, 1980, pp. 375 – 399.

[4] *Ibidem*.

[5] Anton Paragină et Gheorghe Constantinescu, "Câteva descoperiri arheologice şi efectuate în judeţul Vrancea", *Vrancea, Studii şi comentarii*, 8 – 10, 1991, pp. 163 – 175.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0160

documents. De la sorte, vers 1823 le métropolitain de Valachie, Grégoire, témoigne que le peintre d'église David de Braşova laissé dans un coffre chez Niţă Creăoiu plusieurs monnaies.[1] Vers 1822, une liste d'argent d'un marchand de Craïova fait mention, des monnaies en circulation.[2]

Les documents font ressortir l'importance que les dénominations ottomanes ont eu sur le marché monétaire de la Valachie. On ne connaît même pas un seul trésor enterré entre 1750-1820 qui ne contienne une partie importante des monnaies ottomanes. De la sorte, 13 des 24 trésors qui ont été analysés sont composés seulement de monnaies turques : Iepureşti, dép. de Giurgiu ;[3] Băneasa (Bucarest); Odobeşti, dép. de Dambovița;[4] Dobra, dép. de Dâmbovița;[5] Râmnicu Vâlcea;[6] Ciochina, dép. de Ialomița;[7] Romăneşti, dép. de Prahova;[8] Găvani, dép. de Brăila; Tibăneşti, dép. de Brăila;[9] Cârligele, dép. de Vrancea; Netezeşti, dép. d'Ilfov;[10] Roşu (1931) dép. d'Ilfov[11].

Les autres trésors sont composés pour la plupart de monnaies ottomanes auxquelles s'ajoutent des émissions autrichiennes, russes, ragusaines et polonaises: Colibaşi, dép. d'Ilfov;[12] Roşu (1966) dép. d'Ilfov; Mera, dép. de Vrancea;[13] Bucarest (Brezoianu); Văleni, dép. de Vrancea; Câmpulung, dép. d'Argeş; Buda, dép. de Vâlcea;[14] Lişcoteanca, dép. de Brăila; Grația, dép. d'Ilfov; Străuleşti (Bucarest); Cărămidarii de Jos (Bucarest).

---

[1]Nicolae Iorga, *Studii*, vol. 8, p. 91

[2]*Ibidem*, *vol.* 7, p. 312

[3]Elena Isăcescu dans *Caiet selectiv de informare asupra creşterii colecţiilor Bibliotecii Academiei RPR*, 10, 1964, pp. 349 – 353.

[4]Valentin Drob, "Două tezaure monetare otomane de la sfârşitul secolului al XVIII – lea descoperite în judeţul Dâmboviąa", *CN*, 7, 1996, pp. 209 – 211.

[5]Une fraction du trésor de Dobra se trouve dans les collections du Musée National d'Histoire de Roumanie, publiée par Paraschiva Stancu et George Trohani, "Un tezaur monetar de la sfârşitul secolului al XVIII – lea decoperit în comuna Dobra, judeţul Dâmbovița", *CN*, 3, 1980, pp. 117 – 120, le reste se trouve dans une collection privée, monnaies publiées par Valentin Drob, *op. cit.*, pp. 209 – 211.

[6]Aurel Dumitraşcu, "Un tezaur monetar din secolele XVII – XVIII descoperit la Rm. Vâlcea", *Buridava, Studii şi materiale*, 2, pp. 101 – 106.

[7]Corneliu Matache, *op. cit.*, pp. 185 - 189.

[8]Le trésor est conservé dans les collections du Musée Départemental d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Prahova. On détient l'information de Mme Elisabeta Savu à qui nous adressons nos remerciements.

[9]Ionel Cândea, *op. cit.*, pp. 375 - 399.

[10]George Trohani et Done Şerbănescu, "Tezaurul monetar turcesc din Netezi – Nuci, jud. Ilfov", *CN*, 1, 1978, pp. 83 - 85

[11]Il est conservé au Musée National d'Histoire de Roumanie.

[12]George Trohani et Done Şerbănescu, "Un tezaur monetar din secolele XVIII – XIX descoperit la Colibaşi (jud. Ilfov)", *BSNR*, 67 – 69, 1973 – 1975, 1976, pp. 181 – 186.

[13]Le trésor est conservé au Musée National d'Histoire de Roumanie.

[14]Aurel Dumitraşcu et Mihai Emil Dumitraşcu, "Un tezaur monetar feudal descoperit la Buda – Ocnele Mari judeţul Vâlcea", *Sesiunea anuală de comunicări ştiinţifice*, Piteşti, noiembrie 1997.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0161

La dépendance de plus en plus marquée par rapport à la Sublime Porte, à quoi s'ajoute la réforme du système monétaire ottoman de 1687 sont les facteurs principaux qui ont déterminé la prépondérance des émissions monétaires ottomanes en Valachie depuis le commencement du XVIII^e siècle. Charles Claude de Peyssonel qui a voyagé dans les Provinces Roumaines en 1758 – 1759 confirme les réalités du marché monétaire de Moldavie et de Valachie.[1]

Le commerce de la Valachie étant dirigé vers le Sud, les émissions monétaires ottomanes seront favorisées. Toutefois, de l'Empire pénètrent non seulement ses dénominations mais aussi des monnaies de la zone centrale et de l'ouest de l'Europe. Peyssonel nous dévoile une autre cause qui contribue à la domination de la monnaie turque en Valachie: les ventes en détail ont comme intermédiaire les émissions turques qui sont préférées aux dénominations chrétiennes. De sorte que, la plus grand partie du total des monnaies qui étaient en circulation en Valachie vers 1800 est constitué par les émissions monétaires ottomanes (surtout des monnaies frappées pour les sultans Mahmud I^er, Mustafa III, Abdülhamid I^er, Selim III).

Les trésor découvert à Buzău (Obor) viennent s'ajouter aux découvertes numismatiques qui offrent de nouveaux renseignements concernant la circulation monétaire de l'époque. Le trésor s'intègre d'une manière générale, parmi les trésors monétaires ordinaires de la fin du XVIII^e siècle et du commencement du XIX siècle.

Catalogue:

POLOGNE
Alexandre I^er
(1501 – 1505)
1/2 grouche

1. AR, ↗, 0,33, 16,5 mm
Cracovie, Gumowski 469

[1] *Călători străini*, IX, 1997, p. 398.

EMPIRE OTTOMAN

paras

Mahmud Ier
(1730 – 1754)

2-3. AR, ↑, 0,41 g, 15 mm; ←, 0,38 g, 15 mm
Kostantiniye, Nuri Pere 578

4. AR, ↑, 0,26 g, 15 mm
Misir, Nuri Pere 580

Mustafa III
(1757 – 1774)
tuğra type I

5. AR, ↗, 0,30, 15 mm
année 2 = 4 IX 1758 – 24 VIII 1759
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

6. AR, ↗, 0,36, 15 mm
année 3 = 25 VIII 1759 – 12 VIII 1760
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

7. AR, ↑, 0,39, 15 mm
année 7 = 12 VII 1763 – 30 VI 1764
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

tuğra type II

8. AR, ↑, 0,38, 15 mm
année 9 = 20 VI 1765 – 8 VI 1766
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

9. AR, ↑, 0,33, 15 mm
année 80 = 9 VI 1766 – 29 V 1767
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

10. AR, 0,30, 15 mm
année 82 = 18 V 1768 – 6 V 1769
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0163

11. AR, ↓, 0,32,15 mm
Mısır, Nuri Pere 643
(Frappé au temps de la rébellion d'Ali Bey
1769 – 1771)

12. AR, ←, 0,25, 15 mm
année 85 = 16 IV 1771 – 3 IV 1772
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

13. AR, ↗, 0,30, 15 mm
année 86 = 4 IV 1772 – 24 III 1773
İslambol, Nuri Pere 639

14. AR, ↗, 0,24, 15 mm
année 87 = 25 III 1773 – 13 III 1774
Mısır, Nuri Pere 643

15. AR, ↓, 0,29, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 643

tuğra non précisée

16-17. AR, ,↓, 0,28, 15 mm; AR, „, 0,27, 15 mm
année illisible, Misir
Nuri Pere 643

18. AR, ↑, 0,20, 15 mm
année illisible, Islambol
Nuri Pere 639

Abdülhamid I^er^
(1774 – 1789)
tuğra type II

19. AR, ↑, 0,31, 15 mm
année 1 = 21 I 1774 – 13 III 1774
Kostantiniye, Nuri Pere 681

20. AR, ↑, 0,19, 14,5 mm
année 6 = 30 I 1778 – 18 I 1779
Mısır, Nuri Pere 683

21. AR, ↑, 0,30, 15 mm
année 7 = 19 I 1779 – 7 I 1780
Mısır, Nuri Pere 683

22. AR, ↑ 0,20, 15 mm
année 8 = 8 I 1780 – 27 XII 1780
Mısır, Nuri Pere 683

23-24. AR, ↑, 0,42, 15 mm; AR, ↑ 0,36, 15 mm
année 9 = 28 XII 1780 – 16 XII 1781
Kostantiniye, Nurî Pere 681

25. AR, ↑, 0,30, 15 mm
année 11 = 7 XII 1782 – 25 XI 1783
Mısır ?, Nuri Pere 683

26. AR, ↑, 0,42, 15 mm
année 13 = 14 XI 1784 – 3 XI 1785
Kostantiniye, Nuri Pere 681

27. AR, ↗ 0,20, 15 mm
année 201 = 24 X 1786 – 12 X 1787
Mısır, Nuri Pere 683

28. AR, ↑, 0,32, 15 mm
année illisible, Kostantiniye
Nuri Pere 681
Av: ornement à droite

29. AR, →, 0,32, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 683

30. AR, ←, 0,31, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 683

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0165

31. AR, ↗, 0,28, 15 mm
année illisible, Kostantiniye
Nuri Pere 681

32. AR, →, 0,25, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 683

tuğra non précisée

33. AR, ↗, 0,21, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 683

34. AR, ↑, 0,20, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 683

Selim III
(1789 – 1808)
tuğra type II

35. AR, ↑, 0,24, 15 mm
année 6 = 9 VIII 1793 – 28 VII 1794
İslambol, Nuri Pere 713

36. AR, ↑, 0,18, 14,5 mm
année 7 = 29 VII 1794 – 17 VII 1795
Mısır, Nuri Pere 717

37. AR, ↑, 0,30, 15 mm
année 8 = 18 VII 1795 – 6 VII 1796
İslambol, Nuri Pere 713

38. AR, ↑, 0,29, 15 mm
année illisible, İslambol
Nuri Pere 713

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0166

39. AR, ↓ 0,20, 14,5 mm
année illisible, İslambol
Nuri Pere 713

40. AR, ↓, 0,21, 15 mm
année illisible, Mısır
Nuri Pere 717

Mahmud II
(1808 – 1839)

41. AR, ↑, 0,29, 14,5 mm
année 3 = 6 II 1810 – 25 I 1811
Kostantiniye, Nuri Pere 807

Non précisé
para ou aspre
XVII^{e} siècle

42. AR, 0,52, 15 mm

Non précisé
para
Deuxième moitié du XVIII^{e} siècle

43. AR, 0,25, 15 mm

III. ROMANIAN - OTTOMAN INTERFERENCES IN THE MODERN ERA

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0169

THE POLITICAL ELITE IN THE DANUBIAN PRINCIPALITIES AND RUSSIA AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 19th CENTURY. A CASE STUDY: THE MORUZI BROTHERS[1]

Armand GOŞU

When Alexander Moruzi (? - 1816) was made governor of Moldavia, the Sublime Porte circles assumed he was a "French sympathiser".[2] His appointment was meant to counterbalance the presence of Constantine Ypsilanti, an admirer of the Russian Tsar, on Wallachia's throne.

On November 14th, 1802, the Russian Chancellor Alexander Vorontsoff sent his instructions to Andrei I. Italinsky, the new ambassador to Istanbul and they tell a lot about the Russian government's views on the Turkey-appointed Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia. The Chancellor knew Constantine Ypsilanti as a long-time friend of Russia and recommended that special and friendly relations should be kept with him, as well as a rich correspondence, in order for Italinsky to get the most intelligence about the area. The Russian ambassador was instructed to keep his relations with Ypsilanti away from Ottoman suspicions. A totally different story surrounds the "wholly French-leaning" Alexander Moruzi. Even though he had tried to convince the former Russian chargé d'affaires to the Sublime Porte, Vasily Tomara, that he is devoted to the Tsar, Italinsky was told not to trust him and to try "to learn about all his secret liaisons".[3]

---

[1] There are several studies about the relations the Moruzi brothers had with Russia: W. Wilkinson *Tableau historique, géographique et politique de la Moldavie et de la Valachie*, traduit de l'anglais, Paris, 1821, p. 105-106; Manolachi Draghici *Istoria Moldovei pe timp de 500 de ani. Pîna in zilele noastre* [Moldavia's History for 500 Days. Up to Nowadays], II, Iaşi, 1857, p. 77-79; Dionisiu Fotino *Istoria generala a Daciei, sau a Transilvaniei, Terei Muntenesti si a Moldovei* [The General History of Dacia, or of Transylvania, Walachia and Moldavia], translated from Greek by George Sion, tome II, Bucharest, 1859, p. 259-260; Nicolae Iorga "Alte lamuriri despre veacul al XVIII-lea dupa izvoare apusene. Luarea Basarabiei si Moruzestii" [New Insights on the 18th Century in Western Documents. The Seizure of Bessarabia and the Moruzi family], in *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile sectiunii istorice*, 2nd series, tome XXXIII, Bucharest, 1910, p. 185; Leon Casso "Rusia si bazinul dunarean" [Russia and the Danube Basin], translated from Russian with a foreword by St. Gr. Berechet, Iaşi, 1940, p. 203-204.

[2] Mustafa Mehmet (editor) "Cronici turcesti privind Tarile Române" [Turkish Chronicles on Romanian Principalities], subtracts, III, 1980, p. 401.

[3] *Arkhiv Vneshnei Politiki Rossiiskoi Imperii*, fond Posol'stvo v Konstantinople, opus 517/1, d. 28, f 90-92 (later quoted as: Arh.VPRI).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0171

The position Moruzi had was not one to be envious of. In September-October 1802, under Russian pressures, the Ottoman Empire had approved the so-called hatt-i-sheriffs — statute-codes which acknowledged several older privileges Moldavia and Wallachia had. But they also introduced a few fresh provisions, which meant the rulers of the two principalities (also known as Hospodars or Governors) were now dependent on both Turkey and Russia. They could rule for only seven years and could be punished only if found guilty to both the Sublime Porte and the Tsarist Government.[1] Petersburg's suspicion towards Al. Moruzi could be lethal since the very moment he took on the throne.

The first letter, which the Russian consul in Iasi, V. F. Malinovsky, sent to Moruzi on September 14th, 1802, originated a diplomatic scandal. After congratulating him for the job, the Russian reminded the prince that he had to respect the new hatt-i-sheriffs and to stop the administration's abuses.

The conflict that started between Al. Moruzi and the Moldavian boyars was also triggered by the abuses made by the caïmacams (tax enforcing clerks), which he sent to Iasi in order to raise taxes. And that happened very shortly after the new hatt-i-sheriffs were trying to regulate taxes: they had to be fixed "together with the Divan (Council) boyars" and, what is more, the Governors had "to respect the opinions which Russia's ambassador could have on the matter" (the amount of taxes - Ar. G.).[2]

Seeing the abuse, the boyars asked for help from Russia, the only one who could force the prince to respect the new regulations. It was a practice started at the end of the 18th century, but which reached large proportions in the beginning of the 19th century. For the local political elite, appealing for Russian intervention, in order to make law respected in the Romanian principalities, became a political behavioural norm. Corruption, a wide array of abuses, lack of laws to regulate state affairs, incorrect justice, all these determined many people to search for justice in neighbouring countries.

Russian diplomacy was very shrewd in using these circumstances for extending its influence and imposing its control over the Romanian Principalities. For some times, Petersburg itself originated such crises, building opportunities for a new intervention. Therefore, Russia was not

---

[1] Mustafa A. Mehmet, *Documente turcesti privind istoria României* [Turkish Documents Regarding Romania's History], III, 1791-1812, Bucharest, 1986, p. 167-188.
[2] *Ibidem*, p. 174.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0172

anxious about the law not being respected, but it kept a close interest in maintaining a solid influence over the Governors of the two countries. As a proof, right after the incident between Moruzi and the Russian consul in Iasi, Malinovsky was dismissed.[1]

Demetrios Moruzi (1768-1812), the brother of Moldavia's Hospodar, had an important role in getting this conflict settled. While he was in Istanbul, he made several interventions to both Tomara and Italinsky, trying to convince Petersburg's envoys that the Moruzi family was deeply attached to Russia and his brother was determined to respect the new regulations with regard to the Principalities.[2] The events also forced Demetrios Moruzi to have several contacts with the Fontons, the translators of the Russian Embassy to the Sublime Porte, and who had worked, not long before, for France.[3]

The Moruzis had also a wide support from Prince Constantine Ypsilanti, the Governor of Wallachia, who was held in high esteem in Saint Petersburg. Italinsky wrote to Ypsilanti on December 28th 1802, asserting that one of the reasons Russia had approved of Moruzi's appointment was the assurances made by Wallachia's ruler.[4] There were some other episodes when Ypsilanti defended Alexander Moruzi trying to calm Russia's suspicions.[5] But, with his every move, Moldavia's ruler went on provoking new crises in his relations with Russia. That is what happened in spring 1803, when the Petersburg circles learned in amazement that Alexander Moruzi asked the French government to send a diplomatic agent in Moldavia. He had used the French embassy in Istanbul, and even sent his own envoys directly to Paris. In the message that Chancellor Vorontsoff sent to Italinsky to inform him about the facts, he reminded that in the past the Moruzis have had very good relations with France.[6]

Another report, sent by Italinsky to the Chancellor on June 30th 1803, brings more light on the Moruzis. The Russian ambassador wrote that "Moruzi (Alexander, that is - Ar. G.) never was in his inner self an enemy of Russia", and his behaviour was presumably dictated by his intention "to acquire all the benevolence of the Porte", until the moment when one of the

---

[1] *Arh. VPRI,* fond Posol'stvo v Konstantinople, opus 517/1, d 28, f. 29 (Tomara to Chancellor Vorontsoff, October 28th, 1802).
[2] *Ibidem,* p. 110 (Italinsky to Vorontsoff, December 28th, 1802).
[3] One of the first letters sent by D. Moruzi to one of the Fontons, was found in the Russian archives, dating from December 23rd 1802. *Ibidem* f.116-117.
[4] *Ibidem* f.125.
[5] For instance, the letter Ypsilanti sent in October 1803 to Italinsky. *Ibidem* d 32, f.132-133.
[6] *Ibidem,* d 33, f. 109-112.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0173

Principalities would have a ruling vacancy. Now, as he was eventually seated on Moldavia's throne, went on Italinsky, he hopes to keep it for the whole seven years and "will try to present himself as a friend who deserves Russia's protection, without which the intrigues of the Phanariot Greeks could easily make him lose his reigning position".[1]

The Russian diplomats stationed in the Bosphorus capital were very familiar with the intrigues that were cooked by the Phanariot families against Alexander Moruzi and, especially, Constantine Ypsilanti. Italinsky was positive that French diplomats were behind this manoeuvre.[2] Russia's support was one of the most important conditions to get somebody appointed on the thrones of the two principalities or to keep them.[3] The competition between the Phanariot families to get Russia's sympathy for one of theirs was very harsh. When the scope was compromised the Phanariot families tried their luck with the other embassies in Istanbul, which could somehow equal Russia's influence over the Porte (Britain and France being the most outstanding).

It is, most probably, the reason for the actions Demetrios Moruzi took in order to prove his family's attachment towards Russia. By way of consequence he could have Petersburg's support for his brother ruling in Iaşi. At the time, the most important thing Moruzi could offer the Russian embassy, was intelligence — details about the often secret discussions in the Moldavian Divan and government, about the relations between the Porte and the Western Powers. And in a short while after his brother was installed in Iaşi, Demetrios Moruzi became one of the main intelligence resources the Russians had in Istanbul.

At the beginning of spring, the Russian diplomats learned from him about the discussions the Ottomans had about Pazvantoglu, "the Vidin outlaw" and about the measures they intended to take against him.[4] That was also the time when Moruzi gave the Russians information about the political situation in Europe, especially in France, as he made copies of the relevant reports sent by Turkish agents and gave them to Italinsky.[5] Besides those,

---

[1] *Ibidem*, d 30, f. 344-345.

[2] *Ibidem*, d 29, f. 270 (Italinsky to Vorontsoff, March 14, 1803); file 31, p. 153 (Italinsky to Vorontsoff, August 30th, 1803).

[3] *Ibidem*, d 30, f. 231.

[4] *Ibidem*, d 29, f. 272-277.

[5] Copie d'une lettre reçue de Paris pour le Prince Mourousy et communiqué à S. E. M. l'Envoyé de Russie (Piotr Fonton's handwriting). D. Moruzi made himself the copy of the original letter. *Ibidem*, d 30, f. 57-60.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0174

Moruzi wrote his own reports about the inner dealings of the Sublime Porte, its diplomatic relations or international affairs, and the Russian embassy sent them by courier to Petersburg.[1] The most important fraction of the information Moruzi delivered was not really secret, while some other pieces could be acquired, most probably, from other sources.

Demetrios Moruzi could easily access state information, because the Turks, who believed he was close to France trusted him, and because he was an advisor of the Reis Efendi.

In the special circumstances of the summer of 1803, as the French representative in Istanbul, Gen. Guillaume Brune sent various urgent dispatches to Paris, Moruzi was quickly contacted by Piotr Fonton (1765-1846, second translator of the Russian embassy), who wanted facts.[2] The same Fonton instructed Moruzi to influence certain Ottoman officials to adopt a pro-Russian attitude in their conversations with Brune.[3] In today's jargon, one could say Moruzi was not just a simple information source, but a influence agent working for Russia.

On July 30th, 1803, Italinsky reported on Moruzi's position. The Russian ambassador wrote that Moruzi has gained the Sultan's respect and was very influential in the government. What is more, "with every opportunity he delivers secret information, which, after a thorough examination, were always proven to be correct ...; he (D. Moruzi - Ar. G.) voluntarily tells me about the meetings Brune has with Reis Efendi and other high officials, as well as about the reports which Dragoman Frankini (Francesco Frankini, first Dragoman of the French Embassy - Ar. G.) compiles for him (Brune - Ar. G.). In my opinion, goes on Italinsky, such behaviour could lead to his death, once discovered, and I believe he (D. Moruzi - Ar. G.) would not have engaged on this dangerous road without knowing that the Sublime Porte may sometime endanger his life".[4]

---

[1] *Ibidem,* d 31, f. 32-33.
[2] The July 5th discussion between Brune and Ottoman officials was resumed in Italinsky's report sent to Vorontsoff on July 16th, 1803. *Ibidem,* f.23.
[3] *Ibidem,* f. 78-79.
[4] *Ibidem,* d 30, f. 344.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0175

Piotr Fonton was the liaison between the Russian embassy and Moruzi since as early as December 1802. About the skills this second Dragoman had, obtaining important information and mingling with Istanbul high society, Italinsky sent a delighted dispatch to the Chancellor, on April 15th, 1803.[1]

On the other hand, one must not forget that sometimes the Sublime Porte was itself interested in sending certain information to the Russian embassy, through non-diplomatic channels. In my research, I have found one such instance reflected in documents: the Reis Efendi asked D. Moruzi to tell Italinsky about the discussions he had with Gen. Brune.[2] Anyhow, the Sublime Porte did not encourage the great families to approach Russia, but neither did it stop their tendencies. During those times of weakness, the Turkish government had chosen a similar double play, balancing between the great powers. It was the kind of play that the Phanariot Greeks did too, on another level, and the Ottomans tried to use them to their own goals.

After 1802, the continent enjoyed a period of peace, which for a few years managed to hide the residual tensions between the European powers. But the Duke of Enghien's execution was good enough to start a new coalition against Napoleon's France. Even so, on Europe's battlefields, the French army managed to dominate. During spring 1806, Emperor Napoleon I was highly interested to counterbalance the anti-French coalition led by Great Britain and Russia. Consequently, French foreign policy turned again toward its traditional alliance with the Ottoman empire, using it in European power combinations. Napoleon appointed a new ambassador in Istanbul, the dynamic Horace Sébastiani.

Constantine Ypsilanti was quick in understanding that for him, a greater French influence in Istanbul would mean losing Wallachia's throne. In fact, in a letter sent to his ambassador, Napoleon wrote about his intention of deposing the Phanariot rulers of the Romanian Principalities because "those Greek Princes which are governing now are Russian agents".[3]

---

[1] *Ibidem*, f. 9-10.
[2] As mentioned by Italinsky in his report sent to Vorontsoff on July 30th, 1803. *Ibidem*, d 31, f. 81.
[3] *Correspondance de Napoléon I-er*, XII, Paris, 1863, p. 474-475.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0176

On the 24th of August, 1806, the French ambassador in Istanbul managed to push things forward, obtaining that Ypsilanti and Moruzi are deposed and replaced by Alexander Suçu and Scarlat Callimachi.[1] After the onset of the Eastern crisis, in 1806, Ypsilanti joined openly the Russians, but Alexander Moruzi, Moldavia's ruler, chose the other option and remained a humble servant of the Sublime Porte. But that was not enough to save the Moruzi brothers, which in April 1807 had to face the Ottomans' revenge. Alexander was arrested and thrown into jail, while Demetrios was only sent into exile. As the former ruler of Wallachia was now in Russia, the Turks caught his old father, Alexander Ypsilanti, and executed him after being tortured.

Not long after, the accession of Mustafa Pasha Bayraktar to the position of Grand Vizier gave the Moruzis an unexpected chance. Demetrios Moruzi was called from exile in autumn 1808 and hastily made Grand Dragoman.[2] In response to the secret mission of a Russian officer[3], who brought to Istanbul a special message from General Al. A. Prozorovsky, commander of the army stationed in the Principalities, the Porte accepted to take part in the peace negotiations to be held in Iasi. The Ottoman delegation, which included Moruzi, had to leave for Moldavia's capital at the end of November 1808,[4] but the Istanbul revolt, which killed Grand Vizier Mustafa Bayraktar, delayed its departure with a few weeks. The delegation arrived in Iasi at the beginning of spring 1809, after following a by-road through Vidin, Craiova and Bucharest. The Ottomans were presented with Petersburg's conditions: fixing the border along the Danube and the Saint George river arm. In fact, the Russian diplomats wanted just to have the peace treaty mention the Erfurt document, which Emperor Napoleon I and Tsar Alexander had signed, France accepting that Moldavia and Wallachia were annexed by Russia.[5] As the Ottomans refused to accept the Danube border, Russians waited for a reason to break the Slobozia armistice (August 24th, 1807) and to restart military manoeuvres.

---

[1] About the international context of summer 1806 and the replacement of the Principalities' rulers, in Edouard Driault "La politique orientale de Napoléon, Sébastiani et Gardane 1806-1808"; Germaine Lebel, *La France et les Principautés Danubiennes (Du XVI-e siècle à la chute de Napoléon I-er)*, Paris, 1955; Stanford J. Shaw *Between Old and New. The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III 1789-1807*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971; I. S. Dostian *Rossia i balkanskii vopros. Iz istorii russko-balkanskih politiceskih sveazei v pervoi treti XIX v.*, Moskow, 1972.

[2] Florin Marinescu, *Etude généalogique sur la famille Mourouzi*, Athens, 1987, f. 66.

[3] He gave details about his mission in a travel diary published by "Ruskii vestnik", Moskva, avgust 1810 g; sentiabr 1810 g.

[4] A. F. Miller, *Mustapha Pacha Bairaktar*, Bucharest, 1975, p. 337.

[5] F. Martens *Sobranie traktatov i konventsii, zakliucennakh Rossieiu s inostrannami derjavami*, tome XIV, (Traktati s Frantseiu), S. Petersburg, 1905, p. 68-73; *Vneshneaia politika Rosii XIX i naciala XX veka. Dokumenti Rosiiskogo Ministerstva Innostrannah Del*, tome IV, Moscow, 1965, p. 360.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0177

The pretext was found when the Dardanelles Peace Treaty was agreed between the British and Ottoman empires.[1] The Russians felt that their plans to expand were endangered by London's representative to the Sublime Porte, Sir Robert Adair, who offered to mediate.

In the first days of April, Al. A. Prozorovsky sent an official message to the Turkish chief negotiator, Mehmed Said Galib Efendi. It made known that, as the Tsar's ultimatum asking for Robert Adair's expulsion was duly rejected, the armistice is obsolete and fights will immediately resume.[2] But despite the military victories of the Russian in the 1809 and 1810 campaigns, the Ottomans did not accept their territorial demands.

Even if the official positions of the sides were quite irreconcilable, in December 1810 rumours of a new round of peace talks started to circulate. They were induced by the fact that the Russian negotiating team, headed by A. Italinsky, the former ambassador to Istanbul, was moved to Bucharest.[3]

Trying to provoke a first contact with the Ottoman side, Piotr Fonton was sent in the Grand Vizier's camp, in Shumla. His mission — to assure the Turks that Russia will give back the territories it had occupied at the north of the Danube, but only if the border will be established on the river. The Turks decided to reject the Russian proposals, saying that putting the future border on the Danube means the Tsar does not want peace. The Ottoman officials also gave a hint that Wallachia's restitution is a mandatory condition for peace, but with Moldavia some concessions would be accepted.[4]

Besides his mission to clarify the intentions the Sublime Porte had — learning about the territories it would possibly give up—Piotr Fonton was also told to speak to the Grand Dragoman Demetrios Moruzi, who was in the Grand Vizier's camp, too. The instructions Fonton received on February 9th, 1811, specified the orientation of the conduct he had to display towards Moruzi. Russians knew that "the loss of Moldavia and Wallachia is precisely something that deeply hurts Prince Moruzi, as his family has ruled several

---

[1]Gabriel Noradounghian, *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'Empire ottoman*, tome II, Paris, 1900, p. 81-84.

[2]Armand Goşu, "*Rusia la Dunarea de Jos. Pacea de la Bucuresti (mai 1812)*" (Russia on the Lower Danube. The Bucharest Peace - May 1812), in *Studii si materiale de istorie moderna* X, (1996), p. 54-55.

[3]Alexandru Odobescu (editor), *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor. Colectia Hurmuzaki* [Documents Regarding the History of Romanians. Hurmuzaki Collection], I, II, (1781-1814), Bucharest, 1885, p. 580 (later quoted as *Hurmuzaki Collection*)

[4]A. N. Petrov "Voina Rossii i Turtsii" (1806-1812 gg.), tome III, (1810, 1811, 1812), Sankt Petersburg, 1887, p. 321-322.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0178

times, from father to son, one or another, and he hopes to continue after signing the peace" (La perte de la Moldavie et de la Valachie est certainement ce qui touche au vif le Prince Morouzy, sa famille ayant été plusieurs fois, pourvue, de père en fils, d'une des deux principautés, et ayant l'espoir fondé encore, après la paix). Piotr Fonton had to tell Prince Moruzi in private that, independent of the interests of the great powers, "it is absolutely certain that they (the Romanian Principalities - Ar. G.) are lost forever for the Ottomans" (il est de toute certitude qu'elles sont irrévocablement perdu<es> pour la Porte) and that the Sublime Porte would be happy "if this loss would not be followed by others, more sensible and more significant" (si cette perte n'est pas tôt ou tard suivie d'autres plus sensibles et beaucoup plus important<e>s).

The Russians were determined to exploit "the personal bonds which existed between Court Councillor Fonton and Prince Demetrius Morouzy, the current Dragoman of the Porte" (les liaison intimes qui ont existé entre le conseiller de cour Fonton et le Prince Démétrius Morouzy, drogman actuel de la Porte). So they asked Fonton "to assure him (Moruzi - Ar. G.) that His Imperial Majesty knows about the services his family provided while their older brother was the Hospodar of Moldavia, that he is aware how to repay them, that he does not doubt the constancy of their zeal and that he is ready to give them the most rewarding proofs of his royal benevolence. But he (Fonton - Ar. G.) will not pronounce anything positive and will make no formal promise. He will work to understand if he (Moruzi - Ar. G.) is listening to these general offers, and if this is the case, which favours of His Imperial Majesty would please him and his brothers" (de l'assurer que Sa Majesté Impériale connaît et sait apprécier les services rendus par lui et par ses frères lorsque leur aîné était Hospodar de Moldavie, qu'elle ne doute pas de la constance de leur zèle, et qu'elle est disposée à leur donner les marques les plus éclatantes de sa haute bienveillance. Mais il n'énoncera rien de positif à cet égard, et ne fera aucune promesse formelle. Il tâchera de connaître s'il est accessible à ces offres générales, et dans ce cas, quelles faveurs <de> Sa Majesté Impériale seraient de sa convenance personelle et de celle de ses frères). [1]

The Russian territorial claims were conflicting with the interests of the Phanariot families, among which the Moruzis. For the Phanariot Greeks, being appointed on the thrones in Bucharest or Iasi was an ideal worth spending any money and indulging in any plot. On one side, the Phanariot

[1] *Arh. VPRI,* fond Kantselеariia, d 1957, f.123-124. The document was published in the collection *Vneashneaia politika Rossii,* VI, Moscow, 1962, f. 50.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0179

families, who were given the ruling of the Romanian Principalities on a regular basis, should have fought with all their might the Russian annexation of Moldavia and Wallachia. On the other hand, they had the same religion with the Russians, they instinctively hated the "pagan" Turks, and hoped that the Tsar will help liberate their own country. These were reasons that made them support Russia's penetration in South-Eastern Europe.

That is why Demetrios Moruzi, the Grand Dragoman, a powerful influence over the Empire's foreign policy,[1] was now strongly targeted by the Russians, who wanted to convince him that Ottoman resistance to their annexation of Moldavia and Wallachia was futile and belated. But the secret report that Fonton wrote on February 17th, when he returned from Shumla shows a different account. Moruzi had told Fonton that the Sublime Porte would never accept the Danube border, which Britain offered the Tsar certain American territories in exchange for the Principalities that should be returned under Ottoman reign. Austria and France were equally displeased with Russia's annexation of Moldavia and Wallachia.[2]

The first Russian-Ottoman tentative talk was therefore fruitless. But the Russian pressed on, and the new commander of the Danube army, Gen. M. I. Kutuzov, straight after coming to Bucharest, sent Fonton on a new mission to Shumla. In his new instructions, written by Italinsky on May 15th, 1811, the special relation that Fonton should have with Moruzi is mentioned again.

"These ideas (the territorial abandons and other sacrifices which the Porte could make in exchange for peace - Ar. G.) will not be successful without Prince Demetrios Moruzi's confidences. Those he already gave raise the hope that he may continue. In order to keep his good will awake, Court Councillor Pierre Fonton will reiterate the assurances he gave during his first voyage, that His Imperial Majesty, aware of his past services, and knowing how to reciprocate for those to follow in this occurrence, is willing to show his satisfaction and to make his benevolence felt, to him and this family". (Ces notions ne pourront, sans doute, s'acquérir que par les confidences du prince Démétrius Morouzy. Celles qu'il a déjà faites donnent l'espoir qu'il voudra bien en faire encore. Pour exciter encore davantage sa bonne volonté, le conseiller de cour Pierre Fonton lui réitérera l'assurance qu'il lui a donnée dans son premier voyage, que Sa Majesté Impériale, connaissant ses services

[1] Moruzi's unfortunate place in Ottoman policy is detailed in Champagny's letter to Muhib Efendi, the Turkish ambassador to Paris, *Hurmuzaki Collection*, I, II, p. 560-561. About his influence over the Ottoman foreign policy, *ibid.*, I, III, 1889, f. 55-56.

[2] *Vneshneaia politika Rossii*, VI, f. 112.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0180

passés, et sachant apprécier ceux qu'il rendra dans cette occasion, ne manquera pas de lui en témoigner sa satisfaction et de faire ressentir les effets de sa haute bienveillance, tant à lui-même qu'à toute sa famille).[1]

The second Russian attempt was successful, it seems, as the Grand Vizier decided to send the Commander of the Janissaries, Abdülhamid Efendi, for further negotiations in Bucharest.[2] He arrived in Wallachia's capital at the beginning of June. Anyhow, during his discussions with General Kutuzov, or with negotiators Italinsky and Fonton, Abdülhamid Efendi stressed that his mission is just to "reinstate the old border" (along the Dniestr River - Ar. G.).[3] The conference was in deadlock, before it began.

When he came back from the Grand Vizier's camp in Shumla, Piotr Fonton wrote two secret reports, one for Kutuzov (June 10 1811), the other for Italinsky (June 11, 1811). Demetrios Moruzi told Fonton, in their confidential meetings, that the French chargé d'affaires in Istanbul, Latour-Maubourg, gave Reis Efendi a secret note, with assurances that Napoleon was forced in Tilsit and Erfurt to adopt an anti-Ottoman attitude which was contrary to his own will. From now on, the French Emperor intended to show his good will toward the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, Reis Efendi was led to believe that a French-Russian war is looming.[4] Therefore, the Sublime Porte had not to hurry to close a wretched peace deal with Russia.

So, in May 1811, for the first time in the new environment, Demetrios Moruzi gave intelligence to the Russians, regarding French diplomatic efforts in Istanbul. But Moruzi was in the Grand Vizier's camp at Shumla, how could he know such information?

After being appointed Grand Dragoman, Demetrios Moruzi left the Ottoman capital for a short while, in the spring of 1809, to partake in the peace congress at Iasi. Since then, he never returned in Istanbul. His replacements at the Porte, as Grand Dragoman, were first Scarlat-Rosetti-Bibica, and later his own brother, Panayotis Moruzi (1780 or later -1812).[5] In spring 1811, Demetrios Moruzi was informed by his brother Panayotis about

---

[1] *Arh VPRI,* fond Kantselеariia, d 1957, f.127-128. The instructions were published in *Vneshneaia politika Rossii,* VI, p. 112.

[2] *Arh. VPRI,* fond Posol'stvo v Konstantinopole, 517/1, d 55, f. 39. On the outcome of the mission, see M. I. Kutuzov *Sbornik dokumentov*, III, 1808-1812, L. G. Beskrov (editor), Moskow, 1952, p. 381-382.

[3] M. Mehmet, *op cit.,* III, p. 273-280.

[4] *Vneshneaia politika Rossii,* III, p. 697-698, note 132.

[5] F. Marinescu, *op cit.,* p. 66.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0181

the dealings the French led at the Sublime Porte. From his position of substitute Grand Dragoman, Panayotis Moruzi knew about all diplomatic affairs in Istanbul, one of his duties being to take part in the discussions between Reis Efendi and the foreign envoys.

In the secret report Fonton sent to Italinsky after coming back from Shumla, he wrote that Moruzi was told about the high esteem he was held in Petersburg circles, while the Tsar himself knew about the "services" Moruzi had presumably paid to the Russians. What is more, in May 1811, Moruzi was promised that he would be awarded secretly with a Russian medal. The possibility to emigrate in Russia with all his family was also mentioned.[1]

Russian relations with France were getting more and more cumbersome, a decisive confrontation between emperors Napoleon and Alexander was in sight, such as the Russian cabinet felt it should lessen its territorial claims in order to close a peace deal with the Sublime Porte.[2] If, until the spring of 1811 Russia wanted the future border to follow the Danube River, from now on, Petersburg became available to discuss other options too, the most talked about being a border along the Siret River. But the Sublime Porte also dismissed this claim, as being too overstated.

*
* *

The 1811 summer and autumn military manoeuvres on the Danubian front ended with the Ottoman army being surrounded. The Grand Vizier had to press for an armistice and to start peace negotiations. They were to be dealt in Giurgiu, with the delegations being led by Galib Efendi[3] and A. Italinsky.

The discussions were fruitless because the Sultan did not agree with a border on Siret River and wanted to renegotiate the preliminaries for peace. With the prospects of a harsh winter and long negotiations, the two teams left the bleak Giurgiu for the more comfortable Bucharest. But the first meeting that took place in Wallachia's capital on the 12th of July, 1812, ended again in a stalemate. Kutuzov threatened to break the armistice and to restart the military operations, but the Turks could not be convinced to accept a future Siret River border.

---

[1] *Arh. VPRI, f*onds Posol'stvo v Konstantinopole, opus 517/1, d 55, f. 61 (P. Fonton to Italinsky, June 11, 1811).

[2] On Jarcutchi, Vladimir Mischevca, *Pacea de la Bucureşti (din istoria diplomatică a încheierii tratatului de pace ruso-turc de la 16/28 mai 1812),* [The Bucharest Peace - the Diplomatic History of the Russian-Ottoman Peace Treaty of 16/28 May 1812], Kishinew, 1993, p. 112-113.

[3] The complete list with the members of the Ottoman delegations was sent to the Russians by D. Moruzi, *Arh. VPRI,* fonds Kantseleariia, d 1982, f. 271.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0182

The peace negotiations were stopped. The military preparations Napoleon made foretold about Russia's invasion, in the beginning of the summer. Under the deadline, Kutuzov decided to bring more pressure over the Ottomans. But the Russian attacks lacked consistence.

In early 1812, Istanbul was the battlefield for the great powers' diplomats, who tried to determine the Ottoman Empire to engage on one of the conflicting sides — either the Napoleonic coalition or the anti-Napoleonic coalition. Russia's interest for the information provided by Moruzi soared. In fact, after the Bucharest stalemate, Piotr Fonton and the Grand Dragoman often met in secret. Their meetings were fixed depending on the importance of the information to be exchanged. One of those meetings was ordered by General Kutuzov. Demetrios Moruzi had already met Italinsky that day, giving him intelligence about the instructions the Turks received from Istanbul. Moruzi stressed that the Ottoman representatives were told exactly how to behave and what to say. After detailing a discussion with Galib Efendi, over the preliminaries of the peace accord, Moruzi told that "the Palace intrigues want to impose for Dragoman a French sympathiser" *(les intrigues tendent aussi à lui donner pour Drogman un individu qui tient au parti français)*. In his secret report of March 17, Fonton averted Kutuzov that "the person in question (D. Moruzi - Ar. G.) may fall to mischievous intrigues. He is accused to support the peace process only as long as it fits its personal purposes. They believe that he wants to sacrifice state interests hoping that his conduct will gain the benevolence of the Imperial House (of Russia - Ar. G.) when peace will be established. This is the advice that his brother (Panayotis Moruzi - Ar. G.) gave in his latest letters, when he also said that the accusations and innuendoes surrounding him were inspired by information coming from Bucharest". *(La personne en question est en but à toute la malveillance des intrigants. Ils l'accusent de n'encourager, de n'exhorter à la paix qu'en raison de ses intérêts particuliers, et de vouloir, à cet effet, sacrifier ceux de l'État dans l'espoir que sa conduite lui assurera la bienveillance et la voix de la Cour Impériale dans ses vues au moment de la pacification. C'est l'avis que lui a donné son frère par ses dernières lettres, en prévenant en même temps, que ces insinuations et ces accusations ont eu lieu d'après des information transmises de Bucarest).*[1]

[1] f. 135-140.

It is beyond doubt that the Grand Dragoman led secret connections with the members of the Russian negotiating team. As the delegation comprised his former Istanbul acquaintances, A. Italinsky or P. Fonton, Moruzi's defection was made easier. The relations which Moruzi had with them between 1803-1806, the aborted tentative to get French political support for his family, all these seem to show that the conduct adopted by Moruzi in 1811-1812 was not a simple choice. He simply could not adopt another one. His options were limited. In order to win again a reigning throne, in Bucharest or Iasi, he had only one card to play — the Russian card.

The perspective of the Napoleonic invasion, the fear that Russia could lose (with a weakening of Petersburg's voice in Istanbul) forced the Moruzi family to look for the protection which other great powers could provide. Panayotis and Alexander Moruzi contacted both the French chargé d'affaires, and the Austrian internuncio, the latter being more sympathetic to their cause, says Latour-Maubourg.[1]

While the two Moruzi brothers were trying to capture French sympathies in Istanbul, the other one, Demetrios, was fighting along in Bucharest, offering information in exchange for Russia's goodwill. He offered an insight into the workings of the French diplomats around the Sublime Porte, for which the Russians had a huge interest. Fonton's reports reveal that Russia was, in fact, more interested in what the French diplomats were doing in Istanbul than in the results of the last meetings of the peace negotiations in Bucharest.

Even after the peace treaty was signed, on May 28th 1812, Demetrius Moruzi, was still in Wallachia's capital, altogether with the Turkish delegation, and kept on giving information to the Russians. In one of the letters sent to the Tsar by the new commander of the Danube army, Admiral P. V. Tchitchiagoff he writes about several news Moruzi passed on during a private meeting. Tchitchiagoff noted in that letter of June 8th, 1812, that "the Prince Morouzi ... is so deeply attached to us that he runs the risk of losing his head". (Le P<rince> Morouzi ... nous est attaché autant qu'il est possible de l'être au risque de perdre la tête).[2] The disclosure prompted Tsar Alexander I to make a crayon note on the letter: "do not mention Moruzi" (ne point faire

[1] *Hurmuzaki Collection*, I, II, p. 721.
[2] *Art VPRI*, fond Kontsebaric d. 1991, f. 25.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0184

mention du Mourousi).[1] The Russian Emperor knew much too well who Demetrios Moruzi was, and knew, via the secret reports, about the services he had done to Russia. The Tsar was right — it was completely inappropriate for his name to appear in clear in an uncoded letter (even it had a secret status), as the source for some of the information Tchitchiagoff sent home. But on the 28th of June the Russian admiral sent a new letter, mentioning again Moruzi's name in connection to some information concerning the Grand Vizier, the source being the same Moruzi.[2]

Was Demetrios Moruzi a traitor in 1812? Yes, because he betrayed the Sublime Porte whose Grand Dragoman he was. He gave information to the Russians using P. Fonton, the translator of the Russian negotiating team. The Russians knew what were the instructions received by the Turks, what was the attitude of the Sultan and of the ruling circles in regard to Petersburg's territorial claims. Therefore they could build a more flexible negotiating strategy and modify their demands depending on the circumstances.

The documents reveal that Moruzi on one side, Italinsky and Fonton on the other, considered their relation a secret one, while the Grand Dragoman was not regarded as a casual source, who unwittingly dropped valuable information from time to time. A thorough research in other archives may bring out certain surprises — it is possible that Moruzi gave information not only to the Russians, but to other embassies too, regarding the inner workings of Istanbul.

Moruzi was not an innocent. His betrayal was not born out of ingenuity or some deep beliefs. He followed his own interest in cold blood. He went to great lengths to get Russia's sympathy, in an era when the ruling positions in the Principalities depended equally on the Tsar and the Sultan. Moruzi was devoted to that one who could provide him the best protection inside the Ottoman high circles, who defended him from the intrigues and fabrications of the other Phanariot families and from the pressures of other embassies in Istanbul. His attraction to Russia was mainly motivated by that country's influence over both the Sublime Porte and the Romanian Principalities. Demetrios Moruzi was not a philo-Russian as Constantine Ypsilanti.

