

AN UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPT ABOUT THE RELEGATION OF VOIVODE CONSTANTIN BRÂNCOVEANU

Abstract: In 1718 there appeared in Venice *Istoria delle moderne rivoluzioni della Valachia*, written by Anton-Maria Del Chiaro, who was, at first, secretary of the princely court chancellery of Wallachia during the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu, and then tutor to the children of the latter's successor to the throne, Ștefan Cantacuzino. The book presents the author's two-decade experience in a Christian country located at the gates of the Orient and provides a genuine overview of the Romanian society at the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the next. Many of the aspects recounted by the Italian are unique and cannot be found in the writings of other chroniclers of the time, which is why historiography has always sought confirmations from other preserved documentary sources. One such example is the scene of Voivode Constantin Brâncoveanu's relegation in the spring of 1714. In the fund of the Department of Manuscripts from the Cluj-Napoca Branch of the Romanian Academy Library, there is kept an original version of a manuscript compiled by an anonymous author, bearing the title *Brevis Descriptio Fatalis casus principis Valachiae Constantini Bassarabae Brancovan Anno 1714 (mille septingenti quatuordecim) die vero quarta mensis Aprilis Bukurestini Executa*, which refers to the aforementioned moment. It confirms the veracity of Del Chiaro's account and, at the same time, it represents a new, unpublished historical source about the dramatic events from the beginning of the 18th century in Wallachia.

Keywords: Wallachia, Constantin Brâncoveanu, the Ottoman Porte, Anton-Maria Del Chiaro, unpublished manuscript.

*

In 1718, there appeared in Venice a relatively modest printed text in terms of its number of pages, which was nonetheless rich in informational content. This is the reason why it was and continues to this day, to be highly appreciated by all those who are interested in the history of Wallachia during the timespan between the late 17th century and the beginning of the 18th. The author of the book entitled *Istoria delle moderne rivoluzioni della Valachia*,² a Florentine named Anton-Maria Del Chiaro,³ had been unknown, until then, in the literary landscape of the peninsula. In his memoir-based work, he offered Italian readers the experience he had lived in a European country located near the gates of the Orient, Muntenia, at first, as secretary of the court chancellery during the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu and, then, as tutor to the children of the latter's successor to the throne, Ștefan Cantacuzino. In the nearly two decades he spent on Romanian soil, through the frequent journeys he

¹ PhD. Anton Dörner, Scientific Researcher II, "George Barițiu" Institute of History, Cluj-Napoca, e-mail: domeranton@yahoo.com

² In Romanian translation, it appeared under the title *Revoluțiile Valahiei* (Wallachia's Revolutions), Iași: Editura Viața Românească, 1929, after a text from 1914 that was re-edited by Nicolae Iorga.

³ For biographical and bibliographical references concerning Anton-Maria Del Chiaro, see [www.treccani.it/Dizionario Biografico](http://www.treccani.it/Dizionario/Biografico) di Gino Benzoni.

undertook, also obliged by the nature of the office he filled, he managed to acquire thorough knowledge of the country and its people, the culture and the habits of the people here, from the simple peasants in the country to the well-off boyars. He also came to know the typical religious holidays of the Romanians and the practices associated with the Orthodox rite, the hierarchy and the everyday life at the court of the sovereign, the political relations between the Wallachian rulers and the Ottoman Empire, etc. In his narrative, particular attention is given to four rulers. He met some of them only tangentially (Șerban Cantacuzino, Nicolae Mavrocordat), while others he even served in different capacities (Constantin Brâncoveanu, Ștefan Cantacuzino). As secretary of the princely chancellery, he observed closely the intricate off-stage mechanisms of power during Brâncoveanu's reign, a ruler to whom he had also become sentimentally attached, which is why the latter occupies a larger space in the aforementioned memoirist account. This represents, in many respects, an unequalled historiographical source for the period of Brâncoveanu's reign in Wallachia. Besides being highly valuable, the historical information offered by Del Chiaro's writing is also often unique; among other things, he is, to our knowledge, the only author from the beginning of the 18th century who described in detail the dethronement of the Wallachian ruler by the representatives of the Sultan of Constantinople in the spring of 1714. This very aspect of singularity, characteristic of the dramatic events described (the published text includes several other episodes of this kind), caused a certain reluctance, among some historians, to unquestionably accept the Italian's claims, at least until the emergence of new, similar evidence provided by other authors who were contemporary with the events presented, making it possible to confront and substantiate the information in Del Chiaro's account.

