

[https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2022.5\(2\).07](https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2022.5(2).07)
UDC [947.89+949.8]"17/18"



THE PHANARIOTE SYSTEM IN MOLDAVIA AND WALLACHIA UNDER THE OTTOMAN RULE

Ömer Bedir*, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7735-6473

Independent Researcher, Turkey

*Corresponding author: Ömer Bedir, omeromerb@gmail.com

Received: 03. 18. 2022

Accepted: 05. 04. 2022

Abstract. Dobruja, Moldavia and Wallachia remained under the Ottoman sovereignty for more than 400 years. Dobruja was inhabited mostly by Turks and Muslims, and was administered by Muslim-Turkish governors assigned directly from the Sublime Porte. However, Wallachia and Moldavia were inhabited overwhelmingly by Christian-Orthodox people and were governed by local voivodes designated by the Ottoman Sultans. These voivodeships were autonomous entities in their internal affairs but were dependent to the Ottoman State in their foreign affairs. Upon the betrayal of the Moldavian prince during the Pruth River campaign of 1710-1711, the Ottoman authorities were compelled to implement the *Phanariote System* which lasted until 1821. Following the abolition of the Phanariote System, the Ottoman authorities returned to the previous method of appointing local princes which, in turn, lasted until the independence of modern Romania. Upon the independence of Romania in 1878, the Ottoman Empire had to switch to a new form of relationship with this newborn state. As a result, these two states resumed their relations through diplomatic means and, in its modern sense, the Turkish-Romanian diplomatic relations were established.

Keywords: *Dobruja, Moldavia, Phanariote System, Voivode, Wallachia.*

Rezumat. Dobrogea, Moldova și Țara Românească au rămas sub suveranitatea otomană mai bine de 400 ani. Dobrogea era locuită în mare parte de turci și musulmani și era administrată de guvernanți musulmani-turci desemnați direct de Sublima Poartă. Cu toate acestea, Țara Românească și Moldova erau locuite în mare parte de creștini-ortodocși și erau guvernate de voievozi locali desemnați de sultanii otomani. Aceste voievodate erau entități autonome în afacerile lor interne, dar erau dependente de statul otoman în afacerile externe. La trădarea prințului moldovean în timpul campaniei pe râul Prut din anii 1710-1711, autoritățile otomane au fost nevoite să instaureze Sistemul fanariot care a durat până în 1821. În urma desființării Sistemului fanariot, autoritățile otomane au revenit la metoda anterioară de numire a prinților locali care a durat până la independența României moderne. Odată cu independența României, în 1878, Imperiul Otoman a trebuit să treacă la o nouă formă de relație cu acest stat. Ca urmare, aceste două state și-au reluat relațiile pe cale diplomatică și, în sensul ei modern, s-au stabilit relații diplomatice turco-române.

Cuvinte-cheie: *Dobrogea, Moldova, Sistemul fanariot, Voivode, Țara Românească.*

Introduction

The first Turkish settlers arrived in the Balkans in the 4th century through migrations and wars [1].ⁱ Contrary to the first Turkish settlers who inhabited the region temporarily, the Ottoman Empire transformed the Balkans, as a result of its conquest and settlement policies, to a permanent homeland. When the Ottoman Empire started to rule the Dobruja, Wallachia and Moldavia, the Turkish-Romanian relations gained new dimensions in political, administrative and economic terms. Especially within the scope of the settlement policy pursued in Dobruja, the Muslim-Turkish population in this region became dominant and, as a result, the Dobruja region was governed directly by Muslim-Turkish administrators appointed from the capital. On the other hand, Wallachia and Moldavia which were inhabited overwhelmingly by Christian-Orthodox people were administered through the local voivodes (also named as hospodar) [2]ⁱⁱ appointed by the Sublime Porte. These two principalities were considered autonomous entities in their internal affairs, but were subject to the Ottoman State in their foreign affairs. This autonomous status of voivodeships continued until the independence of Romania in 1878.

In the first part of this article, the historical background of the Ottoman rule in Dobruja, Wallachia and Moldavia will be explained and, in this context, their different administrative status will be assessed. In the second part, the transition to the Phanariote System in Moldavia and Wallachia, and subsequently the dissolution of the Phanariote System in the principalities will be explored. Ottoman archive sources on Moldavia and Wallachia are primarily utilized within the framework of this study. This article aims to bring clarity to the relation between the Phanariote System and the Turkification process of the Ottoman foreign bureaucracy.

The Status of Dobruja, Wallachia and Moldavia Under the Ottoman rule

The Ottomans granted different administrative status to communities with different ethnic and religious identities and developed a flexible administrative management mechanism. Dobruja, inhabited mostly by Muslim-Turks, was directly attached to the capital and Muslim governors were assigned to Dobruja by the Sublime Porte. On the other hand, Wallachia and Moldavia which were densely populated by Christian-Orthodox people were governed as autonomous principalities. Local boyars, [3]ⁱⁱⁱ native Christian-Orthodox nobles, were appointed by the Sublime Porte as rulers to these principalities. Within the framework of this autonomous status, Wallachia and Moldavia were free in their internal affairs but dependent in their foreign affairs. These voivodeships appear as autonomous units that collectively pay taxes to the Ottoman Empire and contribute to the Ottoman army in wartimes.

