

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XV–XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History Sciences.

This special issue of *Eastern European History Review* addresses the complex and intense history of Christian-Ottoman relations in Central and Eastern Europe during the Early Modern Period. Tracing the salient moments and facts with battles, border issues, diplomacy and intelligence, the volume – with the participation of authors from different parts of Europe and Türkiye – constitutes an international opportunity to analyze topics that continually offer new study themes.

Central and South-Eastern Europe between the Christian world and the Ottoman world: conflicts, encounters and compromises (XVI-XVIII centuries), edited by the Turkish historian Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy, is the result of research and scientific collaboration between the CESPoM Study Center and Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE).

Alessandro Boccolini
Director of EEHR

In copertina: Antonio Stom, *Alvise II Mocenigo a Costantinopoli*, (1710)
(Venezia, Palazzo Mocenigo)

euro 19,00

ISBN 979-12-5524-026-6



9 791255 240266 >

ISSN 2612-0402



9 772612 040002



CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

Edited by Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy



EEHR
EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Annually Historical Journal

n. 5/2022
Special issue

**CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE
BETWEEN THE CHRISTIAN AND OTTOMAN WORLDS:
CONFLICTS, ENCOUNTERS AND COMPROMISES
(XVI-XVIII CENTURIES)**

Edited by
Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy

Co-edited by
Katalin Nagy

Special Participation of
Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE)



Director Emeritus

Gaetano Platania (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Director

Alessandro Boccolini (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Scientific Board

Irena Vaišvilaitė (Ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania to UNESCO)

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Massimo Carlo Giannini (Università degli Studi di Teramo)

Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University)

Giordano Altarozzi (Petru Maior University of Târgu Mures)

Giovanni Pizzorusso (Università degli Studi Gabriele d'Annunzio, Chieti-Pescara)

Michaela Valente (Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza")

Cesare La Mantia (Università di Trieste)

Prokhorov Andrei (Belarusian State University of Minsk)

Olexiy Sokyrko (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Rafał Quirini-Popławski (Jagiellonian University of Kraków)

Jarosław Pietrzak (Pedagogical University of Kraków)

Marta Gołębek (Museum of King John III's Palace at Wilanów – Warsaw)

Dorota Gregorowicz (University of Silesia in Katowice)

Michał Salamonik (Södertörn University)

Language Expert

Sonia Maria Melchiorre (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Editorial Board

Bogdana Nosova (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Francesco Vitali (Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza")

Małgorzata Trzeciak Cygan (University of Warsaw)

Giulio Merlani (University of Caen Normandy)



Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna
(Study Center on the Sobieski Age and of Modern Poland)

www.cespom.eu

Proprietà letteraria riservata. La riproduzione in qualsiasi forma, memorizzazione o trascrizione con qualunque mezzo (elettronico, meccanico, in fotocopia, in disco o in altro modo, compresi cinema, radio, televisione, internet) sono vietate senza l'autorizzazione scritta dell'Editore.

Eastern European History Review è una rivista on-line peer-reviewed con lettori anonimi

Chiuso il 31-12-2022

Impaginazione a cura di: *Fabiana Ceccariglia*

ISBN: 979-12-5524-026-6

ISBN ebook: 979-12-5524-011-2

ISSN: 2612-0402 006

Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/49299>

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Via Santa Maria in Gradi 4 – 01100 Viterbo
www.easterneuropeanhistory.eu
eehr@unitus.it

Edizioni **SETTE CITTÀ**
Via Mazzini 87 – 01100 Viterbo
t. +39 0761 303020 – info@settecitta.eu

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW

Annually Historical Journal

n. 5/2022
Special Issue

**CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE
BETWEEN THE CHRISTIAN AND OTTOMAN WORLDS:
CONFLICTS, ENCOUNTERS AND COMPROMISES
(XVI-XVIII CENTURIES)**

Edited by
Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy

Co-edited by
Katalin Nagy

Special Partecipation of
Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE)



EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: LA RIVISTA

Il Comitato redazionale e scientifico è lieto di presentare al pubblico la rivista scientifica *Eastern European History Review*.

Con un carattere internazionale e interdisciplinare, una cadenza annuale e una fruibilità *open access* la rivista focalizza i propri interessi sulle dinamiche occorse nell'Europa Orientale durante tutta l'età moderna (XIV-XIX). *Eastern European History Review* è espressione del Centro Studi dell'Università della Tuscia CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna) nato nel 1997 per intuizione del Prof. Gaetano Platania, Direttore Emerito della Rivista.

L'iniziativa editoriale che presentiamo nasce dall'evidente mancanza in Italia di una rivista scientifica relativa alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale in Età Moderna, nonostante la penisola abbia giocato un ruolo fondamentale per la Storia e la Cultura di una parte integrante del continente, a torto considerata come lontana e periferica.

Consapevoli di questo, il Comitato ha posto quale obiettivo primario della *Eastern European History Review* quello di offrire uno spazio di riflessione e di discussione su temi che appartengono alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale, e insieme alle relazioni - politiche e culturali - che questa vasta area del Vecchio Continente ha avuto con l'occidente d'Europa, e l'Italia in particolare, incoraggiando il dialogo tra studiosi e esperti di settore, e tra differenti approcci della ricerca scientifica.

Il Comitato Redazionale e Scientifico

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: THE JOURNAL

The Editorial and Scientific Board are proud delighted to present the *Eastern European History Review* under the aegis of Sette Città Editore.

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV-XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997, from an idea of Prof. Gaetano Platania, today Director Emeritus of this journal.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History sciences.

The editorial initiative we present comes from the obvious lack of a journal, in Italy, concerning the history of Central and Eastern Europe during the Modern Age, this despite its fundamental role in the history and culture of that part of the continent, wrongly considered distant and peripheral.

Quite the contrary is true, in fact. Main objective of the journal is to create a space for reflection and discussion on topics pertaining to Central and Eastern Europe, but also relations with Continental Europe, encouraging dialogue between scholars and experts in the field, and between different approaches of scientific research.

The Editorial and Scientific Board

SUMMARY

Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy <i>Introduction</i>	9
Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE) <i>Presentation</i>	13
Katalin Nagy, Giulio Merlani <i>Gregorio XIII e l'Europa orientale: la visita apostolica del vescovo di Stagno Bonifacio de Stefani</i>	13
Florin Nicolae Ardelean <i>Contested Borderlands: war and territorial disputes between Transylvania and the Ottoman Empire (1594-1595)</i>	29
Gabriel-Felician Croitoru <i>The borders between Wallachia and the Giurgiu Kaza, an area of conflict and cooperation on the Imperial Ottoman Danube limes</i>	43
Tamás Kruppa <i>The written and oral disputes of István Szántó (Arator)</i>	59
Gábor Nemes <i>Instead of Anti-Ottoman help an Anti-Imperial League papal nuncio Giovanni Francesco Capi's mission of 1526</i>	71
Adrian Magina <i>"Nos Christiani qui habitamus in hac urbe Temesuar". Christians and Ottomans in Timișoara in the second half of 16th century</i>	83
Livia Magina <i>"Novitates de turcis scribit": spies and news about ottomans on borders of Transylvania and Southern parts up to 1526</i>	97
Valentin Cseh <i>The collapse of the border fortress system against the Ottoman Empire between 1521 and 1527</i>	111