In the fund of the Department of Manuscripts from the Cluj-Napoca Branch of the Romanian Academy Library, there is preserved – also in an original version – yet another document referring to the moment of Constantin Brâncoveanu's relegation, a document that may represent an argument upholding the veracity of Del Chiaro's account and serve, at the same time, as a new historical and informative source about the dramatic events that took place in Wallachia at the beginning of the 18th century. The original text, entitled *Brevis Descriptio Fatalis casus principis Valachiae Constantini Bassarabae Brancovan Anno 1714 (mille septingenti quatuordecim) die vero quarta mensis Aprilis Bukurestini Executa*,⁴ has so far remained unvalorised by the Romanian historiography.

The manuscript describes the events that occurred in Bucharest on 3-6 April 1714. The writing preserved in the above-mentioned collection may be regarded as information attached to a private or to a diplomatic letter. Personally, we are inclined to credit the latter version, according to which the author must have been the official of a European state, sent to the court of Wallachia's ruler for a purpose that is not revealed in the text itself. It is not clear whether he came to Bucharest at the same time as the Turkish army or whether he already was, in that period, in the capital of Muntenia, in Brâncoveanu's entourage. It is a well-known fact that the Wallachian

⁴ Library of the Romanian Academy - Cluj-Napoca Branch. Department of Manuscripts. The Kemény József Collection.

ruler entertained secret high-level relations with several European monarchs,⁵ and that they sent, in turn, officials entrusted with the mission to inform the entire continent about the Turks' movements and intentions in the Balkan area. An argument in favour of a foreign diplomatic presence is provided by the stereotypical language used therein. The description of an event is short, clear and precise, without unnecessary flourishes. Where necessary, further explanation is given, sometimes with a didactic intent, which suggests that the addressee required these details in order to properly understand the information conveyed to him. By contrast, the author of the narrative is familiar with both Turkish and the administrative structures of the Ottoman Empire. For example, he explains what responsibilities the position of *kapudju* of the Porte⁶ entails, the meaning of the words *masil*⁷ or *hatiserif*.⁸ He reproduces a summary of the speech delivered by the *kapudju* in Osman in the prince's audience hall, after which he also transcribes the speech of the envoy of the Ottoman court at Văcărești. All the aforementioned aspects denote that the person whom he addressed was definitely not from Transylvania, for the explanations highlighted by the writer would have been known here, even by persons with a lower political and intellectual training. What remains to be done is to search, in Central or Western Europe, the recipient to whom our unknown author sent this description.

The essence of the 4 pages of the report fully confirms the data in Del Chiaro's writing about the moment of Brâncoveanu's dismissal. Sometimes, the two sources complement each other with elements that eluded or were unknown to either of the authors, of course, all to the benefit of historiography. But let us reconstruct, in what follows, the moments of the Wallachian ruler's arrest, using as a starting source the anonymous manuscript from Cluj. We shall complete the gaps then with the information included in the creation of the Italian Del Chiaro, who is more generous in the details he supplies.

The preamble of the arrest action started on **3 April 1714**, with the arrival in Bucharest, at the order of the Vizier from Constantinople, of the *kapudju* of the Imperial Porte (*Aulae Supremi Sultani Camerarius*).⁹ The latter had accompanied 1,200 workers sent to carry out a task on the Prut River. Once in the capital, he sent a delegation to announce his presence at the princely court for the next day.

*

Del Chiaro's account does not feature this episode. However, we learn other interesting details from him: the name of the *kapudju* was Aga Mustafa, one of Brâncoveanu's oldest friends at the Porte, and his destination appears to have been the fortress of Hotin; the day of the arrival was Tuesday, 4 April, the third day of Easter

⁵ The Ottomans' first count of indictment against Constantin Brâncoveanu was that he had maintained a secret correspondence with the Emperor of Austria, the Tsar of Russia, the King of Poland and the Venetian doges.

