
THE OTTOMAN FORTRESS FROM HÂRȘOVA IN RECENTLY DISCOVERED RUSSIAN CARTOGRAPHIC SOURCES (18TH CENTURY)

Aurel-Daniel Stănică*, Constantin Nicolae**,
Mihai Anatolii Ciobanu***

Abstract: Like all the Ottoman fortresses in Dobrudja, the fortress of Hârșova was little known until today. In the absence of an archaeological research, only a few documents, often questioned too, were the only sources that presented the image of a strong fortification.

The conquest of Dobrudja at the beginning of the 15th century also involved the Ottomans' preoccupations regarding the care and repair of the existing fortress, the conquerors being motivated by the strategic and military importance of the region. The integration in the political, military, administrative, economic, and social system of the new Ottoman province represented for Hârșova a new historical stage of special relevance.

Hârșova was a significant fortified centre, that housed an important garrison, but also with a decisive economic function given by the port and by the access to the main roads that crossed Dobrudja, as well as a crossing point of the Danube, which offered a connection with the Transcarpathian roads. All these aspects gave Hârșova a special place in the Ottoman administrative framework, with consequences in the organization of the city and the surrounding land integrated into a kaza.

The image of the Ottoman fortress was well known, especially thanks to the lithographs dated 1826, which depicted an imposing structure. The cartographic document published by von Moltke in 1856, which represents the oldest plan of the fortress and the town of Hârșova known so far, recorded an imposing bastion fortification, which closed the perimeter between Citatel Hill (Dealul Cetății) and Belciug Hill (Dealul Belciug). Aside from this plan, to which some brief descriptions could be added, we notice a lack of data regarding the Ottoman fortress. Thus, we turned our attention to the cartographic sources, trying to identify new plans and maps which would allow a clarification of the evolution of the Ottoman fortification.

In this article, we present some of the plans of the Hârșova fortress recently discovered in the archives of Kiev and Moscow. These are particularly important and will be critically analysed in relation to the results obtained in the archaeological research so far and other documentary sources that we have at our disposal. The discovered plans constitute new, original research sources, and allow a better knowledge of the situation of the fortification from Hârșova in the course of the 18th-19th centuries.

Rezumat: Asemeni tuturor cetăților otomane din Dobrogea, cetatea de la Hârșova a fost prea puțin cunoscută până astăzi. În lipsa unor cercetări arheologice, doar câteva documente, și acestea puse adesea sub semnul întrebării, erau singurele surse care prezentau imaginea unei fortificații puternice.

* "Gavrilă Simion" Eco-Museum Research Institute in Tulcea, Romania; e-mail: aurelstanica@gmail.com

** "Carsium" Museum Hârșova, Romania; e-mail: ct.nicolae@yahoo.com

*** Faculty of Archiving and Documentology, Historical-Archival Institute, RGGU, Moscow; e-mail: ciobanumihaianatolii@gmail.com

Cucerirea Dobrogei la începutul sec. al XV-lea aduce după sine și preocupările otomanilor față de îngrijirea și repararea cetății existente, cuceritorii fiind motivați de importanța strategică și militară a regiunii. Integrarea în sistemul politic, militar, administrativ, economic și social a noii provincii otomane a reprezentat pentru Hârșova o nouă etapă istorică de o relevanță aparte. Hârșova a fost un Însemnat centru fortificat, cu rol militar, ce găzduia o garnizoană importantă, dar și cu o funcție economică hotărâtoare dată de port, de accesul la principalele drumuri care traversau Dobrogea, și de rolul de punct de trecere al a Dunării, care oferea o legătură cu drumurile transcarpatice. Toate aceste aspecte au conferit Hârșovei un rost aparte în cadrul administrativ otoman, cu urmări în organizarea orașului și a ținutului din jur integrat unei kazale.

Imaginea cetății otomane era cunoscută, îndeosebi mulțumită litografiilor dateate în 1826, care înfățișau o cetate impunătoare. Documentul cartografic publicat de von Moltke în 1856, care reprezintă cel mai vechi plan al cetății și orașului Hârșova cunoscut până acum, consemna o impunătoare fortificație bastionară, ce închidea perimetrul cuprins între Dealul Cetății și Dealul Belciug. Cu excepția acestui plan, la care se pot adăuga câteva descrieri sumare, constatăm o lipsă a datelor privind cetatea otomană. Astfel, ne-am îndreptat atenția spre sursele cartografice, încercând să identificăm noi planuri și hărți, care să permită o lămurire a evoluției fortificației otomane.

În articolul de față prezentăm câteva dintre planurile cetății de la Hârșova descoperite recent în arhivele de la Kiev și Moscova. Acestea sunt deosebit de importante și vor fi analizate critic în raport cu rezultatele obținute în cercetarea arheologică de până acum și alte surse documentare pe care le avem la dispoziție. Planurile descoperite se constituie în surse de cercetare noi, originale, și permit o mai bună cunoaștere a situației fortificației de la Hârșova în scurgerea sec. XVIII-XIX.

Резюме: Как и с другими османскими крепостями Добруджи, история Хыршовской крепости до сегодняшнего дня мало известна. В отсутствие систематических археологических раскопок у исследователей было только несколько источников, которые представляли образ мощного укрепления у берегов Дуная, но даже эти источники часто подвергались сомнению. Османское завоевание Добруджи в начале XV века повлекло за собой озабоченность османов уходом и ремонтом существующей крепости у Хыршова, поскольку завоеватели руководствовались стратегическим и военным значением самой крепости и региона. Интеграция в политическую, военную, административную, экономическую и социальную систему новой османской провинции представляет для Хыршова значительный исторический этап. Важный укрепленный центр с военной ролью, в котором размещался значительный гарнизон, у Хыршова была и решающая экономическая функция, предоставляемой портом и доступом к основным дорогам, пересекающим Добруджу. У Хыршова находился и переход через Дунай, соединяя османскую провинцию с Закарпатскими дорогами. Все это играло важную роль для крепости, которая стала частью османской административной структуре, что повлекло за собой и организацию города и прилегающих земель, интегрированных в казу. Образ Османской крепости был хорошо известен, особенно благодаря литографиям 1826 года, на которых изображены могущественные стены. В картографическом документе, опубликованном фон Мольтке в 1856 году, который представляет собой самый старый план крепости и города Хыршова, известный до сих пор, зафиксировано бастионное укрепление, закрывающее периметр между Деалул Цетэций и Деалул Бельчуг.

В этой статье мы представляем исследователям и всем читателям некоторые планы крепости Хыршова, недавно обнаруженные в архивах Киева и Москвы. Они особенно важны и будут подвергнуты критическому анализу в связи с результатами, полученными в ходе

археологических раскопок на данный момент, и другими источниками, которыми мы располагаем. Обнаруженные планы представляют собой новые оригинальные источники, позволяя лучше узнать ситуацию крепости и города Хыршова в течение XVIII–XIX вв.

Keywords: Dobrudja, Lower Danube, Hârşova, Ottoman Empire, fortification.

Cuvinte cheie: Dobrogea, Dunărea de Jos, Hârşova, Imperiul Otoman, fortificație.

Ключевые слова: Добруджа, Нижний Дунай, Хыршова, Османская империя, фортификация.

INTRODUCTION

Hârşova. Historical and archaeological file

The historical evolution of the fortress from Hârşova has been clarified in older or newer studies¹, based on historical sources. For Antiquity, we can already speak of the existence of an earthen camp, not attested by archaeology, erected by *Ala (Gallorum) Flaviana* and which was here, as evidenced by the large number of stamped tegulae of this unit, most likely activating at *Carsium* during the reign of the emperor Vespasian.² The fortress was built during the reign of the Emperor Trajan, as it results from its foundation stone, published by Vasile Pârvan.³ After the devastating invasions of the third century CE, the construction of the new fortification followed during the reign of Emperor Constantine the Great.⁴ The reconstruction of the fortress in the time of Justinian is attested by Procopius.⁵

The archaeological researches have not highlighted, with sufficient clarity, the end of the Roman-Byzantine life here. A few coins (from the emperors Tiberius (578-582), Maurice (582-602) and Phocas (602-610) dated to the end of the 6th century and the first part of the 7th century CE⁶ seem to suggest a continuity of the economic life, while in most Dobrudjan settlements the relations with the eastern emitting centres come to an end. Most likely, the location near the Danube ford and the role of transit settlement led to the perpetuation, without interruption, of the human life here, in one form or another.

The period of the 8th-10th centuries witnesses the existence of a strong human community. We find it not only present, but also very active in the "fortress" or in its surroundings.⁷ The return of the Byzantine administration in the last quarter of the 10th century marked a new stage, with the complete rebuilding of the fortress.⁸ In the

¹ These can be found in the following notes.

² Chiriac *et alii* 1998, 139-162.

³ Pârvan 1913, 481-489.

⁴ Nicolae 2018, 343-363.

⁵ Mihăiescu *et alii*, 474.

⁶ Vertan, Custurea 1981, 341-342; Vertan, Custurea 1986, 300-301; Custurea 1986, 277.

⁷ Aricescu 1971, 357-368; Paraschiv-Talmațchi 2009, 424, 428; Paraschiv-Talmațchi 2016, 121-142.

⁸ Nicolae *et alii* 2008, 316; Nicolae 2015-2016, 283-284; Damian 2015, 229-230; Stănică 2015, 138-140.

absence of historical sources and archaeological data, it is difficult to appreciate the evolution and role of the fortress after the year 1000.⁹

Hârşova during the Ottoman rule

Possibly rebuilt in the 13th century by the Genoese¹⁰, then controlled by Mircea the Elder at the end of the 14th century¹¹ and conquered by Sultan Mehmed I Celebi following the campaign of 1419¹² or the spring of 1420¹³, the medieval fortress was the basis for the fortification during the Ottoman period. Evidence of this period, regarding the reconstruction of the fortification in the 13th century, is the wall of the port installation between the two rocky spurs on *Dealul Cetăţii* where two windows framed by Gothic warheads are "opened", drawn, and described by those who came by Hârşova at the beginning of the 19th century.

The conquest of Dobrudja at the beginning of the 15th century also involved the Ottomans' preoccupations regarding the care and repair of the existing fortress, the conquerors being motivated by the strategic and military importance of the region.

⁹ A document often used for Dobrudja was the map drawn up around 1154 by the Arab geographer Idrisi, from the court of the Norman king Roger of Sicily. The translations of the document drew the attention of the Romanian historians, who hoped to clarify some information about Dobrudja. The area between the Danube and the Black Sea, Dobrudja, was identified in Idrisi's geography with Bruġan (Burġan, Borġan, Berġan), a name that designated the Bulgarians from the Danube. Among the points listed by Idrisi, for the location of which all sorts of hypotheses were issued, we find Linocastro. The wool fortress, as the toponym is translated, was considered to be identifiable with the fortification of Hârşova, to which the description made by Idrisi fits: "fortress, fair and communication centre for merchants". Brătescu 1920, 29; Chiriac 1993, 447-456. Relatively recently, the issue of the translation errors of the itinerary along the Danube is reported by Al. Madgearu, who proposes another reading "... the toponym is read Aytucastru and identified with Ajtos, near Burgas. Therefore, there was no fortress [Linocastro] mentioned by the Arab geographer near Hârşova". See: Madgearu 2017, 141-143.

