

DIMITRIE CANTEMIR AND HIS TIME: NEW DOCUMENTS FROM THE TURKISH ARCHIVES

MIHAI MAXIM

THE MAIN COLLECTIONS OF OTTOMAN DOCUMENTS USED IN THIS RESEARCH

In the famous Ottoman Archive of Istanbul, the biggest archive in Turkey that nowadays belongs to the Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey (*T.C. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi*, BOA from now on) and that once was the Grand Viziers' archive, there are, according to the latest estimations, over 130 million documents or, more precisely, 100 million documents and 365.000 defters (registers)¹. So far only the third part of this collection has been catalogued and thus placed at the researchers' disposal.

For this research on Cantemir's time, which started a few years ago within the Project "Cantemir" of the *Dimitrie Cantemir* Romanian Cultural Institute in Istanbul and required diligent work, the great collections of documents of this archive has been consulted: **D.BRZ** (*Bab-ı Defteri. Büyük Ruznâme*), that is The Great Registers *Ruznâme*, recording the daily incomes and expenditures of the Central Treasury of the Ottoman State), **D.KRZ** (*Bab-ı Defteri. Küçük Ruznâme*), the Registers of the Small *Ruznâme*, recording incomes and expenditures regarding the high officials and soldiers paid by the Treasury); **D.BŞM** (*Bab-ı Defteri. Başmuhasebe*), totalising the registers issued by the General Accountancy Office); **D.MMK.BĞN** (*Bab-ı Defteri. Maden Mukataası. Boğdan*), registers of the Mining Office regarding Moldavia); **D.MMK.EFK** (*Bab-ı Defteri. Maden Mukataası. Eflâk*), registers of the Mining Office regarding the Wallachia; **A.DVN** (*Bab-ı Asaflı. Divan-ı Humâyun*), registers elaborated by the Imperial Divan Office); **MAD** (*Maliyeden Müdevver Defterleri*), registers issued by the Financial

¹ Dr. Önder Bayır (The Prime Ministry Archive's Director), "Rumeli Araştırmaları Açısından Osmanlı Arşivinin Önemi" (The Ottoman Archive's Importance from the point of view of research concerning Rumelia), paper delivered at the International Symposium on Ottoman Studies in South-East Europe, organised by IRCICA (Research Centre for Islamic Art, History and Culture), Istanbul, 12 July 2008.

Department and so on (the political-administrative offices/chancelleries belonged to the Grand Vizier's Porte, i.e. *Bab-ı Asafi*, and the financial ones belonged to the Grand Defterdar's Porte, i.e. *Bab-ı Defteri*).

In the case of these BOA collections (fonds), there are both basic inventories (catalogues), comprising registers (*defter usulü*) and file divided inventories (*dosya usulü*), that is documents selected according to different themes. Each of these collections includes a few tens, even hundreds of registers or files, with thousands and thousands of documents, usually written in the extremely difficult financial Ottoman "code" *siyakat* (it is worth mentioning that in order to keep the secret over the demographic-financial potential of the Ottoman State, its Finance Department, which had more than fifty offices (*kalem*), used a real "cipher", known at that time only by specially trained persons and nowadays by a small number of Ottomanists).

On the whole, a few documents about Dimitrie Cantemir himself could be discovered at BOA. Given the huge amount of documents existing in this archive, this scarcity could be understood by taking into consideration the interruptions in the recordings that occurred exactly during these years and the very short period of time during which the Romanian Prince held an official position as the *Voyvoda* (Reigning Prince) of Moldavia, whose official relations with the Porte, recorded in the Ottoman Offices, took approximately five months, between November 14/25, 1710 and April/May 1711.

