

Frontiers of Ottoman Studies:
State, Province, and the West

Volume II

Edited by

Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey

I.B. Tauris

London • New York

Published in 2005 by I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd
6 Salem Road, London W2 4BU
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010
www.ibtauris.com

In the United States of America and in Canada distributed by
St Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010

Copyright © Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey, 2005

The right of Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey to be identified as the Proprietors of this work has been asserted by the Proprietors in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book or any part thereof, may not be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Volume 1.
ISBN: 1 85043 631 2
EAN: 978 1 85043 631 7

Volume 2.
ISBN: 1 85043 664 9
EAN: 978 1 85043 664 5

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
A full CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress catalog card: available

Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall
Camera-ready copy edited and supplied by Keiko Kiyotaki

Ottoman Accounts of the Hungarian Movements against the Habsburgs at the Turn of the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Centuries

Sándor Papp

In the second half of the seventeenth century, as a consequence of the absolutist ambitions of the Habsburg Empire and the counter-reformation, the Hungarian Estates were hostile to the Viennese Court.¹ There were five movements between the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries, which, ranging from plots and uprisings to wars of independence, were directed against the Habsburg House. These movements have a common character: they were trying gradually to make contacts with the Ottoman Empire.

The Wesselényi Movement

The first case was the plot of the Hungarian magnates, among whom the most important was the Palatine,² Ferenc Wesselényi. After the victory of the Habsburg Army in 1664 at Szentgotthárd (Vas county in Hungary) came the Peace of Vasvár.³ The Hungarian nobility expected the Viennese Court to claim two fortresses, Várad⁴ and Érsekújvár⁵ which fell in 1660 and in 1663 respectively, and were converted into seats of two *vilâyets* by the Ottomans. However, the treaty was based on the *status quo*. The clauses of the peace-treaty were composed in a charter (*abdnâme*) by Grand Vizier Köprülü Fazıl Ahmed on behalf of Sultan Mehmed IV in the camp at Érsekújvár between 22 September and 1 October 1664 (1-10 Rebi'ü levvel 1075 A.H.). The Hungarians protested against the 4th, 5th, and the 9th clauses, according to which the successors of the princes of Transylvania supported by the Habsburgs were excluded from power and banished from Transylvania. The Treaty also forbade both parties to accept refugees from the other side.⁶

The movement of Palatine Wesselényi was mentioned in Sarı Mehmed Pasha's chronicle under the year 1092 A.H. (1681).⁷ The Ottoman chronicles mixed up the plot of Palatine Wesselényi and the subsequent insurrection, and the execution of Ferenc Nádasdy,

Péter Zrínyi and Ferenc Frangepán. Another chronicler, Silahdâr started the account of this epoch with a religious classification of Hungarian society. According to his opinion, the Hungarian nation was split into two parts: an idolator (*putperes*) and a non-idolator (*puta tapmaz*). The editor of this chronicle, Ahmed Refik reminded the Turkish reader in a foot-note that the first category meant the Catholics and the second one the Protestants.⁸ Unfortunately, this simplification got into the Turkish historical literature and it is a still existing misconception for Turkish historians that the Hungarian opposition consisted only of Protestants.⁹

The program of the Ottoman alliance (or subordination) was made public by a document of Palatine Ferenc Wesselényi, on 27 August 1666, which was also an instruction for a Transylvanian envoy travelling to the Ottoman Porte. It was the first attempt of the Hungarian side to submit a draft of a treaty (*ahdnâme*) to the dignitaries of the Ottoman Porte. The most important issue in it was that the Hungarians agreed to pay a yearly tribute and accept the terms of vassalage. The tribute was as much as hundred thousand thalers. However, Palatine Wesselényi laid down several conditions. One of the paragraphs stated that Hungary was ready to pay taxes if its wishes were accepted. Palatine Wesselényi stipulated a tax of maximum one hundred thousand thalers and that the amount of the tax would be reduced in accordance with conditions the court of the sultan was willing to offer. The taxes from the part of Hungary under Ottoman rule which had been defined earlier were not to change and the Ottomans were not to interfere in the possessions of the nobility or carrying of arms and migration. If you read the draft carefully it is clear that this freedom of migration was basically supported by nobles who had their estates on the borderline with the territory under Ottoman rule and they wanted to secure their position. They also demanded that in return for paying the tax the Porte should not interfere with the country's internal affairs and it should not encroach upon the liberties and the customs of the people. In addition, the Porte was to refrain from obstructing the election of its king and from forcing the country to make war without its consent. The Hungarians wished to call the payment not a tax or tribute but a 'present' as was customary in the Ottoman-Habsburgs relations. Customarily, the sum of thirty thousand Hungarian gold Forints paid to the Porte annually in the sixteenth century was called 'Ehregeschenk'.¹⁰ In the draft-contract Wesselényi requested that the sultan should be called the 'patron' of Hungary and not its lord.¹¹ The entreaty of the Hungarian lords was sent to the Grand Vizier Köprülü Fazıl Ahmed, who was busy besieging Kandia, and refused by him, because of the peace-treaty with the Habsburg Empire.¹²