¹⁰ Ciobanu 1970, 27.

¹¹ Nicolae 2016, 55.

¹² Sezer 2019, 555-556.

¹³ The moment of the conquest of the land between the Sea and the Danube generated a rich literature, the opinions being divided. A group of historians estimate that the territory between the Danube and the "Great Sea" – Dobruca-eli, "Land of Dobrogea" – part of the medieval state of Wallachia, was occupied by the Ottomans following the campaign of 819 after Hegira (March 23, 1416 – February 17, 1417). According to another point of view, the Ottomans extended their effective domination over Dobrudja only during the reign of Mihail, the successor of Mircea the Elder, in 1419 or spring of 1420, the border of the empire being established on the line formed by the fortresses of Enisala (Yeni-Sale) and Isackea (Isakci), which become serhats (marginal fortresses): Panaitescu 2000, 50-53.

The integration in the political, military, administrative, economic, and social system of the new Ottoman province represented for Hârşova a new historical stage of special relevance. The locality became a significant fortified centre of the empire, with a military role, that housed an important garrison, having also a decisive economic function given by the port, by the access to the main roads that crossed Dobrudja and its role as a crossing point of the Danube, which offered a connection with the Transcarpathian roads.

The leading role of Hârşova in the Ottoman administrative framework implied the organization of the town and the surrounding land integrated into a *kaza*. If we refer to similar situations, the *kaza* had a distinct legal regime, which included a military and economic complex, consisting of a fortress (*kale*), the town (*varoş*) outside the walls and an agricultural area, which grouped a number of 20-50 villages (*Nahiye*).¹⁴ The *Kaza* of Hârşova was an administrative subunit of the Sanjak of Silistra, under the jurisdiction of a *kadi*.¹⁵

By analogy with other Ottoman border structures, the existence of a stage prior to the standardization of civilian, military structures, and integration into the new Ottoman administration, including a reference to the specifics of the area, can only be intuited.

In the Ottoman system of border organization, fortresses are indicators of border areas. An analysis of the documentary sources highlights the existence of two ways to reward military service. The first consists in the allocation of plots of land (*tımâr*) for the soldiers guarding the fortresses. The second way is to provide salaries for troops in the fortresses' garrisons.¹⁶

After 1470, there is a change in the practices of financing the border fortresses. In most fortresses, soldiers began to receive wages (*ulûfe*).¹⁷ The registers of *tımâr* and *muqata'a* record this transformation in the context of the reorganization of the Ottoman borders during the last years of Mehmed II's reign, when a series of expenditures for the groups of soldiers serving the border fortresses and sources of income were recorded.¹⁸

In a register that specifies the number of garrisons paid in Rumelia for the years 1490/91, 80 soldiers are mentioned at Hârşova.¹⁹ Another register from 1491 includes in the list of fortresses from Rumelia and Hârşova 53 soldiers who receive salary (*ulûfe*).²⁰

¹⁴ Rădvan 2011, 255; Popescu 2013, 63-79.

¹⁵ For the status of the Ottoman Hârşova in the 15th century: Popescu 2015, 85-112.

¹⁶ Göksel 2017, 15-26 (See the discussion on the Ottoman borders with the mention of documentary sources and methods of payment for city staff).

¹⁷ Göksel 2017, 18-20.

¹⁸ Göksel 2017, 18, 40-41.

¹⁹ Göksel 2017, 23.

The register from 1490/91 contains the first mention for the Ottoman Hârşova, also attesting the existence of a garrison that served a border fortress. Thus, we have the confirmation of the existence of a fortress in Hârşova at the end of the 15th century.²¹

The integration of the northern region of Dobrudja (north of the Carasu Valley) into the Ottoman Empire, as well as the control of the right bank of the Danube, the oldest known form of territorial organization of Hârşova kaza²², dates back to the end of Sultan Bayazid II reign. The information is found in a defter for collecting taxes owed by the Christians in the Ottoman Empire – *cizye*. The register dated 1507/8 mentions only two fortresses on the territory of the kaza: Hârşova and Enisala.²³ After almost two decades, more precisely in 1526-1529, in a defter (register) from which we find out the composition of the Sanjak of Silistra, we find a new mention for the kaza of Hârşova.²⁴

The register for year 1530 represents the next documentary source in which Dobrudja is included. It records no less than 240 toponyms, representing villages, ports of entry, fairs and agricultural lands that were part of the *kaza* of Hârşova, which included a territory bordered by the Danube to the Sfântu Gheorghe branch to the east and north and the Carasu Valley to the south. A slightly more detailed document from 1570 records a number of 270 toponyms for the kaza of Hârşova, marking an evolution compared to the previous register.²⁵ Summarizing the data, we notice that Hârşova (Hirsova) was registered as a fortress, port of entry and village, outlining the image of the kaza headquarters, which included all its constituent elements.²⁶

In addition to garrisons, groups of "customary origin" with specific tasks in time of war and exemption of taxes in return, such as the *müsellem*, were also assigned to the Ottoman fortresses.²⁷ In this case, the fortress supervised arteries and communication points with the outside; through it the ford of Hârşova was controlled as well as the connection with Wallachia. From an economic and commercial point of

²⁰ Göksel 2017, 20.

²¹ The large-scale archaeological research in 2020, carried out within the project "Restoration, conservation, arrangement and cultural tourism capitalization of the fortress Carsium (Hârşova)", led to the discovery of fragments belonging to Ottoman pottery (Miletus) and Valencian pottery (Spain). The association of the two categories of archaeological materials suggests an involvement of the centre from Hârşova in the intense commercial exchanges taking place at the end of the 15th century. The authors would like to express their thanks to dr. Niculina Dinu (Museum of Brăila) for the information.

²² Administrative subunit under the jurisdiction of a *kadi*.

²³ Popescu 2015, 97-98.

²⁴ Popescu 2013, 64.

²⁵ Popescu 2015, 86; Popescu 2013, 65.

²⁶ Popescu 2015, 98-99, 104.

²⁷ Popescu 2015, 97-98.

view, the Ottomans developed a system of control of the navigation on the Danube, through installed wharfs, implementing the customs regulations as well as personnel. Such a wharf existed in Hârşova, which acted as a port of entry, where transport taxes could be charged, and customs paid.

The short incursion in the documentary mentions from the 16th century, the analogies with similar situations, indicate the purpose and importance of the fortified complex from Hârşova in the Ottoman period. The position and the role played in the political-administrative and military system of the Ottoman Empire constantly involved the fortress of Hârşova, with the necessary consequences, in the regional events of the time. It is here that the troops of Iancu de Hunedoara pass the Danube, in Muntenia, in their retreat after the battle of Varna.²⁸ From Oraşul de Floci, where he was with the army, Michael the Brave sent against Hârşova a part of his soldiers on the New Year's Day of 1595, the Ottoman army being defeated, and the fortress burned to the ground; the offensive on the Danube fortifications, which also affected the fortress from Hârşova, was resumed in 1603 by the ruler of Muntenia, Radu Şerban.²⁹ After a period of relative calmness, the fortress is caught in the tumult of the events during the Russo-Turkish wars of 1768-1774, 1806-1812, 1828-1829.³⁰

THE OTTOMAN FORTRESS IN HÂRŞOVA. DATA AND RESEARCH

The image of the medieval Ottoman fortress from Hârşova is known, for the time being, from some brief descriptions. The first, and the most elaborate, is the one made by Evliya Çelebi after passing through Dobrogea in 1651.³¹ In his description, the chronicler provides information on the origin of the toponym, the organization and the military endowment, the shape of the fortress and the town. For our discussion from the following pages, Evliya Çelebi statement, according to which, *"It has three thousand steps around. The man does not dare to look down, towards the Danube, from the western part of this fortress"*, has a very special meaning. The second description, in a few lines, is made by the Count of Langeron in 1809. *"Two huge rocks dominate a small plateau on which the town is built, almost at the same level as the Danube. It is surrounded by a fortification that also includes the two rocks; above one of them there is a large stone castle, a Gothic fortification, on the other lower rock there is a stone tower, but it is dominated by a height on which can still be seen traces of a fortification built by the Marshal Rumeantsev in*

²⁸ Brătulescu 1939, 17.

²⁹ Rădulescu, Bitoleanu 1979, 217-218; 222.

³⁰ Moltke 1845; Moltke 1854; Chesney 1854.

³¹ *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, VI, 1976, 450-541.

1773".³² In the case of the first description, the assertion "around has three thousand steps" is a reference to the precincts that defended the town and joined the two fortifications, built perhaps in the first part of the seventeenth century.³³

Since 1826, there are two lithographs, depicting the imposing fortress of Hârşova.³⁴ In fact, they are the oldest and most extensive representation of an Ottoman fortification in Dobrudja known so far.

The first lithograph illustrates the castle, the port facility, the eastern and western parts of the town. In the main plan is represented the fortification from Citatel Hill (Dealul Cetății), with the two rocky spurs which support the towers and the enclosures of the castle, on the south side, upstream and downstream, on the edge from the Danube. Inside, sheltered by the walls, there are monumental buildings, which could accommodate the headquarters of the fortress, the garrison, the supply warehouses, etc. The south side (the rock on the right of the image) is controlled by a large tower, and from here starts an enclosure and a bastion to the north. Outside the wall, on the eastern slope, a group of houses is marked, some with floors, which seem to be placed around a mosque. In the western part of the castle, under the shelter of an enclosure, the houses are shown a little more scattered around a new mosque that dominates the landscape. The two rocky spurs from the Danube, which ensured the southern side of the fortress, are connected by a wall in which two windows framed by Gothic warheads are made. The same architectural element can also be seen on the left of the image on the defensive wall of the town from the Danube. The illustration of these windows with Gothic framing provoked the interest of the specialists, who considered it an exaggeration of the author of the drawing after which the lithography was made. Still, the fact that two sources from the same period, unrelated to each other, present this characteristic of the wall from the Danube behind which were certainly customs offices and defence services, indicates that this was the reality. It is an additional argument regarding the Genoese origin of the port facility used from the 13th century until the first part of the 19th century, when the destruction of the fortress took place.

In close-up, the lithograph is completed by a boat, with a mast, with a tight sail, operated by six oarsmen and a helmsman, who undertake manoeuvres near the right bank.³⁵

³² *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, Serie Nouă, I (1801-1821), București, 2004, 334; Langeron 2019, 93 (author's translation).