⁶ *Kaputschi Bassa-Aulae Supremi Sultani Camerarius, se non Camerarium*.

⁷ *masil (idest degradatum)*.

⁸ *decretum Imperatorium (hatischeriff dictum)*.

⁹ The porter of the seraglio from Constantinople, the chamberlain (quartermaster) of the Ottoman sultan.

in the Christian calendar. This last detail, which is highly important, betrays the princely secretary's dating mistake; based on the specifications made by the Italian, the date in the original manuscript from Cluj, 3 April, was the correct chronology. The error is understandable, since Del Chiaro wrote his memoirs a few years after the facts he narrated. The different terminologies used in the two sources for the position Mustafa occupied in the Ottoman hierarchy (pasha, aga) represent by no means a fault of either of the authors. Both titles were employed to designate a high-ranking official in the political system of Constantinople.

4 April. According to custom, the next morning Brâncoveanu sent to the *kapudju*'s place of abode a festively adorned horse and a body of Seymen soldiers to accompany him to the palace. With an escort of about 30 Muslim soldiers, he entered the reception hall where the prince, descended from the throne, was already on his way to greet him in a friendly manner. The newly arrived, however, without further ado, snapped at him that under the supreme decree of the sultan, he would be deposed and compelled to leave, with his entire family, for the Porte, under the direct supervision of the Ottoman *imbrohör* (*Supremum Stabuli Magistrum Imperatoris*).¹⁰ Amidst the general consternation, the *kapudju* read, then, in Turkish, in front of all those present, the firman of the Porte with all the accusations of infidelity levelled against Brâncoveanu, which included: meeting with the Tsar's emissaries at Brăila; providing the Russians with food supplies; the introduction a new system of taxation on the country that had spoliated the people; the failure to comply with the place of residence imposed by the Turkish authorities and the establishment, at his sole discretion, of another such place, where he lived for longer periods of time than in Bucharest.¹¹ Amid the commotion and uproar created by this unexpected occurrence, the *kapudju* then addressed himself, in a threatening tone, to the boyars present at the event in the reception hall, telling them that if they did not accept the sultan's directive and did not vouchsafe the arrest of the ruler and his family, he was under orders to summon the Tartars, as soon as possible, to devastate the entire country. Under such circumstances, unprepared for such forceful action, the Wallachian courtiers unanimously decided to abide by the decree of the Porte and to take Brâncoveanu and his relatives under their guard. This was followed by Turkish officials speedily sealing the location of the treasury and of the voivode's private treasure, after which the *kapudju* returned to his place of accommodation. At noon, in the general confusion instituted in Bucharest, the *imbrohör* arrived accompanied by not too large a suite, of about 200 Ottoman soldiers,¹² whose purpose was, for now, not known to the population. He set camp in the immediate proximity of the capital, whence he came to the sultan's quartermaster, to inquire about the course of events from the princely palace.

*

¹⁰ The overseer of the Ottoman sultan's stables, who was sometimes sent to the Romanian Countries on a mission to relegate the ruler in office and, then, to enthrone a new one.

¹¹ The reference is to Mogoșoaia Palace.

¹² An uncertain figure because of the manner in which the document was arranged into book form.

An extremely hectic day for the political life of Wallachia, rendered almost identically – with small exceptions – by both sources. In fact, the two texts complement each other. The anonymous author of the unpublished manuscript from Cluj knew, approximately, of course, the number of the *kapudju*'s escorts, he pinpointed the specific accusations made against Brâncoveanu in the sultan's relegation ordinance, faithfully conveyed the discussions Mustafa Aga engaged in, at the princely audience hall, with the Wallachian boyars, and insisted on their reactions. By contrast, Del Chiaro described the concrete way in which the relegation unfolded and knew many other details about what had occurred outside the audience hall where the sovereign's dethronement had taken place. Thus, he showed that the palace doors had been guarded by heavily armed elite soldiers in the service of the Grand Vizier, who had been brought in specifically to prevent anyone from getting out of or entering the room, and whose mission, in case of necessity, was to intervene in force. He then described the atmosphere in the streets of Bucharest, the rumours regarding the attempts of the ruler's son to flee to Italy or the imminent attack by an army of 12,000 Turks on the capital. He lived intensely the events happening before his eyes, openly showed his sympathy for the drama Brâncoveanu and his family went through and insisted on their human reactions throughout the entire day.