The Péter Zrínyi Movement

Later, the Ban¹³ of Croatia, Péter Zrínyi was in charge of Hungarian-Ottoman relations. Unfortunately, we only have records of the interrogation, which were made after the movement had been suppressed and the participants were put in prison.¹⁴ It may be important to find original Ottoman documents about the movement, because it is apparent from the material, available that Péter Zrínyi was preparing his inauguration as king to the Hungarian throne by the sultan. The historical sources mention a *batt-i šerîf* (it can be similar to a *berât-i šerîf*) and a flag (*sancak*), which according to the Ottoman inauguration process are two insignia, symbolizing a vassal ruler. This theory can be confirmed by Ottoman narrative sources to the effect that Péter Zrínyi would have been helped by Köprülü Fazıl Ahmed, if he had not been busy in the war of Kandiá.¹⁵ A short draft *‘ahdnâme* proves this theory as well, which was sent to the Sublime Porte 1670 probably by the envoy of Péter Zrínyi and the conditions in the draft disclosed to the Turkish interpreter of Transylvania, Dávid Rozsnyai by a trusted man of the grand vizier.¹⁶ Probably, the same conclusion about Péter Zrínyi’s diplomatic relation can be drawn from an *‘ahdnâme* of the ‘King of the *Kurucs*’, Imre Thököly.¹⁷

The Imre Thököly Movement

The next period to be examined is the period of Kuruc¹⁸ attacks, it is the period of the insurrection led by Imre Thököly at the 70’s and 80’s in the seventeenth century. Then many people fled to Transylvania because several Hungarian aristocrats—rebels—were executed and their property was confiscated and because of the abuse of the Habsburg troops. These refugees soon started an armed uprising against Habsburg rule. Armed fights all over the country began only then. The Porte recognised the Kuruc king in the summer of 1682, who was at the zenith of his power, as the prince of Central Hungary in a letter of appointment by the sultan (*berât-i hümayun*)¹⁹ and in a letter of contract consisting of 14 paragraphs (*‘ahdnâme-i hümayun*).²⁰

The first subject treated in the *‘ahdnâme* was legitimacy of power, i.e. who would inherit the power in case Thököly should die. Thököly, who ‘was working hard for the interest of my empire and who was always sincerely faithful to it’ was under the protection of the sultan. The document emphasises that the Kuruc king is related to the family of Gábor Bethlen, who occupied and annexed important territories to Transylvania in the first third of the seventeenth century with Ottoman backing.