Tamás Fedeles <i>From the army of King Matthias to the service of God. A case study on the role of the apostolic penitentiary in the promotions of clerics in the time of King Matthias Corvinus</i>	139
Viktor Kanász <i>Nuncio Girolamo Martinengo's reports on the military events of 1552</i>	161
Ágnes Szalai <i>Conflicts of joint sovereignty on the border of the Principality of Transylvania and the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the 17th century</i>	179
Piotr Chmiel <i>A third way. An attempt to reorient history of early modern Venetian/Italian connections with the Ottoman Empire and its borderlands</i>	199
Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy <i>Events that took place in the relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Venice: from the Cretan War (1645-1669) to the Alliance of 1684 according to Ottoman and Venetian sources</i>	215
Harun Tuncer <i>"News in papers are not that much credible!". Abdulhamid I and the efforts to follow the European press</i>	231
VARIA SECTION	
Michał Hirsch <i>The role of cardinal protectors of the Polish Crown in embassies of obedience in the 16th century – preparations for missions, ceremonies and diplomacy</i>	251
Bibliocard Csák Krisztina Csilla <i>I Barberini e l'Europa</i> , Acta Barberiana, vol. 5, edited by Tusor Péter and Boccolini, Alessandro. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2022.	277

INTRODUCTION

The advance of the Ottoman Empire in Europe in the Modern Age posed a threat to many European states. The conquest of Constantinople (later İstanbul) during the reign of Sultan Mehmed II (the Conqueror) in the XV century, followed by the Otranto expedition and siege, the Ottoman advance in Central Europe during the reign of Sultan Suleyman I in the XVI century, particularly the Siege of Vienna, as well as the successes of Chief Admiral Barbaros Hayreddin Pasha in the Mediterranean and many other similar events generated a sense of anxiety and fear in Europe for centuries. As a matter of fact, the phrase *Mamma li Turchi!*, used by Italians even today in response to negative events, dates back to this historical Turkish threat and the negative feeling it generated, which has its roots in the XV and XVI centuries.

It is rather challenging to cover such a broad subject as the relations between the Ottoman Empire and European states in the Modern Age, especially between the 16th and 18th centuries, in an introduction. However, in order to understand the dynamics between the Ottoman Empire and the Christian world, it would be useful to go back a little further and give a brief overview of how the parties viewed each other as an introduction to the subject. Starting from the Late Middle Ages until the middle of the Modern Age, the East and the West, in other words, the two worlds comprised mostly of Muslims and Christians, were in constant interaction with each other in a relationship that alternated between wars and trade. However, the fear became a dominant emotion in this intense and dynamic relationship from the XV century onwards. Although the world order changed due to geographical discoveries, the main region where the conflict of control and domination took place was the Mediterranean and Central-Eastern Europe. On the one hand, there was the Western Christian world, which had entered a new era with the Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia, and on the other was the Ottoman Empire, which had conquered Byzantium and its culture. From another perspective, it can be deduced that the conflict between these two sides evolved from a clash of "civilizations" to a clash of "powers" and gained a stronger political character at least since the XVI century¹. At this point, it is necessary to underline the differences between Western historiography and Ottoman historiography. For a long time, contrary to what Western historiography suggests, the Ottoman Empire did not carry out its conquests with the aim of forcibly converting the peoples of the conquered regions to Islam, however mainly aimed to expand the borders of the Empire². The distinguished Turkish historian Professor Halil İnalcık provided in his works important information on Ottoman conquest policy. For example, how the Ottomans conquered the Christian Balkans and managed to establish themselves there for so long remain a historical question even today. According to the old theory, Ottoman rule was manifested by force and persecution and lasted

1 Franco Cardini, *Il Turco a Vienna. Storia del grande assedio del 1683* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2011), 4.

2 Marko Jacov, *L'Europa tra conquiste ottomane e leghe sante* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana), 255.

as a regime of exploitation under the control of a military class of Sipahi³. However, according to the current historical analysis derived from research based on Ottoman archive documents, the Ottoman Empire was able to persuade the local Christian populations to peace and reconciliation thanks to the principles of *istimalet*⁴ and *aman* which meant looking out for the people, especially non-Muslim subjects, and treating them with clemency. The Ottoman Empire always offered the opponent three chances to surrender, and if the offer was accepted, a sworn “ahdname”⁵ guaranteed the opponent’s security of life and property. These guarantees were rigorously implemented, and many conquests were accomplished by this way. In fact, speaking about the Balkans again, it is known that Orthodox Greeks and Slavs often viewed the Ottoman regime as a protector of their Church. In addition, one of the main reasons for the long-lasting Ottoman rule in the conquered lands was the Ottoman tax-land system. Unlike the old feudal system, this system guaranteed the peasant’s land use through the *mîrî* land (State owned land that was transferred to those who use the right of disposition) regime⁶.

The Ottomans have been called “Turks” by the Western world for centuries. In the Modern Age, fear for the “Turk” has manifested as activities and efforts of “marginalization”, “vilification” and therefore “disparagement”. Turks have been the main representative of the “other” for Europeans for centuries, from the very beginning of Muslim-Christian contact⁷. However, the Ottoman Empire was not only a source of fear for the Western world, but also a source of great curiosity and fascination. In the West, most literary scientific works were written against the Ottomans, who were described as “*infidel*”. Thus, for centuries, the Ottomans were not only unlikeable and feared by Europeans, but also appealing and attractive. In addition to being “foreigners” for historical and geographical reasons, their traditions became the focus of interest for researchers and scholars as they were

3 The most distinguished group of the household cavalry troops in the Ottoman military system. Erhan Afyoncu, “Sipahi”, *DİA*, 37 (2009): 256-58.

4 The dictionary meaning of “*istimâlet*” is «to predispose, to appeal, to win the heart». In Ottoman chronicles it meant: «to look after the people, especially non-Muslim subjects, and be lenient towards them». Treating the people of conquered places well, protecting them, ensuring the security of life and property against external enemies, granting freedom in religious matters, facilitating taxation are the main elements of Ottoman *istimâlet*. See: Mücteba İlgürel, “İstimalet”, *DİA*, 27 (2001): 362.

5 A document issued by the order of the rulers to grant special rights to certain states, groups and individuals. See: Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu “Ahidname”, *DİA*, 1 (1988): 536-40.

6 Halil İnalcık, *Doğu Batı, Makaleler II* (Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2008), 248, 96-110. On Ottoman provincial administration and the fief system, see also Halil İnalcık, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ (1300-1600)*, trans. Ruşen Sezer (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995), 108-23. The work was first published in English. See Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, Classical Age (1300-1600)* (London: Nicholson Publishing, 1973).

7 Mustafa Soykut, *Papalık ve Venedik Belgelerinde Avrupa’nın Birliği ve Osmanlı Devleti (1453-1683)* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), 17, 24.

close or neighbors. In short, many works depicting the Ottomans and providing information about them appeared in the XVI and XVII centuries⁸. In many of these works, when Western historiography tried to explain the success of Ottoman progress, the concepts such as “religious fanaticism”, “oppression”, “persecution” were used, contrary to the information given above⁹.

Today it is still evident that such images persist in Western historiography. However a significant effort in consulting Ottoman and Turkish sources by historians would lead to a more objective perspective on the complex relationships between the Ottoman and Christian worlds.

The issue of Eastern European History Review titled *Central and South-Eastern Europe between the Christian and Ottoman Worlds: conflicts, encounters and compromises (XVI-XVIII centuries)*, contains 14 articles on the topic. This issue presents articles by researchers from different countries such as Italy, Hungary, Romania, Poland and Türkiye and was prepared in collaboration with *Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group* (ELKH-PPKE-PTE).

I extend my sincere appreciation to the director of EEHR, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Alessandro Boccolini for offering me the special editorship of this issue of the journal.

Dr. PhD. Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy
National Defense University, Türkiye

8 Giovanni Ricci, *Ossessione turca. In una retrovia cristiana dell'Europa moderna* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002), 41; Soykut, *Papalık ve Venedik Belgelerinde*, 19-24.

9 İnalçık, *Doğu Batı, Makaleler II*, 248.