5 April. In the morning, the *imbrohör* convened the boyars from Bucharest to Văcărești, to accompany him to the place of abode reserved for him in the capital. The procession was carried out with great pomp, in the sound of music, everyone being in good humour. Here the *imbrohör* read to the people present a new hattishef issued by the Sultan, declaring once again, officially, Brâncoveanu's dethronement on the grounds of infidelity. He presented the order issued by the Porte Sovereign that the nobles should elect a new ruler, leaving at their discretion whether the designated person would be indigenous or a foreigner. On hearing the variants offered by the imperial decree, those present shouted in a chorus that they did not want a foreign ruler, but one from their own ranks. The decision concerning the nomination of the new Wallachian sovereign was delayed until after the Ottoman officials' lunch. After eating, the assembly met again with the envoys from Constantinople, and the boyars communicated their decision regarding the ruler they had chosen, i.e., the high sword-bearer (*Supremum Regni Generalem*) Ștefan Cantacuzino, approved both by the *kapudju* and by the *imbrohör*. On hearing his name invoked and the acclamations that resounded everywhere, the elected ruler tried to flee for fear of impending misfortune, but was detained by the soldiers and brought, against his will, before the emissaries of the sultan. They explained to him and to those present that they received a refusal from the nominee, they had an imperial mandate to summon the Ottoman troops, which were already by the country's border, ready to intervene, and consisting of 4,000 Tatars and 6,000 Turks. Moreover, they had upon them two more hattishefs issued by the Porte for summoning 40,000 Tatars and 1,200 from the contingent stationed in Sofia, in to put the country to fire and sword. Hearing these ominous words, they all agreed to designate Ștefan Cantacuzino as the new ruler. There followed the enthronement ceremony. The *imbrohör* was called to place the princely kaftan on the shoulders of the elected ruler,

in the name of the sultan and amid the cheers of those present. After putting on his coat, a Turkish parade horse was brought in, pompously equipped, which was mounted by Ștefan Cantacuzino, guarded, on the left, also on horseback, by the *kapudju* and by the *imbrohör* on the right. The whole procession, cheerfully accompanied by cheers and volleys of weapons, as well as by about 1,000 soldiers, headed then to the princely palace in Bucharest. Before crossing the threshold of his new residence, the recently elected ruler went first to the metropolitan church in Bucharest to receive the blessing of the Orthodox superior. Once the ceremony was concluded, the Turks began to tackle a much more important mission for them, taking over the country's treasury and Brâncoveanu's wealth, previously sealed.

*

The information found in both sources is consistent regarding this day. In Del Chiaro's account, there are more colourful details through which the events are rendered: the events took place on Holy Thursday and the feast of the Annunciation, the kaftan placed on Ștefan Cantacuzino's shoulders was not princely, but improvised, as the *kapudju* took his own coat off and put it on the new ruler's shoulders (subsequently, the high sword-bearer's own kaftan was brought and Cantacuzino was enthroned wearing it), the coronation process is presented in utmost detail, as is the homage paid by the boyars, who kissed the hand of the elected voivode. The Italian also mentioned three relatively significant moments that the anonymous manuscript from Cluj did not convey. First, the preamble to the action of electing Cantacuzino as a ruler. In the description, there appears the sword-bearer's refusal to seize power and his fleeing attempt. By contrast, Del Chiaro recounts the subterfuges of this story with a moral. The Ottoman emissaries and the boyars were engaged in a series of intense disputes regarding the right person for the princely throne; all the proposals made by the boyars were rejected by the representatives of the Porte and Cantacuzino's final nomination was imposed by the will of the *kapudju*. What Brâncoveanu's secretary failed to mention, however, were the reasons why the boyars so easily accepted Cantacuzino's appointment, and the cause is found, as we have seen, in the lines of the narrative manuscript we have presented. In fact, Del Chiaro reproduced even the suspicion of several domestic power holders, showing that all this performance had been orchestrated by the Cantacuzino family, first at the Porte, and then continued and directed here, in the country. The second issue that was not mentioned by our anonymous author was the visit undertaken by the new ruler to the place of Brâncoveanu's house arrest and the dialogue with him. In their conversation, the new ruler assured Brâncoveanu of his total innocence in the action of involuntary enthronement and commended the merits of the detainee. Contrary to all the ceremonies of the Princely Court, throughout their meeting Ștefan Cantacuzino stood, while Brâncoveanu sat on a chair with the kuka on his head! The third information unrecorded or unknown by the manuscript from Cluj, but which can serve as an argument supporting the possibility that the Cantacuzinos had intervened in Constantinople to obtain the Wallachian throne was based on a reference coming from the boyars at the court. In Del Chiaro's account, immediately after the exchange