Dobruja: A Region Directly Attached to the Sublime Porte

Dobruja [4]^{iv} has been strategically an important region throughout the history. The shortest land route from Rumelia to the steppes of Ukraine and Russia, as well as from Russia and Ukraine to Rumelia, and therefore to Istanbul, passes through Dobruja [5].^v The Ottomans utilized this strategic region in their expeditions to Poland and Russia, and also for their cooperation with the Crimean Khanate. The Dobruja region served also as a buffer zone for the Ottoman Empire against the European powers and Russia. Dobruja passed to the Ottoman rule in 1394 during the reign of Yıldırım Beyazıt [6].^{vi} After the conquest of Dobruja, Yıldırım Beyazıt brought the nomad Turks (Yoruk) from Anatolia and the Tatars from the north of the Black Sea, and settled them in the region. These settlement processes were pursued during

the reign of Beyazıt II and Yavuz Sultan Selim as well [7].^{vii} As a matter of fact, the most intensive Ottoman settlement activities in the Balkans were implemented in the Dobruja region [8].^{viii} The Dervishes (Muslim clerics), forefront military groups (Akıncılar) and nomadic Turks were the main settler groups. In addition to these groups, the tribes that caused trouble in various parts of Anatolia were also exiled to and resettled in this region. Accordingly, the Muslim-Turkish population in Dobruja had increased and become dominant. The censuses conducted in the 19th century reveals that most of the villages in Dobruja and Deliorman, especially in the northeast of the Balkans, had Turkish names [9]^{ix} and their populations were predominantly composed of Muslims [10].^x

The Dobruja region was directly attached to the mainland and was administered by Muslim governors appointed from the Sublime Porte. The military and civil administrative structures were organized in line with the Ottoman mainland's system. As a result of this, Ottoman cadastral registers were kept and judges (*kadi*) were assigned to solve judicial problems among Muslims. In 1850, Dobruja was composed of Silistra and Varna *sandjaks* [11]^{xi}: whereas Tulça, Isakca, Maçın and Hirşova were attached to Silistra *sandjak*; Babadag, Constanta and Mangalya were attached to Varna *sandjak*. With the adoption of the Tuna (Danube) Provincial Regulation in 1864, [12]^{xii} the Tuna prefecture [13]^{xiii} was established and Tulça was upgraded to the level of county [14].^{xiv} According to this new administrative arrangement, Babadag, Kili, Hirşova, Isakça, Constanta, [15]^{xv} Maçın, Mahmudiye, Mangalya, Mecidiye and Sunne towns were attached to the new Tulça county. As seen, under the Ottoman rule, the Dobruja region was treated directly within the Ottoman administrative structure and maintained this status until the loss of this territory by the Ottoman State [16].^{xvi}

Muslim and Non-Muslim Population According to Tuna Prefecture Yearbook 1290 (1873)

County	Muslim				Non-Muslim			Total	
	Number of Villages	Number of Houses	Population	%	Number of Houses	Population	%	Number of Houses	Population
Silistre	235	7.425	21.935	64.77	3.377	11.933	35.23	10.802	33.868
Varna	411	21.566	45.553	73.06	4.689	16.801	26.94	26.255	62.354
Tulça	272	17.405	56.724	56.23	11.599	44.147	43.77	29.004	100.871

Source: Salnâme-i Vilâyet-i Tuna, Defa 6, Year 1290, Matbaa-i Vilâyet-i Tuna, p. 106-309.

Wallachia and Moldavia: Autonomous Principalities in the Ottoman Empire

The first encounter between the Ottoman and the Wallachian forces dates back to 1368 [17],^{xvii} to the siege of Vidin. During this siege, Voivode Vlaicu was fighting for the Hungarian King Lajos against the Ottomans. Following this encounter, Vlaicu realized the gravity of the Ottoman progress in the Balkans and decided to sign an agreement with Murat I in 1373. This agreement between the Ottomans and Wallachia remained in force until Voivode Mircea's accession to power in 1386. Mircea initiated a struggle against the Ottoman armies but was soon defeated. The Ottomans imposed a tax on Wallachia in order to punish Mircea. Thus, Wallachia accepted to pay tax to the Ottomans for the first time in 1391 during the reign of Mircea and was obliged to recognize the Ottoman supremacy [18].^{xviii} After Mircea, the Wallachian voivodes took advantage of the struggles between the Hungarians and the Turks. With the Treaty of Segedin (1444), they opted for a dual policy: economic subordination to the Ottoman Sultan through payment of tax on the one hand, and political

subordination to the Hungarian king on the other hand [19].^{xix} However, within the time, some prominent boyars whose interests were harmed started to advocate for political subordination to the Ottoman Empire and in this regard challenged voivode Vlad Tepeș. Tepeș defeated the boyars and achieved to establish a centralized administration in Wallachia between 1456-1462. He did not shy away from waging a struggle against the Ottoman forces. Mehmed II, the Conqueror of Istanbul, commissioned Hamza Bey, the Governor of Niğbolu, to capture Vlad Tepeș. Wallachian forces killed the Ottoman governor, then crossed the Danube and massacred the Muslims in the Dobruja region. Thereupon, Mehmed II decided to organize a vast military campaign against Tepeș in 1462. Tepeș had to withdraw to Transylvania and was imprisoned there by the Hungarian king. Subsequently, the Ottoman Empire brought his brother Radu (1462-1474) to the voivodeship of Wallachia [20].^{xx}

With respect to the Moldavia, the first encounter between the Ottoman and Moldavian forces took place during the reign of Çelebi Mehmed (1413-1421). He besieged Akkerman in 1420 but failed to seize the city. During the reign of Sultan Mehmed II, as of 1456, Moldavia accepted to pay tax to the Ottoman Empire, like Wallachia [21].^{xxi} Later, Ștefan cel Mare (Great Ștefan) [22],^{xxii} the Moldavian voivode, refused to pay tax and defeated the Ottoman forces under the command of Hadım Süleyman Pasha in 1475 in the Racova region. Subsequently, Mehmed II ordered a military expedition to Moldavia in 1476. The Ottoman army defeated the Moldavian troops in Akdere (Valea Alba) and entered Suceava, the center of the principality, but could not seize its castle. During the reign of Beyazıt II, the Ottoman forces captured Kili and Akkerman in 1484. Thus, Moldavia was definitely subordinated to the Ottoman Empire. In addition to this, with the conquest of Hungary by the Ottoman Empire in 1526, the Hungarian sovereignty claims over Wallachia and Moldavia were invalidated, and the Ottoman rule over these principalities had been further strengthened.