---

[1] f.24.
[2] f. 25.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0185

At the same time, one could say that Moruzi did not betray his family, hoping to acquire Wallachia's throne, with Russian help, after peace was settled. Moruzi did not betray his religion and nation, even if it seems he did not have the same strong feeling Ypsilanti had.[1]

The Moruzi brothers did betray, but how much influence did this act have over the negotiations in Bucharest?

Impossible to give a clear-cut answer.

The position of Grand Dragoman, even if not of secondary importance, was not decisive in matters of making peace or not. The chief negotiator was Galib Efendi, not Moruzi. And then, his decisions had to be sanctioned by the Grand Vizier in Shumla and finally by the Sultan. The peace treaty provisions were not negotiated by Moruzi alone. He was mainly the translator of the Ottoman delegation of which he was a member. At the time the dragomans were kept in suspicion. Even those in the Russian camp. Tsar Alexander I felt it was necessary to mention in a letter that he sent to Tchitchiagoff that the Fontons had to be kept under scrutiny: "Don't forget what I told you about the Fontons: guard yourself! They are sold to the Turks". (N'oubliez pas ce que je vous ai dit des Fonton; défiez-vous en. Ils sont vendus aux Turcs).[2]

On the other side, the Moruzi brothers were instrumental in blocking the French diplomatic efforts at the Porte. Latour-Maubourg has tried to convince Panayotis Moruzi (as his brother Demetrios once confessed to Fonton in one of their secret meetings) that he should use his influence in Istanbul "in order to determine the Ottoman government to sign a secret document with a single clause: that it will not make a separate peace with Russia, in other words keeping indefinitely the state of war with that power". (... pour déterminer la Porte à consentir à la signature d'un acte secret, par lequel elle s'engagerait à une seule et unique clause, celle de ne point faire une paix séparée avec la Russie, dès lors à se maintenir en état de guerre avec cette puissance). In exchange, the French chargé d'affaires promised to obtain "an

[1] An interesting commentary Ypsilanti made in regard to the relation between religion and civilization can be read in a secret report that he addressed to the Petersburg Chancellery, see V. Boghisici, p. 53.

[2] M. I. Bogdanovitch "Pis'mo imperatora Aleksandra I k admiralu Tchitchiagoff" in *Sbornik Russkogo Istoriceskogo Obshcestva*, VI, S. Petersburg, 1871, p. 73. About "Fontons' betrayal" in Boris Mouravieff, *L'alliance russo-turque au milieu des guerres napoléoniennes*, foreword by Carl J. Burckhardt, Neuchâtel, 1954.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0186

active benevolence" (une bienveillance active) for the Moruzi family.[1] In fact, France has tried to make the Ottoman Empire join the Napoleonic coalition, using exactly the Moruzi brothers, those who sold to the Russians information about the Austrian and French diplomatic dealings in Istanbul. The Moruzis were not the main obstacle to stop Turkey from joining the 1812 anti-Russian coalition. The Ottoman government was suspicious in respect to Napoleon's promises. In 1807 the Sublime Porte had found itself abandoned by Napoleon, even if it declared war to Russia, in the fall of 1806, under French pressure. That experience was too close to be forgotten by the military elite in Istanbul. At the same time, the empire was too weak to sustain another military effort. And finally, one must not forget the diplomatic influence applied by the British government during the summer of 1812.

In August 1812, Demetrios Moruzi was replaced from his position of Grand Dragoman. At the end of the month, Moruzi and Galib Efendi were ordered to go to Shumla in the Grand Vizier's camp. While in Bucharest, Moruzi watched with passion and anxiety the French armies advance towards Moscow. He arrived in Shumla at the beginning of November. On the 8th of November he received from the Grand Vizier himself a kaftan, as a gift for his part in closing the peace agreement with Russia. Minutes later he was dragged outside from the tent and beheaded. A few days later, on November 20th, Panayotis Moruzi was executed in Istanbul. The Sultan came to assist in person to the spectacle of his torture. A banner was hanged over his corpse, reading: "Because he knew the political affairs of his government and he joined with his father in order to sell them to the enemies of the state, the traitor has paid for his crimes with his head".[2]

Getting rid of the Moruzi brothers, the Sublime Porte gave satisfaction to France, whose insistent alliance advances it had refused.

Both before and after the executions of his brothers, Alexander Moruzi kept secret connections with the members of the Russian embassy in Istanbul, offering, of course, information. But the death of the two brothers had some echoes in the diplomatic circles in Istanbul. At the beginning of December 1812, Italinsky wrote to Chancellor Roumiantseff that the Moruzi killings "forced some people to keep distance from us and to suspend certain interesting relations, for fear of being exposed". (... quelques individus à se tenir éloignés de nous, à suspendre des relations intéressantes pour ne pas s'exposer".[3]

(Translated by Jan Goanta)

[1] *Arh. VPRI,* fond Kantselеariia, d 1991, f.36-37.
[2] *Hurmuzaki Collection,* supplement I, tome II, f.700.
[3] *Arh. VPRI,* fond Kantselеariia, file 2282, f.191.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0187

MÖSYÖ YUAN GİKA'NIN SİSAM BEYLİĞİ DÖNEMİ VESİKALARI

Ali Fuat ÖRENÇ

Sisam Adası, Ege Denizi'nde Anadolu kıyılarına oldukça yakın bir mesafede yer almaktadır (1464 metre). Ada Türk idaresine II. Mehmet'in (Fatih) İstanbul'u alışı akabinde girmişti (1453). Yaklaşık bir asır sonra Kılıç Ali Paşa, ahalisi tamamen göç eden adayı iskana almıştır (1550). Sisam bu tarihten itibaren Ali Paşa'nın Tophâne'deki camii vakfına tahsîs edilmiştir.

1821 Rum isyânı sonrasında bağımsız bir Yunan Devleti oluşturulurken, isyân müddetince Ege Denizi'nde gerçekleştirdikleri korsan eylemleri ile şöhret bulan Sisam Adası'na yeni bir statünün verilmesi gündeme gelmiştir. Nitekim, Avrupa kamuoyunun, hükümetleri kanalıyla Babıali'ye yaptığı baskılar neticesi adaya iç işlerinde kısmen serbestlik tanıyan bir imtiyâz fermânı bahşedilmiştir.

10 Aralık 1832 tarihini taşıyan ve sekiz maddeden oluşan fermana göre; Sisam Adası'nın dâhili yönetimi, seçimle işbaşına gelecek bir meclise ait olacak ve idarî teşkilât yine bu meclis tarafından oluşturulacaktı. Bu meclisin başkanlığı ise Osmanlı Hükümeti tarafından Rum-Ortodoks mezhebine mensup olmak üzere, Sisam Beyi nâmıyla tayin edilecek reise ait olacaktı. Bey, mezhepdaşı olmak şartıyla, yerine bir vekil (Kaymakam) tayin etme hakkına sahip olacaktı.

Muhtariyet esaslarının belirlenmesi ardından adaya ilk yönetici olarak Divan-ı Hümâyûn tercümanlarından ve devletin güvenini hâiz bir zat olan Stefan Vogoridis atanmıştır.

İsyan süresince olduğu gibi, Yunan taraftarı kimselerin propagandalarına alet olan Sisamlılar, İngiltere, Fransa ve Rusya'nın öncülüğünde kendilerine verilen ayrıcalıklara rağmen, isyan etme huyundan vazgeçmeyerek devletin başını ağrıtmaya devam etmişlerdir. Osmanlı Hükümeti, bu sorunu çoğu zaman nasihat yoluyla, ancak çok gerektiğinde ise üç büyük devletin bilgisi dahilinde asker kullanmak suretiyle, asayişi sağlamaya çalışmıştır.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0189

Uzun müddet adada görev yapan Stefan Vogoridis, Yunan sempatizanlarının şiddetli muhalefeti sonucu yıpranmış; onun yerine atanan Aleksandr Kalimaki döneminde ise bu şahısların idaredeki etkinlikleri devletin tahammülünü aşacak derecede artmıştır. Adadaki huzur ortamının bozulması üzerine, yeni bir Bey tayini gündeme gelmiştir.

Sisam'da gerginliği tırmandıran son olaylar Osmanlı Hükümetini idareye teb'a-i Rumdan mu'teber bir şahsın seçiminde bir hayli zorlamıştır. İlk akla gelen şahıslardan Musurus ailesine mensup Yanko ve Pavlaki Beyler'in Stefan Bey ile olan akrabalıklarının ahalide tepki uyandırmasından çekinilmiş ve öncelikle ahalinin memnuniyeti gözetildiğinden, bu fikirden vazgeçilmiştir. Arayışlarını sürdüren hükümet, başka önemli bir vazife için merkezde beklettiği Boğdan boyarlarından Yuan Gika'yı Sisam'a yönetici tayin etmeyi uygun bulmuştur. Esasında Babıali, 1853 Kırım Harbi dolayısıyla savaş hali devam eden Rusya'ya muhalif ve hasım olup, dirayet ve sadakati herkezce bilinen Mösyö Gika'yı, ordunun Eflak-Boğdan taraflarına yapacağı muhtemel bir harekatında bazı mühim hizmetlerde kendisinden yararlanılmak düşüncesiyle Istanbul'da bekletmekte idi. Ancak Sisam'daki gelişmeler üzerine Gika Bey'in önce bir iki ay müddetle adaya gidip, gerekli idari tedbirleri almak suretiyle tam olarak asayişi sağladıktan sonra, eğer Eflak-Boğdan cihetinde vazifelendirilmesi gerekir ise geri çağırılması daha münasip görülmüştü.

Nihayet Mösyö Gika, 18 Mart 1854 tarihli irade ile önce Kaymakam, ardından 10 Şubat 1856 tarihli emir ile de Sisam Beyi olarak atanmıştır.

Mösyö Gika'ya görev mahalline gitmeden önce dikkat edeceği hususları içeren bir talimatname verilmiştir. Bu talimatda ana hatlarıyla; Yunan fesatçılarının son günlerde Sisam Adasına asker ve mühimmat yüklü gemi göndermek suretiyle ahaliye tahrik ve isyana teşvik niyetinde bulunduklarının haber alındığı, bir çok imtiyaza ve inayete sahip olan Sisamlıların böyle kışkırtıcılar tarafından ortaya atılacak vaadlere aldanmayıp, her durumda devletin yanında yer alacakları ve bu fesatçılar tarafından bir durum vukuunda sadakatlerini ortaya koyacakları ümit edilmekte ise de, adanın asayişinin devlet açısından önemi vurgulanarak, kendisinin sadakati ve dirayeti bilinen bir zat olduğundan, adanın ahvâlini ıslaha gayret göstereceğinden hiç şüphe edilmediği belirtilmiştir. Ayrıca son olaylar sebebiyle adaya askeri mükemmel bir geminin de yollandığı, görev yerine vardıktan sonra kendisinden ilk iş olarak Yunan fesatçıları tarafından ortaya konulacak kötülükleri ortadan kaldırarak, huzuru temin etmesinin beklendiği ifade edilmiştir.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0190

Emrine tahsis edilen *Cenâh-ı bahri* adlı gemi ile 9 Nisan 1854 tarihinde İstanbul'dan ayrılan Mösyö Gika, 14 Nisan'da Sisam'ın Vati Limanı'na ulaşarak, elindeki talimat uyarınca resmen görevine başlamıştır.

Vazifesine başlayan Gika Bey önce 30 Nisan'da Sisam Emareti'nin merkezi olan Vati'de Osmanlı askeri, adada görevli konsoloslar ve ada ileri gelenlerinin hazır bulunduğu halde, atandığına dâir Divan-ı Hümâyûn'dan yazılan beratı okumuş, ardından Osmanlı sınırları içerisinde bulunan Yunanlar ve Yunan gemilerinin on beş gün içerisinde vatanlarına dönmeleri hususunu ilan etmiştir. Tören sırasında ahaliye çeşitli nasihatlerde bulunan Gika Bey adına *Tevfik-i hüda* vapurundan yirmi bir pare top atışı da yapılmıştır. Ardından kendisine tahsis edilen konağa geçen Gika, tebrikleri kabul etmiştir.

Mösyö Gika'nın Sisam'a tayini ilk etapta Osmanlı Hükümeti açısından ümit ettiği sonucu vermemiştir. Nitekim, Gika'dan önceki yöneticinin toleransı sayesinde adadaki önemli idari mevkileri ellerine geçirmiş bulunan Yunan sempatizanları daha Gika Bey adaya ayak basmadan çeşitli entrikalara başlamışlardı. İlk hadise Mösyö Gika ile beraber İstanbul Patrikhanesi tarafından adaya tayin edilen piskoposun ahalice istenmediği bahanesiyle patlak vermiştir. İçlerinde Sisamlı papazların da bulunduğu bir çok kimse piskoposun adaya çıkışını engelleme girişiminde bulunmuşlardır. Meselenin daha fazla büyümesini istemeyen Babıali, Patrikhane nezdinde girişimde bulunmuştur. Bu arada Gika Bey'e emir yazılarak piskoposu ada merkezine çıkartmayarak, kenar bir mahalde bir müddet bekletmesi teklifi kabul edilmiştir.

Aldığı emir gereği ve son gelişmeler üzerine adada ıslahâtlara başlayan Gika Bey, Yunan sempatizanlarının engellemeleriyle karşılaşınca, durumu derhal hükümete bildirmiş ve acilen emrine takviye asker ve gemi talebinde bulunmuştur.

Bu dönemde merkeze gönderdiği yazılarda Gika Bey, Sisam ile ilgili oldukça önemli bilgilere yer verdiği görülmektedir: Gika, adada büyük bir kuraklığın yaşandığını, bu yüzden halkın ihtiyaç içinde bulunduğunu, her ne kadar Istanbul'dan buğday ile adada çok tüketilen arpa gelmiş ve dağıtılmış ise de fakirliğin her geçen gün arttığını, hatta, bu sebepten cinayetlerin dahi işlenmekte olduğunu bildirmiştir. Halkın bu zor durumunun Yunan fesatçılarının işini kolaylaştırıp propagandalarını etkili kıldığını, bu etkiden ahalinin her an silaha sarılmaya hazır vaziyette bulunduğunu bildiren Mösyö Gika, Sisam'da nizâmın oturtulması için öncelikle mühim mevkileri işgal

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0191

eden Yunan sempatizanlarının adadan uzaklaştırılması için yapacağı girişimlerde kendisine yetki ve destek verilmesinin önemini ısrarla vurgulamıştır.

Merkezde konu görüşülerek, Gika'nın talebi yerinde bulunmuştur. Durum Kaptan-ı Derya ile Serasker Paşa'ya havale edilmiş, vaziyet bir de Meclis-i Vâlâ'da müzakere edilmiştir. Gemi ve asker sevki yanında Meclis'in Gika'ya adada yapacağı mülki ve idari yenilikleri önlemeye çalışan fesatçıları bir daha geri dönmemek üzere Kütahya'ya sürülebilmesi hususunda yetki verilmesi teklifi Padişahın 1 Ocak 1855 tarihli emriyle, yürürlük kazanmıştır.

Diğer taraftan ada etrafında karakol vazifesi yapacak geminin tesbiti, Kaptan Paşa tarafından Bahriye Meclisi'ne havale edilmiştir. Mecliste yapılan görüşmede şu sıralarda Tersane-i Amire'de Sisam için elverişli gemi bulunmadığından, Cezayir-i bahr-ı sefid Vâlisi emrinde bulunan vapurun geçici olarak kullanılması tavsiye edilmiştir. Ayrıca Serasker Paşa'ya havale edilen asker sevki hususu da Darü'ş-şura-yı Askerî'de müzakere edilerek, adaya muvazzaf asker nakli uygun bulunmuştur.

Osmanlı Hükümetinin kesin desteğini arkasına alan Yuan Gika, gerçekleştirdiği icraatlarıyla adada arzu edilen huzur ortamını kısa sürede temin etmiştir.

Sisam'da aldığı neticeler devlet tarafından memnuniyetle karşılanan Mösyö Gika'nın rütbesi Kaymakamlıktan Beyliğe tahvil edilerek, kaymakamlara mahsus olan 7.500 kuruş maaşı Sisam Beylerine verilen 12.500 kuruşa çıkarılmıştır. Gika'nın dâimi surette adada ikamet etmesine dair Padişahın emri ilan edilmiştir (10 Şubat 1856).

Sisam Adası'nda başarılı bir yöneticilik gösteren Gika Bey, Kırım Harbinî bitiren Paris Andlaşması (30 Mart 1856) ile Eflak-Boğdan'a verilen yeni nizam uyarınca, burada vazife alacağından, Sisam Emâreti Beyliği'nden istifa etmiştir. İstifası 1 Nisan 1859 tarihli Padişah iradesi ile kabul edilmiştir.

Mösyö Gika'dan boşalan Sisam Beyliği'ne Eflak Kapukethüdalığı hizmetini yürütmekte olan Miltiyadi Aristarki atanmıştır.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0192

EK I

BOA, MD, Nr. 258, h.1008, s.218.

Uhde-i dirayetine Sisam cezîresi Beğ Ka'immekamlığı ihale ve tevcih kılınan Gika zidet rutbetühûya hüküm,

Sen ki mûmâ-ileyhsin sen erbâb-ı dirâyet ve sadâkatden olarak şimdiye kadar bulunduğun hidemât-ı Devlet-i aliyyemde ibrâz-ı sıdk ü istikamet etmiş olman hasebiyle bu def'a müte'allik ve şeref-südûr olan emr ü irâde-i mekarim-ade-i şehr-yârânem mûcebince Sisam cezîresi Beğ Ka'immekamlığı uhdene ihâle ve tevfiz kılınmış olmağla me'muriyetini mütezammın Divan-ı hümâyûnumdan iş bu emr-i celilü'l-kadrim ısdâr olundu sen dahi muktezâ-yı me'muriyet ve dirayetin üzre cezîre-i mezkure ahâlisinin matlûb-ı mu'adelet-mashub-ı mülukanem vechile vekaye-i âsâyiş ve istirâhât ve istidame-i huzur ve emniyetleri esbab ve vesa'ilin istihsal ve istikmâline mezid-i ihtimam ve sarf-ı makderetle hakkında der-kar olan hüsn ü zan ve i'timad-ı mülûkanemin bir kat daha tezyîd ü te'yidiyle nisâr-ı nakdine-i vas' ü kudret eyleyesin. Fi Evâhır-ı C sene 270.

Mail yazı:

Mûmâ-ileyhin Sisam ceziresi Beği ta'yin kılındığını mübeyyin emr-i âli yazılmıştır. Fi Evahır-ı C. sene 72.

EK II

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 75, Lef 1.

Sisam Ceziresine Emaret Ka'immekâmı nasb olunan Mösyö Gika'ya verilecek ta'limat müsveddesidir.

Yunanistan fesedesinin bu günlerde Sisam cezîresine asker ve mühimmat-ı harbiye mahmul sefâyin irsaliyle ahali-i meskuneyi tahrîk ve ifsâd eylemek da'iyelerinde bulundukları istihbar olunmuş olub zîr-i cenah-ı müstelzimü'l-felâh-ı hazret-i şehen-şâhide müstezil ve bunca iltâf ü inâyât-ı mülûkaneye na'il olan Sisam ahâlisinin öyle fesede makulesi tarafından ilka olunacak va'ad ve va'ide aldanmayup her halde hak-ı veli'-ni'metiy gözedecekleri ve ağyar tarafından iğva vuku'ında sadakat ve dirayetleri semerelerini meydana koyacakları me'mul ise de saye-i kudret-vâye-i cenâb-ı

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0193

cihân-bânide cezîre-i mezbûrenin hıfz-ı âsâyîş ve zâbıtası levazım-ı umûr-ı mülkiyeden ve mûmâ-ileyh sıfat ve dirâyet ve sadakatle muttasıf bendegandan olduğundan ümniyenin husûlü zımmında emâret ka'immekamlığı uhde-i dirâyetine ihâle ve geçende Yunanlıların ihsâs olunan niyât-ı fâsideleri üzerine cezîre-i mezkûreye Donanmâ-yı Hümâyûndan neferatı mükemmel bir sefine-i münâsibe dahi ta'yin kılınmış olmağla mûmâ-ileyh mazbût olan sıdk ü istikameti ve müsellem bulunan gayret ve fetâneti icâbından olduğu vechile mahal-i me'muriyetine vusûlünde evvel bâ-evvel Yunan fesedesi tarafından ika'ına çalışılacak olan şerr ü mazırratın mahallince men'-i tefsiratı esbâb-ı âcilesinin istihsâliyle beraber gerek âti'z-zikr mevâd hakkında ve gerek min külli'l-vücûh cezîre-i mezbûre ahvâlinin ıslâhât-ı muktaziyyesine sarf-ı nakdine-i hayr-hâhi ve gayretle bu yüzden dahi Saltanat-ı Seniyyenin kendisine olan hüsn-i i'timad-ı alisini bir kat daha tezyîde bezl-i sa'y-i evka[t] eyleyecekdir.

Cezîre-i mezbûre ahâlisi bu sene zâhireden dolayı hayli müzâyakaya giriftâr olması ve ilerüde kaht ve ğalâ vuku'ı melhuz olup bir yandan da ecânib tarafından ahâlinin ifsâdına çabalanmakda bulunmuş olduğu beyânıyla icrâ-yı iktizası ka'immekam-ı sâbık tarafından inha kılınmış ve husûsât-ı âtiye ve sa'ire ile bu maddeyi bi't-tahkîk sıhhati takdirinde me'mul olan kaht u ğalânın esbâb-ı indifa'iyesi ve bundan dolayı ahalinin def'-i müzâyakalarıyla asâyiş-i hallerinin ifadesi ne makule tedâbire muhtac olduğunu anlayarak Bâb-ı âlîye bildirmesi zımmında geçende Fethullah Efendi'ye me'muriyet-i mahsûsa verilüp oraya gönderilmiş olduğundan ka'immekam-ı muma-ileyh dahi bu maddeye sarf-ı efkar ve reviyyet birle hakikat-i hal ve tedâbir-i lâzımesinin işfarına mübaderet edecektir.

Mukaddemce Sisam'da zuhûr etmiş olan ihitilâl maddesinde medhalleri olan hırsız ve kalpazan ve edebsiz makulesinden bulunan Sisamlı ve Yunanlıları ka'immekam-ı sâbık kendüye tarafdar ittihâzıyla meclis a'zalığında ve sâ'ir me'muriyetlerde istihdam etmekde ve bir takım na-ehl adamlara dahi i'tibar eyleyerek mesarif-i mukarrereden hariç bî-lüzum ma'aş tahsisiyle umûr-ı memleketde kullanmakda ve bu vasıta ile ahaliye cevr ü ta'addi eylemekde olduğu ba'zı tarafdan rivâyet ve istihbâr olunmuş ve ta'rife hâcet olmadığı vechile memâlik-i mahrûsa-i şâhânede mahal be-mahal mecalis tahsisinden murâd ancak her bir madde tetabü'-i ârâ ve tevâli-i efkâr ile sâdıkane ve hayr-hâhâne düşünülüp sûret-i müstasvebede karar bulmak ve bu vesa'il ile memâlik-i mahrûsa-i şâhâne sekenesinin istihsâl-i sa'adet-i hâli ve irâha-i umûm-ı tebe'a ve ahâli maksad-ı aksasına varılmak kazayâ-yı nâfi'asından ibâret olup bu dahî her bir yerde ilerü gelen mu'teberânın ve hak-ı şükr-i

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0194

ni‘meti bilür nik ü bedi fark eder garazsız kesanın a‘zalığa intihabıyla ve sair me‘muriyetler dahi ehl ve erbâb olanlara taklidiyle hâsıl olacağı derkar olduğundan ka'immekam-ı mûmâ-ileyh bu fukarâya dahî ihâle-i çeşm-i tedkik ve ahvâl-ı lâzımeyi kema hiye hakkuhâ tahkîk ederek a‘zada öyle nâ-ehil ve uygunsuzluk ve dena'ete ma'il kimseler var ise îcâbına bakılmak üzre anlar kimlerdir ve uygunsuzlukları nedir bi'l-etraf Bâb-ı âliye bildirüp küçük me'murlarda dahi uygunsuz adamlar olduğu ve ihdas olunmuş bî-lüzûm ma‘aş ve mesarif bulunduğu halde der-akib meclisce icrâ-yı iktizasıyla keyfiyatının bu tarafa iş‘arına müsârefat eyleyecekdir.

Cezire-i mezbure mal vergisü yerlü yerinden tahsil olunmuşiken hazîne-i celileye teslim olunmadığından gayri cezirenin Mal Sandığı tahammülünden ziyâde medyûn olduğu dahi rivâyet olunmuş idüğünden fi'l-vâki‘ Mal Sandığı medyûn ise deyni kimleredir ve istidâne olunmuş olan mebaliğ nereye sarf olunmuşdur bu dahi etraflıca istiknah olunarak bildirilecektir.

Hasılı ka'immekam-ı mâmâ-ileyh iktizâ-yı fetâneti üzre her hâlde rizâ-yı cûyâne ve reviyyetmendâne hareketle şimdiye kadar hissedar olmuş olduğu me‘âlî-i teveccühât-ı mülûkanenin bir kat daha tevfîrine sa‘y ve verziş eyleyeceği âşikar bulunduğundan me‘mûriyetinin iktiza-yı tabi‘iyesinden olan mehâm-ı mülkiye ve umûr-ı âdiyenin ne sûretle hüsn-i idâresine bakması ve matlûb ve mültezim-i âlî-i cenâb-ı cihândâri bulunan celb-i kulûb-ı âhâli ve fukarâya ne dürlü çabalayup çalışması lazım geleceği yedine verilen me‘muriyet emr-i âlîsinde münderic olduğundan anlara dâ'îr ahir vesayâya hâcet görünmeyüb ancak bend-i evvelde beyân olunduğu vechile Yunanlu tarafından vuku‘ı melhûz olan ifsadâtın men‘-i te'siratının esbab-ı seri‘asını bi'l-istihsal ıslâhât-ı lâzımeyi teh'iye etmek akdem veza'if-i me'muriyet olduğundan bu bâbda gerek hâricden vuku‘a gelmesi melhuz olan ilka‘at ve serrişte-i ifsadâtın sâhil-i cezîreye erişememesi gerek ahâli-i cezîre sebük-mağzanından efkarı değişmiş veyahud sû-yı hilâfa meyle müstefidd bulunmuş kesan var ise anların ta‘dil-i efkar ve ezhânıyla Saltanat-ı Seniyyenin böyle bir vakitte görülmemiş ve mustahikkini hakkında gün be gün terakkide bulunmuş olan rahm ü şefkatini sûreta ve ma‘na kendilerine bi'l-ifham intibâhları semeresinin meydana çıkarılması husûsuna derece-i ğâyede ikdam ve diğer bendlerde muharrer mevâd içün dahi alâ-ma‘yelîk nasb-ı nefsi ihtimâm eyleyerek iktizâ-yı halin Bâb-ı âlîye iş‘arına dikkat eyleyecektir.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0195

EK III

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 75, Lef 2.

Atûfetlü efendim hazretleri,

Bu def'a muktezâ-yı irâde-i seniyye-i hazret-i Pâdişâh^ı üzre Sisam ceziresi ka'immekamı ta'yîn kılınan Gika'ya verilecek ta'limat kaleme aldırılarak manzûr-ı âli buyurulmak içün arz ve takdîm kılınmış olmağla medlûl ve ifâdesi hakkında her ne vechile emr ü irâde-i seniyye-i cenâb-ı cihân-bân^ı müte'allik ve şeref-sünûh ve südûr buyurulur ise âna göre harekete mübâderet olunacağı beyânıyla tezkîre-i senâviri terkim kılındı efendim. Fi 27 C. sene 70.

Ma'ruz-ı çâker-i kemîneleridir ki,

Enmile-zîb-i ta'zim olan iş bu tezkire-i sâmiye-i âsâfâneleriyle zikr olunan ta'limat meşmul-nigah-ı şevket-iktina-ı hazret-i Pâdişâhi buyurulmuş ve mezkur ta'limatın medlûl ve ifâdesi yolunda görünmüş olmasıyla icrâ-yı iktizâsı müte'allik ve şeref-südur buyurulan irade-i seniyye-i cenâb-ı cihân-bâni iktiza-yı âlîsinden olarak marrü'z-zikr ta'limat yine taraf-ı sâmî-i âsâfilerine ifâde ve tesyid kılınmış olmağla ol-bâbda emr ü fermân hazret-i veliyü'l-emrindir. Fi 28 C. sene 70.

EK IV

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 79, Lef 1.

Makâm-ı vâlâ-yı Nezâret-i Hâriciyeye bin sekiz yüz elli dört senesi Mayısının biri tarihiyle müverrahan Sisam Ceziresi Ka'immekamı Mösyö Gika tarafından takdim olunan arîzanın tercemesidir.

Sisam ceziresi ka'immekamlığına me'muriyet-i bendeganeme da'ir olan emr-i âlî şehr-i Nisanın otuzuncu Pazar günü Vati nâm mahalde asâkir-i hazret-i şâhâne ve konsoloslar ve cezire-i mezkurenin nevâhi-i muhtelifesi meb'usları hazır olduğu halde kemâl-i ta'zim ve tevkir ile alenen kıra'at olunmuş ve bunun hitamında tercemesi leffen takdîm-i hâkipâ-yı âlî-i nezâret-penâhîleri kılanan nutk-ı resmî ahâliye hitaben serd ü ityan kılınmışdır. Her bir mahalde vukufı umur-ı tabi'iyeden olan ba'zı cerâim ve kabâyıhdan başka buralarda âsâyiş-i umûmîyi ihlâl ider hiçbir şey vuku' bulmamaktadır. On beş günden berü gerek buğday ve gerek fiyatı muftedil olduğu cihetle buralarda

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0196

ziyade sarf ve istihlâk olunmakda olan arpa hamûlesiyle mikdâr-ı vafi sefayin vârid olmuş ise de fakr ü zarûret gün be gün tekessür etmekde bulunduğu misillü bunun Sisam ahâlisinin Anadolu semtinde iş bulacakları mevsime ya'ni şehr-i Mayıs ahırine kadar tezâyüd edeceği ve mahsûlât şimdiki halde pek eyi olup eğer mevsim vakt-i hasada kadar müsa'id olur ise bu sene de feyz ü bereketin husûle geleceği âşikardır. Burada pek çok müşkilât mevcut olup bunlardan evvel be-evvel tanzîmine eşedd-i lüzum olduğuna dâir vakt-i âli-i nezâret-penâhilerini celb ve da'ved etmiş olduğum Zabtiye askerinin beyân-ı ahvâlini sa'irlerine takdim eyledim. Şöyleki, âsâkir-i merkumenin tanzimine bed'en ve mübâşeret etmek içün evvel-emirde bunlara edibâne bir tarz üzre münâbip elbise ve me'mur oldukları hidemâta muvâfık esliha tahsîs olunmak ve bundan başka merkumları usûlüne tevfîkan idâre etmek üzre Sisam ahâlisinden olmayarak bir nefer müste'idd zâbit ta'yin kılınmak elzem olup çünki Sisam cezîresi zabtiye askerinin memlekete emniyet bahş olması şöyle dursun şu haliyle bir gâ'ile ve muhataradan ibaret olmağla iş bu uygunsuzluğun indifâ'ı zımmında âsâkir-i merkume içün tensîb buyurulacağı vechile esliha-i lâzıme ile bir nefer müste'idd zâbitin bu tarafa irsaline himem ü müsâ'ade-i seniyye-i cenâb-ı nezâret-penâhilerinin şâyân buyurulmasını tazarruf ve niyâz iderim. Bir de Dersa'adet'de bulunan Sisam kançilaryasının beher sene kırk üç bin guruş mesarifi olup buna mukabil âaridatı beş bin guruşu tecavüz etmediğini mu'ahharen cezîre-i mezbûre meclisi taraf-ı bendegâneme beyân ve ihtâr etmiş ve meclis-i mezbûr bir taraftan iş bu mesârifin Sisam Emaretinin ihtiyacât-ı vâkı'a ve medâr-ı isti'ânetine kıyâsen bir şey dimek olmadığını beyân ile diğer taraftan dahi Sisam Kançilaryasının Dersa'adet'de ahz etmekte olduğu rüsumâtın otuz bin guruşu tecavüz ettiği iddiâa eylemekde olmağla buna dahi bir çare bulunmak ve bu bâbda husûle gelecek iştibahı def' ü izale etmek içün zikr olunan kançilarya mesâlihini rü'yet ve tesviye etmek üzre Sisamlı olarak bir müdîrin irsâlini tasmîm eylediğinden ve meclis-i mezbur muhâsebât-ı lâzımeyi usâlünde tutmağa muktedir ve zaten mütekayyid olmak üzre Siyor Kaçolidi nam kimsenin bu hidmete ta'yinini münâsip görmüş olduğundan merkum Kaçolidi Remosten Jeroyani'nin yerine kançilarya müdîri olarak şu günlerde bu tarafdan hareket etmek üzre bulunmuş ve bundan ma'da umûr-ı mâliye-i emâretin evvelki gibi kendisine ma'aş i'tasına adem-i müsa'adesi cihetiyle iş bu şehr-i Mayıs-ı Rûminin ibtidâsından i'tibaren ma'aşının tenzîl olunacağı Mösyö Petropolo'ya dahi taraf-ı bendeganemden bildirilüp merkum Kaçolidi'nin mâhiyesi dahi selefinin ma'aşından pek dûn olarak tahsis kılınmıştır. Bendenize kalur ise kapukehyalığı içün Dersa'âdet'de olunan mesârif bütün bütün bî-lüzûm ve zâ'id gibi olduğundan bunun bir hüsn-i sûrete ifrağı lazım gelmiş ise de evel-emrde ruhsat ve müsa'ade-i seniyye-i daverânelerini istihsâl etmedikçe bu bâbda

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0197

hiçbir şey yapamıyacağım âşikârdır. Kaldıki ba'zı ihbârata nazaran civârda bulunan cezâyir-i sağîre de bir takım hırsız kayıkları zuhûr edüp bu cihetle iş bu sevahilde bir kıt'a küçük vapur sefinesinin bulunması lazım geldiği misillü Sisam cezîresine asker sevk olunmak üzre Yunanistanda hazırlanmakta olduklarına dâ'ir sahîh veya gayr-i sahîh ahz eylediğim havâdise göre vapur-ı mezbûrun vücûduna eşedd-i lüzûm görünmüş ve zâhir-i hâle nazaran burada Sisamlılardan ba'zılarıyla Yunanlılar beyninde öteden berü yoluna konmuş bir muvâfakat mevcûd olup her ne kadar ahalinin cümlesi bu efkârda değil ise de ekseriyâ bir âded-i kalîlin umûm ahâliyi tahrîk eylemeğe ve belki âsâyişi ihlâl etmeğe kâfi olabileceği ve ahâlinin zarûreti keyfiyeti dahi bu uygunsuzlukların tezâyüdüne medar olacağı derkar bulunduğuna mebni bu günki gün öyle bir küçük vapurun burada bulunması iş bu melhuzatın önünü alabileceği hüdânekerde iş bu fenâlıkların vukû'ı halinde ise bir takım tedâbir ve vesâ'il-i müte'ellime ve mükeddireye müraca'at olunmak icâb edeceği emr-i âşikârdır.

EK V

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 79, Lef 2.

Makam-ı Nezâret-i Celîle-i Hâriciyeye bin sekiz yüz elli dört senesi Nisanı'nın yirmi tarihiyle muvahharen Sisam Kaimmekamı Mösyö Gika Beğ tarafından takdîm kılanan arîzanın tercemesidir.

Bin sekizyüz elli dört senesi Nisanının dokuzunda Cenâh-ı bahri nâm korvet sefine-i hümâyûnuna rakiben mâh-ı mezkurun on dördüncü cum'a günü Sisamın Vati nâm limanına vâsıl olmuşumdur. Yolda bu kadar ziyade gün geçirmekliğimin sebebi evvela Lapseki'de kırk sa'at tevakkufumuza bâdi olan lodos rüzgarından ve sâniyen Bahr-ı sefîd Boğazından çıktığımız gibi sert hevalara tesâdüf olunmasından ibâret bulunmuş ve sefinenin arma halatlarına ârız olan sakatlıktan ma'da şükürler olsun bir gûne kazaya giriftar olmaksızın mahal-i maksûdumuza muvâsalat olunmuşdur. Mezkur Vati Limanına demür attırıldığını müte'akiben Bâb-ı âlî'nin evâmirine kesb-i ittilâf etmeleri içün kendülerini sefineyi da'vet zımmında birisini Fethullah Efendiye ve diğerini ka'immekam-ı sabık Mösyö Konnemenos'a isâl etmek üzre sefinede bulunan asâkir-i şâhâne Yüzbaşısı Memiş Ağa'ya iki kıt'a tahrirat ile beraber Lord Istratford de Rediklif cânibinden İngiltere Devletinin Sisamda mukim konsolos vekiline olan mektubu dahi ağa-yı mâmâ-ileyhe i'ta eyledim. Cezîre-i mezkurede bulunan Devlet-i aliyye komiseri iki gün akdem Dersa'adete gitmiş olduğu cihetle mûmâ-ileyh Mösyö Konnemenos yalnızca da'vetime icâbet eylediğinden hamil olduğum tahriratı kendisine i'ta ettim. Mûmâ-ileyh

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0198

vusûl-ı âcizânemden birkaç sa‘at evvelce takdim ve irsal etmiş olduğu bir kıt‘a ar^ıza-i mahsûsasıyla hakipâ-yı sâmî-i hidivîlerine arz etmiş olduğu vechile Sisamlıları isyân ettirmek niyetiyle ba‘zı Yunanlıların vaki‘ olan mesâ‘ileri vesilesiyle ahâlinin meşhûd olan hüsn-i hareketlerini bendelerine bildirmekle beraber ahâlinin zarûret ve müzâyakalarıyla ezhânın heyecân ve galeyânını ve fırkaların tahrikât ve ifsâdatını çâkerîlerine bir sûret-i mükeddere ile ta‘rif ve beyân ve ka'immekam tebeddülü havâdisinin ahâli üzerine olacak te'sir ve netâyicinden dolayı gâyetle muzdarip olduğunu bendelerine i‘tiraf eylediğinde bendeniz dahi gerek hidmet-i devlet-i aliyye ve gerek herbirimizin ahvâl-i istikbâliyesi menafi‘inde olarak teslim ve tesellümnü hükümetin zerre kadar gürültüsüzce ve kemal-i sükânet ve intizâm ile icrâ olunmasının ne derecelerde ehemm ü elzem olduğunu ve bu husûsu ahâli-i cezireye ve hususiyle kendisine ikîden tavsiye eylediğimi ka'immekam-ı sâbık mâmâ-ileyhe ifâde ve tefhim eylediğimin üzerine mûmâ-ileyh gemide kalarak karaya çıkmamaklığımı çakerilerine teklîf ettiğinde iş bu teklife muhalefet etmiş isem de ma‘mafih beynimizde bi's-suhûle ittihad-ı ârâ hâsıl olarak mûmâ-ileyh Mösyö Konnemenosun vâki‘ olan mu‘âvenet-i dostane ve müstekimanesiyle hükümetin teslim ü tesellüm intizam ve sükunet ve istirahat ile icra olunduğunu ve Hora nâm mahale kadar geçdiğim her bir yerde Padişâhım bin yaşa du‘asıyla kabul olunduğumu hakipâ-yı âlî-i hazret-i Nezâret-penahilerine ma‘a'l-memnûniye arz etmekliği lazıme-i zımmetden add etmişimdir. Evvel-emrde kendisiyle korvet derûnunda eyüce ittifak ve ittihâd ârâ hâsıl oldukdan sonra mûmâ-ileyh Mösyö Konnemenos Emâret Meclisi a‘zasını da‘vet zımmında cum‘a-irtesi gecesi mezkur Hora nâm mahale bir kuryer gönderdi o gece yirmi nefer mahbûsun Sisam mahbesinin duvarını delerek firâr ettikleri ferdası cum‘a-irtesi günü istihbar etmekle müte'essif olduğumdan ma‘da Sisam piskoposunun vusulü havâdisinin üzerine Vati şehrinde bir azîm hareket ve heyecân zuhûrunu istihbâr eylediğimden asâkiri karaya indirtmeğe başlamağla beraber bizzat ezhanın ahvalini anlamazdan evvel karaya çıkmamasını piskopos-ı muma-ileyhe tenbih ettim cum‘a-irtesi günü ifâ-yı lâzıme-i tebrîk ve tehniyet zımmında meclis takımının talep eylediğim vechile gemiye geleceklerini ve ba‘dehu gidüp çâkerilerini iskelede istikbâl ve kabul eyleyeceklerini mûmâ-ileyh Mösyö Konnemenos cum‘a-irtesi günü vakt-i zuhûrdan evvelce gelüp bendelerine ifade eylemiş ve bir müddet sonra salifü'z-zikr meclis a‘zası zabtiye sergerdesiyle beraber derûn-ı sefineye gelmiş olduklarından dilhah ve efkâr-ı âliye-i Saltanat-ı Seniyyeyi kendilerine çend kelime ile arz ve ifham eyledim. Meclis-i mezkur a‘zası el-hâletü-hâzihi umûmen mu‘teber adamlardan olarak muhafaza-i imtiyazatlarına da'ir kendilerine ibraz eylediğim te'minât ve me'mûlatın kaffesi Sisam ahâlisinin emel ve arzûlarına kâmilen tevâfuk eylediğini çâkerilerine te'min etmekle

beraber ahâlinin ba'zısının ahvâl-i bedbâhtanelerini bir sûret-i mü'essirede beyan ve piskoposun karaya çıkması adem-i hoşnudî ve heyecân ve haraketi ve belki ihtilâli müstelzim olacağını ve mûmâ-ileyhin aleyhinde birbirini müte'âkib akd olunan dört meclisin dört kıt'a mazbatası mevcut olduğu misillü Dersa'âde'de Patrikhâneye dahi kezâlik dört kıt'a şikayet vukuf bulduğunu bendelerine ifâde ve ihtâr eylediklerinin üzerine icâb ve iktizasını mütâla'a edeceğimi kendilerine va'ad ederek iş bu efkar ve mütâla'alarının tahriren ifâde olunmasını talep ettim. Piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin karaya çıkmasının ne dürlü netayici müstelzim olabileceğini kesb-i itlâf edinceye kadar mûmâ-ileyhin karaya çıkmasına ruhsat vermemesini korvet süvârisine tavsiye ve tenbih eyledim. Cum'a-irtesi günü sa'at ikide sıfât-ı me'muriyet-i cedîdem lâzım gelen kâffe-i i'tibar ve ta'zimat ile Vati'ye çıkarak mahal-i mezkûr iskelesinde papaz takımıyla a'za-yı meclis ve mu'teberân-ı memleket taraflarından istikbâl ve kabul olunduğum misillü kâffe-i ahâlî tarafından dahi Pâdişahım bin yaşa du'ası bi'l-ifâ baş kilisede tezâyüd-i ömr ve ikbâl-i hazret-i Pâdişâhi da'vat-ı halisâsını terdifen bi'l-cümle teb'a-i sâdıka-i cenâb-ı mülûkanenin tevafür-i ömr ü âfiyetleri da'vâtı merfu'-ı bâr-gâh-ı cenâb-ı ahâdiyyet kılınmışdır. Kiliseden çıkıldıkda Mösyö Konnemenosa vizite etmeğe gidüp oradan dahi bendeleri içün hazırlanmış olan bir küçük konağa giderek kemterlerine vizite etmeğe gelmiş olan ka'immekam Emrullah Ağa ve konsolos vekilleriyle mu'teberân-ı memleketi kabul ettim. Piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin hakkında vâki' rivâyâta dâ'ir en ziyâde mu'teber olan adamlardan vâki' olan istifsâr ve istiknâh-ı âcîzânemin üzerine mûmâ-ileyhin hayrhâh dostlarından bulunan zevât ile konsolos vekilleri bile bilâ-istisna cümleten piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin karaya çıkmasının sû-i te'siri olacağını cevaben bendelerine ifâde eylediklerini beyan etmeği vâcibe-i zimmetden add ederim. Ertesi Pazar günü a'za-yı meclis ve ka'immekam-ı sâbık ile beraber Sisamın makarr-ı hükümeti olan marrü'z-zikr Hora nâm mahale gitmek üzre oradan hareket ederek esnâ-yı mürûrumda her yerde ahalinin bendelerini bir devlet me'muruna icrâsı iktiza eden ri'âyet ve hürmetle kabul etmeğe hâhiş-ger olmalarıyla beraber piskopos husûsundan dolayı heyecan üzre bulunduklarını ve papaz gürûhunun bile piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhe muhâlefet üzre olduklarını müşâhede eyledim ve Sisamlıların piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyh aleyhinde olmalarının ne sebebe mebni idüğüne ve bu seseplerin dahi sıhhat ve ma'mûliyetine dâ'ir hiçbir gûne mütâle'at serdine girişmeksizin bu memleketde ahâlinin ekserisi piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin aleyhinde olduğuna cezm ü yakin hâsıl eylediğim aşikâr olduğu misillü eğerçe piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyh husamâsına rağmen karaya çıkdığı halde bu husûsa bir muhâlefet-i şedîde vukû' bulmayacağı me'mul idiyse de ma'mafih her halde kuvve-i cebrîye i'mâline hâcet mess edeceği derkar ve buranın zabtiye neferatı ise bir hey'et-i

muntazamada bulunmadığından piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin cebren karaya ihracı murâd olunduğu halde asâkir-i hazret-i şâhânenin mu'âvenetlerine muhtâc olacağım melhûz ve âşikâr olup diğer cânibden dahi devletlu Kapudan Paşa hazretleri taraflarından piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin râkib olacağım korvete râkib olacağı çâkerilerine ifâde buyurulmasından ve Mösyö Konnemenosun dahi piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhin karaya çıkması bir tecemmu'a sebep olacağını beyân ve inbâ eylediğinden başka piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhe dâ'ir hiçbir gûne ma'lumatım olmadığından ve şifâhen ve tahrîren çâkerîlerine i'ta buyurulmuş olan ta'limat-ı hâzret-i nezâret-penâhileriyle dahi te'lif-i menafi'-i ahâli ve teskîn-i ezhâna me'mûr olduğumdan ileride piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhe dâ'ir evâmir-i hazret-i hidivânelerini ahz etmek üzre bir kıt'a sûreti üç numerosuyla murakkam olup leffen takdim kılınan mektubumla şimdilik ya piskoposluğu dâhilinde ve civar olan Nikarya ceziresine veya Sisamın civarında istediği diğer bir mahale gitmesi piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyhden rica etmiş ve azimetiçün kendisine teshilât-ı lâzıme ifa eylemişimdir. Fakat piskopos-ı mûmâ-ileyh gâyet mürtekib bir adam olduğu meşhûr ve mütevatırdır. Mevâd-ı meşrûhayı hâkipâ-yı âli-i hazret-i hidivânelerine arz ile ol-bâbda isdârı nezd-i hikmet-peyvendi-i hazret-i nezâret-penahilerinde tensib buyurulacak evâmir-i dâverânelerine intizâr üzreyim kaldı ki pazar günü ahşam üzeri marrü'z-zikr Hora'ya vasıl ve teslim ve tesellüm-i hükümet ile meşgul olarak Sandık Emini meclisin dört a'zası ve ka'immekam-ı sâbık ile bendeleri meclis odasında bi't-tecemmu' memleket sandığının bin sekiz yüzelli dört senesi Nisanının on sekizinde bulunduğu hâli mübeyyin bir kıt'a defter ile me'muriyyet-i acizâneme şuru' ve mübâşeret-i acizânemin bir kıt'a mazbatası dahi kaleme alındıktan sonra birisi meclis ve ikincisi Mösyö Konnemenos ve üçüncüsü taraf-ı âcizânemden olarak ahâliye hitaben üç kıt'a i'lan-nâme neşr olunmuş ve iş bu i'lan-nâmelerin sûretleri dahi dört ve beş ve altı ve yedi numerolarıyla murakkam oldukları halde leffen takdim kılınmışdır. Zât-ı fihâmet-semât-ı nezâret-penâhileri emâretin ahvâl-i mâliyesine lutfen ve tenezzülen ifâdât-ı âtiyeden kesb-ı buyuracaklardır. Şöyle ki geçen senenin vergisi hemen kâmilen tahsîl olunmamış ve me'murinin üç ve zabtiye neferâtının altı aydan beri ma'aşları te'diye olunmayıp bu ma'aşlar dörtyüz elli dokuz bin sekiz yüz on beş guruşa baliğ olduğundan ma'dâ zikr olunan memleket sandığının az ve çok münâzi-ün-fih olan düyûnu dahi mevcut olarak mezkur sandığın ise iş bu düyunun kaffesini kapatmak içün bir mikdarının mümteni'ü'l-tahsîl idüğü çakerilerine te'min olunan üçyüz kırk beş bin elli sekiz guruş matlûbâtından başka bir ümîdi olmadığı manzûr-ı âli-i hidivâneleri olduğu üzre zikr olunan sandığın düyûn-ı kadimesinden fazla olarak la-akal yüz on dört bin yedeyüz elli yedi guruş açığı olduğu aşikârdır binâen-aleyh zikr olunan açığın çaresine bakılarak ba'de-zin meclis a'zasının bu makule

hatalarının önü alınmak üzre tedâbir-i mukteziyyenin ittihazını emr buyurmaları içün ahval-i mezkurenin esbâbını karîben hakipâ-yı me'ali ihtivâ-yı daverânelerine arz etmek niyetindeyim. Sisam Emareti'nin ahvâli vech-i âti üzre icmâlen beyân olunabilür şöyle ki ahâli tahrîk ve ifsâda meyyâl ve cüz'i bahâne ile teşhîr-i silaha hazır olup idâre-i memleketde dahi nizâmsızlık derkar olarak zabtiye neferatı ise muhâfaza-i asâyiş ve emniyeti sâlih olmadıklarından başka ka'immekam ile ahâli haklarında mahz-ı muhâtara demek olduğunu ve bunlardan fazla mûceb-i keder ve ızdırâb olacak suretde bir dahi mevcut olarak bu babda yedi sekiz yüz familyanın yabânî kiyah ekliyle inti'aş eylediklerini ve bunun ise ba'zı vefayâta istilzâm eylediğini hakipâ-yı âlî-i nezâret-penâhilene arz etmekliğim kifâyet eder el-hâsıl bu memleketin asla arzu buyurdukları halde olmadığı ve fermân-ı âlînin infazı henüz kuvvede olduğu cihetlerle ifâsına me'mur olduğum me'muriyetden tevahhuş etmekde bulunduğumu ve yeniden ba'zı ıslahatın icrası asîr ve müşkil olarak vakt ve mesâ'iye menût ve mütevakkıf idüğünü zat-ı ıbbehet-simat-ı hidivâneleri kâffe-i alemiyândan ziyâde bildikleri cihetle bu bâbda müsâmaha-i aliyye-i dâverâneleri iltimâs ederim. Teslim ve tesellüm-i me'mûriyet husûsunun nizâm ve sükunetle icrâsıçün lâzım gelen mesâ'i ve mu'âvenet-i haseneye mûmâ-ileyh Mösyö Konnemenos tarafından mazhar olmuş ve bu vechile teslim ve tesellüm hususunun ilk def'a olarak icra olunduğunu istihbâr eylemişimdir. Bu vesile ile ba'zı uygunsuzluk ve karışıklığı zuhûru me'mul olduğundan iş bu teslim ve tesellüm hususunun ber-vech-i meşruh nizam ve sükunetle vuku' bulduğundan dolayı halk ta'accüb etdi. Meclis a'zasıyla ka'immeka-ı sâbık her dürlü uygunsuzluğun men'i zımmında pek çok sa'fy ve ikdam etdiler hâl-i bühranın geçtiğini ve teslim ve tesellüm husûsunun iş bu sûret-i tesviyesi âti içün bir mukaddem emsâl olacağını me'mul eylerim mezhebimiz muktezasınca diyanetle meşgul olduğumuz iş bu hafta geçtiği gibi fermân-ı âlîyi asker ve konsolos vekilleri ve ahali ile zabtiye neferatı huzurlarınada alenen kıra'at ettirmek içün paskalya günlerinden istifade edeceğimdir. Mösyö Konnemenos heva müsa'id olduğu halde yarınki veyahut ertesi gün gidecektir. Mûmâ-ileyhin Dersa'adete gitmesiçün İzmirde suhulet bulacağından kendisini şehr-i mezkura götürmesini korvet kumandanına tavsiye ve sipariş ettim. Burada bulunan üç kıt'a sefin-i hümayûnûn kapudanları bu sabah nezd-i çâkeriy egelüp Sisam ceziresinde yalnız Vati Limanından başka liman bulunmadığı cihetle cezire-i mezkure sevâhilinde sefâin-i mezkure ile karağol gezmeleri muhal olduğu ve cezirenin etrafını dolaşmakla muhataradan hâli olmadığı ve fakat bir küçük vapurun diğer sefineye muhtac olmaksızın karağol dolaşarak cezireyi kâmilen muhafaza edebileceği keyfiyatının hakipa-yı âlî-i nezaret-penahilerine resmen arz ve iş'arını çâkerilerinden talep ve iltimas etmişlerdir.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0202

EK VI

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 79, Lef 3.

