

Regards sur l'entrée des Balkans dans l'histoire européenne moderne

FROM ALLEGIANCE TO CONQUEST. OTTOMANS AND MOLDO-WALLACHIANS FROM THE LATE FOURTEENTH TO MID SIXTEENTH CENTURIES (I)

VIOREL PANAITE

(Institute for South-East European Studies)

The political moments when the voivodes had accepted to pay tribute and to submit themselves to the Porte were called acknowledgments of allegiance (*inclinare*, in Moldo-Wallachian chronicles). In Wallachia, this allegiance was established during Mircea the Elder's reign (1386–1418) and its conditions changed in 1462 at Radu the Handsome's enthronement, even though a complete and long-term submission was imposed in the third decade of the sixteenth century. In Moldavia, the paying of tribute began in 1455–1456 and ended in 1538, but also the peace agreements concluded by Stephen the Great with Mehmed II Fatih (in 1480–1481) and Bayezid II (in 1486) were relevant episodes. Despite the resistance and peace agreements from the late-fourteenth to the mid-sixteenth century, Wallachia and Moldavia were conquered by sultans, who would consequently invoke the “right of sword” (*kılıç hakkı*) over them. In Ottoman documents of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, the idea of conquest was usually connected frequently to Süleyman the Magnificent, as a turning-point in the relations of the Porte with the tributary principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia.

Keywords: Wallachia, Moldavia, Ottoman Empire, homage-paying, allegiance, conquest.

In the following pages my attention will be focused on deciphering the various meanings of the notions “allegiance”, “submission” and “conquest”, often used in a narrow significance. In this respect, I have used various Ottoman narrative and official sources, as well as Byzantine, Moldavian, Wallachian and Western ones.

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS OF ALLEGIANCE

1.1. Terminology

Simple or phrasal verbs of Ottoman chronicles and documents, as *boyun eğmek*, *boyun vermek*, *tapmak*, *itâ'at ve inkiyâd etmek*, *yüz sürümek*, *yüz sürmek* etc, have both concrete and abstract meanings. They can be translated with a figurative meaning, as “to obey”, “to submit”, “to pay homage”, “to reverence”, “to acknowledge allegiance”, or with a proper signification, as “to bend”, “to hang one's head down”, “to make a low bow.” In this regard, we should note the presence of concrete nouns like “head,” “neck” (*baş*, *boyun*), or abstract terms like

Rev. Études Sud-Est Europ., XLVIII, 1–4, p. 211–231, Bucarest, 2010

“submission,” “obeisance,” “allegiance” (*itâ‘at, inkıyâd, muti, münkad*) in constructions of phrasal verbs.

Let us also underline the abundant, but diffuse, use in Ottoman translation (“to rub one’s face,” “to pay one’s humble respect or homage to a superior,” “to prostrate oneself humble,” “to bow,” “to humbly kowtow”) in descriptions of ceremony taking place at the sultan’s court (e.g. reception of tributary princes, envoys, Ottoman dignitaries etc.) or in designation of acknowledgment of allegiance. For instance, according to the terminology used in the 1480–1481 *‘ahdname*, the conclusion of peace with Mehmed II Fatih implied beforehand that Stephen the Great “rubbed his face against the land of servitude” (*zemin-i hizmete yüz sürüyüb*). Also, Sa’adedin used the verb *yüz sürmek* when describing the ceremony of reception by the sultan of the Anatolian and Rumelian *beylerbeyis*, as well as of the envoy sent by the Hungarian king Mathias Corvinus:

“The Hungarian envoy, coming as well, he rubbed his face against the Court-shelter of the world.” (*Ungurus kıralın dahi elçisi gelüb Dergâh-ı Cihânpenâha yüz sürdü*)

Yet, another Ottoman chronicler, Mehmed Neşri, relating Mehmed II’s campaign of 1462 and the settlement of the relations with the Wallachian boyards, used the verb *tapmak*, which means “to bend”, “to hang one’s head down”, “to make low bows”, but also “to meet someone”.¹

Also, the Ottoman chancery had its own expressions that were meant to define the relationship with tributary princes, as follows: *sadâkat ü-istikâmet*,² two synonyms which can be translated “faithfulness and loyalty” or “fidelity and devotion; *‘ubudiyet ü-itâ‘at*, *‘ubudiyet ü-rıkkıyet*, *itâ‘at ü-inkıyâd*, which means “obedience and submission,” “obeisance and servitude,” “homage paying,” “acknowledgment of allegiance.” Unfortunately, it is difficult to define precisely the legal meanings of these terms, due to the fact they were abundantly used in both *‘ahdnames* granted to Western states like Venice, England, Poland etc.³ and documents relating to tribute-payer princes. Thus, before 1475, according to the 1476 *fetihname*, the prince Stephen the Great of Moldavia was in

“a state of obeisance and of tribute payer condition and of real submission and servitude towards my Imperial Threshold”⁴

¹ *Redhouse*, 540, 564, 804, 823, 1095, 1267; Sa’adedin, *Tevarih*, in Decei, “Sulhâme,” 125, n. 6; Gemil, *Documente turc.*, 304; Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 1, 73, 164, 437; Neşri, *Tarih*, ed. Unat, Köymen, II, 757; Decei, “Sulhname,” 122.

² Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 42, 209.

³ In 1540 *‘ahdnâme* to Venice, “request of submission” (*‘arz-ı ‘ubudiyet*) (Gökbilgin, “Belgeler I,” 121).

⁴ In the *fethnâme* of 1476: *Atebe-i ‘aliyyeme şol ki resm-i itâ‘at ve harâc-güzârî ve mahz-ı ‘ubudiyet ü hidmetkârî der-i müeddî kılurken* (Gemil, “Fetih-nâme,” 254, 257).

Also, in 1641 George Rákoczy I sent a “letter of submission” (translated in Turkish as *‘ubudiyet-name*) towards the sultan Ibrahim (1640–1648), promising at the same time to deliver the tribute due to the Porte in his quality of *harâcgüzar*.⁵

The Greek word *proskynesis* was invariably translated as “bowing”, “prostration”, “adoration” etc., being encountered in fifteenth century Byzantine chronicles together with other related expressions, e.g. “to bow one’s head,” “to bend”.⁶ It lay at the origin of the term *închinare* used abundantly in the Wallachian and Moldavian annals or official documents.⁷

1.2. General significations

Analyzing the Moldo-Wallachian sources, one can say that the Romanian term *închinare* was used with various meanings. Here are the most important ones.

Prostration was a custom characteristic to the Christian ritual, marking the recognition of God (and, implicitly, of God’s church) as supreme lord. The Romanian term *închinare* was abundantly used with this signification in Wallachian and Moldavian sources.⁸

Prostration was also a simple ceremony practiced at a sovereign’s court with or without a slight political charge. In Byzantium, where etiquette was of utmost importance, the reception of envoys and vassal princes was accompanied by their “prostration” (*proskynesis*) in front of the Basileus. Ducas, relating the siege of Constantinople by Murad II in 1422, presents a certain Dan (the future Dan II of Wallachia) who, after having left the sultan’s encampment in that of the Basileus “prostrated in front of the emperor (*proskynesas to basilei*) and asked for permission to go straightly to his country.” Having an Oriental origin, the humble prostration in front of a superior in the hierarchy of power was also taken over, on the Roman – Byzantine channel, by the aulic ceremony in Southeastern Europe, including the Ottoman, Wallachian and Moldavian courts. The emissaries sent to the Sultan’s Court, either to negotiate peace treaties or for less important problems, invariably bowed in front of sultans. Here is a case, chosen at random. In 1484, “an envoy came from the Hungarian king too, bowing before the world-protecting Court.”⁹

⁵ Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 106. In October 1613, Radu Mihnea, Ștefan II Tomșa and Gabriel Bethlen were sworn in submission to the serdar Iskender pasha, as “tributaries” (*harâcgüzarlar*) (Decei, *Imp. otoman*, 370).