DIMITRIE CANTEMIR BEFORE HIS REIGN IN MOLDAVIA

Regarding the origin of the Romanian Prince, I found no clue whatsoever in the available Ottoman documents. However, there is no relation between *Kantemiroğlu* (*Küçük Kantemiroğlu*), the youngest son of Constantin Cantemir, Prince of Moldavia (1685–1693), and *Kantemir Mirza*, a Tatar Nogay Prince (*Emir-Zade*) from Bucak, who supported the Porte against the rebellion of Mehmed Giray, Khan of Crimea, and of his brother, Şahin Giray, *Kalgay* Sultan, that is, the heir of the Crimean throne), between 1624–1628. In exchange, Kantemir was appointed *Beylerbeyi* of Silistra in 1624², became very influent in Crimean and Moldavian affairs and dangerous for Poland. In the end, by order of the powerful Murad IV, was executed in Istanbul in 1637³, that is, a few decades before Prince

² Mihai Maxim, in *Istoria Românilor*, edited by the Romanian Academy, vol. V, Editura Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 2003, p. 815.

³ Nicolae Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi* (History of the Ottoman Empire), vol. 3 (1538–1640), translation (from the German) by Nilüfer Epeçli & Kemal Beydilli, Yeditepe Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 318–323.

Dumitrașco's birth⁴. Nevertheless, we can not exclude the possibility that the Cantemirs is a family of Tatar descent. A Tatar converted to Orthodoxy and Romanized could have been their ancestor, as certain Russian sources, the Prince's physiognomy and his own claims (on *Cengiz Han*'s lineage, treated with derision by Voltaire) seem to indicate.

Moreover, I found no mentions of Cantemir's studies at the Imperial (Inner) Palace School (*Mektebi-i Enderun*), probably because the Prince did not converted to Islam, as his predecessor in the field of the Turkish music, the Pole Wojciek Bobowski (Albertus Bobovius), who became Ali Ufki (d. 1675). That is to say, being a non-Muslim, the Moldavian Prince couldn't attend such a school. Nevertheless, despite having consulted a few tens of registers issued by the Office (*Kalem*) of the so called *muşaherehoran* (high ranking officers, and especially their sons, monthly paid by the Ottoman Treasury), registers in which there were mentions of the sons of the Crimea Khans and of Ottoman high Officials, I found no record of *Küçük Kantemiroğlu*'s presence amidst the *muteferrikas* of the High Porte (honorary officers), monthly subsidised by the *Hazine-i Amire* (The Imperial Treasury)⁵, as it was the case with some Romanian princes in the sixteenth century⁶. Nevertheless, the explanation of this absence can be directly found in Cantemir's *Descriptio Moldaviae* (1716), in which the Prince states that, in the past, princes' sons and destituted (*mazîl*) princes received a daily stipend from the Imperial Treasury, but later it became obsolete. In his words, "*Olim, tum filiis Principum tum exauctoratis Principibus ex Imperatorio Thesauro diurna quinque, aut decem Imperialium stipendia destinata fuerant, is tamen mos postea in desuetudinem venit*"⁷.

However, I did discover a very interesting document regarding the international context that directly influenced the appointment of Dimitrie Cantemir

⁴ A descent of Dimitrie Cantemir from Kantemir-Mirza, asserted without proof by some historians, was also denied by Giuseppe Cossutto, in his (unpublished) PhD on Kantemir Mirza, prepared under my supervision in Istanbul and Prof. Biancamaria Scarcia-Amoretti's supervision in Rome.

⁵ This *Kalem-i müşaherehoran* (Chancellery for *muşaherehoran*) was subordinated to *Kalem-i Ruznamçe-i Küçük*, i.e. Chancellery/Office of Small *Ruznâmçe* (see, for instance, *BOA, D.KRZ, dosya 78/gömlek 91, sene 1115/1703–1704; dosya 80/gömlek 8, from 16 Rebiülevvel 1120/05.06.1708, etc.*). There are over 80 dossiers (*dosya*) *D.KRZ* that contain information about Dimitrie Cantemir's presence in Istanbul intermittently between 1688–1710.

⁶ Mihai Maxim, *L'Empire ottoman au Nord du Danube et l'autonomie des Principautés Roumaines au XVIe siècle. Études et documents*, Les Éditions ISIS, Istanbul, 1999, pp. 43, 50–61.

