



INTERNATIONAL BALKAN ANNUAL CONFERENCE (IBAC)
BOOK SERIES {4}

Editors

Prof. Dr. Florentina Nitu
Asst. Prof. Cosmin Ionita
Asst. Prof. Metin Ünver
Asst. Prof. Özgür Kolçak
Assoc. Prof. Hacer Topaktaş

TURKEY & ROMANIA

A HISTORY OF PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATION IN THE BALKANS

İstanbul 2016



TÜRK DÜNYASI BELEDİYELER BİRLİĞİ
UNION OF TURKISH WORLD MUNICIPALITIES
СОЮЗ МУНИЦИПАЛИТЕТОВ ТЮРКСКОГО МИРА

INTERNATIONAL BALKAN ANNUAL CONFERENCE (IBAC)
BOOK SERIES [4]

TURKEY & ROMANIA

A HISTORY OF PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATION IN THE BALKANS

İstanbul 2016

Publish Date

November 2016

•

Editorial Board

Prof. Dr. Florentina Nitu

Asst. Prof. Cosmin Ionita

Asst. Prof. Metin Ünver

Asst. Prof. Özgür Kolçak

Assoc. Prof. Hacer Topaktaş

•

Composition and Printed by

Babil Basım

Litros Yolu 2. Matbaacılar Sitesi

ZB-22 Topkapı / İSTANBUL

•

ISBN

ISBN-978-605-65863-3-0

•

TÜRK DÜNYASI BELEDİYELER BİRLİĞİ (TDBB) Publications, No: 18

Copyright © 2016 Union of Turkish World Municipalities and Istanbul University. All rights reserved.

Unless otherwise indicated, all materials on these pages are copyrighted by the Union of Turkish World Municipalities and Istanbul University. All rights reserved. No part of these pages, either text or image may be used for any purpose other than personal use. Therefore, reproduction, modification, storage in a retrieval system or retransmission, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or otherwise, for reasons other than personal use, is strictly prohibited without prior written permission.

All authors in the book hold every responsibility for the content of their papers.

Back cover: Prof. Dr. Nicolae Iorga with a group of Turkish students (c. 1914)

ESTABLISHMENT OF RUSSIAN INFLUENCE IN WALLACHIA AND MOLDAVIA ACCORDING TO A WALLACHIAN

Feyzullah Uyanık*

Introduction

In the process of Ottoman withdrawal from the Balkans Russian influence on the Danubian Principalities had an important role. In this paper it is tried to evaluate – in general terms- the Russian policies undertaken in order to establish its political and military influence on the Danubian Principalities. The views put forward here have been shaped around a booklet named *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi* (History of the Danubian Principalities or Wallachia and Moldavia) which is recorded with the accession number of TY 2479 in Istanbul University Library of Rare Books. The booklet has only one copy of 58 leaves (116 pages). Though the exact time when the booklet was written is not known, it is thought to have been written in the second half of the 19th century as it describes events that took place in the Danubian Principalities up to 1850. Though no exact information about the identity of the author exists in the booklet, the expression “*işbu risalenin müellifi Eflak’lı olub/ the author of the booklet is Wallachian*” makes it possible to deduce that he is from Wallachia.¹

1. Wallachia and Moldavia in Turco-Russian Relationship

The Balkans with its Orthodox Christian majority attracted the attention of Russia who followed the policy of Orthodox union.² Dimitrie Cantemir’s siding with Russia in 1711 Prut War was the first fruit of that interest.³ According

* Trakya University, (feyzullah_uyanik@hotmail.com)

1] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi Tarih Yazmaları (TY) 2479, folio, 1b. (The full text of this booklet is being prepared for publication by us.)

2] For Russia’s Balkan policy see Hasan Demiroğlu, “Rus Kaynaklarına Göre Rusya’nın Balkan Siyaseti: Ortodoks Birliği ve Panslavizm (1856-1878)”, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Doktora Tezi, İstanbul 2009, p. 19-76.