⁶ *Proskyno* means to prostrate (M. A. Bailly, *Dictionnaire grec-français*, Paris, 1894, p. 1670); Ducas, *Istoria*, 262–3, 429, 430, 435.

⁷ See, *Letopisețul cantacuzinesc*, passim; Miron Costin, *Letopisețul*, passim; Nicolae Costin, *Letopisețul*, passim etc.

⁸ *Letopisețul cantacuzinesc*, 25, 190; Nicolae Costin, *Letopisețul*, 164.

⁹ Ducas, *Istoria*, XXIX/7; Solakzade, *Tarih*, in *Cronici turc. I*, 145; Sa’adeddin, *Tevarih*, in *Cronici turc. I*, 327, 329.

Prostration designated also the acceptance of a new prince by his subjects (dignitaries, noblemen and people). The word *închinare* was frequently used with this signification in narrative and official Moldavian and Wallachian sources. In 1476, coming to the throne for the third time, Vlad the Impaler was writing to the inhabitants of Braşov: “all the Wallachian country and its boyars paid homage to me.”¹⁰ According to the *Cantacuzine Annals*, as well as to other Wallachian chronicles, the submission ceremony of the boyars and of the country was a standard action accomplished whenever a voivode came to the throne, since legendary Radu voivode up to Şerban Cantacuzino.¹¹

Anyway, this customary practice, actually equivalent to the recognition of the new sovereign, was widespread during the Middle Ages and it is also to be found with the Ottomans. Homage paying by state dignitaries (*bey'at*), loosely translated as acknowledgment of allegiance, accompanied and completed the ceremony of enthronement of a new sultan (*cülüs*).

Let us also mention that in the eighteenth century, the acceptance by local high officials and nobles of Phanariote voivodes appointed directly by sultan, as well as their recognition as rulers meant – from the Ottoman point of view – a new homage-paying towards the Sublime Porte. Thus, in an order (*hüküm*) of the summer of 1123/1711, Ahmed III asked the Moldavian notabilities to obey Ioan Mavrocordat as a head official (*kaymakam*) for,

“paying homage and submitting to my High State (*taraf-ı Devlet-i aliyye'me itâ'at ve inkıyâd edüb*)..., and obeying him, they shall be protected as before under my imperial shelter.”¹²

Capitulation was usually used to call that method by which were regulated relations between two armies at war. In fifteenth century Byzantine chronicles, the term *proskynesis* was used whenever fortresses or towns capitulated in front of the victorious Ottoman military commanders. The signification of “capitulation” was often represented by the term *închinare* in Wallachian and Moldavian sources. After military resistance against the Ottoman army, the Moldavian voivode, Ioan Vodă cel Cumplit, accepted to surrender: “He started delivering messages of capitulation to them...” said Grigore Ureche.¹³ This is only a military capitulation, although initially some Moldavian boyars advised him to submit politically to Selim II even before starting the rebellion:

“Either acknowledge allegiance towards the sultan or leave for foreign countries, but do not set out against the Turks.”¹⁴

¹⁰ Tocilescu, *534 documente*, doc. 102.

¹¹ *Letopiseşul cantacuzinesc*, 2, 19, 45–6, 50, 89, 103, 175.

¹² Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 1.

¹³ Ureche, *Letopiseş*, 147 (*Începu a trimite la dânşii că să va închina...*).

¹⁴ *Cronica lui Azarie*, in *CSR*, 151.

Acknowledgment of allegiance indicated usually a medieval political moment in which a prince accepted the trusteeship of a superior power center, i.e. a more powerful sovereign who became by this act his suzerain. The term *închinare* can be frequently found with this signification in the Moldavian and Wallachian medieval chronicles, sometimes in official documents as well, as an expression of the relations established between Wallachian princes and Hungarian kings or between Moldavian hospodars and kings of Poland. Let us mention a few examples, not in the chronological order of the historical events – which is of secondary importance in this case –, but in that of their registration by sources. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Vladislav III was writing to the inhabitants of Braşov

“that I paid homage with absolute fairness to the holy crown and to his <Royal> Highness the king and to the Transylvanian voivode, as well as to all Hungarian noblemen and to you.”¹⁵

According to the Cantacuzine Annals, the Wallachian voivode Nicolae Alexandru (1352–1364) as a result of his conflict with the king of Hungary

“submitted and went to the king <to present him> with plenty of gifts, with a thousand golden *hrivne*, paying homage and promising an annual poll-tax.”¹⁶

At Colomeea, in 1485, Stephen the Great paid personal homage towards Kazimir IV. How did he do this?

“Prostrating to the king in accordance with the Moldavian custom, <i.e.> bending the flag to the king’s feet.”¹⁷

The term *închinare* was used by Wallachian and Moldavian chroniclers even in defining the political relations that were going to be established between Transylvania and the Habsburg Empire. Thus, the Transylvanian nobles promised George Basta the Transylvanian throne of Michael the Brave, “and we shall pay homage the emperor with all the country.”¹⁸ From this point of view, the homage paying to the Porte, discussed below, is a particular case belonging to the medieval ordinary and frequent practice, mentioned above. Thus, in Grigore Ureche’s opinion, Selim II banished Bogdan Lăpuşneanu (1568–1572) because of his close

¹⁵ Tocilescu, *534 documente*, doc. 279 (letter of 2 July, without year, anyway between 1523–1525).

¹⁶ *Letopiseţul Cantacuzinesc*, 80 (*plecă capul şi mersă la craiul cu mari daruri, cu mie de hrivne de aur de s-au închinat şi s-au făgădui că-i va da dajdie pe an*).

¹⁷ Nicolae Costin, *Letopiseţ*, 124 (*închinându-se craiului după obiceiul moldovenesc, plecând steagul Ţării la picioarele craiului*). Later, John Albert besieged the fortress Suceava “hoping that the country would obey <to him>” (Ureche, *Letopiseţ*, 54: *să va închina ţara*). See, also, other examples in Nicolae Costin, *Letopiseţ*, 129 (*Ştefan vodă să nu se închine la Turcu...*); Ureche, *Letopiseţ*, 83 (in 1509, *Vasco oarecarile de ai noştri... s-au închinat la leşi*). See, also, Victor Eskenasy, “Omagiul lui Ştefan cel Mare de la Colomeea (1485). Note pe marginea unui ceremonial medieval.” *AIIAI*, XX, 1983, 257–67.

¹⁸ *Letopiseţul Cantacuzinesc*, 198 (*şi noi să fim închinaţi împăratului cu toată ţara*).

relationship with Poland, which could have turned into “homage paying” to the Polish king by Moldavia. Therefore, the sultan

“reckoned <the Moldavian voivode> not to break his oath and turn his thoughts to that country and to surrender his country, lest he should have many accounts to settle with the Poles.”¹⁹

1.3. Myth of crucial episodes

The Romanian term *închinare*, having the signification of an initial, unique and crucial episode (‘the first moment,’ ‘firstly,’ ‘they first devised and began’, ‘ever since’ etc.), was the most belated, being imposed by eighteenth-century Wallachian and Moldavian chroniclers and boyars.²⁰ Paying homage was depicted by them as military, political and diplomatic actions which took place in end fourteenth – mid sixteenth century interval, having a special signification and decisive consequences in the future evolution of the legal status of the principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania.

About Wallachia, both the author of the *Cantacuzine Annals* and the chronicler Radu Popescu assigned the initiation of this political decision to Basarab Laiotă (more reigns in 1473–1477), “who yielded the country to the Turks.”²¹ Late-eighteenth-century scholar Ienache Văcărescu considered that this landmark has to be settled during the reign of Mircea the Older’s successor, Mihail I (1418–1420):

“Wallachia was yielded... They decided it and in a public assembly in the year 1418 and 820 the voivode and the boyars willingly yielded Wallachia to the emperor Mehmed the First and became tributaries.”²²

Still variations exist. In a petition submitted in August 1772 to the attention of count Orlof, the Russian representative at the Congress of Focșani, they promoted the idea of two Wallachian acknowledgments of allegiance towards the Porte.