of courtesies between the two rulers, who would henceforth have a different power status, the new ruler, extremely impatient, proceeded straightaway to assign the positions in the state, replacing all of Brâncoveanu's followers with the nobles who were loyal to him. This haste left a negative impression not only on the Wallachian boyars, but also on the foreigners present in the capital; an incomprehensible gesture, all the more since the two were relatives and there was required a minimum respect for the old sovereign, who was still present in the chambers of the same palace as a prisoner.

6 April. Around noon, the former ruler Constantin Brâncoveanu, with his four sons and three other members of his family (his daughters were allowed to remain in the country), accompanied by the *kapudju* of the Porte and military units, who were joined by three Walachian boyars, began the journey of no return to Constantinople. The first short stop was by the Danube, where the necessary preparations were made for crossing the river.

*

The events of the day presented very briefly by our unknown author may be supplemented by other data from Del Chiaro's account. Thus, the latter states that attempts were made by some of the boyars to delay the departure because it was a feast day (Good Friday), but the advocates of the Cantacuzino party urged the *imbrohör* to set off with the convoy, claiming that there was the possibility of an Austrian attack that might lead to Brâncoveanu's release. The procession set off in the evening. On leaving the palace and climbing down the stairs, Ștefan Cantacuzino (bareheaded, without the kuka!) accompanied the former ruler to the carriage, where they had another brief conversation, in which the old voivode asked God for the forgiveness of his enemies' sins. The Italian, however, does not say anything concrete about the three relatives that accompanied him in captivity, stating that Brâncoveanu was joined, in his journey, by his wife, their four sons. He adds that the wife of the eldest son¹³ and the latter's child, together with Brâncoveanu's four sons-in-law remained in the capital. The princely secretary shows that the sad convoy reached the Danube the next morning, on the holy feast of Easter.

8 April. The procession crossed the river at Rusciuc; thence, it continued the journey to Constantinople.

*

The information is found in both sources. With a divine invocation at the end, the manuscript preserved in the library from Cluj ends here, while Del Chiaro provides other images that complete the picture of that day. Thus, the *imbrohör* who remained in Bucharest opened the treasure sealed by the *kapudju* and made its inventory. Then, by public announcement, he continued the action of searching other prized possessions. He arrested Constantin Brâncoveanu's secret treasurer and his

¹³ The reference is to Constantin.

Prime Minister, Văcărescu,¹⁴ suspected to know of other hidden assets of the former ruler. However, the activity carried out by the *imbrohor* in Wallachia was above expectations, and the riches seized and transported to the Porte astonished even the sultan.

Including this unpublished manuscript, preserved in the cultural institution from Cluj, in the historiographical circuit will contribute to a better understanding of the biography of the Wallachian rulers from the beginning of the 18th century.