³³ Nicolae 2016, 66. Here the period between 1620-1630 is proposed as the date of the construction of the Ottoman fortification.

³⁴ Boca 1968, 484 și 485 (no. 28; 29).

³⁵ A lithograph unknown to us with the same image of the fortress is in circulation online. The boat has no oars, but raised sails, slightly exceeding the image of the fortification in the

The second print presents a slightly different perspective, showing in detail the east side of the castle, equipped with a high wall and rectangular towers at the corners, endowed with crenels, merlon and three bastions. Outside the walls, on the downhill slope to the Danube, a group of houses, around a monumental mosque, whose minaret dominates the foreground (landscape). In the background, the author rendered either tall trees or minarets of other places of worship. The eastern curtain walls, which advance to the north, are presented in more detail. On this side, even the tower of a gate can be distinguished. Outside the wall, there are several constructions with a minaret. From the northern enclosure, covered by the close perspective of the fortress, it can be seen only the western end, which closes with the western enclosure in a tower well represented in the image. On the other rocky ridge, downstream, there is a small fortification, with two corner towers to the Danube. The cliff is reinforced with an enclosure, too. The access to the town, here, is made through a gate marked above with a round arch. According to this document, the image of the fortress in its extent is faithful to the descriptions made by Evliya Çelebi and the Count of Langeron, which allowed its reconstruction starting from this representation.³⁶

In 1854, Baron H. von Moltke, in his work dedicated to Russia's military campaign against the Ottoman Empire, inserted a series of maps with theatres of operations and plans for the fortresses of Brăila, Hârşova, Măcin, the siege of Silistra in 1828 and 1829.³⁷

The oldest plan of the fortress and the town of Hârşova published by von Moltke records the bastion fortification, the old castle, the town sheltered by the walls and the access roads from / to the city. The plan was based on another similar one drawn up by the Russians at the end of 1828, which we recently discovered in Moscow, and we will publish it in a separate contribution.³⁸

The cartographic document published by von Moltke illustrates the defensive complex of Hârşova, which closes the perimeter between Citatel Hill (Dealul Cetății) and Belciug Hill (Dealul Belciug), including the Ottoman town. Inside the fortified area, there are *the old castle*, the port installation, the outskirts, as well as an access gate to the fortress. Outside the town, to the east, a hatched perimeter in the shelter of a small enclosure provided with a bastion, doubled by a ditch, attached to the main enclosure. To the east, a second perimeter appears outlined. The landscape is completed by windmills located on the hills near the fortress, and across the Danube, in Balta

background; the nearby shore is occupied by higher vegetation, and in the foreground, on the left, there is a character, with specific oriental clothing, on a white horse.

³⁶ Nicolae 2016, fig. 3.

³⁷ Moltke 1845; Moltke 1854; Chesney 1854.

³⁸ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia (RGVIA), f. 438, op. 1, d. 463.

Ialomiței, the places where the Russian guard is located. This last aspect suggests that the data necessary for the realization of the plan were previously collected in 1828.

In his extensive description of the war on 476 pages and 12 drawings, von Moltke also has some references about the fortress of Hârșova.³⁹ It was defended on three sides by walls, and on the fourth side by the Danube. The Russians occupied it in 1809 and they fortified it with ditches. In 1822, the Turks rebuilt the fortress. The precinct had short fronts (curtain walls), defended by bastions, on which were mounted 10 cannons each. The defence ditch was dry, with a depth of 14-15 m, with a steep masonry slope and counter-slope. However, the defence system had some major problems that Turkish engineers did not consider. First, the enclosure was not built close enough to the limestone slope. Then, the surroundings, especially the island in front of the fortification, were not sufficiently strengthened. For this reason, towards the Danube, the fortress was exposed to enemy artillery. The Russians took advantage of this situation, occupying the island and bombing from here the western part of the fortress, which was the most exposed. From the interior of the province, the fortification was able to withstand efficiently.

The fortress from Hârșova came to the attention of archaeologists quite late. It is very likely that the overlap of the modern settlement over the ruins of the fortress prevented this. For this reason, the first excavations were sporadic, limited to only one year. The campaigns of 1939⁴⁰, 1940⁴¹ and 1963⁴² did not provide the necessary information to propose a true chronology of the remains of walls on the surface of the current locality, especially those in the reserved perimeter on Citatel Hill (Dealul Cetății), entered the public consciousness under the name of Carsium "fortress". The old descriptions of the remains of the walls, from pertinent sources, worthy of all trust, which indicated some differentiation between antiquity and the medieval period, were not considered either. Pamfil Polonic⁴³ saw the walls of the Ottoman fortress on the banks of the Danube, and inside the town, remains of Roman walls and bricks, while Netzhhammer made a brief description of the western side of the Turkish fortification from Hârșova, which was preserved throughout the entire place to the steep rock of the water. Thus, the plan prepared and published in 1967 by Emil Condurachi was based not so much on the information provided by the excavation, although it states this, but on a standard typology of the development of Roman fortifications in Dobrudja, according to which the wider perimeters are dated early, and the smallest have much

³⁹ Moltke 1854, 72-73.

⁴⁰ Brătulescu 1940, 3-24.

⁴¹ Florescu 1943, 179-180.

⁴² Aricescu 1971, 351-369; Paraschiv-Talmațchi 2009, 424-428; Nicolae 2017, 312-313; 321, fig. 9.

⁴³ Polonic, *Mss*, Notebook 12, 1.

later origins. According to this logic, the three walls on the reserved surface from the Danube were dated as follows: the wall that encloses the largest surface dates from the time of Emperor Trajan, the middle one originates in the time of Emperor Constantine the Great, and the interior one was built in the 10th century. The chronology thus proposed was followed by all specialists and was maintained until recently. The biggest problem created by this proposal is that the Ottomann fortification, was not considered, being excluded from the beginning, and being left out of discussions for years.

The research program started in 1993, in which we mention especially the opening of the "western precincts" sector on the large, reserved area from the Danube (Citadel Hill/Dealul Cetății) and the excavations here, brought new data on the chronology of the walls brought to light. It was shown that the originally proposed dating is erroneous. The remains of the walls on the surface belong to the Ottoman fortification, while the Roman period must be sought at great depth and much further north.⁴⁴

The complexity of the archaeological contexts made the analysis and interpretation of data and measurements difficult for the research team. The walls were built and repaired during various historical stages, and the discovered segments provided the characteristic image of the sites attesting an uninterrupted continuity of habitation. The study of the available information and data provided the research team with the premise of discussions and the issuance of hypotheses regarding the succession of walls, constructions, and related restorations.

The extensive archaeological research has allowed the detailed mapping of the system of fortifications represented by the fortresses of Hârşova, from the Roman antiquity to the Middle Ages, on a historical framework between the 13rd-14th century and the 19th century.⁴⁵ Valuable information on the integration of the old walls in the defensive system of the fortress in the Ottoman era was also obtained in the "northern enclosures" sector.⁴⁶

The implementation of the wastewater pipeline installation project, in 2014, on Carsium Street, which was known from various sources to delimit the enclosure that protects the medieval town⁴⁷, allowed the identification of some elements of this wall⁴⁸ (the bastion on the NE corner, the entrance gate on the north side and the west

⁴⁴ Nicolae 2015-2016, 281-282.

⁴⁵ Nicolae 2015-2016, 281-282, fig. 1.

⁴⁶ Nicolae 2017, 312.

⁴⁷ In Official Monitor (Monitorul Oficial) of Romania no. 33 of 13 (26) May 1915, regarding the amendment of the regulation for street cleaning in Hârşova, the obligation to collect garbage was imposed "to all residents of the town bounded by Carsium Boulevard (the old wall of the fortress) ...".

⁴⁸ Nicolae 2017, fig. 1.

enclosure). To these is added the north-western bastion which was partially identified by a preventive investigation in 2003.⁴⁹ The planimetry of the discoveries corresponds to the known plan from von Moltke and the topographic reconstruction based on the image from the 1826 lithograph described above.⁵⁰

RECENTLY DISCOVERED RUSSIAN CARTOGRAPHIC SOURCES (18TH CENTURY)

The information from cartographic sources is important not only in the case of Hârşova, but also for the towns of Măcin, Isaccea, Tulcea, Babadag or Constanţa, for which von Moltke draws up plans of the respective fortresses and fortifications as they looked in the first part of the 19th century.

In the following, we intend to present some of the plans of the Hârşova fortress recently discovered in the archives of Kiev and Moscow. These are particularly important and will be subjected, in the following pages, to a critical analysis, in relation to the documents presented above or to the results obtained in the archaeological research so far. They are new, original sources of research, and allow a better knowledge of the situation of the fortification from Hârşova in the course of the 18th-19th centuries. At the same time, our analysis can be a reference tool for clarifying the evolution of the Dobrudjan fortifications during the Ottoman period. It can also provide logistical support for the protection, conservation and efficient use of the remains of walls, which are still visible on the surface of the locality, or in the perspective of planning preventive research on the objectives that the new documents reveal.

1. The first cartographic source depicts *the Plan of the Hârşova Castle*, 34 × 45 cm (*Plan du chateau de Hirsow*), with the legend in French, preserved today in Moscow and made by soldiers of the Russian Imperial Army.⁵¹

The defensive complex from Hârşova includes the medieval citadel rebuilt by the Ottomans, which has three rectangular towers, one tower bastion-shaped, and three other towers with an initially quadrilateral shape, which underwent restorations on the eastern and western precincts, the tower from Danube. The fortress is doubled by the bastion fortification, supplemented by a defence ditch with a stone-lined escarpment, suggesting a later construction phase. On the south side, from the Danube, you can see the parapet made of gabions (vertical baskets woven from twigs and filled with earth) as well as the wall between the two rocks. The entrance to the bastion fortress was made on the north side, and, in the castle, there was a gate in the enclosure wall (B) on the

⁴⁹ Nicolae *et alii* 2008, 324-325.

⁵⁰ See footnote 29.

⁵¹ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 438, op. 1, d. 456.

NNE side. Other entrances can be seen on the eastern enclosure in the tower area and another one on the SW corner, where the plan of a quadrilateral construction can be observed, the functionality of which cannot be specified. No other buildings are shown inside the walls. The bastion fortification is surrounded by a ditch with a rectangular trapezoidal section, lined with stone in the glacis area, being much wider and deeper than the castle ditch. On the left side of the plan, up and down, are the sections of the fortress, the first passing through the North enclosure (ditch, bastion fortification and castle) and the second through the South side (gabions and the wall between the two rocks). At the bottom right, there is the staircase, different for plan and profile.




Fig. 1. The Plan of the Hârşova Castle.