The first is said to have been initiated by Mircea the Older who at an undetermined date – anyway, before the battle of Rovine in 1395 – “yielded the country to the Turk” (*a închinat țara turcului*). “The second submission or paying homage” was justified by a seventy-year period of “release” and is said to have taken place during Basarab Laiotă (yet, in the inappropriate year of 1462!) when “the Voivode himself, of his own accord, yielded the country.”²³ However, there

¹⁹ Ureche, *Letopiseș*, 139 (*socoti să nu să lepede dispre dânsul și să să lipască spre aceia parte și să închine țara, mai apoi să nu aibă mai multă gâlceavă cu leșii*).

²⁰ In Walachian and Moldavian chronicles: *întiași dată, mai întâi, au izvodit întâi și au început, de atunci* etc.

²¹ *Letopiseșul Cantacuzinesc*, 4; Popescu, *Istoriile*, 252 (*care au închinat țara turcilor*).

²² Văcărescu, *Istorie*, 204 (*Mihai Vodă sin Mircea Vodă... S-a închinat Valahia... Au hotărât și cu sfat de obște la leat 1418 și 820, domnul cu boierii au închinat Țara Românească fără război la împăratul Mehmed cel dintîiu și s-au făcut tributar*).

²³ *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, 495–9.

are differences between the two episodes, concerning both the circumstances (in comparison with the first homage paying, Basarab Laiotă himself was the initiator this time), and the irreversible consequences (“Laiotă Basarab Voivode, in the year of 1460. The one who in absolute submission, yielded the country to the Turks...”).²⁴

The idea of the existence of two Wallachian acknowledgments of allegiance towards the Porte was also emphasized by the brothers Tunusli in the Greek edition of the ban Mihai Cantacuzino’s work, published at Vienna in 1806, and subsequently translated into Romanian by G. Sion. Moreover, it equalized the terms homage paying, submission, *proskynesis* and capitulation, but with chronological ambiguity and overlapping of personalities. So, it is about “the first capitulation (*proskynesis*) of Wallachia towards the Ottoman Porte under Mircea Voivod. In the year of 1383” and “The second capitulation” (*Devtera proskynesis. En etei 1460*), initiated by Basarab Laiotă, but in 1460.²⁵

As concerns Moldavia, the seventeenth and eighteenth-century tradition, noticed – with many chronological ambiguities and overlapping of personalities, as in the case of Wallachia – by Dimitrie Cantemir and Moldavian chroniclers, and taken over by eighteenth and nineteenth century Western scholars, as Thomas Thornton, assigned the acknowledgments of submission to the voivodes Bogdan III the Blind in 1512 and Petru Rareș in 1529. Let us note also that in many 20th century studies of Southeastern Europe history the reign of Stephen the Great’s son, Bogdan III, and 1512 are still wrongly considered as a turning point episode of the relations between the Porte and Moldavia.²⁶

In the mythical view, the voivode Stephen the Great (1457–1504), “alarmed at the conquests of the Turks over the Hungarians, the Tartars and the Wallachians, and fearing to rely either on the Poles and the Germans, advised with the last breath the surrender of his country to the Ottoman power in the name of a fief, if the inhabitants could obtain peace on honorable terms, together with the preservation of their civil and ecclesiastical laws.”²⁷ It would be firstly Bogdan III the Blind, who in 1512 would follow his father’s advice and submit Moldavia to the Turks, receiving in return a so-called “Capitulation.”

“Learning the lesson from his father, Stephen the Great, he sent the great chancellor Tăutu to the Turkish empire, with servants, infantry, foot soldiers ... to carry the tribute, ten burdens of money – wrote

²⁴ *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, 67 (*Laiot Basarab Voevod, la anul 1460. Acesta este carele cu totul s’a supus, închinând Țara Românească la Turci...*).

²⁵ *Istoria Țării Românești, politică și geografică, de la cea mai veche întemeiere până la anul 1774, acum pentru prima dată editată prin toată grija cinstiților și iubitorilor de neam frații Tunusli*, Viena, 1806, 125; *Istoria Țerei Romănesci de frații Tunusli*, tradusă de G. Sion, București, 1863, 66.

²⁶ For instance: Sugar, *South-eastern Europe*, 121, 322 (“1512 Moldavia becomes vassal state”).

²⁷ Thornton, *Turkey*, II, 312.

Grigore Ureche – and acknowledged allegiance of all the country towards the sultan Süleyman, the Turkish emperor.”²⁸

Consequently, the sultan accepted the Moldavian prince’s homage and his “small sum of money” which, having once obtained, they soon found means of reducing to a real tribute. But, in exchange, the sultan left them the privilege of electing their own governors on every vacancy, subject to the approbation of the Porte.²⁹ Here is Dimitrie Cantemir’s account from his history of the Ottoman Empire:

“Moldavia made a fief of the Empire. XVII. Whilst *Soliman* after the taking of the City, staid in the neighborhood some days to refresh his army, *Teutuk Lagotheta* is sent in embassy by *Bogdan* Prince of Moldavia to the Turkish camp. Having obtained an audience, he declares his mission from the Moldavian Prince and People, to offer the Sultan both *Moldavia’s* upon honorable terms, particularly that their Religion should be preserved entire, and the country be subject as a fief to the Empire. Nothing could be more grateful to *Soliman*, whose more weighty affairs hindered him from turning his arms that way, and yet the defeats received from the Moldavians, obliged him to have always an eye to their motions. Wherefore readily accepting the offered terms, he confirms them with his own hand, and delivers him the instruments to be carried to his Prince at *Soczava*. Afterwards in his return from that year’s expedition he is met near *Sophia* a City of *Servia* by *Bogdan* with some of his Barons, and presented by him with four thousand gold Crowns, forty bred Mares, and twenty four Falcons, with a promise to send yearly to *Constantinople* the like present in token of his feudal subjection. The Emperor admits the Prince to his presence, and again ratifies the conditions made with the Ambassador, gives him a larger *Cucca* adorned with jewels, with a *Chylaat fahire*, and a horse with all the imperial trappings. Moreover he orders four of his guard to attend him, which custom is still observed whenever the Prince of *Moldavia* comes to the *Othoman Court*.”³⁰

²⁸ Ureche, *Letopiseș*, 78 (*Pre învățătura tătine-său, a lui Ștefan vodă, trimis-au la împărăția turcilor pre Tăutul logofătul cel mare, cu slujitori, pedestrime, dărăbani de au dus birul, zece povară de bani și s-au închinatu cu toată țara la sultan Suleimanu împăratul turcescu*). See, also Nicolae Costin, *Letopiseș*, 154 (... *i s-au închinat cu toată țara*); Cantemir, *Descrierea Moldovei*, 270 (*Bogdan cel Chior a închinat turcilor Moldova*); Neculce, *O samă de cuvinte*, X(12) (*când au închinat țara la turci*); Alexandru Beldiman, *Tractaturile prin care s-au închinat țara, de către Bogdan vovod, domnu al Moldoviei, împărățind Baizet al 2-lea*, BAR, ms. 566, f. 126v–136. For discussions on this event, see N. Bălcescu, “Ioan Tăutul, marele logofăt al Moldovei.” *Magazin istoric pentru Dacia*” (Bucarest) I, 1845, 135–7; Maxim, “Cantemir,” 69–78; Gorovei, “Casa Păcii,” 629–67 (with accurate interpretations of sources).

²⁹ Thornton, *Turkey*, II, 312.

³⁰ Cantemir, *Othman History*, 186–9 and n. 28–34; Cantemir, *Imp. otoman*, I, 75, n. 24.

According to the same local tradition, after the conquest of Buda, the new prince Petru Rareș of Moldavia (1527–1538; 1541–1546), should acknowledge also his submission by paying homage to Süleyman the Magnificent in 1529. Let us emphasize that the above-mentioned episodes are marked by confusions of personages and data, which increased the distrust in these accounts, transforming them in simple legends. As a matter of fact, the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century English scholar Richard Knolles, who proved an accurate interpretation of precedent sources, did not mention any substantial political change that it should occur in the years 1512 or 1529 in connection with Moldavia.