We learn from the document that the sultan took the same measures in case of the king of Central Hungary as in the case of Transylvania when recognising the prince. He declared Thököly 'according to the kind elections and prayers of the people in Central Hungary' the king of Central Hungary. When Thököly dies 'the successor should be elected by the Hungarian nation and his name should be reported to my Sublime Porte. But no papists²¹ should be proposed for the Hungarian throne. If someone becomes a papist, but nevertheless he applies for this position he should be hindered by my empire and not allowed to become a king'. The quotation above partly regulates succession. It is highly interesting that the Ottomans declared their opposition to Catholics (papists). In relation to this paragraph I would like to call attention to two important elements. First, as we could see from narrative sources, the Ottoman chronicles say that the only reason for anti-Habsburg movements in Hungary is the conflict of religions which is in accordance with our quotation. Secondly, the fact that the Hungarian word '*pápista*' is used in the original Turkish text instead of the word Catholic shows that the document in question relies on a Hungarian document. In my present study I wish only to refer to the fact that every Hungarian movement beginning with the Wesselényi movement wished to subjugate the rest of Hungary to the sultan in return for military support against the Habsburg Empire. The conditions of submission were organised in paragraphs and they were handed in to the Porte as a draft 'ahdnâme. I believe that the document in question was made the following way. At first they translated the Hungarian sentences of the draft into Turkish where it was possible. If there was no adequate terminology in Turkish, they used the Hungarian word written in Arabic letters. There is another example of it in the third paragraph of the 'ahdnâme, where it says: 'the religious ceremonies (*âyân*), customs (*âdet*) and the rights in Hungary and Croatia as part of Hungary should be respected. Accordingly, the ceremonies of the Calvinist²² and Lutheran²³ religions must not be disturbed...'. It is noteworthy that the writer of the Turkish text was not acquainted with the real facts as the overwhelming majority of Croats were Catholics. The abovementioned opinion is proved by the existence of a draft 'ahdnâme (condition; *atbname*) from the year of 1681, which survived in the collection of a famous Jesuit-scholar, Gábor Hevennesy. The content of the Latin version is 90% identical with the well-known Turkish text.²⁴

By economic relations between Hungary and the Ottoman Empire they meant only tax paying and commerce. The sultan allowed the merchants of Central Hungary to trade freely. The annual tax was forty thousand *kara* (black) *guruş* which was the equivalent of the silver (imperial) thaler. The permanent Hungarian

envoy at the Porte and the envoy extraordinary, whose task was to deliver the tribute from Hungary, were supported by the Porte. The same practice was applied in Transylvania. The anti-Catholic character of the document is evident. There is an extra paragraph about the Order of Jesuits.

The last paragraph is about the relations between the Ottoman Empire and the new Hungarian state. It says that Ottoman troops must not disturb the Hungarian population. The castles, palisades (*palanka*) occupied by the Ottoman army must be handed over to the Hungarians so that they can reconstruct the ruined territories. Hungarian matters must be included in the peace treaty between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs. The Ottoman Empire must protect the Hungarians in the future. Clause 9 refers to parts of the agreement signed in 1664 by the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, the so-called Peace of Vasvár, which concerns Hungarians: 'The paragraphs of the treaty in 1075 signed between us and the Habsburgs, which were made in the interest of Central Hungary in the frame of a letter of contract (*'ahdnâme-i hümâyun*) must be respected. According to the conditions of the above treaty Hungarians must have the right to keep their villages, communities, the government of the country and other affairs as they used to'. The sultan confirmed the treaty with his oath as was customary.

The Ferenc Rákóczi II Movement

The next movement to be examined is the War of Independence under the leadership of Ferenc Rákóczi II. Ottoman chroniclers hardly ever mention his name when they speak about the War of Independence in 1703-11. Râşid was well acquainted with the fact that the fight started near the border between Hungary and Poland. He writes that Ferenc Rákóczi had an army of sixty thousand people. He gives an interesting fact: five hundred soldiers were sent to support Rákóczi both from the town of Belgrade and Temesvár.²⁵ There is no evidence of it in Hungarian documents, but a nearly identical description can be found in the chronicle of Sarı Mehmed Pasha.²⁶

Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II had decided to establish contacts in the same way as his forefather had with the French King Luis XIV. However, the great king supported the Hungarians since the first days of the revolt, because the Hungarian rebels made the position of the French army easier in the War of the Spanish Succession. At the same time the French king did not make an official alliance with the rebels, who revolted against their 'anointed king'. Also, the Sublime Porte was considered as a most important ally. The Hungarian and Ottoman relations were necessary, because Hungary in revolt could obtain war material, provisions and cloth only from

the Ottoman Empire. The 'Kuruc State' started a great diplomatic manoeuvre in 1704 to find a foreign supporter. Prince Rákóczi wanted to get involved in the conflict between Sweden and Russia, namely he wanted to turn the Ottoman State against the tsar, Peter the Great. He sent his envoy Pál Ráday to the Swedish King Carl XII and offered to help with arbitration between the Swedish king and the Ottoman Porte. The Swedish king did not want to have an official agreement with the Ottomans, but it would have been useful for him, if the sultan had gone against the tsar, too.²⁷ It was enough for Prince Rákóczi to have an acquiescence of the Swedish king and he sent his envoy, János Pápay to the Sublime Porte. His instruction survives in Hungarian.