**Brevis Descriptio Fatalis Casus Principis Valachiae Constantini
Bassarabae de Brancován¹⁵ Anno 1714 die vero quarta mensis Aprilis
Bukurestini Executa.**

Die 3-tia Aprilis appulit Bukurestum Aulae Supremi Sultani Camerarius, Kapischti Bassa, se non Camerarium, verum ordinar Vezérii officialem pro educendis 1200 Laboratoribus hominum Flumen Pruth purgatum, ad Principem delegatum esse nominando, secunda die ~ idest quarta ejusdem [~] minit Princeps ornatum equum, ac Selymenones Milites, ut solito honore ad Aulam praefatus Turca Conventum Principem veniat, adveniens itaque Turca cum 30 circiter secum habentibus Turcis ad Principem eum praeprimis salutavit, ac illico effarus est dicens : Decretum Supremi Sultani est Te esse masil (idest degradatum) ac cum tota Domo Filiis tuis et Generis debere proficisci Constantinopolim, compatior tibi ac doleo tām ingrata tibi tulissé mandata. Post haec verba Decretum Hatischeriff dictum per Turcicum scribam legi curat, cujus contentia haec erat : Si quidem nos Te Constantinum Brancovanum indignum ac infidelem reperivimus, qui Muscovitas Brailam duxisti, Annonam illis subministrasti, novas contributiones Regno imposuisti, ac per eas spoliasti, neque a nobis tibi destinata Residentia contentus fuisti, vérum tibi pro placito aliam constituisti Residentiam ibique magis plurimum residebas; Hos itaque ac etiam complures aliis ob tuos errores, a Principatu te degradamus, utque cum integra tua Domo et Familia huc ad nos venias mandamus, eum etiam in finem, nostrum Supremum Stabulae Praefectum ad te expedivimus. Quo mandato Sultani perlecto clamavit Turca: Bojarlár, Bojarlár, idest Bojarones sive Nobiles convorabat, concurrerunt, quibus indem exponendo Decretum Imperatoris, alloquutus est illos dicendo : An velitis Vestrum Principem ac ejus Filios et Generos, in Vestram summere Fidejussionem, ne quisquam illorum fugiat, donec accipiantur, vel véro mandatum ad Tartaros mittam (quistant parati) ut hanc inuant Provinciam totamque devastat responderunt Bojarones omnes praestare velle Fidejussionem pro Principe, quam Turca ab ipsis scripto tenus expetiit, ac ea accepta, proposuit itdem mandatum Supremum Sultani esse ut ac alterum habere, verum parati sunt cum praesente

¹⁴ The reference is to Ianche Văcărescu, who was executed at the Porte at the same time with the former voivode.

¹⁵ The diacritical marks belong to the author.