Transylvania's acknowledgment of submission of the first part of the sixteenth century did not cause so many confusions as in the case of Wallachia and Moldavia. Anyway, the decisive event in the subsequent evolution of the relations with the Ottoman Empire was assigned – according to certain Moldo-Wallachian chronicles – to John Sigismund Zápolya in 1541:

“7049. Süleyman, after king Janosz's death, took hold of Buda and the Hungarian Belgrade..., and gave Transylvania to the king's son – George Brancović accounted. And it is ever since that Transylvania had remained under the infidels' domination.”³¹

Ottoman sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also invoked – on the occasion of abuses denunciation – ancient acknowledgments of allegiance of Wallachian and Moldavian voivodes towards the Porte but without offering any chronological details. I have met an example in a *hüküm* of 1769 which reiterated the Moldavians' obligation to obey the sultan's orders but also their rights to be protected. In this order, Mustafa III appealed to – as an argument – the fact that the Moldavian principality (*Memleket-i Boğdan*) “has since times of yore been yielded to and obeying my High Devlet”.³²

2. ELEMENTS OF THE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS OF ALLEGIANCE

Şükrullah's account on the peace agreement concluded between Mehmed I Çelebi and Mircea the Older in 1417 is an example of acknowledgment of allegiance. It is a summary record, like the other accounts on fifteenth-century pacts with Southeastern Europe princes, which could imply more or less elements of a homage paying. The chronicler noted briefly its preceding actions, i.e. force threat, peace request, negotiations, and then the proper acknowledgment of submission, i.e. oaths, compact, tribute payment. First, force threat being used (the

³¹ Brancovici, *Cronica*, 73 (7049. Suliiman, dupre moartea craiului Ianoș, au luat Buda și Belgradul cel unguresc..., iar fiului craiului au dat Ardealul. Și de atunci au rămas Ardealul supt ascultarea păgânilor).

³² *öteden berü Devlet-i aliyye' me muti ve münkad olan* (Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 164 : *hüküm* of 1183 *evâhir-i Receb* / 1769 November 20–29).

sultan “went to the infidel from Wallachia”, said the chronicler), subsequently, the Wallachian prince requested peace (“seeing the greatness of Muslims, the infidels asked peace”). Second, negotiations took place which conducted to establishing of certain duties for new tributary prince (tribute payment, sending of hostages and military support for sultan). To enforce this new kind of relationship, both parts, took oaths. All these steps meant, according to Şükrullah, to conclude peace (“thus, they make peace”). He did not forget to precise that peace was valid only for “the sultan’s life”.³³ This pattern can be called an homage paying, as Mehmed Neşri did clearly:

“After that, the prince of Wallachia, sending the tribute by his envoy, acknowledged his submission” (*andan Eflak Beyi, elçiyle harâcını gönderüb itâ ‘at etdi*).³⁴

Regardless the exact year and voivode, this political episode was considered by most historians as the first submission of Wallachia towards the Porte, by acknowledging the suzerainty of the Porte and paying a regular tribute.

The sources from the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries associate the acknowledgments of allegiance of the principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia and then Transylvania towards the Porte to at least one of the following political and diplomatic actions: presentation of the voivode himself, of a representative or, sometimes, of the great boyars of the country at the Porte; submission to the sultan willingly, not as a result of open military confrontation ended in a defeat; negotiation and conclusion of an oral or written compact; payment of a sum of money, invariably considered a tribute by Ottomans (called either *cizye* or *harâc*); granting of protection by sultan; acknowledgment of enthronement and granting of some distinguishing marks of investiture to the voivode or to his delegate. Here are arguments for each of the cases.

2.1. Acknowledgments of allegiance and willing submissions

First of all, let us mention that the submission was frequently regarded as a result of a state of military inferiority in which the weaker surrenders to the stronger, admitting its supremacy. From this point of view, an acknowledgment of allegiance appears as a direct consequence of the threat or use of force:

“And Stephen the Great asked the hermit – says the legend registered by Ion Neculce – what he should do, for he could no longer fight the Turks, should he yield the country to the Turks, or should he not?”³⁵

³³ Şükrullah, *Tevârih*, in *Cronici turc.*, I, 32.

³⁴ Neşri, *Tarih*, II, ed. Unat, Köymen, 536–7.

³⁵ Neculce, *O samă de cuvinte*, 166 (*şi au întrebat Ştefan-vodă pe sihastru ce va mai face, că nu poate să să mai bată cu turcii, închina-va țara la turci, au ba?*).

All Balkan princes had done it, sooner or later. Ducas underlined this state of facts, in the context of the supremacy acquired by Ottomans after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453:

“Thus, involuntarily and under strain, they were obeying and bringing gifts to him (Mehmed II – o.n) for fear they might share the same fate.”³⁶

In Byzantine and Ottoman annals, the voivodes' acknowledgments of allegiance were always associated to their submission. Vlad the Evil went to Brusa, to Murad II's court, and “paying his homage, submitted to him.”³⁷ According to an anonymous Ottoman chronicle, as a result of the Mehmed II's expedition of 1462, the Wallachian “infidels... came in groups wishing to pay homage and submitted to His Majesty the Emperor.” In 1538, the “country <Moldavia – o.n> submitted to the *padişah* root and branch”, Muhieddin al-Cemali accounted.³⁸

Seventeenth and eighteenth-century chroniclers also associated acknowledgment of allegiance to submission, being equivalent to the coming under Ottoman domination. For instance, referring to Basarab Laiotă, the Transylvanian annalist J. Filstich stated:

“It is under his reign that the Turks first laid hands on Wallachia, a country they could not have taken hold of ever before.”³⁹

For Mihai Cantacuzino, Mircea the Older “acknowledged allegiance of the country towards the Turks” by paying *harâc* “under submission oath”, and Laiotă Basarab “completely submitted, acknowledging allegiance of Wallachia towards the Turks.”

Generalizing, from the chroniclers' point of view, acknowledging the allegiance of the country became the starting point in the state of submission and dependence towards the Porte: “And ever since hath the country remained subject to the Turkish Porte.”⁴⁰ A similar situation was applied to Moldavia. In Dimitrie Cantemir's opinion, before the times of legendary Bogdan and of Süleyman the Magnificent (!?) when the Moldavian prince “yielded” Moldavia to the sultan, the country “had not been yielded to the Turks.”⁴¹

A difference of interpretation must be emphasized here. If, in the Ottoman view, there was an indissoluble link between the tribute payment (and other voivodes' duties) and the state of submission to the Porte (*'ubudiyet*), the Christian

³⁶ Ducas, *Istoria*, XLII/6; Melissenos, *Cronica*, IV/18, 2, 543–5.

³⁷ Ducas, *Istoria*, XXIX/10. Other example, in Ducas, *Istoria*, XLV/17.

³⁸ DANIC, mf. Turkey, r. 65, fr. 751–2, cf. Gemil, *Români și otomanii*, 144, n. 375; Muhieddin el-Cemâlî, *Tevarih*, in *Cronici turc. I*, 188; Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 132, 178.

³⁹ Filstich, *Istorie*, 104–5.

⁴⁰ *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, 67–70 (*și de atunci până astăzi a rămas țara supusă la Poarta turcească*).