THE VILMOS FRANKÓI VATICAN HISTORICAL RESEARCH GROUP (ELKH-PPKE-PTE)

The *Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group* of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Péter Pázmány Catholic University was established in the June of 2012 as the 'Impetus' Church History Research Group in the frame of the Church History Research Institute of the University founded by Rector Péter Erdő in 1999. It carries on independently the latter's publications (*Bibliotheca Historiae Ecclesiasticae Universitatis Catholicae de Petro Pázmány Nuncupatae*) and researches in Rome and in Vienna, with the involvement of academic and other funding sources. From 1st July 2017 onwards it performs its activity within the framework of the Supported Research Places Program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences visualizing its goals and professional identity also in its name. The official name from 2022: ELKH-PPKE-PTE *Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group*.

Its examinations concentrate decisively on political, diplomatic, cultural and institutional history. Its priority task is the systematic publication and processing of sources that has been heavily neglected since the age of positivism. The Vatican collections serve as the primary place of research, completed by the relating material – primarily in thematic context – of the Hungarian and Vienna archives and manuscript collections. Its publications provide space to the results of revealing of sources and historiographic works according to their scholarly profile (*Collectanea Textuum et Studiorum*), and separately to the Hungarian researches in the Vatican due to its particular importance (*Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae*). The long-term aim of the research institute is to serve as the professional framework of the establishment and efficient operation of an independent Hungarian institute of history in Rome of purely scientific nature. Owing to its academic background it pays special attention to the education of the future historian generation, to the engagement of students in certain phases of its work.

The main international cooperative partners are: Università della Tuscia (CESPoM-Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna), Universität Wien (Institut für Historische Theologie), Deutsches Historisches Institut in Rom, Università Pontificia Gregoriana (Facoltà di Storia e Beni Culturali della Chiesa), Archivio Apostolico Vaticano. The relevant common publications are published by Edizioni Setta Città and Duncker & Humblot

More info at: www.institutumfraknoi.hu



THE BORDERS BETWEEN WALLACHIA AND THE GIURGIU KAZA, AN AREA OF CONFLICT AND COOPERATION ON THE IMPERIAL OTTOMAN DANUBE LIMES

ABSTRACT

When the Ottomans created a new territorial entity with fixed borders at Giurgiu, this was due to Sultan Kanun's initiatives to centralize the Empire. The border between Wallachia and this new Ottoman region at Giurgiu dates back to 1544, but is later on confirmed by successive sources. Starting with the second half of the 16th century relations between the Ottoman authorities in Giurgiu and the rulers of Wallachia were not always conflictual. There were periods of cooperation and every act of transgression by Ottoman subjects on Wallachian soil were punished. At the same time, Romanian subjects tried to appeal to the Porte for help and protection whenever they were abused by Ottoman representatives, Christian or Muslim. As far as the Wallachian prices were concerned, the borders at Turnu, Giurgiu and Braila were a place for conflicts, violence, excesses and delinquents, largely because the area was lightly defended and lacked central authority. Giurgiu, a Muslim city on Christian lands, was however a tempting place for the inhabitants of Wallachia.

KEYWORDS: Ottomans; Wallachia; Danube; Giurgiu; Diplomacy.

In the Romanian Historiography, we have not ignored issues such as border disputes, but these are, of course, more common in the modern and contemporary works. For the Medieval Era however, the study of borders has been intermittent, without an exhaustive view on the area inhabited by the Romanian people. This was caused, on the one hand by the lack of documentary sources, and on the other by the state ideology when the studies were written. The subject of border analysis was sometimes in direct contradiction with the official line of the Historiography, which propagated the idea of a union between Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania going as far as the Middle Ages.

We should define the terms from the beginning. According to the contemporary sense, the *frontier* is a line drawn between certain points on the map, to define the limits for the territory of a state from other states, open seas or even cosmic space and going underground as far as modern means can reach. Frontiers are usually established through treaties between countries and naval frontiers through unilateral declarations. There are many types of borders: natural, geometric, astronomical, land, river, maritime and air borders¹.

In current tongue and broadly speaking *frontier*, *border* or *boundary* mean the demarcation line between countries, properties or settlements.

1 Petre Bărbulescu, Ionel Cloșcă, Nicolae Ecobescu, et al., eds., *Dicționar diplomatic* (București: Editura Politică, 1979), 446.

Despite the fact that in the Middle Ages the term of *frontier* had a slightly different meaning than today, it is undoubtedly that even then there were well-defined limits for the territories of states, both from a military and a political sense. In the case of Giurgiu, the creation, its existence and its evolution were strongly influenced by its status as a fortress-town on the border, and only after that, we could add its economic dimension.

During the Sultan led expedition of Mehmed I, which some sources place in 1417 or in the autumn of 1419, (we actually argue it was more likely to have happened in the spring of 1420), the Ottomans conquered Giurgiu. Its walls were damaged and required substantial repairs.

46 From an Ottoman perspective, Giurgiu was an important outpost for the protection of their Danube borders. It could control the river passing and control the trade coming from Wallachia. Some recent discoveries point to the fact that there was a strategic element as well². Both from a military and strategic point of view, the fortress, well defended by small isles and channels and close to the left bank of the river, was an excellent bridgehead for future campaigns. The Ottomans frequently attacked the territories north of the Danube, using the irregular troops of the Akinji. All of these points in mind, it is clear that the Ottomans were interested in holding Giurgiu and its limitrophe territory. Thus, they instituted a very strict administrative status similar to that of their vast empire. The non-believers were tolerated, order preserved and economical profitability prioritized³.

All of the known sources confirm that the conquest of Giurgiu did not mean the annexation of its hinterland. Despite this, the pattern of Ottoman conquests leads us to speculate that at first they only acquired the fortress on the island. Down the line, taking advantage of the inactivity of the Wallachian princes, they secured the outpost by expanding in the neighbouring regions. This slow but steady expansion made it necessary to have a written document, defining the borders between Giurgiu and Wallachia in the late Sixteenth Century.

This was similar to the way in which the Ottomans handled the larger bridgehead of Europa, earlier on, in the Fourteenth Century. In addition, this was their method of colonizing the Balkan countries, all done under a centralized policy based upon the superiority of their administrative skills compared to those of the local Balkan rulers⁴. To that we must add their religious tolerance, which was very important during those times. The Ottomans realised that a policy of the concessions towards the Orthodox Christians would allow them to accept Muslim rule and increase their revenue⁵.

Therefore, we cannot state that they occupied the city and its hinterland all at once, or if this territory was annexed later on, as part of peace deal between the Turks

2 Marian Coman, *Frontierele medievale ale Țării Românești* (PhD Thesis Summary: București University, 2011), 27.

3 Nicolas Vatin, *Ascensiunea otomanilor (1362-1451)*, in *Istoria Imperiului Otoman*, ed. Robert Mantran (București: Ed. All, 2001), 40.

4 Halil Inalcik, *Imperiul Otoman. Epoca clasică (1300-1600)* (București: Editura Enciclopedică, 1996), 55.

5 Inalcik, *Imperiul Otoman*, 56.

and Wallachia. However, it is more plausible that they first got the city, which was then reinforced. We know the Ottomans aimed at the conquering the Moravia Valley, towards the Middle Danube to subdue the Serbian territories and then Hungary. Later on, after they had taken the city, the Ottomans slowly expanded in the surrounding territories. This was done in style of medieval border marches. Lastly, we have to take into account the supply needs of Giurgiu and its substantial garrison, which had to rely on the food being produced on the left bank of the river. We can explain in this manner the inclusion of Giurgiu and its “dependencies”⁶ among the border fortresses of the Ottoman Empire, mentioned in the treaties with Hungary in 1479, 1503 and 1519.

We find a mention, albeit indirectly, about the border between Giurgiu and Wallachia in one of Vlad Țepeș's letter dated February 11, 1462. It was written in Giurgiu and the ruler describes the Turkish attempts of seizing the fortress. This was actually the start of his anti-Ottoman campaign⁷.

