

THE ANTI-OTTOMAN BATTLE AND ITS RELIGIOUS JUSTIFICATION IN THE TEXTS OF THE ROMANIAN CHRONICLERS

Carmen ALEXANDRACHE¹

¹"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galați-Romania

Abstract: *The military and political events that were part of the Anti-Ottoman attitude have created the occasion to develop the connection between God and man, and it also offered examples of divine intervention in the human destiny and also a series of teachings that a good Christian should respect. This is the vision Romanian chroniclers of the XVIIth century.*

In the Romanian society of those times, it continued to exist the connection between the Turks' actions and the divine punishment given for someone's sins. The details regarding the Romanian Anti-Ottoman actions were not of a major interest for the chroniclers and they were not always explained from a historical perspective. Therefore, neither their religious justification was not purposeful; it was just sometimes suggested with the help of the moral precepts. The observation are contextualised and its seem the ethnic labels. The feelings that were associated to the Anti-Ottoman events have had a religious support, but they were fueled by the politics led by the lords and the resentments towards the hostile actions of the Turks against the Romanians.

After a while, the power of the religious unity was no more a strong enough argument in order to convince" and to unite the entire Christian world against the Ottomans.

Keywords: *alterity, Christianity, morality, diplomacy*

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

There were enough reasons for which the topic concerning the Ottoman Empire should be allocated a large space in the historical writings; the change of the political-governmental configuration of Europe and of the perception upon the reports between Christianity and Islam (5: 152), are only some of them. If the subject concerning the relationships between Christians and Turks is inexhaustible due to the European historiography (19; 22), the approaches from the perspective of the mental and affective attitudes which have developed alongside these relationships, are not very frequently approached in studies (3). Beyond the manifestation of the feelings of fear (9: 117-132) and despair which are unavoidable in the context of the strong Turkish rise in Europe, beyond the religious differences invocated whenever they were profitable for the political and economical interests, it is imposed a reevaluation of the religious feelings and gestures that *came along* with the Anti-Ottoman initiatives. It is a reference to the assembly of beliefs, convictions and representations which have led to certain behaviors towards the Turks and have reflected in the writings of the writers of those times ("The total hostility of the Christian world towards the Islam leads sometimes, according to the mentality of those times, to the idea of a world battle between the Christianity and the Islam" (18: 225). In this context, the historical reality has proven that the Romanian countries, which were concerned only with their own fundamental interests, have diminished the impact of the Ottomans over Europe (6: 10).

Taking into consideration the Romanian Extra-Carpathian realities of the XVIIth century and focusing on the historical writings of those times, it is expected that the chroniclers' ideas do not depart substantially from the European perceptions of those times, especially because, in general, they were anchored intellectually and by means of their readings, in the European cultural environment. The use of this kind of historical and literary sources is explainable; the Romanian chronicles have not been sources of information for the historians, but through they are importante, through the life details which we decode or infer. Thus they might become the "voice", "the mirror" and the "analysts" of their author's contemporary. In order not to uselessly complicate our discourse, we do not insist on their subjectivity and we are not interested in their degree of representativeness within the collective mentality collective.

Either they are interested in social groups or their own community; either they mention them in the terms of some observations, these mentions are valuable for understanding the society's attitude towards the ones that are part of other ethnical structures, so as for explaining their own schemes of ethnical perception. For these mentions to become specific features of the social group they must be *verified* and *verifiable*. In the social knowledge, we consider that the stereotype and prejudices have an good place, because the social perceptions and the attitudes are associated with facts, actions, events, and intentions "*well-known*" by the observers. Beyond the cognitive function, it have also a defensive role,

also being a mean to simplify of the inter-human relations and consequently a mean to a stronger social cohesion.