⁷ *Demetrii Cantemirii, Principis Moldaviae, Descriptio Antiqui et Hodierni Status Moldaviae/ Dimitrie Cantemir, Principele Moldovei, Descrierea stării de odinioară și de astăzi a Moldovei*, ediție critică întocmită de Dan Slușanschi, Institutul Cultural Român, București, 2006 (later on: *Descriptio Moldaviae*, ediție critică), p.188.

as Prince of Moldavia in a very troubled period, Cantemir being considered a very reliable person (*itimadlı*) by the Porte from the perspective of the newly declared Ottoman-Russian war. The document concerns the famous battle of Poltava between the Swedes led by Charles XII and the Russians of Peter the Great (July 8, 1709), whose well-known result is the defeat of the Swedes and their King's refuge in Tighina (Bender), more precisely at Varnitza, from whence he instigated to a new Ottoman-Russian war. This newly discovered document is, in fact, the summary of the letter sent by the Prince of Moldavia to Cupărescu (*Kupar oğlu*), his *Kapu Kethüdası* (representative) at the Porte (*Boğdan Voyvodasından Kapu Kethüdası olan Kupar oğluna gelen mektubun hulasasıdır*)⁸.

The BOA experts dated the letter in the year of the Hegira 1122 (A.D. 1710/1711). Indeed the letter seems to have reached Istanbul around 1122, but after a long detour: Poltava-Kiev-Jassy-Istanbul. The author of the report, an agent of the Prince of Moldavia, Nicolae Mavrocordat, begins his account stating that “*a decisive battle between the Moscovers and the Swedes has not taken place yet. The fortress called Poltava had been besieged before by the Swedes, but it resisted...*”, which proves that the Moldavian agent was already in Poltava at the beginning of the summer of 1708, when, as we know, the siege took place⁹. Apart from the technical details of the report, e.g. the movements of the Tsar's troops, the Poles and Kazaks' movements, the report suggests that the Prince of Moldavia had his men (*adamlarımız*) in Kiev (*Kiyöv, Chiov*), who were closely following the unfolding of the events and informing, via Jassy, the Porte. Thus, it gives new evidence on the importance of the Romanian Voyvodas' intelligence supply to Istanbul¹⁰.

DIMITRIE CANTEMIR'S APPOINTMENT AS PRINCE OF MOLDAVIA

We know from Neculce¹¹ and Silahdar¹², both contemporaneous with and directly involved in the events of the times of Cantemir, that *Dumitrașco*/

⁸ BOA, fond A.DVN (*Bab-ı Asafî.Divan-ı Humâyun*), i.e. the Office of the Imperial Council, subordinated to the Grand Vizier, *dosya 505, belge* (doc.) 84.

⁹ See Mehmet Emin Üner, “Prut Seferi'nde İsveç Kralı XII. Karl ve Kırım Hanı Devlet Giray'ın Rolü” (The Role of the Swedish King Charles XII and of the Crimean Khan Devlet Giray in the Prut Campaign), in: derleyen (“collector”, i.e. editor) Prof.Dr.Kemal Çiçek, *Baltacı Mehmet Paşa-Sempozyum Bildirileri* KaraM, Çorum, 2007, pp.73–74.

¹⁰ See Mihai Maxim, “Obligațiile militare în muncă și de transport ale Moldovei și Țării Românești față de Poartă în a doua jumătate a veacului XVI”, in: *Analele Universității București. Istorie*, 28, 1979, pp. 99–109.

¹¹ *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei-Grigore Ureche, Miron Costin, Ion Neculce*, Ed. “Universul”, Chișinău, 2006 (later on *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*), p. 372.

¹² Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretname*, in: *Cronici turcești privind Țările Române. Extrase*, II, edit.Mihail Guboglu, Editura Academiei, București, 1974, p. 517.