⁴¹ Cantemir, *Othman History*, 186–9 and n. 28–34; Cantemir, *Imp. otoman*, I, 75, n. 24. See, also, Maxim, “Cantemir,” 69–78.

princes did not always equate the payment of a sum of money with the state of submission, considering that this kind of payment – called as a rule *harâc* or *cizye* by Ottomans – did not mean necessarily to obey. Thus, in first part sixteenth century Polish official view, expressed by their most competent representative, the king Sigismund II August, Moldavia was not yet yielded to the Porte before 1538 even though it already paid tribute to it.⁴²

Acknowledgment of allegiance did not stand for any kind of submission but only for a “willing” one, either without battle or under pressure of forces, but removing in any case the idea of a decisive military confrontation. According to Ienache Văcărescu, in 1418, “the voivode and the boyars yielded Wallachia without war the emperor Mehmed the First.”⁴³ For Mihai Cantacuzino, in 1460–1462 (!), “the voivode himself < naming inappropriately Basarab Laiotă – o.n. > on his own accord, yielded the country.”⁴⁴

Radu de la Afumați and the Wallachian boyars, getting acquainted with the military inferiority of Wallachia towards the Ottoman Empire which was about to reiterate the Central European expansion, willingly initiated the pacifying procedure, it is true, after strong resistance against Mehmed Bey, the *sancakbeyi* of Nikopol:

“The wish of them all was for the voivode to go to the Porte and take a large bow before the emperor.”⁴⁵

Acknowledgment of allegiance as a moment of pacification before starting open warfare, bringing thus about delay of the state of war, was also emphasized by Mihnea II the Turkified in a letter of 14 December 1594. In the context of rebellion of Wallachia, the military steps taken by the Porte in the spring and summer of 1595 were preceded by attempts of replacing the rebel voivodes. Moreover, wrote the Wallachian voivode that

“They sent me ahead, so that I may determine the country yield before the war is waged and harms the land.”⁴⁶

The tradition of acknowledgment of allegiance was yet strong in the case of Moldavia, being assiduously circulated by the Moldavian annalists and the petitioner boyars of 1774. In Dimitrie Cantemir’s opinion, the legendary submission of Moldavia to the sultan during the reign of Bogdan III the Blind was

⁴² *terra ejus Turco non est subjecta* (Ciurea, “Relații,” 6–7; Gemil, *României și otomanii*, 35, n. 83).

⁴³ Văcărescu, *Istorie*, 204 (*domnul și boierii au închinat Țara Românească fără război la împăratul Mehmed cel dintâiu*).

⁴⁴ *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, 67–70 (*însuși Domnul, din a lui voință, a închinat țara*).

⁴⁵ Popescu, *Istoriile*, 274 (*Au voit cu toții să meargă domnul la Poartă să plece capul la poala împăratului*).

⁴⁶ Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, XIV/1, doc. CLXXXIII (*pe mine m-au trimis înainte, poate să fac țara să se închine și să nu mai fie războiu și să se strice locul*).

a special event because the “prince Bogdan submitted it to him of his own accord”⁴⁷ and not else.

2.2. Acknowledgments of allegiance and compacts

The submission was often associated to conclusion of a negotiated peace agreement. This kind of acknowledgment of allegiance was specific to the tributary states, being also called “conditioned submission.”⁴⁸

Let us mention that at the state level, the conclusion of a pact did not necessarily mean also acknowledgment of allegiance of a party towards another, but when sources speak of acknowledgment of allegiance, there is high probability that this moment be reinforced by an official regulation of the relations between them. Anyway, this was a customary practice to be found at least in Southeastern and Central Europe, in the suzerain – vassal relationship. A treaty could stipulate a future acknowledgment of allegiance but the latter could in its turn be reinforced by a bilateral agreement.⁴⁹

The historical sources frequently related acknowledgments of allegiance to issuing or renewal of oaths (in Ottoman *‘ahd*, in Romanian *jurământ*) between sultans and voivodes. But, eighteenth-century Wallachian and Moldavian chroniclers and boyars especially exaggerated the association between end-fourteenth to mid-sixteenth century homage-paying and granting of old and long-term privileges (so-called “Capitulations”). Thus, the acknowledgment of allegiance assigned to Mircea the Older, later to Basarab Laiotă, were conditioned – in Mihai Cantacuzino’s opinion – by covenants with sultans (in Romanian, *învoiala* or *tocmeala*),⁵⁰ whose “clauses” (*legături*) are listed by the Wallachian boyars in the report addressed to count Orloff. Let us mention, in the case of Moldavia, only the already famous manuscript *The Compacts by which the country was submitted by Bogdan voivode, ruler of Moldavia, during the reign of Bayezid the Second*.⁵¹

2.3. Acknowledgments of allegiance and tribute-paying

The habit of “gift-giving” when coming to the throne, when sending envoys, or in preventing military conflicts was practiced not only in the Christian – Ottoman relations but, apparently, on a much larger area, including the Christianity.

⁴⁷ Cantemir, *Imp. otoman*, I, 75, n. 24 (*principele Bogdan a supus-o acestuia de bună voie*). See, also, Golimas, “Închinare,” 14.

⁴⁸ This formula was applied by Tahsin Gemil to Moldavia in and after 1538 (*Petru Rareș*, 158).

⁴⁹ The case of the treaty concluded between Stephen the Great and Kazimir IV in 1462 is relevant (Bogdan, *Documente. Ștefan*, II, doc. CXXIX).

⁵⁰ *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, 67–70.

⁵¹ Alexandru Beldiman, *Tractaturile prin care s-au închinat țara, de către Bogdan voevod, domnu al Moldoviei, împărățind Baizet al 2-lea* (BAR, ms. 566, fol. 126v–136).

However, before John Albert's foray into Moldavia in 1497, Stephen the Great himself sent Tăutu the Chancellor and Isaac the Treasurer

“With many gifts and greeted him <the Polish king – o.n.> on the other side of the Dneestr and presented the gifts before him.”⁵²

Yet, an acknowledgment of allegiance towards the Porte required a special procedure. First, it should be inconceivable without gift-giving. In 1451 as well, but especially after the conquest of Constantinople, Christian princes “acknowledged allegiance towards him <Mehmed II – o.n.> by gift giving.”⁵³ Moreover, a characteristic of the relations between sultans and tributary princes was acknowledgment of allegiance accompanied by payment of a negotiated tribute. For example, according to the Byzantine chronicler Ducas, it was Mehmed II who asked that “all peoples by the Black Sea come and acknowledge allegiance every year”, not only with gifts but also with tributes. I should also remember that Vlad the Impaler was summoned to come to the Porte, pay his homage and “bring by all means... the yearly tribute”.⁵⁴ This difference will be emphasized by Stephen the Great in a retrospective letter in which he compared the theoretical advantages of his homage paying towards the Polish king, with the submission towards the sultan which implied the tribute payment:

“I admit I acknowledged allegiance towards the king <of Poland>, as a benefactor of mine... lest I should become tributary to the Turks.”

Later, when the peace with Bayezid II was concluded, most probably in 1486, the homage paying – term which is not explicitly used either in Moldavian and Ottoman sources – was accompanied by tribute payment.⁵⁵

2.4. Acknowledgment of allegiance and warranty of fidelity

Having an obvious political signification, the homage paying is abundantly encountered in fifteenth century sources as a modality of periodical verification of tributary's fidelity towards sultan. After the conquest of Constantinople, Mehmed II claimed that the despots of Serbia and Peloponnesus, the rulers of Chios, Mytilene and Trabzond, as well as all those living

“by the Black Sea come every year and acknowledge allegiance by gift giving and tribute paying.”⁵⁶

⁵² Ureche, *Letopiseț*, 54.

⁵³ Ducas, *Istoria*, XLII/6.

⁵⁴ Ducas, *Istoria*, XLII/6 and XLV/20.

⁵⁵ Papacostea, “Colomeea,” 536. See also Ș. Papacostea, “Relațiile internaționale ale Moldovei în vremea lui Ștefan cel Mare,” *RdI*, 5–6, 1982, 607–38; Tahsin Gemil, “Observații referitoare la încheierea păcii și stabilirea hotarului dintre Moldova și Imperiul Otoman.” *RA*, 2, 1983, 117–28; Șt. S. Gorovei, “Pacea moldo-otomană din 1486.” *RdI*, 7, 1982, 807–21 (French version in *RRH*, 3–4, 1982, 405–21).

⁵⁶ Ducas, *Istoria*, XLII/6.

Successive appeals of presentation to pay homage sent to Wallachian and Moldavian hospodars – and I remind here the most representative ones: Vlad the Evil, Vlad the Impaler, Stephen the Great –, often followed by their rejection, testify for the real relations with the Porte in the fifteenth century. Verification of loyalty supposed the personal presentation of the prince at the sultan's court (in capital or in military camps) with the remaining tribute.