Atûletlu efendim hazretleri,

Sisam ka'immekamı Mösyö Gika'nın Sisama vusûlüyle me'muriyet-i fermân-ı âlisini kıra'at ettirmiş olduğu ifâdesini ve tebliğat-ı sâ'ireyi mütezammın vürud iden iki kıt'a şukkasının tercemeleri mesmûl-ı nazar-ı şevket-i hazret-i Pâdişâhi buyurulmak içün arz ve takdim kılınmış olup rüveş-i iş'aratından anlaşıldığı üzre ka'immekam-ı mûmâ-ileyh cezirenin umûr-ı mülkiye ve mâliyesini hüsn-i sûretde idâreye teşebbüsü ve mesârifât-ı vakı'adan ba'zı tenkihât ve tasarrufât icra edişi yolunda şeyler olarak ve saye-i şevket-vaye-i hazret-i cihan-dâride oraca selb-i emniyet edecek hâlât olmıyarak zabtiye neferâtının sûret-i mazbûtada istihdamı içün istediği esliha ile bir nefer-i müstefidd ve muktedir zabit gönderilmesi münâsip olacağından icâbına bakılması ve cezirenin muhafazasıçün lüzûmunu beyân eylediği vapur-ı husûsinin dahi devletlu Kapudan Paşa hazretlerine bildirilmesi ve oranın piskoposu hakkında nefret ve şikâyet-i umûmiye olmasıyla şimdilik bir gûne sızıldıyı mûcib olmamak içün merkez-i hükumete çıkmayıp bir kenar mahalde tevkifini kendisine ifade etmiş idüğünden bu maddenin dahi Patrikhaneye bildirilerek iktizasının icra edilmesi ve ka'immekam-ı mûmâ-ileyhe dahi icabı vechile cevap-nâme yazılması husûslarında her ne vechile emr ü ferman-ı hazret-i şehen-şâhi şeref-sünuh buyurulur ise ana göre hareket olunacağı beyânıyla tezkire-i senâviri terkim kılındı efendim. Fi 6 N sene 270.

Ma'rûz-ı çâker-i kemîneleridir ki,

Enâmil-zâıb-i ihtirâm olan iş bu tezkire-i sâmiye-i sadâret-penâhileri ile zikr olunan tercemeleri mesmûl-ı nazar-ı âli-i hazret-i şehen-şâhi buyurulmuş ve husûsat-ı merkumenin istizân-ı âli-i âsafâneleri vechile icrâ-yı iktizaları müte'allik ve şeref-sünûh buyurulan emr ü irade-i seniyye-i cenab-ı şehr-yâri muktezâ-yı münifinden bulunmuş ve mezkur tercemelerine savb-ı sâmi-i âsâfilerine ifade kılınmış olmağla ol-bâbda emr ü fermân hazret-i veliyyü'l-emrindir. Fi 7 N sene 70.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0203

EK VII

BOA, Nr. 84, Lef 1.

Ma'rûz-ı çâker-i kemîneleridir ki,

Sisam ceziresinin umûr-ı dâhiliyesine müteferri' inâyet ve ihsân-ı şâhâne buyurulan nizâmnâme-i celîle ve imtiyâzât-ı âliyye-i mülûkânenin hükmünce senede bir kere tertib ve teşkîl olunan Meclis-i Umûmi'nin ahâli-i cezire taraflarından sırran ekseriyet-i ârâ ila intihab olunan a'za-yı mahsûsaları mu'teberandan ve vatanpervelik ile şöhret-yafte olan adamlardan oldukları halde mukaddema mu'tv̈d olan mahale bi'l-celb umûr-ı mahsûsalarına bed'en ve mübâşeretle sâye-i adâlet-pirâye-i hazret-i şehen-şâhî ve sâye-i mu'adelet-vâye-i cenâb-ı nezâret-penâhilerinde ûmûr-ı me'mûresi irâde-i hikmet-numûde-i cihândâri ve imtiyâzât-ı celîle-i mezkûreyi imtisalen mâh-ı Nisanın yirmi ikinci gününde reside-i hitam olmuşdur.Ve a'za-yı merkume-i bendeganelerinin nizam-nâme-i celîle-i mezkûrenin hükmünce rü'esa-yı meclis-i memleket ta'yin olunmak üzre sırran ekseriyet-i ârâ ile intihâb etmiş oldukları sekiz nefer eşhâsdan en mu'teberândan ve iffet ve istikamette ve metbu'-ı mu'azzâmamız olan Saltanat-ı seniyyeye sadakat gösterecekleri me'mul ve melhuz olan adamalardan dört neferi yafni Dimitri Eksilara ve Mizali ve Mihaliyo Nikolayidi ve Leonido nâmûn bendeleri taraf-ı çakeranemden bi't-tensib nasb ve me'mur oldukları ve elhamdülillahi te'âlâ zilli zalîli inâyet-delîl-i zıllıyet-penâhide ahâli-i cezirenin bendeganeleri kemal-i emn ü refâh ve istirahatde bulunarak da'vat-ı hayriyet-âyât-ı Devlet-i aliyye ile meşgul ve evkat-güzâr idüğü bi mennihi-te'ala meşmûl-nigâh-ı devlet iktinâh-ı nezaret-penâhileri buyuruldukda her halde emr ü fermân hazret-i men-lehü'l-emrindir. Fi 23 S sene 71.

Bende Ka'immekam-ı
Cezire-i Sisam
(Yuan Gika)

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0204

EK VIII

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 84, Lef 2.

Atûfetlu efendim hazretleri,

Sisam ceziresinde be-her sene icrâ olunduğu misillü bu sene de dahi Meclis-i Umumi teşkîl olunup ekseriyet-i ârâ ile mu'teberân-ı milletden dört nefer a'za intihab ve ta'yin kılınmış ve sâye-i âsâyiş-vâye-i cenâb-ı kitisitânide cezîre-i merkume ahâlisinin kemvl-i emn ü refâh ve istirâhatleri yerinde olarak taraflarından müretteb zımmetleri olan da'vat-ı bi'l-hayr-ı hazret-i Padişâhi ne sûretle evride-i zebâ-ı tekrar olunmuş olduğu ifâdesine da'ir cezire-i merkume ka'immekamı Gika'nın makâm-ı Nezâret-i Hâriciyeye mevrud şukkası mücerred manzûr-ı âlî-i cenâb-ı cihânbâni buyurulmak içün arz ve takdîm kılındığı ve muvafık-ı emr ü fermân-ı hazret-i Pâdişâhi buyurulduğu halde mûmâ-ileyhe cevâp-ı münâsip yazılacağı beyanıyla tezkîre-i âcizi terkimine ibtidâr kılındı efendim. Fi 8 N sene 71.

Ma'rûz-ı çâker-i kemineleridir ki,

Hâme-pirâ-yı tekrim olan iş bu tezkire-i sâmiye-i âsâfâneleriyle zikr olunan şukka manzûr-ı şevket-mevfûr-ı hazret-i şehen-şâhi buyurulmuş ve istizân buyurulduğu vechile mûmâ-ileyhe cevap-ı münâsip yazılması müte'allik ve şeref-südûr buyurulan emr ü fermân-ı hümâyûn-ı cenâb-ı şehryâri iktiza-yı âlisinden olarak mezkur şukka yine savb-ı sâmî-i âsâfilerine ifâde kılınmış olmağla ol-bâbda emr ü fermân hazret-i veliyü'l-emrindir. Fi 9 N sene 71.

EK IX

BOA; Sİ, Nr. 86, Lef 1.

Atûfetlü efendim hazretleri,

Viyana sefîri Kalimaki Beğin nâ'il olduğu âtıfet-i celîle-i cenâb-ı velini'metden dolayı uhdesinde bulunan Sisam Beğliğinin diğer bir münasibine ihâlesi tab'îat-ı maslahatdan olarak el-hâletü-hâzihi Sisamda Emaret Ka'immekamı bulunan Gika Beğ ısdıka-yı bendegândan bulunmasına ve dirâyet ve reviyetle ittisafi cihetiyle şimdiye değin oranın idâresinde mesâ'-i

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0205

memdûhası dahi meşhûd olmasına nazaran dâ'ima merkez-i me'muriyetinde bulunmak ve sâye-i şevket-vâye-i hazret-i cihan-bânide bi'z-zat hüsn-i idâre-i memlekete sarf-ı makdaret etmek ve bu hâlde ka'immekamlığa mahsûs olan yedi bin beş yüz guruş kafî olamayacağından bunun dahi ilerüde icabına bakılmak üzre cezire-i merkume beğliğinin mûmâ-ileyh Gika Beğ uhdesine ihâlesi zat-ı hazret-i ka'imekami devletlû re'is ve Nâzır Paşalar hazerâtıyla münâsip gibi tezekkür olundu ise de ol-babda her ne vechile emr ü ferman-ı cenâb-ı mülûkâne müte'allik ve şeref-südur buyurulur ise mantûk-ı celîlilinin icrâsına ibtidar olunacağı beyânıyla tezkire-i senâviri terkim kılındı efendim. Fi 2 C sene 72.

Ma'rûz-ı çâker-i kemîneleridir ki,

Esâbi'-pirâ-yı ta'zim olan iş bu tezkire-i sâmiye-i âsafâneleri mekarim-nuşûr-ı hazret-i şehen-şahi buyurulmuş ve ber-vech-i istizân cezire-i merkume beğliğinin ol-sûretle mûmâ-ileyh Gika Beğ uhdesine ihalesi şeref-sünuh ve südur buyurulan emr ü ferman-ı hümâyûn-ı cenâb-ı cihan-bânî muktezâ-yı münîfinden bulunmuş olmağla ol-bâbda emr ü ferman hazret-i veliyü'l-emrindir. Fi 3 C sene 72.

EK X

BOA, Sİ, Nr. 91, Lef 1.

Atûfetlü efendim hazretleri,

Sisam Beği bulunan Eflaklu Con Gika memleketinde istihdâm olunacağından Sisam Beğliğinden istif'a eylediğini mukaddem ve mu'ahhar iş'ar eylemiş olduğuna ve bu cihetle yerine diğerinin nasbı iktizâ-yı halden olup bu me'muriyet teba'a-i gayr-i müslimeye mahsûs hidmetlerden olmasıyla bir hayli kimseler talip bulunduklarına binâ'en münâsibi intihâb olunmak üzere keyfiyet Encemen-i Mahsûs-ı Vükelâ'da dermiyân-ı müzakere olunup bir müddetden beri Eflak Kapukethüdalığı hidmetinde bulunan Miltiyadi İristarki Beğ sadakat ve istikamet eshabından olarak cezire-i mezkureyi idareye liyâkati olduğundan mûmâ-ileyh müretceh görünmekle beraber hidmet-i mezkure şimdiden Beğlik ünvanıyla verilir ise sâ'ir talibleri indinde bunun tercihi belki ziyade dilşikesteliğe sebep olacağından hem şu mülahazayı dâfî' olmak ve hemde mümkün olabilir ise bu takrib ile Beğlik unvânı mensî hükmüne konulmak üzre şimdilik ka'immekamlık unvânı ile mîr-i mûmâ-ileyhin

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0206

cezîre-i mezkûre idâresine ta'yîni müttehiden tensîb olunmuş ise de ol-bâbda her ne vechile emr ü fermân-ı hazret-i Pâdişâhi müte'allik ve şeref-südûr buyurulur ise mantûk-ı münîfi infâz olunacağı beyânıyla tezkire-i senâviri terkîm kılındı efendim. Fi 26 Ş sene 75.

Ma'rûz-ı çaker-i kemineleridir ki,

Enmile-zîb-i tebcîl olan iş bu tezkire-i sâmiye-i sadâret-penâhileri manzûr-ı şevket-nüşûr-ı cenab-ı Pâdişâhi buyurulmuş ve tensîb ve istizân buyurulduğu vechile ka'immekamlık unvânı ile mîr-i mûmâ-ileyhin cezîre-i mezkure idâresine ta'yînini müte'alik ve şeref-südur buyurulan emr ve irâde-i seniyye-i mülukane muktezâ-yı münîfinden bulunmuş olmağla ol-bâbda emr ü fermân veliyü'l-emrindir. Fi 27 Ş sene 75.

LEGISLATION OF INDEPENDENT ROMANIA IN THE OTTOMAN PERCEPTION (1878-1888)

Silvana RACHIERU

The Russian-Turkish war from 1877-1878 represents a very important moment in Romanian history. From that moment, one can include Romania in the family of European independent states. The war did not only bring Romania's independence from the Ottomans, but also provided it with a new territory, Dobroudja, once a Wallachian possession, which was for approximately four hundred years an Ottoman province. This gain determined of course a series of legislative problems. Special laws for Dobroudja were issued in the first decade of independence and all the efforts were directed towards the assimilation of the territory and its inhabitants. In this paper, I will focus on the perception of Ottoman officials, from the diplomatic staff who worked in Romania to the higher clerks from the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the legislation concerning Dobroudja created by the Romanian Parliament. Primary source for this analysis is the diplomatic correspondence between Ottoman diplomats in Romania and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Istanbul.[1] I will identify which laws determined more debates and consequently what kind of legislative problems had the Ottoman subjects from Dobroudja, both the ones who stayed and the ones who emigrated to the Empire. Also, I will support my arguments with quotes from the documents.

Romanian-Ottoman relationships represent a long episode both in the medieval period and modern time. Generally designated with the term Romanian-Ottoman, the relationships refer in fact to two different aspects. Until 1859, the correct formulation is the study of the relationship between Wallachia and the Ottoman Empire or Moldavia and the Ottoman Empire, the tendency of generalisation creating the danger to ignore particularities of the regions. Of course, the problem is similar in the case of Transylvania, which was included into the Romanian state only in 1918. Consequently, the term is

[1]For the possibility to have access to this correspondence I have to thank both Paul Dumont, Director of the French Institute for Anatolian Studies (IFEA) who granted me a scholarship at the Institute in December 2000 and Prof. Mihai Maxim, my supervisor who told me about this unpublished fund and guided me in my first steps in the rich Ottoman archives at Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0209

representative for the period after the unification of Wallachia and Moldavia and has its diplomatic understanding best represented after 1877-1878 when it refers to the relationship between two independent states, Romania and the Ottoman Empire. In the following paragraphs I will use it with the last meaning.

In Romanian historiography, Ottoman-Romanian relationship after the Independence War[1] and to the First Word War is less researched. Volumes of edited and translated Ottoman documents stop to 1821[2], the translations of fragments from Turkish chronicles also did not cover the 19th century[3], and the most important Romanian Ottomanists worked and work mainly on the previous centuries.[4] Consequently, the information is reduced to the mention of Turkish emigration from Dobroudja to the Ottoman Empire and of course to the study of the situation of the Aromanian population from the empire and the efforts of Romanian officials to improve their situation— opening schools in Romanian language, sending teachers to the important towns etc.[5] Also, there are information about the involvement of Romania in the major political events from the region after 1877 such as the Bulgarian crisis, the Macedonian crisis, the Young Turks revolution, the Balkan Wars, etc. Because the Ottoman documents are still unpublished, the information has the tendency to be unilateral, more precisely to reflect only Romanian-Ottoman relationship and not the other way around. For example, one can find the information about the exchange of diplomats between Romania and the Ottoman Empire from September 1878, but details are only regarding Romania's representatives sent to the Empire.[6] To conclude, new writings devoted to this period and this topic are very important and research in the Ottoman archives should be encouraged in order to have a more informed and bilateral view on the problem.

---

[1]This is the name which designates in Romanian historiography the Turkish-Russian War of 1877-1878.

[2]There are two edited volumes of documents which have some information on the 19th century-Mustafa Ali Mehmet, *Turkish Documents concerning History of Romania,* the 3rd volume (1791-1812), Bucharest, 1986 and Valeriu Veliman, *Romanian-Ottoman Relationships (1711-1821),* Bucharest, 1984.

[3]The last volume, the 3rd from the collection *Turkish Chronicles concerning Romanian Principalities,* edited by Mustafa Ali Mehmet, Bucharest, 1980 goes until the beginning of the 19th century.

[4]On exception is the volume edited by Gheorghe Zbuchea and Stelian Brezeanu, *The Romanians from the South of Danube,* Bucharest, 1997, which includes four Ottoman documents from the period after 1877.

[5]See Gheorghe Zbuchea, *A History of the Romanians from the Balkan Peninsula (18th-20th centuries*), Bucharest, 1999.

[6]"In September 1878, the two states started to change diplomats, according to the new situation, Romania sending its first plenipotentiary and extraordinary minister in the person of Dimitrie Bratianu. From the Romanian Legation in Constantinople depended the consulates general from Constantinople, Salonica, Smyrna. Afterwards were opened consulates in Monastir, Ianina, etc.", Nicolae Chiachir, *Great Powers and Romania, 1856-1947,* Bucharest, 1996, p. 119.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0210

Before going further in the discussion of the Romanian legislation, it is necessary to give some information about the situation of the two states after 1878. As I have already mentioned, Romania, ruled by Prince Carol I Hohenzolern, gains in 1878 its independence from the centuries long sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire. The recognition of independence was conditioned in the Treaty of Berlin by some changes in its 1866 constitution, changes concerning especially the situation of religious minorities.[1] In the next ten years, Romania, guided by a liberal government developed and modified its legislation in the direction of a modern independent state. Religion played a less important role in Romanian society, at least from the point of view of legislation.[2] Also, it made efforts to create special legislation for Dobroudja. The Law for the Organisation of Dobroudja was issued on 9th March 1880 (with modification in 1886), the law for regulation of the real estate property on 3rd April 1882 (with modification in 1893), the Law for juridical organisation of the new territory on 30th March 1886 (with modification in 1896).[3]

In the Ottoman Empire, situation was developing in a different direction. After two years of constitutional monarchy with a parliament, years which correspond to the war, the sultan Abdül Hamid II introduced an authoritarian regime which made more difficult some of the developments. Still the reforms initiated in the Tanzimat era continued and the empire did not stagnate as it was frequently claimed.[4] Maybe the main difference from the Tanzimat era was the empowerment of the role of religion in politics and the proclamation of Islamism as state ideology.[5]

---

[1]The problem (very similar with the Serbian one) was the 7th article from the Romanian Constitution issued in 1866 which claimed that "The quality of Romanian can be obtained, preserved and lost according to the rules decided by the civil laws. *Only foreigners belonging to Christian rituals can receive citizenship.*" After the modification asked by the Great Powers, the article stipulates that: "Difference in religious beliefs and confessions does not represent in Romania an obstacle to obtain and exercice civil and political rights. The foreigner, without any religious differentiation, subject or not of a foreign protection can receive the citizenship in the following conditions: to send to the government his citizenship request, in which he will present the capital which he owns, job or profession which he practices and the will to reside in Romania; following this request he will reside ten years in the country and he will demonstrate, through his activites that he is useful for the country." The article continues with other 4 sub-articles which detailed this problem. Constantin Bacalbasa, *Bucharest from the Past,* Bucharest, 1993, p. 243.

[2]Still, Jews and Muslims received unconditional citizenship only with the Constitution of 1923.

[3]See *The General Code of Romania (1856-1907),* vol. III, *Usual Laws (1856-1900)* edited by C. Hamangiu, Bucharest.

[4]See the chapter of François Georgeon, "Le dernier sursaut (1878-1908)", in *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman,* sous la direction de Robert Mantran.

[5]See Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and Legitimization of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*, London, 1998.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0211

Concerning its diplomacy,[1] for the period analysed, the Ottoman Empire had diplomatic representation in Romania both through legation and consulates. As documents inform us, of course the imperial legation functioned in Bucharest and the empire opened consulates in some of the main cities where there was a Muslim population or simply where there were important commercial routes and opportunities: Galati, Braila, Constanta, Iasi, Craiova and Turnu Severin and vice-consulates in Calarasi, Tulcea, Sulina, Giurgiu, Calafat. The diplomatic correspondence is very vast and covers various problems. For the present paper, my research focuses on the so-called "documents concerning juridical problems" as appear in the catalogue from the Turkish Archives.[2] In the following paragraphs I analyse the impact of Romanian legislation on Ottoman officials and consequently Ottoman subjects.

The first aspect which one can notice analysing the Ottoman diplomatic correspondence, Bucharest-Istanbul, in the first ten years after independence is the difficulty of the Ottoman officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to get used that Dobroudja is no longer the sultan's possession but was incorporated to a different independent state, Romania. The main tendency is to ask the minister or the consuls from Galatzi, Tulcea, Braila, Constanta, Sulina to solve themselves the problems/requests of both former and present Muslim inhabitants of Dobroudja. Frequently, the Istanbul letters end with the formula:

"Please inform yourself on the problem and do, if necessary, the actions which you consider mandatory to protect the interests of the petitioner and his co-heirs."[3]

This difficulty of Ottoman officials to adapt themselves to the new reality should not be misunderstood, in my opinion, as an attempt to still consider Romanian territories under Ottoman control. More, I presume, was a problem of transition from a situation which for centuries represented the reality to a different type of Ottoman-Romanian relationship, that between two independent states. It should not be forgotten that even for the population who emigrated from Dobroudja or stayed in Dobroudja, the new legislation

---

[1] For the modernization of Ottoman diplomacy see Carter Vaugh Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom,* Princeton, 1991 and Roderic Davison, *Nineteenth Century Diplomacy and Reforms,* Istanbul, 1999.

[2] Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA), Hariciye Nezareti Evrakı. Hukuk Kısmı (HR.H), Istanbul 1995.

[3] BOA, HR.H. 70/65.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0212

was not very clear, they still had the tendency to refer to the previous Ottoman laws. The war ended in 1878 but the law for the organisation of Dobroudja was issued only on 9th March 1880. This was only 4 years later from the moment when, in the Ottoman Constitution, Romania was considered as a "protected province"...

I consider that in this issue of adaptability to the new Romanian legislation, more illustrative are the answers from the Ottoman minister in Bucharest. For the period 1879-1885 the minister in Bucharest was Süleyman Bey who demonstrates in his diplomatic reports seriousness and good knowledge of Romanian realities. He tries to find answers and solutions to every question asked by the Ministry and consequently wrote long and detailed reports to the high officials. To support my impression about Süleyman Bey, I am quoting from one of his reports. In a problem of transfer of heritage for a certain widow, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs asks Süleyman Bey on 27th of January 1881 to communicate with the competent authorities to solve the issue. Süleyman's answer follows:

"I think necessary to remind Your Excellency that, according to Romanian legislation, the intervention of the Bureau of the Imperial Legation in the favour of this widow cannot determine the practical result to her request, which Your Excellency advised me to pursue at the competent authorities. Only Romanian tribunals can realise this transfer...".[1]

Similar answers one can notice as well in other documents. As another example, Süleyman writes on 4th June 1880 concerning the request of a certain Ali Agha who asks the execution of two judgements made by the former Ottoman tribunal from Tulcea in a problem of money reimbursement :

"Romanian legislation prescribes that the solution to this type of litigation belongs exclusively to territorial tribunals. The interested people must, themselves or through legal representatives, [...] open judicial action and follow the procedure. Ali Agha should comply to this principle of jurisprudence which does not admit any exception.

The Imperial legation will make its intervention to the office, as it did in other cases as well. And its appeal to central and provincials administrations remains sterile in the presence of the mentioned disposition of

[1]BOA, HR.H. 68/68.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0213

the country laws. Anyway, I will not hesitate to find some facilitations, as for example the choice of an efficient lawyer and recommendations for the prompt resolution of the litigation to Ali Agha or his legal representative [...]".[1]

Even with these very clear explanations about the functioning of Romanian juridical system, I still met the same type of requests coming from Istanbul, requests which determines Süleyman Bey to repeat his explanation:

"The legislation of this Kingdom, as those of the majority of states, claims that every individual, subject of the state or foreigner must come in person or send a legal representative in front of the competent juridical authority in order to follow his request. The legislation is against the involvement of another existing authority and consequently a Legation or a Foreign Consulate cannot intervene to influence a result."[2]

As can be easily observed, the Ottoman representative from Bucharest made strong efforts to explain and present Romanian legislation to the officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in order to avoid abusive requests from former residents of Dobroudja who still considered the old Ottoman laws as the present reality in Dobroudja.

Another aspect which I discuss in the following paragraphs concerns the type of juridical problems which Ottoman subjects, mainly present and former inhabitants of Dobroudja address to the legation in Bucharest and its consulates in Romania, directly or through the intermediary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Istanbul and the Emigration Committee from the same capital. My conclusions are based on the research of catalogues of diplomatic correspondence for the period 1878-1888, which represents 343 files and more than 1500 documents. Consequently, the main subjects of discussion in the diplomatic correspondence are:

- properties-estates and houses- in Romanian Dobroudja of the Ottoman subjects who emigrated from Dobroudja to Istanbul.
- inheritances in Dobroudja of different Ottoman subjects
- citizenship problems for former/present Ottoman subjects, both Muslims and non-Muslims who did not leave Romanian Dobroudja after 1878.

---

[1]BOA, HR.H. 68/38.

[2]BOA, HR.H. 68/79, 10.05.1881. The same idea in the document 68/82 from 24.06.1881: "I cannot ignore Romanian legislation..."

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0214

• military service imposed to inhabitants of the Romanian Dobroudja.
• family problems-separation of some Ottoman families due to emigration.[1]

In the next lines I detail every problem and I support the discussion with some examples from the documents.

About the propriety right in Dobroudja, Romanian legislation stipulates the following according to the law from April 1882:

"I.3. All the rights of absolute property (*mülk*) and those of rural estate possession (*miri*), received according to the existing law in Dobroudja until the promulgation of the present law, are recognised and will be respected."

"I.9. The emigrants who left their proprieties can ask for their land and their rights, and after they are checked and accepted, the Minister of Public Domain will give them administrative possession, because they made their request and came back with their families to their households in one year from the moment of the promulgation of the present law."

"I.10. Rural land of those emigrants who did not come back and did not request them in the period of time mentioned in the previous article [...] becomes state property."[2]

As one can easily notice, the problem with the new Romanian law was not that the propriety right was not respected or recognised. From the documents researched, it becomes clear that the main problem with this law was the short time in which the emigrants should ask for their rights. Emigrants had a period of one year to decide to come back or not, and, as the 7th article from the same law mentioned, they were obliged as soon as possible to show their property acts to a commission especially designated for. In this perspective, Ottoman diplomats from Romania made strong efforts to determine Ottoman subjects to act quickly and not to lose more time in long discussions:

[1]For information on the topic see S. Rachieru "Guerre, genre et émigration: l'impact de la guerre d'indépendance sur les familles musulmanes de Dobroudja (1878-1888)" in *Nouvelles perspectives dans l'histoire sociale en France et en Roumanie*, coord. par Al. F. Platon, C. Oghină Pavie, J.P. Petit, Iaşi, 2003.
[2]Hamangiu, p. 658-9.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0215

"So, it is mandatory for Mehmed Halil to act without any delay in the direction of the law. [...] Romanian authorities, as it is publicly well-known, will not hesitate to consider his properties as the state's if, till the expiry of this last delay, the petitioner does not start the juridical action requested by the mentioned law."[1]

This is one example of a situation frequently met in the problem of estate or land properties in Dobroudja. Also, it seems that the transfer of property was not easily done in Dobroudja, and that sometimes Romanian authorities got tired of Ottoman interventions and refused to answer, due to the fact that in the majority of cases the subjects were now Romanian citizens.[2]

In the case of inheritance, situations are complicated enough. The problems are determined by the fact that usually those who are heirs lived in the Ottoman Empire, even sometimes they emigrated from Dobroudja and those who left the inheritance died in Dobroudja and were assimilated as Romanian citizens.[3]

Another aspect which frequently appears in the diplomatic correspondence is the issue of citizenship. As the Romanian law concerning Dobroudja from 1880 stipulated, "all the citizens from Dobroudja who on 11th of April 1877 were Ottoman citizens become and will be considered Romanian citizens."[4] This automatic citizenship did not please of course, all the former Ottoman citizens. There are situations in which emigrants from the Ottoman Empire wanted to return to Dobroudja but tried to remain Ottoman subjects and not to become Romanian citizens as they had the right to do. Of course this happened frequently in the case of Muslim subjects because they prefer to belong to a country where they were not considered as religious minority and had to follow certain rules. Also, they claimed the protection of the Ottoman Empire, seen as a great power and they were afraid to belong to a small and newly independent state. Sometimes, the situation is opposite, Ottoman citizens who were not from Dobroudja claimed Romanian citizenship because they had juridical problems in the empire. They tried to escape, considering that due to the amalgamated situation after the war nobody would

---

[1]BOA, HR.H. 69/31.

[2]"For the information of Your Highness' departement, I consider necessary to add that, in the problems concerning inhabitants of Dobroudja or the lands owners, at least in what concerns their property rights they are completely assimilated as Romanian subjects, and our intervention sometimes not only does not receive any answer but also is accompanied with bad will which makes the tasks of our protected people extremely difficult", BOA, HR.H. 69/79.

[3]BOA, HR.H. 68/43, 68/68, 68/79, 68/82 etc.

[4]Hamangiu, p. 458.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0216

have the exact information about them.[1] At a certain extent one can approach this problem of Ottoman/Romanian citizenship as a hunt for people, as can be taken into consideration from the following notice of the Ottoman minister Süleyman:

"I heard in the last days that the Romanian legation from Constantinople wanted to take under its protection as Romanian citizen every individual resident in the Empire who is originated from Dobroudja. As we do not consider as Ottoman subjects those inhabitants from different parts of the Empire who were found established and resident in Dobroudja by the time of annexation, I think that pretension of the Royal legation, if it is true, could not find justification."[2]

Rumours, sometime spies used by both sides, even in fact all went to people and their desire to conduct their destiny. One example is the case of a young man from Sulina who claimed that "a young man, at age of maturity should not be obliged to have the same citizenship as his father, he has the right to claim whichever nationality, but which is desired by him."[3]

In a very strong connection with the problem of citizenship is the issue of military service which I will mention in the following lines. According to Romanian law for the organisation of Dobroudja:

"For the next ten years after the promulgation of the present law, in Dobroudja people will not be recruited for the front army. This disposition does not include voluntary enlistment. For these ten years, inhabitants from Dobroudja will form a territorial army corps designated to the service inside this territory. In normal times, inhabitants who are included in these corps cannot be used in service more than a week monthly, when they will be paid and nourished according to the law for the territorial army. This army will not be used outside the territory of Dobroudja, with the exception of war situation."[4]

Even for the first ten years the situation did not appear to be very difficult for the inhabitants of Dobroudja, there is an impressive number of requests directed to the Ottoman Legation or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

[1]BOA, HR.H. 69/21.
[2]BOA, HR.H. 69/21.
[3]BOA, HR.H. 69/61.
[4]Hamangiu, p. 463.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0217

in order to escape from military service. Solutions are very innovative: from the tentative to convince Ottoman authorities that the Romanian passports were imposed recently to some faithful Ottoman citizens,[1] to the request of new Ottoman passports in the name of the past. They even asked Ottoman authorities to help them escape from the enlisting in the Romanian army. Interesting enough is the fact that sometimes Ottoman authorities from Istanbul were convinced by those requests and asked their diplomatic representatives to solve the problems as soon as possible.[2] As I mentioned before, the Ottoman minister in Bucharest was well informed on the subject of Romanian legislation and was able to explain the situation. For example, he presents very clearly the situation of those who were Romanian citizens and were obliged to be included in the military service.[3]

In some cases, the minister is obliged to explain and clarify funny situations as for example that of the Greek Panayoti Kotcha Stamuli, Ottoman subject from Pechovitcha. His parents sent a letter to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in which they claimed that their son was enlisted by force in the Romanian army while he was for business in Constanta (Köstence). The Ottoman authorities solicited from the minister to obtain the liberation of Panayoti. The minister's answer, after he was helped in his research by the consul from Constanta, follows:

"Stamouli was not in fact enlisted, he was only inscribed on the Enlistment Table realised by the local town hall which has the duty to write all the young men without any distinctions of nationality. [...] In front of the military council, the foreign subjects have to demonstrate their rights to be excepted from the military service of the Kingdom. Consequently Panayoti Kotcha Stamouli should wait for the convocation of the council named below and, as all his papers are correct, his reclamation will be take into consideration with no doubt."[4]

Of course, there were also some abuses of the Romanian administration, when Ottoman citizens were enlisted, and in those cases the minister strongly reacted.[5]

---

[1]BOA, HR.H. 60/61.
[2]BOA, HR.H. 71/24.
[3]BOA, HR.H. 71/14, 71/37, 71/44, 71/54, 71/59.
[4]BOA, HR.H. 71/14.
[5]BOA, HR.H. 71/66, 71/73, 71/34.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0218

To conclude, the perception of the Ottoman officials of Romanian legislation was very much influenced by the previous relationship between the two states and the multitude of problems which appeared after independence surprised both Romanian and Ottoman authorities. Ottoman diplomats sent in Romania made efforts to understand and to better learn Romanian laws and to explain them to Istanbul officials. The difficulties appeared due to the emigration from Dobroudja as well as to the fear which the inhabitants of Dobroudja felt in front of a new legislation. The main problems of debate, at least in the first decade after independence, were connected to the rights of property in Dobroudja, inheritance, military service and citizenship. This paper represents the first attempt to analyse the documents collected from the Turkish archives. Further research will demonstrate if the first impressions expressed in the previous paragraphs are a permanence in the diplomatic relationship. The field is opened for study and there are still many things which wait to be researched and also published, due to the fact that the archival funds are very rich.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. PRIMARY SOURCES:

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA), 975 Hariciye Nezareti Evrakı. Hukuk Kısmı (HR.H), Istanbul 1995, files 68-71.

2. SECONDARY SOURCES:

Bitoleanu, Ion and Radulescu, Adrian. *Istoria Dobrogei* (History of Dobroudja), Constanta: Ex Ponto, 1998.

Braude, Benjamin and Bernard Lewis, editors. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society,* New York-London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982.

Ciachir, Nicolae. *Marile Puteri si Romania 1856-1947* (The Great Powers and Romania), Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1996.

Codul general al Romaniei (The General Code of Romania), 2nd vol., edited by Constantin Hamangiu, Bucharest: Editura Librariei Leon Alcalay.

Davison, R. F. *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876*, New York: Princeton University Press, 1963.

— *Nineteenth Century Ottoman Diplomacy and Reforms,* Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1999.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and Legitimization of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909,* London: Victoria House, 1998.

Duben, Alan and Behar, Cem, *Istanbul Households. Marriage, Family and Fertility 1880-1940,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0219

Dumitrescu, Stelian. *Comunitatea turco-musulmana din Dobrogea in cadrul statului roman* (The Turkish-Muslim Community from Dobroudja inside the Romanian State), unpublished PhD thesis, University of Bucharest, 1998.

Ekrem, Mehmet Ali. *Din istoria Turcilor Dobrogeni* (From the History of the Dobrogean Turks), Bucharest: Kriterion, 1994.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, Leiden, 1994.

Findley, Carter Vaugh. *Ottoman Civil Officialdom,* N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.

İnalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergency of Modern Turkey,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Mantran, Robert, ed. *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* (History of the Ottoman Empire), Paris: Fayard, 1989.

McCarthy, Justin. *Muslim and Minorities: the Population of the Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Ottoman Empire,* New York: New York University Press, 1983.

Shaw, Stanford J. and Ezel Kural Shaw. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey,* vol. II *Reform, Revolution and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey 1808-1975,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0220

THE MUSLIM-TURKISH COMMUNITY IN THE DOBRUDJA WITHIN THE ROMANIAN STATE (1900-1918): THE ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK ACCORDING TO THE ROMANIAN ARCHIVES

Stelian DUMITRESCU

The Muslim Turkish community in the Dobrudja has been a subject of study for both Romanian[1] and foreign research workers.

Unfortunately, some foreign authors works are marked by the criticism against Ceauşescu's regime and therefore, they lack the required objectiveness.[2] On the other hand, quite many of these studies are not based on new, unpublished material[3] selected from the archives of the cities of Bucharest, Constanţa and Tulcea. That is why this study is an attempt of approaching the subject mentioned above, on the basis of the rich archival material found at the National Archives Direction of the county of Constanţa.

X

The Muslim-Turkish community in the Dobrudja had to face a totally new situation after 1878, the interval 1900-1918 being the age of its participation within the Romanian state to both the efforts of modernising the region and to outstanding events such as the end of the exceptionally prolonged war, the granting of political rights for the inhabitants of the Dobrudja, the Balkan war and the war for the national reunification of Romania.

---

[1]Some of the Romanian authors who contributed through their works to the study of the Muslim-Turkish community are as follows: Al. P. Arbore, "Contribuţiuni la studiul aşezărilor tătărilor şi turcilor din Dobrogea", *AnD*, 2, 1919, 3-4, p. 213-260; Al. Alecu, "Istoria seminarului musulman din Medgidia", *AnD*, 9, 1928, 2, p. 181-187; Petrescu, "Urme turceşti din Cadrilater", *AnD*, 13,14, 1932,1933, p. 53,56; T. Gemil, "Asociaţia din România a *Junilor turci*", *AIIAADX*, 7, 1970, p. 173-195; I. Nuredin, "Şcoli confesionale şi ale comunaţitlor din Dobrogea pâna la 1878", in Şt. Lascu, C. Vitanos (coordinators) *Colegiul pedagogic"Constantin Bratescu". Valorile civilizaţiei româneşti în Dobrogea,* Constanţa, 1993, p. 50-56; M. A. Ekrem, *Din istoria turcilor dobrogeni,* Bucureşti, 1994; V. Ciorbea, "Aspecte privind pozitia populaţiei musulmane la sfârşitul primului razboi mondial faţă de problemele Dobrogei", in *Originea tătarilor. Locul lor în România şi în lumea turcă,* coordinated by T. Gemil, Bucureşti, 1997, p. 227-231.

[2]See F. De Jong, "The Turks and the Tatars in Romania", *Turcica,* 18, 1986, p. 165-187.

[3]See M. Ülküsal, *Dobruca ve Türkler*, Ankara, 1966. The author, born in Romania relies on personal observations and memories, using at the same time a limited number of published sources.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0221

On the other hand, the long drought which lasted until the first decade of our century had repercussions over all inhabitants of the Dobrudja, despite the efforts the state made in order to help them. Within this context the aspect of emigration should also be taken into account. It was first recorded in the local press towards the end of the 19th century, and it became more evident at the beginning of the 20th century and after the First World War. Despite the difficulties met even nowadays in clarifying the causes which generated emigration, nevertheless we can express the opinion that for the interval 1900-1918, they had a local and temporary character and this phenomenon highly preoccupied all succeeding governments which endeavoured to stop or at least to diminish it.

At the beginning of the interval we are focusing on, the Dobrudja had two counties, Constanţa and Tulcea, and it was administrated under an exceptional regime, centralisation here being more accentuated than in the rest of the country. In the meeting of the town council on January, 26, 1901, the major of Constanţa asserted that "...here, in the Dobrudja, the Mayor is the spokesman of the Government...",[1] acting by virtue of the law and under the permanent control of the council and the government. He justified the lack of a detailed exposition, saying that" it is not necessary here; it is much more necessary in the villages across the Danube, where the principle of communal autonomy and the tendency for administrative decentralisation are much stronger".[2] We assume that in his exposition the Mayor was referring to the Law on the Organisation of the Dobrudja of March 1880, which clearly pointed out the Mayor's prerogatives.[3] As for the communal councils composition in Tulcea and Constanţa, in accordance with article 48 in the Law on the Organisation of the Dobrudja, each council consisted of nine members, three of them being appointed by the Prefect "from the notables".[4] For instance, in a letter issued by the Prefecture of Constanţa on November, 12, 1901, addressed to the Town Hall, the Prefect made known the fact that, by virtue of article 48 from the Law on the Organisation of the Dobrudja, besides the six elected councilmen, he would appoint three councilmen,

[1]The National Archives Direction of the County of Constanţa, fund of the Townhall of Constanţa, file 33/1901, 1, 23 verso. It presents a detailed situation of the town administration by the former and the present communal council.
[2]*Ibidem.*
[3]See *Monitorul Oficial,* No. 57 of March, 9 (21), 1880, p. 1582-1583.
[4]*Ibidem,* p. 1583.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0222

Abdula Hagi Zait being one of them.[1] On the first of May, 1904, the Law on the Organisation of the Rural Communes[2] came into operation, and it aimed at a better organisation of communal structures, a new system of capitalising economical potentialities and participation in public life as well, by setting up village councils, elected for four years. Each village was to be represented by a literate delegate of the council (who was supposed to support the interests of his community in front of the communal council).[3] Article 246 specified that the law, besides the orders of title VII, with reference to the setting up of communal inspectors, was to be also applied in the Dobrudja.