Kantemiroğlu's appointment to the throne of Moldavia is due to the direct intervention of the Crimean Khan, through the agency of Ismail Ağa, the Khan's *Kapu Kethüdası* at the Porte, an old friend of the Moldavian *Beyzade*. A document issued by the General Accountancy of Istanbul on the 1st of Zilk'ade 1122 (A.D. December 12, 1710, new style) records the expenditures occasioned by the Khan's visit to the Porte, the arrival date being the 11th of Ramazan 1122 (A.D. November 3, 1710, n.st.)¹³, that is, fourteen days before Cantemir's appointment as Prince of Moldavia on the 3rd of Şevval 1122 (A.D. November 25, 1710, n. st. = 14 Nov., old st.)¹⁴. Unfortunately, records regarding the expenditures of the Porte related to the appointment (*tevcih*) and the ceremony of investment (*teşrif*) of the new Prince did not survive, a misfortune if we compare it with the wealth of records regarding similar events in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries¹⁵. Only a few records regarding the days after the investment were kept, including expenditures for caftans¹⁶, pieces of harness¹⁷ and so on for the new Prince of Moldavia. The record of the reward (*ilbâs*) of Prince of Moldavia (*mir-i Boğdan*) with 26 caftans (*hil'athâ*)¹⁸, obviously for D. Cantemir's boyars (*boyaran*)¹⁹, faithful companions, was done on 4 Şevval 1122, i.e. the next day after the Prince's official nomination (in the Imperial Divan), including also this very important mention: "in audience with the Emperor" (*der huzûr-u hümayûn*)²⁰. The same "scenario" is written by the Ottoman official historiographer (*vak'anüvis*) Silahdar²¹: in a hurry, despite of Bayram (Muslim religious feast) days, in which the Divan too was on holiday, the Supreme Imperial Council was convoked in an extraordinary session on Tuesday (*Salı*), the third day of Bayram, "an exception granted to a sinful giaour"; Cantemir was given the *insignia* (*hükümet alâmetleri*), that is, the symbols of delegation of power by the Sultan, namely

¹³ BOA, fond D.BŞM(*Bab-ı Defteri.Başmuhasebe*), dosya7681, vesika 61.

¹⁴ *Demetrii Principis Cantemirii Incrementorum et Decrementorum Aulae Othman(n)icae... Libri Tres*, praefatus est Virgil Cădea, critice editit Dan Sluşanschi, Editura Amarcord, Timişoara, 2001, p. 289; A.N. Kurat, *Prut Seferi ve Barışı* (The Prut Campaign and Peace), vol. 1, Ed. TTK, Ankara, 1951, p. 179.

¹⁵ Mihai Maxim, *L'Empire ottoman au Nord du Danube*, pp. 159–168; idem, *Romano-Ottomanica. Essays & Documents from the Turkish Archives*, The ISIS Press, Istanbul, 2001, pp. 80–84, 107–111, 114–116, 125–127, 131–134, 155–161.

¹⁶ BOA, fond Kamil Kepeci(KK), *Teşrifat Defteri* (Register of Protocol), no. 687, p. 4.

¹⁷ BOA, Kamil Kepeci, *Ruznâmçe Defteri*, no. 2032, p. 197 (the amount of these expenses was of 789 *guruş-u esedi*, i.e. Holland thalers, or 126.240 *akçe*/aspers).

¹⁸ Cantemir himself mentions in *Descriptio Moldaviae* that on the occasion of the Prince's appointment 27 caftans (*togas*) were distributed to his boyars (*ipsius Baronibus*)(*Descriptio Moldaviae*, ediție critică, p. 154).

¹⁹ See also BOA, D. BŞM, *defter no. 1163*, p. 11(caftans for *boyaran-ı Mir-i Boğdan*).

²⁰ See *supra* footnote 16.

²¹ In *Cronici turceşti*, II, p. 517.

an *üsküf* (knitted cap with a tassel worn by the officers of Janissaries), a beautiful horse (*esb-i mükemmel*), with a sword (*şimşir*) at the left of the saddle and an iron war -mace (*bozdoğan, topuz*) at the right, apart from robes of honor²²,” and then ”(the next day?), Silahdar continues, at *Arz Odası* (the Sultan’s Audience Hall), the newly appointed Prince, has kissed the hand of the Padishah (the ceremony of *dest-bûs*).