The legend of the plan indicates:

- A. Remains of old walls;
- B. Gates;
- C. Gabion parapet on the side from the Danube;
- D. The place where the projectile fell... into the powder magazine, which blew up.

It can be considered that the plan was made shortly after the conquest of the fortress by the Russians, recording, on this occasion, the damage caused during the assault of the Imperial Army in 1773.

2. Additional information regarding the defensive complex is documented graphically in the *Prospectus of Hârșova*, 50 × 68 cm (*Проспектъ Гарсова*), kept in the State Military-Historical Archive of Russia. The prospectus is not dated by its authors, but on a closer observation it is understood to follow chronologically the plan written in French.⁵²




Fig. 2. The Prospectus of Hârșova.

This document shows the perspective of the fortress and the topography from the Danube, being presented the main defensive elements and constructions from the intramural space. The novelty element is represented by the way in which the wall between the two rocky spurs was drawn, provided with a staircase carved in it, which made the connection between the fortress and the bank of the Danube. The prospectus depicts the fortress on a quadrilateral plan, the towers, the access steps and the guard roads, and the western enclosure broken by the artillery fire is reinforced by gabions. Inside the wall, a quadrilateral building draws attention, possibly the commander's

⁵² State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 438, op. 1, d. 457.

house or with other use, and constructions rendered schematically. On the south side, towards the Danube, we notice the palisade and the gabion parapet. The drawing also shows the ditch of the fortification on the west enclosure and the counterscarp on the east side. In the distance, north of the fortress, there is a redoubt built by the Russian military, according to the legend. Not being a topographic plan, the prospectus depicts the perspective of the fortress from a graphical point of view; it differs from this type of sources by some details. We cannot say that the representation is entirely reflecting the reality, the author wanting rather to present the repairs made by the Russians and to provide an overview of the fortified area.

Legend of the analysed document:

1. The Castle ("Замокъ");
2. The blown-up wall against which a gabion reinforcement is made ("Подорванная стена противъ которой ис туровъ сделано укрепление");
3. Old gabion reinforcement against the river ("Противъ реки старое ис туровъ укрепление");
4. Soldiers' huts ("Салдатский землянки");
5. Stone wall by the river ("На берегу реки каменная стена");
6. Redoubt built by the Russian armies ("Редутъ построенной российскими войсками");
7. the Danube River ("Река Дунай");
8. The road to Doeni [actually Dăeni, n.n.] ("Дорога к местечку Доень").

3. Complements to those noted can be found on the *Prospectus of the Hârşova fortress, located across the Danube, in Bulgaria. In what condition is it now at his conquest by the Russian army from the Turks, that is, in 1772, 102 × 38 cm.*⁵³ (*Проспектъ Гирсовскоі крепости. Состоящей за Дунаемъ в Булгаріи в какомъ состояни нне по взятъе Россіискимъ войскомъ отъ турокъ находитца, то есть от 1772-го году*).

Description of Hârşova ("Описание Гирсова"):

1. The Castle ("Замокъ");
2. The blown-up wall against which the gabion reinforcement is made ("Подорванная стена противъ которой ис туровъ сделано укрепление");
3. Old gabion reinforcement against the river ("Противъ реки старое ис туровъ укрепление");

⁵³ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 349, op. 51, d. 186.




Fig. 3. Prospectus of the Hârșova fortress.

4. Soldiers' huts ("Салдатские землянки");
5. Stone wall by the river ("На берегу реки каменная стена");
6. Redoubts that are built by the Russian armies ("Редуты кои построены российскими войсками");
7. The Danube River ("Река Дунай");
8. The road to the locality of Doeni [Dăeni, n.n.] ("Дорога къ местечку Доень").

This prospectus is longer than the previous one, the novelty being the representation of the redoubt on the road to Dăeni – which also appears in plan no. 5 of this contribution – as well as of some rowing boats.

4. The fourth source is the *Plan of the castle from Hârșova showing the rooms indicated by numbers, where the mines are located, and the amount of gunpowder to be placed. Made up on the 1st of July 1773, 49 × 73.5 cm (План Гирзовскому Замку с показанием в которых заложены мины и сколка в которых каморах надлежит пороху положить значит под номерами. Сочинень июля 1 числа 1773 году)*, which is a pencil sketch⁵⁴. This plan is important due to the details regarding the location of some mines, the Russians intending to blow up the fortifications of Hârșova in case the situation on the battlefield would have required such a gesture. The same plan also shows the amount of gunpowder used "How much gunpowder should be placed in each storeroom is indicated by the numbers:

⁵⁴ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 349, op. 51, d. 189. The authors would like to thank the researcher A. D. Paskal from Moscow and the researcher M. Șlapac from Chișinău for the corrections received when reading some plans.




Fig. 4. The Plan of the castle from Hârşova showing the rooms indicated by numbers, where the mines are located, and the amount of gunpowder to be placed.

No. 1 – for loading 7 gunpowder loads; the storeroom will be size 1-9; blowing up 10 fathoms and 170 cubic feet.

2. for loading $8\frac{1}{2}$ gunpowder loads; the storeroom will be 1-10; throwing 12 fathoms and 96 cubic feet.

3. for loading $2\frac{1}{2}$ loads; the room will be 1-3; throw 2 cubic fathoms.

4. for loading 2 loads; the storeroom will be 1-2; throw 1 fathom (?) and 101 cubic feet.

On the shovels (?) 18 burdens of gunpowder". Two profiles appear on the same plane on the AB and CD line.

5. The fifth cartographic source also discovered at the State Military-Historical Archive of Russia is the *Plan of Hârşova Castle with the indication of Vorstadt* (the neighbourhoods around the fortress n.n.) and the *newly made fortifications* (Планъ Гйрзовскому замку с показаніемъ варштата и вновь зделанныхъ укрепленийевъ).⁵⁵ This one is larger, not dated, but we can assume that it was developed in 1773 or immediately after, anyway

⁵⁵ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 846, op. 16, d. 2064.

with information specific to the year indicated, including the defensive complex of Hârșova fortress, the urban structure, the repairs made by the Russians, the position of redoubts and Russian troops. The fortifications from Gâsca Island and Privalul Băroi to Citatel Hill (Dealul Cetății) are also shown on this plan.

From upstream to downstream, the cartographic source begins with Hârșova Fortress, which is rendered with a quadrilateral plan, with a north wall having a small deviation, with a naturally fortified southern side, which includes the stone walled enclosures, structural elements specific to the Turkish fortifications in the 16th century, as well as previous defensive structures integrated in it. Four towers of the castle are rectangular, and the corner towers, two in number, are in the shape of a bastion. A second enclosure is formed by the bastion fortress, with slightly smaller walls, which doubles to the east, north and west the space in the vicinity of the castle. To the west, the wall blown up was repaired and strengthened. Palisades and gabions can be seen on the new earth curtain walls. The defensive complex was further strengthened with a defensive trench. Two redoubts were built to the north of the fortress and on the west hill (Belciug).

The legend of the plan and notes on the plan:

Explanation ("Экспликация")

A. The Castle ("Замокъ");

B. The wall blown up, and now against it is made reinforcement of gabions ("Подорванная стена а н<ы>не противъ оной ис туровъ сделано укрепление");

C. Exit (small gates in the wall) ("Сортий");

D. The former suburb (Vorstadt) which is completely destroyed and now levelled ("Бывшей варштатъ которой весь разоренъ и ныне заравнянь");

E. Newly made redoubts ("Вновь сделанные редуты");

F. Ravine in the stone mountain ("Ущелина в каменной горе");

G. The ruined Turkish battery ("Турецкая батарея разваленая");

H. The companies of the *Vyborgski* regiment standing near the redoubts and the fortress ("Стоящие подле редутовъ и крепости Выборскаго полку роты");

J. The newly made Schanze next to which the 1st *Moskovsky* Regiment stands ("Вновь сделанной шанецъ подле котораго стоитъ первой Московскою полкъ").

On the plan, near the fortress: 5 *Vyborgskie* companies ("5 Выборские роты"); near the redoubt in front of the fortress: 2 *Vyborgskie* companies ("2 Выборские роты"); near the redoubt on the bank of the Danube: 3 *Vyborgskie* companies ("3 Выборские роты"); near the New Ditch: the 1st *Moskovsky* ("1-я Московскою"). Crossing the pontoon bridge, in front of which was a redoubt, above the locality of Măgureni from today⁵⁶ – 3 squadrons of the

⁵⁶ Today Măgureni Village (in the past, Strâmba), Mărașu commune, Brăila county (in Great Brăila Island).

Vengherski regiment of hussars ("Венгерскаго гусарскаго полку 3 эскадрона"); *Sevskoi* ("Севской"); artillery ("артилерия"); 2nd Moskovsky ("2-й Московской").

6. The sixth document presented is the *Plan of the Turkish Assault Attempt on Hârşova and the attack of the detachment of the 1st Moskovsky Infantry Regiment on other fortifications*; [the enemy was, n.n.] met, repulsed and pursued by the Russian army corps under the command of Major General Suvorov, 1773, September 3. 23 × 100 cm (*План покушения турецкаго на Гирзов и атака ретранжамента в коем первой Московской пехотной полк находился и на другие укрепления российскими войсками корпусом под командою... Суворова встречен, разбит и преследован 1773 году сентября 3 дня*), which today is in the National Library of Ukraine in Kiev⁵⁷, with the following legend:

Explanation ("Экспликация")

A. The Fortress of Hârşova ("Гирсовская крепость");

B. The redoubt in which Major Buturlin commanded ("Редутъ в которомъ командовалъ майоръ Батурлинъ");

C. The redoubt commanded by Major Posieta ("Редутъ что командовалъ майоръ Пасиетъ");

D. The Schanze in which the 1st Moskovsky Regiment was stationed ("Щанецъ в коемъ стоялъ «1»-й Московской полкъ");

E. The movement of the enemy towards Hârşova ("Неприятельское движение къ Гирзову");

F. The battery of the enemy from which the cannon was fired on the schanze ("Батарея неприятельская с которой производилъ на щанецъ пушечную палбу");

G. Body Camp ("Лагири корпуса");

H. The square of the *Sevski* regiment ("Карей Севскаго полку");

J. Square of the 2nd Moskovsky Regiment ("Карей «2»-го Московскаго полку");

K. Squadrons of *Vengherski* Regiment Commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel and Knight Rozer ("Венгерскаго гусарскаго полку эскадроны коими командовалъ подполковникъ и ковалеръ Розеръ");

L. Hunters under the command of Major Shirtkov ("Езари под командою майора Ширткова");

M. 4 separate companies of the *Sevski* regiment which were commanded by Major and Knight Faminzyn ("Отделенные Севскаго полку «4» роты коими командовалъ майоръ и ковалеръ Фаминцинъ");

⁵⁷ National Library of Ukraine (NBUV), Д18(4РУМ)725-6, no. 6341K. For the plans in Kiev, Russian titles are resumed from the inventory of the National Library of Ukraine.