Populated largely by Christian-Orthodox people, the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, named also as "*Memleketeyn*" [23],^{xxiii} were granted autonomous status within the Ottoman Empire. Unlike Temeșvar, Budin, Aegean Islands and Bosnia, these two principalities were not ruled by Muslim administrators appointed from the Sublime Porte [24].^{xxiv} Instead, they were ruled by voivodes who shared the same faith and ethnicity with the local people. The Ottoman Empire did not directly intervene in the internal affairs of Wallachia and Moldavia, did not pursue a settlement policy towards these two voivodeships, did not try to Islamize its people, and did not allow Turks to buy land and build mosques in these territories [25].^{xxv} In return for this autonomous status [26],^{xxvi} the voivodes of Wallachia and Moldavia agreed to regularly pay taxes to the Ottoman Empire, to grant commercial concessions, to supply basic agricultural products and to provide military support in time of war [27].^{xxvii}

The voivodes were kept in their positions as long as they preserved their loyalty to the Ottoman State and paid their taxes regularly. After the decease of a voivode, mostly his son or his brother was appointed to replace him [28].^{xxviii} The Ottoman State developed also a hostage mechanism within the scope of the voivode nominations. Accordingly, those who were appointed as voivodes left their sons or close relatives as hostages to the Ottoman palace [29].^{xxix} This mechanism was developed as a precautionary method to prevent the probable treason attempts of voivodes. Although the Ottoman Empire resorted to such measures in order to thwart the betrayal of voivodes, the increasing influence of Russia and the changes in the regional power balances pushed the voivodes to seek new alliances. When the Wallachian and Moldavian princes collaborated with the Russians in the Pruth campaign

of 1710-1711, the Ottoman authorities decided to revise the nomination procedure of the voivodes.

The Phanariote System: the Assignment of Ottoman Officers with Orthodox-Greek Origins Instead of the Local Princes

The Ottoman Empire, for almost three centuries, pursued the policy of designating local princes to administrate Wallachia and Moldavia. This policy was in compliance not only with its multi-cultural and multi-national structure but also with its traditional tendency to recognize an autonomous status to the communities which adhere to different religions and ethnicities. However, the Ottoman authorities were compelled to amend this policy and invent a new system to administrate these two principalities.

The Ottoman authorities' trust in the local princes was deeply shaken when it was revealed that the Wallachian and the Moldavian voivodes had collaborated with the Russians during the Pruth War. Due to the betrayal of local princes, the Ottoman State developed a new method of nomination for these principalities, which would be called later the "*Phanariote System*". In this new system, the Greeks of Phanar (a district of Istanbul and historical center of the Orthodox Patriarchate) were assigned as administrators to Wallachia and Moldavia. The Ottoman authorities opted for this new system because the Ottoman subjects of Phanar were being employed for a long time as dragomans (translator) in the bureaucracy and therefore they were deemed reliable and loyal officers to the state. In addition to this, the Greeks of Phanar [30]^{xxx} shared the same religion and sect with the people of Wallachia and Moldavia. This aspect also played a crucial role in the adoption and implementation of this new assignment system.

Transition to the Phanariote System

The Moldavian voivode Dimitrie Cantemir [31]^{xxxi} who collaborated with Russians against the Ottomans during the Pruth War sought refuge in Russia. After this incident, the Ottoman authorities were aware that they could no longer trust in local princes. The Ottoman State deemed it an urgent necessity to take measures against the possible betrayal of local princes and sought an alternative solution to designate the successor of the Moldavian voivode. In this context, the Ottoman capital appointed Ioan Mavrocordat, the Phanariote Greek translator of the *Divan-ı Hümayun* (Ottoman Council of Ministers), as voivode to Moldavia in 1710. Mavrocordat was urgently dispatched to the city of Iasi in accordance with the Sultan's *ferman* (imperial edict), and thus the Moldavian principality had begun to be administered by the aforementioned Phanariote Greek officer [32].^{xxxii} After Ioan Mavrocordat's temporary assignment, his elder brother Nicolae Mavrocordat was permanently assigned to Moldavia. The Phanariote system, which the Ottoman Empire considered more reliable and trustworthy, was thus in the process of institutionalization in Moldavia as of 1711 [33, 34].^{xxxiii}

After Cantemir's treason, the Ottoman authorities were suspicious about the loyalty of the Wallachian voivode Constantin Brancoveanu as well. But, as they were not fully convinced yet on Brancoveanu's disloyalty, they preferred to closely watch his acts. In 1714, when it was finally revealed that he was colluding with the Russians, he was removed from office. He was arrested and brought to Istanbul with his four sons. They were executed in Istanbul in the same year [35, 36].^{xxxiv} Mirahor Mehmed Ağa who was ordered to execute the sentence of Brancoveanu was given a *ferman* to appoint a voivode on site. In the imperial edict, the name of the voivode was left blank and Mirahor Mehmed Ağa was granted the authorization to

designate the person he deemed appropriate. Thereupon, he appointed Stefan Cantacuzen, a member of a reputable local family of Wallachia, as the new voivode. The imperial edict also ordered that the properties, money and other belongings of the executed prince and his sons be fully recorded by Mirahor Mehmed Ağa and be used appropriately for the needs of the Wallachian country and its people [37].^{xxxv} The new voivode Stefan Cantacuzen also collaborated against the Ottomans, with the Habsburg. Therefore, he was dismissed from his post on 30 December 1715 and executed in Istanbul in June 1716. Nicolae Mavrocordat was assigned to replace Cantacuzen [38].^{xxxvi} With this nomination, the Phanariote system was institutionalized in Wallachia as well. The method of designating the Phanariotes as administrators to Wallachia and Moldavia lasted for 110 years, until 1821.