Nevertheless, articles 47, 48, 51, 53 and 55 from the Law on the Organisation of the Dobrudja of March 1880 were still maintained.[4] The new law which came into operation on the first of May 1904 also maintained the judicial organisation in the Dobrudja, in accordance with article 60 from the law of 1880. The existing subprefectures were maintained as well, and they continued to function on the basis of the attributions established by the laws.[5]

The existence and the maintenance of the exceptional regime in administrating the Dobrudja caused some abuses at the local administration level, which were recorded by the Dobrudja press. For instance, the local newspaper *Dobrogea jună* relates on its first page the conclusions Lascar Catargiu reached after having inspected the Dobrudja in 1889; the idea is that quite many of the officials who had come from different parts of the country or from the neighbourhood of Transylvania or Bessarabia, especially notaries and

---

[1]The National Archives Direction of the County of Constanţa, fund of the Townhall of Constanţa, file 30/1901, 1. 62. Abdula Hagi Zait was member of the communal council—with several interruptions and of the provisional committee in those 44 official reports from January, 21, to December, 14, 1901; see *Ibidem,* file 33/1901.

[2]*Monitorul Oficial,* No. 26 of May, 1 (14), 1904, p. 985-1348.

[3]About the election, composition and duties of the village councils see *Ibidem,* p. 987-995.

[4]*Ibidem,* p. 1009. With reference to the articles 47, 48, 51, and 55 from the Law on the Organization of the Dobrudja, of 1880, see *Ibidem,* No. 57 of March, 9 (21), 1880, p. 1583, where, among others, it is specified that for the urban and rural communes the Mayors are appointed from among the counsellors by the Minister of Internal Affairs and respectivelly by the prefects, the appointments being revocable (article 47).

[5]*Monitorul Oficial,* No. 26 of May 1 (14), 1904, p. 1009. Article 60 from the Law on the Organization of the Dobrudja of 1880 stipulated the foundation and functioning of a court of Appeal at Constanţa, see *Ibidem,* No. 57 of March, 9 (21), 1880, p. 1583. A few months after the new law came into operation (the law for organizing rural communes), the prefect of the county of Tulcea, Luca Ionescu stated that the Law on the Organization of the Dobrudja of 1880 would be maintained, specifying that the village delegates would be appointed by the prefecture. He also referred to the difficulties in applying the new law, since in many villages it was impossible to find people who knew the legislation and especially in the villages of the small rural district of Sulina there were people who did not know the language of the country; see the *Report presented to the county council by the prefect Luca Ionescu, Tulcea,* Bucharest, 1904, p. 156-160.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0223

tax collectors, had only one purpose: to get rich at the expense of the local population.[1] In the same newspaper fragments from M. Kogălniceanu's speech in the Chamber, on March 1889, are recorded. On this occasion he asserted that the Dobrudja "is groaning with tax collectors and notaries who are more terrible and worse than the janissaries in Turkey".[2] Since nobody called these corrupt officials to account, such abuses continued to exist in the years to come. For example, in 1904, the prefect of the county of Constanţa pointed out that it was necessary that such habits should be set right.[3]

Vasile M. Kogălniceanu, who also insisted on removing the exceptional regime, mentioned that were some national iron-handed prefects who can do anything.[4]

These examples illustrate that abuses affected all people alike in the Dobrudja, no special minority being referred to.

The granting of political rights to the inhabitants of the counties of Constanţa and Tulcea and the removing of the exceptional regime from administration by virtue of the laws of 1909,[5] 1910,[6] and 1912[7] were of great importance for the further evolution of the Dobrudja. In the county of Tulcea the granting of full, non-restrictive political rights was delivered by King Carol I himself, to the delegation of the county council made up of five persons, the Muslim Ali Sabri being one of them.[8]

---

[1] See *Dobrogea Jună*, I, No. 7 of January, 23, 1905, p. 1, where the article "Administraţia din Dobrogea" has no signature but the initial /S/. The author of this article might have been Constantin M. Sarry, the owner director of the publication. In the end of this article the author expresses his hope that the new prefects of the two counties would do away with the irregularities occurred in the local public services.

[2] *Ibidem.*

[3] *Ibidem.*

[4] V. M. Kogalniceanu, *Dobrogea 1879-1909. Drepturi politice fără libertăţi*, Bucureşti, 1910, p. 210. In fact, the author's observations (in the introduction to the book mentioned above, he shows that, what he meant in his book was to point out the negative aspects of administrating the Dobrudja under an exceptional regime) were taken over by some authors, for example F. De Jong, *op cit.*, p. 169.

[5] See *Monitorul Oficial*, No. 35 of March, 27, 1909, p. 401-404.

[6] *Ibidem, No.* 13 of April, 15, 1910, p. 588.

[7] *Ibidem, No.* 10 of December, 19, 1912, p. 43-44.

[8] *Expunerea situaţiunei judeţului Tulcea pe anul 1909*, reported to the county council on the occasion of opening the ordinary session by P. C. Athanasiu, prefect of Tulcea, 1909, p. 4. The prefect also mentions the visit he had paid in almost all communes and villages of the county in the same year (1909), together with Ioan I. C. Bratianu, Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs, Spiru Haret, Minister of Cults and of Public Instruction, A. Carp, Minister of Domains and V. G. Mortun, with a view to a better understanding of the inhabitants' situation, special attention being given to the causes for which a lot of people emigrated and to the difficult condition of veterans (p. 9).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0224

With regard to the necessity of granting political rights to the inhabitants of the Dobrudja, C. Nacu, speaker of the law project for granting these rights to the people in the counties of Constanţa and Tulcea, in the Senate session of March, 13, 1909, asserted that "the Romanian State had never treated the inhabitants of the Dobrudja as a conquered people since they could enjoy laws which protected their life, honour, wealth, in impartial justice, religious liberty and other political liberties" and that "the granting of political rights is an act of justice as the inhabitants of the Dobrudja have always fulfilled their duties to the country, proving that they are conscious of the rights which have been acknowledged to them".[1] On the same occasion, Ion I. C. Bratianu, Minister of Internal Affairs at that time, concluded his speech with the following words: "Today, the condition of transition should cease; it is time the people on the right side of the Danube were granted political rights".[2]

As for the representation of the Muslim-Turkish community in the parliament of the country, it is worth mentioning that for the first time four Muslim representatives entered the Assembly of Deputies in 1919. Mustafa Mehmet Fehim was one of them, and he considered this moment as being "historical for us, the Muslims from all over the Dobrudja".[3]

On December, 19, 1912, a new law came into operation. It contained new regulations which removed from the administration some provisions of the exceptional Law on the Organisation of the Dobrudja. For instance, article IV of the new law stipulated that "the councils of the counties of Constanţa and Tulcea, as well as the communal councils of the urban communes, residences and non-residences of these counties are legitimately dissolved, new elections are about to be initiated by virtue of the laws enumerated in article II, which are to be also applied in the Dobrudja".[4]

---

[1] *Monitorul Oficial,* No. 35 of March, 27, 1909, p. 401.

[2] *Ibidem,* p. 404.

[3] See *Minorităţile Naţionale din România, 1918-1925. Documente,* Coordinated by I. Scurtu and L. Boar, 1995, doc. 21, p. 182-183.

[4] *Monitorul Oficial,* No. 10 of December, 19, 1912, p. 43, where Take Ionescu, Minister of Internal Affairs, considers that "there is no reason that the dispositions of the exceptional law on the organization of the Dobrudja should be maintained" since the people living in the Dobrudja are having representatives in the Chamber and in the Senate. On the other hand, I. T. Ghica, representative of the Liberal National Party, remarks: "The Liberal National Party that had voted the law for granting political rights in the Dobrudja, wishes the exceptional regime in the Dobrudja would cease from now on" (*Ibidem,* p. 44).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0225

The opinion according to which the corruption and the abuses manifested at the level of administration may have been the cause for which many of the Muslim people emigrated (especially during the thirty years of exceptional regime), was shared by some authors in their studies.[1] It seems that after the Law on the Organisation of Rural Communes had come into operation in May 1904, the new officials of local administration were appointed only on the basis of their competence[2] and more drastic measures were adopted against abuses and corruption. For example, the subprefect of Isaccea, a small rural district, sent an official letter to the prefect of the county on October, 22, 1910, informing him that the communal secretary and the preceptor had been unfairly put in possession of land by the chief of the domain district.[3] In the same address it is mentioned that the communal secretary was dismissed and severe punishment is demanded for the chief of the domain district and for the Mayor.[4] On the occasion of opening the ordinary session of the county council, the prefect of Tulcea pointed out that, as a result of the checks run in the county, those culpable of enrichment "...by fleecing, oppressing or wronging the people had been replaced by officials who can be compared to those in the rest of the country".[5]

Within this administrative context, appreciations of some local administrators are worth mentioning, especially because of the existence of more nationalities in the Dobrudja. The subprefect of Macin, another small rural district of the county of Tulcea, showed in his report dated September, 1907/n. 4618 that the ethnic structure of the district was made up of: "Romanians, Gagauz, Bulgarians, Turks, Tatars, Greeks, Russians, Christian Gypsies, Lipovanes, Armenians, Jews, Germans and Italians". The subprefect

---

[1] F. De Jong *op. cit.*, p. 169. He uses rather exagerated terms, we consider, stating that from 1880 to 1910 (for thirty years) "a reign of terror in the region" was enforced. For the same interval of time the author mentions another historian who enumerates the villages from the Dobrudja deserted by Turkish inhabitants till 1910: see M. Ülküsal, *op. cit.*, (apud) F. De Jong, *op. cit.* p. 169. He also mentions V. M. Kogălniceanu who does not make any reference to the Muslim population, but to the negative aspects in administration during the exceptional regime. We think it is more realistical to consider the abuses and the corruption of some local officials as being the cause of emigration (see M . A. Ekrem, *op. cit.* p. 90-91).

[2] The secretaries of local administration are to be appointed only after going in for qualification examination, only former notaries or literaes being allowed to participate; see *Dare de seama presentata consiliului judeţean (prefect Luca Ionescu)*, Tulcea, 1978.

[3] The National Archives Direction of the County of Tulcea, fund of the Prefecture of the County of Tulcea, file 15/1910, I. 12.

[4] *Ibidem.*

[5] *Expunerea situaţiunei judetului Tulcea pe anul 1910.* Reported to county council on the occasion of opening the ordinary session by I. C. Athanasiu, prefect of Tulcea, 1910, p. XI. For three years, till 1910, Athanasiu was prefect of the county.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0226

hinted that "the easiest to administrate were the Turks and the Tatars who were very honest".[1]

After the Balkan Wars and the Treaty signed at Bucharest[2] on the occasion of the Peace Conference (July, 17/30-July, 28/August, 10, 1913), Romania was granted the southern part of the Dobrudja, known as the Cadrilater. It had an area of 7726 square kilometres[3] and a population of 282,778 inhabitants. 123,848 of them were Turks, 12,376 were Tatars, therefore, there were 136,244 Muslims, representing 48.1%.[4] Article II from the Treaty of Bucharest (1913) rectified the border of the Dobrudja with Bulgaria in the following way "The new border starts from the Danube, from the north of Turtucaia and reaches the Black Sea southwards of Ekrene".[5] The Cadrilater, which preserved lots of traces of the long Ottoman administration,[6] and whose toponimy until 1878 was exclusively Turkish (with the exception of a few localities on the bank of the Danube and on the Black Sea coast)[7] had a temporary organisation of justice on the basis of "ministry decision"[8] until the first of April 1914. Thus, a translator of Turkish and Bulgarian was to join the staff of the districts courts, founded on the model of the judiciary instances in Romania.[9] Islamic courts were being founded at Silistra and Bazargic, having a *kadı* and a clerk, and functioning according to the same

---

[1]The National Archives Direction of the County of Tulcea, fund of the Prefecture of the County Tulcea, administrative service, file 13/1907, f. 1 verso.

[2]T. Maiorescu, *România, războaiele balcanice şi Cadrilaterul,* published by Stelian Neagoe, Bucureşti, 1995, doc. 99, p. 232-239. It is worth mentioning that before the treaty was signed, Romania demanded that the principle of protecting the minorities should be inscribed in the Proceedings of London of January 16/29, 1913, and of Petersburg of April, 26/May, 9, 1913. As a result, Bulgaria had to agree to the autonomy of the *Cuţovlahi* in Bulgaria, to their schools and churches and to set up an episcopate of theirs, institutions subsidized by the Romanian state under the supervision of the Bulgarian government. The protection of minorities was demanded and obtained by Romania in 1913, and this principle was further inscribed in the international treaties of 1919; see D. Stoicescu, "Organizarea Dobrogei-Noi şi principiile de justiţie", in *Cadrilaterul 1913-1938* (= *AnD*, 19, 1938, 2), p. 168.

[3]I. Nistor, "Recuperarea Cadrilaterului. Cu ocazia aniversarii de 25 de ani de la anexarea Dobrogei-Noi", in *Cadrilaterul 1913-1938* (=*AnD*, 19, 1938, 2), p. 157.

[4]S. Mehedinţi, "Observari asupra Dobrogei", *Convorbiri Literare* 51 (1919), p. 79; *cf.* Al. P. Arbore, "Caracterul etnografic al Dobrogei sudice din epoca turceasca pâna la 1913", in *Cadrilaterul 1913-1918* (= *AnD*, 19, 1938, 2), p. 118, where there are a few figures resulted from Bulgaria's census of 1910, when the two counties of Caliacra and Durostor had a population of 282, 228 inhabitants of whom 106, 830 were Turks and 11, 584 were Tatars.

[5]Titu Maiorescu, *op. cit.*, 99, p. 234.

[6]Petrescu, "Urme turceşti in Cadrilater", *AnD*, 13, 14, 1932-1933, p. 53-56.

[7]C. Brătescu, "Populaţia Cadrilaterului între anii 1878-1938", *Cadrilaterul 1913-1938* (= *AnD*, 19, 1938, 2) p. 193.

[8]D. Stoicescu, *op. cit.*, p. 184. The provisional organization of justice till April, Ist, 1914, was due to the late approval of the treaty of July, 28, 1913 by the Romanian legislative body (*Ibidem,* p. 183-184).

[9]*Ibidem,* p. 184.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0227

rules as those in Constanţa and Tulcea.[1] Starting with April, 1st, 1914, the Law on the Organisation of the New Dobrudja came into operation,[2] and consequently, the region was administratively divided into two counties: Caliacra, with the residence at Bazargic and Durostor, with the residence at Silistra. Special attention was given to the organisation of the local administration, which was to function on the basis of the Law on General Administration. However, the county prefect, who had larger prerogatives, was to depend directly on the Ministry of Internal Affairs; at the same time he was to benefit from a "Prefecture council with advisory vote in administrative, economic and cultural problems".[3] On the other hand, the mayors of the urban communes were appointed with the notification of the prefect, and those of the rural communes were directly appointed, five counsellor in the towns residences of counties, three in the urban communes and two in the rural communes.[4] At the prefect's proposal, in the structure of the county councils, the Ministry of Internal Affairs would appoint five counsellors in addition to those already elected.[5] As for the judicial organisation, the Law on the Organisation of the new Dobrudja stipulated the functioning of Mohammedan courts at Silistra, Turtucaia, Bazargic, Balcic. They had to judge according to the Mohammedan laws and usages. The Appeal Court in Constanţa, besides prerogatives similar to those in the rest of the country had to judge also "the appeals against the sentences of Mohammedan courts according to the Mohammedan usages and laws".[6] The law also provided for dispositions with reference to citizens' rights, which were almost similar to those in the rest of the country.[7] The liberty of conscience and the freedom of worship were also guaranteed on condition that they were exercised in accordance with legal provisions and good manners.[8] The Christian Orthodox church was declared dominant and two Muftiates were to be set up at Silistra and Bazargic, the

---

[1] *Ibidem,* p. 184-185.

[2] *Ibidem,* p. 169. Some dispositions of this law will be changed by virtue of law no. 99 coming into operation starting with April, 22, 1924. See also *Colecţiune de legi şi regulamente 51 ianuarie 1924-31 decembrie 1924,* Official publication drafted by the Ministry of Justice, cf. to art. 37 from the constitution, Bucharest, 1925, p. 206-215.

[3] D. Stoicescu, *op. cit.,* p. 172-173.

[4] *Ibidem,* p. 173.

[5] *Ibidem.*

[6] *Ibidem,* p. 185-186.

[7] Here we mention some of the differences and exceptions from the political and civil rights of the Romanian citizens: the right to have representatives in the Parliament could be obtained by a special ordinary law, rural houses could be got only in the New-Dobrudja, public meetings could take place only after police authorities had been informed, associations with various aims were allowed only under the control of justice, they could benefit from free education in public schools, the teaching staff being paid by the state, the right to carry weapons and to deal in weapons had to be approved by the prefect etc. See *ibidem,* p. 172.

[8] *Ibidem.*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0228

main mosques being supported by the Romanian Church House.[1] Therefore, in 1914 the new Dobrudja started to be administrated under an exceptional legislative regime,[2] with a break between august 1916-November 1918, when the Dobrudja was occupied by troops of the Central Powers,[3] the transition process being considered as closed on January, 1st, 197.[4]

The year 1914 was strongly marked by the aggravation of international situation, and further events, which were determined by military operations of the Central Powers, were to make the Dobrudja "one of the main fronts in the Balkans".[5] Before the first World War broke out, on June, 1st, 1914, Nicholas II, the Tsar of Russia, had come to Constanţa, at the invitation of Carol I and of the Romanian government. The Tsar's visit was preceded by the arrival of King Carol I and of the Queen, an event for which the townhall invited many notables to be present, the Mufti of the county of Constanţa and the kadi of the Muslim Court being two of them.[6] The citizens were informed in a printed appeal signed by the mayor himself, that on June, 1st, 1914, in Constanţa, "the great Emperor of Russia meets with the King of Romania. The most powerful Emperor from the north with the most powerful King from eastern Europe."[7] The ceremonies and the pomp occasioned by the two sovereigns' meeting[8] confirmed what the town's officials estimated as being "a historical event of remarkable importance".[9] On the following day, Ion I. C. Bratianu sent a telegram to the mayor of Constanţa which was made known to the citizens of the locality. It said: "On behalf of His Majesty the King, please convey to the citizens of Constanta, and particularly to all representatives of the local administration, special thanks for the warm reception they have

---

[1] *Ibidem.*

[2] *Ibidem,* p. 173, 187.

[3] S. Lascu, "Din istoria Dobrogei de sud în cadrul României întregite (1913-1940)", N. S. 6, 1995, 11-12, p. 10.

[4] D. Stoicescu, *op. cit.,* p. 188.

[5] A. Radulescu, I. Bitoleanu, *Istoria românilor dintre Dunare şi Mare. Dobrogea,* Bucureşti, 1979, p. 307.

[6] The National Archives Director of the County of Constanţa, of the Townhall of Constanţa, file 9/1914, 1.90.

[7] *Ibidem,* 1.192-193.

[8] The official reports of the communal council and the address no. 8673 of August, 1914, to the Ministry of Internal Affairs show that a large sum of money of 172,307 Lei and 57 Bani was spent for decorating and adorning the town on the occasion of the Tzar's visit. Taking into account the difficult financial situation of the community, the communal council considers that too much money was spent for this visit and it is demanded that it should be paid by the state, or taken from the loan of 3 million Lei destined for the consolidation of the sea shore, with the obligation to return the money within two years (*Ibidem,* 1.228,228 versom, 289).

[9] *Ibidem,* 1.193.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0229

given to his noble guests, Their Imperial Majesties, the Emperor and the Empress of all Russians".[1]

It is known that after the First World War had broken out Romania declared its neutrality, which lasted for two years; however, there was a rather worried frame of mind among the people of the Dobrudja, as well as among the local and central authorities, caused especially by the war situation in which the two neighbouring countries, Russia and Bulgaria found themselves. We would like to mention some examples selected from archive documents which reflect this state of spirit. For example, in the county of Tulcea, in October and November 1915, reports of the Special Brigade of Security to the prefect, with the specification "confidential" or "strictly confidential" referred to Russian vessels with soldiers, sailors and war equipment on board, which were frequently passing through Lascăr Catargi and Chilia ports.[2] The police of the town of Isaccea informed the prefect that German inhabitants were spreading pro-German propaganda and other Russian persons were suspected of spying or of socialist propaganda that were endangering the state interests.[3] In another address with the specification "strictly confidential" sent by th chief of the Police Station of Isaccea to the prefect, on March, 9, 1916, four Muslims are mentioned and a certain Ilie Strumschi (whose identity is difficult to establish). It was proved that they possessed printed forms with telegrams and other news about the German army operations, German newspapers, Ottoman newspapers, materials which in the conception of the police inspector were meant to spread among the inhabitants "the pro-German spirit".[4] The prefect demanded a check on those mentioned in the report, whether they were Romanian citizens and whether they were spreading propaganda "in the presence of others".[5] Alarming news was reported in the address no. 4015 of the Police Station of the town of Sulina to the prefect, news based on the testimony of a Greek subject, captain of a merchant ship,[6] who, describing the existing situation on his way from Constantinople through Bulgaria, noticed (here, in Bulgaria) "numerous distributions of troops".[7] A copy of this report which contains further information (regarding the thousands of wounded

---

[1] *Ibidem,* 1.188. About the tzar's visit in Constanţa see also I. G. Duca, *Memorii,* I, *Neutralitatea, I, 1914,1915,* 1992, p. 29-34.

[2] The National Archives Direction of the county Tulcea, fund of the Precture service administrative, of the Country of Tulcea, file 23/1915-1916, 1.8,34,57. The documents in the respective file are from January 9, 1915-April 8, 1916.

[3] *Ibidem,* 1.69,174.

[4] *Ibidem,* 1.201.

[5] *Ibidem.*

[6] *Ibidem,* 1.3.

[7] *Ibidem,* 1.3 verso.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0230

people who came daily from Istanbul, or the high prices of food, a kilogram of bread was 1.60 lei, or the concentration of the Turkish fleet at the straits mouth from the Black Sea, etc., was to be sent to the Ministry of Internal Affairs.[1]

After the Romanian army had been defeated in the Dobrudja, the territory occupied by the hostile armies was divided into administrative halting places on economic criteria,[2] with the main purpose of turning to account the economic resources and the existing potentialities. For instance, the administration of the German halting places included the county of Constanţa and part of the south of the county of Tulcea separated in the north by the following localities: Ostrov, Ayar-Ahmet (nowadays Magurele), Orumbei (Luminiţa), Topolog, Baş-Pînar (Fantana Mare), Slava-Rusa, Caugagia (Unirea), Canla-Bugeac (Lunca), Paya-Caşla (Vişina) and Jurilovca.[3] The Bulgarian halting places administrated the territory north of this limit.[4] The only area of the Dobrudja left under the control of the Romanian army and administration was the Danube Delta,[5] where, ever since December, 1916, in such localities as Chilia Veche, Caraorman, Sf. Gheorghe, C. A. Rosetti, lots of refugees had come, especially from the county of Tulcea.[6] Besides the difficulties in supplying these refugees with food and in administrating the small territory left unoccupied from the Dobrudja, there were cases when Russian soldiers used to arrest Romanian police soldiers and escort them to Sulina, declaring that "...they do not acknowledge the Romanian civilian and military authorities".[7] In the occupied territory the Romanian and Muslim

---

[1] *Ibidem,* 1.3,3 verso.

[2] Fr. K. Mann, *Kriegwirtschaft in Rumänien,* Bucharest, 1918, p. 13. A calculation was made for the year 1917 and it was revealed that the whole population of Germany and of Austro-Hungary could have lived for almost two months exclusively with cereals from the occupied territory of Romania. See also *Ibidem,* p. 27: the German lieutenant-colonel Van den Bergh the chief of the German halting places administration of the Dobrudja, showed the importance of exporting cereals and raw materials to Germany, Austro-Hungary and other allies. His conclusion is that "Romania's participation to the War was a stroke of luck for us". See: also C. Bratescu, "De sub ocupaţia germană în Dobrogea", *Arhiva Dobrogei*, 2, 1919, 2, p. 118.

[3] C. Bratescu, "Doua statistici etnografice germane în Dobrogea", in *Arhiva Dobrogei*, 1919, 1. p. 61.

[4] These divisions and subdvisions were based on economic reasons, our administrative divisions having not been taken into account. see *Ibidem;* this division functioned starting with January, 5, 1917. Till then, functioned (defectively, from the German point of view) the Bulgarian administration. See C. Bratescu, *De sub ocupatia germana..., cit.,* p. 126-127.

[5] V. Ciorbea, *Aspecte privind pozitia populatiei musulmane la sfârşitul primului razboi mondial faţă de problemele Dobrogei,* in *Originea tătarilor, ... cit,* p. 227.

[5] The National Archives Direction of the County of Tulcea, fund of the Prefecture of the County of Tulcea, administrative service file 40/1916, 1.2, 13,16,22; file 60/1917, 1.3.

[6] The National Archives Direction of the County of Tulcea, fund of the Prefecture of the County of Tulcea, administrative service file 40/1916, 1.2, 13,16,22; file 60/1917, 1.3.

[7] *Ibidem,* file 60/1917, 1.2; see copy of the report no. 489 of December 1916 to the Administration of the fisheries in Tulcea.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0231

people had to suffer many privations owing to the Bulgarian and German administration.[1] After the peace treaty signed at Buftea-Bucharest on April, 24/May, 7, 1918, the Dobrudja was admitted under the condominium of the Central Powers, Romania being ensured the way out to the Black Sea through the strip Cernavoda-Constanţa.[2]

This situation determined the intensification of Bulgarian propaganda, materialised in those two "congresses" which took place at Babadag, in December, 1917 and in July, 1918, which tried to prove to the international world the would-be rights of Bulgaria over Romania.[3] The decision of those two "congresses" brought about hostile reactions from the Romanians and the Muslim Romanian citizens. In his article entitled *In numele musulmanilor din Dobrogea* (In the Name of the Muslims in the Dobrudja), Mustafa Hagi Abduraman, former teacher at the Muslim Seminary of Medgidia, pointed out that Romania provided Muslim people with schools and mosques of their own, "which few other so-called civilised countries did", and concluded with the following remark: "The Muslim population in the Dobrudja cannot have a common cause with those few irresponsibles or cowards who, because of having been either tempted or threatened, signed the Bulgarians written statement of Babadag."[4] In November, 1918, the teacher Mustafa Hagi Abduraman was a member of the delegation that was to lay down a written statement to General Coanda, President of the Council of Ministers, the same written statement being handed over to the representatives of Romania, England, France and the U.S.A., whose support being required in solving the difficult situation of the population in the Dobrudja.[5]

After the armistice between the allies and Germany had been signed, and as a result of the repeated steps taken by the Romanian authorities and by some personalities of the Dobrudja, "Romania's allies agreed to the return of the Romanian administration and afterwards of the Romanian army on the right side of the Danube".[6] The reinstalling of Romanian administrative authorities in the two counties of Tulcea and Constanţa took place in the first half of December, 1918. In a publication of the prefecture of the County of Constanţa issued on December, 1st/14th, 1918, all people of Constanţa were

---

[1] See V. Ciorbea, *op. cit.*, p. 227-228.
[2] A. Rădulescu, I. Bitoleanu, *op. cit.*, p. 321. V. Ciorbea, *op. cit.*, p. 228; N. Ciachir, *Marile Puteri şi România (1856-1947)*, Bucureşti, 1996, p. 178.
[3] V. Ciorbea, *op. cit.*, p. 228.
[4] *Dobrogea Junǎ*, year XIV, No. 3 of November, 30, 1918, p. 1.
[5] *Ibidem*, No. 2 of November, 24, 1918, p. 1.
[6] V. Ciorbea, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0232

invited on the following day (December, 2nd/15th, 1918) at 0 a.m. to attend a divine service, followed by "the ceremony of installing the judicial and administrative authorities in the Palace of Justice".[1] In the county of Tulcea the staff required in administration were reinstalled with a certain difficulty because quite many of the office workers who had taken refuge to Chilia Veche and Sulina since the beginning of December did not come back. In the telegram no. 76 of December, 4, 1918, sent by the prefect of Tulcea to the Minister of Internal Affairs it is shown that "till now no administrator of any small rural district has presented himself at the post, only four notaries came".[2] In the same telegram it is mentioned that in the town of Tulcea there were "...only one police subinspector, two town sergeants brought from Sulina. No district judge in the whole county".[3] It is also mentioned that provisional committees were working in several communes, in a few others the old ones could not be replaced, and in the rest of them "people councils will function till the authorities who have not come yet from their refuge install themselves."[4]

A rather difficult situation had been created in the Counties of Durostor and Caliacra, in the south of the Dobrudja, because the Bulgarian army and authorities refused to withdraw, hoping that —in spite of having been defeated— the stipulations of the treaty signed at Bucharest would be cancelled.[5] Within this context it is worth mentioning the attitude the Muslim Romanian citizens had expressed in a declaration of devotion to the Romanian state. It is specified that "... the Muslim people in Romania, who have shared the same rights with the people of Romanian nationality, declare once again what they have always stated and put into practice, their solidarity with the Romanian people."[6]

On May, 29, 1919, at the meeting which took place in Constanţa and where lots of Romanians, Muslims, Greeks and others participated, the right of Romania over the Dobrudja was reasserted.[7] In July, 1919, the Congress of the Muslim representatives from the four Counties of Constanţa, Tulcea, Durostor and Caliacra took place at Constanţa, and on this occasion a strong

---

[1] *Din tezaurul documentar dobrogean,* 1988, doc. 360, p. 418-419.
[2] The National Archives Direction of the County of Tulcea, fund of the Prefecture of the County of Tulcea, administrative service, file 66/1918, 1.1.
[3] *Ibidem.*
[4] *Ibidem.*
[5] See V. Ciorbea, *op. cit.,* p. 229.
[6] The Library of the Congress of the U.S.A. The Manuscripts Department. Papers of Robert Lansing, roll II, p. 166,170; *cf.* V. Ciorbea, op. cit., p. 229.
[7] See Farul, No. I, of June, 1st, 1919, p. 1.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0233

protest was launched against the attempts to change the border of the south Dobrudja.[1] Later on, on December, 13, 1919, Mustafa Mehmet Felim, one of the first four Muslim representatives in the Romanian Parliament stated from the rostrum of the Assembly of Deputies that the Muslims who were participants at the Congress of Constanţa in July, 1919 "protested against detaching the Cadrilater from the mother-country".[2] On November 27, 1919, at Neuilly sur Seine the peace treaty with Bulgaria was signed. As a result, it was acknowledged that the Dobrudja with its four counties was part of the Romanian state and consequently the frontier, "as it had existed on August, 1st, 1914"[3] was re-established.

In conclusion, the regime exceptionally prolonged till the legislative provisions of 1909, 1910 and 1912 came into operation caused a series of abuses of the local officials, abuses which affected the Romanian and the Muslim people alike. Such aspects were recorded in the contemporary press as well as in the archival documents. The removing of the exceptional regime and the granting of political rights to the inhabitants of the Dobrudja had as a result the first representation of the Muslim population in the Romanian Parliament, when in 1919 four Muslim deputies entered the Chamber of Deputies. The Muslim people expressed their attachment to the Romanian state not only when they responded to the Bulgarian propaganda and to those two "congresses" of Babadag, but also on the occasion of the Congress of the Muslim representatives of the four counties of the Dobrudja, which took place at Constanţa, in July, 1919.

---

[1] V. Ciorbea, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[2] *Minoritatile nationale din România 1918-1925... cit.*, doc. 21, p. 181-183.

[3] I. Scurtu (coordinator), Gh. Z. Ionescu, Eufrosina Popescu, Dorina Smârcea, *Istoria României între anii 1918-1944. Culegere de documente*, Bucureşti, 1982, p. 34.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0234

IV. IN MEMORIAM

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0235

NICOARA BELDICEANU - SES ÉTUDES À ISTANBUL
La correspondance adressée au Prof. Victor Papacostea (14 oct. 1946 - 28 sept. 1948)

Cornelèa PAPACOSTEA - DANIELOPOLU

C'est en automne 1946 que les jeunes diplômés de la Faculté d'Histoire de Bucarest, Nicoara Beldiceanu et Ioan Matei — particulièrement doués et passionnés d'histoire balkanique et tout spécialement de l'histoire de l'Empire ottoman — partaient vers Istanbul, afin d'y compléter leurs connaissances en langue turque et aussi dans le but de pénétrer dans les riches archives et bibliothèques de la ville.

En l'absence de bourses proprement dites, la formule financière trouvée par leur professeur et mentor, Victor Papacostea, de commun accord avec l'ambassadeur de la Roumanie en Turquie, Grigore Moisil, fut celle d'un poste d'attaché culturel de l'Ambassade qui devait être partagé par les deux jeunes historiens, afin de se spécialiser dans un domaine pour lequel ils étaient si doués.

Pendant ces deux années, 1946-1948 — qui se sont avérées décisives pour leur formation — Nicoara Beldiceanu et Ioan Matei avaient régulièrement écrit à Victor Papacostea, en lui donnant de véritables rapports d'activité, ainsi que des renseignements bibliographiques, des relations de leurs rencontres scientifiques et des nouvelles de leur santé. Sur ce dernier point, le prof. Papacostea était particulièrement strict, car il craignait que la modique somme dont ils disposaient ne les oblige pas à de trop grandes économies qui auraient nuit à leur santé. C'est pourquoi, les lettres mentionnent souvent des détails sur la manière dont ils se nourrissaient et même sur leur poids, afin de le rassurer à ce sujet.

Du grand nombre de lettres, dont plusieurs ont disparu au fil des années, nous avons choisi celles qu'on conserve dans les archives de famille du Prof. Papacostea, datant de la période oct. 1946 à sept. 1948.

Nous commençons par la première — écrite à Pera — dans laquelle il décrit l'arrivée à Istanbul, le 14 X. 1946 :

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0237

Le voyage par mer, nous ne l'avons même pas senti. Le matin, lorsque nous sommes sortis sur le pont, nous avons aperçu à l'horizon l'entrée dans les Détroits. Une fois entrées, on a commencé différents contrôles.

Sur le quai m'attendait Matei, qui m'a facilité les formalités de douane. Le même jour, nous avons trouvé deux chambres à 130 lires par mois. J'aurais voulu une seule chambre, mais Matei m'a dit que pour eux ce qui les intéressait c'était le nombre de personnes, car ils pensent au linge à laver. A un endroit où il n'y avait qu'une seule chambre à louer, on nous a demandé 100 lires, mais seulement pour une personne. Ils ne voulaient pas louer à deux personnes. Ici, comme à Bucarest, il y a une grande crise du logement. Les repas, si on mangeait tous les deux à midi et le soir en ville, nous coûteraient entre 7 et 9 lires. Ce dimanche nous avons déjeuné à la maison, des provisions que j'avais apportées de Roumanie et de celles qu'on avait envoyées à Matei. Aujourd'hui nous ferons de même. Dimanche nous avons visité Sainte Sophie, en allant ensuite à Yedi-kule. A Yedi-Kule on est impressionné par la chambre d'exécution, qui a un aspect sinistre. Au milieu, il y a une fontaine communiquant avec la mer. C'est par là qu'on jetait les corps de ceux qu'on exécutait.

Matei s'entend assez bien avec les Turcs, n'ayant plus besoin d'un interprète.

Les magasins sont remplis d'une grande variété de marchandises. Il y a des confiseries à chaque pas. Les restaurants même ils sont très propres.

Dans les bibliothèques on ne peut pénétrer pour copier ou photographier quelque chose qu'avec une approbation d'Ankara. D'après ce que Matei m'a dit, ce n'est qu'à la bibliothèque de l'Université qu'on n'a pas besoin d'autorisation. La Bibliothèque où se trouve le manuscrit de Guboğlu continue à être fermée. J'irai avec Matei pour voir ce que nous pourrons apprendre sur sa réouverture. On trouve des livres, mais ils sont chers. Matei en a quelques uns et nous ferons des notes pour *Balcania*.

Nous avons vu, le premier jour, au Consulat, M. Decei. Il s'est renseigné sur la personne qui enseigne le turc et il a semblé, ainsi que l'a remarqué Matei, aussi, assez déçu, quand il voit l'importance qu'on accorde à l'étude de la langue turque à l'Institut. Je lui ai montré les publications parues pendant l'absence de Matei; il en a été impressionné, je crois, car il n'a fait aucune remarque sur l'activité de l'Institut.

J'espère que dans deux mois je pourrai aussi m'entendre assez bien avec les Turcs. Matei a un très bon livre dont il enverra quelques-uns à l'Institut et dont nous faisons nous aussi des exercices. A Topkapi se trouvent des manuscrits concernant Bucarest, ainsi que je l'ai vu dans un catalogue. Quand il sera ouvert, j'irai voir de quoi il s'agit.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0238

La lettre suivante, datée "Istanbul, le 6 novembre 1941", doit être entièrement reproduite, comme la précédente, car Nicoara Beldiceanu y présente ses premiers contacts avec le Prof. Moisil, avec Ritter, le professeur d'arabe et de persan, avec Brânzeu, le lecteur de la langue roumaine. En voici le texte :

Il y a quelques jours vient d'arriver ici M. l'Ambassadeur Moisil. Il nous a dit que cette année il nous laisse à Istanbul, afin de pouvoir nous occuper de nos études. Tout le temps il a été très aimable, nous montrant un intérêt spécial. Nous sommes en bonne santé et, d'ailleurs, le temps aussi a été très beau jusqu'il y a deux jours. Depuis hier c'est le vent qui a commencé et tout le ciel s'est couvert de nuages ; pourtant le temps ne s'est pas trop refroidi. Les habitants disent que c'est passager. Moi et Matei avons profité du beau temps pour visiter la ville. Nous avons été au musée de Topkapi mais nous n'avons pas pu y voir grande chose, parce qu'il est fermé. J'ai écrit à Guboğlu que je ne pouvais rien faire, car le musée est non seulement fermé, mais aussi évacué. Dans un catalogue j'ai vu qu'il s'y trouvent aussi beaucoup d'autres choses qui regardent l'histoire roumaine, mais malheureusement, pour le moment, on ne peut rien faire. Je vous prie de le lui dire, vous aussi, parce que je ne voudrais pas qu'il ait l'impression que je ne veux pas le servir. Un autre jour, nous sommes allés à Rumili-Hisar, une forteresse à quelques km. de Constantinople et nous sommes passés pour la première fois sur la côte asiatique, où nous n'avons pas eu grande chose à voir. Nous devrons y aller une autre fois, après nous être documentés d'après un guide.

Nous avons connu, il y a une semaine, M. Brânzeu, qui a été très aimable. Avec lui nous sommes allés chez le professeur Ritter, qui enseigne l'arabe et le persan à la Fac. de Lettres. Nous avons décidé qu'au début nous prendrons des leçons avec son assistant, un monsieur Ateş. Ritter a dit que lui n'enseignait qu'à ceux qui étaient plus avancés dans cette étude. Pourtant il a accepté que, dans le cas où nous ne serions pas satisfaits de la méthode d'Ateş, nous allions chez lui. Brânzeu le lui a demandé parce qu'il pense que les professeurs turcs ont une méthode pour enseigner l'arabe qui ne convient pas aux Européens. Ritter a accepté de nous l'enseigner lui, mais, ainsi que je l'ai montré, seulement dans le cas où nous ne serions pas contents ; mais il nous a assurés qu'Ateş était formé par lui et qu'il enseignait d'après sa méthode.

C'est resté décidé qu'on ferait deux heures avec les étudiants turcs et une heure seulement pour nous. Nous commencerons les leçons ce samedi.

Nous voulions commencer maintenant le persan aussi, mais Ritter nous a dit de le laisser pour plus tard, car lorsque nous serons avancés pour l'arabe, il nous sera très facile d'apprendre le persan.

.....

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0239

M. l'Ambassadeur nous a dit que nous recevrons aussi le reste des livres que nous avons amassé. Nous vous prions de dire à Mlle. Vulcu de nous envoyer plusieurs exemplaires de chaque numéro de *Balcania*, lorsqu'ils seront parus.

.....

Nous avons vu dans un catalogue qu'à Topkapi se trouve un manuscrit de la chronique de Pecevi, qui semble plus riche que l'édition publiée, ainsi que me l'a dit Aurel Decei.

Il y a trois jours, M. l'Ambassadeur nous a invités à déjeuner, il s'est tout le temps intéressé à nous, il nous a dit que de soucis vous vous faites pour nous et je vous prie de croire que nous ferons de notre mieux pour vous satisfaire et ne pas perdre le temps inutilement.

Le 9 déc. 1946, Nicoara Beldiceanu écrivait au Prof. Victor Papacostea surtout pour lui donner des détails au sujet de l'étude de la langue arabe.

Je profite du départ vers la patrie des courriers venus ici il y a quelques jours, pour vous écrire.

Ainsi que je vous l'ai montré dans une autre lettre aussi, nous avons commencé l'arabe et nous sommes à la sixième leçon. Le professeur s'avère être très bon et surtout très bienveillant. Pourtant, l'arabe nous semble pour le moment plus difficile que le turc. Nous avons commencé par le verbe, qui est assez difficile à apprendre, mais nous espérons que, une fois que nous le saurons, le reste sera plus facile.

A la Bibliothèque de l'Université, que nous avons commencé à fréquenter, j'ai vu, en regardant le fichier des manuscrits, beaucoup de choses qui pourraient vous intéresser.

J'ai été aussi à la Fac. de Lettres et j'espère y trouver un ancien camarade de la I-ère année de Faculté, Vehbi Bekir, qui, venant ici, a continué à étudier l'histoire. Maintenant, à ce que j'ai entendu, il se trouve à la veille de l'alliance. Si je le trouvais, je crois qu'il nous serait très utile.

J'ai reçu, le 5 déc., une carte postale de Guboğlu, par laquelle il me posait des questions au sujet du manuscrit de Matreqci. Je lui ai écrit à plusieurs reprises que la Bibliothèque de Topkapi continue à être fermée et les matériaux évacués quelque part en Anatolie. Nous serons nous aussi intéressés par certaines choses qui se trouvent à Topkapı, car il y a là-bas des manuscrits concernant la Moldavie et la Valachie. Il paraît que l'un de ces manuscrits traite des événements qui se rattachent à l'année 1564. Guboğlu m'écrit aussi que les séances de communications ont commencé, mais il ne me dit rien sur la situation où se trouvent les publications de

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0240

l'Institut qui se trouvaient sous presse à mon départ. La semaine passée, M. l'Ambassadeur est venu d'Ankara. Il s'intéresse beaucoup à nous et se montre soucieux de notre bien-être. Dès qu'il est arrivé, il nous a demandé de nous faire peser, pour voir si nous n'avions pas maigri. Moi j'ai pris 3 kg. et Matei 1 kg., ce dernier mois.

Ce dimanche (le 15 déc.), le prof. Moisil donne un thé où il a invité, parmi d'autres, quelques professeurs d'histoire auxquels il veut nous recommander.

.....

Je vous envoie cette lettre et une note que j'ai rédigée au sujet d'un livre récent, qui traite de la bataille d'Ankara, le domaine de Mme, Bulgaru.

M. l'Ambassadeur envoie pour l'Institut l'*Enciclopedia Islamului*. Il y manque 2 fascicules, 8 et 10, qui n'ont pas pu être trouvés.

Le 8 Janvier 1947, la lettre de Beldiceanu reflète un intérêt spécial pour l'activité de l'Institut Balkanique de Bucarest, au sujet duquel lui a écrit Mihai Guboğlu. Il exprime sa joie d'avoir appris "qu'une série de communications à caractère plus restreint viennent de commencer et que bientôt on va reprendre les séances publiques". Au centre de ses préoccupations reste l'étude de la langue arabe. "Pour la langue arabe — écrit-il — nous avons appris les onze formes du verbe ayant une racine à trois consonnes. Nous avons commencé à faire aussi des exercices de traduction d'un livre contenant de petites histoires. Mais ce n'est pas bien facile, car nous ne possédons pas toutes les connaissances de grammaire nécessaires. "

Un autre souci constant est la confrontation des manuscrits Pecevi, car il a trouvé à la Bibliothèque de l'Université cinq manuscrits de la chronique et il veut comparer les passages qui l'intéressent. "A cette occasion — écrit-il — je ferai un utile exercice de paléographie turque."

Enfin, il veut apprendre ce qu'on a décidé à l'Institut Balkanique au sujet de son ouvrage sur le "vacarit" et si sa note concernant Decei paraîtra dans *Balcania* VIII.

Il signale aussi un aspect météorologique : "Jusqu'ici l'hiver a été très doux. Mais depuis quelques jours il a neigé abondamment, ce qui — vu que le thermomètre a baissé à - 3° — a terriblement effrayé les Turcs, qui trouvent que l'hiver est dur. De notre fenêtre nous voyons de nombreux vaisseaux qui ne peuvent pas entrer dans la mer Noire à cause de l'orage qui sévit depuis quelques jours".

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0241

A la fin de la lettre nous lisons :

> M. Decei viendra à Bucarest pour deux ou trois semaines, vers la fin de ce mois. Il dit qu'il veut vous voir aussi. Il y a quelques jours, on lui a proposé d'acheter un grand nombre de documents roumains. Beaucoup d'entre eux sont écrits sur du parchemin. Ils n'ont pas le sceau en parfait état. Il a aussi une grande quantité de photos d'après des documents se trouvant dans la possession de la Patriarchie. Aujourd'hui il paraît que les originaux se sont égarés, étant vendus par ceux qui auraient dû les garder. Pour les documents on lui demande 3000 lires. Il a offert 500, ce qui est toujours énorme (1 napoléon = 3,3, l.t.).

Le 25.1.1947, Nicoara Beldiceanu continue à être préoccupé par l'échange de publications :

> J'ai pris contact avec différentes personnes pour un échange de publications. Ce n'est pas facile à faire, car ici on n'en a pas eu l'habitude, ni quelqu'un qui s'en occupe dans les différentes institutions culturelles. Je veux obtenir certaines publications de la Faculté de Lettres et de l'Institut de Turcologie d'Istanbul. Mais nous aurions besoin de quelques séries de publications de l'Institut et de plusieurs exemplaires de celles qui ont paru depuis mon départ.
>
> Nous avons pensé aussi à un moyen qui nous permette d'acheter des livres. Si on vendait *Balcania* (les numéros en français) et avec l'argent obtenu on achèterait des publications pour l'Institut ? Ici l'on s'intéressait à la revue partout où nous avons été ainsi qu'à la Faculté et tous étaient étonnés de constater qu'une pareille activité scientifique est déployée dans notre pays.
>
> Nous avons essayé d'obtenir des notes et des compte-rendus, mais jusqu'ici personne ne nous a rien donné. Pourtant, je vais insister. Il est vrai qu'ici on s'intéresse moins aux questions dont nous nous occupons.
>
> Dans la lettre précédente, je vous écrivais au sujet des documents qu'on a proposé à Decei. M. Decei les apportera maintenant, en partie ou en totalité. "

En achevant sa lettre, N. Beldiceanu ajoute un renseignement bibliographique:

> Il y a quelques jours — écrit-il — en feuilletant un livre à la Bibliothèque, je suis tombé sur une *Kanunname* concernant les Valaques de la région de Séméndria, donné par Suliman le Grand vers 1527. Le privilège est semblable à celui accordé par le même sultan aux Valaques se trouvant entre Braniceva et Vidin, privilège signalé par Trâpcea dans sa thèse de doctorat.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0242

Le même souci pour l'échange de publications paraît aussi dans les lettres suivantes. Le 10 février 1947, Beldiceanu réussit à envoyer un premier transport de livres turcs, qu'il avait pris, avec Matei, d'un professeur de l'Institut de Turcologie, Caferoğlu.