But, the analysis of these aspects from the perspective of alterity, presume assuming some risks, meaning the awareness of the observation and interpretation point of view's subjectivity and implicitly of the emotional reactions which generates. We must underline though the chroniclers' efforts to be correct in their appreciations concerning the others. It is not good to leave "image" to preserve deformed, because, says le chronicler, "it is not joking to write disgrace for a nation's eternal, „I will give my account of how many write" (7: 243). Taking somewhat part in the destiny of their country, the Romanian chroniclers, as all the other people that have faced the Muslim violence (8: 125u), or that have seen the danger which lurks the Christianity (9: 130-131) from the part of the pagans, have seen the Ottoman Empire as "a hard to understand, odd and mysterious country" where "war and religion go hand in hand" (26: 141) and which only gives "reasons to hate and to fear it" (The conflict between the Islam and "the only body of Christianity" was called by the medieval writers as "The Debate of the World" (26 :149,150).

Between these limits, the perceptions of the Romanian chroniclers have met different nuances and changes of structure,

The social representativeness of the chroniclers' statements remains debatable; coming from among the boyars, but without ever being a part of "the diplomatic staff" (so they did not have access to the official information nor to the state secrets), the chroniclers have proven to be well documented, but their writings focused mainly on what was of their interest. Without being isolated from the rest of the people and without remaining always under the influence of the lord's court, (20: 505), the Romanian chroniclers have become "the only voice" and "the only mirror" of the community (as lofty means of *knowledge* and *communication*).

For the Romanian world of XVI-XVIII centuries, as well as for any medieval society, dominated by religious convictions, the main criteria for social and assessment perception in the *ethical-religious* one. Thus, the attitude towards the religion of the majority and the behaviour towards the community have been the main landmarks in the formation of social representations. Having positive or negative connotations, the stereotype and the prejudices develops errors and standardization in the interpersonal and intercommunity relations, affecting the composition of "the self image". That is why it is not surprisingly that in the nowadays writings the image of the "pagan" persists, and tens to resume to the significance of non-Christianity because it to exit of *rule* and *pattern*. Associated with "*disbelief*", "*transgressions*" and "*enemies*" non-Christians (attributes of the Turks), the image of the "pagan" is simplified, discouraging the relations attempts. This labelling invites us to *prudence*, *mistrust*, *isolation* or *hostility*. He became as we report Dimitrie Cantemir, "a habit of Moldovans (...) to kill and to rob a Turk, or Jew", because ei "I reckon that is not sin and much less sacrilege" (4: 210) (that it is possible because these ethnic groups are not Christian, so do not violate rules).

In general, in the Romanian chronics of the XVIIth century, the battle against the Turks has had a religious dimension. The feelings that were associated to the Anti-Ottoman events have had a religious support, but they were fueled by the politics led by the lords and the resentments towards the hostile actions of the Turks against the Romanians. In the Romanian society of those times, it continued to exist the connection between the Turks' actions and the divine punishment given for someone's sins. Alongside this emotional fund, the perception of the chroniclers' towards the Romanian Anti-Ottoman attitude was influenced by the moral and social values transmitted by means of tradition (10: 6), and also by the observations made in this respect by other foreign Christian "observers".

In the conception of *the literates*, persons that we see as exponents of the people, the representation of "the pagan" is sensibly nuanced to:

- the values and attitudes preserved and transmitted by tradition;
- the emotional background generated and fed social and political context of Romanian-Turkish contacts;
- the content and duration of social and political contacts;
- the images brought by others observers foreign;
- the modality through which the Other makes himself known, what is left exposed.

In that historical time, identity was expressed rather through collectivity, situation which favoured the social „customary law”, „the voice of the people”, as well as „the wagging tongues of village” had filtered individual reaction, working, acting at the physical, intellectual and also affective levels, shaping, with harshness or wisdom, conscience and behaviour.

Either it imposed a set of attitudes, a certain way of observing and understanding reality, either it stir public reprobation, people' resentments or even living their own regrets, the community succeeded in some way to remove the dangers of social dissolution. That is why the foreigner was perceived in a collective sense, his features becoming representative for his whole community. When the foreigner is mentioned in writings in singular, but not individualized, the detail acts like a category which gives specificity to the social group that he is a part of; he is a label which needs no probation.

The presence of the Turks in the Danube area led to the threatening of the territorial- political integrity of the Romanian states and to the intensification of the economical pressure put by the Ottomans over them (16: 24); the relationships between the Turks and the Romanians seem to have been also influenced by the different understanding of the notions of peace and war (16: 187; 11: 203-262). As a result, the anti-Ottoman fight was justified through "the needs that came because of the Turks", "because the Turkish Iain siege on even more than before, with money taxes and shams („zaharele") (15: 75).