Fig. 5. The Plan of Hârșova Castle with the indication of Vorstadt.



Fig. 6. The Plan of the Turkish Assault Attempt on Hârșova and the attack of the detachment of the 1st Moskovski Infantry Regiment on other fortifications.

N. The square which consisted of four companies which are shown with the letter "...". ("Строющиеся карей изъ «4» ротъ которые значатъ под литерою «...»");

O. Retreat of the enemy on the road to Carasu [Medgidia, n.n.], ("Неприятелская ретирада по Карасуиской дороге");

P. The enemy's convoy ("Обозъ неприятелской").

At the end of the rejection and expulsion of the enemy were taken as trophies 6 bronze cannons, 1 mortar, a lot of schanze instruments and otherwise, their whole caravan in which there were up to half [..., broken doc., n.n.] gunpowder, bombs, cannonballs and other [..., broken, n.n.] things, and all sorts of food [..., broken, n.n.]. During this incident, the enemy was fired from the cannons below. Namely, from the castle - from the cannons «7» pounds caliber (?), 22 of «6» pounds, 4 of «5» pounds, «5» from the retreat of the redoubts (?), from the unicorn [type of Russian cannon, n.n.] ½, [..., spot, broken, n.n.] grenades «3», cartoccio [cartridges, n.n.] «3». From the cannons (?) From cannons «36» cannonballs, cartoccio «11», [..., broken, n.n.] (?) Cartoccio «1», of all «85». In this battle they were defeated [..., broken, n.n.] by enemies on the spot and during the pursuit of more than [..., broken, n.n.]. And 52 people were taken captive. These enemies [partially broken, completed, n.n.] numbered 4,000 infantry among the chosen janissaries and 3,000 cavalries under the command of two pashas.

In pursuing the enemy back [..., broken, n.n.] our armies are marked with green paint.

[Blue dots on the plan, n.n.] Ottoman cavalry ("Турецкая конница");

[Red dots on the plan, n.n.]: Ottoman infantry ("Турецкая пехота").

The conductor Ivan Sobol has copied [samur, sable, n.n.] ("Копировалъ кандукторъ Иванъ Соболевъ").

7. In addition to the document presented is the *Plan of the redoubt built on the island that is now on the Danube, against the mouth of the river Borşa* [Borcea arm, n.n.], by order of the General Command. Built on August 3rd, 1773. Construction began on July 30th and was completed on August 2nd; each day [for works, n.n.] there were 80 people, 37 × 31.5 cm (Планъ построенному редуиту на острове ныне лежащемъ по Дунаю противъ устья реки Борша. По приказанию генералного дежурства. Сочиненъ августа 3 числа 1773 года. Зачетъ строить июля 30-го оконченъ августа 2-го числа, в каждой день находилось восемьдесят человекъ).⁵⁸ A profile of the redoubt on the line AB is also drawn on the plan.

8. From the same day with the plan of the redoubt is also the *Plan of the Hârşova fortress with the showing of what was done and what was left* [to be done, n.n.]. Compiled in 1773,

⁵⁸ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 349, op. 51, d. 191.

August 3rd, 34.5 × 43 cm (*Планъ Гирсовской крепости с показаниемъ что сделано и что осталось. Сочинень 1773 году августа 3 дня*).⁵⁹




Fig. 7. The Plan of the redoubt built on the island that is now on the Danube, against the mouth of the river Borșa, by order of the General Command. Composed on August 3, 1773.

Explanation ("Экспликация")

- A. The Castle ("Замокъ");
- B. Place blown up, and now the reinforcement is made ("Подорванное место а н<ы>не сделано укрепление");
- C. Exit ("Сорти");
- D. What is now done – indicated with an earthy colour ("Значитъ земленого краскою что н<ы>не сделано");
- E. What has not yet been done – indicated in a yellow colour ("Значитъ желтого краскою что еще не сделано");
- F. Mines ("Мины").

With a profile on the GH line ("Профиль по линей GH") and the author's signature – the engineer-praporshchik Andrei Juravliov ("Инженер прапорщик Андрей

⁵⁹ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 349, op. 51, d. 190.

Журавлев"). The plan can be considered a supplement to the fourth cartographic source published in this contribution, because both places show the mines locations.




Fig. 8. The Plan of the Hârşova fortress with the showing of what was done and what was left [to be done, n.n.]. Compiled in 1773, August 3rd.

9. The ninth cartographic document is the Plan of Hârşova Castle showing the project around it, and the new constructions follow in the report. May... day 1774 (Планъ

*Гирзовскаго замка с показаниемъ вокругъ онаго прожекта, а вновь пристроекъ, следуетъ при рапорте. Маия ... дня 1774 года).*⁶⁰

Explanation ("Экспликация"):

A. The Castle ("Замокъ");

B. The main wall ("Главная стена");

C. Fasobre ("Фасобре");

D. Ditch ("Ровъ");

E. Blown-up place where the gates were previously located, and next to it the powder magazine, which was blown up by the Russian army at its siege in the year <1>771 ("Подорванное место где находились прежде ворота, и возле оныхъ пороховой погребъ, которой подорванъ Россійскимъ войскомъ при осаде онаго въ <1>771-омъ году");

F. Above this place, at the taking of that castle, a *brustwehr* was made by ours, which has now been renewed ("Надъ онымъ местомъ зделанъ по взятие того замка нашими брустверь, кой н<ы>не поновленъ");

G. Slight fortifications on the riverbank above the precipice – an earthen *brustwehr* still made by the Turks ("Сотъ речной стороны надъ прорвою земляной брустверь зделанной еще турками");

H. Beneath this right by the river there is a small stone wall ("Подъ оною при самой реке находится малая каменная стенка");

J. In this place there is a cliff in the rock with a length of 5 feet and a width of 1 fathom, the height from 4 to 5 feet ("При ономъ месте находится ущелина въ каменной горе, длиною отъ 5-ти ф. и щиротою въ 1 сажень, высотой отъ 4 до 5-ти футъ");

K. Sortie⁶¹ or gates in the wall for the exit ("Сорти или вылазечные калитки");

L. Gate in the counterscarp for entering the ditch ("Ворота въ контроскарпе для въезду въ ровъ");

M. The project overlaid by the Major General engineer and the knight Righelman in the year <1>773, after which a redan was made, which is shown under the letter N ("Наложенной прожектъ инженеръ генераль майоромъ и кавалеромъ Ригельманомъ <1>773 году, по которому зделанъ флешъ одинъ, что значитъ подъ литерою N");

O. In the same year <1>773 a redoubt was built by our armies at the command of Major General and Knight Suvorov ("Того жъ <1>773 году построенные нащими войсками редутъ по повелению генераль майора и кавалера Суворова");

P. The suburbs that were burned during the siege ("Предмѣстїи которыи во время осады сожжены");

⁶⁰ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 349, op. 51, d. 193.

⁶¹ The author of the plan uses the term in French to designate an exit.



Fig. 9. The Plan of Hârşova Castle showing the project around it, and the new constructions follow in the report.

Q. The Turkish entrenchments, but now they are levelled ("Турецкии ретранжаменты, н^ые жъ оныи скрыты").

Profile on the ab line ("Профиль по линей ab"); Profile on the CD line ("Профиль по линей CD"); Profile on the EF line ("Профиль по линей EF"); a Profile on the GH line ("Профиль по линей GH"); Profile on the JK line ("Профиль по линей JK").

The conductor Timofei Golopopkin have copied ("Копировалъ кандуктор Тимофей Голопопкин").

The redoubt from the road to Dăieni also appears on this plan.

10. The tenth document is the *Plan of Hârşova Castle with the showing of the former suburb and the situation of the year 1775, February*, 48 × 58 cm (*План Гирзовскаго (!) замка с показанием бывшаго форштата и ситуаций 1775-го года февраля... дня*)⁶², which is in Kiev. Otherwise, we consider that in Romanov times both plans found by us in Kiev were in Odessa, being part of the Collection of maps and plans of the Museum of the Imperial Society of History and Antiquities established in 1839.

The operations carried out during the Russian-Turkish conflict (1768-1774) by the two great fighters, led to the devastation of Dobrudja, causing significant material damage and the loss of a large number of human lives. In the spring of 1771, the army of Tsarist Russia crossed the Danube and, after engaging in direct confrontations with the Ottomans, in the same year, the Russians managed to conquer, one by one, the fortresses of Tulcea, Isaccea and Hârşova.⁶³

The document dated February 1775 shows the situation of the fortress and the surrounding area. Certainly, the plan was drawn up for the requirements of the Russian army, which owned the fortress, being drawn in colour, including the topography of the town, the legend, two profiles and the scale. The fortress with the defensive elements, the redoubts, the neighbourhoods of the town, the two limestone hills, elongated to the north, which frame the town, as well as a neighbourhood to the Northeast of the fortress are rendered.

The following colours were used to make the drawing: red and gray – they render the fortification elements belonging to the fortress (walls and defence ditch); scarlet – the islands that include the groups of houses and related gardens; brown – the access roads to the town and to the fortress, as well as the rocky cliff; blue – the Danube line.

⁶² National Library of Ukraine, Д18(4ПУМ)72, no. 13050 (the date February 9th appears in the Kiev inventory, but it is not mentioned in the original). In Бертъе-Деларгад 1888 21, no. 54, a plan from 1773 is mentioned for Hârşova.

⁶³ Хронологический 1908, 136-137.



Fig. 10. The Plan of Hârşova Castle with the showing of the former suburb and the situation of the year 1775, February.

The town plan suggests an attention to detail and accuracy, which involved the input of military engineers, who resorted to field measurements.

Explanation of the plan ("Изъяснение Плана")

A. Castle Gir[zov] ("Замокъ Гиръ");

B. The blown-up wall, and now a reinforcement of gabions is made against it ("Подорванная стена а нынѣ противъ оной изъ габіоновъ сдѣлано укрѣпленіе");

C. Exit ("Сорти");

D. Traps made in three rows, which are placed so that the enemy cannot flee to the gabions during the assault ("Сдѣланныя рогатки въ три ряда, которыя поставлены чтобъ непріятель во время штурма не могъ взбежать на габіоны");

E. The former suburb (Vorstadt) which is completely ruined and now levelled ("Бывшій фор-штатъ которой весь раззоренъ и нынѣ заровненъ");

F. Newly made redoubts ("Вновь сдѣланные редуты");

G. Crumbled Turkish battery ("Турецкіи развалившіися бат<a>реи").⁶⁴

DISCUSSION

As we have shown above, some of the plans analysed here, one in French, made shortly after the conquest of Hârşova by the Russians ("*Plan du Chateau de Hirsow*")⁶⁵, the prospectus of the fortress ("*Проспектъ Гирсова*")⁶⁶, which is from the same period, but following the plan drafted in French (most likely showing the situation of 1773), the topographic survey of the Danube bank from Hârşova to Măgureni⁶⁷ ("*Планъ Гйрзовскому замку с показаніемъ варштата и вновь зделанныхъ укрепленьевъ*")⁶⁸, together with other plans, are located in Moscow, at the RGVA – State Military-Historical Archive of Russia.