> De même, écrit-il, j'essaye d'obtenir aussi les publications de la Faculté de Lettres d'Istanbul. J'ai été chez le doyen, il y a une semaine ; il a admis en principe l'échange et on a décidé de lui porter une lettre, par laquelle je le lui propose. Pourtant, d'après ce que m'a dit M. Brânzeu, ici les choses se feront plus difficilement car le doyen promet et, ensuite, il ajourne sans cesse.
>
> Afin de pouvoir continuer l'échange, nous avons encore besoin de 3-4 séries de *Balcania* et des autres publications de l'Institut. De celles qui sont parues avant mon départ, il nous faudrait d'avantage, parce que nous devons en donner là où il faut compléter les collections existantes.

Cette lettre nous révèle aussi le progrès que les deux jeunes historiens avaient enregistrés dans l'étude de la langue arabe :

> Moi et Matei nous commencerons le 1er mars à suivre les cours de calligraphie arabe à l'École des Beaux-Arts. Nous avons cherché à la Faculté de Lettres des cours de paléographie, mais nous n'en avons pas trouvé. C'est pourquoi je suivrai ceux de calligraphie des Beaux-Arts. L'explication du fait qu'on ne donne pas des cours enseigner les anciens caractères, c'est l'interdiction d'apprendre l'alphabet arabe sur tout le territoire de la Turquie. A l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, la calligraphie est considérée comme étant l'un des arts qu'on apprend à l'école. D'ailleurs, le fait qu'on nous ait reçu représente une faveur, puisque les étudiants de la Faculté de Lettres (section d'histoire), comme tous les autres également, ne peuvent pas suivre ces cours. Peut-être fera-t-on maintenant certains changements ; c'est pourquoi on permet l'enseignement d'une éducation religieuse aux jeunes et il est même possible qu'on crée une faculté de théologie.

Un problème qui revient dans cette lettre aussi, comme dans quelques unes des lettres précédentes c'est celui d'une biographie du sultan Bâyazıd, qu'une ancienne camarade de la Faculté de Bucarest, Mlle. M. Rallet, envoie à Beldiceanu:

> Ainsi que je vous l'ai écrit, j'ai reçu de Paris un manuscrit contenant la traduction d'une biographie du Sultan Bâyazıd II (les fragments concernant l'histoire de la Roumanie). Mais pour pouvoir l'utiliser, j'ai besoin d'une série d'ouvrages que je ne puis trouver ici. C'est pourquoi, je vous prie beaucoup de demander à quelqu'un de l'Institut Balkanique de copier pour moi les passages qui m'intéressent des livres que je vais indiquer dans une liste.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0243

Voici la relation d'une discussion scientifique avec Brânzeu :

> Ces derniers jours j'ai eu une discussion avec Brânzeu. Comme on parlait — entre autres — de l'élément roumain de l'Empire turc, il m'a dit qu'il a appris de Zerva, le consul général d'Ankara, que dans une chronique persane on parle des Roumains qui ont lutté dans l'armée ottomane contre les Perses. Le sultan, en remarquant leurs qualités, a décidé de les coloniser, paraît-il, dans une région de l'Asie Mineure près de Constantinople. Je lui ai parlé de l'ouvrage de Theodor Burada *Les Roumains de Bythinie*, qu'il ne connaissait pas. De même, sur Arravantinos, où l'on parle de 12.000 armatoles qui ont lutté à l'époque du sultan Murad IV contre la Perse. Il m'a prié de vous écrire et de vous demander instamment de faire copier à l'Institut les passages de Burada concernant l'établissement de ces Roumains en Asie et la région où ils se trouvaient (les noms des villages). De même pour Arravantinos, vol. II, p. 225-226, pour le passage relatif aux armatoles de l'armée de Murad IV (1635).

Nous apprenons des lettres suivantes que les deux jeunes historiens roumains commencent à traduire, pour l'Ambassade roumaine, des articles de la presse turque :

> Depuis le départ de M. A. Decei, Matei et moi devons traduire des articles de presse qui présentent un intérêt spécial. C'est pourquoi, ces derniers jours nous avons eu beaucoup de travail. Cela nous prend du temps, surtout lorsque nous avons un article de fond. Pourtant, ce travail est en même temps un bon exercice également. Parfois c'est plus facile, mais il nous arrive souvent de nous engluer dans une phrase que nous n'arrivons pas à tirer au clair. Notre consolation est de savoir que le vice-consul d'ici et d'autres qui ont fait ici leurs études lycéales, ont une grande difficulté à comprendre la langue des journaux. Nous avons deux dictionnaires, l'un turc-français et l'autre turc-turc. Le dernier comprend les termes introduits dans la langue jusqu'en 1945. Si on a la chance que ce soit un mot plus récent, il ne nous reste que la possibilité de le déduire du sens de la proposition.

En ce qui concerne ses recherches sur les manuscrits de la chronique de Pecevi, qu'il a interrompues à cause des matériaux envoyés par Mlle Rallet de Paris, Beldiceanu montre qu'il a fini de les comparer avec le troisième manuscrit, " Fait qui me m'a pas donné quelque chose d'intéressant" écrit-il.

En vue de réaliser l'échange de livres tant désiré, pour la bibliothèque de l'Institut Balkanique de Bucarest, il demande qu'on lui envoie des exemplaires de *Balcania*.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0244

Les livres que nous expédions maintenant valent, je le pense, 30-40 lires, ou même davantage peut-être, parce que certains d'entre eux sont rares sur le marché. Nous vous prions instamment de nous confirmer l'arrivée des livres. Nous sommes inquiets aussi pour ceux que nous avons déjà envoyés, comme par exemple l'Encyclopédie de l'Islam, dont nous ne savons pas s'ils sont arrivés à l'Institut.

A la fin du mois de février, Beldiceanu écrit :

J'ai reçu ces derniers temps plus régulièrement des nouvelles de l'Institut, grâce à Berindei et à Guboğlu. De Guboğlu j'ai reçu beaucoup de lettres. Il me demande de lui envoyer le manuscrit Tabaquet ..., qui a trois copies. Deux se trouvent à St. Sophie et un autre à la Suléimanie. Malheureusement, toutes les trois sont évacuées. Mais puisque l'ami Guboğlu n'a pas cru qu'un autre manuscrit, qu'il avait demandé il y a quelque temps, avait été évacué, je ne vois pas pourquoi il le croirait maintenant. J'ai l'impression qu'il nous soupçonne de ne pas vouloir le lui donner, ou bien que nous voulons le garder pour nous. Je le regrette beaucoup, car je vois qu'il ne nous fait pas du tout confiance.

J'ai prié M. l'ambassadeur de lui expliquer la situation, si par hasard il allait rencontrer Guboğlu.

.....

Nous continuons les leçons d'arabe et nous avons fait des progrès. J'espère qu'une fois une année d'études accomplie, nous pourrons nous orienter dans un texte. En tout cas, même avec les notions reçues jusqu'ici, nous pourrons faire des traductions d'un livre de textes. En plus, les connaissances déjà obtenus nous sont très utiles aussi pour la langue turque des textes anciens. M. Zerva nous conseille d'apprendre un peu de persan également.

Les leçons de calligraphie nous les commencerons en mars, parce que jusqu'au 1er mars l'école est en vacances.

En cherchant le manuscrit de Guboğlu j'en ai trouvé quelques-uns dont je pourrais extraire certaines données sur les Roumains (l'époque de Petru Rareş) à l'époque de Soliman le Grand. Je ne peux pas vous donner plus de détails, car je n'ai vu dans ces manuscrits qu'une biographie du sultan Soliman.

En ce qui concerne Pecevi, j'ai vu un manuscrit, mais celui-ci non plus ne m'a apporté rien de nouveau.

L'obstacle auquel je me heurte sans cesse, c'est l'évacuation de nombreux manuscrits des différentes bibliothèques d'Istambul.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0245

Nous avons fait des progrès dans l'étude de la langue turque. Je vous envoie un article concernant la vente des livres étrangers en Turquie, article que j'ai traduit d'un journal turc.

Si Guboğlu m'envoie les passages requis au sujet de la bataille de Codrul Cosminului, je pourrai vous envoyer aussitôt un article.

Ici le temps se maintient beau ; il y a eu des jours où le thermomètre montait à +23. Un de ces jours nous sommes allés voir les mosaïques de la Kharie Geami.

Le 21 mai 1947, Beldiceanu écrivait au prof. Papacostea, en lui répondant à une série de questions concernant les documents relatifs aux Roumains macédoniens, la situation de la bibliographie à laquelle travaillait Beldiceanu, les notes et l'introduction de la traduction de Zerva (c'est-à-dire un chapitre de Mustafa Celalzade — la Campagne de Moldavie du Sultan Suléiman le Législateur). Sur ce dernier, Beldiceanu dit :

C'est exactement ce que Guboğlu voulait. Peut–être ne sera-ce pas tout de suite. Mais Zerva l'a traduite il y a deux ans et me l'a donnée maintenant pour l'Institut. Il m'a promis aussi Enveri Hadista (qui n'a pas été publié, se trouvant sous forme manuscrite), Urugi et plusieurs autres chroniques dont il a traduit ce qui concernait notre histoire.

La traduction que je vous envoie a été faite d'après la Chronique de Celalzade publiée en 1937. Ouvrage ignoré par les spécialistes. Même dans *İA*, on dit, en parlant de Celalzade, où se trouve le manuscrit, *mais on rappelle le fait qu'il a été publié*. Decei a le chapitre relatif à 1538 en photocopie. Il paraît que lui non plus ne connaît pas le livre. Ce qui est intéressant c'est que celui qui a publié la chronique n'a pas utilisé l'un des manuscrits connus, mais un manuscrit qui lui a été apporté par un élève.

En répondant à la question concernant les collaborations proposées par les intellectuels turcs, Beldiceanu précise :

En ce qui concerne les collaborations, ainsi que je vous l'ai dit, on nous a fait deux promesses. L'une, plus sûre, l'autre, de Fuad Köprülü, qui a promis, mais qui se trouve pour le moment à Londres, où il est parti il y a une semaine.

Moi, entre autres, je m'occupe des principautés anatoliennes. Pour le moment, je cherche des matériaux. Les ouvrages sont peu nombreux, l'un de Wittek sur Menteşe et l'autre, récent, dû à un Turc, sur Ayolica. Pourtant elles contiennent aussi d'autres renseignements assez intéressants.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0246

Le 20 juin 1947, Beldiceanu confirme la réception de cinq collections de *Balcania* et a joute :

> M. Brânzeu, le lecteur de langue roumaine, m'a promis pour *Balcania* une épopée sur l'attaque de Malte par les Turcs à l'époque de Soliman le Législateur. L'épopée est écrite par un Français et, d'après ce qu'il m'a dit, il paraît qu'elle n'est pas connue.

Plus loin, il parle des mêmes difficultés auxquelles il s'était heurté à Topkapı.

> J'ai de nouveau été à Topkapı pour voir s'ils ont apporté les manuscrits. Le mois dernier ils m'avaient dit qu'ils les apporteront ce mois-ci. Hier, ils m'ont dit qu'ils viendront dans deux mois. D'après ce que je vois, je ne pense pas qu'on les apportera ni dans trois mois.
>
> En voyant que je ne puis trouver aucun des manuscrits concernant les Principautés, j'en cherche un autre, afin de pouvoir le présenter pour le doctorat. Des matériaux amassés, concernant les relations entre nos Principautés et celles d'Anatolie, je ne crois pas pouvoir faire plus d'un article.

En achevant la lettre, il ajoute : " Matei va bien, lui aussi, je crois que cet été il pourra finir quelque chose. A part cela, il est en train de mettre au point la traduction de Zerva. "

Le 11 juillet 1947, il communique, joyeux, les bons résultats obtenus partout les deux.

> Avec Matei on a réussi à bien nous débrouiller dans les journaux turcs. Ces derniers temps on a eu à traduire de nombreux articles, ce qui nous a pris beaucoup de temps. Certains étaient faciles, d'autres plus difficiles, cela dépendait de l'auteur. Ce sont les articles d'*Ulus* qui sont plus difficiles, car ils emploient les mots les plus récents, que souvent nous ne trouvons pas dans le dictionnaire, ce qui représente un vrai casse-tête.
>
> Je suis content qu'enfin, je pourrai satisfaire Guboğlu. Il m'a demandé de copier d'un ouvrage se trouvant à la Bibliothèque de l'Université. Il s'agit d'un manuscrit de l'œuvre d'Ali, œuvre qui a été publiée en partie.
>
> Matei a trouvé, je crois, un sujet. Les nouvelles turques concernant Michel le Brave. La partie la plus importante serait formée des chapitres qui décrivent la révolte, qui se trouvent dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de l'Université.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0247

..... Cet été je vais profiter du fait que M. Zerva reste ici, pour mieux étudier la langue des chroniques.

Nous n'avons toujours pas pu passer l'examen de langue arabe. Le professeur a été occupé deux semaines à cause d'une exposition des livres étrangers achetés par la Bibliothèque de l'Université au cours de l'année.

.....

Je ne sais pas si vous avez reçu à l'Institut le paquet de livres envoyé l'année passée. La lettre que je vous avais écrite à cette occasion contenait aussi une liste des livres envoyés. Il s'agissait d'une série de publications grecques et turques pour la bibliothèque de l'Institut.

Nous avons reçu, ici, les livres envoyés et nous allons les expédier à leurs destinations. De même, nous avons reçu les tirés-à-part de *Balcania* V, pour lesquels je vous remercie beaucoup.

M. Decei a été rappelé. Je ne sais pas ce qu'il va faire. A notre égard il a été très aimable et lorsque nous avons eu besoin d'un livre, il nous l'a toujours prêté.

.....

J'espère arriver à rédiger quelque chose cet été et je ne ménagerai pas mes efforts dans ce but.

Notre temps étant limité je vais seulement énumérer les renseignements particulièrement intéressants de la lettre du 17 sept. 1947. En premier lieu, la nouvelle qu'en juillet les deux jeunes historiens ont passé l'examen de langue pour la matière déjà parcourue (déclinaison, pronom, conjugaison).

Après ils pourront se débrouiller pour un texte arabe. Mais pour mieux posséder une langue — écrit Beldiceanu — il est nécessaire d'avoir plus de temps. Pourtant en connaissant la grammaire, nous avons marqué un grand pas. Ce que nous avons appris nous est fort utile pour la langue osmanlie. A part cela, en ayant des connaissances en arabe classique, on peut s'orienter beaucoup plus facilement pour les langues qu'on parle dans différents États arabes. Surtout en ce qui concerne les publications, partout on emploie normalement l'arabe classique. Maintenant, en Égypte on tend à simplifier la langue et l'orthographe.

Par la suite, Beldiceanu fait la critique d'un volume récemment paru, d'histoire de l'Empire Ottoman d'Uzunçarşılı " ancien professeur universitaire et député actuel. Son ouvrage est plutôt médiocre, ayant aussi de grandes lacunes bibliographiques. Sans parler de la méthode. Ce n'est que la manière

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0248

dont il a organisé son exposé qui présente quelque attention. En tout cas, jusqu'ici, ce sont toujours Hammer et N. Iorga qui restent valables. Matei veut vous en envoyer un compte-rendu. "

Les trois dernières lettres datent de la période avril-septembre 1948. Le 17.IV.1948, Beldiceanu écrit :

> Ici, en Turquie, on a fondé une société d'études orientales encouragée par l'officialité. Ils vont publier une revue qu'ils feront imprimer en Allemagne. L'organisateur de la société est le Prof. Helmut Ritter, le titulaire de la chaire d'arabe et de persan de la Faculté de Lettres d'Istanbul. Le professeur qui nous enseigne l'arabe et le persan est le conférencier à la chaire de Ritter.
>
> Ces derniers temps, une certaine agitation a été produite parmi les spécialistes en études hittites, par le Prof. Bossert, qui a réussi à déchiffrer l'écriture hiéroglyphique hittite, qui ne pouvait pas être lue jusqu'ici. Il nous semble pourtant que le fait a été mieux connu en Occident et spécialement à Paris, où se trouve un centre d'études hittites qui publie aussi une revue.
>
> .....
>
> Il y a une semaine a paru un ouvrage sur l'architecte Sinan (le contemporain de Soliman le Législateur), qui, à l'occasion de l'expédition de 1538 a été en Moldavie aussi, où l'on a construit les ponts nécessaires au passage de l'armée. L'ouvrage se résume à une sèche énumération des constructions qu'il avait élevées et à quelques sommaires données biographiques. Malgré tout, l'ouvrage coûte 5 l.t., ce qui est assez cher.
>
> En ce qui concerne l'initiative d'une maison d'édition de publier tous les chroniqueurs turcs, je vous ai écrit, il y a quelque temps. Le côté intéressant c'est que la langue sera " turcisée ", c'est-à-dire qu'on remplacera le plus possible les mots arabes et persans. En tout cas, cette opération va beaucoup aider à les rendre plus accessibles. Nous avons vu ainsi publiés des extraits de la chronique de Dilahdor.
>
> Il y a aussi des parutions d'ouvrages concernant le passé ottoman d'Istanbul. Certains d'entre eux ne sont que des collections de citations de différents historiens et voyageurs occidentaux. Cette préoccupation subite pour le passé de la ville a pour explication le fait que dans quelques années on va commémorer 500 ans depuis la conquête de la ville.
>
> Quand je vous écris tout ceci — s'adresse-t-il, en achevant, au Prof. Victor Papacostea — je pense que récemment se sont accomplis deux ans depuis que vous nous avez donné la possibilité de continuer nos études à Istanbul. Je ne puis pas oublier que j'ai dirigé mes pas dans cette direction grâce à vos conseils et sous votre surveillance. De même, je n'oublierai jamais que vous avez fait pour moi et mes collègues beaucoup plus qu'un professeur, ce qui, au cours des années, au sentiment d'admiration et de respect que j'ai acquis pour vous, s'est ajouté à un autre, celui de l'amour pour l'homme bon et compréhensif que nous avons eu la chance de rencontrer. Aujourd'hui, quand tout paraît si trouble, je pense à vous et vous pouvez être sûr que vous êtes pour moi un exemple et un encouragement.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0249

Dans la lettre du 28 août 1948, nous retenons le cas intéressant du directeur du Musée de St. Sophie, Mustafa Ramazanoğlu, qui, étant invité au Congrès des Archéologues de Paris et ne recevant pas d'argent, pour pouvoir partir, a vendu les meubles de sa maison et est parti quand même. " C'est un homme intéressant — ajoute Beldiceanu — et qui semble être arrivé à des résultats surprenants par ses fouilles archéologiques". Nous retenons aussi le renseignement donné par le professeur d'arabe et de persan, après avoir participé au Congrès des Orientalistes de Paris, en juin 1948. Envoyé par Beldiceanu, il avait porté un exemplaire de *Balcania* VIII à l'École des Langues Orientales. " D'après ce qu'il a dit — écrit Beldiceanu — il résulte que la revue y a été très appréciée. "

Il signale aussi quelques détails concernant les Roumains de Brousse, qu'il tient d'un témoin qui, en passant par un quartier de la ville, a entendu des citoyens parlant un dialecte parsemé de turcismes. " En demandant à l'un de ceux qui parlaient quelle langue ils emploient entre aux, celui-ci lui répond qu'ils parlaient de la sorte lorsqu'ils ne voulaient pas être compris par les autres. Selon ce fonctionnaire, il paraît qu'à cette époque ils étaient encore assez nombreux. Son témoignage — ajoute Beldiceanu — me rappelle la langue secrète des habitants de Craiova, dont vous nous parliez".

Les deux dernières lettres (du 28 août et du 21 sept. 1948) évoquent avec une émotion spéciale le séminaire d'Histoire des peuples balkaniques du samedi matin, les camarades chers dont la vie l'a séparé et dont il brosse un rapide portrait.

> Aujourd'hui, notre petit séminaire est éparpillé dans différentes directions... Notre séminaire avait réussi à acquérir un "style" à lui, ne ressemblant aucunement aux autres. Nous y apprenions à travailler et à penser et nous avions la possibilité d'affirmer notre personnalité. Tout ceci dans une atmosphère qui a créé un climat d'amitié, de respect et de confiance.
>
> Je ne sais pas pourquoi je vous écris tout cela. Mais les deux années de séparation m'ont permis de voir plus clairement certaines choses. L'été a été dur. Je me suis rendu compte que ce n'était pas bien de m'avoir créé une vie solitaire et retirée. Mais maintenant tout est inutile. Tout a une échéance.
>
> Vous m'excuserez de vous écrire de la sorte, mais dans l'absence de mon père, je me suis rapproché de plus en plus de vous et l'admiration et le respect se sont transformés, sans que je m'en rende compte, en amour. La distance et deux années de séparation m'ont donné un courage que je n'aurais pas eu peut-être. "

Nous nous arrêtons ici, en laissant de côté d'autres renseignements et impressions, que nous espérons faire connaître lorsque nous allons publier cette correspondance.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0250

NICOARA BELDICEANU SUR FRANZ BABINGER

Dan PRODAN

En paraphrasant la célèbre maxime latine *Et in Arcadia ego !*, je puis dire que moi aussi j'ai personnellement connu le si regretté Nicoara Beldiceanu.

L'acte de la connaissance s'est déroulée en trois étapes.

Durant la première étape, j'ai connu le turcologue Nicoara Beldiceanu grâce à ses études de turcologie, contributions fondamentales que j'ai approfondies étant poussé par une irrésistible soif de connaissance et par le désir de clarifier certaines confusions liées à l'histoire ottomane et aux complexes relations roumano-ottomanes au Moyen Âge. Je puis dire que ces intéressantes lectures m'ont réellement aidé en renforçant d'une manière scientifique l'image globale que j'avais déjà sur cette expérience historique unique, appelée en général l'Empire Ottoman.

Pendant la deuxième étape, par l'intermédiaire de Monsieur Ioan Caproşu, le doyen de la Faculté d'Histoire de l'Université de Jassy, j'ai connu Nicoara Beldiceanu l'épistolier et le mémorialiste *ad-hoc* et *sui generis*. Comme je faisais des recherches sur le sujet de ma thèse de doctorat (*Préoccupations de turcologie en Roumanie à la fin du XIX^e^ siècle et pendant la première moitié du XX^e^ siècle, concernant surtout l'activité de Franz Babinger (1935-1943)*, j'ai pris contact avec "la source historique vive" Nicoara Beldiceanu, ancien étudiant et candidat au doctorat de Franz Babinger à Munich entre 1953-1955. Nous avons entretenu une correspondance entre décembre 1990 et avril 1991 ; je lui avais expédié quatre lettres contenant nombreuses et insistantes questions concernant Franz Babinger — l'homme et le savant ; il m'avait envoyé quatre lettres-réponses, de vrais "puits d'informations" pour le sujet que j'étudiais. Dans sa première lettre du 15 décembre 1990, Nicoara Beldiceanu a répondu aux questions générales formulées par moi le 7 décembre 1990. Le savant roumain a raconté des souvenirs concernant Franz Babinger et à sa collaboration avec lui à Munich entre 1953-1955. Comme c'était à prévoir, ces évocations ont engendré de nouvelles questions, auxquelles le professeur Nicoara Beldiceanu a répondu le

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0251

28 janvier 1991 dans sa deuxième lettre. Les nouvelles révélations ont complété le portrait complexe de celui qui a été Franz Babinger. La troisième lettre (le 1er mars 1991) et la quatrième (le 17 avril 1991) offrent des réponses à mes autres questions si insistantes.

La troisième étape m'a offert l'honneur et le plaisir de connaître personnellement Nicoara Beldiceanu à Jassy, dans la première moitié de juin 1991, quand il a fait sa dernière visite en Roumanie, s'arrêtant quelques jours à Bucarest et quelques semaines à Jassy, chez ses parents. À cette occasion il a participé à la session scientifique anniversaire de l'Institut d'Histoire "A. D. Xenopol" de Jassy (6-7 juin) et il a prononcé quatre conférences, ayant comme sujet l'histoire de l'Empire Ottoman et les relations roumano-ottomanes au Moyen Âge, à la Faculté d'Histoire de Jassy, suivies par un grand auditoire et couronnées par un succès particulier (10-14 juin). Le 7 juin, à l'Institut, quand l'atmosphère est devenue plus détendue, M. Ştefan S. Gorovei m'a présenté à l'illustre invité, en discutant (encore) de Franz Babinger et de mes projets scientifiques d'avenir. Le 14 juin j'ai revu le professeur Beldiceanu, on s'est serré les mains en silence, pressentant tous les deux que c'était la dernière rencontre. Et la vie l'a confirmé.

Pour compléter ce succinct médaillon commémoratif, je reproduis *in integrum* les quatre lettres, ayant l'intention de dévoiler une autre forme d'expression et de manifestation du professeur Beldiceanu, forme qu'il n'a pas negligée pendant sa vie: ses souvenirs concernant Franz Babinger.

SIT TIBI TERA LEVIS, MAGISTER EMERITUS !

I

Nicora Beldiceanu
Parc de Lormoy (G. 1)
91240 St. Michel sur Orge

St. Michel sur Orge, le 15 Décembre 1990

Cher Monsieur Prodan,

Je réponds à votre lettre du 7 Décembre 1990. Je ne sais pas si vous le connaissiez, mais après ma grand-mère, Sofia Nadejde, je suis originaire de Botoşani. Elle me racontait souvent son enfance, ses premières années de l'école élémentaire, où elle a appris à lire et à écrire, mais revenons à nos questions.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0252

J'ai connu le professeur Franz Babinger à München, le mois de novembre 1953. J'étais venu d'Istanbul à Paris en 1949, conseillé par un ami qui travaillait dans le domaine des anciennes civilisations mésopotamiennes et par Mircea Eliade (qui avait été, lui aussi, élève au lycée "Spiru Haret" de Bucarest). C'est à Paris que je me suis rendu compte que les études ottomanes n'existaient pas. Le professeur de langue turque était philologue pur et, ce qui était plus difficile, il avait des opinions politiques tout à fait opposées aux miennes. Tous les jours je me plongeais dans l'étude des manuscrits *du fond turc* de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris et je publiais par rapport au passé roumain-turc. Le professeur Franz Babinger était à München et il a lu mes articles publiés dans le pays et en exil. Il m'a proposé une bourse en 1953 pour soutenir un doctorat sous sa direction. C'est à München que j'ai connu Babinger; il connaissait parfaitement le français, l'italien, l'anglais et le roumain. Le professeur Babinger a accepté le sujet que j'avais proposé pour ma thèse de doctorat, ce qui était une grande bienveillance de sa part (c'était le temps où le professeur proposait le sujet et l'étudiant ne pouvait pas le refuser). J'ai eu plusieurs collègues allemands qui craignaient terriblement le professeur Babinger. J'avoue qu'ils étaient tous extrêmement gentils et prêts à m'aider pour bien apprendre l'allemand, l'atmosphère du séminaire était très agréable quand Babinger n'y était pas. Il était un homme très irascible, qui avait parfois des accès de colère. Son assistant, Hans Joachim Kissling, tremblait devant son professeur. Je ne sais pas pourquoi, Babinger s'est montré fort bienveillant avec moi, même un jour où je lui ai dit qu'il datait d'une manière erronée la première émission d'une monnaie d'or des ateliers de la monnaie ottomane du sultan Mehmed II. Près de moi, son assistant est devenu livide (*pâlit*). Babinger m'a longuement regardé et il m'a demandé des arguments. Je lui ai recommandé des documents d'Étienne le Grand (Ştefan cel Mare şi Sfânt), mais la bibliothèque de l'Institut de Turcologie de München n'en possédait pas la collection. Le professeur, qui avait ces documents à la maison, m'a dit : "Venez chez moi, demain matin à huit heures, on prendra le petit déjeuner et vous présenterez vos raisonnements". Le lendemain matin je lui ai présenté quelques documents de la chancellerie d'Étienne le Grand. Il était furieux et quand la ménagère a apporté la cafetière, Babinger l'a saisie pour m'en offrir, mais ses mains tremblaient à cause de l'irritation et il a répandu tout le café sur la table de la salle à manger, quelques instants après, il se sentit gêné, mais peu à peu se calma et s'en excusa.

Ses cours étaient souvent une simple lecture des articles de *l'Encyclopédie de l'Islam,* en plus chaque jeudi il faisait un séminaire de paléographie turque d'après les documents publiés par F. Kraelitz. Il était passionnant quand il parlait de ses propres recherches, il y en avait vraiment quelque chose à apprendre dans ces moments-là, mais je doute que les étudiants débutants aient pu tirer profit et les connaissances nécessaires de ces "cours" imprévus.

Babinger avait un flair remarquable dans la découverte des sources inédites ou inusitées. Mais son tempérament volcanique et passionné a fait que les doctorats qu'il a accordés soient très rares : cinq ou six personnes pendant plus de trente ans. Parmi ceux qui ont passé quand même cet examen, c'est moi et ma femme, née Steinherr, la fille du hittitologue qui a déchiffré, le premier, les mystères de l'écriture hittite hiéroglyphique.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0253

Ma femme, elle aussi, ne craignait pas du tout Babinger ; un jour elle lui a prouvé qu'il s'était trompé dans un renvoi de *G.O.W.*. J'étais présent lorsque Babinger avait refusé la thèse à l'un de mes camarades. Il sortit en coup de vent de son bureau, entra dans la bibliothèque en poussant des cris terribles et jeta la thèse dans la tête du collègue allemand, qui avait compris qu'il devait disparaître pour toujours du cours de son professeur.

À cause de moi, Babinger a eu une querelle très violente avec le célèbre byzantinologue Dölger, qui me proposa de faire des études byzantines. Je l'ai refusé, faute des connaissances de grec byzantin, en lui disant que j'étais intéressé seulement par le monde ottoman. Ce fut une impolitesse de ma part, je le reconnais.

Je me rappelle un épisode intéressant de sa vie : il était étudiant à Oxford où il a connu celui qui est devenu le célèbre colonel Lawrence. Pendant la première guerre mondiale, Babinger commandait une batterie. Un Arabe lui apporta une lettre de la part de Lawrence. Celui-ci lui présentait la joie de retrouver un vieux camarade d'Oxford et l'invitait au thé *(five o'clock tea)*, entre les deux lignes du front. Babinger lui a répondu que, dans sa qualité d'officier allemand, il ne pouvait pas accepter une telle invitation. Il a gardé la lettre de Lawrence, mais celle-ci a été brûlée avec sa bibliothèque à la suite d'un bombardement, pendant la deuxième guerre mondiale. C'est un épisode connu seulement par ses 6 ou 7 étudiants.

Babinger estimait beaucoup le professeur Gh. I. Bratianu, dont la femme, Madame Bratianu, m'a raconté quelques histoires de l'époque de Jassy, mais je crois que je n'ai pas le droit d'en parler. De toute façon, une chose est certe : Babinger était un homme bizarre, il avait souvent des querelles avec la femme du professeur pour les études grecques Constantin Balmuş, chez lequel il habitait.

Babinger vénérait le turcologue français Jean Deny, auquel il s'adressait chaque fois qu'il se heurtait à des difficultés dans l'étude des textes ottomans. Il a écrit un très beau nécrologue à la mort de Deny, où il se rappelait, parmi les autres aspects de leur connaissance, le moment où, pendant la première guerre mondiale, Babinger était à Gallipoli, dans les lignes turque-allemandes, Deny se trouvait devant lui, sur un vaisseau de guerre français. Deny est l'auteur de la meilleure grammaire de la langue turque-ottomane, livre qui doit être réédité et qui se vend à un prix exorbitant.

Babinger a laissé une vaste œuvre qui prouve ses préoccupations dans des domaines très différents : *G.O.W.* reste un chef-d'œuvre pour tous ceux intéressés des sources narratives ottomanes. Il était un homme très étrange, plein de contradictions et de bizarreries, il ne pouvait pas se regarder dans un miroir et il a demandé qu'on démonte le miroir qui se trouvait au-dessus du lavabo de son bureau.

Personnellement, je lui reste reconnaissant pour m'avoir permis, à München, de soutenir mon premier doctorat; après, étant donné le renom de Babinger, le professeur Paul Lemerle m'a proposé de travailler ensemble, et Babinger m'a donné une lettre de recommandation pour être accepté au Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. La grande sympathie qu'il m'a toujours

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0254

montré reste encore un mystère pour moi. Ça ne m'a pas empêché quand même d'avoir des ennuis avec le professeur Babinger à cause d'un manuscrit ottoman de Paris. Jusqu'à la fin, il a publié le fac-similé du manuscrit et moi, j'ai publié la traduction française. Je ne sais pas qu'on fasse à München des préparatifs pour célébrer la Mémoire de Babinger. Malheureusement, ses successeurs n'ont pas la valeur de leur professeur.

J'espère que ces souvenirs vont compléter vos informations sur la vie assez bizarre et pleine d'aventure du professeur Babinger. On disait qu'il fût membre des services secrets du célèbre amiral Canaris, mais qui sait la vérité ? En tout cas, il n'a été jamais l'adepte du nazisme, car sa grand-mère était française, c'est lui qui me l'a dit.

Il est mort accidentellement en Albanie, dont il connaissait le dictateur Enver Hogea depuis le temps où celui-ci était professeur au lycée.

Qu'est-ce que je pourrais y ajouter ? Babinger était en relations excellentes avec le fameux helléniste français Louis Robert, chez lequel il habitait à Istanbul et qui avait été le directeur de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie. Babinger aimait beaucoup les chats et il donnait souvent de l'argent à l'intendante de l'Institut de München pour nourrir tous les chats qui vivaient aux environs.

Je vous laisse, cher Monsieur Prodan, en vous souhaitant de joyeuses fêtes et une bonne année !

Nicoara Beldiceanu

Lettre originale en roumain, texte dactylographié, avec la signature autographe du professeur Nicoara Beldiceanu, qui se trouve dans les archives personnelles de Dan Prodan.

II

Nicoara Beldiceanu
Parc de Lormoy (G. 1)
91240 St. Michel Sur Orge

St. Michel sur Orge, le 28 Janvier 1991

Cher Monsieur Prodan,

Je vais essayer de répondre à vos questions dans la mesure du possible, mais premièrement je vous remercie pour la photo de mon père, tel qu'il était pendant la première guerre mondiale.

Il y avait et il y a encore à München un Institut dont j'ai appris le nom allemand très compliqué parmi les papiers de ma femme, concernant sa participation au séminaire *(Pro/Hauptseminar-Zegnis)*, signé par Babinger et ayant

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0255

l'estampille de l'Institut : *Institut für Geschichte und Kultur des Nahen Orients*. Le titre prouve que Babinger voulait, en principe, monopoliser tout le Proche Orient, mais pratiquement il s'agissait de l'histoire ottomane qui contenait aussi les Balcans, dans la mesure où cette région a été ottomane. Je ne me souviens pas, et ma femme non plus, si ses cours avaient un thème principal. Je crois qu'ils étaient plutôt en rapport avec les préoccupations du moment du professeur, qui se contentait souvent de lire ses articles de *l'Encyclopédie de l'Islam*. Ce qui avait caractère de permanence, c'était le séminaire de paléographie ottomane, qui se déroulait tous les jeudis matins. On y présentait des communications scientifiques. Moi aussi, si je m'en souviens bien, j'ai eu deux exposés qui j'ai publiés après dans *Südost-Forschungen*. C'est *Südost-Institut* qui m'a payé ces articles, ce qui m'a permis de finir le doctorat et de soutenir ma thèse.

Ma femme, elle aussi, a soutenu un doctorat à München, avec la thèse intitulée *Scheich Üftâde der Begründer des Gelvetijje-Ordens*, parue seulement en 1961 à München (132 pages+13 pages+1 photo+5 planches). À l'origine de cet ordre de derviches a été un prisonnier d'Étienne le Grand. Ma femme a soutenu aussi à la Sorbonne un doctorat en histoire et un autre, en lettres. Je vous attire l'attention sur le système du doctorat allemand qui est différent du français.

J'ignore les conditions dans lesquelles Babinger a été à Oxford, il semble qu'il ait suivi les études ottomanes seulement après la première guerre mondiale. C'est difficile pour les jeunes hommes d'embrasser l'étude des disciplines humanistes sans avoir la certitude d'être parmi les meilleurs dans le domaine.

La bibliothèque dont je vous ai déjà parlé et qui a brûlé au cours d'un bombardement se trouvait à Würzburg et Babinger a réussi à rassembler une nouvelle bibliothèque importante. Babinger s'est réfugié à Bucarest après que Hitler s'était emparé du pourvoir ; il me semble qu'une grand-mère, *fama est dicitur* aurait été Juive. Il m'a parlé, une fois, de sa grand-mère française. Le fils d'un bouquiniste (libraire) de Bucarest, qui n'avait pas un sou, était souvent invité au dîner chez cette famille (je crois qu'il s'agissait de la famille Pach). Le magasin du bouquiniste Pach se trouvait tout près des Maisons des bouquinistes, l'une des réalisations de Nicolae Iorga ; il me semble que c'est aussi N. Iorga qui avait créé l'Institut de Turcologie de Jassy, mais vous devez le savoir mieux que moi.

Je n'ai connu Babinger qu'à München. En Roumanie, c'est madame Maria Matilda Alexandrescu Dersca-Bulgaru qui a passé l'examen de doctorat avec Franz Babinger, vous pouvez le lui demander, car elle vit encore à Bucarest.

Le *Grammaire* de Jean Deny a été réédité photographiquement (de manière photographique) en Allemagne, je l'ai vue dans un catalogue, elle coûte très cher ; chez nous, il y eu a deux exemplaires de l'ancienne édition, l'un c'est le mien, l'autre est à ma femme et il avait appartenu à mon beau-père, qui était, lui aussi, orientaliste (c'est lui qui a déchiffré, le premier, les hiéroglyphes hittites, en soutenant la thèse avec le professeur Bossert à Istanbul).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0256

Le mystère de la sympathie de Babinger pour moi ? J'ignore ses causes. C'est, peut-être son impression que mes connaissances étaient plus vastes et plus profondes que la réalité objective. Je me rappelle qu'il fut surpris et même méfiant quand je lui ai dit que j'avais plusieurs règlements et ordonnances ottomanes inédits émis par Bâyezîd II après avoir soumis les deux cités roumaines. Quand il a vu que j'avais raison, il a considéré ces documents extrêmement intéressants. Babinger parlait roumain d'une manière parfaite.

L'histoire des manuscrits de Paris est pénible. Quand je suis entré au *C.N.R.S.*, je lui ai écrit que j'avais été engagé pour éditer les documents ottomans qui se trouvaient, en manuscrits, dans la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, et qui avaient été émis entre le début de l'Émirat Ottoman et le début du XVI^{e}, siècle. Un jour je lui ai écrit qu'en étudiant les fonds turcs de la B.N. de Paris, j'ai trouvé les *mss. fonds turcs anc. 39,* qui contenaient des actes intéressants sur l'émission des aspres et des florins par Mehmed II. Il m'a demandé que je lui renvoie le microfilm pour son information. Ma surprise fut totale quand j'ai reçu à München, où j'étais venu, pour quelques jours, en 1956, avec ma femme, le volume dans lequel Babinger avait déjà publié, en fac-similé, le *mss.* 39. C'était extrêmement pénible pour moi et dangereux pour ma carrière. J'ai écrit à Paul Lemerle à Paris, qui était mon directeur au *Centre Nationale de Recherches Scientifiques*. Une désagréable correspondance s'est déroulée entre les deux savants, dont le résultat pratique fut que Paul Lemerle m'avait demandé de ne pas publier les documents découverts dans la B.N. de Paris dans l'ordre normal, chronologique, mais de faire connaître premièrement la traduction française du *mss. 39.* (*Les actes des premiers sultans conservées dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque nationale à Paris,* tome I, Paris-La Haye, 1960). La suite fut que le deuxième volume (422 pages) avait inclus les actes miniers et l'étude sur l'exploitation des mines dans les Pays serbes du XV^{e} siècle, ce livre a représenté ma thèse de doctorat en histoire à la Sorbonne, une autre partie de ces documents j'ai éditée avec une longue étude (plusieurs chapitres) sur les institutions urbaines ottomanes. Plus de 30 documents traduits se trouvent encore dans nos tiroirs, car les recherches dans les Archives d'Istanbul ont ouvert de nouvelles voies de documentations. J'ai presque 20.000 documents photographiés. En ce qui concerne l'épisode *mss. 30,* il s'est éteint au cours des 35 ans qui se sont écoulés. J'ai revu Babinger à München, il était surpris de tout ce que j'avais écrit sur les mines d'or et d'argent de l'époque ottomane en utilisant les documents des sultans. La découverte des richesses énormes conservées dans les archives ottomanes a éclipsé "l'enlèvement" des 60 actes, que j'ai publiés, à la fin, en traduction française.

Je veux préciser que ma mère, née à Jassy, était la fille de Ion et Sofia Nadejde ; moi, je suis né à Bucarest, où j'ai suivi les cours de l'école primaire, du lycée et de la faculté.

Si Babinger a fait ou non de l'espionnage, qui sait ? Il semble qu'il était officier de réserve, mais ça ne veut rien dire. On disait même qu'il fut aux services secrets de l'amiral Canaris, mais c'est aux archives de la Wermacht de démentier ou de confirmer la vérité. Je ne crois pas que Babinger ait pu être le traducteur du sultan Mehmed V Reşad ou d'autre.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0257

Le professeur H. J. Kissling est mort après sa retraite, il a été touché par la personnalité de Babinger, mais du point de vue scientifique il n'a pas fait grande chose, je regrette de le dire. Jadis, il m'a attaqué dans une publication et, à cause de mon esprit de combattant, je lui ai répondu d'une manière assez dure. Plus tard j'ai commenté peu agréablement un volume publié en son honneur par ses étudiants et on dit qu'il aurait pleuré en lisant ce que j'avais écrit. Dans ma carrière, j'ai été parfois en désaccord avec mes collègues, par exemple, un collègue américain a répondu à l'une de mes critiques en écrivant qu'il va me casser la tête. À mon tour j'ai critiqué sa publication qui prouvait son incompétence dans les domaines de la paléographie et de l'histoire ottomanes. Il a perdu son poste de Washington. Je le regrette bien, mais il y a des personnes qui traitent des sujets sans s'y connaître.

J'ai écrit déjà deux pages et je ne sais pas si j'ai répondu à toutes vos questions, sinon, c'est seulement ma faute.

Je vous laisse, en vous souhaitant tout le bien et beaucoup de succès dans votre activité scientifique.

Nicora Beldiceanu

Lettre originale en roumain, texte dactylographié, avec la signature autographe du professeur Nicoara Beldiceanu, qui se trouve dans les archives personnelles de Dan Prodan.

III

Nicoara Beldiceanu
École Pratique des Hautes Études
IV-e Section
Sciences Historiques
et Philologiques
Sorbonne
45-47, Rue des Écoles-75005 Paris

Paris, 01.III.1991

Cher Monsieur Prodan,

Je vais répondre à votre lettre du 14 février 1991 :

a) Je n'ai aucune photo de F. Babinger et je ne sais pas qui puisse en avoir, c'est peut-être l'actuel professeur de turcologie de München ;

b) Madame Bratianu est morte, donc je ne peux plus lui demander sa permission pour révéler ce qu'elle m'avait raconté ;

c) Le volume collectif d'*histoire ottomane* est paru à l'édition Fayard. J'ai offert un exemplaire à mon ami Ştefan S. Gorovei, donc il y eu a un en Moldavie.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0258

En ce qui concerne les autres questions, malheureusement, je ne peux pas vous aider.

Au revoir,

Nicora Beldiceanu

Lettre originale en roumain, texte autographe du professeur Nicoara Beldiceanu, qui se trouve dans les archives personnelles de Dan Prodan

IV

Nicoara Beldiceanu
École Pratique des Hautes Études
IV-e Section
Sciences Historiques
et Philologiques
Sorbonne
45-47, Rue des Écoles-75005 Paris
Téléphone 0 633 - 19 - 94

St. Michel sur Orge, 17.IV.1991

Mon Cher Monsieur Prodan,

Je vous remercie pour tout ce que vos avez écrit la dernière fois, mais la déontologie professionnelle m'oblige à une certaine réserve à l'égard des relations entre Franz Babinger et Gh. I. Bratianu.

Je ne suis pas au courant de ce qu'on a publié dans le *Magazine Historique*, il y a de nombreuses obligations pour moi et pour ma femme ; on est presque suffoqué par toutes les collaborations qu'on exige de nous.

Joyeuses Pâques !

Nicoara Beldiceanu

Lettre originale en roumain, texte autographe du professeur Nicoara Beldiceanu, qui se trouve dans les archives personnelles de Dan Prodan.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0259

MIHAIL GUBOĞLU
(1911-1989)

Georgeta ANGHEL

I declare myself unable to express my own opinions on the "Master", since I was not too close to him. That is why I will only draw an image of his life as reflected in his work, in his own words and in the memories of those who were beside him.

He was born on the 4th of November 1911 at Ceadâr Lunga (Tighina), in a Gagauz family. He followed the courses of a primary school in his native village between 1920-1925. He declared about his first year of school: "I was not a good pupil, I even had to repeat this year, since I did not know a single word in Romanian and it was very difficult for me"; however, at the end of the 4th year he even got an award.

After an unsuccessful attempt to enter the high school in Constanţa he followed the courses of "Stephan the Great" Highschool in Bender between 1926-1933. In June 1933 he graduated with very high marks.

In 1933-1934 he served as a short-term soldier in the 30th Artillery Regiment in Kishinev. Beginning with 1934 he was a student, and on the 22nd of October 1938 he graduated from the History Faculty in Kishinev, presenting a paper concerning "The Gagauzes - their history".

A certificate issued by the Letters and Philosophy Faculty in Kishinev shows that during 1938-1939 Mihail Guboğlu was attending preparatory courses and had the right to register for a PhD degree after he presented his paper.

Between 1940-1945 he worked in the same time as an assistant at the Letters and Philosophy Faculty of Iaşi University and as a scientific secretary of the Institute for Turkish Studies, within the same University.

During the next years (1945-1948) he was a lecturer of Ottoman-Turkish language and palaeography at the Institute for Balkan Studies in Bucharest.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0261

After 1948 he worked at the History Institute of the Romanian Academy, up to 1963 when he was transferred to the South-Eastern European Studies Institute.

Starting from 1955 he got a second job as a half-time specialist in the National Archives, up to 1968, when he became a full-time archivist, a position he maintained up to 1970.

From 1970 to 1976, when he retired, Mihail Guboğlu was a lecturer at the History and Philosophy Faculty of the Bucharest University.

His activity as a researcher was extremely rich; he analysed documents in many archives, both in Romania and abroad (Turkey, France, the former USSR, Bulgaria and Poland).

He published a great number of new documents, he wrote many valuable articles, being also the author of remarkable works, of capital importance for any specialist in Turkish studies: *Inventarul manuscriselor orientale de la Academie* [Inventry of the Oriental manuscripts preserved in Romanian Academy], Bucureşti, 1946; *Sultani şi mari dregatori otomani* [Ottoman Sultans and dignitaries], *Hrisovul*, VII, 1947; *Tabele sincronice* [Synchronistic tables], Bucureşti, 1955 *Paleografia şi diplomatica turco-osmană* [Ottoman-Turkish palaeography and diplomatics], Bucureşti, 1958.