Dissolution of the Phanariote System

As of 1750s and afterwards, the Phanariote Greek rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia, in cooperation with the Phanar Greek Patriarchate, sought to revive Byzantium, and in this respect, tried to spread Greek and neo-Byzantine nationalism. The political, intellectual and economic environment of the Phanariote-led principalities constituted an ideal atmosphere for the dissemination of these ideas [39].^{xxxvii} Although the Ottoman Empire tried to take various measures against these nationalist activities, its influence remained limited due to the interventions of Russia. With the conclusion of the Küçük Kaynarca (today a town in Bulgaria) Treaty in 1774, the Ottoman Empire accepted to consult the Russians with regard to the nomination of voivodes to Wallachia and Moldavia. The Russian Tsardom received also the right to open consulates in the principalities and to conduct free trade with them. The Ottomans were troubled with the Russian interference to the principalities. During the 19th century, Russia continued to expand and further consolidate its sphere of influence in the region. Upon the shifts in the regional power equilibrium and the Pan-Slavist policies pursued by Russia, the Phanariote rulers became more prone to collaborate with the Russians. In August 1806, when the Ottoman authorities decided to dismiss pro-Russian Phanariote rulers Alexandre Mourouzi (in some texts Mouzuri) and Constantin Ipsilanti (in some texts Ypsilanti) [40],^{xxxviii} respectively rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia, Russia immediately displayed its firm reaction to these revocations. Upon the pressure and war menace of Russians, the Ottoman State was compelled to reinstate Mourouzi and Ipsilanti [41].^{xxxix} Despite their reinstatement, Russia launched a surprise attack [42, 43]^{xl} against the Ottoman Empire in November 1806. The Russian troops crossed the Dniester River and occupied Wallachia and Moldavia [44].^{xli} The Ottoman-Russian war (1806-1812) which lasted for six years ended with the signing of the Bucharest Treaty in 1812. According to this treaty, Akkerman, Kili and Bender which were located in the eastern part of Moldavia were left to Russia, in return for ending its occupation in Wallachia and Moldavia [45].^{xlii}

Nevertheless, Russia continued to be influential on the Phanariote Greek rulers and to abuse the Orthodox population in Wallachia and Moldavia as an alibi to intervene in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire. The latter which lacked the required capacity to control effectively the principalities assessed that the Phanariote system should be dissolved definitively [46].^{xliii} The uprising led by Tudor Vladimirescu [47]^{xliv} against the Phanariote rulers in 1821 was considered an opportunity to put an end to the Phanariote era [48].^{xlv} Thus, the Phanariote system was eventually dissolved and the previous method, more precisely the designation of local princes, was revitalized [49].^{xlvi} The Phanariote system which was initiated during the reign of Ahmet III was abolished in 1821, during the reign of Mahmut II.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the Greek revolt which started in the Peloponnese peninsula in the same year was also determinant on the decision of the Ottoman authorities because the Phanariote rulers in Wallachia and Moldavia were striving for the independence of Greece and supporting the Greek nationalist movements. Upon these evolutions, apart from the dissolution of the Phanariote order, the Greeks were also deposed from the dragoman duties. In 1821, a separate and new translation office, composed of Muslim-Turks, was established for the Sublime Porte. Yahya Naci Efendi, professor at Mühendishane-i Hümayun (Imperial Engineering School), and his son Ruhiddin Efendi were assigned as directors to this new translation office [50].^{xlvii} They were entrusted with the task to manage and reorganize the translation office which would be the nucleus of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the future. As a result, the dissolution of the Phanariote system accelerated the Islamization and Turkification process of the Ottoman foreign affairs bureaucracy [51, 52].^{xlviii}

Conclusions

Wallachia and Moldavia, the two principalities which were granted autonomous status under the Ottoman rule, were initially governed by local Orthodox voivodes. However, when it was revealed that the local voivodes had collaborated with the Russians during the Pruth War, the Ottoman authorities decided to appoint Phanariote Greeks to replace them. The Greeks of Phanar had been employed for long time as dragomans in the Ottoman bureaucracy. In that sense, they were considered reliable and loyal Ottoman subjects. Besides this, they were Christian-Orthodox and shared the same faith with the local people of Wallachia and Moldavia. Thus, as of 1711 in Moldavia and as of 1715 in Wallachia, the Phanariote era began in the *Memleketeyn*.

However, in the 1750s, the Phanariote Greek rulers started to support the Greek nationalist movements and to finance Greek revolutionary activities in the Ottoman lands. They also sought covert alliances with the Russian Tsardom which was becoming more influential in the region. With the conclusion of the Küçük Kaynarca Treaty in 1774, Russia became an important factor in the process of the nomination of the Phanariote Greeks to Wallachia and Moldavia. The Russian interference on the issue was further consolidated with the Bucharest Treaty of 1812. Finally, the Ottoman authorities were compelled to reconsider the Phanariote system. The Ottoman State abandoned the Phanariote system in 1821 and returned to the policy of appointing local princes.

Both under the rule of local princes and the Phanariote Greeks, Wallachia and Moldavia maintained their autonomous status. They were free in their internal affairs but dependent on the Ottoman Empire in their foreign relations. During these two consecutive periods, the relationship between the Ottoman State and the principalities was characterized by the subordination of the latter. Therefore, it is not possible to qualify this relationship as a diplomatic relation in its modern sense.

On the other hand, the Phanariote System had crucial consequences on the Ottoman foreign affairs bureaucracy in long term. The collaboration of Phanariotes with the Russians demonstrated to the Ottoman authorities the importance of having Muslim-Turkish officers in the foreign affairs bureaucracy. Upon the dissolution of the Phanariote System and the Greek revolt of 1821, a new translation office was founded for the Sublime Porte. This new translation office was managed by Muslim-Turks and its employees were mainly Muslim-Turks. Thus, the Phanariote System triggered the Turkification of the Ottoman foreign affairs bureaucracy.