3] For the beginning of the relationship between Russia and Principalities see Muhammed Ali Kılıç, “Russian Challenges Concerning Ottoman Bogdan”, University of Fatih Institute of Social Sciences MA Thesis, İstanbul 2008, p. 61-72.

to the author, the war was a great economic destruction for the Romanians who provided logistic support for Russia.⁴ The most significant outcome of the war in terms shaping the future of the Danubian Principalities was that the Hospodars would be appointed among Phanariots. According to the booklet, the situation apparently came to the interest of the Ottoman Empire had negative outcomes in the long run. The Phanariot administrators not giving priority to public interest and observing their own interests like tax farmers left the door open to the establishment of Russian influence in the region. The inability of the Ottoman Empire to establish political stability and the Ottoman defeat in the war of 1768-1774 gave rise to decisive effects on the political future of the Danubian Principalities. One of the most important of them was granting Russian ambassadors the right to negotiate with the Ottoman Empire about the affairs of the Danubian Principalities. By means of those negotiations Russia was able to express its demands about the Danubian Principalities and the Ottoman Empire was expected to consider reasonable demands. Another effect was that Russia had the right to establish consulates in Ottoman lands by means of which it could closely follow local developments and take first hand information.⁵ The confirmation of annexation of Crimea by Russia by Iași Treaty signed in 1792 and determination of the Turla River as the border between two countries strengthened Russia's position not only in the Danubian Principalities but also in Bulgaria, Serbia and Black Sea ports.⁶

In the beginning of the 19th century Russia had attained geographical enlargement necessary for realizing its political aims. Later, it aimed to attain the right to express opinion directly on the appointment of Hospodars of the Danubian Principalities. Russia attained its aim with the decree of 1802 which determined the tax rates and privileges of the Danubian Principalities and aimed at minimizing the negative outcomes of Pazvandoğlu Rebellion which blazed the Balkans.⁷ The office of Hospodars were determined as 7 years according to the

4] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 13b-16a.

5] Osman Köse, *1774 Küçük Kaynarca Andlaşması*, Ankara 2006, p. 115; Kemal Beydilli, "Küçük Kaynarca Antlaşması", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXVI, Ankara 2002, pp. 524-527; For Russian pressure and Porte's policy during the establishment process of consulates see Osman Köse, "Balkanlarda Rus Konsolosluklarının Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetleri", *Türkisch Studies/Türkoloji Dergisi*, I/2, Erzincan 2006, p. 141-155; Radu Florescu, "The Roumanian Problem in Anglo-Turkish Diplomacy, 1821-1824: British Reaction to the Wallachian Revolt", Indiana Universty, Phd Thesis, 1959 p. 105-155.

6] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 17b; Kemal Beydilli, "Yaş Antlaşması", *DİA*, XLIII, Ankara 2013, pp. 343-347.

7] For the detail of rebellions that put Wallachia and Moldavia in a difficult situation see Yücel Özkaya, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Dağlı İsyanları (1791-1808)*, Ankara, 1983, pp. 14-116;

Treaty of Kainarja Ghica. Sublime Porte declared clearly that they would not be expelled from their offices as long as they did not abuse their position and that Russia's consent would be taken for their appointment and expulsion.⁸ While the decree prevented suppression of the people of the Danubian Principalities under financial obligations, determination of its political future came under the control of two rivaling Powers. It is a reality to be expected easily that the autonomous structure of the Principalities was shaken seriously.

Russia which succeeded in having a voice in the administration of the Danubian Principalities intensified its propaganda activities for Orthodox union. In 1814 with the aim of realizing the projects of the Russian Tsar who was aggrandized as the successor of Jesus, *Philiki Etaireia* (Friendly Society) – which would later trigger Greek Revolt in 1821 – was established in Odessa under the leadership of Capodistria and Ypsilanti.⁹ Acquisition of power by the Society in real sense became possible with appointment of Alexandru Sutu¹⁰ to the Position of Hospodar of Wallachia and Mihail Sutu¹¹ to Hospodar of Moldavia in 1819 by the Sublime Porte. Rebel of 1821 which put the Ottoman Empire in a very difficult position took place with the contribution of last Phanariot Hospodars in the region.¹² The Phanariot which lost their prestige in the eyes of the Sublime Porte lost their privileges in the Danubian Principalities with new regulations. From then on Hospodars would be elected by councils of the Danubian Principalities among native boyars. The candidates then would be presented to the Sublime Porte and appointed to the post after necessary investigation.¹³ The first Hospodars