The envoy has to inform the grand vizier in an audience about the election of Rákóczi as prince both in Hungary and Transylvania. He was to talk about the plan of his prince to wage a war against Russia and ask for eight thousand Albanian (*Arnol*) infantry and four thousand Ottoman cavalry, but the Porte should not send all of its army, because that might prompt the European states to intervene on the side of the Habsburg Empire. If the abovementioned conditions were accepted by the Porte he had to ask for such a contract ('ahdnâme), in which Rákóczi, Hungary and Transylvania would be taken under protection by the sultan. If the Hungarians elected a new king, he would be protected by the Ottoman Porte too. Moreover, the border between the Ottoman Empire and Hungary, which was fixed by the Peace of Karlowitz (1699) would not be changed. If Hungary was attacked, the Ottoman sultan would give military support. If the above mentioned conditions of 'ahdnâme were accepted by the sultan, Rákóczi would give a yearly tribute of thirty thousand thalers for Transylvania and forty thousand thalers for Hungary.

The reasoning by which the Hungarian prince wanted to provoke the Ottomans against the Russians was very interesting. As the dependents of the Ottomans in the Balkans, the Greeks, Serbs, Albanians, Bulgarians, Moldavians, Wallachians alike were all Ortodox-Christians the same as the Russians. It would be possible that they might side with the Russians if the Russians were to attack the Ottomans. Keeping out of harm's way it would be better to fling back the enemy from the northern borders of the Ottoman Empire.²⁸ On reflection, we have to admit that the above mentioned reasoning was valid. For example, the Moldavian Voivode Dimitrie Cantemir, who was raised and educated in Istanbul, crossed to the side of the tsar in the battle on the Prut in 1711.²⁹

The negotiations between the Hungarians and the Ottomans in Istanbul finished without success. One could continuously follow the diplomatic efforts of the Sublime Porte and Prince Rákóczi from the

documents of the permanent Hungarian legation. It could already be seen by the summer of 1706 that the Ottoman Porte was reacting to the Hungarian proposal very slowly. When the Porte postponed the official answer for many years, the Russian Tsar Peter the Great offered the Hungarian prince the throne of the Polish King, Stanisław Leszczyński (1707).³⁰ In the last years of the Hungarian War of Independence there was a possibility to make an agreement with the Ottoman Porte twice, through the *beylerbeyi* of Belgrade. In both cases the former conditions were repeated, so these efforts were unsuccessful as well.³¹

A much more detailed description can be found about an event which is considered to be only an episode in Hungarian history. After long years of exile Ferenc Rákóczi II received an invitation from the Porte. In Ottoman sources and in the special literature by Turkish specialists based on such primary sources it is stated that it was Ferenc Rákóczi II who took the initiative to enter into relations. He sent his confidential secretary János Pápay as his envoy to Wallachia who arrived at the Porte with the help of the Voivode of Wallachia 'İskerletzâde Nikola' (Nikolae Mavrocordat). Then the grand vizier sent one of his ağas, Lipveli Ahmed together with Pápay to the Prince who was then in France. Râşid in his chronicle quotes from the letter sent to Rákóczi: 'We present you the kingdom of Transylvania and Hungary—like my noble forefathers used to present it to your forefather and to your father—which are parts of our well-defended empire and which have been occupied by the Habsburgs for a short time' (dated the 2nd decade of Rebiyülâhir 1128/3-13 April 1716).³² As opposed to Râşid, Uzunçarşılı writes that it was Küçük Bahri Ağa who escorted János Pápay, Rákóczi's diplomat at the Porte back to the Prince. His rank was more important in this case than his person; he was a *kapuçbaşı*. People in this rank used to be the representatives of the Porte when the Prince of Transylvania was inaugurated and they used to deliver the sultan's letters of confirmation. Fortunately we know the Turkish copies of documents issued by the sultan and the grand vizier in those times. The most important data concerning my topic are that the above mentioned letter of the sultan sent to Rákóczi is nothing other than the document which installed him as Prince of Transylvania: 'As you have spared no effort to defend and guard the country of Transylvania—our inherited possession—like your glorious forefathers who used to be the Princes of Transylvania and as you have met our lordly requirements of friendship we present you the principality of Transylvania'.³³