State Military-Historical Archive of Russia is, in fact, the heiress of the Archive of the maps of His Imperial Highness, established on August 8th, 1797, through the ukase of Emperor Paul I.⁶⁹ The RGVA preserves several thousands (or maybe even more) historical documents about Romania, including the oldest Russian topographic plan of a Romanian town, that of Iaşi, built in 1739, whose form processed in the nineteenth century was recently published⁷⁰, and a study will appear on the originals of the plans from the same year – some sources regarding the fortification of the capital of Moldova, as well as a plan with a street network – later discovered at RGVA. Two other plans analysed here, as we noted, were part of the collection of the Odessa History Society Museum, located in Kiev today.

⁶⁴ In the fund of the Museum "A.V. Suvorov" in Sankt-Petersburg, documents regarding Hârşova are kept, including some plans. Two of them are of interest, reported and partially commented on by Шабловский in 1957, 63-68. One of them is the plan of the Ottoman attack of September 3rd, 1773, of which we publish here the version from Kiev. Another one is "The plan of the Hârşova fortress taken by the Russian armies from the Turks in 1771, showing the remote situation and in what condition it was returned to the Turks", which shows the works carried out by the Russians under Suvorov's command to strengthen the fortress. Both plans can be found in the "Journal or Description of the Actions of the First Conqueror Army from the Beginning of the Ottoman War to the End of It", with plans and maps in the appendices.

⁶⁵ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 438, op. 1, d. 456.

⁶⁶ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 438, op. 1, d. 457.

⁶⁷ Village in Insula Mare a Brăilei, in the past, Strâmba, belonging to Măraşu commune, Brăila county.

⁶⁸ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 846, op. 16, d. 2064.

⁶⁹ Пучкова, Иванов 2008, 20. Not on August 7th, as Лукашевич 2007, 13 notes, to which we referred in the study: Rădvan, Ciobanu 2019, 199 (reference to note 22), indicating also the date of August 7th.

⁷⁰ Rădvan, Ciobanu 2017, 195-218.

*
* *

The Romanian historiography did not pay much attention to Dobrudja during the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-1774 and hence the lack of data in the knowledge of the unfolding of the events.

On June 1st, 1771, the Russian commander of Brăila, Borzov, transmitted to Piotr Rumeantsev (Zadunaïski) the news collected from two men from Hârşova, according to which the vizier was in Babadag, being accompanied by "no more than 2,000" soldiers.⁷¹ On June 3rd, the Turks stationed in Hârşova, already numbering more than 2000, crossed the Danube and attacked the position of the Russians at the mouth of the Ialomiţa river.⁷²

According to A.N. Petrov, an excellent connoisseur of the historical sources, in August 1771, Ahmet Pasha was in Hârşova with no less than 12,000 soldiers.⁷³ The Russians had planned to conquer the fortress, preparing for it but the Turks found out about their movements. From Măcin, 20 cannons were sent to Hârşova, and the fortifications of the place were strengthened. Moreover, the Ottoman armed contingent was supplemented with 3,000 soldiers.⁷⁴

The quartermaster General Friedrich Wilhelm Bauer sent an expeditionary corps made up of Zaporozhians, embarked on ships, with the order to destroy the quay and the warehouse in Hârşova. The local warehouse was of crucial importance to the Ottoman troops in Dobrudja. The attack was to end with the conquest of the fortress. The action was planned under the cover of the night, on August 23rd, 1771. According to the orders received, immediately after midnight, the Zaporozhians, who served in the Russian Imperial Army, had to climb the quays, to seize a certain number of ships, as many as they could, the rest being set on fire and left to the flames. The same fate was predestined to the town and the warehouse. At the same time, another 100 of the best hussars were ordered to attack the castle. The two access roads to the quays from the Danube were to be blocked with two galleys, the occupation of the island of Gâsca being necessary⁷⁵ by the battalion of Vladimir Ivanovici Rozen. The enemy's battery had to be conquered as soon as the key was set on fire. The action would have been successful, with some Zaporozhians seizing up to 50 Turkish ships, but other comrades of theirs opened fire on the Turks too soon. The enemy left the town

⁷¹ Румянцев 1953, 448, no. 219.

⁷² Румянцев 1953, 454, no. 221.

⁷³ Петров 1874a, 128, 130.

⁷⁴ Петров 1874a, 131.

⁷⁵ The Gâsca Islet is one of the most important islets created by the Danube, facing Hârşova towards Giurgeni near the bridge from Vadu Oii, the Borcea branch of the Danube.

defenceless and retreated to the fortress, from where it counterattacked with artillery fire, the Russians being forced to give up fulfilling the initial plan.⁷⁶

Quartermaster General Friedrich Wilhelm Bauer tried to conquer Hârşova on the night of the 3rd to the 4th of September. However, the initial plan was not put into practice, because the Turks had blocked the entrance to the Hârşova quay, sinking ships in the branch of the Danube that allowed the access. In order not to be completely confused, Bauer ordered the attack of the Turkish camp from Dăeni. The attack, opened on the morning of September 4th, was only partially successful, with the Russians taking six flags, but retreating.⁷⁷

The conquest of the fortresses from Măcin and Tulcea and of Babadag decided the fate of Hârşova. The fortress was strongly fortified and defended by a large garrison of about 2,000 soldiers, who had 70 cannons at their disposal. However, psychologically speaking, the Turks had lost the confrontation with the Russian side. On October 24th, 1771, under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Aleksandr Iakovlevici Iakubovici, the Imperial Army launched the attack. The Turkish eight-gun battery was conquered without too much difficulty. Later, the fire was opened on the walls of the fortress, from seven cannons, an artillery projectile falling right into the powder magazine. A powerful explosion followed, a part of the fortress wall being blown up, thus opening the way for the decisive assault. As a result of the explosion, the commander of the fortress and a lot of Turks died. The fortress was conquered, but also ruined. The Russians set fire to up to 100 Turkish ships anchored at the quays. At the Town (Târgul de Floci), position of the Russians on the opposite bank of the Danube, were carried six small cannons taken from the Turkish battery, two galleon-type vessels and 25 smaller vessels.⁷⁸

After the conquest of the fortress, before November 25th, an engineer officer was sent to investigate the place. It is said that then, up to 40 bronze cannons were found in the fortress, and it was ordered their lifting⁷⁹, although A. N. Petrov reported about 32 bronze cannons and six mortars transported to Brăila in November of the same year.⁸⁰

On August 18th, 1772, P. Rumeantsev referred to the importance of Hârşova for the Turks before its conquest by the Imperial Army, with a considerable number of soldiers stationed in the fortress, with ships, with which they acted against the Russians, crossing the Danube on the opposite bank, in the direction of Târgul de

⁷⁶ Румянцев 1953, 475-476, no. 236. Vezi şi Петров 1874a, 139.

⁷⁷ Петров 1874a, 142-143.

⁷⁸ Петров 1874a, 166.

⁷⁹ Румянцев 1953, 507, no. 252.

⁸⁰ Петров 1874a, 166.

Floci. At the time of this account, the fortress was in poor condition.⁸¹ However, it is known that the Russians did not always rule Hârşova after the conquest in the autumn of 1771.

The fortress – it is true, partially ruined – remained a significant strategic point for both sides involved in the armed conflict, and it is understandable why Rumeantsev ordered Grigori Aleksandrovici Potiomkin to recapture it. The order was hastily fulfilled, Hârşova being reconquered on April 24th, 1773, at the time of the Potiomkin assault, having under his command only 200 Zaporozhians. Immediately afterwards, work to strengthen fortifications has been ordered. A.N. Petrov pointed out that Piotr Rumeantsev intended to march with the main army towards the mouth of the Ialomița river, a place where the Danube could be crossed in the direction of Hârşova.⁸²

On May 13th, 1773, there were reports about the strengthening of the fortress in Hârşova by the Russians "... to serve as much as possible for our support, as well as for the closure of various stocks that are brought there...".⁸³ These works can also be traced on the plans published here, which confirms that all the Russian topographical elevations on which the gabion reinforcements appear near the crack in the wall, following the explosion of 1771, give a situation after April 24th, 1773.

On May 16, 1773, Piotr Rumeantsev asked G.A. Potiomkin for more information "About the islands close to Hârşova, situated between the rivers Danube and Borșca [actually the branch Borcea, n.n.], I'm waiting very shortly your notification: are they really dry and [if they are dry, n.n.] all the time and are they convenient for armies to be placed on them and to have posts?".⁸⁴ According to Rumeantsev's strategy, Hârşova was chosen as the main point of the Russian attack on Ottoman Bulgaria.⁸⁵ However, on June 1st, 1773, visiting the fortress, the commander understood that the passage of the Imperial Army to Hârşova would have been a risky action⁸⁶, opting for the place next to the Gurobale⁸⁷, near the village of Izvoarele.⁸⁸ P. Rumeantsev himself confessed that "But, researching Hârşova, on the 1st of this month, and passing on a light Zaporozhian boat with 26 oarsmen, I barely was able to cross the river and the straits

⁸¹ Румянцев 1953, 546, no. 275.

⁸² Петров 1874b, 28.

⁸³ Румянцев 1953, 609, no. 308.

⁸⁴ Румянцев 1953, 611, no. 310.

⁸⁵ Румянцев 1953, 620, footnote 1.

⁸⁶ Румянцев 1953, 622, no. 318.

⁸⁷ Румянцев 1953, 623, no. 319; Петров 1874b, 47.

⁸⁸ Pârjoia (today Izvoarele), village in Lipnița commune, Constanța county. Here there was a ford for crossing the Danube. Diaconu 1971, 315-316.

there in four hours".⁸⁹ Even in these conditions, the Russians continued to bring supplies to Hârșova and to strengthen the fortifications of the place, with the possibility of a Turkish attack.

On July 30th, 1773, there were reports about the approach of the Turks to Hârșova, on land and on the Danube, their attempts to recapture the fortress being serious.⁹⁰ On the same day, most of Rumeantsev's army arrived at Ialomița's mouth. Major General Andrei Stepanovici Miloradovici, accompanied by two regiments of infantry, artillery, three squadrons of hussars and three other of carabinieri, was sent to Hârșova to prevent the conquest of the fortress.⁹¹ That same day, the Turks attacked Hârșova, but were forced to retreat to Carasu.⁹²

On August 4th, after verbal discussions between Rumeantsev and A.V. Suvorov about the situation of the local castle, Suvorov was appointed commander of Hârșova. The Zaporozhians and the ships at Hârșova remained at Suvorov's disposal, with Major General Miloradovici's brigade ordered to support the Russian forces in case of need.⁹³ A.V. Suvorov confessed in his autobiography that: "I repaired the fortress, added earthen constructions to it and made various fieldschanze", thus preparing for the confrontation with the Turks.⁹⁴ Or, according to the plans we have at our disposal, under Suvorov's command, a single fieldschanze was built, also known as schanze, and a redoubt [tabie n.n].