References

1. ¹. In 375 A.D., the Huns crossed the Don River and captured the lower Danube basin. Thus, for the first time in history, a Turkish tribe settled on the territory of the Roman Empire. Although the Hun Empire was dissolved after Attila's death, the Hun presence in Romanian territories continued. After the Huns, the Avars became influential in these lands and their activities in the region lasted for 250 years. See. GEMİL, T. Turkish Presence on the Romanian Territory Before The Ottomans. Ed.: Gemil, Tasin and Pienaru, Nagy. In: *Moștenirea Istorică A Tătarilor*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2012, pp. 27-29.
In 1048, the Pechenegs settled in Northern Dobruja. In the following years, the Uz (Oghuz) Turks and, at the beginning of the XII. century, Cuman, Kipchak and some other Turkish tribes arrived to Dobruja. With the aid of Cumans, the Byzantine Empire defeated the Pechenegs in 1091 and opened its borders to its new ally, the Cumans. This Turkish tribe advanced to the south of the Balkans and accepted Orthodox Christianity under the influence of the Byzantine church. The second Bulgarian state, founded by the Cumans in 1186, continued to exist until the Mongol invasion of Dobruja in 1241. The transition of the Seldjuki Turks to the Balkans and Dobruja took place in this period. When Sultan Izzeddin Keykavus II was defeated by the Mongols, he took refuge with his companions in the Byzantine Empire in 1263. Emperor Mihail Paleologos VIII settled Keykavus and his entourage in the Northern Dobruja, on the Western Black Sea coast. These Turks who were settled in Dobruja converted to Christianity due to the Byzantium pressure. When the Ottomans arrived in the Rumelia, they encountered Cuman, Pecheneg and Oghuz Turks. These Turkish communities played an important role in the progress of the Ottomans in the Rumelia and the Balkans. See. BOZKURT, G. S. Geçmişten Günümüze Romanya'da Türk Varlığı [Turkish Presence in Romania from the past until today]. In: *Karadeniz Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2008, V. 5, Issue 17, Ankara, pp. 14-15.
1. ¹. *Voivode* is originally a Slavic word. It is derived from the combination of the words *voin* (soldier) and *vodac* (leader). It is observed that between 15th and 19th centuries the word *hospodar* is also used as a title in Slavic documents for the Moldavian and Wallachian rulers. See. ÇİFTÇİ, C. Bab-ı Ali'nin Avrupa'ya Çevrilmiş İki Gözü: Eflak ve Boğdan'da Fenerli Voyvodalar (1711-1821) [The Sublime Porte's Two Eyes Fixed over Europe: Phanariote Voivodes (Principalities) in Wallachia and Moldavia (1711-1821)]. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 2010, Vol. 7, Issue 26, Ankara, p. 28.
Hospodar is defined in Merriam Webster dictionary as "A governor of Moldavia and Wallachia under Turkish rule". Available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hospodar> [Accessed: 21.02.2022]. In Collins dictionary, "(formerly) the governor or prince of Moldavia or Wallachia under Ottoman rule". Available at <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/English/hospodar> [Accessed: 21.02.2022].
2. ¹. *Boyar* is a title used for large landowners and nobles in the Danube region, Transylvania and Russia. Available at <https://sozluk.gov.tr> [Accessed: 15.02.2022].
3. ¹. Dobruja is surrounded by the Danube in the west and north, by the Black Sea in the east and by Deliorman in the south. Today, the northern Dobruja remains within the borders of Romania while the southern Dobruja remains within the borders of Bulgaria. During the Ottoman period, the Dobruja region was an important food supplier for Istanbul. It met a significant part of Istanbul's grain needs, especially wheat. Large granaries were built in many port cities on the Black Sea coast of Dobruja. Timber, salt, felt and slaves were shipped to Istanbul from the ports of Silistra, Tulça, Isakça, Maçin and Hırsova. See. DOĞRU, H. Osmanlı Devleti'nin Rumeli'de Fetih ve İskan Siyaseti [Conquest and Resettlement Policy of the Ottoman State in Rumelia]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 9, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, p. 303.
4. ¹. Ottoman forces which advanced to the west, northwest and northeast through the Balkans took the advantage of the roads built by the Romans and later used by the Byzantium. These roads were known as the Left Arm (Via Egnatia-Canib-i yesar), the Middle Arm (Via Militaris-Tarik-i evsat) and the Right Arm (Crimea-Black Sea trade route). See. *Ibid.*, p. 303.
5. ¹. The Ottomans lost the control of Dobruja in 1402 but Sultan Mehmet I regained the control of the region in 1418.
6. ¹. Gökbilgin T. *Rumeli'de Yörükler, Tatarlar ve Evlad-ı Fatihan* [Yörüks (Nomades), Tartars and Descendants of Conquerors in Rumalia]. İstanbul: Osman Yalçın Matbaası, 1957, pp. 13-16.
7. ¹. Doğru H. Osmanlı Devleti'nin Rumeli'de Fetih ve İskan Siyaseti [Conquest and Resettlement Policy of the Ottoman State in Rumelia]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 9, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, p. 310.