Principe con[...] ¹⁶ Imperatore comparere, falsasque has refutare accusationes, q[ui] Bojaronum audito Sermone Turca, etsi ab ipsismet scripto tenus fidejussionem habuit, duos tamen suis pro custodia Principis constituit Turcas, illicoque ad Cameram seu Cassam c[um] reliquis suis Turcis properavit, interiorem etiam Principis Domum sub suum posuit sigillum, peractaque sigillatione ac vigiliis in omnibus Januis constitutis, prandisqui ibidem sumpt [...] ¹⁷ ad suum se vertit hospitium, indeque venientem cum 200[...] ¹⁸ circiter confinariis militibus Turcis Supremum Stabuli Magistrum Imperatoris de actione certioravit, quinta ejusdem idest sequenti die matutino tempore ipsummet etiam Supr[emum] Imperatoris Stabuli Praefectum ad vicinum Pagum Vakarest appulisse Bajarones percipiendo, omnes obviam cum musica ac splendida Pompa iverunt, pariterqui Bukurestum ad dest [ra] ¹⁹ natum Hospitium introduxerunt, ubi illico alterum Decretum Imperatorium (Hatischeriff dictum) in praesentia omnium perlectum est, cujus tenor erat hic : Cum nos Constantinum Br[an]covanum ob ejus infidelia acta degradati Jussimus, pleno nostro Supr[emum] Stabuli Praefecto dedimus facultatem, ut quem vos Regni nostri Valachiae Bajarones, pro Principis fideliter gerendo munere sive extraneum, sive de Gremis Vestri eligeritis, nomine nostro confirmet; Quod dum Bajarones lectum Imperatoris audiissent mandatum, exclamarunt omnes nolle extraneum, verum de Gremio Regni, quorum vere Supr[emum] Stabuli Praefectus audita, ad suas Domos illis pransum ac pensitatum discedendi (donec et ipse prandeat) ac iterum ²⁰ redeundi facultatem pribuit. Prandis itaque iterum ad eundem Supremum Stabuli Praefectum, ibidemqui insimul existentem prius nominatum Kampischer Bassa omnes concurrerunt, ac una voce nutuqui omnes Stephanum Supremum Regni Generalem pro Principe elegisse exclamarunt, ipse vero Praefectus Stephanus hoc audito clamore effugere voluit, at fugam ei denegatam in praesentia duorum Praefectorum Imperatorum ministrorum invitus etiam ductus est, cui Supremus Stabuli Praefectus locutus est in hanc modum : Situ Electionem Regni renuis Imperatoriae voluntati te reddis inobedientem, scitote itaque si renueris, habeo parata 6 millia confiniorum militum, item 4 millia Tartarorum in confiniiis, praeterquam quod et Decreta expediverim, unum ad Tartarorum Hannum, ut 40 millia Tartarorum suppeditet, alterum ad Soffiensem Bassam 1200 properet, in eum finem, si vel minimam Imperatoriae voluntati resistentiam fuero expertus illico totam Provinciam in Praedam tradam; Quibus verbis auditis Bojarones iterum exclamarunt: Hunc Stephanum eligimus, hunc volumus, hunc confirmatique ²¹ rogamus, ad querum omnium exclamationem Stephanum Cantacuzenum toties dictus Stabuli Praefectus invitum etiam vestre Imperiali Kafftam dicta induit, nomineque sui Imperatoris, Valachiae Principem nominavit, auspicantibus Bajaronibus omnibus, aliisque adstantibus, Vivat, vivat. Indutum itaque

¹⁶ The letters are no longer discernible because of the system of binding the manuscript between the covers of the volume.

¹⁷ A few letters are covered because of the manuscript binding system.

¹⁸ A likely manner of reading due to the manuscript binding system.

¹⁹ A few letters are covered because of the manuscript binding system.

²⁰ The word was written twice, the first version being erased.

²¹ Next comes a word that was struck through.

vestre Imperiali Stephanum super ornatum Imperatorium Equm conscendere qvibet Turca, ipsisque ambobus equm conscendentibus Turcis, ad dextram scilicet ipso Supremo Stabuli Praefecto, ad sinistram vero Kampischtzi Bassa concomitantibus, reliqua etiam tota Bajarorum cohorte subsequente in residentiam introduxerunt, ubi praeprimis intrando Stephanus Princeps Ecclesiam debitas Deo fudit preces, et post in Palatium ductus, pro moreque solito a praefatis Turcis, totaque Bojarorum consensu inthronizatus est, quem etiam in signum laetitiae irmis[?] tormentorum ac 1000 circiter militum explosionibus sclopetorum salutarunt, cum magno omnium augurio, Vivat Princeps Stephanus. His ceremoniis peractis Turcae intimarunt deposito Principi velle illum crastina die e loco movere, uti et sequenti die 6-ta ejusdem circa meridiem una cum quatuor Filiis et tribus Generis (Filiabus in loco permissis) praefatum Principem sub suam custodiam Kapischtzi Bassa acceptum movit, comitati sunt ad unum fere miliare duae Compagni circiter militum Regni, tres vero Bajarones usque Danubium Ge[...]goffum²² appulit ibidem mansit, 8-va trajecit Danubium ad Rusztanch, inde iter continuavit Constantinopolium versus. Ipse vero Supremus Stabuli Praefectus mansit Bukuresti cuncta bona mobilia et immobilia depositi Principis conscripturus. Quid exhinc emerget Deo soli notum est, hoc unicum constat quod omnium bonorum Provisores in arrestum adduci curet, quosdam etiam favoritas praecedentis principis incaptivet.

²² One or two letters are covered because of the manuscript binding system. The reference is probably to Giurgiu.