Robert W. Zens, "The Ayanlik and Pasvanoglu Osman Paşa of Vidin in the Age of Ottoman Social Change", 1791-1815, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Phd Thesis, 2004, pp. 119-197; Kemal Beydilli, "Pazvandoğlu Osman", *DİA*, XXXIV, İstanbul 2007, pp. 208-210.

- 8] BOA (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi), A.DVN.DVE.d. (*Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defteri*), nr. 81/5, p. 108; Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, VII, İstanbul 1309, p. 358-359; Akitsu Mayuzumi, "Issues Pertaining to Wallachian and Moldavian Voyvodas and Their Effect on Russo-Ottoman Relations (1774-1826)", *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies*, XXVII, 2006, pp. 16-17.
- 9] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 18b-19a.
- 10] BOA, *Hatt-ı Hümayûn (HAT)*, nr.45624.
- 11] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 20a.
- 12] For the contribution of Hospodars to Greek Revolt's development see BOA, *Bab-ı Asaî Mektubi Kalemi Dosyaları (A.MKT)*, nr. 1580/24; *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 20a; BOA, A.MKT, nr. 1580/25; BOA, A.MKT, nr. 1582/47; Şânî-Zâde Mehmed Atâullah Efendi, *Şânî-Zâde Târîhi*, II, (haz.ZiyaYılmaz) İstanbul 2008, p. 1059-1071; The rebellion reached to such an extent that Turkish ethnicity nearly vanished in Mora. See Ali Fuat Örenç, *Balkanlarda İlk Dram Unuttuğumuz Mora Türkleri ve Eyaletten Bağımsızlığa Yunanistan*, İstanbul 2009, pp. 29-48.
- 13] BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45441; In the background of this application were the important role of

appointed to the region according to this method was Grigore Ghica for Wallachia and Ioan Sturdza for Moldavia.¹⁴ From then on the intervention of Russia who closely followed the efforts of the new Hospodars to develop the region and establish a central administrative system marked a new start in the establishment of Russian influence in the region. Russian efforts to manipulate the struggle of the Danubian Principalities to restore their former autonomous structure laid the background for incessant process of Russian invasion which lasted from Turco-Russian war of 1828-1829 to the Treaty of Saint Petersburg in 1834.¹⁵ The process which was detailed elaborately by the author corresponds to the strongest period of Russian influence in the Danubian Principalities.

2. Russian Influence in the Process of Preparation and Implementation of Organic Statutes

Wallachian Hospodar Gika which came to the post with the consent of Russia and the Ottoman Empire started the business of modernizing and raising life standards in Wallachia. He assigned a committee made up of 5 people with preparation of a bill about ancient administrative order of the Danubian Principalities. In order to realize the projected development movement he laid the foundations for modern educational institutions. He enabled the handover of monasteries which were usurped by Greek clergy to local ecclesiastics. However; in the eve of Turco-Russian War of 1828-1829 Russia demanded re-establishment of old order under the pretext of inability of Romanian priests to manage and problems in distribution of revenues from foundations among other monasteries. Considering the demand of Russian ambassador, the Ottoman Empire approved the demand provided that Greek priests who were involved in Greek revolt of 1821 would not step up monasteries and churches.¹⁶ Thus Russia prevented strengthening of Hospodars and acquisition of privileges by local elements in the

Romanian boyars' complaints about Phanariot Hospodars. see BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45586-A; BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45528; BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45547-A.