8. ¹. Some villages, towns in the region still bear Turkish names. Turkish architectural structures which date back to the Ottoman period still preserve their existence. For more information, see. COMAN, V., YENİKALE, A. *Osmanlı Kartografya Kaynaklarında Dobruca (XVI.-XIX y.y.)* [Dobruja in the Ottoman Cartographic Sources (XVI-XIX centuries)]. Bucharest: Etnologica, 2015.
9. ¹. Doğru H. Osmanlı Devleti'nin Rumeli'de Fetih ve İskan Siyaseti [Conquest and Resettlement Policy of the Ottoman State in Rumelia]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 9, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, pp. 311-313.
10. ¹. Prior to the adoption of the Tuna (Danube) Provincial Regulation in 1864, federative state system (Eyalet sistemi) was used in the administrative structure of the Ottoman Empire. In this system, *sandjak* is comparable to a sort of province.
11. ¹. Through the adoption of the Provincial Regulation in 1864, Province (Vilayet), County (Sancak/Liva), Town (Kaza) and Village (Nahiye) were classified as the main administrative units in the Ottoman Empire. In 1871, these units were re-organized as Province (Vilayet), County (Liva), Town (Kaza), small town (Nahiye) and Village (Köy). This administrative reform was largely inspired from the French administrative system. For further information, see. TORAMAN, Ö. *Osmanlı Taşra Teşkilatında Yenilikler (1826-1876)*. [Novelties in the Ottoman Provincial Organization (1826-1876)]. Master Thesis, Dicle Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kamu Hukuku Anabilim Dalı, Diyarbakır, 2002.
12. ¹. Niş (today in Serbia), Silistra and Vidin (today both in Bulgaria) States (Eyalet) were united as a single administrative unit under the Tuna prefecture with the adoption of the Provincial Regulation of 1864.
13. ¹. Koyuncu A. Tuna Vilâyeti'nde Nüfus ve Demografi (1864-1877) [Population and Demography in the Tuna Prefecture (1864-1877)]. In: *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 2014, Volume 9/4, Ankara, p. 677.
14. ¹. As Constanta was becoming a hub in terms of maritime trade, its population tended to increase. The Ottoman Empire started in 1857 the construction of a railway between Cernavoda and Constanta on the Danube, and this railway was completed in 1860. In addition to this, the port of Constanta was expanded, a lighthouse and nearly 400 new houses were built during this period. In 1864, the town of Constanta was attached to the Tulça county. See. MURGESCU, B. "Köstence". [Constanta]. In: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 2002, Vol. 26, İstanbul, pp. 276-277. The developments in Constanta have drawn the attention of the leading foreign powers as well. Some countries asked permission to open consulates in this city. In this context, the Ottoman Empire granted permissions to Austria-Hungary, England, France, Germany, Italy and Russia to open consulate in Constanta. See. İBRAM, N. *Dobruca'daki Müslüman Topluluğu Manevi Hayatından Sayfalar* [Pages from the Spiritual Life of the Muslim Community in Dobruja]. (Trans: Belghiuzar Cartali Bulğa, Namık Kemal Yıldız), Constanta: Ex Ponto, 1999, p. 31.
15. ¹. Dobruja remained under the Turkish rule for about 460 years and became a Turkish homeland. It was lost with the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian war. Turkish presence in the Balkans and in the Rumelia suffered a great shock due to the massacres of the Russian and Bulgarians troops. Consequently, Turkish population in the Balkans diminished and the Turks became minority in the region. See. ÖNAL, M. N. Romanya Türklerine Bakış [Glance to Turks of Romania]. In: *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, 1994, Issue 93, İstanbul, p. 180.
16. ¹. Some historians claim that the first encounter between the Ottoman and the Wallachian forces took place in the Battle of Sırpsındığı in 1364, during the reign of Murat I. For detailed information, See. SARĞIN, Y. *Başlangıcından 1606'ya Kadar Osmanlı Devleti İle Eflak ve Boğdan Voyvodalıkları Arasındaki İlişkiler* [The Relations between the Ottoman State and Wallachia and Moldavia from the beginning to 1606]. Master Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2013, pp. 5-6.
17. ¹. Yalçınkaya M. A. Osmanlı Döneminde Eflak ve Boğdan (Memleketeyn) [Wallachia and Moldavia in the Ottoman Period]. In: *Balkanlar El Kitabı*, 2006, Vol. 1, Ed.: Osman Karatay - Bilgehan A. Gökdağ, Karam Vadi Yay., Ankara, p. 386.
18. ¹. Karpat K. "Eflak" [Wallachia]. In: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1994, Vol.10, İstanbul, p. 468.
19. ¹. Türkal M. K. 18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Eflak ve Boğdan Üzerinde Osmanlı-Avusturya Mücadelesine Dair Anonim Bir Eser: Vakayi-i Eflak [An Anonymous Work About Ottoman-Austria Controversy Relating to Wallachia and Moldavia in the First Part of 18th Century: Vakayi-i Eflak]. In: *Turkish Studies, International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 2017, Vol. 12/9, Ankara, pp. 39-40.
20. ¹. Sarğın Y. *Başlangıcından 1606'ya Kadar Osmanlı Devleti İle Eflak ve Boğdan Voyvodalıkları Arasındaki İlişkiler* [The Relations between the Ottoman State and Wallachia and Moldavia from the beginning to 1606]. Master Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2013, p. 46.