József Rákóczi Movement

To close this study I would like to refer to the successful negotiations of the last Hungarian pretender, the son of Ferenc Rákóczi, József Rákóczi and the contents of his contract (‘ahdnâme) given to him by the sultan. It is well-known that the Prince Ferenc Rákóczi died on 8 April 1735 in Tekirdağ. Then the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires waged war against each other again. The grand vizier wanted to start a Hungarian uprising supported by the Ottomans behind the Habsburg borders. In March 1737 József Rákóczi arrived at Tekirdağ, from whence he handed his memorandum to the Sublime Porte on 8 September.³⁴ The timing of presenting the memorandum was carefully chosen as this period saw the worsening of relations between the two great empires. József Rákóczi achieved what his father could not years previously during the War of Independence. The Porte recognized him as Hungarian and Transylvanian Prince with all solemnity and a sultan’s ‘ahdnâme was issued and handed over to him. The ratification of this ‘ahdnâme in Latin preserved in Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi presents the circumstances of its issue. At first, according to the interposition of the Grand Vizier Yegen Mehmed Pasha an application (*telbîs*) was handed to the sultan, which was based on the abovementioned memorandum. Then the Sultan’s order was issued to make conditions acceptable for the Hungarians. Subsequently, a draft ‘ahdnâme was handed to the sultan, who accepted it and issued an ‘ahdnâme-i hümayun.³⁵ The text of the contract was handed over to József Rákóczi, who compiled his agreement with the help of his men on 20 January 1738.³⁶ The conditions of the ‘ahdnâme are as follows:

1. According to the old diplomatic traditions the rulers of Transylvania were confirmed by the Ottoman sultan after the free election of the estates. The former rulers’ family, the Bethlens and Apafis soon died off, but József Rákóczi, who descended from the old ruler family of Rákóczi is living at present. Therefore, he is confirmed as a Transylvanian governor (*Erdel bâkimi*) and as a Hungarian prince (*Macaristan dukası*).
2. Rulers, who have not been elected by the Hungarian nation, are not accepted by the sultan.
3. The reoccupied territories will be divided between the Hungarians and the Ottomans. The borders between the mentioned states will be fixed by the embassies of neutral states, which are accredited to Istanbul.
4. The Hungarian population should have the benefit of the freedom of religion; the destroyed churches should be rebuilt.

5. Hungary should be friend of the friends and enemy of the enemies of the Ottoman Porte. Transylvania should keep twenty thousand soldiers inside the country and ten thousand outside of his border and Hungary should keep hundred thousand soldiers inside the country and thirty thousand ones outside of his border. In case of need, the Sublime Porte promised to send an army of eighty thousand soldiers.
6. After the proclamation of the prince, if somebody does not take the side of Rákóczi and the Ottomans, this person will be considered an enemy.
7. Until the liberation of Hungary and Transylvania, the Hungarian refugees, who arrived to support the Hungarian princes, will be accepted by the Porte.
8. Because the Ottoman sultan is a protector of Hungary and Transylvania both countries should give a present (yearly tribute) to the Sublime Porte.
9. Between the two sides a trade agreement should be made and Hungarian consulates should be opened in the Ottoman Empire and an embassy will be established in Istanbul with three diplomats by the Hungarians and all of this will be supported by the Porte.
10. After finishing the war new conditions should be included in a renewed contract.
11. If the effort is not crowned with success, the Hungarian refugees should stay in Tekirdağ under the same circumstances, as in the times of the former Prince Ferenc Rákóczi. If they want to leave the Ottoman Empire and move to another Christian country, it will be allowed by the sultan. The *âhdnâme* was concluded with the oath of the sultan, and the ratification-document of the Hungarian with the oath of József Rákóczi.