I haven’t found yet the *berat* (diploma) of the appointment to the throne of Dimitrie Cantemir, which, we learn from similar situations, was issued by the Imperial Divan (*Divan-ı Humâyun*) two or three months after the order of appointment (*emr-i şerif*) of the Sultan. These documents were registered with the Office of Mines (*Maden Kalemi*), but the records of those years have not been located yet (I shall remind the fact that only the third part of the *BOA* documents have been so far catalogued; consequently, the other two thirds might offer many surprises). Instead, I found the *berat* of Ştefan Cantacuzino, appointed Prince of Wallachia (1714–1716), with the presentation of all bureaucratic procedures: the Sultan’s decision (*emr-i şerif*) on 3 Rebiülevvel 1126/19.03.1714, n. st. (or 08.03.1714, old st.), when Constantin Brâncoveanu was still in power; the *berat*, issued by the *Divan-ı Hümayûn* approximately 3 months later, that is on *gurre-i Cemaziülâhır* 1126/14.06.1714, n. st.; the record (*kayıt*) of the *berat* at the *Maden Kalemi*²³.

DIMITRIE CANTEMIR AS PRINCE OF MOLDAVIA AND HIS OBLIGATIONS TO THE PORTE

According to the informations offered by Neculce²⁴, but also by the Turkish sources, until Petru I’s arrival to Jassy, Cantemir had tried to maintain the official relations with Istanbul, to fulfil his obligations to the Porte, even to begin, upon receiving the approval of the Porte, the negotiations with the Russians²⁵. To give one example, Moldavia contributed to the repair or supplying of the Tighina (*Bender*) fortress²⁶, the form of contribution being the *ocaklık* system, that is the deduction from the tribute (*harac, ciziye*) of these expenses, in other words, a transfer of financial resources (*havale*).

One of the most important discoveries made during this research in the Istanbul archives was that of two registers issued by The Office of Mines, recording the tribute (*harac, ciziye*) of Moldavia between the years of the Hegira

²² Cf. Mihai Maxim, *Romano-Ottomanica*, Part II, *Teşrifat* (Protocol).

²³ *BOA, C. MTZ (Cevdet. Eyâlet-i Mümtâze/ Privileged Provinces)*, no. 12/569.

²⁴ *Letopiseşul Ţării Moldovei*, p. 374–381.

²⁵ A.N. Kurat, *op. cit.*, I, p. 331.

²⁶ *Letopiseşul Ţării Moldovei*, p. 374.

1114–1174 (A.D. 1703–1761)²⁷ and the tribute of Wallachia between the years of the Hegira 1097–1183 (A.D. 1686–1771)²⁸. These novel sources suggest that even at the height of the Phanariot era, that is, the Ottoman system's decline, the bookkeeping of the tribute had been still rigorously done and that the nominal amount of the tribute of Moldavia had remained the same for more than half of a century. Taking into consideration the devaluation of the Ottoman currency, which was mainly used for the payment of the tribute, we witness in fact the diminution of the real amount of this tax. During Cantemir's time, including the financial year 1710–1711, year in which the cultivated prince reigned, the Moldavian tribute amount was of 65454 *guruş* (piasters)²⁹, an amount (mentioned also by Cantemir himself in *Descriptio Moldaviae*, 1716: 65000 Imperial thalers³⁰) that confirms the precedent results of my own research³¹. It is worth specifying the the tribute of Wallachia was more than double, Brancoveanu himself, exactly on the days in which Cantemir was appointed Prince, that is on 4 Ramazan 1122/27.10.1710, n. st., was paying his entire tribute of 141 718 *guruş*, at Bender (Tighina)³², in order to prevent the Porte grow suspicious about his relationships to the Russians and Austrians. A document issued by the General Accountancy Office (D.BŞM) during the month of Zilhicce 1122 (A.D. January 21–February 18, 1711, n.st.), that is, exactly during the time in which Dimitrie Cantemir was reigning in Jassy, mentions the delivery of a quantity of 10 000 *vukiye*, i.e. *okka* (12, 83 tons) of honey ('*asel*)³³.

**CANTEMIR AFTER STĂNILEȘTI (JULY 23, 1711).
THE DETHRONING AND SEIZURE OF PROPERTIES BY THE PORTE
(THE MÜSÂDERE PROCEDURE)**

At the end of the Prut Campaign – about which there is a huge documentary evidence in the Turkish archives and a rich body of literature³⁴ –, the Moldavian

²⁷ BOA, D. MMK.BĞN, no. 23. 247.