The formation of a territorial entity at Giurgiu could be attributed to Sultan Suleiman the Lawmaker (*Kanun*) also known as “The Magnificent” [1494-1566]. He was the one that initiated a centralized administrative system, which was to become the classical *eyelet*, *sancak*, *kaza* and *nahiye*⁸.

The first mention of a stable ottoman possession in Wallachia comes from 1544, during the reign of Radu Paisie (or Radu of Argeș, son of Radu the Great, which ruled intermittently from 1535-1545). An ancient Wallachian chronicles said that «[...] during his rule the Turks took Braila, Giurgiu and Turnu»⁹. At his settlement the prince was represented by the great vornic (governor) Constantin Coadă and the Great Ban of Oltenia¹⁰.

Another argument that proves this settlement was achieved in 1544 and not in 1546, as it was credited so far is the fact that the boyar Constantin Coadă held the title of great vornic between January 10, 1542, and February 28 1545¹¹. We know he was present in this quality in the commission that made that settlement at Braila¹² and it

-
- 6 Paul I. Cernovodeanu, “Cetatea Giurgiului. Studiu istorico-militar”, *Studii și materiale de muzeografie și istorie militară*, 2-3 (1969-1970): 85.
 - 7 Nicolae Iorga, *Scrisori de boieri. Scrisori de domni* (Vălenii de Munte: “Datina românească”, 1932), 167.
 - 8 Anca Popescu, “Vestigii ale organizării Dobrogei preotomane într-un defter din anul 1530”, in *Vocația istoriei: prinos profesorului Șerban Papacostea*, eds. Ovidiu Cristea and Șerban Lazăr (Brăila: Istros, 2008), 506.
 - 9 *Istoria politică și geografică a Țerei Românești, de la cea mai veche a sa întemeiere până la anul 1774*, trans. George Sion (București: Typographia Națională a lui Ștefan Rassidescu, 1863), 136.
 - 10 Sion, *Istoria politică*, 136.
 - 11 Nicolae Stoicescu, *Dicționar al marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova (secolele XIV-XVII)* (București: Edit. enciclopedică română, 1971), 45.
 - 12 In a document of 1643 about Radu of Izvorani (Great Ban, August 30, 1535 and May 18, 1539), it is stated that he died at Istanbul, «when he was accused in the Empire with the vornic Coadă that he gave up on Brăila to the Turks». Stoicescu, *Dicționar*, 95.

is known that he was a trusted member of Radu Paisie's inner circle.

When he took the reign, Mircea Ciobanu (1545-1552, 1553-1554 and 1558-1559) had to agree to the new borders in 1546¹³. The hostility of the boyars towards him seems to come from this agreement and the fact that he used this to blame the vornic Coadă as the main culprit for the territorial losses two weeks after he took the throne¹⁴. The same opinion about Coadă's blame was shared by the Ban Mihail Cantacuzino. He thought that «[...] it was the Vornic Coadă the one that split these cities [Braila, Giurgiu and Turnu] when they were given to the Turks. History also says that he was one of the traitors that worked towards this loss»¹⁵.

In this context its worth mentioning that the exact borders of the Giurgiu Kaza must be analysed with an eye on the bigger picture. During the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566) the Ottoman foreign policy was changing drastically with a new offensive to the European Centre¹⁶. It was not a coincidence that the settlement of borders between Giurgiu and Wallachia coincided with the conquest of Tighina (1538) and the occupation of Braila (1538-1540) and their conversion into kazas. It was also during the time of the creation of the pasalik of Buda (1541). Along the Danube, there was now a strong defensive belt for the Ottomans.

We cannot state the length of the Giurgiu kaza, as it was settled in 1544. We can agree with Constantinescu however. He stated that the Ottomans followed the Sub-Danube terrace as a frontier between Giurgiu and Wallachia. It was even stated that they wanted to control the Danube meadows, which is about 15-20 km from the river¹⁷. The length of the meadows varied in time and their height was 60-65 m compared to the riverbank¹⁸.

This assertion is backed by logical arguments, especially since in the Middle Ages borders tended to be settled on geographical structures, such as rivers, mountains etc.¹⁹. Both in the Eastern and Western worlds the idea of borders was not connected with fixed lines.²⁰ Instead, they relied on relative terms, unlike the Roman limes, for

13 Ion Heliade Rădulescu, *Elemente de historia românilor sau Dacia și România*, (București: Typographia Statului, 1869), 187.

14 Stolnicul Constantin Cantacuzino, *Istoria Țării Românești*, ed. Mihail Gregorian (București: Editura Minerva, 1984), 111.

15 Sion, *Istoria politică*, 136.

16 Tasin Gemil, "În fața impactului otoman", in *Petru Rareș*, ed. Leon Șimanschi (București: Editura Academiei, 1978), 136.

17 N.A. Constantinescu, "Întinderea raielelor cu deosebită privire la raiaua Giurgiului", *Anuar de geografie și antropogeografie*, 2 (1911): 70.

18 Constant Nițescu, "Monografia regiunii sud-estice a județului Vlașca. Contribuțiuni la cunoașterea caracterului agricol-tehnic și social-economic al regiunii", *Buletinul agriculturii (Supliment)*, 2 (1928): 10.

19 Ioan Marian Țiplic, "Hotar, graniță și/sau frontieră în Evul Mediu timpuriu", in *Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis*, 2 (2003): 156.

20 Jacques Le Goff and Jean-Claude Schmitt, *Dicționar tematic al Evului Mediu occidental* (Iași: Polirom, 2002), 138.

example²¹.

It is worth remembering that all other borders rectifications between Giurgiu and Wallachia happened from East to West, but not from North to South, which is exactly where the border followed the Danube terrace.

The “initial” borders between Giurgiu and Wallachia can be identified to some degree through Selim II’s firman (edict) granted to the ruler of Wallachia, Alexandru Mircea [1568-1577]. This firman confirmed the borders settled thirty years before that.

Four years later, another firman of Murad II (1574-1595) enforced the same borders, based on the findings of a “special commission”²². This was during the reign of Mihnea Turcitul (1577-1583, 1585-1591) in Wallachia²³. The documents asked that the borders, «as they were done before that» should be respected by the Turkish authorities in Giurgiu. This proves that there were some border disputes. To settle the conflicts and establish fixed borders and to put the border markers (*direk*)²⁴, the Wallachians sent some representatives, such as Ștefan. The Turks were represented by Behram bin-i-Abdullah, Casâm voivode, bin-i-Casim, Sinan bin-i-Mustafa, Mehmed bin-i, Behram bin-i-Yusuf. From Giurgiu came Ali bin-i, Yahya bin-i-Ali, Hasan bin-i-Ali, Elias bin-i-Piri, Davud bin-i-Hadâr. The judge (cadiu) of Cernavodă, Ahmed Efendi, was the one that settled the matter.