In the ceremonious audience of the grand vizier the documents of the contract were exchange on 25 January 1738 in Istanbul. Two days later Rákóczi published his manifest for the Christian European rulers explaining his contract with the sultan and the circumstances of the war against the Habsburg Empire.³⁷ After the diplomatic arrangements he left Istanbul with his small army and made his way towards Vidin to participate in the liberation of his own country.³⁸ His efforts were not crowned with success; he died on 10 November 1738 from plague.³⁹

To sum up, it can be proved that for a part of the Hungarian Estates it was imaginable to break away from the Habsburg House, which based its rule on absolutism, and to accept the sultan's supremacy. We have examined five Hungarian movements from 1666 to 1738. During these movements the Hungarian Estates

offered to accept the sultan's supremacy, if he guaranteed Hungarian autonomy and the rights of nobility. In exchange the Hungarians were willing to pay a tribute called 'present'. Out of five efforts, two were successful with contracts between Hungarians and Ottomans. The Hungarians handed in a complete draft of 'ahdnâme in all of the above mentioned cases. They were accepted by the Ottoman Porte with slight modifications. It can be seen that the proposals of the two Rákóczi submitted to the sultan had something in common. The conditions of the contracts were constructed always according to the political conditions of that time. Both 'ahdnâmes from the years 1682 and 1738 contain conditions on the freedom of worship and the rebuilding of destroyed churches, but the 'ahdnâme from the year 1682 has an anti-Catholic overtone. It is very important that both 'ahdnâmes included a condition about a trade agreement, which would be realized after the peace treaty. By accepting to pay tribute the Estates of Hungary and Transylvania acknowledged Ottoman supremacy. It was well-known for the Hungarian politicians in this epoch that for small countries like Hungary and Transylvania, it was not possible to be independent between the two great empires. The only problem was, which ruler would guarantee more autonomy.

Notes

¹ Gábor Ágoston and Teréz Oborni, *A tizenhetedik század története* (Budapest, 2000), 202-210.; László Benczédi, *Rendiség, abszolútizmus és centralizáció a XVII. század végi Magyarországon (1664-1685)* (Budapest, 1980).

² Palatinus (or palatine in English) is locum-tenens of the Hungarian kings.

³ The first copy was published in Latin by J. Du Mont, *Corps universel diplomatique du droit de gens*, VII/2 (Amsterdam et à la Haye, 1730), 23-5.

⁴ Nowadays Oradea in Roumania, Varat in Turkish, and Großwardein in German.

⁵ Nowadays Nové Zámky in Slovakia and Uyvâr in Turkish.

⁶ *Mu'abedât Mecmu'ası*, 3 (Istanbul, 1297), 89-92. The original issue of the Peace of Vasvár is in ÖStA HHStA (Österreichische Staatsarchiv Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv) Türkische Urkunden 1. 10, 22 September 1664.

⁷ Defterdar Sari Mehmed Pasha, *Zübde-i vekayât. Tahlil ve metin* (1066-1116/1656-1704) in Abdulkadir Özcan (ed.) (Ankara, 1995), 124.

⁸ Silahdâr Fındıklı Mehmed Pasha, *Silahdâr Tarihi*. I (İstanbul, 1928), 741.

⁹ Yaşar Yücel and Ali Sevim, *Türkiye tarihi*. 3 (Ankara, 1991), 173. Tayyib Gökbilgin, 'Rákóczi Ferenc II. ve osmanlı devleti himayesinde Macar Mülteciler. In, Türk - Macar kültür münasebetleri ışığı altında II. Rákóczi Ferenc ve Macar mültecileri.; Thököly Imre ve Osmanlı - Avusturya ilişkilerindeki rolü. Birinci ölüm (1670-1682)', *Symposium on Rákóczi Ferenc II and the Hungarian Refugees in the Light of Turco - Hungarian Cultural Relations, 31 May-3 June 1976, University of İstanbul* (İstanbul, 1976), 1-17.; 180-210.

¹⁰ Ernst Dieter Petritsch, 'Tribut oder Ehrengeschenk? Ein Beitrag zu den habsburgisch-osmanischen Beziehungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 16.

Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zu den habsburgisch-osmanischen Beziehungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts, *Archiv und Forschung, Das Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in seiner Bedeutung für die Geschichte Österreichs und Europas. Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit*, 20 (1993), 49-58.

¹¹ Farkas Deák, *A büjdosók levéltára* (Budapest, 1888), 227-32.; Benczédi, 20.

¹² Gyula Pauler, *Wesselényi Ferencz nádor és társainak összehesküvése 1664-1771*, I (Budapest, 1876), 151-3.

¹³ The Hungarian king's locum-tenens in Croatia.