- 14] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 20b.; For the Porte's expectations from the new Hospodar Sturdza see. BOA, *Cevdet Hariciye* (C.HR.), nr. 45/2239; Nikolae Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi* (1774-1912), V, (Çev. Nilüfer Epçeli), İstanbul 2009, p. 40; Mihail Guboğlu, "Eflak ve Buğdan Voyvodalarının Babiâli ile Münasebetleri", *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, Sayı 1, İstanbul 1967, p. 61.
- 15] Barbara Jelavich, *Russia and the Formation of the National State 1821-1878*, Cambridge 1984, p. 21-38.
- 16] For the demands of assignment of the monasteries' administration to the Romanian see *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 21a; BOA, C.HR., nr. 133/6647; for the acceptance and application of new conditions see BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45724; BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45724-A.

Danubian Principalities.

Organization of the National Army was among the issues which Hospodars followed closely. Hospodar Sturdza expressed his wish to found an army by recruiting five armed soldiers from every district and village to Selim Pasha, mayor of Silistra. The Sublime Porte having been informed about the case estimated that an army of 4.000 would be raised if Sturdza were allowed to do so. The Porte was worried that it would risk the security of the Muslim in the region.¹⁷ On the other hand the Romanian abolished Albanian troops founded by the Phanariot and re-established old order.¹⁸ Moreover they wanted the number of Beşlinefer¹⁹ to be cut by half.²⁰ Russia keeping abreast of developments in the Danubian Principalities immediately mediated conveying Romanian demands to the Porte.²¹ Though the Ottoman Empire objected to restoration of the number of Beşlinefer to pre 1821, it accepted the demand with the Treaty of Akkerman whose terms were clarified in October 1826. Moreover the appointment of Başbeşli Ağaları²² was taken from the Porte and given to Hospodars.²³ Thus, Russia succeeded in diminishing the influence of high-ranking Ottoman soldiers.²⁴ In fact, Russia succeeded in getting involved in military reforms of both principalities.

The interim government established under Pavel Kiselev's administration after Turco- Russian War of 1828-1829 consolidated Russian influence in the

17] BOA, *HAT*, nr. 45459-A.

18] BOA, *HAT*, nr. 37877-D.

19] Beşli Neferatare the troops of Janissaries that received five akçes daily. See Abdülkadir Özcan, "Serhad Kulu", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, XXXVI, İstanbul 2009, p. 560-561; When the Greek Revolt broke out in 1821 to prevent the massacre of Muslims and to establish order the Porte sent 1.000 Beşli Nefers to Wallachia and 2.000 Beşli Nefers to Moldavia. See (Selim Aslantaş, "Osmanlı-Rus İlişkilerinden Bir Kesit: 1826 Akkerman Andlaşması'nın Müzakereleri", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, IX/36 (Kış 2013), p. 152, footnote 11) There were Beşli Nefers in the Danubian Principalities in earlier periods. See Mustafa Kesbî, *İbretnüümâ-yı Devlet*, (haz. Ahmet Öğreten), Ankara 2002, p. 129-130.

20] BOA, *HAT*, nr.45588-F.

21] BOA, *Bâb-ıAsaî Amedi Kalemî Dosyaları (A.AMD)*, nr. 74/6; Sahhâflar Şeyhizâde Mehmed Esad Efendi, *Vakanüvis Esad Efendi Tarihi (Bahir Efendi'nin Zeylve İlaveleriyle) 1821-1826*, (haz.Ziya Yılmaz), İstanbul 2000, p. 555.

22] Cheif Commander of Beşli Nefer.

23] Ahmed Lütfî Efendi, *Vakanüvis Ahmed Lütfî Efendi Tarihi*, I, (Çev: Ahmet Hazerfan), İstanbul 1999, p. 61; SelimAslantaş, "Osmanlı-Rus İlişkilerinden Bir Kesit: 1826 Akkerman Andlaşması'nın Müzakereleri", p. 154-155; Nikolae Jorga says that there were five hundred Beşli Nefers in Iaşi before the 1821. See *Nikolae Jorga, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, p. 256.

24] There were complaints that high-ranking Ottoman Soldiers intervened in Hospodars. BOA, *HAT*, nr.45553-G.