To defend the fortress, on the nearby island, Suvorov ordered the placement of two infantry regiments, brought from across the Danube. "The Turks showed up early in the day – the general would write – around 11,000; we ordered various false movements to be made which would have shown our weakness; but, on my part, especially from the fortress, they started firing too early".⁹⁵ Indeed, as A.N. Petrov had pointed out, the Turks began their advance on Hârșova at seven o'clock on the morning of September 3rd, numbering about 6,000 cavalry and more than 4,000 infantries. The fortress (A, on the plan of Kiev) was defended by the polkovnik (colonel) Aleksei Dumashevici (Dumashov), the commander over the troops being

⁸⁹ Румянцев 1953, 631, no. 326. The document was known to Петров 1874b, 47 (in fact, Petrov, as we have already noted, knew very well the historical sources for the Russians' battles with the Turks on our territories).

⁹⁰ Румянцев 1953, 661, no. 337.

⁹¹ Петров 1874b, 81.

⁹² Петров 1874b, 81-82.

⁹³ Румянцев 1953, 662-663, no. 338. The discussions between Rumeantsev and Suvorov were also known to Петров 1874b, 82. Cf and Петрушевский 1884, 167.

⁹⁴ Голохвастов 1848, 547.

⁹⁵ Голохвастов 1848, 547.

General Suvorov. Miloradovici's brigade, who did not take part in the battle in person being ill, was located on the island between the Danube and the Băroi branch (body camp, letter **G**). This brigade was arranged in two squares consisting of the *Sevski* (**H**) and 2nd *Moskovski* (**J**) regiments, being completed with three squadrons from the *Vengherski* regiment of hussars (**K**)⁹⁶ and jägerii (hunters) (**L**). According to a plan from RGVIA, artillery was added to those shown above.⁹⁷ The redoubt near the fortress was under the command of Second Major Buturlin (**B**). To the left of the fortress, on the bank of the Danube, there was another redoubt, under the command of the second-major Posieta (**C**), and at the mouth of the Băroi branch a schanze (**D**). Here was the 1st *Moskovsky* Regiment, under the command of Colonel Bahmetiev, probably Aleksei Anfilofievici. According to Petrov, A.V. Suvorov was in the same fortification.⁹⁸

At the beginning of the attack, the Turks did not go to the fortress, but to the fortification system at the Băroi branch, arranging a battery (**F**) a short distance from the Russian fortification, in order to open fire on it. On the other side, the Russians chose the tactic of expectation, while the Turks continued to approach the schanze. When they were ready to assault, the Russians opened fire, forcing the Turks to retreat. At the same time, the brigade located on the island crossed the Băroi branch and engaged in confrontation. The battle was fierce. The Turks, overwhelmed by the created situation, gave up their positions. It is said that the enemy's losses were great, about 300 soldiers were killed during the battle, and another 800 when they were pursued. The Russians captured six cannons and 1 mortar, almost the entire Ottoman caravan with supplies (**P**), as well as various instruments.⁹⁹

On September 7th, 1773, P.A. Rumeantsev wrote to Catherine II about the Ottoman attack on Hârşova. The enemy "... appeared on September 3rd near the walls and the castle itself, and began, first of all, to attack our separate fortifications here. Major General and Knight Suvorov, who commands that post, with his faithful regiments [...] conquered from them the artillery, the convoy and all the cannonballs (*snaread*) brought to attack the reinforcements".¹⁰⁰

*

⁹⁶ Петров 1874b, 91-92.

⁹⁷ State Military-Historical Archive of Russia, f. 846, op. 16, d. 2064.

⁹⁸ Петров 1874b, 93.

⁹⁹ Detailed: Петров 1874b, 93-95.

¹⁰⁰ Румянцев 1953, 669, no. 341.

From the perspective of the events described above, we can understand that the plans presented were made by the Russian engineers in the military circumstances of those times. They reflect the situation of the fortress and the neighbouring strategic area between 1770 and 1775.

Compared to the facts recorded in the plans, some observations that spring from the few archaeological excavations carried out on Citatel Hill (Dealul Cetății) can be made.

It is obvious that the walls here were part of the defence system in the period to which the documents analysed by us refer. However, archaeological excavations have revealed that the walls of the fortress were built in different periods and ages, from the Roman-Byzantine era to the Middle Ages. The Ottoman rule integrated them into the defensive system and restored them when necessary. The situation seems to be somewhat clarified in the western and northern sectors.

The current plans bring us some clarifications regarding certain constructions or restorations. For example, in the western precincts sector, the "earthen stone wall"¹⁰¹ in front of which several materials were collected, including bombers, pipes, and a *Sadagura*-type coin on which the year of issue is visible (1772), enters to the south under the restoration of the tower captured in section S II, squares 71-76. This wall appears better individualized on plans 2, 5 and 10, with the specification that it is rendered, with the front, outside the large enclosure, (plans 5, 10) while on plan 2 it has another shape. The authors probably had different sources of information. In plan 1, the entire area of the western walls, affected by an explosion, is marked with a large, circular symbol, which also wanted to emphasize the size of the disaster. The relationship between this wall and the remains of the small enclosure tower, rebuilt, in all probability, at the end of the 18th century or the first part of the 19th century, which can be seen right along section S II, under which it falls, seen from the perspective of these plans, indicates that the repairs carried out in this sector, now and in the next period, have been far-reaching. As for the large western enclosure, today it still retains traces of restoration after the wall was broken by a projectile that hit the powder magazine, as explained in the legend of plan 1 (D), in the rows above. In the section on the large northern enclosure carried out in the 2008 campaign¹⁰² a level of destruction was highlighted, where, in addition to gravel and mortar, an appreciable number of bricks with dimensions of $0.27 \times 0.13 \times 0.04$ m were registered. They certainly originated in the slope made outside the second enclosure, towards the fortification ditch, included in the defence system of the fortress, as it appears from profile 2 of plan 2. Still, here we observe that the first enclosure, which was raised, in

¹⁰¹ Nicolae 2015-2016, 289-290.

¹⁰² Nicolae 2017, 312-313 and fig. 6, level 5.

all probability, during the Roman-Byzantine period, is reused in the defence system and acquires the role of a counterscarp.

Regarding the route of the walls that the plans indicate, we cannot say whether it is according to the situation on the ground. Only on the northern side of the reserved area can be clearly distinguished all the three walls, and the drawings seem to represent them well. The archaeological research has not yet established their exact plan.

With reference to the current situation of the towers, only on the north side of the small enclosure there are two quadrilateral towers, one of them is monumental and was named by specialists "commander's tower", and on the west side, in the main section E-V, the platform of another tower appears. It cannot be certified whether the presentation in the plans is accurate, in number, location and shape. A few remarks should be made on the gates indicated in the plans, provided that the situation recorded at that time could change in the restoration of the fortress after subsequent conflicts, which would be the source of current inconsistencies. The documents show us, as can be seen, the position of the gates differently. Today we know a small gate, located west of the "commander's tower" on the small enclosure (on plan 1 is placed a gate on the last curtain wall to the east) while on the middle enclosure there is a larger gate, which opens a few meters in front of the "commander's tower" to the east. This one does not appear in any plan. The gate C in plan 5 can find its indicated place if the wall was much higher than it is now.

We find particularly important the representation of the port facility wall from the Danube. On plan 1, but especially on those with numbers 2 and 5, which show better and detail the objective, there are practically two walls placed one on top of the other between the two rocky spurs. If the situation was like this, referring to the current state in which only the one at the top is still fully seated over a huge levelling with earth pushed here from the fortress, and the other is seen only to the west, we can say that, although they were part of the same complex, these played different roles. The lower one, if initially raised from one end to the other, supported the compacted mass, on which the foundation of the upper one sat, behind which were the customs offices or law enforcement watching over the naval traffic. In its current state (which must have been identical to that of the period in which the drawing was made), in order to increase the degree of resistance to the danger of sliding south, the wall is slightly angular, with a front opening of approx. 150°. The side ends were anchored in holes made in the two rocks to which the two segments are attached, and there is no side wall, facing east, in which the access door to the Danube may have been carved, as it results from plans 2 and 5. On the western section of the wall, only a few stone slabs facilitating the direct access to the keys can be seen today.

In the documents nos. 2, 5, 6 and 10, several redoubts are represented, newly built or rather rebuilt by the Russian imperial army. One constantly appears near the fortress, at the northern end of the limestone hill on which the fortress was built; another one on the hill downstream, right on the edge of the Danube cliff. On plan 5 the fortifications to the west of the fortress appear, on the bank of the Danube, from the point where the Băroi privar detaches and the one placed at the upstream end of the Gâsca island. In the absence of any archaeological research, we know nothing about the fate of these fortifications. Only the one from Belciug Hill was to be preserved and become part of the defence system of the medieval fortress and town, the issue on which we will insist a little below. On plans 5 and 10, at the northern end of the hill that starts in Belciug Hill, a destroyed (10) / ruined (5) Turkish battery is recorded, an important detail for our discussions below. The excavations carried out here, limited to correlate the data provided by the plan with those revealed in the field, brought to light several walls, different in terms of construction technique and planimetry.¹⁰³ Plan 5 lacks the western fortifications, built in Dealul Băroi, the "height" that dominates the rock on which there is a stone tower (the fortification from Beciu Hill/Dealul Belciug), as the count of Langeron noted in the description of the fortress from Hârșova.¹⁰⁴ The traces of these fortifications are still visible today. Some researchers even associate them an antique origin.¹⁰⁵

On plans 5 and 9, where a broader perspective on the fortress and the immediately adjacent area is used, the roads to the important localities nearby (Doeni-Dăeni) or further away (Siliștră, Babadag) are shown. It is interesting that the exit from the fortress is through the west, where the walls were broken by the explosion of a projectile, which we mentioned above, where a redoubt defended frontward by gabions is built. This detail suggests that the fortress was practically destroyed and was reduced, in the new circumstances, only to the western perimeter arranged by the Russian occupiers.

A last aspect related to the contribution of these plans to the knowledge of the planimetry of the Ottoman fortification from Hârșova is related to the fortified enclosure, which defended the town and united the fortress with the castle located on the downstream hill, where there is talk of a redoubt.

As has been written in recent studies on this issue¹⁰⁶, it was argued that this wall could have been erected in the very first part of the seventeenth century. If a later date

¹⁰³ Nicolae *et alii* 2008, 324-326.