¹⁴ Pauler I. 1876, 312-14.

¹⁵ Sari Mehmed Pasha, 124.

¹⁶ Sándor Szilágyi, *Rozsnyai Dávid, az utolsó török deák történeti maradványai*, XXX. MHHS VIII (Pest, 1867).

¹⁷ Ilona Zrínyi is also mentioned in the sultan's *'abdnâme* of Imre Thököly. She was the daughter of Péter Zrínyi and the wife of Thököly. According to Turkish understanding the martyrdom of Péter Zrínyi was a sacrifice made for the sultan. Therefore the Ottoman dynasty is obliged to protect the ones who lost their parents and even their husbands and wives.' [Thököly] 'devlet-i 'aliyemün sadâkatı ogurına cânını bezl eden Zerîn oğlunun İlonâ nâmında kızı zevcesi olmagla kadîmden tasarrufında olan emvâl u emlâkı devlet-i 'aliyem cânibinden hıfz u siyânet oluna', Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek 4° Cod. Ms. Turc. 30. (Turcica 30.) (henceforth abbreviated: Göttingen, Turcica 30) 51v.-52v.

¹⁸ The word of '*kuruc*' (read *kuruts*) means in Hungarian a soldier, who revolted against the Habsburgs at the turn of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.

¹⁹ ÖStA HHStA Türkische Urkunden 26 July- 23 August 1682./Saban 1093. German translation, Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* (henceforth abbreviated: GOR) VI. 731-2.

²⁰ Göttingen, Turcica 30. 51v.-52v., Turcica 30. 51v.-52v.; Zdenka Veselá-Přenosilová, 'Quelques chartes Turques concernant la correspondance de la Porte Sublime avec Imre Thököly', *Archiv Orientální* (AO, Praha) 29 (1961), 553-6. és 566-8.; Ahmet Refik, *Türk hizmetinde kiral Tököli Imre (1683-1705). Orta Macar Kralı Tököli Imre'nin Türkiye'ye de geçen hayatına dair Hazinesi Evrak vesikalarını havidir* (İstanbul, 1932), 8-10. The latter document—although its translation was available in Hungarian archives—escaped the attention of researchers. It was supposed that the document of appointment issued by Hammer-Purgstall was the so-called *'abdnâme* (treaty) of Thököly. The part of the document written in Turkish was not taken notice of by Hungarian researchers. Its translation into French and its written version in Arabic were published by Zdenka Veselá-Přenosilová. A short representation, Vojtech Kopčan, 'A török Porta Thököly-politikája', in Benczédi László (ed.), *A Thököly-felkelés és kora* (Budapest, 1983), 125-6.

²¹ pápista, pápista in Hungarian.

²² kálviništa, kálvinista in Hungarian.

²³ lúterân, lutheránus in Hungarian.

²⁴ Egyetemi könyvtár, Budapest. Coll. Hev. Tom. 69., 61-3. 1681. 'Conditiones Athnarnae Literarum assecuratoriarum Turcici Imperatoris propriae manu Subscriptarum, Sigillosque munitarum genti Hungariae elargitarum'.

²⁵ Timișoare, nowadays in Roumania. Mehmed Râșid, *Târib-i Râșid*, III (İstanbul, 1282), 128.

²⁶ Sari Mehmed Pasha, 839.

²⁷ Kálmán Benda, Tamás Esze, Ferenc Maksay, and László Pap (eds.), *Ráday Pál iratai 1703-1706*, Ráday Pál iratai I. (henceforth abbreviated, *Ráday I.*) (Budapest, 1955), 248-96. Documents of the Swedish and Polish legations in Latin.

²⁸ Ráday I. 1955. 442-4.; Benda, Kálmán, 'II. Rákóczi Ferenc török politikájának első évei 1702-1705', *Történeti Szemle* 5 (1962), 207.

²⁹ Dimitri Kantemir (Dimitrie Cantemir), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun yükseliş ve çöküş tarihî*, II. (İstanbul, 1982), 865.

³⁰ Benda, Kálmán and Maksay, Ferenc, *Ráday Pál iratai* (henceforth abbreviated, Ráday II) (Budapest, 1961), 208-74.