The border settlement started in:

the Eastern part of Giurgiu, in front of the Danube, in the area called Talambăcu-Bogazi²⁵, among the reeds, at the mound called Kuciuk Hislarlık²⁶; then they placed a sign at the mound called Beliclerbaşı²⁷, also known as Straja²⁸; then they placed a sign at that mound, and coming back from there they marked the lake called Chiriva-Golu²⁹ and placed another marker at the public road (Tarik-i-am). This road starts at the markers and goes to Marotin³⁰; then they marked a place

-
- 21 Dan Horia Mazilu, *Lege și fărădelege în lumea românească veche* (Iași: Polirom, 2006), 295.
 - 22 Mihail Guboglu, ed., *Catalogul documentelor turcești*, vol. I (București: Direcția generală a Arhivelor Statului din RPR, 1960), doc. 86, 43.
 - 23 Guboglu, *Catalogul*, vol. I, doc. 86, 43.
 - 24 Hagop Siruni, “Acte turcești privitoare la hotarele dunărene ale Țării Românești”, *Revista arhivelor*, V/1 (1942): 144.
 - 25 Unidentified; it could be Talămbaciu or Glămbocelul, a stream that runs in to the Argeș river, Siruni, “Acte turcești”, 161-65.
 - 26 Unidentified.
 - 27 Unidentified.
 - 28 The name of that mound could come from a permanent border point of Wallachia. Nicolae Stoicescu, *Curteni și slujitori. Contribuții la istoria armatei române* (București: Editura Militară, 1968), 316-17.
 - 29 Lake Criva.
 - 30 Today Frasin, Giurgiu County.

called Suniia³¹. It was agreed that fish in Lake Chiriva to go to Giurgiu with no interference from Wallachia. The deserted places in the Romanian side of Lake Chiriva belonging to Wallachia, they agreed they should be left as pastures for them with no interference from Turks. Also, the Turkish Raias will be allowed to bring their cattle to Lake Chiriva for watering. Going back to the markers put on the public road to Marotin and at the place they call Sulin³², they marked the valley near the village called Cosova³³ the Romanian places will belong to the Romanian areas and the places near Giurgiu to the city. It was settled that the fields would not be confused and that the places shall be owned by the former owners. They marked the place where this valley joins Cosova and the road called Calea Banului³⁴; they also marked this road at its ends. Then they marked the villages of Ului³⁵ and Paraipani³⁶ and Yenige Koi³⁷ of Wallachia and at the road that turns East from this village. Going back to the mark at the end of this road towards the lake known as Mihri golu³⁸, they reinforced the old marks there. New markers were added on the shores of Lake Mihri and on the road leading to the Danube; the fish here was to go to Giurgiu³⁹.

In 1669, during the reign of Antonie Vodă of Popești (1669-1672), a new border was agreed for the «restoration of the older borders»⁴⁰. In those times, «the estates of the country around Giurgiu are offended and breached by the people of that town»⁴¹. Gheorghe Băleanu, former Ban of Oltenia and current *mare vornic*, helped establish the new border, alongside Radul Crețulescu, former *mare logofăt* (chancellor) and

31 Unidentified.

32 Unidentified.

33 Probably Coșoveni or Onceasca, a hamlet of the village of Bălănoaia, «placed on the hills of the Danube, from Stănești». P.S. Antonescu-Remuși, *Dicționar geografic al județului Vlașca* (București: Stabilimentul grafic Socecu., 1890), 82.

34 Because the road (or “calea”) Banului appears as a border element in this settlement at Turnu, Giurgiu and Braila, we have to admit the hypothesis that in the Ban of Oltenia must have been in the first commission, Cf. Constantinescu, “Întinderea raielelor”, 71. The road to Banul also appears as a border element in a Ottoman document of 1819, under the same name, but in Turkish *Eski Ban Yolu*.

35 Unidentified.

36 In 1872 this hamlet was called Arasche, after the name of the owner of the estate. Today its part of the Vedea commune, Giurgiu County. Cf. Antonescu-Remuși, *Dicționar geografic*, 226

37 Could be Enichiom or Zlatum, «a valley with reeds in front of the village of Gostinu». Antonescu-Remuși, *Dicționar geografic*, 116.

38 The lake of Mahăru, near the village of Slobozia, Giurgiu County, is quite a large one: at the start of the XX century it had about 890 ha. Cf. Grigore Antipa, *Regiunea inundabilă a Dunării. Starea ei actuală și mijloace de a o pune în valoare* (București: Inst. de Arte grafice Carol Göbl 1910), 15.

39 Siruni, *Turkish documents*, 144-45.

40 Cf. Constantinescu, “Întinderea raielelor”, 73.

41 Sion, *Istoria politică*, 98.

other boyars and dignitaries. The Turkish side was represented by Hussein Selam-Agais, special envoy from the Sultan, Mehmed Efendi Endreneli, the *cadiu* of Rusciuk and other *cadii* from Giurgiu and Rușava – Haselim Efendi Ghiumulgalini. They started from the «estates of the Radu-Vodă monastery, Paraipanii and Recenii, north of Giurgiu, from the bank of the Danube straight to the estate of Odiovoaia, where they set a stone. From there beyond the pond⁴², at the mound that we call Mihnea Vodă's; from there on the valley towards the Ban's road, at the ends of the estates we call Stepănești (Stănești?), Gurbanul, Oțești (Oncești), Cossoveni, Frătești and Șirmănești (Daia), up untul Știubeiul near the lake and from thereto the Danube, at the mouth of that water called Cumasca⁴³, where they set a stone right on the river banks. The territories before those stone were left to the country. And the people of Giurgiu were not to cross those stones, because the *cadii* agreed that was the just border»⁴⁴.

Even so, it seems that this settlement of 1669 was breached right after Constantin Brâncoveanu was dethroned (1714). The «elders say that people of Giurgiu extended their lands and crossed the border from the East and from the West, making *senete* and *ciftlicuri*»⁴⁵, meaning estates. Furthermore, starting with the first reign of Nicolae Mavrocordat (1715-1716, 1719-1730) there were increasing cases of Ottoman and breaches into Wallachia from the Danube *kazas*. They entered in official positions or as simple individuals⁴⁶.

Another settlement was made on July 13 1764 and it is recorded in an Ottoman document of July 1802⁴⁷. It was done during the reign of Ștefan Racoviță (1764-1765):

North of the Gura Gârliei, which was shut by Constantin Vodă Brâncoveanu with șarampoaie (stakes), the border runs from the village belonging to the people of Giurgiu which we call Braniștea to Știubeii, at the estate of Șerbatesci⁴⁸ near a lake. From there it goes into the Ban's road to Zăgazu, where we find the borders of the Odiovoaiei estate, called today Mihnea Vodă's, through the river bed of the Pârâu up until Balta and from there straight to the banks of the Danube⁴⁹.

Alongside this new settlement, we find other agreements on the line of the Danube

42 Probably the pod of Mahâru.

43 A small arm of the Danube, near the hill and forest of Penciu. It flows near the villages of Băneasa, Meletie and Pietrele.

44 Sion, *Istoria politică*, 98-9.

45 Sion, *Istoria politică*, 98-9.

46 Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Despre regimul supușilor otomani în Țara Românească în veacul al XVIII-lea", *Studii*, 14/1 (1961): 89.

47 Mustafa A. Mehmet, ed., *Documente turcești privind istoria României*, vol. III: (1791-1812) (București: Editura Academiei, 1986), doc. 106, 164-65.

48 Probably Șerpătești, today Daia, Giurgiu County.

49 Sion, *Istoria politică*, 89-90.

between Wallachia and the Ottoman Empire⁵⁰ concerning some estates. The last known settlement was in 1796, a small one. The Wallachian Prince was represented by the *great paharnic* Vintilă Prejbeanu and Alexandru, *ex mare medelnicer*. They focused on the Western borders of the *kaza*, on the lands of the Paraipani estate.

Besides the settlements that concerned the border between Giurgiu and Wallachia, there were some other minor border agreements. From the correspondence of Mustafa Paşa, *muhafâzul*⁵¹ of Giurgiu and the Prince of Wallachia, Alexandru Şuţu in 1819 we find that the two parties agreed to cooperate in draining some neighbouring lakes. There were some agreements for (or between) the estates of Daia in Wallachia and the village of Oinak Koy (Oinac) of the Giurgiu *kaza*⁵².

Therefore, broadly speaking, until 1829, the limits of the Giurgiu *kaza* were the same as in the sixteenth century: starting from Arsache, passing Hodivoaia, Stăneşti, Bălănoaia, Frăţeşti, north of Oinac and Braniştea, reaching the Danube beyond the stream of Comasca, near Gostinu⁵³.