For the Romanian countries, the XVIIth century was a time of decay (25), of accentuating the misunderstandings between the boyars, of weakening the central authority, and of decreasing their military capacities. The change among the international relationships which became more obvious after the year 1683 (Ottomans defeat at Vienna), has determined The Sublime Porte to manifest a new politics towards the Principalities through which it has consolidated its economical and political dominance. All of these led to the diminution of the Anti-Ottoman battle force. The religious reasons lost a part of their consistency, so at the beginning of the XVIIIth century, the message sent towards the Principalities regarding the need for the Anti-Ottoman battle was limited to the emphasis of the fact that the Turks have broken all their agreements in the last two centuries. "The power of the religious unity was no more a strong enough argument in order to convince" and to unite the entire Christian world against the Ottomans. Thus, the Romanian lords' preoccupation regarding the alignment to the European politics meant not only keeping their conviction in their duty towards Christianity (a continuation of the "crusade" spirit), but also a preoccupation for the highlighting of their politics as brave warriors, at the European level ("Aron

Voievode had to demonstrate himself strong for the Christians, had cut lots of Turks in order to gain honour").

The details regarding the Romanian Anti-Ottoman actions were not of a major interest for the chroniclers and they were not always explained from a historical perspective. Therefore, neither their religious justification was not purposeful; it was just sometimes suggested with the help of the moral precepts.

Starting from the texts of the Romanian chroniclers from the XVIIth century, this paper intends to emphasize some facets of the Romanian Anti-Ottoman attitude, as it was presented at the literary level. These aspects are important because the chronicles have a great addressability: by means of their content and their writing style, they were addressed to a larger audience and they were supposed to encourage new literary and historical writings.

THE ROMANIAN ATTITUDE AGAINST THE OTTOMANS - BETWEEN POLITICAL INTERESTS AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF

The vision of the Romanian chroniclers over the religious aspects that accompany or motivate the Anti-Ottoman battle is manifesting on two plans:

1. The educational- moralizing vision

For the chroniclers, morality was strongly linked to the religious feeling; the violation of some principles that regard decency, humanity and rightness towards others was interpreted as an offence brought to God. The morale values that were being promoted by the chroniclers (the heroism of the secular battle against the Turks in the name of Christianity, the wisdom of Stephen the Great, the courage of Michael the Brave, the obedience of the freeholders, the firmness of the boyars) (19), have spiritually bonded by means of the always present Christian- Orthodox feeling. But, it is quite possible that in this way they have found the support needed to sustain the idea of the Christian solidarity in front of the Ottoman threat. From these perspectives, "the images" of the Turks have become some persistent clichés, barring a negative load, even though the concept of Islam was not very well understood.

First of all, the Ottomans are *damned*; identified as "genetic pagans" (2: 12) and heretics who not recognize Jesus Christ, the Turks were noticed in the artistic representations within the churches as inhabitants of Hell; they are refused entrance to Celestial Jerusalem, they "die for eternity", as it sometimes said (27: 212).

To an equal extent, the Ottomans were placed in the detestable zone, they were cursed because they were making hostile gestures towards Romanians and they were disturbing the order of the Christian space (17: 231u). Therefore in the texts of the epoch, they were called "bad pagans", "devils", "haughty", "cursed", "madmen", "cattish", "greedy" etc. Be it Turkish or not, the pagan deserves his aversive faith. The torture ("Pagan work"= "muncă păgânească") (24: 358), "pagan greed" ("that do not consider the helplessness of the obedient bastards") (21: 147), "the killing of gentleman" (that crime is considered as a "ungodlinessare", (22: 124) few of "the most terrible angers" (21: 211), the injustices and the wickedness made by the Turks' to their obedient.

Being an embodiment of the heretics, the pagan is replaced, in the literature, with "dishonourable" ("necurăței"), "agareni", "procletți", etc. It is certainly the Turk (considered "hostile for the Christians" and in XIXth century by Dionisie Eclesiarhul) (12: 119). Against this type of enemy the Christians will mobilize.