Danubian Principalities.²⁵ One of the first actions of occupation administration was spreading the propaganda that unlike other territories in Balkans the Wallachia and Moldavia were not conquered by the Ottoman Empire but came under Ottoman rule with their own consent. The presence of a great power like Russia which took over the role of savior and protector of Christianity rendered this subjugation meaningless. The people of Wallachia and Moldavia were expected to express their will towards Russia. The author states that the Russian did more than propagating and collected signatures from boyars.²⁶

Ever since Wallachia and Moldavia were organized as voivodeship a metropolit was always present in the administration of councils. Occupation administration appointed Russian consul Minciaki to the post in violation of traditions. Minciaki assured that legal regulation codified in the Danubian Principalities was carried out under Russian and Ottoman control.²⁷ Thus the Romanian lost their centuries owned privilege of taking decisions about their internal affairs.²⁸ A council with high participation and representation was formed and discussions for Organic Statutes were launched. The aim was diminishing boyars who opposed the intervention of Russia to minority and reducing their influence. Boyars who were aware of the plots protested on the grounds that a council without a metropolit to lead could not be a real council of people. Kiselev sent opponents from Bucharest. Among them Brâncoveanu, Văcărescu, Bălăceanu and Câmpineanu miraculously died before the abolition of the Council according to the account of the author. During their funerals which were carried out in a chaos the new regulations were accepted. But the article about surveillance about Russian Emperor was left blank. Articles which determined appointment of hospodars among local boyars and bended the rules for complete withdrawal of Russian troops from Ottoman lands

25] After the war Ottoman and Russia signed Adrianople Treaty. Porte accepted that Wallachia and Moldavia would remain as a hostage in Russia until the end of war indemnity's all installment were paid. Şerafettin Turan, "1829 Edirne Antlaşması", *Ankara Üniversitesi Dilve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, IX/1-2 (1951), p. 140; When Russia was given the right to occupy, Kont (Fyodor) Pahlen, Pyotr Zheltukhin and General Pavel Kiselev were instructed to administer the provisional government. *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 22b.

26] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 23b.

27] Viktor Taki, "Russia on the Danube: Imperial Expansion and Political Reform in Moldavia and Wallachia, 1812-1834", Central European University, Phd Thesis, 2007, p. 264; Russia raised difficulties for the presence of charge d'affaires and consul of the Ottoman Empire in Bucharest. Thus Russia seized administration of Danubian Principalities. See *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 24a.

28] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 24a.

were added to Organic Statutes which became effective faultily.²⁹ Organic Statutes was approved by Sublime Porte after Petersburg Treaty of 1834.³⁰

Although the Treaty of St. Petersburg ensured withdrawal of Russian troops it did not mean end of Russian influence in the Danubian Principalities. Although Hospodars had to be elected by Councils of Wallachia and Moldavia, Kiselev secretly contacted Sublime Porte and presented the list of candidates whom Russian Tsar proposed.³¹ Alexandru Ghica was appointed as Hospodar of Wallachia and Mihail Sturdza as Hospodar of Moldavia whose former services were appreciated by Mahmud II.³² According to the booklet Russia's seeking consent of the Ottoman Empire may be evaluated as a diplomatic move to consolidate the power of Hospodars who would later follow pro-Russian policies.³³

Kiselev carefully shaped the bureaucratic staff that would take the Hospodars under pressure and control. Diplomatic representative of Wallachia and Moldavia's (Kapı Kahyaları) were selected among pro-Russian Greeks. Odobescu, who was a Russian sympathizer, was appointed as adjutant of Prince Alexandru Ghica.³⁴ Russia was determined to maintain its presence in the Danubian Principalities in accordance with St. Petersburg Treaty. Ghica was forced to convince the Council and demand troops from Russia in order to prevent probable mass unrest during adaptation process of people to the novelty that Organic Statutes brought. The Hospodar knew well that he would lose the control upon arrival of Russian troops so he declared that his own troops could solve the problem and took initiative. Ghica had no choice but give up his post as he lost his prestige in the eyes of the Council. He was thought to consider his own interest rather Wallachia's. When an authority gap occurred in Wallachia due to his resignation developments in Bulgaria gained priority for Russia. The committees which were

29] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 24b-26a.