Personal presentations of voivodes to acknowledge their allegiance were rarely until middle sixteenth century, being exceptionally occasioned by moments of rebellion that caused the mistrust of the Porte. Acknowledgment of allegiance could take place at a special request of the Porte or at the voivode's initiative. To reestablish friendship relations, Vlad the Evil (Dragulios, with Ducas) “came to Brusa”, met with the sultan Murad II and “paid homage to him.” But, in 1460 Vlad the Impaler was summoned by Mehmed II “to come in a hurry and pay homage” (*proskynesis*), an act which the Wallachian voivode would not accept by easy to understand reasons:

“As for himself – wrote Ducas – coming in person to pay homage was even more inconceivable.”⁵⁷

In the same manner and under similar circumstances, but later, Stephen the Great received an ultimatum: to come and yield the tribute in person to the Porte, which equalized an appeal to “homage paying”. Here is Aşıkpaşazade's registration of that episode:

“The *padişah*... called the Moldavian voivode to the Porte telling him: «This time you shall bring the tribute yourself»” (*Padişah... Kara Boğdan ın tekûrunu Kapuya okudular. «Bu kez sen kendiün getür harâcını» dediler*).

Obviously, “the infidel did not come” (*kâfir gelmedi*).⁵⁸ On the other hand, in 1541, in order to get the throne, his son, Petru Rareş, “went to Tzarigrad”,⁵⁹ completing this official trip by “homage paying” to Süleyman the Lawgiver.

A frequent practice was “acknowledgment of allegiance” through personal representatives of the princes, and the messengers had such a statute. Here is how, in 1451, before, the newly enthroned Mehmed II, many European princes send messengers with gifts, who “paid homage” to the sultan.⁶⁰ In the seventeenth century, in moments of supposed rebellion, as in 1658–1659, the Porte required personal homage from the tribute-payer voivodes. In this respect, the Greek annalist Daponte relates that the grand vizier trying

⁵⁷ Ducas, *Istoria*, XXIX/10 and XXIX/20.

⁵⁸ Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, ed. Giese, 178.

⁵⁹ Ureche, *Letopiseţ*, 104.

⁶⁰ Or “paid their respect to him” (Ducas, *Istoria*, XXIX/20).

“to inquire about Wallachia and Moldavia, whether they would submit to the Ottoman Empire or not..., summoned the voivodes, that is Constantin Basarab, voivode of Wallachia, and Ștefan Gheorghe, voivode of Moldavia, to go and kiss, for they had not done it when they had come to the throne.”⁶¹

As the solution of ransoming the cancellation of this request was rejected, and the second “summons” was rejected in its turn, the “logical” result was the banishment.

2.5. Prostration as an usage at a dignitary’s appointment

Beginning with the second half of the sixteenth century, but irregularly before this period too, the voivodes’ enthronements were accompanied by granting special investiture marks – of which the most important were the caftan (*hilat*) and the banner (*sancak*)⁶² – and by a ceremony of their “submission” to the Porte personally or through representatives. In this respect, power relations, voivode’s political position, international circumstances or immediate interests of the Porte were of considerable importance. In 1605, Radu Șerban obtained princely colors and implicitly confirmation as voivode of Wallachia through “submission embassies”. A significant text is to be found in the “charter of submission” (*‘ubudiyet-name*) of 1051 / 1641 by which George Rákoczy I reaffirmed his loyalty towards sultan. The sending of the “head-emissary” (*baş elçimiz*) Stephen Serédi with the proper tribute supposed his “homage paying (*yüz sürmek*) to the blessed imperial Stirrup of his Majesty, my glorious and high *padişah*.” If Radu Șerban and George Rákoczy I had paid homage through intermediaries, other princes, like Radu Leon (1664–1669) and Gheorghe Duca, will do it personally:

“As Radu bey, the current Wallachian *bey*, coming to pay homage (*yüz sürüb*) to the imperial Stirrup, was appreciated as worthy of the imperial goodwill, the reign he has in his care was further entrusted to him and confirmed for three years henceforward.”

In his turn, Gheorghe Duca left for the Porte in the summer of 1681, “to prostrate his face at the Emperor’s feet, on the occasion of obtaining a new province, as is the habit at the Porte.”⁶³

At mid-eighteenth century, the homage paying by new voivodes when they were appointed to throne still implied imperial audience and “kissing the earth

⁶¹ Daponte, *Cronicul*, 7.

⁶² Examples in *Letopisețul Cantacuzinesc*, 45, 47, 48, 53, 103, 176 etc. See also Selaniki, *Tarih*, in *Cronici turc.*, I, 361.

⁶³ Decei, *Imp. otoman*, 292; Gemil, *Documente turc.*, doc. 106, 148; Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, Supl. II/3, doc. LXX (letter of 26 June 1681), LXXI, LXXII.

<before> His Imperial Highness the all happy *şahinşah*”. The new position of the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia during the Phanariote epoch, their legal status being often assimilated to that specific to Ottoman provinces, brought about diminution of the political signification of the voivodes’ homage paying and its practicing as a simple ceremony element in the appointment of an official dignitary. This is also the reason why in August 1758 Ioan Teodor Callimachi protested against his reception for “homage paying” at the same time with foreign ambassadors (*müste’min elçi*).⁶⁴

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu Yusuf, *Kitâb* = Abou Yousuf Ya’koub, *Le livre de l’impôt foncier (Kitâb al-kharâdj)*, Traduit et annoté par E. Fagnan, Paris, 1921.
- Andreescu, “Dominatia” = Ştefan Andreescu, “Limitele cronologice ale domniei otomane în Țările Române.” *RdI*, 27, 3, 1974, 399–412.
- Armanazi, *Islam* = Najib Armanazi, *L’Islam et le droit international*, Paris, 1929.
- Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih* = Fr. Giese, *Die altosmanische Chronik des Aşıkpaşazade*, Leipzig, 1929 (excerpts in *Cronici turc. I*, 81–105; *Crestomatie turca*, 77–101). Also in Çiftcioğlu N. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, I, Istanbul, 1949, 77–319.
- Berchem, *Propriété* = Max van Berchem, *La propriété territoriale et l’impôt foncier sous les premiers califes*, Genève, 1886.
- Biegman, *Ragusa* = N. H. Biegman, *The Turco-Ragusan Relationship. According to the Firmans of Murad III (1575–1595) extant in the State Archives of Dubrovnik*, Mouton, The Hague-Paris, 1967.
- Bogdan, *Documente. Ştefan* = I. Bogdan, *Documentele lui Ştefan cel Mare*, vol. I–II, Bucureşti, 1913.
- Brancovici, *Cronica* = Gheorghe Brancovici, *Cronica Românească*, ediție critică de Damaschin Mioc și Marieta Adam-Chiper, Bucureşti, 1987.
- Cantemir, *Othman History* = Demetrius Cantemir, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire. Part I. Containing the Growth of the Ottoman Empire from the Reign of Othman the Founder, to the Reign of Mahomet IV. That is from the Year 1300, to the Siege of Vienna, in 1683*. Translated into English, from the Author’s own Manuscript, by N. Tindal, London, 1734–1735.
- Cantemir, *Imp. otoman* = Dimitrie Cantemir, (Demetriu Cantemiru), *Istoria Imperiului otomanu. Crescerea și scaderea lui*, cu note foarte instructive de ..., tradusa de Dr. Ios. Hodosiu, Vol. I–II, Bucuresti, MDCCCLXXVI (1876).
- Cantemir, *Descrierea Moldovei* = Dimitrie Cantemir, *Descrierea Moldovei (Descriptio antiqvi et hodierni statvs Moldaviae)*, trad. de Gh. Gutu, introducere de M. Holban, comentariu istoric de N. Stoicescu, Bucureşti, 1973).
- Charrière, *Négociations* = E. Charrière, *Négociations de la France dans le Levant ou correspondances, mémoires et actes diplomatiques des ambassadeurs de France à Constantinople ...*, vol. I–IV, Paris, 1848–1860.
- Ciurea, “Relații” = D. Ciurea, “Relațiile externe ale Moldovei în secolul al XVI-lea.” *AIIAI*, X, 1973, 1–47.
- Cronici turc. I* = *Cronici turcești privind Țările române. Extrase. Vol. I. Sec. XV – mijlocul sec. XVII*, ed. Mihail Guboglu and Mustafa Mehmet, Bucureşti, 1966.
- CSR = *Cronicile slavo-române din sec. XV–XVI, publicate de Ioan Bogdan*. Ed. P.P. Panaitescu, Bucureşti, 1959.