²⁸ BOA, D. MMK.EFK, no. 23. 377.

²⁹ BOA, D. MMK.BĞN, no. 23. 247, p. 33: “*cizye-i gebrân-ı vilâyet-i Boğdan vâcib an gurre-i (Ramaza)n sene 1122 ilâ gâye-i Şaban sene 1123; fi'l asl-ı mal fi sene guruş 65454*”, i.e. “the tribute of the infidels of the vilâyet of Moldavia dued from the first day of Ramazan of the year 1122 (24.10.1710, n.st. – M.M.) untill the final day of Şaban of the year 1123 (13.10.1711, n. st. – M.M.)”.

³⁰ *Descriptio Moldaviae*, ediție critică, p. 264.

³¹ Mihai Maxim, “Haraciul moldovenesc în opera lui D.Cantemir”, in *Analele Universității București. Filosofie. Istorie. Drept*, 22, București, 1974, pp. 69–78.

³² BOA, D.BŞM, dosya 7682/vesika 23.

³³ BOA, D.BŞM, dosya 1651/vesika 13.

³⁴ A source known since 1938, but published only recently, namely the “Memoirs” of a secretary (*kâtib*) of Janissaries, Hasan, does mention the participation of “hain Kantemiroğlu” to the

Prince was not handed over to the victorious Ottomans by Petru I, and the Grand Vizier Baltacı Mehmed Pasha did not dwell on the matter. The Porte was going again to appoint *Nikolay* Mavrocordatos as Prince, instead of Cantemir. But before that, Ioan (*Yani*) Mavrocordatos, the Drogman (official chief translator) of the Imperial Divan, was appointed as *Kaymakam* (deputy) *Voyvoda* and, in the first days after Stănilești, after Prince Cantemir left his capital, Jassy, on 16/27 July 1711, the boyard Lupul Costache was appointed as “deputy of the Prince of Moldavia” (*Boğdan Voyvodası Vekili*). In accordance with an order of the Sultan given on the 21st of Cemaziülahir 1129 (A.D. August 6, 1711), the latter had to prepare and send to Bender, where Charles XII was momentarily located, 100 carts and two pairs of horses for each of them and 300 soldiers (*neferan*)³⁵. Wallachia had to contribute with 250 carts and 500 soldiers³⁶. These preparations were demanded for the departure of the Swedish King, who was going to pass through Walachia and Transilvania on his way back to his country. The Vizier Hasan Pasha, *Beylerbeyi* of Rumelia, was designated to be the commander of this real expedition³⁷.

However, the most numerous and interesting documents regarding Dimitrie Cantemir found at BOA reports on the seizure of the former Prince’s properties. After the Stănilești defection, the Islamic punishment *müsâdere*³⁸ was applied in Cantemir’s case, a procedure consisting in the seizure of estates of those accused of betraying the interests of Islam. Nevertheless, these documents prove that Cantemir, who had been so popular in Istanbul before his appointment as Prince of Moldavia, was somehow protected. Unlike the official chronicler Raşid³⁹, the documents of the Porte do not describe him as traitor (*hain*), but record the fact that the former Prince run away (*fırar kerde, fırar şud*). The documents write down several amounts of money collected from either the confiscation of the goods (*eşya*) left in Istanbul or the selling of the villa (*yalı*) in Ortaköy, where it is known that Cantemir lived most of the time he spent in Istanbul – he did not have the necessary time to live in the palace he built for himself in Fener, a palace that he equipped with paintings and a wonderful library and that would initially be in

siege and the conquest of the fortress of Brăila, as commander in chief (!), during this campaign, and his barbarian conduct against local population (!) (see *Prut Seferi’ni beyanımdır.Yeniçeri Kâtibi Hasan*, hazırlayan Hakan Yıldız, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 28–29), a totally unfounded gossip and a calumny spread perhaps by the Janissaries officers, whose knitted cap with tassel, called *üsküf* (*kuka*), was worn also by Cantemir, as *Boğdan Beği*.