30] According to the Petersburg Treaty the Russian troops would be withdrawn from the Danubian Principalities. For details of the treaty see BOA, A.DVN.DVE.d., nr. 83/1, p. 232-235; *Kaynarca, AynalıKavak, Bükreş, Edirne, Petersburg Muahedeleri*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Kütüphanesi (TTK), Y/135, p. 49-51; For acceptance of Organic Statutes by the Ottoman Empire see BOA, HAT, nr. 46120; *NikolaeJorga, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, p. 315.

31] BOA, HAT, nr.45375-A; BOA, HAT, nr.45375-C; BOA, HAT, nr.45375-D; BOA, HAT, nr.45375-E.

32] BOA, HAT, nr. 45381; BOA, C.HR., nr. 71/3543; *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 26a; According to Nikola Iorga Hospodar Gika is merciful and dreamer on other hand Mihail Sturdza seems as if influenced by Russian Tsar's ideas but he really is rational, practical and despotic. *NikolaeJorga, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, p. 315.

33] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 26a.

34] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 26b.

organized by Russian consuls in Brăila and Galați were in action. Events which started in Brăila and spread to Bucharest formed a negative outlook. Those developments were enough for Russia which was warrantor of peace and prosperity in the area to send troops.³⁵

The new Hospodar Bibescu who was brought to the post in a chaotic atmosphere agreed with Russia on military matters. Russia being unable to drive its army into the area because of hardening discourse of European Powers planned to realize its aim by its investments in metalurgy. Trandafilov, who was originally an engineer, acquired the concession of mines in the Danubian Principalities with the consent of the Council.³⁶ Four or five thousand workers were needed for operating mines. The intended workers were actually Russian soldiers infiltrated into the Danubian Principalities in worker uniforms. When the Council realized the *fait accompli* and put it onto agenda, extreme discussions broke out. After it became clear that Russian soldiers would not be allowed to infiltrate into Wallachia and Moldavia, Bibescu abolished the council and won Russia's favour.³⁷

Keeping the council closed for three years enabled Bibescu to rule as he wished without a control mechanism. Authors writing books in Romanian were tried to be kept under control. Youth who were trying to revive national consciousness were sent to exile with Russia's support in alliance with the Phanariot. They tried to prevent national awakening in the area in that way. Russian influence had its golden age during that period. According to the author Bibescu acted like *aide de camp* of Russian Tsar and made important contributions to consolidation of Russian influence.³⁸

Conclusion

Russia reached the peak of its power in the Danubian Principalities with the interim government which was established after the revolution of 1848. The process which ended with Paris Treaty of 1856 turned the Danubian Principalities issue which was formerly an area on which Russia and the Ottoman Empire struggled for influence, into an issue which concerned the whole Europe.

35] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 27a-30a.

36] Barbara Jelavich, *Russia and the Formation of the National State 1821-1878*, p. 38.

37] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 30a-31a.

38] *Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi*, folio, 31b-32a.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Archival Materials:

- BOA (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi)
Bâb-ı Asafî Amedi Kâlemi Dosyaları (A.AMD.)
74/6.
Bab-ı Asafî Mektubi Kâlemi Dosyaları (A.MKT.)
1580/24, 1580/25, 1582/47.
Cevdet Hariciye (C.HR.)
45/2239, 133/6647, 71/3543.
Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri (A.DVN.DVE.d.)
81/5, 83/1.
Hatt-ı Hümayûn (HAT).
45624, 45441, 45586-A, 45528, 45547-A, 45724, 45724-A, 45459-A, 37877-D, 45588-E, 45553-G, 46120, 45375-A, 45375-C, 45375-D, 45375-E, 45381.

2. Unpublished Manuscripts

Memleketeyn Yani Eflak-Boğdan Tarihi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi Tarih Yazmaları (TY) 2479.