Other indicators of the borders of Giurgiu in the Middle Ages are represented by Daia and Hodivoaia (Odivoaia)⁵⁴, where some *Captaincies* existed⁵⁵ with border duties, tasked with looking out for the borders of Wallachia and follow the Prince's orders during war⁵⁶. At Daia and Hodivoaia, border settlements («two hours away from the fortress of Giurgiu»⁵⁷) there were some quarantine zones, to protect the people of Wallachia from contagious diseases such as plague, like in 1825⁵⁸.

Some settlements near Giurgiu which were mentioned in the border agreements were not part of the *kaza*. The village of Marotin (Frasin) was not part of the *kaza*, as stated by a document in March 19 1779 from the Metropolitan Church of Un-

50 Mihail Stăncescu, "O delimitare de moşie la hotarul Țării Româneşti în 1764", *Revista arhivelor*, 1 (1924): 131-32.

51 "Muhafâz" (*muhafız*): the one that guards and protects; the commander of a town.

52 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, doc. 1381, 272-73.

53 Scarlat A. Stăncescu, *Din trecutul oraşului Giurgiu* (Bucureşti: Institutul modern de Arte Grafice Unirea, 1935), 28.

54 The importance of the Hodivoaia marginal Captaincies is also given by the fact that for small cases, the captain had the right to sue for Vlaşca County. Cf. Sion, *Istoria politică*, 35.

55 In the middle of the Seventeenth century there were ten *Captaincies* in the area of Vlaşca County, with 120 servants at Cacleşti (Izvoru), Călugăreni, Podul Doamnei (both close to Videle), Frăsineşti, Găeşti, Hodivoaia, Izvor, Udeni and Meri (close to Găeşti). The border *Captaincy* at Hodivoaia had 23 servants. Cf. Olga Cicanci, "Informaţii despre organizarea administrativă şi fiscalitatea în Țara Românească (1764-1765) în opera lui Atanasie Comnen Ipsilanti", *Studii*, 19/2 (1966): 11/353-12/354).

56 Nicolae Stoicescu, "Despre organizarea pazei hotarelor în Țara Românească în sec. XV-XVII", *Studii şi materiale de istorie medie*, 4 (1960): 218.

57 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, doc. 1999, 401.

58 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, doc. 1999, 401; doc. 2234, 447-48; doc. 2235, 448.

gro-Wallachia during a divorce settlement between one Stana and her husband, Istrate, both from that village⁵⁹. If Marotin were a part of the *kaza* the situation would have been settled by the *cadiu* from Giurgiu⁶⁰. Similarly, the villages of Prundu, Puieni and Pietrele were on Wallachian territory at the end of the Eighteenth century having Church estates (Puieni was a part of the St. George monastery and Pietrele of the Cotroceni one, both from Bucharest) or noble estates, as was the case of Prundu under the lordship of the *vornic* Racoviță.

During the Sixteenth-Nineteenth centuries the abuses done by Ottoman subjects in the territories considered Wallachian were treated as such and punished. Romanian rulers felt within their rights to appeal to the Sultan for protection whenever Ottoman subjects breached their territories (be it Muslims, Christian, Turks, Tatars or otherwise). To counteract these acts, the Sultans often issued decrees to the Danube *kazas* to stop such activities⁶¹.

The Prince Mihai Racoviță (1730-1731, 1741-1744), for example, asked the Great Vizir Seyyid-Hassan Paşa in 1744 to stop the breach of the Wallachian borders and of its lakes formed by the Danube's overflow⁶².

Many of these conflicts were caused by agriculture. In 1768 Sultan Mustafa III (1757-1774) order the *vali*⁶³ of Oceaş, Mustafa Paşa and the *nazâr*⁶⁴ of Silistra to settle the boundary disputes between Wallachia and the *kaza* of Giurgiu caused by sowing. The same document warned the Paşa of Oceaş that the claims of the people of Giurgiu were unfounded, prohibiting them to sow, gather wood or otherwise infringe on the territories of Wallachia⁶⁵. The Sultan's decision was enforced immediately, announcing to the people of Giurgiu, called *raialâi*⁶⁶ or *serhatlâi*⁶⁷ that they mustn't sow or cut the wood from the land of Wallachia⁶⁸.

59 Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu, *În şalvari şi cu işlic. Biserică, sexualitate, căsătorie şi divorţ în Ţara Românească a secolului al XVIII-lea* (Bucureşti: Humanitas, 2011), 401.

60 There are some opinions, based on oral sources that claim that Daia and Marotin (Frasin) were actually a part of the Giurgiu *kaza*. Cf. Ion Boldescu, *Monografia oraşului Giurgiu* (Giurgiu: Institutul Grafic Ulpiu Stănculescu, 1912), 67.

61 Viorel Panaite, *Pace, război şi comerţ în Islam. Ţările Române şi dreptul otoman al popoarelor (secolele XV-XVII)* (Bucureşti: Ed. All, 1997), 349.

62 Valeriu Veliman, *Relaţiile româno-otomane (1711-1821). Documente turceşti* (Bucureşti: Direcția generală a Arhivelor Statului din RPR, 1984), doc. 110, 278.

63 "Vali": governor, the ruler of a province (vilayet or eyalet).

64 "Nazâr" (*nazir*): supervisor or the ruler of city.

65 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, doc. 254, 77.

66 From "raia" (turk: *re'âyâ*), which literally means "herd". Until the Seventeenth century, the Ottoman Empire recognized by this only the non-Muslim. After that, it included Muslims.

67 From "serhad" (*serhat*): border, frontier. "Serhatlâi": people on the fringes, frontiersmen.

68 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 77, doc. 255.

Despite this, in 1774 the Princial Chancellery told the Ottoman authorities that the people of Giurgiu occupied 17 estates that used to belong to Wallachia⁶⁹.

Although the Turks restricted the entry into Wallachia for the people in the *kazale*, during the reign of Alexandru Moruzi (1793-1796) and Constantin Hangerli (1797-1799) there were some people from Giurgiu roaming the Romanian villages from Vlaşca County, stealing produce from peasants or plowing their fields. In May 1796 some 15 huts made by Ottoman subjects from the *ciftik* of Hagi Minus-aga were demolished. Constantin Hangerli ordered the *inspravnic* from Vlaşca County to prevent the people of Giurgiu to cross the borders⁷⁰.

In 1801 the *capucheia* of the Wallachian ruler from Istanbul pointed out in a document (*takrir*) from April 15 addressed to the Chancellery of the Great Vizir that the *serhat* of Wallachia near Giurgiu are being overrun by the people of the *kaza*. The dignitary showed that, although there were strict orders to settle the borders, they were not enforced⁷¹. In July 1802 he pointed out to Sultan Selim III (1789-1807) the repeated violation of the Wallachian border by Giurgiu. He asked for the copies of former orders to enforce the borders and the issue of another one to settle the grievance:

Any strong advice that is given, despite illustrious orders issued for the removal of the intruders that attack the borders of Wallachia and occupy our estates, breaching the Imperial borders at the Danube, as in the *serhats* on Wlach soil, it is clear that at this moment some of the inhabitants of Giurgiu are disrespecting the established borders and are occupying Wallachian lands. This calamity makes the *raia* of Wallachian very upset as is the case with the owners of the estates. It is also apparent that even though there will be new orders issued, they will be without effect if we do not extract from the *chornicles* the old border lines established between Giurgiu and Wallachia [...]⁷².