⁶⁴ Veliman, *Documente turc.*, doc. 134.

- D'Ohsson, *Tableau* = Ignace Mouragea d'Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. I–VII, Paris, 1784–1824.
- Daponte, *Cronicul = Cronicul lui Chesarie Daponte de la 1648–1704*, în C. Erbiceanu, *Cronicarii greci carii au scris despre români în epoca fanariota*, textul grecesc și traducerea românească, București, 1988, 5–63.
- Decei, "Mircea" = A. Decei, "Expediția lui Mircea cel Batrân împotriva acingiilor de la Karinovasi (1393)." In Decei, *RRO*, 140–155 (French version in *Revue des Études Roumaines* (Paris), I, 1953, 130–51).
- Decei, "Sulhname" = A. Decei, "Tratatul de pace – sulhname – încheiat între sultanul Mehmed al II-lea și Ștefan cel Mare la 1479." *Revista Istorică Română*, XV, 1945, fasc. IV, 465–94 (also in Decei, *RRO*, 118–39).
- Decei, *Imp. otoman* = A. Decei, *Istoria Imperiului otoman până la 1656*, București, 1978.
- Decei, *RRO* = A. Decei, *Relații româno-orientale. Culegere de studii*, București, 1978.
- DRH, A* = *Documenta Romaniae Historica. A. Moldova, vol. II (1449–86)*, București, 1974.
- DRH, D* = *Documenta Romaniae Historica. D. Relațiile între Țările Române*, vol. I, București, 1977.
- Ducas, *Istoria* = Ducas, *Istoria turco-bizantină (1341–1462)*, ediție critică de V. Grecu, București, 1958 (in *FHDR*, IV, 416–37); Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks, An Annotated Translation of "Historia Turco-Byzantina"* by Harry J. Magoulias, Wayne State University, Detroit, 1975.
- EI-2* = *The Encyclopaedia of Islam/ Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, nouvelle édition, B. Lewis, Ch. Pellat, J. Schacht, Paris – Leyden: E. J. Brill, I–X, 1960–1999.
- FHDR* = *Fontes Historiae Daco-Romanae*, vol. IV: *Scriitori și acte bizantine. Secolele IV–XV*, București, 1982.
- Filstich, *Istorie* = Johann Filstich, *Încercare de Istorie Românească*, ediție de Adolf Ambruster, București, 1979.
- Gemil, *Documente turc.* = Tahsin Gemil, *Relațiile Țărilor române cu Poarta otomană în documente turcești. 1601–1712*, București, 1984.
- Gemil, "Fetih-nâme" = Tahsin Gemil, "Fetih-nâme a sultanului Mehmed al II-lea privind campania din 1476 împotriva Moldovei", în *Revista arhivelor*, XLIV, 3, 1982, 252–258.
- Gemil, "Mircea" = Tahsin Gemil, "Raporturile româno-otomane în vremea lui Mircea cel Mare", in *Mircea*, 330–64;
- Gemil, *Românii și otomanii* = Tahsin Gemil, *Românii și otomanii în secolele XIV–XVI*, București, 1991.
- Genealogia Cantacuzinilor* = Mihail Cantacuzino banul, *Genealogia Cantacuzinilor*, ed. N. Iorga, București, 1902.
- Gherghescu, *Drept* = Vasile Gherghescu, *Reguli de drept internațional privind starea de pace și starea de război*, București, 1972.
- Golimas, "Închinare" = A. H. Golimas, "Sensul închinării de la Vaslui a lui Petru Vodă Aron. Din legăturile de drept ale Moldovei cu Poarta Otomană", *Cuget Moldovenesc*, 9–12, 1940 (off-print, Iași, 1941).
- Gorovei, "1486" = Șt.S. Gorovei, "Pacea moldo-otomană din 1486." *Revista de Istorie*, 7, 1982, 807–21 (French version in *RRH*, 3–4, 1982, 405–21).
- Gorovei, "Casa Pacii" = Șt.S. Gorovei, "Moldova în 'Casa Păcii'. Pe marginea izvoarelor privind primul secol de relații moldo-otomane." *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie «A.D.Xenopol»* (Iași), XVII, 1980, 629–67.
- Gökbilgin, "Belgeler I" = Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib. "Venedik devlet arşivindeki vesikalar külliyatında Kanunî Sultan devri belgeleri". *Belgeler*, C. I, 1964, Sayı 2, 119–220.
- Granara, "Jihâd" = William Granara, "Jihâd and Cross-Cultural Encounter in Muslim Sicily." *HMEIR*, 3, 1/2, 1996, 42–61.
- Grotius, *Drept* = Hugo Grotius, *Despre dreptul războiului și al păcii*, traducere, note și comentarii de George Dumitriu, București, 1968 (traducere după Hugonis Grotii, *De iure belli ac pacis. Libri tres. In quibus ius nature & Gentium: item iuris publici praecipua explicantur*, Paris, MDCXXV).

- Guboglu, "Arhive Braşov" = Mihail Guboglu, "Şapte documente turceşti din arhivele Braşovului privind relațiile Transilvaniei cu Poarta otomană la începutul secolului al XVII-lea." *RA*, VIII, 1, 1965, 213–256.
- Guboglu, *Paleografia* = M. Guboglu, *Paleografia și diplomatica turco-osmana. Studiu și album*, București, 1958.
- Hammer, *Empire Ottoman* = Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, I–X, Pest, 1827–1835; J. de Hammer, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours*, vol. I–XVIII, trad. J.J. Hellert, Paris, 1837–41.
- Hill, *Hostilities* = D. R. Hill, *The Termination of Hostilities in the Early Arab Conquests. A.D. 634–656*, London, 1971.
- Hurmuzaki = *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor culese de Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki*, Supl. I/1 (1510–1600), București, 1893; Supl. II/3 (1641–1703), București, 1900; XVII (1825–1846), București, 1913; XIV/1, București, 1915.
- Inalcık, "Policy" = Halil Inalcık, "The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City." *DOP*, 23/24, 1969/1970, 213–249 (reprinted in Inalcık, *O.E. Studies*).
- Inalcık, *Emergence* = Halil Inalcık, *The Emergence of the Ottomans*, in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, ed. P.M. Holt, A.K.S. Lambton and B. Lewis, vol. I, Cambridge, 1970, 263–291.
- Iorga, *Istoria Românilor* = N. Iorga, *Istoria Românilor*, III–VI, București, 1936–39.
- Kader, "Land" = Ali Abd al-Kader, "Land Property and Land Tenure in Islam," *Islamic Quarterly*, V, 2 1959, 4–11.
- Kivâmî, *Fetihnâme* = F. Babinger, *Fetihnâme-i Sultan Mehmed*, müellifi: Kivâmî, Istanbul, 1955.
- Kur'an* = *The Glorious Kur'an*, Translation and Commentary by Abdallah Yousuf Ali, Lahore, 1973; *Le Saint Coran*, Traduction et Commentaire de Muhammad Hamidullah, Nouvelle Edition, Publiée par Amana Corporation, 1989; *Kur'an-ı Kerim ve Türkçe Açıklamalı Meâli*, Hazırlayanlar: Prof. Dr. Ali Özek, Medine-i Münevvere, 1412/1992; *Coranul*, traducere din arabă: dr. Silvestru Octavian Isopescu, Cernăuți, 1912 (reedited Cluj-Napoca, 1992).
- Laoust, *Ibn Taimîya* = H. Laoust, *Contribution à l'étude de la méthodologie canonique de Takî-d-dîn Ahmad b. Taimîya*, Le Caire, 1939.
- Letopisețul cantacuzinesc* = *Istoria Țării Românești. 1290–1690. Letopisețul cantacuzinesc*, ed. C. Grecescu, D. Simonescu, București, 1960.
- Mas Latrie, *Traité*s = M. L. de Mas Latrie, *Traité*s de paix et de commerce et documents divers concernant les relations des Chrétiens avec les Arabes de l'Afrique septentrionale au Moyen Âge, vol. I–II, Paris, 1866.
- Mawardi, *Statuts* = Mawardi (Aboul-Hasan Ali), *al-Ahkâm al-Sultâniyah (Les Statuts Gouvernementaux ou règles de droit public et administratif)*. Traduction et notes de E. Fagnan, Alger, Paris, 1915; *Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyyah. The Laws of Islamic Governance*, by Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Habib al-Basri al-Baghdadi al-Mawardi (d. 450 AH), Translated by Dr. Asadullah Yate PhD, London, 1996.
- Maxim, *CTO* = Mihai Maxim, *Culegere de texte otomane. Fasc. I. Izvoare documentare și juridice (sec. XV–XX)*, Universitatea din București, 1974.
- Maxim, "Cantemir" = Mihai Maxim, "Haraciul moldovenesc în opera lui Dimitrie Cantemir." *AUB*, XXIII, 1974, 69–78.
- Maxim, *ȚRÎP* = Mihai Maxim, *Țările Române și Înalta Poartă. Cadrul juridic al relațiilor româno-otomane în evul mediu*, București, 1993.
- Mehmet, *Documente turc. I* = M. A. Mehmet, *Documente turcești privind istoria României. Vol. I (1455–1774)*, București, 1976.
- Mircea* = *Marele Mircea Voievod*, Coord. I. Pătroiu, București, 1987.
- Miron Costin, *Letopiseț* = Miron Costin, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei de la Aron vodă încoace*, in Miron Costin, *Opere*, ed. critică de P. P. Panaitescu, București, 1958, 41–201.