³¹ Ráday II, 403, 408. (12-13 April 1708); Thaly, Kálmán, *Történelmi naplók 1663-1719* MHHs XXVII, (Budapest, 1875), 178-256. The conditions of the contract in Latin (February, 1709), *Puncta Atbname*, 252-5. This conditions are identical with an other charter, which was compiled on 26 or 27 October 1705. The draft made by the chancellery, Dunamelléki Református Egyházkerület Levéltára. Ráday család levéltára. Ráday I. Pál iratai. Kancelláriai iratai. Külpolitikai iratai. IV. d/2-13. (Diplomáciai kapcsolatok a török Portával. 1703-10.) (later to be referred to as Ráday 1t. IV. d/2-13.) No. 10. document 49-51.

³² Râşid, IV. 219.

³³ BOA (İstanbul), Nâme-i hümayun defteri 6. 377-8.

³⁴ Mikes, 123-4.; H.I.S., *Leben und Thaten des Prätendenten von Ungarn und Siebenbürgen, Joseph Ragoczy und seiner Vorfahren aus zuverlässigen Nachrichten und Urkunden.* (Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1739), 79-84. The text of the memorandum, Thaly, Kálmán, *Az utolsó erdélyi trónjelölt történetéhez* (Történeti Tár, 1890), 401-5. *Copia di Memoriale presentato alla Porta Ottomana in nome del Principe Giuseppe Rakotz*. Li 8. 7-re 1737.

³⁵ 'tarafımızdan iltimâs olunan hususlar vekil-i mutlak hazretlerinin vesâetleriyle pâye-i serir-i â'lâ-yi saltanatlarına 'arz u telhîs olunub müsâ'ade-i pâdişâhaneleri bildirig buyurulub der-i devlet-i 'alîyeleriyle müzâkere olunmak üzere emr-i hümayunları sudur ve iltimâslarımız suret-i 'ahdnâmeye ifrâg olunmasına gereği gibi tetebbü' ve su'ubetlü olan maddeler tenzîl u teslîl ve tarafeynün re'yi ile tertîb u tekrîr olunduktan sonra rikâb-i şehriyârîye yine 'arz u telhîs ve makbul-i hümayunları buyurulub tarafeynün re'yi ile 'ahdnâme-i hümayun suretine ifrâg olunub ism-i hümayun ve nişân-i şerifleri ile devletlü se'âdetlü vezîr-i â'zam ve vekil-i mutlak-i ehem hazretlerinin vesâetleri ile yedimize itâ u şâyeste olan itîbâ u ta'zim birle makbul olub'. TSMA E. 8217. 32-9.; BOA Dîvân-i hümayun defteri 7, 489-90.; Akmed Refik, *Memâlik-i 'Osmâniyede krâl Râkoçî ve tenâbi'i (1109-1154)* (İstanbul, 1333 A.H.) 57-60, 13. Ramazân 1150/13 December 1737). BOA, Nâme-i hümayun defteri 7, 483-6.

³⁶ This copy was found by Kálmán Thaly at the end of 19 century in Topkapı Saray Müzesi Kütüphanesi, and edited in Latin. The Turkish translation from the Latin text is in Topkapı Saray Müzesi Arşivi (TSMA E. 8217.) and in BOA Nâme-i hümayun 7. defteri. 'Krâlzâde prinç Yojef Râkoçîya itâ olunan 'ahdnâme-i hümayun siyâki üzere krâlzâde tarafından dahi lisân-i lâtin üzere 'ahdnâme-i hümayun mevâddidur 'ahda olundugını müş'ir 'ahdnâmeyi devletlü 'inâyetlü sâhib-i devlet veliyü n-ni'am mürüvvetlü efendimiz hazretlerinin hâk-pây-i devletlerine teslîm u mübâdele olun magla 'ahdnâme-i hümayun min evvelihî ilâ âhîrihî tercüme olunub krâlzâde-i mumâ ileyhün te'ahhüdini müş'ir 'ahdnâmesinde bast eyledüğü ancak dibâce vü hâtimenün tercümesidir" TSMA E. 8217. 1-5.

³⁷ *Leben und Thaten ...*, 1739. 88-95.

³⁸ Refik, 1333. 60-8.

³⁹ Kelemen, Mikes, *Törökország levelek*. Budapest, 2000. Publishing House of Osiris 10.