Selim III replied in October 18-27 1802 with a *hатиşерif* in which, among other things, he ordered that none would enter Wallachia except on the basis of a *teşcherele*⁷³, since there were some many violations from the *sethatâli*. This new document had to be issued by a *zabit*⁷⁴ without infringing on the Romanian *raiale*. Also, the *ai-ani*⁷⁵ on the Danube, from Turnu, Giurgiu and Brăila were ordered not to send their *mubaşiri*⁷⁶ into Wallachia to cause problems there⁷⁷. In August-September 1806 the

69 Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Despre regimul", 17, doc. 103.

70 Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Despre regimul", 13, doc. 99.

71 Alexandrescu-Dersca, "Despre regimul", 158, doc. 669.

72 Mehmet, *Documente*, vol. III, 164-65.

73 "Teşcherea" (*tezkere*, *tezkire*): letter, permit.

74 "Zabit": one that rules, officer, leader, commander.

75 "Aian" (*a'yan*): notable figure, leader of a small community or a region.

76 "Mubaşir" (*mübaşir*): civil servant acting for the state or in place of a dignitary.

77 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 166, doc. 705.

capuchehaia came back with a new complaint with similar issues⁷⁸.

It's worth remembering that the Ottoman central authorities and those in Giurgiu assured the rulers in Bucharest that the old boundaries will be respected. As commanded by Sultan Ahmed III (1703-1730) on November 18/27 1714, the Ottoman authorities on the Danube were ordered to respect the sanctity of the Wallachian borders⁷⁹. Another example is the letter of 1751, signed by Mir Mustafa, Hasan and Selim, voivodes⁸⁰, *aiani* and *agale*⁸¹ of Giurgiu who promised that in peace times the Ottoman soldiers would not cross into Wallachia or cause any damage there⁸². The situation repeated itself in 1822; a report (*inha*) on October 14 from Mehmed Salih, *mufahâz* of Giurgiu, was sent to the ruler of Wallachia, Grigore Ghica. In it was said that in the future only *capalnâi* merchants⁸³ with official documents and the people of Giurgiu would be fined if they didn't refrain.⁸⁴ The *molla* of Rusciuc, es-Seid Mustafa, acted in a similar manner which proves that the people in Giurgiu were crossing illegally into Wallachia, as did the ones in Rusciuc, south of the Danube⁸⁵. Two years later, on September 13 1824, the *naib*⁸⁶ of Giurgiu, es-Seid Feizullah, told the Porte that he received the imperial firman ordering him to stop the crossings into Wallachia, except for the *capalnâi* and *serhatlâi* merchants. He assured his superiors that measure will be taken to prevent future border problems⁸⁷.

It is noteworthy that after each new appointment of a dignitary in Giurgiu, he would send letters of recommendation to Bucharest, always accompanied by gifts, as was the Oriental tradition. Mehmed, the new Aga of the Janissaries did just that on March 28 1824, when he sent to Grigore Ghica a letter expressing his wishes to cooperate⁸⁸. After being named *muhağfâz* of Giurgiu, Husein Paşa also sent a letter to the same Wallachian ruler on March 27 1825, calling for good relations⁸⁹.

We mustn't consider the relations between Giurgiu and Wallachia as constant bickering; there were moments of cooperation. On February 19 1826 the *mufahâz* of Giurgiu, Mustafa Paşa, sent a new letter to Ghica, in which he stated that he was

78 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 175, doc. 752.

79 Veliman, *Relațiile româno-otomane*, 94-6, doc. 16.

80 "Voievod" (*voyvoda*): administrator of a Vizir's estate.

81 "Aga" (*ağa*): military leader.

82 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 59, doc. 173.

83 Merchants from Kapan (warehouse), tasked with the resupply of the imperial capital markets and Danube cities with different items. Cf. Mustafa A. Mehmet, "O condică domnească din a doua jumătate a veacului al XVIII-lea scrisă în limba turcă, privind Țara Românească", *Revista arhivelor*, 2 (1958): 249.

84 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 291, doc. 1462.

85 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 292, doc. 1470.

86 "Naib": a *cadiu*'s help.

87 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 385, doc. 1919.

88 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 387, doc. 1927.

89 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 398, doc. 1983.

informed of the Wallachian ruler's visit to the village of Daia. The Prince greeted his envoy, returning from Istanbul. As a token of friendship, Mustafa sent the *cumbaragibaşa*⁹⁰, Mehmed Aga and Ahmed Aga, one of the *aga* of the city fortifications⁹¹. A few days later, on February 25, the *muhafâz* of Giurgiu invited the Prince to «visit for a few days and strengthen our friendship»⁹².

The Ottoman authorities in Giurgiu had to contend with illegal border crosses themselves. Some Wallachian subjects crossed the frontiers of the *kaza*. In 1826 a few gypsies fled Wallachia to Giurgiu and «after they committed robberies here as well», they fled the city even though the Prince of Wallachia demanded they return⁹³. In the Eighteenth Century some couples are mentioned fleeing to Giurgiu, where they could get married without the restrictions they had to endure in Wallachia. Giurgiu was definitely seen a refuge from the authorities in Bucharest. At the start of the Eighteenth Century, Maria Cantacuzion, a relative of the Prince, Nicolae Mavrocordat (1715-1716, 1719-1730) left Wallachia for Giurgiu to get married with Constantin Zaguriano, a Greek noble from the court⁹⁴. In 1786, one called Gheorghe with his partner, Maria, from the village of Ștefanda, Vlașca County, fled to Giurgiu and married there. They ended up staying for five years⁹⁵. Similarly, Petco and Neaga, from Singureni, also found refuge in Giurgiu, married there and even had a child in the city⁹⁶. These all mean that there weren't any major problems for the Wallachians to cross into the territory of Giurgiu.

As a result, Giurgiu, a city run the Muslims, but with a majority of population of Christian faith, offered some temptations. From a private life point of view, the freedoms there were quite appealing. Indirectly, the people of Wallachia found different ways to reach the *kaza*, some of them actually owning properties in the city. Interestingly, the *serhatlâi* of Giurgiu were more strictly regulated and prevented to roam the territories to the north.

For the Princes of Wallachia, the area around Giurgiu was seen as turbulent region, characterized by delinquencies and excesses. The area was lightly defended and the central authority there was scarcely represented⁹⁷. The Ottoman authorities found that it was in their interest to cooperate with the Wallachians in keeping the central decrees in effect. In an address on November 30 1822, the *aian* of Rusciuc, en-Seid Mustafa, announced to the Prince of Wallachia that he took all measure to stop all suspects, Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs or Albanian, to cross into Romanian lands. Mustafa also wanted the speedy arrival of a *capuchehaie* at Giurgiu to help him in

90 “Cumbaragi-başâ”: from *cumbara* (big bomb, shell) and *baş* (leader); the gunnery commander in a garrison.

91 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 434, doc. 2161.

92 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 434, doc. 2163.

93 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 436, doc. 2171.

94 Vintilă-Ghițulescu, *În șalvari și cu ișlic*, 125.

95 Vintilă-Ghițulescu, *În șalvari și cu ișlic*, 365-66.

96 Vintilă-Ghițulescu, *În șalvari și cu ișlic*, 366.

97 Mazilu, *Lege și fărădelege*, 296.

protecting the border⁹⁸.

One year later, the *muhafâz* Salih Mehmed told Ghica that he took coercitive actions against 30 Muslims and 4-5 Serbs who all grazed their horses on Romanian lands, terrifying the border villages⁹⁹. In 1826 some horses are mentioned, stolen from Wallachia and sold at Giurgiu¹⁰⁰.

Evidently, there were some abuses on the other side. Ahmed, an aide to the *muhafâz* of Giurgiu sent a letter to Grigore Ghica. In it he asserted that one Iorgu, the captain of Hodivoaia, is disturbing the Muslims of Giurgiu, curses and beats them. Ahmed could not explain such an attitude, since the Muslims were warned to be on their best behavior when they travelled into Wallachia¹⁰¹.

98 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 302, doc. 1512.