In order to explain and revive Christianity and the Christian life, the invoking of the biblical texts also obliges us to mention pagans compared to Christians, certainly in terms of religious confrontation.

Was cruel community response and and from converts to Islam. Is eloquent example Chronic retained, The tradition of the Chronicles of Ilias Voievod (whom the people would have called "Mahmet"), who was publicly condemned because "leaving his right belief for the bad belief, his virtue for deceit and bad habit, and he sincerely began to believe and respect the law of the Turks and their false traditions" (8: 194-195).

In the Romanian space also, the perception of the Turks largely results from the relations established with them without awareness of the total meaning of Islam ("for us, for a long period, Islam was the Turk") (1: 141). The use of "the pagan" word, as a synonym for "Turkish", is connected to the religious belief but also to the evil suffered by the Christians, subsequently being accompanied by powerful resentments. Falling into the "hands of the pagans" was seen, write the cronicler, was a great loss, "a great disgust" (28: 27).

In the texts of the chroniclers, it is present the conviction that a Christian must never forget that whatever happens in this world is actually a part of the divine plan, a plan unknown to man, so God always intervenes in man's life. Hence, man will praise God as a means to recognize His power proven by facts and wonders. When Belgrade was under siege, "God helped the Christians win" (14) and the Turks declared their defeat. The same thing happened half a century before, when Stephen the Great fighting with Turks, he said that his help to become victorious came from God and from the Holy Mother (28: 22). The same thing is stated by Grigore Ureche when talking about the Moldovan-Turkish confrontation, when "with the help of the divine intervention, the Turks were covered in darkness, so they could not see one another". (28: 26).

The observation are contextualised and its seem the ethnic labels. For example, about the turks it says that they are "unstable, they not comply with their words, they some others are saying" (22: 200); the Turk is like the "weather", "gentle when is time for gentleness, proud and keen when it's time for haughtiness" (7 : 58).

The ones that mercilessly attack destroy, kill, rob the civil population cannot be anything but pagans. Proved enemies were also the soldiers lui Timus Hmelnitki, în 1653 that robbed the monastery Dragomirna and "more that the pagans" they behaved badly with the people from the monastery. Pagan was the One that with its non-Christian habits, acted against the community ("they were serving with evilness, instead of mercy and kindness" says Radu Greceanu) (21: 218).

The reprehensible acts of Ottomans remained in the popular consciousness, marking the unfriendly attitude of the community against these culprits. In the work chronicles, is possibility, its opened the way to solidarity with the past, to a miraculous divine intervention to rescue.

2. THE HISTORICAL VISION OVER THE ROMANIAN EVOLUTION.

Commune to all the medieval historians, the notion of history has always had a moralizing dimension, it being "necessary for all the young men as a lesson about the bad things which they should protected themselves from and about the good things which they should assimilate in order to become good people" (20: 504). The things that were supposed to be "assimilated" were in concordance with the Christian teachings and with the belief in the existence of "the divine compensation"; man must believe "in God the Almighty, He who fights against the unjustness and praises the rightness, and who punishes roughly the ones that break their oath" (20: 503).

Another component of this way of understanding the Romanians' existence has manifested under the form of the solidarity towards the Christian cause and of the political and military involvement in the battle against the spreading of Islam (a form of sincerely manifesting their belonging to the Christian countries).

No matter the means of manifesting the Anti-Ottoman battle, the Romanians' feelings were directed towards Christianity, from which they were expecting help and which they were using as a justification for their actions. By means of this term, "Christianity", one must understood all the European Christian states (the European civilization) (20: 489), especially those interested in casting out "the pagans" from Europe. By the politics they led, the Romanian lords have tried to synchronize their political expectations to those of the rest of the Christian world. So, by means of all the conflicts that Michael the Brave has led against the Turks, he "was helping the Christians and was brave for them, in order to make the Turks fear him" (14: 27).