Kaynarca, Aynalı Kavak, Bükreş, Edirne, Petersburg Muahedeleri, Türk Tarih Kurumu Kütüphanesi (TTK), Y/135.

3. Secondary Literature

- Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, VII, İstanbul 1309.
Ahmed Lütî Efendi, *Vakanüvis Ahmed Lütî Efendi Tarihi*, I, (Çev: Ahmet Hazerfan,) İstanbul 1999.
Aslantaş, Selim, “Osmanlı-Rus İlişkilerinden Bir Kesit: 1826 Akkerman Antlaşması’nın Müzakereleri”, *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, IX/36 (Kış 2013), s. 149-169.
Beydilli, Kemal, “Küçük Kaynarca Antlaşması”, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXVI, Ankara 2002, s. 524-527.
Beydilli, Kemal, “Pazvandoğlu Osman”, *DİA*, XXXIV, İstanbul 2007, s. 208-210.
_____, “Yaş Antlaşması”, *DİA*, XLIII, Ankara 2013, s. 343-347.
Demiroğlu, Hasan, “Rus Kaynaklarına Göre Rusya’nın Balkan Siyaseti: Ortodoks Birliği ve Panslavizm (1856-1878)”, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Doktora Tezi, İstanbul 2009.
Florescu, Radu, “The Roumanian Problem in Anglo-Turkish Diplomacy, 1821-1824: British Reaction to the Wallachian Revolt”, Indiana Universty, Phd.

Thesis, 1959.

Guboğlu, Mihail, "Eflak ve Buğdan Voyvodalarının Babiâli ile Münasebetleri", *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, Sayı 1, İstanbul 1967, s. 61-67.

Jelavich, Barbara, *Russia and the Formation of the National State 1821-1878*, Cambridge 1984.

Jorga, Nikolae, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi (1774-1912)*, V, (Çev. Nilüfer Epçeli), İstanbul 2009.

Kılıç, Muhammed Ali, "Russian Challenges Concerning Ottoman Bogdan", University of Fatih Institute of Social Sciences, MA Thesis, İstanbul 2008.

Köse, Osman, "Balkanlarda Rus Konsolosluklarının Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetleri", *Turkish Studies/Türkoloji Dergisi*, I/2, Erzincan 2006, s. 141-155.

Köse, Osman, *1774 Küçük Kaynarca Andlaşması*, Ankara 2006.

Mayuzumi Akitsu, "Issues Pertaining to Wallachian and Moldavian Voyvodas and Their Effect on Russo-Ottoman Relations (1774-1826)", *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies*, XXVII, 2006, s. 1-31.

Mustafa Kesbî, *İbretnü'mâ-yı Devlet*, (haz. Ahmet Öğreten), Ankara 2002.

Örenç, Ali Fuat, *Balkanlarda İlk Dram Unuttuğumuz Mora Türkleri ve Eyaleten Bağımsızlığa Yunanistan*, İstanbul 2009.

Özcan, Abdülkadir, "Serhad Kulu", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, XXXVI, İstanbul 2009, p. 560-561.

Özkaya, Yücel, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Dağlı İsyanları (1791-1808)*, Ankara 1983.

Sahhâflar Şeyhizâde Mehmed Esad Efendi, *Vakanüvis Esad Efendi Tarihi (Bahir Efendi'nin Zeyl ve İlaveleriyle) 1821-1826*, (haz. Ziya Yilmazer), İstanbul 2000.

Şâni-Zâde Mehmed Atâullah Efendi, *Şânî-Zâde Târîhi*, II, (haz. Ziya Yilmazer) İstanbul 2008.

Taki, Viktor, "Russia on the Danube: Imperial Expansion and Political Reform in Moldavia and Wallachia, 1812-1834", Central European University, Phd. Thesis, 2007.

Turan, Şerafettin, "1829 Edirne Antlaşması", *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, IX/1-2 (1951), s. 111-151.

Zens, Robert W., "The Ayanlık and Pasvanoglu Osman Paşa of Vidin in the Age of Ottoman Social Change", *1791-1815*, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Phd. Thesis, 2004.