He edited: *Catalogul documentelor turceşti* [Catalogue of the Turkish documents] 2 volumes, Bucureşti, 1960, 1965; *Cronici turceşti privind Ţările Române* [Turkish chronicles concerning the Romanian Principalities], Bucureşti, 2 volumes, 1966, 1974.

Here are some of his studies and papers published in Romania: *Inscripţia sultanului Suleiman Magnificul în urma cuceririi Moldovei-945 H/1538* [The Inscription ordered by the Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent after the conquest of Moldavia-945 H/1538] *Studii. Revista de istorie*, IV, 2-3 (1956); *Orientalistica Română* [Romanian Oriental Studies], *Studii şi articole de istorie*, 1956; *Răscoalele ţărăneşti din Imperiul Otoman (1418-1420) şi bedredinismul* [Peasant uprisings in the Ottoman Empire (1418-1420) and the bedreddinism], *Studii. Revista de istorie*, X, 2 (1957) (co-author Mehmed Mustafa); *Manuscrisele şi tipăriturile orientale din fondul "Timotei Cipariu" al Bibliotecii filialei din Cluj a Academiei R.P.R.* [The Oriental manuscripts and printed books in "T. Cipariu" fund of the Romanian Academy-Cluj branch], *Language and literature* III (1957); *Dimitrie Cantemir şi istoria Imperiului Otoman* (Dimitrie Cantemir and the history of

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0262

the Ottoman Empire]. *Studii şi articole de istorie*, II (1957): *Documente turceşti din Arhivele Statului şi importanta lor pentru cercetarile istorice* [Turkish documents in the State archives and their importance for the historical research], *Arhivele Statului-125 ani de activitate, 1891-1356* [The State archives-125 years of activity], Bucureşti, 1957: *Un manunchi de documente turceşti privind evenimentele din ţarile româneşti în jurul anului 1821* [A series of Turkish documents concerning events around the year 1821 in the Romanian Principalites], *Revista Arhivelor* (New Series), I (1958); "L'inscription turque de Bender relative à l'expédition de Soliman le Magnifique en Moldavie (1538/945 H.)", number 5 variant, "Studia et Acta Orientalia", I, 1958: *Quarante ans d'études orientales en URSS (1917-1957).* "Studia et Acta Orientalia", I, Bucureşti, 1958: *Despre arhiva turco-orientala din Biblioteca de stat "V. Kolorov"/Sofia. Importanta ei pentru istoria Bulgariei, României şi altor state din sud-estul Europei* [On the Oriental-Turkish archive of "V. Kolorov" State Library (Sofia). Its importance for the history of Bulgaria, Romania and other South-Eastern European countries], *Revista Arhivelor*, 2, 1959; *L'importance de matériaux documentaires orientaux existant dans les archives, bibliothèques et collections roumaines, Studia et Acta Orientalia*, II, 1961; *Arhiva insulei Ada-Kale şi importanta ei* [The archive of Ada-Kale and its importance], *Revista Arhivelor*, V, 1 (1962); *Din calatoriile lui Evliya Çelebi în Transilvania, Apulum*, V, (MCMLXV); "L'historiographie ottomane des XV-e-XVIII-e siècle", *RESEE*, III (1965), nr. 1-2:

Articles and studies published abroad: "Materialî po vostokivedenii, hroniciesco v arvivah, bibliotecah i muzeiah Rumînskoi narodnoi Respubliki", *Uzvestia Akad. Nauk Uz.S.S.R.*, I, Taşkent, 1958; "V rumuskih fondah vostokovedenia", *Pravda vostoka*, April 10th, 1958; *Eflâk ve Boğdan voyvodalarının Babıâli ile münasebetleri, Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, 1, Istanbul, 1967; "Romanya türkolojisi ve Romen dilinde Türk sözleri hakkında bazı araştırmalar", *XI Türk dil kurultayında okunan bilimsel bildirilerden ayrıbasım*; 1968; *Dva ukaza (1801 g) u"Svjoseennii rescrept" (1802g), s turetsko-rumunskimi otnoseni jami, Fontes orientales*, 2nd volume (Moskova, 1969); *Le tribut payé par les Principautés Roumaines à la Porte Ottomane jusqu'au début du XVI-e siècle d'après les sources turques. REİ*, XXXVII, 1, Paris, 1969: "Fatih Sultan Mehmed ve Yavuz Sultan Selim'in Boğdan voyvodalarına yazdıkları slavça mektuplar". *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi*, (1969).

Definitely, it is difficult to draw an image on Mihail Guboğlu's activity in only a few lines.

In addition to those mentioned above, he presented scientifical papers and presided numerous international conferences and congresses of Oriental

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0263

studies (Tashkent, 1957; Moskow, 1960; Warsaw, 1964; Sofia, 1966; Ankara, 1966 and 1970: Athens, 1970: Strasbourg, 1970:) He was a redactor of *Studia et Acta Orientalia* (volumes I-VIII) and president of the Oriental Studies Section of the Romanian Society for Historical and Philological Sciences (1959-1979), as well as vice-president of the above-mentioned Society.

Starting from 1967 he was a member in the editorial committee of the Turkish review *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, published in Istanbul.

For years he attended a great number of international reunions concerning Turkish language, literature and folklore held in Selçuk, İzmir, Istanbul, Ankara, Konya. He was, even since its foundation, a vice-president of the *Laboratory of Ottoman-Turkish Studies*, from the Bucharest University-Faculty of History (later, after his death, the *Laboratory* turned into the *Center for Ottoman-Turkish Studies*).

In reward for his intense scientific activity, in 1980 he was elected a corespondent-member of the *Turkish Historical Society*, and in 1982 he was named Member of Honour of the same institution. As he himself declared, in 1989, during his last visit to Turkey, he was to be designated a Member of Honour of the *Turkish Society for Literature and Folklore*, in Eskişehir.

But it was not only the scientist, but also the person Mihail Guboğlu who was a very complex personality. Either in the past or now, 14 years after the Master's death, those who knew him describe his as a friendly man, who rarely lost his temper, but when he did it he became terrible; he was a hard-working, tenacious nature. He used to say, about those who failed to accomplish his professional requirements, that they were "vast as the sea and only a finger deep". He shared his knowledge with his colleagues, students or researchers, with anyone who was interested; however, few of them followed his path.

Permanently dissatisfied with himself and the others he worked hard to decipher more and more documents, and to gather materials from foreign archives. There were moments when he was overwhelmed, but he would not give up.

He was a man of exceptional vitality, who worked until the final day in 1989; in a symposium held in Turkey he presented two papers: *Projects for the Danube-Black Sea Channel (1836-1876)*" and "*The first Railway (Constanţa-Cernavoda) in the Ottoman Empire (1855-1860)*". It was the last reunion he attended.

Undoubtedly, he would have continued his work if he had not suddenly passed away on May 11th, 1989 in Istanbul.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0264

ION MATEI (1921-1996)

Viorel PANAITE

Ion Matei was born on 11th of January 1921, in Coifrângeni from Argeş district, and graduated University of Bucharest.

A short period he was cultural attaché of the Romanian consulate in Istanbul. In 1949—after the installation of the Communist regime in Romania — he chose to come back in his native country, contrary to his colleague and friend Nicoara Beldiceanu, who preferred to emigrate in Western Europe. Both Ion Matei and Nicoara Beldiceanu became well-known and respected Ottomanists.

Between 1958-1975 Ion Matei was lecturer at the Faculty of Classic and Oriental Languages of the University of Bucharest. For about ten years his teaching activity was happily connected with his research work. Almost thirty years, i.e. from 1964 until 1991, he worked as senior researcher at the *Institute of South-East European Studies* of the Romanian Academy.

Colleague with Nicoara Beldiceanu at the beginning of his scientific career, Ion Matei belonged to a "golden" generation of the Romanian ottomanists, together with Aurel Decei, Mustafa A. Mehmet and Mustafa Guboğlu. As orientalist and ottomanist, he studied various aspects of Islamic culture, the impact of Ottoman-Turkish civilisation on the Balkans, and relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Romanian Principalities. The way opened by Aurel Decei, who started to emphasise the Islamic legal view on Ottoman-Romanian relationships, was constantly followed by Ion Matei. He has shown us — in his few but accurate studies — what good results can be obtained by joining in the same person the historical training with the legal one.

In this respect, the best example is his article on the regime of the Ottoman rule in the Romanian Principalities, i.e. "Quelques problèmes concernant le régime de la domination ottomane dans les pays roumains (concernant particulièrement la Valachie)", published in two parts in *RESEE* of 1972-1973. Actually, this study should have been the introduction of a special

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0265

work concerning the representatives (*kapu-kethüdaları*) of Wallachia in the Ottoman empire, a book which has not been published yet, waiting probably an editor and a publishing house. Although many historians did not and do not agree with Ioan Matei's ideas expressed in that article, one can say they represented basic arguments in studying the legal and political status of Wallachia and Moldavia towards the Ottoman Porte. From the very beginning he aimed to emphasize the status of the Romanian Principalities within the Ottoman Empire and not outside it ("1. Position des Principautés roumaines et leur régime dans le cadre de l'Empire Ottoman"). In this respect, he exposed briefly the main elements of the *cihad* doctrine, using as basic source al-Mâwardî's *Kitâb al-Ahkâm al -Sultaniyya* of eleventh century. Considering the '*ahdname*s granted to certain Moldo-Walachian princes, the Shafi'te concept *dar al-'ahd* (Abode of Peace) could define better — in Ion Matei's view — the legal status of the Romanian principalities. In a distinct part of the same article, Ion Matei attempted — for the first time in Romanian historiography — to study objectively and in a comparative view the legal status of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania, pointing out both the common and divergent places ("3. Le régime juridique et politique de la domination ottomane dans les trois pays roumains. Ressemblances et dissemblances"). Moreover, the last part of this brilliant study is a real contribution to Ottoman history, generally, unfortunetaly — probably because it was published in French — less known and used by Ottomanists around the world. ("4. L'autonomie des Principautés Roumanies - analogie et modèle pour d'autres pays dominés.").

His studies published in Romanian journals and collective volumes became indispensable for researchers who have followed him. Unfortunately, less known are his unpublished works, which there are deposited in the archive of the Institute of South-East European Studies, and are waiting editors and publishing houses.

Here is a selected bibliography:

"Mots d'origine roumaine en turc." *RESEE* Bucharest,IV, 1966, 1-2, pp. 223-232.

"Notes sur les "turcismes" du dialecte roumain de Banat". *RESEE*, Bucharest, V, 1967, 3-4, pp. 657-571.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0266

"Notes concernant l'enseignement des langues orientales dans les pays roumains". *SAO,* V-VI, 1967, pp. 93-117.

"Sur les relations d'Ahmed Vefik Pacha avec les Roumains". *SAO,* VII, 1969, pp. 95-133 (I) and VIII, 1971, pp. 71-103 (II).

"Le maître de langue turque de Dimitrie Cantemir: Es'ad Efendi". *RESEE,* X, 1972, 2, pp. 281-288.

"Quelques problèmes concernant le régime de la domination ottomane dans les pays roumains (concernant particulièrement la Valachie)". *RESEE,* X, 1972, 1, pp. 65-81 (I), and tome XI, 1973, 1, pp. 81-95 (II).

"Regimul juridic al relaţiilor internationale" (The Legal Condition of International Relations). In *Istoria dreptului românesc,* I, Bucureşti, 1980, pp. 458-470; in *Istoria dreptului românesc,* vol. II/1, Bucureşti, 1984, pp. 221-230.

"Românii în Imperiul Otoman. Probleme generale". *Cercetari de istorie şi civilizatie sud-est europeana,* III, 1986, Bucureşti, 1987, pp. 141-149.

"Unele aspecte privind autonomiile locale în Imperiul otoman în spatiul sud-est european." *Cercetari de istorie şi civilizatie sud-est europeana,* 1988, V, Bucureşti, 1989, pp. 65-73.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0267

VALERIU VELIMAN
(1947-1999)

Georgeta ANGHEL

Don't cry. The days to come
need not to cry.
Save your tears for other days
to come.
They come by foot, lugging
away
The sun.

Premonition? Confession? Farewell? A little bit of each and also nothing. Several lines of a poem that were meant to prepare us, us who were left behind, for the Great Step. The man who only enjoyed Spring for 52 times left us the very same way he came to us: lonely. Behind him there were just Autumn, leafless trees and an overwhelming silence...

Valeriu Veliman, who was born on the 1st of March 1947 in Popricani (Iasi County), graduated the National Highschool (Liceul National) in Iaşi, then moved to Bucharest, where he followed the courses of the Romanic, Classic and Oriental Languages Faculty (Turkish language) of Bucharest University.

After graduation he taught Romanian language in a small locality (Jegălia), then due to his specialization, was asked to investigate the Ottoman-Turkish documents preserved in the National State Archives. He remained there for 20 years (1971-1990), the philologist Valeriu Veliman becoming the archivist Valeriu Veliman, a specialist in Ottoman-Turkish palaeography. His former colleagues respectfully recall his long years of hard work that turned him into a reputed specialist in Turkish studies, author of a great number of articles and collections of documents which already were or are still to be published; here are a few titles: "Izvoare turcesti despre Mihai Viteazul" [Turkish Sources on Michael the Brave], *RA*, 2,1975 (co-author Aurel Decei): "Cercetari în arhivele din Turcia" [Researches in the Turkish Archives], *RA*, 4,1976: "Noi documente turceşti privind evenimentele din 1821-1822" [New Turkish Documents Concerning the Events of 1821-1822], *RA*, 1, 1981;

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0269

"Centenarul nasterii lui Mustafa Kemal Atatürk"[Mustafa Kemal Atatürk-100 Years Since His Birth] *RA*, 3,1981; *Câteva consideraţii privind haraciul Moldovei la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea* [Some Considerations on Moldavia's Tribute at the Middle of the 16th Century], *AIIAADX*, Iaşi, 1982; *Documente turco-osmane privind vilaietul (eialetul) Timişoara* (Ottoman-Turkish Documents on Timişoara vilayet (Eyalet)), *RA*, 4, 1985; "Date noi cu privire la circumstanţele alegerii Mitropolitului Moldovei (1792) si statutul juridico-politic al Principatelor Române" [New Information Concerning the Election of Moldavia's Metropolitan and the Romanian Principalities' Politic-Juridical Status], "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie şi Arheologie «A. D. Xenopol»". Iaşi, 1986; *O carte de legământ din 1581 privitoare la Transilvania* [An *Ahidname* of 1581 Regarding Transylvania]. Iaşi, 1986; *O cronica turcească despre domnia lui Mircea cel Mare* [A Turkish Chronicle Concerning the Reign of Mircea the Great], *RA*, 4,1986.

In 1986 the National State Archives published his volume "Relaţiile româno-otomane (1711-1821)". *Documente Turceşti* (Romanian-Ottoman Relations (1711-1821). Turkish Documents), wich has 796 pages (plus 30 facsimiles). A second volume is still in manuscript.

Valeriu Veliman also worked for a PhD paper on Romanian-Ottoman relations (coordinated by Georgeta Penelea-Filitti), but time and "times" did not let him bring it to an end.

Between 1994-1996 he taught Ottoman-Turkish palaeography at the Faculty of Archival Sciences.

Valeriu Veliman was also a diplomat, as First Secretary of the Romanian Embassy in Ankara between 1992-1996, and in November 1997 being appointed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to found the Romanian embassy in Tashkent. He returned to Bucharest in December 1998, already ill, and after a few months he passed into eternity.

This portrait would not be complete without a few consideration on Valeriu Veliman as a philologist and a translator. During his short life he published several translations from modern Turkish literature: Yaşar Kemal, *Arşita* [The Heat] (short-stories), Bucureşti, 1974; Samin Kocagöz, *In İzmir* [In İzmir] [novel] Bucureşti, 1978; Necati Cumalı, *Zeliş* [novel]. Iaşi, 1983; Bülent Ecevit, *Poezii* [Poems] (with a Preface by Valeriu Râpeanu), Bucureşti, 1978.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0270

Whereas the "archivist" Valeriu Veliman was in a permanent competition with the "philologist" Valeriu Veliman, it is only the "poet" that could fulfil the MAN.

Although during his life-time he published only one poetry volume (*Cu ochii larg deschişi* [With eyes wide-open], Bucureşti, 1983, his talent was certified by prestigious "names" such as Professor Romulus Munteanu or the poet Geo Dumitrescu, and more than that, he was accepted as a member of the Writers 'Union. During his stay in Tashkent, between March-November 1998, his poetical creation was fruitful, but, unfortunately, these last rhymes, entitled by the author himself *Uzbek Journal*, are now still waiting to be published.

Valeriu Veliman drew his first breath in Spring and in Spring did he pass away. He left away speaking and being silent at the same time while the man Valeriu Veliman was silent, his work was speaking for him:

I might be a bird, but birds would push me away.
I might be a wolf, but wolves would push me away.
I only try to be a man.
I am still trying.

This is how the MAN Valeriu Veliman defined himself in the most prolific day of his poetical existence —4th of March 1998— in the poem entitled *Myself*.

V. BOOK REVIEWS

Tahsin Gemil, *Românii şi Otomanii în Seculele XIV-XVI,* Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 1991, 231 p.

Preoccupied to reveal the dimensions and the origins of the greatest enemy of Christendom during the Middle Ages from its beginnings, south-eastern and then European history has been interested in the Ottoman states. In agreement with the directions of European politics, European historical writing devoted to Ottoman history some remarkable chapters.

Owing to the fact that in Romanian historiography the Ottoman impact was fully felt by the presence of the Danubian principalities in the first line of the anti-Ottoman struggle, our historiography has been interested in the investigation of the economic and political system of the Ottoman society.

Safeguarding the independence of the Romanian countries and their autonomy, maintaining a special relationship with the Sublime Porte, the imminence of changing them into Turkish provinces, changing for the worse of the economical status of the Principalities are just some of the reasons, besides many others, that determined the priority of Ottoman history in Romanian historical writing. Through the special status of the Romanian countries in their relations with the Porte during the Middle Ages and in the modern epoch, Ottoman society was in permanent contact with the Romanian geopolitical space, that in its turn, influenced, in time, the evolution of the Romanian states, being the most important political element that exercised an influence over the development of events in Danubian countries.

Marked by the contribution of tradition and special experience, Romanian historical writing has been enriched with a publication, destined to explain the controversial aspects of the Romanian-Ottoman relationship from the first contacts us to the middle of the XVIth century.

Written as a first stage of a thorough research to be carried on, Dr. Tahsin Gemil's ample and competent volume *The Romanians and the Ottomans in the XIV-XVIth centuries,* was printed in the year 1991 at the Romanian Academy Publishing House. The new synthesis of the historian Tahsin Gemil supplements a rich scientific activity, whose continuity covers

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0275

more than two decades.[1] Together with the regretted scholar Mihail Guboglu, or other historians such as Mihai Maxim, Valeriu Veliman, Şt. S. Gorovei, Andrei Pippidi, Tahsin Gemil distinguished himself as one of the few experts on the complex Romanian-Ottoman problems.

Until now Romanian-Ottoman relations have been approached onesidedly, under the impact of definite backgrounds (economic, juridical, political). In this new volume however we have a first attempt at assembling these elements in order to fix them into a complex political background, other than that of bilateral relations. The declared aim is to offer a strict interpretation of the collections of documents in the Ottoman archives, to shift Romanian historical writing from stereotype syntheses to the real scientific research based on sources, eager for quantitative and qualitative explanations.

From the perspective of our historiography, that began to surpass the old barriers some 20-30 years ago, the author organises his own scientific approach into three chapters: I. The juridical background; II. Political relations of the Romanian Countries with the Sublime Porte, and III. Economic Romanian-Ottoman relations. By this new method we can conclude that the actual Romanian research is exceeding the old historical interpretation that paid attention only to the political background. In the new variant put forward by Tahsin Gemil the investigation tries, in its first stage, to offer the dimensions of the juridical background in which Romanian-Ottoman relations were carried on. The juridical aspects are considered in their essential elements, shifting the subject of investigation to the views offered by the outlook of classical Islam, as far as the relations with non-Musulmans were concerned. The juridical background cannot be supported without the economic one, considered as a second state to understand certain essential connections in the development of the Romanian society in the Middle Ages as well as in the modern period. The economic framework and its up-to-date approach is too little known and used in our historiography, except the decades in the second half of the XVIth century, period thoroughly studied by Professor Mihai Maxim. the necessity of an exhaustive study of the economic aspects of Romanian-Ottoman relations is evident in the sense that the economic

[1] T. Gemil, "In faţa impactului otoman", in vol. *Petru Rareş*, Bucureşti, 1978, p. 136,151; idem, "Modificarea regimului politic al Transilvaniei la jumătatea sec. al XVI-lea", in D.D.I.A, 1986, p. 55,56; idem, *Raporturile româno-otomane în vremea lui Mircea cel Mare*, in vol. *Marele Mircea Voievod*, p. 330-365; idem, *Relaţiile Ţărilor Române cu Poarta Otomană in documente turcesti 1601-1712*, Bucureşti, 1985 ; idem, *Ţările Române in contextul politic international 1621-1672*, Bucureşti, 1979.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0276

element influenced them in a greater degree than we believed, practically being the material expression of the political relations. The juridical and economic background are complementary, they reach their true value when compared to the political factor whose evolution decisively influenced the background. For the first time in Romanian historiography, the political factor as sustainer of the juridical and economic backgrounds has become a barometer of the bilateral relations with the Porte; it is now approached from the point of view of oriental display of Ottoman policies. Ottoman sources are the fundamental ones, finally they reveal the true dimensions of the relations of the Romanians with the Ottoman society, the struggle against the Ottoman interference, and the organic connections and unity of action of the three Romanian countries.

Due to their condition as small countries, permanently surrounded by great powers, the Romanian countries were forced to continually follow on the context at that time, the leading political factors and adopted the most suitable solutions to affirm and to protect the fundamental aim: maintaining the existence of the state. The Romanian-Ottoman relations all along many centuries were not restricted to narrow, bilateral relations, as the author intended to underline ; from the beginning they had been integrated in the course of European and universal history. The main characteristic of these relations was the resistance of the Romanians to the expansionist tendencies of the Ottoman Empire that had ambitions of world hegemony. The author's approach is interesting from this point of view: the Romanian-Ottoman relations, in connection with the significant historical moments of the Ottoman state, from its foundation till the glorious epoch of Süleyman the Magnificent. It is interesting to see that Tahsin Gemil does not offer his readers only a history of two nations in permanent dispute. He considers that those relations were not exclusively antagonistic, they witnessed periods of understanding and even co-operation, especially from a commercial point of view. Existence, in certain periods, of good commercial relations, is yet another proof that the old expression "Ottoman commercial monopoly" has to be abandoned and replaced with that of "the right of the Porte's pre-emption". The revaluation of the terms imposes, as the Turkish-Ottoman documents introduced in scientific circulation in the last decade demonstrate, the groundlessness of the cliché "Ottoman monopoly" limited to the right of priority of the Porte in the foreign trade with the Romanian countries.

The initiative and leading role of the great material and moral effort that meant the fight to defend Romanian independence belonged, in turn, to every Romanian country.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0277

Successively or together, they had the capacity to mobilise the necessary energies to stop the Ottoman bulldozer, realising as N. Iorga said "a true war of national defence" integrated in the general European efforts to stop the new conquerors.

The study of the Romanian-Ottoman relations is a very important source of special research. For example, by approaching the Ottoman archives and sources, we can arrive at a better knowledge of the problems concerning the history of the Principality of Transylvania. The break of Transylvania from the Magyar Kingdom and its organisation as an autonomous Principality under the Porte's protection and suzerainty had great importance in Romanian national history. The Porte was aware of the organic relationship between the three Romanian countries: it promoted, with consistency, the unity of action between them, under its aegis and with the mission to become a defence system against the "imperial" tendencies of Poland. From the same point of view, the framing of Transylvania under the same Ottoman suzerainty, Moldavia and Wallachia were already there, they actually contributed to the development and strengthening of the organic connections between the Romanian Principalities.

The Romanian-Ottoman relations represented, symbolically, through their dimensions and consequences, a reality that crossed centuries, gradually establishing themselves as the political, juridical and economic factors that amplified and faithfully reflected a certain mentality and a cultural, religious and political option.

As a subject that tends to occupy a more and more important place in the actual scenery of the Romanian historical writing, the Romanian-Ottoman relations justify their presence through Tahsin Gemil's new synthesis.

With the conviction that this superb writing is only a beginning that has to be carried on, we consider that Romanian historiography has been enriched with a new and valuable contribution.

Călin Felezeu

*
* *

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0278

Zeki Kuneralp, *Les débuts de la soviétisation de la Roumanie: Août 1944-août 1945. Témoignage d'un diplomate turc,* Éditions Isis, Istanbul, 1992, 42 p.

Aux sources nouvelles, de plus en plus nombreuses, concernant l'histoire de la soviétisation de la Roumanie (1944-1947), s'ajoute maintenant le témoignage du diplomate turc Zeki Kuneralp, secrétaire à la Légation de Turquie à Bucarest de 1943 à 1947, qui a consigné "*dans un carnet, les principaux événements qui se déroulèrent en Roumanie durant la phase finale du conflit mondial. Ce texte, rédigé en français il y a près de cinquante ans, n'a point été remanié* ", selon les propres paroles de l'auteur, à l'occasion de la publication de ce journal en 1992 par les Éditions Isis, dans la série "*Cahiers du Bosphore*", No VIII.

Bucarest a été le premier poste à l'étranger du jeune diplomate turc, qui a connu ultérieurement une longue et brillante carrière, courronnée par les postes d'ambassadeur à Berne (1960-1963), Londres (1964-1966 et 1969-1972) et Madrid (1972-1979) de même que par le Secrétariat Général du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (1966-1969). À la retraite, ce très rigoureux diplomate de carrière, entièrement dédié à sa profession, a publié ses mémoires, accompagnées par de documents et de "réflexions de vieillesse" (voir Zeki Kuneralp, *Sadece Diplomat. Anılar- Belgeler* / Seulement Diplomate. Mémoires -Documents, Isis, 1999, 378 p.). C'est dans cet ouvrage que la période de la mission à Bucarest a été de nouveau embrassée, cette fois- ci dans tout son ensemble. Par conséquent, le journal de 1944-1945, en tant que source historique, doit être complété par les mémoires publiées en 1999 (à savoir le III-ème chapitre, pp. 29-37: *La première mission à l'étranger- Bucarest, 1943-1947*), afin d'avoir une meilleure compréhension des événements relatés. En comparant les deux textes, on peut constater que le premier est précieux surtout par ses informations détaillées sur le processus de la soviétisation de la Roumanie, tandis que le deuxième contient aussi des nouveaux renseignements sur les relations roumano- turques de l'époque envisagée, sur la manière de travailler du fameux Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver en tant qu'ambassadeur, sur la Roumanie et les Roumains de ces années, etc.

Le jeune diplomate turc a constaté, depuis son arrivée en Roumanie, la vive sympathie des Roumains pour la Turquie et en donne l'explication: "*Depuis mon arrivée en Roumanie, à la fin du mois de mars 1943, j'ai constaté que les Roumains, en grande majorité, étaient animés des trois*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0279

*sentiments suivants: antipathie à l'égard de l'Allemagne, crainte de la Russie, sympathie mêlée d'admiration pour les Anglo-Saxons, surtout les Américains. La solution idéale pour sortir de l'impasse dans laquelle ils se trouvaient, était d'après eux, l'occupation du pays par les Anglais. Confondant leur désir avec la réalité, beaucoup de personnes parlaient avec conviction de la nécessité d'un débarquement allié en Grèce ou même sur le littoral de la mer Noire. En raison des (ou selon eux, conformément aux) nécessités géographiques, la Turquie devait jouer, dans l'exécution de ce plan audacieux (utopique) un rôle de premier plan soit en ouvrant les Détroits aux flottes alliées, soit même en entrant en guerre contre les Allemands. Nombreuses furent les personnes qui me demandèrent :"Mais qu'attendez-vous donc pour venir occuper la Roumanie?" C'est ce qui explique la vogue dont a joui la Turquie jusqu'au 23 août (*date du coup d'état qui a renversé le régime Antonesco, allié des Allemands –M.M.). *L'opinion publique roumaine, et même, en partie, les cercles officiels, impuissants de manifester ouvertement leur sympathie pour les Anglo-Saxons, le faisaient d'autant plus bruyamment pour les Turcs qui étaient, parmi les nations avec lesquelles les Roumains entretenaient encore des relations diplomatiques, les plus rapprochés des Anglo-Saxons en raison du traité d'alliance anglo-turc. Il convient de relever, en outre l'appui que donnait le Vice-Président du Conseil* (et Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Mihai Antonesco –M.M.) *à ce mouvement philo-turc. Prévoyant que la Roumanie devait, tôt ou tard, faire nécessairement volte face dans sa politique étrangère et sortir de l'Axe, Mihai Antonesco comptait sincèrement sur l'aide de la Turquie dans l'exécution de cette opération aussi délicate que dangereuse."* (*Les débuts de la soviétisation*, pp. 5-6). Dans *Sadece Diplomat* (pp. 30- 32), Zeki Kuneralp fait aussi mention d'autres raisons de la sympathie et de la position privilégiée dont jouissaient les Turcs à Bucarest à l'époque, à savoir la personnalité exceptionnelle de l'Ambassadeur Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, le souvenir d'une domination ottomane assez légère, enfin le soutien accordé par les Turcs dans le passé pour que les Roumains restent "*une île latine dans un océan slave et hongrois*".

Le jeune diplomate turc a eu raison: les Roumains ont confondu leur désir (l'arrivée des Anglais avant les Russes) avec la réalité: celle-ci s'est avérée cruelle. L'offensive de l'Armée Rouge (déclenchée le 20 août 1944 sur la ligne Iaşi -Chişinău) a eu comme résultat l'occupation progressive de la Roumanie par les forces soviétiques. En dépit du coup d'état du 23 août et "*des combats violents*" des Roumains avec les Allemands qui ont été battus et

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0280

chassés de Bucarest[1], les Soviétiques ont occupé la capitale roumaine. Quant à la date de l'entrée de l'Armée Rouge à Bucarest, selon le diplomate turc c'était le 29 août (*Sur les débuts de la soviétisation*, p.10; *Sadece diplomate*, p. 34), tandis que selon l'historiographie roumaine c'était le 30-31 août (voir, par exemple, *Chronological History of Romania,* under the guidance of Constantin C. Giurescu, Bucharest, 1974, p. 354). On peut expliquer cette petite différence par le fait que Zeki Kuneralp a consigné la "*date de l'entrée à Bucarest des* premières (souligné par moi-M.M.) *troupes russes*", tandis que l'historiographie roumaine fait mention de la date de l'accueil officiel et solennel du gros de ces troupes ("*The population of Bucharest, liberated by the Romanian insurrectional forces, warmly welcomes the Soviet troops*", selon la *Chronological History of Romania).* Voilà la description de cet accueil et de la conduite des Russes: " *Reçus avec une crainte dédaigneuse par la majorité de la population — les sentiments de sympathie que leur prodigua la foule à leur entrée dans la capitale sentaient trop la commande et n'étaient sincères que de la part des communistes et des Juifs — les Russes ne se donnèrent guère la peine d'augmenter leur popularité. Les actes de violence commis par les soldats et la sévérité des mesures prises par le commandement russe, firent clairement sentir aux Roumains qu'il n'était point possible d'effacer dans une nuit les réminiscences de trois ans de guerre et de 20 années de politique hostile. Les réquisitions radicales des automobiles privées et des appareils TSF provoquèrent une vive émotion. Le peuple commença à faire des comparaisons entre la manière dont s'étaient conduits les Allemands et la façon dont se comportaient à présent les Russes, comparaisons qui n'étaient guère en faveur de ces derniers." (Les débuts de la soviétisation,* p.11*).*

Quelques incidents provoqués par les soldats russes et consignés par l'auteur dans son carnet sont " *de nature à démontrer le peu d'importance que les Russes attachent au matériel humain* " *(Les débuts de la soviétisation,* p. 18). Un fait avec des conséquences terribles, y compris pour les Roumains. Quant aux communistes roumains (environ 1000 personnes avant l'arrivée de l'Armée Rouge-M.M.), "leurs journaux sont les plus bruyants, leurs manifestations les plus imposantes" (*Les débuts,* p.12). Mais,

[1]La presse turque de l'époque, écrivait, elle-aussi, dans le même sens. Par exemple, *Tasvir-i Efkâr* (L'Opinion Publique) du 27 août 1944 informait ses lecteurs que le jour précédent "*Bucarest a été complètement nettoyé des Allemands",* dont 4000 ont été pris comme prisonniers. *Akşam* (Le Soir) du 28 août relatait que 25 divisions roumaines participaient aux luttes contre les Nazis. *Yeni Sabah* **(Le Nouveau Matin)** du 29 août précisait que "*l'armée roumaine a complètement sauvé son pays"* et que 12 divisions allemandes ont été détruites. Voir Mihai Maxim, ***Presa turcă despre 23 August** 1944* **(La presse turque sur le 23 août 1944),** dans *Magazin istoric,* anul XV, Nr. 10 (175), octombrie 1981, pp. 12-14.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0281

"beaucoup de personnes, hostiles à la Russie, espèrent encore que les Anglo-Saxons viendront occuper le pays et chasser les Soviets", note au début d'octobre le jeune diplomate turc, qui met en évidence tout de suite *"l'invraisemblance de l'existence d'un tel plan"*, *"si cher aux Roumains "* : "*Le journal* Curierul *reproduit, dans son numéro du 4 octobre, un passage d'un article paru dans le* Graiul Nou, *organe de la direction politique du front de l'Armée Rouge, qui souligne la bonne entente régnant entre les Russes et leurs alliés anglo-saxons."(Les débuts,* p. 15). Cette *"bonne entente"* a été confirmée, en effet, par un article paru dans le *Times* du 13 octobre 1944 relatif à la Conférence de Moscou (le fameux accord secret Stalin-Churchill du 9 octobre sur les "pourcentages" d'influence dans l'Europe orientale, suivi des négociations complémentaires Molotov-Eden du 10-11 octobre sur le même sujet[1] –M.M.) Quoique l'accord a resté secret et un tel partage des zones d'influence a été officiellement nié par les deux parties, le *Times* a appris l'essentiel. C'est remarquable que Zeki Kuneralp a immédiatement saisi l'importance exceptionnelle de l'événement : "*L'auteur de l'article en question après avoir affirmé que les Balkans ne sauraient constitués une source de conflit entre la Grande Bretagne et les Russes, constate que les intérêts de l'Angleterre exigent l'existence d'une zone de sécurité dans la Méditerranée orientale, basée sur la Turquie et la Grèce, tandis que les intérêts de la Russie demandent l'existence d'une zone de sécurité à la frontière occidentale de l'Union Soviétique englobant la Roumanie, la Hongrie, la Yougoslavie et la Bulgarie." (Les débuts,* p. 19). C'est ainsi que le sort de la Roumanie a été établi pour un demi-siècle! C'est ainsi que tous les efforts du Roi, des partis et des forces démocratiques, y compris la résistance anti-communiste ont été condamnés à l'échec, tandis que les communistes, "*une petite minorité*", *"condamnés à rester une minorité tant que le régime libéral et démocratique continue"*, " *finalement ont abouti à leur but avec le support des autorités soviétiques d'occupation" (Sadece diplomat,* p. 35) et en adoptant" *les méthodes violentes des hitlériens dans les luttes politiques"*, selon les reproches de leurs adversaires (*Les débuts de la soviétisation*, p. 21). "*C'est ainsi qu'un an après l'armistice (*entre la Roumanie et les Nations Unies, signé le 12 septembre 1944 à Moscou-M.M.), *un gouvernement dirigé par les communistes et totalement asservi aux Soviets est venu au pouvoir (*le gouvernement Dr. Petru Groza, le 5 mars 1945-M.M.). *Trois ans plus tard (*le 30 décembre 1947-M.M.) *le Roi aussi a quitté le pays, la Roumanie est devenue une*

[1] Voir, par exemple, Albert Resis, "*The Churchill – Stalin Secret "Percentages" Agreement on the Balkans, Moscow, October 1944*", dans *The American Historical Review*, vol. 83, Nr. 2, April 1978, pp. 368-387.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0282

république communiste, elle est tombée derrière le Rideau de Fer". "Quand on jouait le dernier acte de cette pièce tragique, nous avons quitté la Roumanie et nous sommes retournés dans notre pays. (...) Nous avons vu comment la nation roumaine a espéré et rêvé jusqu'au bout qu'elle occupera sa place dans le monde occidental"(Sadece diplomat, p. 35). Il convient de souligner que les Roumains et surtout les paysans ont continué à vivre avec cet espoir longtemps après le départ de la famille Kuneralp, espoir exprimé dans les mots : "*Vin americanii!"("Viennent les Américains!")*.

Il y a beaucoup d'épisodes, relations et réflexions de ce diplomate de talent, très minutieux et systématique, un vrai intellectuel et ami sincère des Roumains, qui sont pleins d'intérêt et dignes d'être présentés. Malheureusement, il est impossible de le faire ici dans l'espace très limité d'une simple notice. Qu'il me soit permis d'en citer, pour conclure, un seul épisode: celui concernant la visite du vice-commissaire soviétique aux Affaires Étrangères, Vychinski, à Bucarest en novembre 1944 : "*La visite de Vychinski à Bucarest a provoqué un certain malaise dans les cercles roumains bien qu'on ne sache pas avec précision quel en est le but. On parle de la possibilité d'une annexion de la Moldavie* (entre le Prouth et les Carpathes, car la Moldavie entre le Prouth et le Dniestr, c'est-à-dire la Bessarabie, a été déjà annexée entre 1812 et 1918 et, de nouveau, en 1940-M.M.) *qui serait précédée par un simulacre de plébiscite. Selon certains, les Russes auraient déjà préparé l'annexion pour le début de novembre et n'y auraient renoncé qu'en raison de la résistance opposée à ce plan par les Américains. Ce serait la première fois que les Anglo-saxons qui, jusqu'à présent, ont toujours fait des concessions aux Russes, auraient adopté une attitude plus énergique à l'égard des exigences de leurs alliés soviétiques.*" (*Les débuts de la soviétisation*, p. 24). Vrai ou non, ce bruit reflète parfaitement l'appétit territorial insatiable des Russes et nous rappelle l'épisode de l'annexion de la Boucovine du Nord le 26 juin 1940 par les Soviétiques après le pacte Ribbentrop-Molotov du 23 août 1939: Stalin voudrait occuper non seulement la Bessarabie, agréé antérieurement par Hitler, mais aussi la Boucovine (entière): seulement l'opposition de celui-ci, tout-puissant après la capitulation de la France, l'a déterminé se à contenter de la Boucovine du Nord. Cette fois-ci, en novembre 1944, l'annexion pure et simple de la Moldavie occidentale aurait transgressé les termes de l'accord "des pourcentages" d'octobre.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0283

Bref, il faut saluer la publication de ces pages d'histoire politique et diplomatique, qui nous révellent une personnalité extrêmement profonde et ordonnée, entièrement dévouée à son devoir et, surtout, aux hommes.

Mihai Maxim

*
* *

Mihai Maxim, *Tările Române şi Înalta Poartă', Cadrul Juridic Relatiilor Româno-Otomane in Evul Mediu,* Prefaţă de Prof. Halil İnalcık, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică 1993, 300 p.

During the last decades Professor Mihai Maxim, considered by Halil İnalcık — the "Dean" of Ottoman studies — Romania's leading Ottomanist, published fundamental studies in the field of Ottoman-Romanian relations during the Middle Ages. Disciple of the great professors Mihail Berza and Halil İnalcık, the turcologist Mihai Maxim graduated from the universities of Yassy, Baku and Moscow and published more than 100 papers on Ottoman studies and Ottoman-Romanian relations. As a professor at the Faculty of History of Bucharest University, Mihai Maxim put the basis of the Romanian modern school of Turcology founding the *Centre for Ottoman-Turkish Studies.*

Continuing the directions opened by Dimitrie Cantemir, Nicolae Iorga, C. Giurescu, Aurel Decei, Mihai Guboğlu and Nicoara Beldiceanu, the Ottomanist Mihai Maxim has a new and important contribution in the long discussed and controversial matter of bilateral Ottoman-Romanian relations. His book about the relation between *The Romanian Principalities and the Sublime Porte,* published by Editura Enciclopedică' in 1993, intends to give a solid basis to the juridical frame of the Romanians' relations with the Empire. Considered by its author as a first part, the book will be completed by a second autonomous volume, presented in all its concrete and complex articulations and, finally by a third one, which will consist of *numerous unpublished Turkish documents found in archives of Istanbul,* documents that represent examples and concrete evidences that support the arguments revealed in the first volumes.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0284

This present book is intended to be just an introduction, an opening to the great problems concerning the juridical frame of Romanian-Ottoman relations during the Middle Ages. In its six chapters the author reanalyses some of his previous studies and gives a synthetic, systematic and comparatist image of the matter.

The introductory chapter, on historiography, is an up-to-date image of the researches concerning Ottoman-Romanian juridical relations, mainly, since the specialised literature lacks a comprehensive perspective, necessary both to the public and the specialists. Naturally, such an approach of the historical meanings and sources gives the possibility — for the first time — to look into the future, to mark out the new trends of the research.

The analysis of the sources re-brings into discussion the controversial topic of the *ahd-nâmes*. Professor Maxim hopes to definitively put an end to some specialists' lack of confidence into the existence of such regulations between the Romanian Principalities and the Porte, by taking into account documentary evidences and arguments of other nature that can be formulated referring to ancient Romanian-Ottoman treaties. Throughout the book this approach is dominant; it is reinforced also by the arguments of the last chapter, where the author emphasises that "even when we do not have special mentions on the existence of *ahd-nâmes*, of written regulations, thus being the case of the Romanian Principalities during the 15th century, we must not jump to the conclusion that there were no juridical regulations concerning the relations between partners...". The observation is correct, since the term *ahd* can have the signification, on one side of written sermon, or "treaty of tributary protection", or on the other side, that of verbal sermon. In both cases it has the same legal-juridical value in regulating Romanian-Ottoman relations according to the laws of Islam.

The author insists in dealing with the characteristics of the *ahd* status, which puts an emphasis to the fact that this status features cannot be perceived without appealing to the specific sources of the *Islamic law*. The Muslim juridical frame is rather contradictory, because of the discrepancy between theory and practice. "Due to these contradictions, as well as to the provisory and unilateral character of the peace regulations in Ottoman vision, this juridical frame of the relations between the Romanian Principalities and the Porte during the Middle Ages might seem rather frail". But this image is false, and the author underlines the specific Ottoman mentality that a sermon, either verbal or written must be strictly respected. On the other side, the Romanians' attitude imposed to the Porte a conciliatory position.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0285

In the chapter *Why did the Ottoman not annex the Romanian Principalities"?* (p. 111-112) previous opinions—mainly P. P. Panaitescu's — are re-analysed. The author's conclusion corresponds to an undoubted historical reality. In his opinion, the decisive argument for the Porte's attitude versus the Romanians consists in the Empire's option for the efficient regime of an indirect domination, through the Romanian administration.

The Romanian Principalities' status within the frame of their political-juridical relations with the Porte cannot be interpreted isolated or under the incomplete incidence of some simple bilateral relations. It must be supported by similar or opposed examples, detectable at the level of historical reality. The different status of the North-Danubian Romanians, who preserved their state institution and that of the Balkan peoples, as well as the Hungarians, who lost it, is presented in the chapter "*The Status of the Zimmi's in Dar al-Islâm.*" (p. 169-196). More or less evident, this difference has become a favourite topic for researchers and has been approached from different points of view. Some historians from neighbouring countries emphasise some forms or zones of autonomy, whom they compare versus the Porte. Professor Maxim considers such interpretations as being harmful and superficial, since only a small number of non-Muslims enjoyed the advantages brought about by this autonomy, while the great masses endured all sort of discriminations and humiliations. The situation was quite different in the Romanian principalities, who have never been Ottoman provinces and consequently were not subject to Ottoman jurisdiction.

Finally we must say that the reader will find in *Tārile Române si İnalta Poartā* a book of talent and erudition written by a Romanian. As a paraphrase to the author's own words, we consider that, with this significant scientific work Romanian Turcology and historical research has made an important progress.

Călin Felezeu
(translated by Irina Hriţcu)

*
* *

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0286

Mehmet Ali Ekrem, *Din Istoria Turcilor Dobrogeni*, Kriterion Publishing House, Bucharest, 1994, 225 p.

The book represents a historical-demographic contribution, starting from the origins of the Turkish population in Dobrudja and following its evolution in different aspects till nowadays.

In approaching this subject the author uses various sources, of which the following are worth mentioning: 31 archive files from Bucharest and Constanţa as well as 113 Romanian and foreign published documents. At the end of the book a summary in Turkish, English, French and German is presented, followed by an appendix containing 9 archive documents of which the index with the old and new names of 240 localities in the county of Constanţa is of great interest (p. 231-239).

The book is structured into eight long chapters, which are also divided into subchapters for a better understanding of the author's intention to point out the main aspects.

In the first chapter, *The Settling of the First Groups of Turkish Population in Dobrudja,* the author speaks about the first waves of Turks who came to settle down in this province. Yet, before mentioning them, he refers to the existence of the Scythians (who had come from central Asia and who were now living together with the ancient Geto-Dacians), then to the Turks and Avars, followed by the waves of Petchenegs, Uzi, Cumanians. Later on, the Tatars who settled down in the north-Pontic area were to have an important role only in the 13th century (p. 17). The end of the chapter is an attempt to find a solution to the difficult and controversial problem of the Turks' ethnogenesis in the Dobrudja. The researcher considers that the ethnogenesis process of the Turks in the Dobruja had "a heterogeneous and complex character, taking place in several stages. Each stage totalizes a sum of specific features" (p. 25).

Chapter II refers to *The Way of Life, Customs and Traditions of the Turanian People Settled in the Dobrudja,* eventually being pointed out that the Turks and the population of the Golden Horde were converted to Islamism at the same time (p. 36).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0287

Chapter III entitled *The Turks in the Dobrudja in the Time of the Ottoman Empire*, is based especially on foreign sources which show that Ogüz-Turks and north Pontic Turanian elements settled in the Dobrudja while Ottoman imperial registers belonging to the 17th century prove that this period was the last and the most important stage in the process of synthesizing the Turkish element.

Revealing the severe consequences of the Turkish-Russian wars all over the Dobrudja, the author makes reference to the organization system during the Ottoman administration, to some aspects regarding the social, artistic, cultural life, as well as to the spiritual and economic condition of the Turkish population until 1878. From this point of view, Ion Ionescu de la Brad's notes which were taken when he made "a trip" in the Dobrudja in the middle of the 19th century, are mentioned as being of great interest.