The Turkish abuses have also become a cause for the Romanians' reactions to defend the Christian interests that were being threatened. When talking about Walachia, Let wrote about the Turks' "enclosure", about the fact that they "were beginning to build small mosques (...). The Christians were screaming; from everywhere you could here only moans and sighs because of the evil caused by the Turks. The Christians were saying: maybe the Turks will pity us, but they were doing even more evil things. They were beginning to invade the country and to mock the Christian law" (14: 54). When the Turks have asked Lord Radu for the intermediation and obtaining of the Azov Citadel from the Russian Tsar, so as to stop the Kazaks' attacks, the lord has sent the following message to the tsar: "The Turk praises that he will cut the heads of the lords from the two Romanian countries, that he will conquer the third principality as well and that he will ruin all the Christian churches", and he wrote many other similar things and that the tsar should better give up the citadel in order to save the two countries and their Christians and churches (22: 91-92).

At the same time, clichés like "the Pagan Turk", "The enemy of Christianity" have become very useful for the state politics and the lord's interests; the religious justification for the Anti-Ottoman initiatives of the Romanian lord have impelled (in different degrees and not constantly) the revival of the Christian solidarity, of the Christian (European and Romanian) combativity in the face of the Ottoman threat. Therefore Demetrius Cantemir received money from Italy "to assemble an army against the pagans" (24: 243).

Even the actions of Grigore Vodă were just, because the lord "finding the country in need, the people being even more oppressed by the Turks (...) who as lions were opening their mouths to swallow them all and to make the country poorer and even more in need, was not giving up at his country and as much as he could (...) he called all the boyars and demanded them to gather as much wealth as possible and to give it all to the Turks. Maybe God will help them get ride of such an oppressor" (14: 147).

The worsening of the Romanians' situation in report with the suzerain power, especially during the second half of the XVIIth century, has stopped the outspoken initiatives of the Romanian lords to join the other Christian states in their battle against Ottomans. This did not meant the abandonment of the Christian cause. So, one must interpret the "duplicious politics" of the lord Constantin Brancoveanu towards the Tsarist Empire and towards the Sublime Porte in the moment of the conflict from 1710-1711, which was revealed to the presupposed author of the Chronicle as it follows: Wishing to finish this conflict on the side of the winner, Constantin Brancoveanu was hoping that if Russia would win, he "would save his face", "because due to his advice, the enemies of Christianity were beaten", because he was the one that urged the tsar to fight against the Turks; if the Ottoman Empire would win, than the lord will remind the sultan that he was the one that wrote to the Turks "to go and fight fearlessly because their enemy has a small and hungry army" (22: 202). His plan did not work, as the chronicler states with a certain satisfaction, because "the Russians knew that he was deceitful and the Turks called him wicked" (22: 202).

The fact that the idea of Christian solidarity has lost a part of its consistency, it not being anymore the reason to create a coalition against the Ottomans, was suggested by the texts of the chroniclers, without becoming the subject of some specific reflections. During the reign of Ghica Voevode, the seneschal Constantin was threatened to be dethroned and killed which would have affected the country even more: "The good and worthy Christian saw all of these and started to cry and to lament for his poor country that was about to lose its law and its holy churches, and that was to be filled with small mosques (*meceturi turcești*) (...) and so he started to seek help from different countries, but nobody wanted to help him, except for the Almighty God who saved the Israelites from the hands of the pharaoh, Noah from the flood, Lot from Sodom, David from the hands of Saul, and the entire world by means of His blood and from the hands of the Devil. So he was praying to have a strong heart so as to enter and see the vizier" and to ask him to forgive all his mistakes (...) that he will never repeat again (14: 145).

After the battle from Războieni (1476), described by Grigore Ureche in the XVIIth century, despite the heroism and the sacrifice of the Romanian warriors “crushed by the Turkish army”, “the Turks were the ones that won”. “All the surrounding countries have bemoaned the fact that the Moldavians were oppressed by the Turks” (28: 27). Also, the chronicler continues, “it is written in the chronicle that “at Valea Albă was present even Basarab Vodă with his fighters, on the side of the Turks, he was despised by all the surrounding lords for not being on the side of the Cross and of Christianity, but on the side of the enemy, the Turks” (28: 28).