- 21.¹ Voivode Stefan was granted the title of "The Wrestler of Jesus" by the Pope because of his success against the Ottomans. See. ÖZCAN, A. "Boğdan" [Moldavia]. In: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1994, Vol. 6, İstanbul, p. 270.
- 22.¹ The Ottomans named Wallachia and Moldavia as "*Memleketeyn*", which means "The two countries".
- 23.¹ Sözen Z. Osmanlı Kültürünün Eflak ve Boğdan'ın Yaşamına Etkisi [The Influence of the Ottoman Culture on Wallachia and Moldavia]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Cemal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 12, Yeni Türkiye Yay., Ankara, p. 16.
- 24.¹ Papp S. Eflak ve Boğdan Voyvodalarının Ahidnameleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kuzeybatı Hududundaki Hıristiyan Vassal Ülkeleri [An Analysis on the Covenant of Wallachia and Moldavia Voivodes: Christian Vassal Countries on the North-West Border of the Ottoman Empire]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Cemal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 10, Yeni Türkiye Yay., Ankara, p. 1382.
- 25.¹ This autonomous status was expressed in the Ottoman official documents as "*mefrûz ül-kalem ve maktû ül-kadem, min küll il-vücuḥ serbest*". See. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA) [Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry]. Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, No:77/1, Romanya Eflak Defteri: 103.
26. "*Mefrûz ül-kalem*" means that the principalities were not included in the land registry records of the Ottoman State, and in this sense, Ottoman title deeds were not used in the principalities.
27. "*Maktû ül-kadem*" means that the taxes were paid collectively by each principality. The Ottoman State did not collect tax from individuals.
28. "*Min küll il-vücuḥ serbest*" means that the principalities were free in their internal affairs. Ottoman officials such as judge, tax collector, treasurer or governor were not assigned to these lands.
- 29.¹ Sözen Z. Osmanlı Kültürünün Eflak ve Boğdan'ın Yaşamına Etkisi [The Influence of the Ottoman Culture on Wallachia and Moldavia]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Cemal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 12, Yeni Türkiye Yay., Ankara, p. 15.
- 30.¹ For a detailed list including the names of voivodes in Wallachia between 1215-1862 and their terms of office, see. AYDIN, M. Eflak Beyliği [Principality of Wallachia]. In: *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2013, Issue 23, İstanbul, p. 17-18.
- 31.¹ French traveler Brocquiere who accompanied the Milan envoy was granted an audience to the Divan of Murat II. Brocquiere recounts that approximately twenty Wallachian nobles (hostages) were present at the ceremony in Sultan's palace. See. SARĞIN, Y. *Başlangıcından 1606'ya Kadar Osmanlı Devleti İle Eflak ve Boğdan Voyvodaları Arasındaki İlişkiler* [The Relations between the Ottoman State and Wallachia and Moldavia from the beginning to 1606]. Master Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2013, p. 49.
- 32.¹ The term of "Phanariote Greeks" was mainly used for wealthy Orthodox Greeks residing in the Phanar district of İstanbul. Besides them, Romanian, Albanian or Italian nobles of Phanar were also named as Phanariote. See. SÖZEN, Z. *Fenerli Beyler, 110 Yılın Öyküsü (1711-1821)* [Beys of Phanar, History of 110 Years (1711-1821)]. İstanbul: Aybay Yayınları, 2000, p. 7. Although all of them were not Greek in terms of ethnic origin, they were called *Greeks of Phanar* because they spoke Greek among themselves and created a unique Greek culture. See. ÇİFTÇİ, C. Bab-ı Ali'nin Avrupa'ya Çevrilmiş İki Gözü: Eflak ve Boğdan'da Fenerli Voyvodalar (1711-1821) [The Sublime Porte's Two Eyes Fixed over Europe: Phanariote Voivodes (Principalities) in Wallachia and Moldavia (1711-1821)]. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 2010, Vol. 7, Issue 26, Ankara, p. 32. Indeed, the Phanariotes constituted a privileged non-Muslim community in the Ottoman society. They were educated and wealthy people, connected to the outside world, but also an introverted minority, adjacent to the Muslim-Turks who constituted the ethnic and religious majority. See. JORGA, N. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi (1640-1774)* [History of the Ottoman Empire (1640-1774)]. Vol. 4, Transl: Nilüfer Eççeli, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2009, p. 304. As a privileged minority in the Ottoman Empire, the Phanariote Greeks served as officers and translators in the Ottoman bureaucracy. They were appointed to high-level positions such as the voivodeships of Wallachia and Moldavia, to the governorship of Crete and Samos. The Greeks of Phanar, who made their fortunes mostly from trade, shipping and banking, continued to take an active role in the Ottoman bureaucracy until the Greek revolt of 1821. See. ÇİFTÇİ, C. Bab-ı Ali'nin Avrupa'ya Çevrilmiş İki Gözü: Eflak ve Boğdan'da Fenerli Voyvodalar (1711-1821) [The Sublime Porte's Two Eyes Fixed over Europe: Phanariote Voivodes (Principalities) in Wallachia and Moldavia (1711-1821)]. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 2010, Vol. 7, Issue 26, Ankara, p. 32.
- 33.¹ Dimitrie Cantemir (1673-1723) lived in İstanbul for many years. He wrote books on the Ottoman history and the Turkish music. He composed also many songs. For detailed information, available at <https://ottomanhistorians.uchicago.edu/en/historian/dimitrie-cantemir> [Accessed: 12.03.2022].
- 34.¹ BOA [Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry], Mühimme Defteri, No: 119: 39.