The next chapters of the book are dedicated to the newly created situation after 1878, when, within the Romanian state, the Turkish population tried to preserve and at the same time to affirm its identity. From this point of view, the author indicates the stages in the evolution of the Turkish population which were as it follows: the period 1878-1940, when, under the protection of the Romanian authorities and legislation, an integration in the general movement towards culture and progress could be noticed, then a gradual deterioration followed after 1940, and after 1989 the hopes for renewal and a better assertion of identity grew again. It is worth mentioning that the author, besides published sources, also used unpublished, archival sources from Bucharest and Constanţa. Nevertheless, only two of the 31 archive files proceed from the Archives of the Dobrudja.

Owing to the title and the specific character of the book, we take the leave to consider that more comprehensive information with reference to local aspects could have been used. It could have been found in the Archives of Tulcea and Constanta and especially in the rich archive fund of the County Direction of the State Archive of Constanţa.

In the end of this book the author dedicates 72 pages (132-204) to the way in which the inter-war Romanian fiction reflects aspects in the life of the Turks in the Dobrudja and to the important contributions and achievements of the Turkish minority to the progress of science and culture in Romania. In this respect, aspects reflecting the situation of the cultural, artistical organizations and Turkish customs are described.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0288

In conclusion, the book represents an important contribution to the better knowledge of the past, of the present and of the future aspirations of the Turkish minority in the Dobrudja, and it is of real interest for both researchers and for the common reader.

Stelian Dumitrescu

*
* *

Originea Tatarilor. Locullor în România şi în Lumea Turcă, Lucrările Simpozionului Internaţional (Coordinator Tahsin Gemil), Kriterion, Bucureşti, 1997, 371 p.

In 17-20 November, 1994 the Museum of National History and Archaeology of Constanţa housed the International Symposium with the theme *The Origin of the Tatars. Their Place in Romania and in the Turkish World,* organised by the Democratic Union of the Muslim Academy and of the Ministry of Culture. It was the first symposium on such a theme ever organised not only in Romania, but also abroad. A large number of historians, researchers and scientists from Romania and abroad (Turkey, the Republic of Moldavia, Hungary, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Canada, U.S.A., the Russian Federation) participated and presented 71 scientific papers in Romanian, Turkish, English and Russian. Besides already acknowledged researchers and scientists, less known authors with less scientific experience presented papers and distinguished themselves through their wish for a deeper and better understanding of the respective theme. In speeches delivered on the opening of the symposium, Viorel Hrebenciuc, (representative of the Romanian Government), Tahsin Gemil, İhsan Yücel (Consul General of the Republic of Turkey in Constanţa), Lütfi Osman (Member of the Tatar National Council of Crimea) appreciated the fact that along centuries the different ethnies in the Dobrudja have always been on good terms with one another, the Muslim inhabitants having the important role of a bridge between Romania and Turkey. The organizers had also the merit of publishing in only one volume most of the papers presented on this occasion. Thus, of those 71 scientific papers which were presented and which aroused the interest of the audience, 38 were published in this volume, structured on two sections. The first part of the volume is dedicated to the section of history and comprises 18 papers, 13 belonging to Romanian participants and 5 to foreign ones. Here are the names of the authors and of their papers in the order they exist in this volume:

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0289

Nadir Devlet (University of Marmara-Istanbul), *Tatarlarda milli kimlik sorunu* [The Problem of the National Identity of the Tatars in the 20th century]; Ablai Mehmet Necati (Bucharest), *Denumirea în istoriografia universală a tătarilor* [The name Tatar in universal historiography]; Tahsin Gemil ("Ovidius" University of Constanţa) *Problema etnogenezei tătarilor* [The Problem of the Tatars' Ethnogenesis]; Imre Báski (University of Budapest), *Tamgas and Names*; Ernest Öberlander-Târnoveanu (National Museum of History of Romania, Bucureşti) *Inceputurile prezentei tătarilor în zona gurilor Dunării în lumina documentelor numismatice* [The Begininngs of the Tatars' Presence at the Danube Mouth in the Light of Numismatic Documents]; Virgil Ciocâltan ("N. Iorga" History Institute-Bucharest) *Tătarii şi Marea Neagră (sec. XIII-XIV)* [The Tatars and the Black Sea: the 13th-14th centuries]; Daniela Pălici (Ovidius University of Constanţa), *Unele aspecte ale politicii Hoardei de Aur la Dunărea de Jos* [Some aspects of the Policy of the Golden Horde at the Lower Danube]; Ileana Căzan ("N. Iorga" History Institute), *Tătarii crimeeni in contextul diplomatiei Casei de Austria în răsărit (1566-1576)* [The Crimean Tatars within the Context of the Diplomacy of the House of Austria in the East. 1566-1576]; Maria Ivanics (University of Szeged, Hungary), *Kırım tarihine ait kaynaklar: Mülknameler* [Sources with Regard to the History of Crimea: *Mülknameler*]; Ion Chirtoagă (The History Institute of the Academy of Sciences-Chişinău), *Apariţia tătarilor (nogailor) pe teritoriul Moldovei şi semnificatia noţiunii Bugeac* [The occurrence of the Tatars (Nogays) on the Territory of Moldovia and the significance of the term Bugeac]; Ştefan Andreescu ("N. Iorga" History Institute Bucharest), *Mihai Viteazul şi Gazi Ghirai-"Bora"* [Michael the Brave and Gazi Ghirai-"Bora"]; Constantin Şerban (University of Suceava), *Tătarii în politica externă a Moldovei în vremea lui Vasile Lupu* [The Tatars in the External Policy of Moldavia in the Time of Vasile Lupu]; Dan Ion Haidarlî (The History Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Moldavia-Chiăinău), *Relaţile Moldovei cu Hanatul din Crimeea şi Noagii în anii 1699-1783* [Moldavia's Relations with the Khanate of Crimea and the Nogays in the years 1727--1728]; Valeriu Veliman (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania), *Toponimul Dobrogea în documentele turceşti* [The Toponym "Dobrudja" in Turkish Documents]; Stoica Lascu (The "Ovidius" University of Constanţa), *"Călători" străni despre turco-tătarii din Dobrogea (sec. XVII-XIX)* [Foreign travellers about the Tatar-Turks in the Dobrudja, the 17th-19th centuries]; Adina Berciu-Drăghicescu (General Direction of the State Archives-Bucharest) *Tătarii din Dobrogea la mijlocul secolului al XIX in opera lui Ion Ionescu de la Brad* [The Tatars in the Dobrudja in the middle of the 19th century in the work of Ion Ionescu de la Brad]; Valentin Ciorbea (Naval Academy "Mircea cel Bătran" -Constanţa), *Aspecte privind pozitia populatiei musulmane la sfârşitul primului război mondial fată de problemele Dobrogei* [Aspects regarding the position of the Muslim Turkish population at the end of the First World War given the problems of the Dobrudja].

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0290

The second part of the volume includes 20 papers presented within the section of Philology, Art, Demography, Folklore. Of those 20 papers, 12 were written out by Romanian authors and 8 by foreign authors, all of them being attempts to point out the most interesting aspects regarding the themes already mentioned. Results of some researches in this field are also exposed. They are as it follows: İrfan Ünver Nasrattinoğlu (Folklore Institute Ankara), *Tatar kültürünün Türk kültürü içerisindeki yeri* [The place of the Tatar culture within the Turkish culture]; Gisela Sulițeanu ("Constantin Brăiloiu "Ethnography and Folklore Institute-Bucharest), *Importanța etnomuzicologică a studierii folclorului tătarilor români* [The ethnomusicological importance of studying the folklore of Romanian Tatars]; Zekeriya Başarslan (The Marmara University of Istanbul), *Kırım Tatarları'nın Türkiye'deki müzik hayatına etkileri* [The influence of the Crimean Tatars of musical life in Turkey). The Tatars (Crimean) in the artistical, musical world of Turkey]; Agiemin Baubek (University of Bucharest), *Clasificarea limbilor turce şi locul tătarei din România în această clasificare* [The classification of Turkish languages and the place of the Tatar language in this classification]; Nevzat M. Yusuf (University of Bucharest), *Poreclele denotative şi conotative externe legate de părtile corpului omenesc* [The external denotative and connotative nicknames regarding parts of the human body]; Ager Axeit (University of Constanța), *Evoluția bilingvismului tătaro-român în perioada actuală în Dobrogea* [The evolution of the Tatar-Romanian bilingualism nowadays in the Dobrudja]; Elena Diatcu (chief editor of "Kriterion" Publishing House), *Pătrarea valorilor spirituale ale turcilor şi tătarilor din România prin ediția Kriterion* [The preservation of spiritual values of the Turks and Tatars of Romania through Kriterion editions]; Altay Kerim (Chief department at Radio Romania International), *O apariție editorială despre creații perene ale folclorului tătar crimean* [An editorial publication about everlasting creations of the Crimean Tatar folklore]; Ablai Mehmet Necati (Bucharest), *Expresiile turceşti din Amintiri din Copilărie de Ion Creangă* [Turkish expressions from "Memories of my Boyhood" by Ion Creangă]; Iolanda Tighiliu ("N. Iorga" History Institute) *Chipuri în oglinda vremii* [Portraits in the mirror of time]; Nicolina Ursu (Museum of National History and Archeology of Constanta), "Turco-tătarii dobrogeni în recensăminte şi statistici româneşti" [The Turco-Tatars in the Dobrudja in Romanian statistics and census]; Ekrem Menlibay (in Constanța), *Situația demografică a tătarilor şi turcilor din Dobrogea după 1878* [The demographic situation of the Tatars and the Turks in the Dobrudja after 1878]; Nilghiun Ismail (in Bucharest), *Continuitatea etniei turco-tătare în spatiul românesc* [The continuity of the Turkish-Tatar element in the Romanian space]; Gelcu Sefedin Maksutovici (General Secretary of the

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0291

Association for Balkan and Slavonic Studies of Romania), *Dr. Ibrahim Themo - animator al vieţii spirituale turco-tătare din România* [Dr. Ibrahim Themo-animator of the Turco-Tatar spiritual life in Romania]; Gyögy Lederer (York University-Canada), Tatars in Post-Socialist Lithuania; Ismail Türkoğlu (Marmara University of Istanbul), *Kırım tatarlarının vatana geri dönüş sürecinde (1987-1994) Türk ve bazı batı basını* [The phenomenon of the Crimean Tatars' return to the land of their ancestors (1987-1994), reflected in the Western and Turkish press]; Zafer Karatay (Chairman of the "Emel" Crimean Foundation of Turkey-Ankara), *Türkiye'nin siyasi, sosyal ve iktisadi hayatında Kırım Türkleri* [The Crimean Turks (Tatars) in the economic, social and political life of Turkey]; Dilara Kırımtaylı (Ankara), *Tatar çocukları arasında dil eğitimi* [The study of the language by Tatar children]; Fedora Arnaut (University of Comrat), *Basarabya topraklarında tatar yer adları* [Tatar toponyms in Basarabia]; Mustafa S. Kaçalın (Marmara University of Istanbul), *Kırım üzerine yapılmış tezler* [Licence theses regarding the Crimea].

It is obvious that the publication of all those 71 papers would have offered a thorough image of the works of the symposium, but there were a few difficulties in accomplishing this desideratum, difficulties which were expounded by Tahsin Gemil (one of the chief initiators and organizers of the Symposium) in his foreword.

In conclusion, this volume represents an important editorial event proving the researchers' interest in this field and providing the reader with a generous and various amount of information.

Stelian Dumitrescu

*
* *

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0292

Românii şi Otomanii în Folclorul Românesc (The Romanians and the Ottomans in Romanian Folklore), Editura Kriterion, Bucharest, 1998, 249 p.

My book is the fruit of eleven years of specialization in Romanian and Turkish Philology, continued with the comparative study of Romanian and South-East European folklore, particularly the Romanian-Turkish field.

Our approach is based upon documents of authentic folklore (oral sources), which exclude the scholarly and the author creations, meaning we use *the literary folk texts from genuine collections*, recorded on tapes or noted in manuscripts from the National Folklore archive or published in folk papers, reviews, anthologies and typologies.

We use an interdisciplinary approach by comparing the data from our researches and the others with the historical one in order to fix the "oral sources" in the real historical context. Therefore our book is on the border of three fields : the folklore, the Ottoman studies and the history.

We aimed to think that we succeded to respect certain obligatory scientific levels, so that :

- to be known the level of up to date investigations ;

- to be defined the working ways and methods ;

- the analysis in the field to be continued, with new contributions ;

- the efficiency of the method and its results to be demonstrated.

In our demonstration we kept in mind certain constants, proved as scientifical truths, indispensable to an objective analyse of research ;

- the duration of the folk memory, which is between 150 and 200 years but it could be longer when conected to buildings, toponymy;

- the historical fact has value, with social-cultural results and significances;

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0293

- every folk community creates itself its own needed personnalities therefore the historical fact which impresses the community is valuable not the historical event itself;

- no narrative folk product can be born in the absence of a real support of the concrete event.

The paper was structured in three main parts, as following : the *Introductory chapter* where the historiography and methodology theoretical issues, the stage of the study of the problem and the sources are presented and there are some terminological appreciations too.

In the modern research the interdisciplinarity is a must. It is well-known that the object is unique and the possibility of the human knowledge is limited therefore we thought that the interdisciplinary approach becomes an imperative of the knowledge; the interdisciplinary approach is efficient when the inside difficulties of a field, impossible to be solved after a time, becomes easy to solve and the degree of the certainty of the conclusions increases. In order to prove what we have just told we chose as an object of interdisciplinary analyse a ballad, "Marcu and the Frost", thought to be one of the oldest Romanian old songs about Turks (Ottomans), which generated the appearance of two important schools "the mytologisant school" and "the historisant school".

Starting with this hypothesis that this ballad could be generated by a historical event which occured in 1448 in Poland, which was not recorded in Polish folklor, as well as that an narrative product cannot take place in the absence of a real fact, able to impress the community which created it — in our case, the Romanian community — we identified another real event, the battle from Cătăbuga, in the South of Moldavia, at Danube, where Stephen the Great defeated the army of Mahocioglu Ali Bey, in 1485.

Though the ballad could have an universal narrative nucleus, with us it materialized as the theme of "the fight of the frost against the Turks", but it occurred only because of its real support: the event itself.

To support our assumption we have historical evidences, local toponymy, the names of settlements and geographical places (hills and lakes) by the name Malcoci, at Danube, in Dobrodgea, as well as the saying "the frost of Malcoci" to indicate a severe frost, found all over our country but unknown to the Poles.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0294

In *the second chapter* the relationships between Romanians and Preottomans and Ottomans from the prospective of the narrative folk categories: the *heroic epic songs, the family ballad and the narrative song* with historic theme are analized, devolving the following types of mythified relations;

- the respect toward the brave enemy; life and liberty are given to the prisoner fighter;

- the reward for bravery; the hero marries the "daughter of the cadiu" or even "of the Turkish emperor";

- the qualities of honesty, righteousness and diligence of the defeated hero are recognized;

- the kinship, when not the result of rape or hoax;

- the direct confrontation between two different faiths (Constantin Brâncoveanu);

- the fights for national independence (Tudor Vladimirescu);

- the fights for independence (The Independence War, 1877-1878).

The third chapter refers to the relationships between the Romanians and Preottomans and Ottomans as it appears in folk prose:

- in the *historical legends* (and narrations);

- the relations with the Porte: Cuza Vodă;

- the fights with the Ottomans: Vlad Tepeş (Vlad the Splinterer) and Carol the First.

It is significant that the narrative oral literature preserves and registers historic events related with the Turks. The folk creator is present in his time and registers in his own way the historical moment.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0295

The three historical personalities, Vlad Tepeş, Alexandru Ioan Cuza and King Carol the First are presented fabulously, an oversizeness of their features and qualities appears but respectfully to their actions.

Vlad Tepeş is thought a fair, harsh and wise ruler; related with the Ottomans it is preserved the memory of a brave, dignified and patriotic ruler, unshakeable in his creed to protect the liberty of the Romanian Country. The staking was a frightful punishment enforced to the evildoers and to the enemies who invaded our country; it seems interesting too, the episode of the punishment of the Ottoman messengers who did not respect the etiquette of the Wallachian court. "Sometimes he defeated the Turks, other times he took shelter in Argeş Mountains, where he had a hidden fortress". The narratives begin from this tale space, Poienari fortress.

Alexandru Ioan Cuza, "the Ruler of the Union" is received at the Ottoman Court with "joy and honour"; he amazed the whole world with his "intelligence and beauty": "Our Ruler went straight with his chin up, with his sword rattling, to the palace, like a Prince charming". "He brought great rights to our country and he set free all Romanians, who, for quite a long time slaved in Turkish country".

Carol the First is, too, wise and brave, and "all the emperors of the world" have to respect his advice. The "Russian emperor" cannot "overrun Plevna" but for the miraculous help given by another hero, the prince Carol. Under the command of Prince Carol, the Romanian army fights bravely, led by the spirit of justice and by the wish to win the national independence, feelings increased in the battles from Plevna, Smârdan and Grivita. The narrator notices the peace and safety existing in the country, after the independence was conquered and, rhetorically, asks himself: "Why not be thankful to Carol? Nobody is troubling me, nobody is scourging me. Now, I sleep with my treasury on my porch... but then, my mother took the wallets ... and went to the weeds and slept in the swamps ... That was her rest : with the wolves ..."

– in the geographical legends : the Turks and the Tartars are discoverers and founders on Romanian land ;

- the legend of the setting up of Babadag ; the analysis of the narrative subject is based upon historical and field data, older and newer, obtained by personal researches on the Turks and the Romanians from this locality, during may years;

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0296

- the legend of Techirghiol and Lebăda lakes;

- the legend of Mamaia beach;

- the legends of other Romanian localities;

- methods of protection against Tartar invasions

- the earthen knolls, "gorganele", Moslem funeral monuments. Set along the Danube, observation and signaling places of the presence of the enemies, places which hide treasures of the Tartars, "the fire of the treasures";

- in the mythological legends the Turks and the Tartars are mythical people: "the Giants" and "the Cāpcāunii". They are "let by God to exhaust the evildoers". The Romanians were friends with "the Giants".

- Marcoş Paşa, knight hero, legendary hero, who, like Alexandru Macedon becomes a folk hero who fights with his own fate. They are uptaken in Romanian folklore and they become fighting heroes of Romanian ethnic community.

Seeing the oral epical tradition as source of moral examplarity we nuanced the features of Danubian epic hero, Romanian and Ottoman, as hero of the tradition, with qualities as a hero who makes civilization.

The presence of the legendary hero, Koyun Baba is also common to Romanian folk creation in Dobrodgea. Koyun Baba's personality was connected to the real existence of a historical hero, Sarî Saltuk, the founder of Babadag, but Koyun Baba is endowed with special qualities, transcendental ones and of perspicacity too: he discovers the place where Sarî Saltuk was buried and he is sanctified. In Romanian folk tradition, *holy* is not the place where a historical hero was buried, but the one who discovered it, because, owing to his transcendental qualities, the local population endowed him and because his relation with the sacred, he got special, holy qualities. The place of his grave became *holy*.

In conclusion we can assert that the Danubian tradition generated a folklore specific to the interraction area with the Ottoman Empire, where relations existed not only between the oppressors and the oppressed ones, but betweeen the the rebels and the temporary occupants too, where both forces fought but respected each other. More, we can assert that in the space of Dobrogea a joint space of culture formed, what we call today the concept of "Pontic culture".

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0297

These observations were acknowledge from the Romanian ethnical point of view.

The whole paper shows the tolerance specific to our people. The Romanians are tolerant and this feature has to be preservered if it was a must to survival, born and reborn, build and victory of the Romanian being. A future research, from inside and from the point of view of Turkish ethnicity, about the history and the spirituality of the Romanians could confirm or deny this assertion. But we think too, as we express in this paper as a novelty in the folklore field, that this opinion is for the time being and anytime it could be improved.

Cornelia Călin-Bodea

*
* *

Mihai Maxim, *L'Empire Ottoman au Nord du Danube et l'Autonomie des Principautés Roumaines au XVI^e^ Siècle. Etudes*, Les Editions Isis, Istanbul, 1999, 273 p.

Besides studies already published by Professor Mihai Maxim between 1970-1993 in highly-specialized reviews — updated and completed with *addendas* comprising a significant number of recently discovered documents — this volume includes a special category of texts: papers and lectures delivered by the author along the years in various national or international congresses and scientific reunions; the extreme importance of these texts is obvious to all those who had the privilege to attend Professor Maxim's captivating conferences: a strong need — many times loudly expressed by this audience — to have a printed form of these materials to work on.

The first article, which is by far the most extended, refers to *Moldavia's and Wallachia's autonomy as reflected in official acts issued by the Sublime Porte during the second half of the 16th century* (in French, p. 11-82). The study is based on documents preserved in the Prime Minister's Ottoman Archive (*T.C. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi)*, as well as on European documents, Romanian documents included.

---

this subject. Two of them definitely appear to involve the conscription of Wallachian or Moldavian subjects. See M. Maxim, *L'Autonomie de la Moldavie..., cit.*, p. 217, No. 31.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0298

The author focuses on two major aspects: the *essence* of the Romanian autonomy and the juridical and diplomatic modality in which this autonomy was granted.

As regards for the first matter, Professor Maxim shows that documents issued by the Porte definitely grant the intangibility of the Romanian territory and the right of the Romanians to administrate it, therefore preserving their States, meaning their own administration, their legal systems, army, Church, their own official language. However, the author does not hesitate to mention the limitations of these rights, mainly in what concerns the foreign policy of the Principalities, who during the last half of the 16th century lost their position as "subjects of the international law" and were included in "capitulations". The deterioration of their privileged status is more evident towards the last decades of the century, due, on one side, to the Principalities' dimishing defence capacity and internal struggles for power, and on the other side to the economic-institutional decadence of the Empire itself.

The second part is a thorough diplomatic and juridical analysis of the *berat* issued for Mihnea II on September 17th, 1585. Professor Maxim proves that this document has significant resemblances with traditional *ahidname*s, both in form and contents: it contains formulas similar to those that characterize the *ahidname*s; stipulates the obligations of the newly-designated Wallachian Prince and of the Porte; represents an act of privilege and recognizes Wallachia's autonomy. In the author's opinion it indicates a transition between classical *ahidname*s (peace-treaties) to *hatt ı-şerif*s (acts of privilege). Professor Maxim concludes that irrespective of denomination, *ahidname*s, *berat*s and *hatt ı-şerif*s are nothing but acts which attest the Principalities' autonomy versus the Porte and grant their rights.

An addenda includes 12 documents recently discovered in the *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* in Istanbul, transliterated and translated (plus facsimiles), with brief commentaries. These documents are extremely important for a better understanding of the status of the Princes of Moldavia and Wallachia vis-à-vis the Porte before, during and after their reigns.

The aim of the second article (*The Romanian Principalities' relations with the Ohrid Archbishop in unpublished documents*, in French, p. 83-107) is to clarify a highly controversial historical problem: the canonical subordination of Moldavian and Wallachian Metropolitans to the Ohrid Archbishop.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0299

Two Turkish documents of 1544, entirely reproduced in the study (transliterated and translated) attest the fact that the Ohrid Romanian dioceses; therefore the canonic subordination of the Principalities, though temporary and tardy, was a historical reality. As for the moment when this submission produced a complex approach of ecclesiastic history, as well as a rigourous pursuit of the Ohrid Archbishop's actions in order to impose his supremacy make the author assert that this could only take place after 1538-1541.

The documents included and commented both in the study and its *addenda* also offer precious information concerning the taxes regime of the Orthodox Church under Ottoman rule during the 16th century and the possibility to "sell" not only the Principalities' thrones, but also their Metropolitan chairs.

Article nr. III, *The Romanian-Ottoman relations between 1574-1594* (in French, p. 109-128) is a lecture delivered by Professor Maxim in the reunion of December 8th 1976 of the Romanian Association for Oriental Studies.

The author justifies his choice for this period assering that the year 1574 is a moment of capital importance in the evolution of Romanian-Ottoman relations, when Ion the Terrible's anti-Ottoman resistance is annihilated and Moldavia's boyars take a definitive option for the Ottoman political factor. As for the year 1594, it marks the anti-Ottoman war that represented a serious warning to the Porte over the maximum possible extent of its influence in the North of the Danube.

Professor Maxim distinguishes four sub-stages in the evolution of Romanian-Ottoman relations during this period: 1574-1579; 1579-1590; 1590-1593 and after 1593. The study consists mostly of a complex analysis of each substage in relation to three factors: the Principalities' internal situation; the Ottoman Empire's internal situation; the Empire's international situation.

The next two articles are both centred upon Michael the Brave. The first one (article nr. IV, *New Turkish documents concerning Michael the Brave and his time,* in English, p. 129-156) deals mostly with the highly controversial problem of his descendance, but also with the beginning of his reign, the appointement of new voivodes in Wallachia and Moldavia in March 1595 on the eve of the Ottoman Campaign against Michael, the fame of this prince, the arrival in Istanbul of the news of his assassination by the

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0300

Austrians etc. according to the newly discovered Ottoman documents included in *Addenda,* while the second (article nr. V, *Michael the Brave's appointment and investiture September 2nd/12th, 1593 - in two unpublished official Turkish documents,* in English, p. 157-171) aims at giving some precision to the dates and data concerning the beginning of Michael the Brave's reign.

Article nr. IV, which is a paper delivered at the "Nicolae Iorga" Institute of History (Bucharest) on June 7th 1993, includes several the documents entirely reproduced (transliterated and translated) as well as excerpts of acts which give some supplementary information concerning Michael the Brave's origins. The author gives some more documents and details on the topic in the *Addenda* which also contains three facsimiles.

In article nr. V Professor Maxim reveals two unpublished documents concerning the de jure beginning of Michael the Brave's reign. They are entirely reproduced in the text (transliterated and translated, plus fascimiles at the end of the article), carefully analysed and compared with other sources; the result is the precise date of Michael the Brave's appointment and investiture: September 2nd/12th, 1593.

The Romanian Principalities and Ottoman-Habsbourg relations in the second half of the 16th century (article nr. V, in French, p. 173-183) is also a lecture, delivered at the CIEPO reunion *Habsburgish-osmanisch Bezeihungen,* organized in Vienna between 26th-30th September, 1983. It is a synthesis on the Romanian Principalities' distinct place and role in the very core of a region characterized by a permanent balance of power, seen by the author as a triangle which evolved from the medieval structure: Ottoman Empire - Hungarian Kingdom - Kingdom of Poland to Ottoman Empire - Habsbourg Empire - Russian Empire. By means of a very elegant and complex analysis Professor Maxim observes the Romanian Principalities' position within this frame on political, economic and military levels.

The next two articles (nr. VII and nr. VII) may be very well considered as parts of a whole since their subject is almost the same: the tribute payed by Moldavia and Wallachia to the Porte in the second half of the 16th century and the circumstances in which it was increased (the exact titles are: article VII - *Research on the circumstances in which Moldavia's harac was raised between 1538-1574,* in French, p. 184-214; Article VIII - *The circumstances in which the harac payed by Wallachia to the Ottoman Empire was raised between 1540-1575,* in French, p. 215-230).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0301

The first two paragraphs of article nr. VII are a suitable "preface" for both texts: the author states his intention to clarify several aspects of extreme importance, such as the juridical significance of the *harac* payed by the Romanian Principalities, the political and economic context that led to its modifications, the proportion of the *harac* as compared, on one side to the Romanian Princes' incomes, on the other side to the Empire's revenues.

Both articles are based on a great number of Turkish documents identified by the author during his research in *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* in 1970-1971, and their structure is quite similar: for each Principality the author establishes, as precisely as possible, the year each *harac* raising occured, briefly comments on the internal and external context, taking into account political, economic and social factors, and reveals the causes that provoked these raisings. A comparative analysis shows that the *harac* was increased mostly when a new padishah was installed (ceremonial expenses), as a punishment for the princes' anti-Ottoman actions (suspicion of secret alliances, treason, internal policy favourable to a Great Power other than the Porte etc.), as a consequence of increasing military expenses (campaigns, popular uprisings, supplementary subsidies for different categories of troups etc.), in moments of internal conflicts in the Principality (fights for power, antipopular actions of the Prince, complaints of the local dignitaries etc.). To these, the Prince's personal, sometimes ostentative opulence my be added.

The final part of the study concerning Moldavia is a very clear classification of these causes into three groups of factors, which applies to Wallachia too: the internal situation of the country, the internal situation of the Empire, the Porte's relations with the Principalities' neighbouring countries.

Both articles have *Addenda*s which include new documents and further details in the matter (article nr. VII - two documents, article nr. VIII - one document, transliterated and translated, plus facsimiles).

Salt, one of the greatest natural resources of the Romanian Principalities and also one of their most important trade commodity is the subject of the study nr. IX, entitled *Ottoman documents concerning the Wallachian salt in the ports on the Lower Danube in the second half of the sixteenth century* (in English, p. 231-246).

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0302

Based on numerous newly-found documents preserved in *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* (the text includes excerpts and shorter quotations, both transliterated and translated) the author focuses upon such aspects as the jurisdiction of the Wallachian salt in the Danubian ports, the incomes obtained by Wallachian Princes as a result of salt deliveries to the Ottoman Empire (in which they were deeply involved) and the proportions of this export, the conditions in which Wallachian salt was exported through Danubian ports and sold, prices offered by the Ottomans, the *mageriyye* tax, other Wallachian commodities exported to Ottoman lands. He concludes that during the reigns of Süleyman Kanunî and his successors, Wallachian Princes sold very large quantities of salt, collected part of the customs dues, in ports situated both on the Romanian and the Bulgarian banks of the Danube, and the Romanian jurisdiction on the Danube was maintained even after the Ottoman administration was imposed in territories on the Romanian bank of the river.

The matter is further detailed in the *Addenda*, with another series of documents and brief commentaries on the same topics. The article is completed by two facsimiles.

The article *A Treasure of Turkish coins (aspres) of the 15th-16th centuries discovered at Berteyti (Braila Department)* (nr. X, in French, p. 247-262) was presented as a paper in the meeting of March 3rd 1980 of the Romanian Numismatics Society. It refers to a treasure found in August 1958, which consists of 290 Ottoman coins, most of them minted during Bayezid II's reign, in Novo Brdo, Kratovo, Serres, Edirne, Istanbul (Konstantiniyye), Skolpje (Üsküb) Gallipoli, as well as in Bursa and Amasya.

After a detailed technical description and analysis of each type of coins the author comments on the significance of this treasure for the history of the Romanian-Ottoman relations, the circumstances in which Ottoman currency penetrated the Romanian Principalities, mostly Wallachia, its circulation and evolution, various goods traded with the Ottomans, custom taxes etc. The article also includes two statistical tables, with the composition of the Berteşti treasure and the various weights of the coins, respectively, two photos representing coins of the treasure, as well as a short bibliographical list with titles concerning the circulation of the Ottoman currency north of the Danube in the 15th-16th centuries.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0303

Some considerations regarding the monetary circulation in the Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the 16th century (study nr. XI, in French, p. 263-273) is the text of a paper the author delivered at the 3rd International Congress of South-Eastern European Studies, Bucharest, 4-10 September, 1974. It is the result of the author's investigations of 1970-1971 in *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi,* and it is based upon 25 Ottoman-Turkish documents of the 16th century (most of the duplicates of original acts given to Romanian Princes, or contemporary copies), concerning the tribute payed by Moldavia and Wallachia. These comprise mentions of: the financial year, the name of the Prince, the day of payment, the names of the Princes' agents who operated the payment, the total sum (calculated in *aspres*) and the currency.

Observing these data the author draws two tables that illustrate the monetary composition of each Principality's tribute and one table referring to the rate of exchange for Moldavia's tribute (p. 266-267). These statistic tables reveal, on one side, the undoubted preponderence of Ottoman coins (*aspres*) as the common currency in the Principalities during the 16th century, and on the other side that Ottoman coins were gradually replaced by thalers (*guruş*) and *padişahîs*.

The author explains this evident preponderence of the Ottoman currency by the lack of precious metal in Moldavia and Wallachia, and thoroughly analyses its depreciation towards the end of the century, its causes and consequences.

Although it includes studies written in different periods and on various topics, this volume — which is not only a restitution and a precious instrument, but also a veritable renewal of investigation given by rich documentary *addenda* based on the author's recent research in *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* (1995-1999) — reflects on the whole the features of what has become for his disciples "Professor Maxim's style": a veritable "obsession" for a rigourous, exhaustive work on primary sources, equillibrium and elegance of expression.

Irina Hriţcu

*

* *

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0304

Sinan Kuneralp, *Son Dönem Osmanlı Erkân ve Ricali (1839-1922). Prosografik Rehber* (Les hauts dignitaires ottomans de la dernière période <de l'État>, 1839-1922. Guide prosopographique), Isis, Istanbul, 1999, 127 p.

La tache assumée par Sinan Kuneralp dans cette étude prosopographique, à savoir de (re)constituer les listes des hauts dignitaires ottomans de 1839 (l'avènement d'Abdülmecid) à 1922 (la suppression du Sultanat), était très difficile à réaliser. Les sources disponibles à présent sont très rares et difficiles à utiliser: le journal gouvernemental *Takvim-i Vekayı* (Le calendrier des événements), avec sa rubrique *Tevcihât (Nominations),* la source principale de cet ouvrage, mais aussi d'autres journaux d'Istanbul, en outre les *Hariciye Salnameleri* (Les livres annuels du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères), etc. Quant aux sources d'archives, la mise en valeur des registres *Sicil-i Ahval (Dossiers personnels des employés)* des Archives Ottomanes de la Présidence du Conseil (*Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi)* d'Istanbul, "est très difficile avec le système des catalogues existants et, d'ailleurs, ces registres ne couvrent qu'une partie de l'intervalle de 83 ans étudié " (p. XIII). En ce qui concerne la littérature sur le sujet, des études monographiques sur les institutions représentées par les hauts dignitaires de l'État ottoman de la période traitée font défaut. De même, il nous manque des encyclopédies biografiques et d'autres ouvrages de référence sur le sujet. Dans ces ouvrages " généralement les dates données sont douteuses" (p. XIII). Il y avait aussi d'autres difficultés devant le chercheur: par exemple, avant 1934 (l'adoption de la loi sur les noms de famille en Turquie) il était très difficile de distinguer une personne parmi plusieurs Mehmed, Ali, Ahmed, etc. Alors le chercheur a été obligé de s'adresser aux surnoms utilisés. " Par conséquent, les grands visirs Âli Pacha, Fuad Pacha et Midhat Pacha doivent être cherchés comme Mehmed Emin Âli, Mehmed Fuad et Ahmed Şefik Midhat " (p. XII).

Il y avait aussi une différence, parfois assez grande, entre la date de la nomination officielle d'un tel dignitaire et son arrivée effective au poste ; certaines nominations ont restées seulement sur le papier, etc.

Malgré ces grandes difficultés, M.Kuneralp nous a offert un guide prosopographique sur 998 hauts dignitaires ottomans proprement-dits, dont 695 appartenaient à la catégorie *mülkiye* (civile), 268 au *seyfiye* (militaire) et 35 au *ilmiye (*"scientifique"). À cette liste il faut ajouter les chefs des entités autonomes : les patriarches, les grands-rabbins, les *şerif* de la Mecque et Medine, les princes régnants de la Moldavie et de la Valachie, etc.

---

31 luglio 1740. Su questo importante personaggio, zîmmi ottomano che raggiunse le massime cariche diplomatiche e fu uno dei fautori del *Nizam-i Cedid* (nuovo ordine) del sultano Selim III il Virtuoso, si veda Onnik Jamgocyan, "I. M. D'Ohsson, un Arménien au service de la diplomatie, Peeters, Leuven-Paris, 1995, p. 619-630.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0305

Un survol de ces listes nous révèle une grande instabilité dans ces hautes fonctions: le record a été enregistré par les ministres des Finances, qui entre 1857 et 1922 ont changé leurs postes de 92 fois, ce qui indique la situation dramatique des finances ottomanes à l'époque. Fort instable s'est avérée la haute fonction de grand vizir (*sadrazam)* : 79 changements pendant 83 ans. En échange, c'était le poste de grand mufti (*şeyh ül-İslam)* le plus stable: entre 1833 et 1922 seulement 33 changements. Même le *şeyh ül-İslam* Mehmed Cemâleddin Efendi est resté 18 ans (!) dans cette fonction (1891-1909), un indice clair de la politique religieuse du sultan Abdülhamid II. La liste des ministres des Affaires étrangères nous révèle d'une part le professionalisme de beaucoup des titulaires (un cinquième étaient diplomates de carrière) et, d'autre part, la participation importante des non-musulmans *(gayr-i muslim)* à ces fonctions. C'est aussi intéressant d'observer qu'à une seule exception, tous les ministres des Forêts et des Mines (*Orman ve Maadin Nâzırları)* ont été entre 1878 et 1911 des non-musulmans. À la longue, on peut voir les conséquences bienfaisantes de la fondation par Mahmud II du fameux Bureau des Traductions (*Tercüme Odası),* cette véritable pépinière des réformateurs.

Pour conclure, nous devons hautement apprécier les résultats des recherches faites par Sinan Kuneralp, avec une patience de bénédictin et de lui exprimer toute notre gratitude pour cet excellent instrument de travail.

Mihai Maxim

*
* *

Veniamin Ciobanu, *Europe and the Porte. New Documents: Swedish Diplomatic Reports. 1795-1795* (Vol. 1); *1797-1799* (Vol. II), The Center for Romanian Studies-Iaşi-Oxford-Portland, 2001, Vol. 1 p. 396; Vol. II p. 291.

Seppur bene si conosca l'opera massima del diplomatico al servizio della Corona di Svezia,[1] l'armeno cattolico, reppresentante illustre del *Millet-i Sadika,* Ignatius Muradgea d'Ohsson,[2] molto resta da scoprire riguardo la sua attività politica, intensa e fattiva.

---

[1] *Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman, divisée en deux parties, dont l'une comprend la législation Mahomédan et l'autre l'Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman,* Paris, 1787, recentemente riedito dalla Isis Press, Istanbul, 2001, in cinque volumi.

[2] Il Cavalier d'Ohsson, il cui patronimico originario Muradyan fu cambiato dal padre nel più "occidentale Muradgea" dragomanno presso il consolato di Svezia a Smirne, nacque a Pera il

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0306

Lo storico rumeno Veniamin Ciobanu ha raccolto nell'Archivio Nazionale Svedese ben 107 (nel primo volume) e 56 (nel secondo) documenti riguardanti la "Questione orientale" redattia Muradge d'Ohsson o a lui indirizzati.

I documenti in oggetti ricoprono un periodo che va dal 25 aprile 1795[1] al 9 luglio 1799 e affrontano numerose questioni collegate alla situazione dell'Impero ottomano nell'ultimo lustro del XVIII secolo.

L'attenzione del curatore al volume è dimostrata esemplarment e anche dal fatto che i documenti sono accompagnati da un ricco e vario repertorio di note bio-bibliografiche che aiutano meglio a comprenderli.

Citare solo alcuni dei documenti compresi in questa raccolta aiuterà a comprendere l'intensità del lavoro diplomatico del d'Ohhson e l'importanza che questi stessi documenti rappresentano per la storia mediterranea ed Europea in generale.

Interessante è ad esempio, per quanto concerne la difficoltà del processo di modernizzazione delle strutture dello stato ottomano, il doc. No. 3 (Constantinopoli, 10.02.1798) indirizzato dal d'Ohsson al re d Svezia, che tratta tra l'altro, dei successi militari riportati dalle truppe ottomane sul paşa di Vidin, l'"Eroe del Danubio" Paşa Oğlu Osman Aga (Pasvantoğlu)[2] *ayan* partigiano del *Nizam-i Kedid* contrario alle riforme di Selim III.

Importanti sono le notizie riportate nel doc. 4 (Constantinopoli, 24 febbraio 1798), riguardanti i veneziani delle isole adriatiche divenuti cittadini della Françia, oltre agli avvertimenti riguardo l'intelligenza e le connivenze di Paşa Oğlu con i Greci di corea e con i giannizzeri di Rumelia.

Il doc. 7 (Constantinopoli, 24.03.1798) riporta dell'attacco sferrato dall'*ayan* ribelle sopracitato alla Valacchia e delle misure prese dalla Porta per fermare i rivoltosi.

[1] Muradgea d'Ohsson divenne il 15 luglio 1795 ministro plenipotenziario (*Elçi-i muharras*) di Svezia a Istanbul. Precedentemente fu alla Legazione di Svezia a Constantinopoli dal 1768 a 1799 e il autore del trattato della pace e del commercio el 1782 con la Spagna. Tra l'altro fu colui che aiutò a far riconoscere la neonata Repubblica Francese dalla Sublime Porta.

[2] Il doc. 10 (11.04.1798), riguarda anch'esso Pasvantoğlu, ma narra delle sue vittorie e del legame dei giannizzeri con costui.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0307

Gli echi della creazione della Repubblica Romana da parte dei Francesi sono presenti nel doc. 8 (Constantinopoli, 24.03.1798), segno della preoccupazione riguardo il diffondersi delle idee rivoluzionaire.

Il doc. 20 (Constantinopoli 09.08.1798) annucia lo sbarco dell'esercito napoleonico in Egitto e la preoccupazione della Sublime Porta riguardo il filoislamismo misto agli ideali rivoluzionari che Bonaparte propagava tra gli arabi con libri stampati appositamente in arabo, mentre il doc. 22 (Constantinopoli 24.08.1798) mostra la disapprovazione e l'ostilità del popolo musulmano stambuliota verso i Francesi in reazione all'impresa egiziana.

Nell'opera curata da Ciobanu sono inseriti, come annessi al volume secondo (p. 187-279), altri 27 documenti, inviati al sovrano di Prussia.

Ogni ducumento, nei due volumi, rappresenta e aiuta a ricostruire un pezzo importante della storia europea, sia occidentale che orientale, scenario nel quale l'Impero ottomano è ancora un attore fondamentale.

Giuseppe Cossuto

*
* *

Mihai Maxim, *Romano-Ottomanica. Essays and Documents from the Turkish Archives,* The Isis Press, Istanbul, 2001, 213 p.

In 2001 Prof. Mihai Maxim published a new book dedicated to the sensitive subject of Romanian-Ottoman relationships from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century. Mihai Maxim's work includes both articles previously published in different academic reviews and new contributions the result of his past ten years research in the Ottoman Archives.

The book is divided in four parts, with a foreword and an epilogue. The first part entitled *Friend of (My) Friends and Enemy of (My) Enemies: The Status of the Romanian Principalities vis-à-vis the Porte* includes three studies: a summary of Mihai Maxim's book published in 1993 in Romanian, *The Romanian Principalities and the Sublime Porte. The Juridical Aspect of*

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0308

the Romanian-Ottoman Relations in the Middle Ages[1]; an article first published in 1983 *Le statut des Pays Roumains envers la Porte ottomane aux XVIe-XVIIIe siècles* and a second more recent article (1998) *On the right to strike currency of the Reigning Princes of Moldavia and Wallachia during the period of Ottoman suzerainity*. In all three studies Mihai Maxim argues for the necessity of reconsideration of both the terminology concerning the status of the Romanian Principalities in connection with the Ottoman Empire and of the complex aspects (economic, political, financial and cultural) which determined their functioning under Ottoman suzerainty for five centuries.

The second part, *Teşrifat. The Romanian Reigning Princes at the Threshold of Felicity (*Südde-i Sa'adet*) in the Sixteenth Century* represents a detailed analysis of new documents found at Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi on the protocol presents (*peşkeş*) and the symbols of power and investiture which accompanied centuries-long relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Romanian Principalities. The 24 documents translated, presented and analyzed in this part have a significant importance for understanding the medieval history of Moldavia and Wallachia, especially the variation of the obligations towards the Porte and the protocols received in return. As an example, Mihai Maxim published the oldest inventory (found until the present day) of a *peşkeş* offered by a Moldavian prince, Ştefăniţă, to the Ottoman sultan, Süleyman Kanuni. The document is from 1526 and is viewed as an expression of the necessity of the Moldavian voyvode to receive the insurance of a continuous Ottoman support, in the context of the military campaign against Hungary and the internal conflict between Moldavian boyars and Ştefăniţă.

The third chapter is dedicated to two of the most famous Wallachian voyvodes, Michael the Brave (1593-1601) and Constantin Brancoveanu (1688-1714). Also, new information about a crucial moment in the history of the Principalities, 1595, when the Ottomans created a plan for the transformations of the two provinces in beyliks is provided. About Michael the Brave, Mihai Maxim published one new document concerning his long debated (in Romanian historiography) royal origin—this new document, an order from the Porte towards Michael, mentions that he is the son of Pătraşcu Voyvod— and another document which mentions a new date for the beginning of Michael the Brave's reign as voyvode of Wallachia—22nd of August/1st of September 1593, two weeks earlier than the previous date discovered by the same specialist in the Ottoman Archives. A remarkable document is published about Constantin Brancoveanu, an inventory of his property seized by the Ottoman Public Treasury.

[1] See below a detailed presentation of the book.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0309

The fourth part of the book is a republished article from 1995 about the only Ottoman monetary atelier on Romanian territory, in Mudava (identified as Moldova Veche, Caras Severin). The atelier functioned just during Süleyman Kanuni's reign and was strongly connected with the conquest of Timişoara (Temeşvar) by the Ottomans and the transformation of the region in at beylerbeylik.

The epilogue of the most recent work of Prof. Mihai Maxim is a study presented to an international symposium in Sofia in 2000, *The Ottoman Legacy in Romania*. The author emphasized in the last part of his book the variety of aspects of the Ottoman legacy in Romania—from language to popular culture, from arts to human behavior, using especially the example of Dobroudja, the territory which was for 500 years under Ottoman control. Also, Mihai Maxim discusses both sides of the problem, because he also presents the Romanian influence on Turkish culture, such as Romanian words which entered Turkish vocabulary or Romanian artists who worked for the Ottomans. His conclusion is that "the most resistant Ottoman legacy in Romania is constituted by a huge number of Ottoman documents preserved in the fabulous Turkish Archives and concerning the history of this country."(p. 213).

This volume, due to its rich and original documentation, as well as the variety of information included—relations with vassal territories, amounts of peşkeş, the practice of fortune confiscation, etc., — represents an important contribution which illuminates not only the history of Romanian-Ottoman relations but also the general history of the Ottoman Empire.

Silvana Rachieru

*
* *

Giampiero Bellingeri, *Turco-Veneta*, Edizioni Isis, Istanbul, 2003, 463 p.