The Romanian fight back has also to do with the disrespect shown to their country, an attitude considered to be specific for the Turkish conquering attitude: “So the Turks have become so proud that they started to enter Walachia, from the side of Danube, and to steal and enslave people” (27:156).

Sometimes the Ottoman intervention is caused by dysfunctions created in the Christian world, where Christian consciousness misses: “Seeing the Christians fight because of their greed, the Turks have turned against them and a great number of Christians have died, as God wanted” (14: 67).

The intervention of the tsar Peter the Great in Moldavia gained a material connotation, the use of the term Christian in opposition with that of Turk has remained the only witness of the resentments fueled by the religious differences.

This belief that the destiny of the Romanian countries is somewhat linked to that of Christianity was sometimes explicitly mentioned by the chroniclers: beyond the territorial-political state interests, not presented, Ion Neculce motivated the help that Russia wanted to offer to Moldova (in 1711) using the words that “Christians were consumed by pagans” (24: 289) (referring, of course, to obligations material and financial, to abuses). The same idea must be understood so on the German raid in the period of Constantin Brâncoveanu was justified by them that “it was for the crushing of the Turks, that they were fighting for the Christianity” (21: 34).

The Anti-Ottoman politics of the Romanian lords were a clear indicator of the way in which the Turks were “perceived” and “understood”, the differences in perception being caused by the evolution of the relationships with the Ottoman Empire (14: 129, „pagans who never wish the good of Christians”). Thus the Anti-Ottoman attitude was correlated with the different relationships existent in time between the Romanians and Ottomans. It is true that the economical dimension of the Sublime Porte's demands has been a warring factor for the Romanian countries because of the meaningful damages caused to the internal economics (“so did the Turks also: if you give them more money, they will cause you more damage; you offering them money will become a habit, but if latter on you do not want to give them money, they will make you pay”) (14: 135). But the clearer the orientation of economics towards the Ottoman sphere was about to bring changes even in the social- religious plan: the increase of the number of merchants in the Romanian Principalities that were given some advantages could have become a good reason to convert to Islam.

When dealing with these relationships, even though the hostility against the Turks was quite justifiable, the chroniclers state that peace was accepted in favor of the war which they say it is loved by the Devil because it made out of it a weapon against man. Therefore, the local Anti-Ottoman initiatives have received a bad fame, because of their negative effects on “the country” and “the poor”. Such a lord was Mihnea Voevod, which was somewhat despised because of his attitude towards the boyars. During the campaign prepared by the vizier Köprulu in Transilvania against the prince Rakoczi, Mihnea has asked the boyars “how to kill the Turks”. Their response was in perfect concordance with state of mind of the Romanians of those times: “Lord, how wonderful would be to defeat them! But we fear that we will not manage to do so and that we will raise the enemy against us as a snake against its prey. We are a small helpless country, but the Turks are strong, great in number and they always defeat everyone, from the East up until West” (14: 133). War was not the correct solution; it was not demanded by the people, so God could not

like it. The war that Mihnea wanted against the Turks (“following the advice of the Devil that was dwelling in his soul and wanting to kill the Turks and to fight against them”) (14: 138) has become the means through which the lord has shown, as the Ottomans pointed out, “his worst behavior” towards the boyars (22: 28) whom he punished unjustly by taking their fortunes. But “everything was useless” and he “will have to face God at the Last Judgment” (14: 138). In a favorable way were perceived those lords that tried to make peace with the Ottomans “so as to stop them from threatening the reign and the country” (22: 81). Such a thing was done by the lord Șerban Vodă when he “tried to make peace with Mehmet and all his neighbors. They were all happy with this turn of events and with getting rid of slavery, the preys, the mountain runs, of all the horrors caused by the army and they were all praising God” (22: 81).

With certainty, the presence of the Ottomans in the life of the Romanian society, with God's will, has become necessary in order to maintain the existent social- political order. Thus, the compassion of the chronicler shown towards the faith of Lady Elisabeth, the one that was blamed of wanting the reign for herself, even though she knew that this was forbidden for all women, was not absolute because her and her sons' punishment was well deserved (22: 85-86).