³⁵ BOA, D.B.ŞM, dosya 7683/ vesika 73.

³⁶ BOA, D.B.ŞM, dosya 7681/vesika 110.

³⁷ BOA, D.B.ŞM, dosya 7683/vesika 75.

³⁸ On *müsâdere*, see Mihai Maxim, *Romano-Ottomanica*, pp. 173–197 and for bibliography footnote 1, p. 194.

³⁹ *Tarih-i Raşid*, in: *Cronici turcești privind Țările Române. Extrase*, III, volum întocmit de Mustafa A.Mehmet, Editura Academiei, București, 1980, pp. 216–217.

possession of Ioan Mavrocordat. These amounts totalled up the modest amount of 20000 *guruş* (19 999,5 *guruş*, to be more precisely)⁴⁰, while from the former Prince Constantin Brancoveanu a fortune of 818 579 *guruş*⁴¹ was officially confiscated, a few years later. Could we explain this modest amount through the existence of a rebellion plan against the Porte, *Dumitraşko Voyvoda* placing thus in safety his fortune before leaving Istanbul for his Moldavian throne? Or taking into account the informations offered by Neculce⁴² and Raşid⁴³ we have to simply admit that the former Princes of Moldavia Constantin, Antioh and Dimitrie Cantemir were almost broke. There is evidence to support this second affirmation. To give an example, after his younger brother's desertion in Russia, Antioh (also known as *Ando*, *Andiyo* or *Antohi*) was accused of having relations to the traitor Brancoveanu and of borrowing money from him or appropriating a part of his gold. Consequently, Antioh Cantemir had to walk on the rope, so to say, and engaged in different financial manoeuvres in order to save his villa in *Kuruçeşme*, being even imprisoned for three months in the debtors' prison⁴⁴, he, a brother and son of a Prince, he himself ascending twice the throne of Moldavia. As an aside, we can add that the palace in Fener was partially restored, hosting, since June 25, 2007 the *Dimitrie Cantemir* Museum, despite the fact that there are no written documents regarding its fate after Cantemir's desertion. In contrast, the wooden palace in Ortaköy⁴⁵, which fell into an imperial princess's hands, about which there are written mentions, was completely destroyed in a big fire, one of those frequently occurring in the Ottoman capital, ravaging its wooden constructions, leaving no trace, even its location being today impossible to identify.

CANTEMIR IN THE TURKISH CULTURAL HISTORY

On the 18th of October 2001, during an international symposium dedicated to Nicolae Iorga by the Romanian Cultural Institute in Istanbul, the famous Professor

⁴⁰ *BOA, KK (Kâmil Kepeci), no.2034 (Ruznâmçe Defteri)*, pp. 24, 24bis, 25 (two documents); *KK no.2239 (Ruznâmçe Defteri)*, pp. 22, 30; *KK no.2166 (Ruznâmçe Defteri)*, pp. 108, 109, 111.

⁴¹ See *supra* footnote 38.

⁴² *Letopiseşul Ţării Moldovei*, pp. 326, 346, 380.

⁴³ In: *Cronici turceşti*, III, p. 217.

⁴⁴ Mihai Maxim, *Romano-Ottomanica*, p. 191; idem, "Brâncoveanu şi Cantemireştii. Documente noi din arhivele turceşti", in *Arta istoriei, istoria artei. Academicianul Răzvan Theodorescu la 65 de ani*, Editura Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 2004, pp. 125–138.

⁴⁵ *TKSMA/E-11 290*, published 35 years ago by Tahsin Gemil: "Ştiri noi din arhivele turceşti privitoare la Dimitrie Cantemir", *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie şi Arheologie A.D. Xenopol-Iaşi*, Iaşi, 1973; for new findings, at *BOA*, see *supra* note 40.