C'est le premier volume publié aux Editions Isis, par le très distingué professeur Giampiero Bellingeri, de l'Université "Ca 'Foscari" de Venise, iraniste et turcologue, philologue et historien, poète (par son âme) et savant (par sa rigueur). Le deuxième volume, toujours aux les Éditions Isis, sera dédié aux *Turco-Russica*. La simple lecture des sommaires de ces volumes est tout à fait révélatrice de l'esprit encyclopédique et des préoccupations interdisciplinaires du professeur Bellingeri, qui a travaillé non seulement sur des sujets linguistiques et littéraires, mais aussi sur des documents et

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0310

manuscrits des riches archives et bibliothèques de Venise. Toutes les études de cet imposant volume sont fort intéressantes et originales, mais qu'il me soit permis de faire une mention spéciale pour les lecteurs roumains de certaines contributions: "Il Golfo come appendice: una visione ottomana" (pp.9-29), "Un frammento di storia veneto-ottomana a Piacenza, (sul ms.turco "Lansi 246" della Biblioteca Comunale: la Pace Perpetua del 1733)" (pp.103-138), "Questioni di turco di Turchia e *Ortak Dil* ("Lingua comune") (pp. 377-403), etc. *Last, but not least*, il faut apprécier les remarquables qualités de traducteur du Professeur Bellingeri, qui a fait des traductions du turc (ottoman et moderne), du persan (médiéval et moderne), du russe, etc. (voir spécialemenet dans ce volume la section **Ex litteris).** Bref, *Turco-Veneta* nous a révélé de nouveau une personnalité complexe, une âme admirable, un esprit ouvert à tous les horizons.

Mihai Maxim

*
* *

Eugen Nicolae, *Moneda otomană în Ţările Române în perioada 1451-1512 (*La monnaie ottomane dans les Pays Roumains dans la période 1451-1512), Editura ARC, Chişinău, 2003, 125 p.

Cet ouvrage représente une variante abrégée de la thèse de doctorat soutenue par l'auteur en 1997 à l'Université de Bucarest, Faculté d'Histoire, avec un supplément bibliographique commenté. L'étude vise la circulation des monnaies ottomanes d'or, d'argent et de cuivre (les émissions de Mehmed II et de Bayezid II) dans les territoires habités par les Roumains. Tous les chapitres sont pleins d'intérêt et de conclusions nouvelles, mais, peut-être, les **Faux et imitations** mérite une mention spéciale. Il faut aussi apprécier la rigueur du répertoire des découvertes monétaires (d'ailleurs la plupart des monnaies répertoriées sont inédites) ainsi que du catalogue des monnaies en cuivre (peu connues ou inédites). Cet ouvrage représente une consécration sans conteste de M. Eugen Nicolae (l'un de mes disciples comme ottomanisant et du Prof. Constantin Preda comme numismate) en tant que le meilleur spécialiste roumain (de classe internationale) pour la numismatique ottomane.

Mihai Maxim

*
* *

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0311

La Collezione Tonizza nel Museo della Chiesa Nuova di Assisi. Le Monete Partiche, Sasanide e Islamiche. A cura di Maria Vittoria Fontana, Istituto Italiano di Numismatica , Roma, 2001, 119 p. + 1 portrait + XV planches.

Sous le patronage de l'Institut Italien de Numismatique a été publiée récemment *La collezione Tonizza nel Museo della Chiesa Nuova di Assisi, le monete partiche, sasanide e islamiche*, dans le numéro 8 de *Studi e Materiali*. L'apparition d'un nouveau volume a été possible grâce aux efforts d'une équipe de chercheurs qui se sont réunis pour amener au circuit scientifique une importante collection de monnaies parthiques, sassanides et islamiques conservées à présent dans le Musée "Chiesa Nova" d'Assise. Cette collection a été constituée par Mons. Giacinto Tonizza (1866-1935) avec des monnaies trouvées en Égypte et aux alentours. Le volume, publié dans des conditions graphiques excellentes, avec une illustration de très bonne qualité, contient le catalogue de la collection de monnaies Tonizza, à qui s'ajoutent une introduction, la liste des abréviations utilisées et les index. Le matériel numismatique a été identifié par Fabrizio Sinisi (monnaies parthiques et sassanides), Michele Bernardini, Roberta Giunta (monnaies islamiques) et Igor Rachewiltz (une monnaie chinoise du XVIII^{e} siècle).

Les monnaies parthiques, 22 exemplaires, sont des drachmes d'argent auxquelles s'ajoute une monnaie de métal commun. Les pièces ont été attribuées aux rois (avec les noms en italien) Mitridate II (123-88 a.Ch.), Gotarze I (ca. 90 a.Ch.), Orode I (ca. 90-ca. 80 a.Ch.), Mitridate III (57-54 a.Ch.), Orode II (54-37 a.Ch.), Fraate IV (37-2 a.Ch.), Artabano II (10-38 p.Ch.), Gotarze II (40-51 p.Ch.), Vologese III (105-147 p.Ch.), Vologese IV (147-191 p.Ch.), Osroe II (c. 190 p.Ch.) et Vologese VI (208-228 p.Ch.) étant frappées dans les ateliers de Rhaga et Ecbatana. Le catalogue des monnaies est précédé d'un commentaire sur l'attribution des pièces et d'une courte présentation de l'évolution du système monétaire parthique du II^{e} siècle a.Ch. jusqu'au III^{e} siècle p.Ch.

Les monnaies sassanides (4 exemplaires), sont des drachmes en argent émises au temps des rois Shapur I (241-272), Peroz (459-484) et Husro II (591-628). Les pièces sont accompagnées par un court historique des émissions monétaires sassanides et des considérations sur les drachmes qui appartiennent à la collection Tonizza.

La plupart des monnaies de la collection Tonizza sont islamiques, 105 exemplaires bien conservée, en or, argent et bronze frappées aux VIII^{e}-XX^{e} siècles. On remarque un groupe des émissions du temps des Omeyyades (11

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0312

exemplaires) et des Abbassides (31 exemplaires). Les émisions des Omeyyades sont représentes dans le catalogue par neuf monnaies en argent frappées entre 705-719 et deux monnaies anonymes, en bronze, qui ne présentent pas l'année de l'émission. Les auteurs datent les pièces en bronze entre 716-764, car une partie importante de la production de monnaies en bronze du temps des Omeyyades est concentrée dans cet intervalle.

Les monnaies des Abbassides représentent 24 dirhems en argent et quatre pièces en métal commun, émises entre 750-946. Les monnaies en argent appartiennent aux ateliers de Madinat al-Salam (Baghdad), la capitale de l'empire abbasside, Mosul, Balad, Bassora et Raqqah. Les pièces en bronze ont été frappées à Dimaşk (Damas), Mosul, Baghdad, Jérusalem et dans un atelier qui n'est pas précisé. Les légendes des monnaies sont reproduites en arabe et sont accompagnées d'une série de commentaires sur la graphie. Les auteurs mettent en évidence les particularités de la graphie et décrivent en détail les ornements existant sur l'avers et le revers.

Entre les monnaies islamiques remarquables du point de vue de leur état de conservation excellente, on remarque deux dinars en or, émises aux temps des Fatimides à la fin du X^{e} siècle et au milieu du XI^{e} siècle, dans l'atelier du Caire. À la collection Tonizza appartient aussi une pièce en argent de la dynastie des H'amdânides, une pièce en bronze anonyme qui pourrait être attribuée au sultan Malik Shah (la fin du XI^{e} siècle), une pièce en bronze frappée en Anatolie par les Danishmendides, au milieu du XII^{e} siècle et trois pièces en bronze émises par le gouverneur de Dimaşk et Alep, Nur al-din Mahmud ibn Zenki (1146-1174).

Les Seldjoukides d' Anatolie sont représentés dans le catalogue par trois dirhems en argent issues à Konya et Sisiyya entre 1219-1257. Une pièce très intéressante est le dirhem frappé à Ssiyya, comme résultat de l'alliance entre le sultan Kay Chusraw II et Hethum I, roi de la Cilicie. La monnaie a sur l'avers une représentation de Saint George et une légende arménienne et sur le revers des ornements végétaux et une légende arabe. Les sept monnaies des Ayyubides de la collection Tonizza ont été émises dans la deuxième moitie du XII^{e} siècle, et dans la première moitié du XIII^{e} siècle, dans les ateliers de Dimaşk, Alep, Mayafariqin et Qal'at Ga'bar. Les émissions ayyubides sont accompagnées d'un commentaire sur leur typologie et sur les différences en ce qui concerne la graphie.

Les monnaies des Mamelouks sont représentées par huit pièces en argent et en métal commun, frappées aux XIII^{e}-XIV^{e} siècles à Dimaşk, Hamah, Alep et dans un atelier qui n'est pas précisé. Du XIV^{e} siècle provient un dirhem des Germiyanides, frappé à Simav, entre 1320-1381. La monnaie, relativement bien conservée, est rarement trouvée dans des collections.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0313

La collection contient 29 monnaies ottomanes en argent et bronze, appartenant aux XVI^e-XX^e siècles. Les plus anciennes sont trois dirhems en argent, frappés à Alep, au temps du règne du sultan Mehmed III (1595-1603). Il faut préciser que, selon les recherches de Mihai Maxim, ces *dirhem* des catalogues numismatiques étaient en réalité les *padişahî* ou *şahî* des sources documentaires (Mihai Maxim, O lupta monetara în secolul al XVI-lea : padişahî contra aspru/ Une guerre monétaire au XVI-e siècle : padişahî contre l'aspre , dans *Cercetari Numismatice*, Bucureşti, V, 1983, pp. 129-152).

Quatre monnaies en argent sont frappées à Constantinople au temps des sultans Ahmed III (1703-1730) et Mustafa III (1757-1774). Les émissions monétaires du temps du sultan Ahmed III ont sur l'avers et sur le revers des ornements et des sigles. Ce détail a échappé à l'attention des auteurs en ce qui concerne la pièce n° 102. On peut observer dans l'illustration que la pièce n° 102 a des ornements sur l'avers, au dessus du mot "Ahmed" et au revers, au dessus du mot "bin" (sur la troisième ligne). Sous la lettre "nun" du mot "sultan", trouvé sur la dernière ligne de la légende du revers, on trouve un sigle qui pourrait être «ayin». À la position 104 on trouve une pièce très intéressante en bronze, qui pourrait être un faux d'après les émissions en argent du sultan Ahmed III (à consulter sur cette question Samuel Lachman, "The Large Ottoman Copper Coins", *Oriental Numismatic Society Newsletter*, 50, 1977, pp. 2-3).

La majorité des pièces ottomanes de la collection est constituée des monnaies du temps du sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839). On peut remarquer la pièce n° 119 frappée avec des coins d'avers et la pièce n° 121, un faux de l'époque. Les autres pièces constituent des émissions communes, frappées à Constantinople, Trablus Garb et Tunus. Le groupe de monnaies ottomanes contient aussi quelques pièces du temps des sultans Abdül Aziz (1861-1876) et Abdülhamid II (1876-1909). Le groupe des monnaies islamiques est complété par quatre exemplaires qui sont frappés au Maroc au XIX^e siècle.

Publié dans des conditions graphiques exceptionnelles, le volume met dans le circuit scientifique un matériel numismatique inédit. Même si la plupart des émissions sont connues, leur publication en détail fait du volume consacré à la collection Tonizza un instrument de travail très utile pour les chercheurs.

Aurel Vîlcu

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0314

VI. DOCTORAL THESES

Viorel Panaite, *Pace, Război şi Comerţ în Islam. Ţările Române şi Dreptul Otoman al Popoarelor* (Peace, War and Trade in Islam. The Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Law of Nations)[1]

ABSTRACT

This work aims at presenting the specificities of the Ottoman law of nations, on the one hand, and at analysing the Ottoman-Romanian relationship from the point of view of the Ottoman law of nations, on the other hand.

The INTRODUCTION is devoted to the following topics: *historiography, sources, methodology and terminology* (pp. 1-59).

The Ottoman Empire was an Islamic state. Starting from this prerequisite, both general works and special studies on the Islamic Law of nations (the doctrine of *djihâd*), the "Holy War" ideology and the regime of non-Muslims (subjects or foreigners) are presented in detail. Also, a special attention is paid to the results of researches concerning Ottoman-Romanian relations, especially about the political and juridical status of the Romanian principalities towards the Ottoman state and about the Ottoman-Romanian peace agreements.

This work is based on several historical and juridical sources, both official and narrative, both Muslim (Ottoman) and Christian, but the author has preferred to analyse in detail only the most important ones. The juridical-religious sources *(al-Kur'ân, Kitâb as-siyar, fetvâ*s and *kannunnâme*s*)* are presented firstly. To explain the matter at issue, the author had to focus his attention on the following Ottoman legal sources: a) Islamic law treatises (with chapters entitled *kitâb as-siyar, kitâb al-djihâd* etc.), written by Ottoman scholars (*ulema*), who systematised the classical concepts of the Islamic law of nations for Ottoman rulers; b) Juridical consultations (sing. *fetvâ*) issued by "the head of Ottoman scholars" (*şeyh ül-İslam*);

[1]The thesis was defended in September 1995 at the Faculty of History, University of Bucharest. Two years later, in 1997 it was published under the title *Pace, război şi comert in Islam. Tările Române şi dreptul otoman al popoarelor (secolele XV-XVII)* (Peace, War and Trade in Islam. The Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Law of Nations: 15th-17th century), Editura ALL, Bucuresti, 544 p. and awarded with the "Nicolae Iorga Prize" of the Romanian Academy. A part of the documentation from the Ph.D. thesis was used four years later for the book *The Ottoman Law of War and Peace. The Ottoman Empire and Tribute-Payers*, New York, 2001.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0317

c) Regulations and law-codes (*kanunnâmes*) issued by sultans as imperial decrees. In these sources, peace, war, trade and non-Muslims regime were defined only according to the criteria of the Islamic law of nations. The *fetihnâmes* ("letters of conquest"), *gazavâtnâmes* ("chronicles of Holy Wars") are presented in detail, because they are relevant sources for a better understanding of the Ottoman "Holy War" ideology. The specificities of Ottoman law of nations and the particularities of the Ottoman diplomacy are revealed by the peace and trade treaties (*'ahdnâme*, in Turkish; *Capitulations*, in Western languages), concluded between the Ottoman Empire and Christian states. For his research, among other records, the author used transcripts of *'ahdnâmes* made in the Ottoman chanceries and included in the "Foreign States registers" (*Düvel-i Ecnebiyye Defterleri*) of *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* in Istanbul, but, also, the origins of the Ottoman-Polish *'ahdnâmes* in Warsaw (most of these texts are as microfilms in the Bucharest State Archives, microfilms collection, Poland, Roll 1, frames 197-215). Due to the lack of official documents about 15th century Ottoman-Romanian relations, *Tevârih-i âl-i Osmân* ("chronicles of the Ottoman Dynasty") are very important sources for this period and, consequently, the author has paid a special attention to them. Dimitrie Cantemir's interpretations of the matter, from his *History of the Ottoman Empire, description Moldavie* and *The System or Organisation of muhammadan religion*, are abundantly used, too.

Methodologically, it is important to point out that this study is not a chronological history of the political-military relations in Central and South-Eastern Europe during the Ottoman period, but the subject was approached in an interference of political history with history of the law of nations and juridical mentalities. Also, a comparative method was used in this work, confronting theory and practice; several regimes which appeared in relations established by the Ottoman Empire with non-Muslims (on the levels of states, communities or individuals). In this way, the author has tried to offer clear explanations of Muslim (Ottoman) notions of peace, war, treaty, foreigner etc.

PART: I THE OTTOMAN LAW OF NATIONS (pp. 60-27)

The first part of the work contains four chapters devoted to the Ottoman law of nations, the "Holy War" ideology of the Ottomans, the Ottoman law of peace and the foreign merchants' regime in the Ottoman Empire. According to these four directions of investigation, the author has set

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0318

himself the goal, on the one hand, to define the juridical concepts of the Ottoman law of nations (essentially, an Islamic law) and on the other hand, to analyse the political and diplomatic Ottoman practices, reflected official and narrative sources. In this way, the distinction between legal theory and juridical practice could be better emphasised .

CHAPTER I: THE OTTOMANS AND ISLAMIC LAW OF NATIONS (pp. 60-81)

The Ottoman law of nations had two main constituents: the Islamic constituent and the Ottoman one. The Islamic tradition was certainly the strongest element of the Ottoman law of nations. Consequently, in the relations with non-Muslims, the Ottomans extracted the basic rules from *siyar*, one of the branches of *shari'a*, which described the Muslims' attitude towards non-Muslims and established rules binding upon all members of *Umma*, in relationships with non-Muslims, both inside of, and outside of, "territories of Islam", either during peace or war periods. The Ottomans adopted the Hanefi juridical school (from Abu Hanifa - d. 767, its founder), because it was more tolerant in comparison with the other three juridical Sunni schools and, consequently, it fitted like a glove to Ottoman power men, interested to have more liberty for their internal and external policy. It must be also emphasised that the Ottoman law of nations was not a pure Islamic law. On the contrary, the political-military, diplomatic and commercial practice proves that "customs" concerning war, peace, trade and foreigners appeared, in spite of all religious, political and legal differences between Islam and Christendom. This is why the author points out insistently that custom is one of the most important constituents of the Ottoman law of nations. Although there still was, theoretically, a permanent state of war between the Ottoman Empire and the Christian States, in practice the Ottomans accepted gradually the European law of nations during the 17th-19th centuries and even the "permanent peace" concept. The author affirms that an evolution from "Holy War" (*djihâd*) to "Holy Peace" (*mübarek sulh*) took place. As arguments, one can refer to peace and trade treaties, frequently concluded between the Ottoman Empire and Christian States. Until now, historians and jurists asserted the "Capitulations" of 1535-1536 as the starting point for the adoption process of European law of nations. In the author's opinion, firstly, there were Byzantine and Venetian influences on diplomatic methods and peace treaties, but only the Austrian-Ottoman treaty, concluded at Zsitvatorok in 1606, can be considered a turning point in the evolution of the Ottoman law of nations. Over a long

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0319

span of time, the Ottoman Empire had begun to participate in the operation of the law of nations by entering into peaceful relationship with European states, but only at the Peace Congress in Paris (1856), did the Ottomans completely accept, and were admitted to participate in, the public law and concert of Europe.

CHAPTER II: THE OTTOMAN "HOLY WAR" IDEOLOGY (pp. 82-153)

In the Islamic world, since the 8th-9th centuries, the doctrine of "Holy War" (*djihâd*) was formed around warlike activities. It must be emphasised that *djihâd* did not mean only "war with sword", but also moral, spiritual or intellectual efforts for building an ideal community. Concerning the place and the part of the "Holy War" ideology in the foundation and evolution of the Ottoman Empire, the excessive interpretations of certain historians are rejected by the author. It is obvious that the "*djihâd* with sword" was a political instrument, an ideology used by the Ottomans. But, at the same time, the offensive *djihâd* had an important impact on Ottoman individual and collective religious conscience. From the *djihâd* ideology point of view, the author distinguishes two periods in Ottoman history: a) the period of offensive "Holy War" ideology. b) the period of defensive djihâd ideology. But he points out that the defensive *djihâd* ideology existed in the first period, too, as well as the offensive *djihâd* was invoked later, in the 18th century, as part of the Ottoman political ideology, the doctrine of *djihâd* was used by the Ottomans for justifying both warfare and peace with non-Christian states of Central and South-Eastern Europe. Special pages are devoted to the most important problems concerning the "minor Holy War" (*al-djihâd al-asgar*): basic discriminations (*mamin-kâfir; müslim-harbî; dâr al-İslam - dâr al-harb*); *djihâd* as *bellum justum* (justification of the wars between Muslims); from offensive *djihâd* to defensive *djihâd* (*djihâd* from collective duty to individual one); the stimuli of *djihâd* (booty, *gazî*, martyrdom); the summons (in Turkish *da'vet*): religious summons; political summons.

CHAPTER III: THE OTTOMAN LAW OF PEACE (pp. 154-238)

In spite of a theoretic permanent state of war between the "House of Islam" (*dâr al-İslam*) and the "House of War" (*dâr al-harb*), in practice permanent or temporary peaceful relationships with non-Muslims proved necessary. As corollary of the doctrine of *djihâd*, Islamic peace law was used

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0320

by the Arabic Caliphate to legitimise, from a legal-religious point of view, peaceful contacts with non-Muslim individuals, communities or states. The rules of Islamic peace law were used by the Ottomans too for justifying peace and trade treaties concluded with non-Muslim states, including states of Central and South-Eastern Europe. In the 8th-9th centuries, Muslim jurists have already theorised the conditions of definitive stopping and ceasing of the "Holy War" ("temporary peace"), on the other hand. Because Islamic law notions can hardly have contemporary synonyms, some of them (such as *dihamma, djizya, kharâdj, amân, 'ahd, 'ahd ad-dhimma, hudna, muvâda'a, muuste'min, dâr al-'ahd, dâr al-dhimma, dâr al-muvâda'a* etc.) had to be explained. In Islamic law of nations the relationship between the Muslim state and the non-Muslim communities over which Islam extended its tolerance and protection was conceived as regulated by a pact called *dhimma*. Those who benefited from this kind of pact were known as *ahl ad-dhimma* or *dhimmî*s (*T. zimmi*s, *zimmet ehli*) ("protected people"; non-Muslim subjects). During the Ottoman period, *dhimmî*s constituted the non-Muslim part of "tax-paying subjects" (sing. *ra'yet*; pl. *reâyâ)*. In other words, Christians, Jews, Armenians and other non-Muslims living within the "House of Islam", i.e. the Ottoman Empire, are permitted to keep their religion and institutions, upon the condition of paying the poll-tax (*djizye*) and the land-tax (*kharâdj*). The "peace and trade agreements" concluded between the Ottoman Empire and the Christian states belonged to the general "convenant" (*ahd*). According to Muslim legal texts (*kitâb as-siyar, fetvâ*s), there were two kind of *'ahd*: *'ahd ad-dhimma* ("agreement of tributary protection") and *muvâda'a* ("truce" or "treaty of temporary peaceful coexistence"). But, in Ottoman diplomacy, any agreement concluded with Muslim or non-Muslim foreign princes was termed *'ahdname-i hümayûn* ("imperial charter of covenant"). concerning *pacta sunt servanda,* both Muslims and non-Muslims were characterised by a common feature. They acknowledged a customary practice which implies that treaties and oaths be observed, whether they were concluded with co-religionists or "infidels". *Pacta sunt servanda* is not revealed by historical sources as a firm law principle, observed without wavering by Ottomans (as well as by Christians) in the political and diplomatic practice, but depending on momentary political and military interests. At the same time, the author emphasises the clear contradictions between the verses of *al-Kur'ân* which stipulated that the covenant be observed and later legal texts (of *Kitâb as-siyar* or of *fetvâ*s) allowing to *imâm*s (caliphs, sultans) the right to violate any peace agreement, if this action would serve the interests of the Muslim (Ottoman) state.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0321

CHAPTER IV: THE FOREIGN MERCHANTS' REGIME IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE (pp. 239-277)

In the Ottoman Empire, the non-Muslim foreigners' status was established by *shari'a* (Muslim holy law) and international treaties (in Turkish, *'ahdnâmes*; in Western languages, *Capitulations*). The life and property of an inhabitant of enemy territories (*harbî*) venturing into Muslim lands were completely unprotected by *sharia'a,* unless he was given a temporary safe-conduct (*amân*). According to *sharia'a,* he was then called *müste'min*. A general *amân*, i.e. permission for access and guarantee of safety, was granted to traders coming from Venice, Hungary, Austria, Poland, France, England, Holland, Russia and staying in the Ottoman territories and was included in the *'ahdnâmes* granted by sultans to Christian princes. The main articles of the *Capitulations* concerning trade and merchants can be summarised as follows: safe access by land and sea; safety of their persons and properties; the property of the deceased merchants must not be seized; freedom and security of their trade; custom dues are to be levied at the ordinary rates; responsibility for debts and crimes shall be individual only and not collective. In consequence, according to *sharia'a* and *'ahdnâmes*, one can say that the foreign merchants had a "*special status*", called also "capitulatory regime". At the same time, the author emphasises the mutual terms and the most favoured nation clauses expressed in the treaties concluded between the Ottoman Empire and its neighbouring states (e. g. Venice, Hungary, Poland, Austria, Russia).

PART II: THE ROMANIAN PRINCIPALITIES AND THE OTTOMAN LAW OF NATIONS (pp. 277-424)

The main aspects of Ottoman-Romanian relations, analysed from a historical and legal point of view, are stressed in the second part of the book. Considering the general theme, "peace, war and trade in Islam", the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and the Romanian principalities is a case study. It is not a marginal case, but even the substance of an investigation. The suggestive titles of the chapters were chosen from sources, but behind them there are scientific analyses concerning the impact of the Ottoman "Holy War" *(gazâ)* to the Romanian countries, the Ottoman-Romanian treaties, *pacta sunt servanda* in Ottoman-Romanian relations, the place and the part of custom in establishing Romanian voïvodes' rights and duties towards the Porte, the political-juridical status of the Romanian principalities etc.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0322

I. "... DANUBE-*GAZÂ* RIVER..." (pp. 278-292)

During the 14th-18th centuries, the Ottomans used the offensive *djihâd* ideology for a legal justification of military expeditions against Christian states in South-East and Central Europe. All these countries were included in *dâr al-harb* ("House of War") or *dâr ül-kefere* ("House of Infidels"). The ultimate aim of the Ottomans leaders was to bring these territories under the direct authority of the *padişah* and to incorporate them in the "House of Islam" (*dar al-İslam*). All expeditions against Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania were called *gazâ (*pl. *gazavât)*. The heroes of the Ottoman chronicles are mostly termed *gazîler*, a notion associated with courage, belief and martyrdom. From the end of the 14th century to the end of the 16th century, *gazî*s and the Danube have a common history, including "holy war" ideology, booty and martyrdom, as essential elements. Kıvamî was the Ottoman annalist who offered us, as title of this chapter, a significant expression: "...Danube the -*gazî* river...".

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF VASSALAGE ("ÎNCHINAREA") (pp. 293-313)

The political moments when Wallachian, Moldavian and Transylvanian voïvodes had accepted to pay tribute and to submit to the Ottoman Porte were called "închinare" in the Romanian chronicles. Considering the great number of meanings of the term "închinare" in Ottoman, Byzantine and Romanian sources, the author emphasises that to take over only the later meaning (from 17th-18th centuries Romanian chronicles), of decisive moments of Ottoman-Romanian relations, established in the 14th-15th centuries, is not the best solution. He rejects this concept, which implies accepting a political and juridical immobility for the following periods of Ottoman-Romanian relations. Therefore, the author proposes that the moment of "homage" do not be fixed on a certain year and attributed to a certain voïvode, like the 17th-18th centuries Romanian annalists did. Moreover, the "homage" tradition, characterised by an imprecise chronology and confusions, indicates a whole process of establishment of relations between the Ottoman empire and each Romanian countries.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0323

III. 3...AND HE HAS AGREEMENT (*'AHD*) WITH THE SULTAN..." (pp. 314-327)

One of the most controversial questions in Romanian historiography is about treaties concluded between Romanian princes and Ottoman sultans. New arguments, either taken from the Muslim legal texts, or resulting from comparative methods, support the idea of "written documents". On the one hand the author quotes as-Shaybânî (d. 805) and as-Sarakhsî (d. 1090), who affirmed that treaties had to be written, because Mohammed had also settled in written his peace agreements concluded by the Ottomans with the other Christian princes of South-East Europe, especially with the Byzantine emperors. Of course, the political privileges of the Romanian Principalities were laid down in the Ottoman documents named *'ahdnâme-i hümayûn* and *berât-ı hümayûn*. Some of them have been preserved, as the *sulhnâme* concluded between Stephen the Great and Mehmed II Fatih, in 1480-1481, and certain "imperial diplomas" granted to the Wallachian, Moldavian and Transylvanian princes during the 16th-17th centuries.

IV. "...AND HE WAS A TRIBUTE PAYER (*KHARADJ-GÜZAR*)..." (pp. 328-343) AND V. "THE COUNTRY IS UNDER OUR DUE PROTECTION (*HIMÂYET ET SIYÂNET*)" (pp. 344-359)

Since Romanian voïvodes had accepted to pay tribute, they were also termed "tribute payer" (*kharhadj-güzâr*). From the European medieval point of view, the relations between Romanian princes and sultans were looked as vassal-suzerain relations. An ambiguous image about the legal status of the Romanian principalities towards the Ottoman Porte resulted from defining the stages of the Ottoman-Romanian relationship, once using Ottoman criteria and terms (for instance, "tributary state") and then using Western medieval ones. Consequently, the author suggests that only two notions be used: "*tributary states*" and "*protected states*". The first concept was imposed by the outlook of the voïvodes' duties towards the Porte and, of course, is based on the Ottoman notion of *kharâdj-güzâr*. The "Tributary states" concept implied not only sending tribute to the Porte, but also other political-military and economical-financial duties (in Turkish, *hizmet*). Considering the duties of the Porte towards the Romanian Principalities, the author proposes "protected states" or "protectorate" as notions which would better characterised the political-juridical status of the Romanian Countries towards the Ottoman Empire. The following arguments are invoked: protection-tribute exchange,

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0324

stipulated in the Ottoman-Romanian peace agreements (*'ahd*), on the one hand; necessity of protection as buffer-states, stipulated or not in the peace treaties (*'ahdnâmes*) between the Ottoman Empire and Christian states (Hungary, Poland, then Austria and Russia), on the other hand.

VI. "KEEP YOUR AGREEMENT! THOSE WHO VIOLATE THEIR AGREEMENT ARE RESPONSIBLE!" (pp. 360-380)

There was a clear contradiction between Ottomans and Romanians concerning *pacta sunt servanda*, both parts accusing each other. Analysing several informations, one can say that there were different outlooks concerning *pacta sunt servanda* in Ottoman-Romanian relations. The Ottomans seem to be concerned with violation of agreements by the Romanians in definite historical moments. With few exceptions, the Romanians considered the violation of treaties by the Ottomans over long periods, from the 18th century outlook. Due to this reason, the author quotes also third view (Western sources). Also, he points out that both Ottomans and Romanians were scrupulous to legitimate any action which could be against *'ahd*, that is most relevant for the principle *pacta sunt servanda* (in Turkish, *ahde vefa prensibi)*.

VII. "...AS IT WAS IN PRACTICE SINCE THE DAYS OF YORE..." (pp. 381-394)

Considering the great amount of documentary information, especially from 16th-18th centuries Ottoman sources, where "usage" (*âdet, kadîm, mu'tâd, âyin* etc.) is invoked both by Ottomans and Romanians, the author attempts to look at this subject, despite its slippery and established character between the Ottoman empire and every Romanian state. On the one hand, there were the rights and duties which, having been observed through a long period of time, began to be perceived as customary practices, even if these had sometimes been written down in *'ahdnâmes* or *berâts* granted to the Romanian princes. On the other hand, most of the "usages" invoked in the records refer to the quantities of the hospodars' duties (amount, number, weight etc.), the periods of time and payment methods. These alleged "usages" of historical sources could indicate the existence of some practices accepted as laws both by Ottomans and by Romanians, during a longer or shorter period of time.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0325

VIII. ROMANIANS IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE—SUBJECTS OR FOREIGNERS? (pp. 395-408)

The Ottoman view on the status of non-Muslim peoples was a religious one. Consequently, for defining the Ottoman juridical view on non-Muslims, it is necessary to point out especially its Muslim constituent. considering the Ottomans view on non-Muslims, the Romanians had an ambiguous regime, between the sultan's subjects (*dhimmî*s) and foreigners (*müste'min*s). Two reasons are more important for this situation. On the one hand, in the Ottoman juridical practice, a clear difference between *dhimmî*s and *müste'min*s was not made, like in theoretical juridical texts. On the other hand, in the Romanians' case the ambiguousness was stressed by the status of "tributary states", an intermediate regime situated between "House of Islam" and "House of War". Therefore, the status of the inhabitants of Romanian countries were placed between the foreigners' regime and the non-Muslims' one. Nevertheless, the author proposes to be done a difference between the Romanians' regime in the Ottoman territories of the 15th century and the first part of the 16th century, closer to the *müste'min*s one, and the Romanians' regime of the 16th-18th centuries, closer to the *dhimmî*s' one. On long standing, the Romanians' status in the Ottoman territories was not identically neither with the *müste'min*s' regime, nor the *dhimmî*s' one.

IX. THE ROMANIAN PRINCIPALITIES BETWEEN DÂR AL-ISLAM AND DÂR AL-HARB DILEMMAS, CONFUSIONS, PRETENSIONS, ABUSES (pp. 409-424)

For the Romanian turkologists an important subject of research is to define the juridical status of the Romanian Principalities towards the Ottoman Empire during the 15th-18th centuries. The author discussed in this last chapter three controversial questions: what kind of legal method was at the origin of the status of the Romanian Countries ("by force" or "by peaceful agreement"); what kind of peace was concluded between the Ottoman Empire and the Romanian Principalities (from "temporary peace" to "firm and lasting peace"); in what kind of Islamic legal territories were the Romanian countries included during the 15th-18th centuries. To define the regime of the Romanian countries towards the Porte, from the Islamic juridical point of view, the author proposes that the concept of "House of Truce" (*dâr al-muvâda'a)* be used until 1538-1541 and the notion of "House of Tributary Protection" (*dâr al-dhimma*) after this date.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0326

Viorel Panaite's work is completed by the usual research instruments: an extensive bibliography (pp. 434-477), an abstract in English (478-489), a glossary of Ottoman terms and expressions (pp. 496-512), an index (pp. 513-523), 16 facsimiles of document and 16 colour illustrations.

*
* *

*The Black Sea in Russo-Ottoman Relations at the End of the 17th Century and at the Beginning of the 18th Century**

Adrian TERTECEL

For Russo-Ottoman relations (and for the regions close to the northern shore of the Black Sea), the years 1686-1714 represented an extremely tense period. During this period, two Russo-Ottoman wars (1686-1700; 1719-1711) took place and two intervals of tense peace (1700-1710; 1711-1714) were registered.

In that period, the wars and the tensions between Russia and the Sublime Porte were mainly caused by Russian efforts to obtain access to the Black Sea in order to later reach Istanbul and the Straits (Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). Naturally, the Ottoman Empire (which since 1484 had been ruling over almost the whole basin of the Black Sea and had also conquered the Caucasian coast of this sea in 1579) was to fiercely oppose the Russian advance in this direction.

---

*This is an abstract of my Ph. D. thesis. The thesis was elaborated under the scientific guidance of Prof. Dr. Mihai Maxim (University of Bucharest) to whom I express my gratitude again. It was finished in Bucharest in 1998. It was written in Romanian and has six chapters and 542 typed pages. The last 50 pages of the thesis contain a documentary appendage consisting of five published documents (four Ottoman documents and one Russian document) of 1703-1711, with original texts in Ottoman Turkish and Russian and translations into Romanian (made by myself). For the elaboration of the thesis, I used Turkish, Russian, Romanian and West European works and also (published and unpublished) Ottoman, Russian, Romanian and West European historical sources. The novelties which I think that I managed to present in this Ph. D. thesis consists of the synthesizing of many scattered informations from different works. They also consist of new informations concerning the evolution of Russo-Ottoman relations during the whole period 1686-1714 and new interpretations about the nature of Russo-Ottoman relations in the peace years 1700-1710, about the reasons that determined the Porte to start the Russo-Ottoman war of 1710-1711 and about the relative moderation of the Ottoman leaders towards Russia both at the end of this war and during the bitter Russo-Ottoman diplomatic confrontations of 1711-1714.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0327

The international context and the internal situation of the two empires also played a very important role in the process of putting into practice the Russian plans of expansion to the prejudice of the Porte and the Ottoman plans of counteracting the Russian expansion.

In the years 1683-1699, a long war between the Ottoman empire and the Holy League (Austria, Poland and Venice) took place. During this war, the Ottoman troops suffered repeated defeats, especially in front of the Austrian troops. Taking advantage of this favourable international context, in 1686 Russia entered this war on the side of the Holy League.

After two defeats suffered by the Russian army in front of the Crimean Tatars (in 1687 and 1689), there followed a period of undeclared armistice (1689-1695). The young Russian tsar Peter the Great (1689-1725) was to quickly put an end to this situation. Taking advantage of the fact that the Porte was still having great difficulties on the Austrian front, the new tsar resumed military operations against the Ottomans in 1695. It was only then, due to the energy and talent of the tsar and to the reforms started by him, that Russia was able to put to good use the favourable international context. The Russian troops conquered the four small Ottoman fortresses on the lower Dnieper in 1695 and occupied the big Ottoman fortress of Azov (Azak) in 1696. Thus Russia gained access to the sea of Azov as a first step towards gaining access to the Black Sea. Nevertheless, the Russian military successes could not be continued because of the incorrect behaviour of Russia's allies.

In the summer of 1698, in the Russo-Ottoman relations, the international context ceased to be favourable to Russia and began to be favorable to the Porte. This new situation lasted until the end of the year 1714.

As, in the summer of 1698, Austria, Poland and Venice began peace negotiations with the Porte, the tsar was forced to do the same. At Karlowitz, on 26 January 1699, Austria, Poland and Venice managed to conclude separate peace treaties with the Porte, thus gaining large territories to the prejudice of the Ottomans, who found themselves defeated and exhausted at the end of this war. The decline of the Ottoman Empire had become irreversible. At Karlowitz, Russia managed to conclude with the Porte only a two-year armistice.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0328

In order to avoid being left alone at war with the Porte, on 14 July 1700, Russia had to conclude the peace treaty of Istanbul. Although the four small fortresses on the Lower Dnieper were given back to the Ottomans, Russia still preserved its access to the Sea of Azov by maintaining its rule over the strategic port-fortresses of Azov and Taganrog (Taygan). The fortress of Taganrog had been built by the Russians, in 1696-1699, in a region they had conquered from the Ottomans. The Kerch (Kerç) Strait remained however under Ottoman rule, thus forbidding to the Russian fleet in the Sea of Azov the access to the Black Sea (which remained an entirely Ottoman sea). Russia also obtained the right to have a permanent ambassador in Istanbul. The tribute paid by Russia to the Tatar Khans of Crimea was cancelled forever.

The years 1700-1710 represented a period of tense peace for Russo-Ottoman relations. In fact, the Russo-Ottoman peace treaty of 1700 proved to be only an armistice. Both sides were not satisfied with its contents. Russia wished to gain direct access to the Black Sea (not just to the Sea of Azov), hoping to be able to later reach Istanbul and the Straits. In its turn, the Ottoman Empire wished to reconquer Azov and Taganrog and to remove the Russian fleet from the Sea of Azov in order to become again the only master of the Black Sea. For the time being, Russia was not able to attack the Porte because it was caught up (in alliance with Poland, Saxony and Denmark) in the Northern War (1700-1721) against Sweden. The tsar hoped to win this war and thus to obtain for Russia direct access to the Baltic Sea. In its turn, Austria was engaged in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714). However, during the period 1700-1710, the Porte attacked neither Russia nor Austria nor Venice. The exhaution after the long war with the Holy League (1683-1699) and the internal economic, social and political difficulties did not allow the Porte to do this.

Although, in the years 1700-1710, neither Russia nor the Porte could start a new Russo-Ottoman war, both empires made intense preparations in order to be able to do this on the first favourable occasion. On the diplomatic plane, neither the Russians nor the Ottomans obtained any important concession from the opposite side. In exchange, on the military plane, Russia strengthened its fleet in the Sea of Azov, consolidated the walls and increased the garrisons of the fortresses of Azov and Taganrog and built the new fortresses of Kamenka and Samara (on the Lower Dnieper, near the northern border of the khanate of Crimea). The Russian ambassador in Istanbul in the years 1702-1710, P. A. Tolstoi, led on Ottoman territory a vast activity of espionage and propaganda in favour of Russia. In their turn, the Ottomans

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0329

strengthened the presence of their military fleet in the Black Sea, built the fortress of Yeni Kale (on the western shore of the Kerch Strait), repaired and consolidated the Ottoman fortresses on the northern coast of the Black Sea, increasing also their garrisons and armament.

In the spring of 1709, because of the fault of Sultan Ahmed III (1703-1730), the Ottomans missed a huge opportunity to attack and defeat Russia. They rejected the request of military aid made by the Swedish King Charles XII, who at that time was together with his army in the Ukraine (near Poltava). Thus, the Russians managed to decisively defeat the Swedes in the battle of Poltava (8 July 1709). Charles XII was forced to take refuge in the Ottoman Empire, at Bender. He remained on Ottoman territory until 1714. Almost the whole territory of Poland was occupied by the Russian army (after the battle of Poltava).

It was only the threatening growth of Russia's power after the battle of Poltava (combined with a relative internal economic, social and political stabilization of the Ottoman Empire) that convinced the Ottoman leaders that they had to declare war on Russia at once. Otherwise, it would have been too late. The favourable occasion offered by Russia's engagement in the Northern War would have been lost. Russia would have won this war soon (thus gaining direct access to the Baltic Sea) and then it would have attacked the Ottoman Empire with all its troops (in order to gain direct accesss to the Black Sea). For these reasons, the Porte declared war on Russia on 20 November 1710.

As a part of the Russian troops had to remain on the Swedish front (in Poland and in the Baltic regions) and tsar Peter the Great made some important errors while leading the Russian military operations, the Porte won the Russo-Ottoman war of 1710-1711. The Russo-Ottoman peace treaty of the Prut (22 July 1711) confirmed this Ottoman victory. Its stipulations were to be repeated (with some additional details) in the Russo-Ottoman peace treaties of Istanbul (16 April 1712) and Edirne (24 June 1713). On the basis of these treaties, the Porte regained the fortresses of Azov and Taganrog (this second fortress only after demolition by the Russians). The Ottomans also obtained the demolition of the Russian fortresses of Kamenka and Samara and the withdrawal of the Russian troops from Moldavia, Poland and from the territories of the Dnieper Cossacks situated between the lower course of the Bug river and the cataracts of the Dnieper river. At the same time, the Porte gained a large strip of territory between the Dnieper and the Don rivers. Russia

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0330

ceased to have a permanent ambassador in Istanbul. As in the peace period 1700-1710, the Russian merchants had the right to travel to Istanbul and back only by land. Thus the Ottomans maintained the interdiction preventing the Russian merchants from sailing in the Black Sea. The trade and the navigation of the Black Sea remained an Ottoman monopoly. For the Swedish King Charles XII, the above mentioned treaties stipulated only his safe return to Swedish Pomerania through Poland or by another route.

We should also mention that the victory of the Porte in the Russo-Ottoman war of 1710-1711 had also very important consequences for Moldavia and Wallachia. In Moldavia (1711) and Wallachia (1716), the Ottomans established the Greek Phanariotes' reign (which lasted until 1821). After the behaviour of Dimitrie Cantemir and Constantin Brâncoveanu (who had openly or secretely helped Russia), the Porte did not trust the Romanian ruling princes any more. The political and military surveillance and the economic squeezing of Moldavia and Wallachia by the Ottoman Empire were to get worse in the following decades.

In the summer of 1714, the new border between Russia and the Ottoman Empire was marked on the ground. Thus ended the putting into practice of all the stipulations of the Russo-Ottoman peace treaties of 1711-1713. In September 1714, the Russian high rank hostages Piotr Shafirov and M. B. Sheremetev obtained the sultan's permission to return to Russia. After losing any hope about the begining of a new Russo-Ottoman war (which would have been a huge help for Sweden by forcing Russia to fight on two fronts at the same time), in October 1714, the Swedish King Charles XII left the territory of the Ottoman Empire and headed towards the Swedish possessions by a route passing through Wallachia and Transylvania.

By the putting into practice of all the stipulations of the Russo-Ottoman peace treaties of 1711-1713, the Porte had regained full control over the basin of the Black Sea. At the same time, the Ottomans had obtained territorial gains in the Ukrainian steppe and had eliminated (for the time being) the Russian military presence in Poland. Until the Russo-Ottoman peace treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (1774), the Ottoman Empire remained the only master of the basin of the Black Sea. The breach made by the Russians in 1969 had been filled up for a few decades.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0331

Although, in the short term, the Ottoman Empire had won, still, in the medium and long terms, the real winner was Russia. The Ottomans had not been able to take advantage of the huge opportunities (in the spring of 1709 and in July 1711) to stop for a long time the growth of Russia's power and the Russian expansion towards the Black Sea, the Straits and the Balkan Peninsula. In the decisive years 1709-1714, the Ottomans had not the wisdom and the force to firmly sustain the anti-Russian interests of Sweden, of the pro-Swedish Poles and of the Khanate of Crimea. These political, diplomatic and military mistakes were accompanied by the gradual accentuation of the decline of the Ottoman Empire on all planes, caused by the lack of reforms. In fact, the merit for the Ottoman victory of 1711 belonged not to the Ottoman army but to the favourable international context.

By defeating Sweden (1721) and by preserving a pro-Russian King (August II) on the Polish throne, Russia will later be able to use all its forces against the Ottoman Empire. It was only the internal problems of Russia, the complications this empire had to face in other directions, the Russo-Austrian rivalry and, later, the more and more resolute intervention of England and France in support of the Porte in the name of the "European equilibrium" that postponed Russia's getting direct access to the Black Sea until 1774 and allowed the Ottoman Empire (although it suffered severe territorial losses) to maintain its existence until 1918.

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0332

List of contributors:

Georgeta ANGHEL, PhD candidate, senior archivist, National Archives, Bucharest
Cornelia CĂLIN BODEA, PhD, senior researcher Village Museum, Bucharest
Giuseppe COSSUTO, PhD, Italian-Turkish Friendship Association, Ankara
Ana DICU, researcher, museologist, Museum of Buzău County
Stelian DUMITRESCU, PhD, teacher, Năvodari
Călin FELEZEU, PhD, professor, Faculty of History, Babeş Bolyai University, Cluj Napoca
Cristina FENEŞAN, PhD, senior researcher, Institute for Southeastern European Studies, Bucharest
Armand GOŞU, PhD, researcher, Institute for Recent History, Bucharest.
Anthony GREENWOOD, PhD, American Research Institute in Turkey, Istanbul
M. Mehdi İLHAN, PhD, professor, Centre for Arab & Islamic Studies, Australian National University, Canberra
Dariusz KOLODZIEJCZYK, PhD, habil, assistant professor, Institute of History, University of Warsaw
Mihai MAXIM, PhD, professor, Faculty of History, University of Bucharest
Liviu MAXIM, PhD candidate, researcher Village Museum, Bucharest
Bogdan MURGESCU, PhD, professor, Faculty of History, University of Bucharest
Eugen NICOLAE, PhD, senior researcher, "Vasile Pârvan" Archeological Institute, Bucharest
Ana NICULIŢĂ, PhD, senior researcher, Archeological Institute, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova
Ali Fuat ÖRENÇ, assistant professor, Faculty of Letters, Istanbul University
Viorel PANAITE, PhD, associate professor, Faculty of History, University of Bucharest, senior researcher, Institute for Southeastern European Studies, Bucharest
Cornelia PAPACOSTEA-DANIELOPOLU †, PhD, senior researcher, Institute for Southeastern European Studies, Bucharest
Dan PRODAN, PhD, teacher, Botoşani
Silvana RACHIERU, PhD candidate, assistant, Faculty of History, University of Bucharest
Adrian TERTECEL, PhD, researcher, Institute for History "Nicolae Iorga", Bucharest
Aurel VÂLCU, PhD candidate, researcher, Institute for Cultural Memory, Bucharest

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0333

05 SA 8147

ULB Halle 3/1
000 289 221

SZA 802 (1.2003)

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0335

ROMANO - TURCICA

I

2003

ISIS

ANBUL

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt
urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-11920154153-38396195520031-19/fragment/page=0337