Gradually, the conviction that the Ottoman power could not be removed has triumphed and its presence has solved sometimes some internal tensioned moments (22: 134) (the choosing of the lords Duca: „mergând boierimea la viziru și rugându-se sa le dea domn dintre dânșai, le-au dat voe vizirul să-și aleagă domn care le va fi voia”, 22: 134). So, the sultan was called “the master”, “the Ottomans' emperor” (22: 273, 275), and those that were fighting against the Turks were considered to be “crazy, mindless” (22: 211). This attitude was also present in the episode in which lord Ghica was banished by Constantin Voevod with the help of the guards and the foot soldiers. The latter ones have started to commit robberies and to do all sort of bad things.

After seeing all of these, the emperor ordered the Turks and Tartars to enter the country, enslave and rob it.” The banished lord has managed to soften the sultan (“by crying with big tears”) so as “not to send his troops to enslave the country”, but “to send the enemies away”. So, the sultan “pitied him” and sent the troops to help Ghica Voevod (14: 142-143).

DISCUSSION

One cannot reach the end of this debate because it encourages the approach of the problematics from new analysis perspectives. This is why, our conclusions have the aspect of some considerations less generalized.

Regarding in the writing of chronicles at least, the Other presentation it was not a intent, but it was contributed to the formation and the identity preservation, to the activation of self-consciousness.

First of all, one might observe that between the two “worlds” (the Christian and the Islamic one), whose differences are consequent and have been pin-pointed always at the expense of the elements that were similar, the relationships have been established in terms of rejection (so, a *negative alterity*).

The difficulty of overcoming them was fueled by clichés and prejudices with a depreciative connotation, used maybe not out of a bad will or out of ethnical enmity, as it can be believed, but out of lack of knowledge and of the revival of negative feelings. (“The Turks must be banished from Europe because of their barbaric customs, their neglect towards arts; they deserved to be exterminated in order for Europe to become civilized once more.” 15: 224).

Thus, the negative references to the Ottomans have lost their violence.

Secondly, in the Romanian mentality, the pagan is defined in comparison with the Christian, by means of the dichotomy evil- good. Used according to the literary qualities of the narrative authors, the concept defines “the enemy” of Christianity and of the good intended Christian; towards him, one must manifest caution, rejection and even hostility.

Last but not least, a Christian does not desire war, but he cannot remain indifferent to the enmity manifested by the pagans towards their belief in God. This seems to have been the stake which stood at the basis of the Romanian military actions towards the Turks: the religious justification of the wars and rightfully obtaining the support of Christianity. In this respect, it proved to have been extremely important the affirmation of the sincere feeling of belonging to the Christian world, an aspect that has always been repeated by the Romanians in any situation given, and also the emphasis of the justness of the Romanians' actions against the abuses and all the evil things done by the Ottomans to Christians.

As it was expected, unfortunate circumstances, with disturbing effects, in which two ethnic components meet, can lead to nothing but a negative alterity.

We can say that in the Romanian mentality the pagan is defined compared to the Christian and is reflected in the writings of the past by the dichotomy evil-good. Used according to the literary qualities of the narrative authors, the concept represents the “adversary” of the community, towards which inevitably or unpredictable, you must manifest the same rejection or caution attitude.

Generally, the chroniclers views about foreign was expressed depending to consequences of impact which it had on Principalities. Therefore is not surprising that, in writing of time, the presence of “foreign-enemy” reduce to significance of non-Christians, because it out to rule and print.

The presence of the pagan in the historical-literary texts was also an excuse for solidarity and social cohesion, for the reforming of the Romanian society affected by the territorial-political modifications, cultural influences, pretended rationality

The literature of the Chronicles more emotionally involved in the writing and in the explanation of the events sanctioned the pagans (the Turks) as enemies; their presence had been associated with pillage, theft, destruction, fire, cutting and slavery. This hostile alterity has been also drawn by the Ottoman functionaries' and officials' abuses, therefore accentuating the distrust better to be shown in the presence of every Turk (13: 125).