Halil Inalcık, “the dean of the global Turkish studies”, stated that “*the first to open a window toward the West for the Turkish culture was a Romanian, the enlightened Prince Dimitrie Cantemir.*” It is fitting that this statement, uttered by a first rate scientific authority such as Professor Inalcık, to be studied thoroughly, to be detailed, to be demonstrated. Recently, on the 12th of July 2008, during the International Symposium on Ottoman Studies in South-East Europe, held by IRCICA in Istanbul, Professor Inalcık did repeat the aforementioned statement, adding this time that “the Cantemir’s palace of Ortaköy became a place of debating the causes of the Ottoman decline and of ideas concerning the westernization (*batılılaşma fikirleri*), by the agency of his disciple (*onun öğrencisi*) Rami Mehmed Pasha, who signed the Treaty of Karlowitz and later on (1703) became the Grand Vizier of Ahmed III”⁴⁶.

As for me, being myself concerned with this matter⁴⁷, I could establish, especially in the light of the Cantemir’s *Notes* from his *History of the Ottoman Empire*, a line that leads to Nevşehirli Damat Ibrahim Paşa, Great Vizir between 1718–1730, who, with the support of Ahmed III (1703–1730), officially opened an window towards the West. This line starts from Dimitrie Cantemir and then continues, further on, with Rami Mehmed Pasha (d. 1707), *both of them being the disciples of Nefioğlu*, the Coran teacher of the Romanian Prince and a great intellectual authority in Istanbul of this time. On the other hand, it can not be a pure coincidence the fact that Cantemir presented his famous treatise (*edvar*) on Turkish music to Sultan Ahmed III in 1703, exactly at the time when Rami Mehmed Pasha became Grand Vizier. As for Ahmed III, he became the protector of the new era of openings towards the West, the so called *Lale Devri* (the Tulip Era), 1718–1730⁴⁸, inaugurated by Nevşehirli Ibrahim Pasha, Grand Vizier and son-in-law of the Sultan. Cantemir’s treatise on music, famous for its original system of musical notation that was going to save an important number of Turkish melodies and for Cantemir’s own compositions, surpassed thus Ali Ufki’s previous contribution and represented itself a western style innovation in the cultural Ottoman life. *Last, but not least*, the palace of Ortaköy, with its western style garden, beverages (wine, etc.) and especially with its western guests (diplomats and intellectuals), became a

⁴⁶ See also Prof. Halil Inalcık’s *Foreword to Dimitrie Cantemir, Historian of South East European and Oriental Civilizations*, Al. Duşu & Paul Cernovodeanu (eds), AIESEE, Bucharest, 1973.

⁴⁷ Mihai Maxim, “Kantemiroğlu (Dimitrie Cantemir)” in: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, c. 24, Istanbul, 2001, pp.320–322; idem, “Dimitrie Cantemir (1673–1723)” in: C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer (eds.), *Historians of the Ottoman Empire/Osmanlı Tarihçileri*, Harvard Univ. Press, 2006 (www.ottomanhistorians.com).

⁴⁸ See Fuat Andıç ve Süphan Andıç, *Batıya Açılan Pencere. Lâle Devri* (An window open to the West), EREN. Istanbul, 2006.

place of inter-cultural and even inter-religious dialogue between East and West⁴⁹. This dialogue was to be found again in Cantemir's Works, e.g. *Incrementa atque Decrementa Aulae Othomannicae* (especially in its notes), 1716, and *Sistima religii mugamedanskia*, 1722.

This role of Dimitrie Cantemir as an opener of the path to the West for the Turkish music⁵⁰ and culture, in its totality, must be acknowledged as an important research theme by the historians of culture, a theme that will undoubtedly consolidate the glory of the Romanian Prince's spiritual personality.

A failed politician, a durable historian, especially thanks to the notes of his *History of the Ottoman Empire*, but perishable, as any author of interpretable history, Dimitrie Cantemir will nevertheless remain in the cultural history, both Romanian and Turkish and, consequently, in the universal cultural history.

⁴⁹ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı Kültürü ve Gündelik Yaşam*, transl. from German *Kunst und Alltagsleben im Osmanischen Reich* by Elif Kılıç, Tarih Vakfı, EREN, İstanbul, 2005, p. 297.

⁵⁰ See, for instance, Eugenia Popescu-Judet, *Prince Dimitrie Cantemir Theorist and Composer of Turkish Music*, Pan, İstanbul, 1999.