99 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 328-29, doc. 1637.

100 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 436, doc. 2171.

101 Guboglu, *Catalogul documentelor*, vol. I, 459, doc. 2293.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexandrescu-Dersca, Maria Matilda. "Despre regimul supușilor otomani în Țara Românească în veacul al XVIII-lea" [About the regime of the Ottoman subjects in Wallachia in the 18th century]. *Studii*, 14/1 (1961): 87-113.
- Antipa, Grigore. *Regiunea inundabilă a Dunării. Starea ei actuală și mijloace de a o pune în valoare* [Danube floodplain. Current state and means to enhance it]. București: Inst. de Arte grafice Carol Göbl, 1910.
- Antonescu-Remuși, P.S. *Dicționar geografic al județului Vlașca* [Geographical dictionary of Vlașca county]. București: Stabilimentul grafic Socecu, 1890.
- Bărbulescu Peter, Cloșcă Ionel, Ecobescu Nicolae, et al., coord. *Dicționar diplomatic* [Dictionary diplomatic]. București: Editura Politică, 1979.
- Boldescu, Ion, *Monografia orașului Giurgiu* [Monograph of the city of Giurgiu]. Giurgiu: Institutul Grafic Ulpiu Stănculescu, 1912.
- Cantacuzino, Constantin Stolnicul. *Istoria Țării Românești* [The History of the Wallachia], edited by Mihail Gregorian. București: Editura Minerva, 1984.
- Cernovodeanu, Paul. "Cetatea Giurgiului. Studiu istorico-militar" [Giurgiu Fortress. Historical-military study]. *Studii și materiale de muzeografie și istorie militară*, 2-3 (1969-1970): 76-107.
- Cicanci, Olga. "Informații despre organizarea administrativă și fiscalitatea în Țara Românească (1764-1765) în opera lui Atanasie Comnen Ipsilanti" [Information about the administrative organization and taxation in Wallachia (1764-1765) in the work of Atanasie Comnen Ipsilanti]. *Studii*, 19/2 (1966).
- Coman, Marian. *Frontierele medievale ale Țării Românești* [The medieval borders of Wallachia]. PhD Thesis Summary, București: București University, 2011.
- Constantinescu, N.A. "Întinderea raielor cu deosebită privire la raiaua Giurgiului" [The extent of the raia, with a special view of the Giurgiu raia]. *Anuar de geografie și antropogeografie*, 2 (1911).
- Gemil, Tasin. "În fața impactului otoman" [In the face of the Ottoman impact]. In *Petru Rareș*, edited by Leon Șimanschi, 136-50. București: Editura Academiei, 1978.
- Guboglu, Mihail, ed. *Catalogul documentelor turcești* [Catalog of Turkish documents], vol. I. București: București: Direcția generală a Arhivelor Statului din RPR, 1960.
- Inalcik, Halil. *Imperiul Otoman. Epoca clasică (1300-1600)* [The Ottoman Empire. The classical age (1300-1600)]. București: Editura Enciclopedică, 1996.
- Iorga, Nicolae. *Scrisori de boieri. Scrisori de domni* [Boyar letters. Rulers letters]. Vălenii de Munte: "Datina românească", 1932.
- Le Goff, Jacques and, Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *Dicționar tematic al Evului Mediu occidental* [Thematic dictionary of the Western Middle Age]. Iași: Polirom, 2002.
- Mazilu, Dan Horia. *Lege și fărâdelege în lumea românească veche* [Law and lawlessness in the old Romanian world]. Iași: Polirom, 2006.
- Mehmet, A. Mustafa. "O condică domnească din a doua jumătate a veacului al XVIII-lea scrisă în limba turcă, privind Țara Românească" [A royal condica from the second half of the 18th century written in Turkish, regarding Wallachia]. *Revista arhivelor*, 2 (1958): 248-60.
- Nițescu, Constant. "Monografia regiunii sud-estice a județului Vlașca. Contribuțiuni

- la cunoașterea caracterului agricol-tehnic și social-economic al regiunii” [Monograph of the south-eastern region of Vlaşca County. Contributions to the knowledge of the agricultural-technical and socio-economic character of the region]. *Buletinul agriculturii (Supliment)*, 2 (1928): 1-256.
- Popescu, Anca. “Vestigii ale organizării Dobrogei preotomane într-un defter din anul 1530” [Remains of the organization of pre-Ottoman Dobrogea in a defter from 1530], in *Vocația istoriei: prinos profesorului Șerban Papacostea*, edited by Ovidiu Cristea and Șerban Lazăr, 505-530. Brăila: Istros, 2008.
- Panaite, Viorel. *Pace, război și comerț în Islam. Țările Române și dreptul otoman al popoarelor (secolele XV-XVII)* [Peace, war and trade in Islam. The Romanian Lands and the Ottoman Law of the People (XV-XVII centuries)]. București: Ed. All, 1997.
- Rădulescu, Ion Heliade. *Elemente de historia românilor sau Dacia și România* [Elements of Romanian history or Dacia and Romania]. București: Typographia Statului, 1869.
- Siruni, Hagop D. “Acte turcești privitoare la hotarele dunărene ale Țării Românești” [Turkish documents regarding the Danube borders of Wallachia]. *Revista arhivelor*, V/1 (1942): 136-50.
- Stăncescu, Mihail. “O delimitare de moșie la hotarul Țării Românești în 1764” [A delimitation of the estate at the border of Wallachia in 1764]. *Revista arhivelor*, 1 (1924).
- Stăncescu, Scarlat A. *Din trecutul orașului Giurgiu* [From de past of the city of Giurgiu]. București: Institutul modern de Arte Grafice Unirea, 1935.
- Stoicescu, Nicolae. “Despre organizarea pazei hotarelor în Țara Românească în sec. XV-XVII” [The organization of the border guard in Wallachia in 15th-17th centuries]. *Studii și materiale de istorie medie*, 4 (1960): 191-222.
- Stoicescu, Nicolae. *Curteni și slujitori. Contribuții la istoria armatei române* [Courtiers and servants. Contributions to the history of the Romanian army]. București: Editura Militară, 1968.
- Stoicescu, Nicolae. *Dicționar al marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova (secolele XIV-XVII)* [Dictionary of the great rulers of the Wallachia and Moldavia (XIV-XVII centuries)]. București: Editura enciclopedică română, 1971.
- Sion, George, trans. *The political and geographical history of Wallachia, from it's oldest foundation until 1774* [Istoria politică și geografică a Țerei Romanesci, de la cea mai veche a sa întemeiere până la anul 1774]. București: Typographia Națională a lui Stefan Rassidesc, 1863.
- Mehmet, A. Mustafa, ed. *Documente turcești privind istoria României* [Turkish documents on the history of Romania], vol: III: (1791-1812). București: Editura Academiei, 1986.
- Țiplic, Ioan Marian. “Hotar, graniță și/sau frontieră în Evul Mediu timpuriu” [Boundary, border and/or frontier in the early Middle Ages]. *Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis*, 2 (2003): 155-65.
- Vatin, Nicolas. “Ascensiunea otomanilor (1362-1451)” [The rise of the Ottoman]. In *Istoria Imperiului Otoman*, edited by Robert Mantran. București: Ed. All, 2001.
- Veliman, Valeriu. *Relațiile româno-otomane (1711-1821). Documente turcești*

[Romanian-Ottoman relations (1711-1821). Turkish documents]. București: Direcția generală a Arhivelor Statului din RPR, 1984.

Vintilă-Ghițulescu, Constanța. *În șalvari și cu ișlic. Biserică, sexualitate, căsătorie și divorț în Țara Românească a secolului al XVIII-lea* [In shawls and shawl. Church, sexuality, marriage and divorce in Wallachia of the XVIII century]. București: Humanitas, 2011.