- 35.¹. Philliou C. M. *Worlds, Old and New: Phanariot Networks and the Remaking of Ottoman Governance In the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*: Ph.D. Thesis. USA, Princeton University, 2004, p. 83-86.
- 36.¹. The execution of Constantin Brancoveanu and his sons by the Ottomans led to the heroification of Brancoveanu in the Romanian history.
37. Available at https://www.rrr.ro/en_gb/the_reign_of_constantin_brancoveanu-20886 [Accessed: 03.02.2022].
- 38.¹. BOA [Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry], Mühimme Defteri, No: 120: 168.
- 39.¹. BOA [Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry], Cevdet Tasnifi, Hariciye No: 3752.
- 40.¹. Papachristou P. A. *The Three Faces of the Phanariots: An Inquiry into the Role and Motivations of the Greek Nobility Under the Ottoman Rule (1683-1821)*. Master Thesis, Department of History, Simon Fraser University, 1992, p. 122.
- 41.¹. Alexander Suzzo and Charles Callimachi were appointed by the Sublime Porte to replace the revoked Mourouzi and Ipsilanti. See. UZUN, Ö. F. *1806-1812 Osmanlı-Rus Harbi'nde Rus Ordusunun Tuna Harekâtı* [The Russian Operations in Danube in the Russo-Ottoman War of 1806-1812]. Master Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Anabilim Dalı, Ankara, 2020, p. 34.
- 42.¹. Erkutun M. İ. Mevrüdül' Uhd 1812 Bükreş Anlaşması ile İlgili Galib Paşa Evrakı [Galib Pasha Document on the Bucharest Treaty of 1812, Way to the accord]. Master Thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Bölümü, Yakınçağ Tarihi Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul, 1997.p. IX-X.
- 43.¹. The eventual closure of the Turkish Straits to the Russian ships was also an important reason in the outbreak of this war in 1806. The Russian Tsardom, without declaring officially a war, invaded the Ottoman territories See. UZUN, Ö. F. *1806-1812 Osmanlı-Rus Harbi'nde Rus Ordusunun Tuna Harekâtı* [The Russian Operations in Danube in the Russo-Ottoman War of 1806-1812]. Master Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Anabilim Dalı, Ankara, 2020, p. 35-36.
44. The Ottoman Sultan, Selim III, who did not expect such an attack was stunned when he received the news. See. Karal, E. Z. *III. Selim'in Hattı Hümayunları*. [The Hattı Hümayuns (Imperial Edicts) of the Selim III]. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1942, p. 96.
- 45.¹. Wallachia and Moldavia were occupied four times by the Russians during the XIX. century, in 1806, 1828, 1849 and 1853. During the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian war, the principalities fought besides Russia against the Ottoman Empire and at the end of the war became independent. See. KARASU, C. XIX. Yüzyılda Eflak ve Boğdan'daki Rus İşgalleri [Russian Occupations in Wallachia and Moldavia during the XIX. century]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Cemal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 12, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, p. 741- 749.
- 46.¹. Çiftçi C. Bab-ı Ali'nin Avrupa'ya Çevrilmiş İki Gözü: Eflak ve Boğdan'da Fenerli Voyvodalar (1711-1821) [The Sublime Porte's Two Eyes Fixed over Europe: Phanariote Voivodes (Principalities) in Wallachia and Moldavia (1711-1821)]. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 2010, Vol. 7, Issue 26, Ankara, p. 43.
- 47.¹. Local boyars were complaining to the Ottoman authorities about the despotic administration of Phanariote rulers and were denouncing that Phnariotes were betraying to the Ottoman State. Underlining the above mentioned reasons, the local boyars were insisting on the removal of the Phanariote rulers and their substitution by local princes. See. BOA [Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry], Romanya Ahkam Defteri, 80/4, p. 406. Hüküm 1181.
- 48.¹. Tudor Vladimirescu who was initially a leader of a peasant movement assumed later the leadership of a militia army, including the Pandurs (*Pandur* or *Pandour* was a non-professional soldier with semi-permanent obligations. Panduris were generally accused for banditry activities). See. POPESCU-JUDETZ, E. Adakale: Geçmişteki Bir Türk Adası [Adakale: A Turkish Island in the Past]. In: *TÜRKLER*, 2002, Ed.: Hasan Cemal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, Vol. 12, Yeni Türkiye Yay., Ankara, p. 2030-2031. As Phanariote Greek rulers were collecting high taxes and thus financially oppressing the poor peasants, Vladimirescu initiated in 1821 an uprising against the Phanariote rulers. This uprising with nationalist and social aspects aimed to oust not only the Phanariotes but also the Ottoman rule. Vladimirescu was executed in June 1821 by the Philiki Etaireia (Friendly Brotherhood) forces, in other words by the Greek revolutionary society led by the Phanariote Alexander Ipsilanti. See. KARPAT, K. "Eflak" [Wallachia]. In: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1994, Vol.10, İstanbul, p. 469.
- 49.¹. Despite the dissolution of the Phanariote system in 1821, Russia continued to be influential on local princes as well. Upon the Akkerman Agreement signed in 1826 between the Ottomans and the Russians, the term of voivodeship was prolonged from three to seven years and Russia's prior consent in removal of the voivodes was accepted by the Ottomans. See. PAPACHRISTOU, P. A. *The Three Faces of the Phanariots: An Inquiry into the Role and Motivations of the Greek Nobility Under the Ottoman Rule (1683-1821)*. Master Thesis,

Department of History, Simon Fraser University, 1992, p. 141. Thus, in practice, the Sublime Porte could no longer appoint or dismiss the voivodes by its own will. Moreover, upon the conclusion of the Adrianople Treaty with Russia in 1829, the Ottoman authorities were obliged to accept in principle the prolongation of the tenure of voivodes for life. See. PHILLIOU, C. M. *Worlds, Old and New: Phanariot Networks and the Remaking of Ottoman Governance In the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*: Ph.D. Thesis. USA, Princeton University, 2004, p. 330.

- 50.¹. Upon the dissolution of the Phanariote system, the local boyars proposed Gregor Ghica and Ioan Sandu Sturza to replace the former rulers. The Ottoman authorities approved Gregor Ghica and Ioan Sandu Sturza as the new voivodes, respectively to Wallachia and Moldavia. See. BOA [Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry], Hatt-ı Hümayun, No: 14300.
- 51.¹. ÇİFTÇİ, C. Bab-ı Ali'nin Avrupa'ya Çevrilmiş İki Gözü: Eflak ve Boğdan'da Fenerli Voyvodalar (1711-1821) [The Sublime Porte's Two Eyes Fixed over Europe: Phanariote Voivodes (Principalities) in Wallachia and Moldavia (1711-1821)]. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 2010, Vol. 7, Issue 26, Ankara, p. 43.
- 52.¹. Bilim, Cahit. "Tercüme Odası". [Translation Unit]. In: *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi (OTAM) Dergisi*, 1990, Issue 1, Ankara, pp. 33-42.