¹⁰⁴ *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, Serie Nouă, I (1801-1821), 2004, 334. It is possible that this fortification was built at the beginning of the 19th century.

¹⁰⁵ Crăciun 2008, 61.

¹⁰⁶ Nicolae 2016, 66.

is considered, then Evliya Çelebi's assertion can no longer be explained: "*It is a fortified and lasting fortress on the land of Babadag, situated on the right side of the Danube, with its peaks raised to the sky. It has three thousand steps around it. The man does not dare to look down, towards the Danube, from the western part of this fortress*".¹⁰⁷ Through this, the famous Turkish traveller suggests that he visited here a strong fortress with a perimeter of three thousand steps, and from the west side (where it closed with the fortification of today's Belciug Hill) one could not look down on the Danube (because of the height). The following mention about the fortification from Hârşova is from the count of Langeron, dated in 1809. He wrote that the town "*It is surrounded by a fortification that included the two rocks; above one of them there is a large stone castle, a Gothic-type fortification, on the other less high rock there is a stone tower*...".¹⁰⁸

The plans presented above make no mention in this respect. It is difficult to specify the cause of this state of affairs in relation to the image of the fortification of the next century. However, only two hypotheses are to be considered: the "fence" was destroyed along with the town that was ruined (Plan 9, E – Former neighbourhoods destroyed and levelled); the image of the fortification from the first part of the 19th century is due to a substantial restoration that took place during this time. The discovered plans show us the stages and restorations, made by those who controlled the fortress between 1770 and 1774. This aspect is supported by the plans from the beginning of the 19th century, which imposed a transformation of the fortress from Hârşova.

In the analysis and critical interpretation of these documents it must be borne in mind that some inconsistencies, and there are enough, have their origin in the lack of direct knowledge of the situation, on the spot, of the authors. Either battle plans were used, or the information was provided by third parties (at the sources of topographic surveys) in the realization or completion of some details of the Ottoman fortification from Hârşova. Where sources were lacking, the authors used their imagination. Let's not forget that even the archaeological research is not able, for the time being, to certify all the data regarding the route of the walls, the place and shape of the towers, the gates, the interior architecture, etc., later data being able to confirm or refute the situation shown on Russian plans. From this point of view, the plans of the existing fortress in the Ottoman archives that we are waiting for are also of great interest. However, regardless of the value of the critical appraisals of these documents, their importance remains exceptional. They open the long way in the analysis and comparison of previously unknown sources, they complete information and bring unique elements in the research of one of the most fascinating historical and archaeological sites in Dobrudja.

¹⁰⁷ *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, VI, București, 1976, 451.

¹⁰⁸ *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, Serie Nouă, I (1801-1821), București, 2004, 334; Langeron 2019, 93.

The plans recently discovered in the archives of Kiev and Moscow allow a new perspective on the Ottoman fortifications in Hârşova in the 18th century. The present analysis was limited to ten plans, which record the fortress and the surrounding area during the Russo-Turkish conflict between 1768 and 1774. Of great significance are the defensive elements revealed by documents, which, in agreement with the results of the archaeological research and other historical sources, allow a better knowledge, not only of the fortress of Hârşova, but also of the entire area in the 18th century.

Acknowledgements

The research was carried out within the cultural project "(Re) Mapping. Archaeology of maps" implemented by "Gavrilă Simion" Eco-Museum Research Institute Tulcea, in partnership with the Museum of National History and Archaeology Constanța, Pro Noviodunum Association and Eurocentric Association, co-financed by the National Cultural Fund Administration (N.C.F.A.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aricescu, A. 1971, *Noi date despre cetatea de la Hârşova*, Pontica 4, 351-369.
- Brătulescu, V. 1939, *Cetatea Hârşova în legătură cu Dobrogea și ținuturile înconjurătoare*, Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice 33, fasc. 105, 3-25.
- Boca, M. 1968, *Dobrogea veche în stampe și gravuri 1826-1882*, Pontica 1, 455-507.
- Chiriac, C., Nicolae, C., Talmațchi, G. 1998, *Noutăți epigrafice de epocă romană la Carsium (Hârşova, jud. Constanța)*, Pontica, 31, 139-162.
- Chesney, F.R. 1854, *The Russo-Turkish Campaigns of 1828 and 1829: with view of the present State of Affairs in the East*, London.
- Ciobanu, R. 1970, *Un monument istoric puțin cunoscut: Cetatea feudală de la Hârşova*, Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice 1, 24-30.
- Crăciun, C. 2008, *Studiu privind topografia sitului Carsium (sec. 1-6 d.Hr.)*, Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice 19 (1-2), 53-80.
- Custurea, C. 1986, *Unele aspecte privind penetrația monedei bizantine în Dobrogea în secolele VII-X*, Pontica 19, 273-277.
- Damian, O. 2015, *Bizanțul la Dunărea de Jos (secolele VII-X)*, Brăila.
- Diaconu, P. 1971, *În căutarea Dafnei*, Pontica 4, 311-318.
- Mihăiescu, H., Ștefan, Gh., Hîncu, R., Iliescu, V., Popescu, V.C. 1970, *Izvoarele Istoriei Românilor, II, De la anul 300 la anul 1000*, București.
- Florescu, R. 1943, *Raport asupra activității arheologice de la Hârşova în anul 1943*, Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice 1946, 179-180.

- Göksel, B. 2017, *Ottoman serhad organization in the Balkans (1450's to Early 1500's)*, Ankara.
- Langeron, A.F. 2019, *Însemnările contelui de Langeron. Războiul Rusiei cu Turcia, 1806-1812 (Principatele Dunărene)*, București.
- Madgearu, A. 2017, *Comentarii asupra unor informații din Geografia și Harta lui al-Idrîsî, Pontica* 50, 137-159.
- von Moltke, H. 1845, *Der russisch-türkische Feldzug in der europäischen Türkei 1828-1829*, Berlin.
- von Moltke, H. 1854, *The Russians in Bulgaria and rumelia in 1828 and 1829; The Campaigns of the Danube, the sieges of Brailow, Varna, Silistra, shumla, and the passage of the Balcan by Marchal Diebich*, London.
- Nicolae, C. 2016, *Noi date despre fortificația otomană de la Hârşova*, in Stănică, A.D., Custurea, G., Stănică, D., Plopeanu, E. (eds.) *Dobrogea. Coordonate istorice și arheologice*, Iași, 49-84.
- Nicolae, C. 2018, *Poarta de nord a cetății romano-bizantine Carsium (The Northern Gate of Roman-Byzantine Carsium)*, *Pontica* 51, 343-363.
- Panaiteanu, P.P. 2000, *Mircea cel Bătrân*, București.
- Paraschiv-Talmațchi, C. 2009, *Early Middle Ages in Dobrudja. Different data concerning the state of the research at Hârşova (Constanța county)*, in Aparaschivei, D. (eds.), *Studia antiqua et Medievalia. Miscellanea in honorem annos LXXV peragentis Professoris Dan Gh. Teodor oblata*, București, 421-438.
- Paraschiv-Talmațchi, C. 2016 *An Changing Image. The Early Medieval Landscape at Lower Danube. Case Study: Hârşova*, *Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica* 13, 121-142.
- Pârvan, V. 1913, *Descoperiri noua în Schyhtia Minor, II, Stiri nouă din Carsium*, *Analele Academiei Române* 35, *Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice*, 1913, 478-491.
- Popescu, A., 2013, *Integrarea imperială otomană a teritoriilor din Sud-Estul Europei. Sangeacul Silistra (sec. XV-XVI)*, București.
- Popescu, A. 2015, *Dobrogea în epoca otomană: kazaua Hârşova (sec. XVI)*, *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie* 23, 85-112.
- Rădvan, L. 2011, *Orașele din Țările Române în Evul Mediu (sfârșitul sec. al XIII-lea – începutul sec. al XVI-lea)*, Iași.
- Rădvan, L., Ciobanu, M.A. 2017, *Din urmările ocupației ruse în Moldova (1739): cel mai vechi plan al Iașilor*, *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie* 25, 195-218.
- Rădvan, L., Ciobanu, M.A. 2019, *Descoperiri în arhivele de la Moscova: planuri necunoscute ale orașului Iași*, *Historia Urbana* 27, 195-223.
- Rădulescu, A., Bitoleanu, I. 1979, *Istoria românilor dintre Dunăre și Mare. Dobrogea*, București.

- Sezer, M. 2019, *Dobruca bölgesinde üç kaza: hacioğlu pazarı, yenipazar ve umur fakih (xviii. yüzyıl ortalarında nüfus ve yerleşim)*, Osmanlı Mirası Araştırmaları Dergisi 6, 16, 555-572.
- Stănică, A.D. 2015, *Viața economică din nordul Dobrogei în secolele X-XIV*, Constanța.
- Vertan, A., Custurea, G. 1981, *Descoperiri monetare în Dobrogea (III)*, Pontica 14, 331-356.
- Vertan, A., Custurea, G. 1986, *Descoperiri monetare în Dobrogea (VII)*, Pontica 19, 297-308.

*

- Бертье-Делагард, А.Л. 1888, *Каталог карт, планов, чертежей, рисунков, хранящихся в Музее Императорского Одесского общества истории и древностей*, Odessa.
- Голохвастов, Д.П. 1848, *Биография Александра Васильевича Суворова, им самим писанная в 1786 году*, Чтения в Императорском Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских при Московском Университете III, 9, 534-552.
- Хронологический 1908, *Хронологический указатель военных действий русской армии и флота*, I, 1695-1800 гг. (1695-1800 gg.), Sankt-Petersburg.
- Лукашевич, А.М. 2007, *Картографические депо России и их роль в подготовке к войне 1812 г.*, in "Весн. БДУ, серія 3, Гіст., Філас., Псіхал., Палім., Сацьял., Эканом., Права", 2, 13-17.
- Петров, А.Н. 1874а, *Война России с Турцией и Польскими конфедератами с 1769-1774 год*, III, Год 1771, Sankt-Petersburg.
- Петров, А.Н. 1874б, *Война России с Турцией...*, IV, 1772 и 1773 гг., Sankt-Petersburg.
- Пучкова, О.А., Иванов, Д.Д. 2008, *Военно-ученый архив. Краткий очерк формирования ценнейших коллекций*, Вестник Архивиста 1, 20-26.
- Петрушевский, А.Ф. 1884, *Генералиссимус князь Суворов*, I, Sankt-Petersburg.
- Румянцев, П.А. 1953, *Сборник документов и материалов*, II, 1768-1775, Moskow.
- Шабловский, А.Г. 1957, *Активная оборона укрепленного поста Гирсово 3 сентября 1773 г.*, Сборник докладов военно-исторической секции 1, 63-68.