- Morabia, *Ğihad* = Alfred Morabia, *La notion de ğihad dans l'islam medieval (des origines à al-Gazali)*, thèse présentée devant l'Université de Paris IV, 1er Juillet 1974, Service de reproduction des thèses, Université de Lille III, 1975.
- Mühieddin el-Cemâli, *Tevarih* = Fr. Giese, *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken (Tevarih-i Âl-i Osman)*, Teil I, Breslau, 1922 (excerpts in *Cronici turc.*, I, 188–90, and in *Crestomație turcă*, 271–98).
- Neculce, *Letopiseș* = Ion Neculce, *Opere. Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei și O samă de cuvinte*, editat de Gabriel Ștrempel, București, 1982.
- Neșri, *Tarih* = Fr. Taeschner, *Gihannüma. Die altosmanische Chronik des Mevlâna Mehmed Neschrî*, Band I–II, Leipzig, 1951–5; Mehmed Neșri, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-nüma. Neșri Tarihi*, ed. F.R.Unat, M.A.Köymen, I–II, Ankara, 1987 (1st ed. 1947) (excerpts in *Cronici turc.* I, 110–34, and in *Crestomație turcă*, 243–70).
- Nicolae Costin, *Letopiseș* = Nicolae Costin, *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei de la zidirea lumii până la 1601*, ed. C. Stoide and I. Lazarescu, Iași, 1971.
- Oruc bin Adil, *Tevarih* = Fr. Babinger, *Jahrbücher des Urudsc. Nach den Handschriften*, Hanovra, 1925; *Oruç Beg Tarihi*, Istanbul, 1972; excerpts in *Cronici turc.* I, 47–64, and *Crestomație turcă*, 208–42.
- Osmanlı Tarihleri* = Çiftcioğlu N. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, I, Istanbul, 1949.
- Panaite, *Ottoman Law* = Viorel Panaite, *The Ottoman Law of War and Peace. The Ottoman Empire and Tribute Payers*, East European Monographs, No. DLXII, Boulder, Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 2000.
- Panaite, *Pace, război și comerț în Islam* = Viorel Panaite, *Pace, război și comerț în Islam. Țările române și dreptul otoman al popoarelor. Secolele XV–XVII (Peace, War and Trade in Islam. The Romanian Principalities and the Ottoman Law of Nations. 15th – 17th Centuries)*, Ed. All, București, 1997.
- Papacostea, “Colomeea” = Șerban Papacostea, “De la Colomeea la Codrul Cozminului (Poziția internațională a Moldovei la sfârșitul secolului al XV-lea).” *Romanoslavica*, XVII, 1970, 525–553.
- Peçevi, *Tarih* = *Tarih-i Peçevi*, ed. Kemal Efendi, I–II, Istanbul, 1281–1283/1864–1867 (excerpts in *Cronici turc.* I, 469–525). Other edition: *Peçevi Tarihi*, ed. B. Ş. Baykal, vol. I–II, Ankara, 1981–1982.
- Petru Rareș* = *Petru Rareș*, coord. L. Șimanschi, București, 1978.
- Poliak, “Lands” = A. N. Poliak, “Classification of Lands in the Islamic Law and its Technical Terms.” *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, 1, 1940, 50–63.
- Popescu, *Istoriile* = *Istoriile domnilor Țării Românești de Radu Popescu*, in *Cronicari munteni*, ed. M. Gregorian, I, București, 1961, 225–578.
- Redhouse* = *Redhouse yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük / New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, 12th ed., Istanbul, 1991.
- Selaniki, *Tarih* = Selaniki Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânîkî, I (971–1003/1563–1595); II (1003–1008/1595–1600*, Hazırlayan: Prof. dr. Mehmed İpşirli, Istanbul, 1989; *Tarih-i Selaniki Mustafa efendi*, Istanbul 1281/1864 (excerpts in *Cronici turc.* I, 357–98).
- Sertoğlu, *ROTA* = Midhat Sertoğlu, *Resimli Osmanlı Tarihi Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, 1958.
- Sourdel, *Islamul clasic* = D. Sourdel, J. Sourdel-Thomine, *Civilizația Islamului clasic*, vol. I–III, București, 1975.
- Sugar, *Southeastern Europe* = Peter F. Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule. 1354–1804*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1977.
- Șimanschi, “Închinarea” = Leon Șimanschi, ““Închinarea” de la Vaslui (5 <iunie>) 1456.” *AIIAI*, XVIII, 1981, 613–638.
- Ștefănescu, *Țara Românească* = Ștefan Ștefănescu, *Țara Românească de la Basarab I “Intemeietorul” până la Mihai Viteazul*, București, 1970.

- Thornton, *Turkey* = Th. Thornton, *The Present State of Turkey... together with the Geographical, Political, and Civil, State of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia*, Vol. I–II, 2nd ed., London, 1809.
- Tocilescu, *534 documente* = Gr.G. Tocilescu, *534 documente istorice slavo-române din Țara Românească și Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul. 1346–1603*, București, 1931.
- Ureche, *Letopiseș* = Grigore Ureche, *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei*, ed. P.P. Panaitescu, București, 1987 (1st ed., 1955).
- Văcărescu, *Istorie* = Ianache Văcărescu, *Istorie a prea puternicilor înparati othomani*, în *Poetii Văcărești, Opere*, ed. C. Cîrstoiu, București, 1982, 181–312.
- Veliman, *Documente turc.* = Valeriu Veliman, *Relațiile româno-otomane. (1711–1821). Documente turcești*, București, 1984.
- Veliman, “Carte de legământ” = V. Veliman, “O carte de legământ (ahid-nâme) din 1581 privitoare la Transilvania.” *AIIAI*, XXV, 1988/1, 27–44.
- Xenopol, *Istoria românilor* = A. D. Xenopol, *Istoria românilor din Dacia Traiană*, vol. II–IV, ediția a IV-a, București, 1986–1993 (1st edition ended in 1893).