The term “Turkish”, more appropriate for an objective presentation and for a critically fundamental presentation, will replace the term pagan (with a wider meaning) although the significance and the emotional load is kept. These terms (“Turkey” and “pagans”) end up confounding themselves in the same manner as the biblical pagan will confound with the Christian with evil and harmful habits.

Consequently, the military and political events that were part of the Anti-Ottoman attitude have created the occasion to develop the connection between God and man, and it also offered examples of divine intervention in the human destiny and also a series of teachings that a good Christian should respect.

REFERENCE:

1. Anghelescu N., (1993), *Introducere în Islam*, București.
2. Bărbulescu A.M., (2004), *Ingrou vs Outgroup în imaginarul biblic*, Tritonic, București.
3. Berza M., (1972), Turc, Empire Ottoman et relations roumano-turques dans l'historiographie Moldave des XVe-XVII-e siècle. In: Rev. Ét.sud-est europ. (10), nr 3, pp 595-627.
4. Cantemir D., (1956), *Descrierea Moldovei*, ed. Petre. Pandrea, București.
5. Carpentier J., Lebrun Fr., (2006), *Istoria Europei*, București.
6. Căzan Il., Denize E., (2001), *Marile puteri și spațiul românesc în secolele XV-XVI*, București.
7. Costin M., (1958), De neamul moldovenilor, din ce țară au ieșit strămoșii lor. In: Opere, ed. P.P.Panaiteescu, București
8. Cronica lui Eftimie, (1969). In *Literatura română veche (1402-1647)*, ed. G. Mihăilă, D.Zamfirescu, I, București
9. Delumeau J., (1986), *Frica în Occident (secolele XIV-XVIII). O cetate asediată*, II, București.
10. Grancea, M., (2001), Stereotipuri etnoculturale în discursul istoriografic. In : Provincia, (II) nr. 3.
11. Halic, B.A. (2003), *Pace și război, în Țara Românească în secolele XIV-XVI*, București.
12. Ecclesiarchul D., (1987), *Hronograf (1764-1815)*, ed. D.Bălașa, N.Stoicescu, București.
13. Lemny St., (1990), *Sensibilitate și istorie în secolul XVIII românesc*, București
14. *Letopisețul Cantacuzinesc (1973)*. In *Cronicari munteni*, ed.V.Ene, București.
15. Robert Mantran R., (2001), All, București.
16. Maxim, M. (1993), *Țările Române și Înalta poartă. Cadrul juridic al relațiilor româno-otomane în Evul Mediu*, București.
17. Maziliu, D. H., (2001), *O istorie a blestemului*, Polirom, Iași.
18. Mehmed M. A., (1976), *Istoria turcilor*, București.
19. Panaite V., (1997), *Pace și război și comerț în Islam. Țările Române și dreptul otoman al popoarelor (secolele XV-XVII)*, București
20. Panaiteescu P.P., (2000), *Introducere în istoria culturii românești. Probleme istoriografiei române*, Minerva, București.
21. Radu Logofătul Greceanu, (1970), *Istoria domniei lui Constantin Basarab Brâncoveanu voievod (1688-1714)*, ed. A. Ilieș, București.
22. Radu Popescu Vornicul, (1963), *Istoria domnilor Țării Românești*, ed. C.Grecescu, Ed Academiei Române, București.
23. Rezachevici C., (2001), *Rolul românilor în apărarea Europei de expansiunea otomanilor, secolele XIV-XVI*, București.
24. Neculce I., *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei de la Dabija Vodă până la a doua domnie a lui Constantin Mavrocordat*.
25. Nicoară T., (2006), *Sentimentul de insecuritate în societatea românească la începuturile timpurilor moderne (1600-1830)*, Cluj-Napoca
26. Stiles, A., (1995), *Imperiul Otoman (1450-1700)*, All, București
27. Ștrempel, G., (1997), *Antim Ivireanu*, București
28. Ureche Gr., *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei, de când s-au descălecat țara și de cursul anilor și de viața domnilor care scrie de la Dragoș Vodă până la Aron Vodă* (1987). In *Cronicari moldoveni*, București.
29. Wolff, L., (2000), *Inventarea Europei de Est*, Meridiane, București