

A Dissertation in Preparation – Structure, Methodology, Approach and Content
*The Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627) and Its Subsequent Territorial Negotiations (1628–1629) in Light of Péter Koháry’s Correspondence**

Gellért Ernő MARTON

University of Szeged

E-mail: gellertemarton@gmail.com

Article history: Received: 01.02.2021; Revised: 19.03.2021

Accepted: 19.04.2021; Available online: 30.11.2022.

©2022 Studia UBB Historia. Published by Babeş-Bolyai University.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Abstract: The goal of this paper is to provide an outline of the author’s dissertation in progress in terms of its structure, methodology, approach, and content. This article aims to present the author’s work on this topic so far, so it focuses on the Peace Treaty of Szőny with an emphasis on its subsequent territorial negotiations in light of Péter Koháry’s correspondence. The paper also contains an overview of Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties, besides a summary of the afore-mentioned peace process. In this article, one can find a survey of the already collected sources (both published and unpublished). The data from these sources was entered into a database which allowed for the quantitative analysis of these exchanges of letters. The aim of the second part is to present a guide for the documents

* The research related to this paper was supported by the Ministry of Human Capacities (Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma) through a grant (code nr. 20391-3/2018/FEKUSTRAT; TUDFO/47138-1/2019-ITM), by the Bilateral State Scholarship subsidised by the Tempus Public Foundation (Tempus Közalapítvány, Államközi Ösztöndíj). This paper is written as a contribution of the Interdisciplinary Centre of Excellence, the Department of Medieval and Early Modern Hungarian History (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Szeged), MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network). I am grateful to Sándor Papp (Head of the Research Group) who provided useful pieces of advice during the research process and writing of this study, and shared with me sources collected by him as well as to Krisztina Juhász for her methodological and source-reading pieces of advice. Furthermore, my thanks go to Hajnalka Tóth, János Szabados, Gábor Kármán, András Péter Szabó, István Szalma, Gergely Brandl and Csaba Göncöl for their help and sharing with me not just their useful experiences and pieces of advice, but sources collected by them. I am also grateful to Zoltán Cora for the proofreading of this paper. Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to Graeme Murdock for his suggestions.

in Hungarian supplemented with examples. The examples are designed to demonstrate how the sources could be published in accordance with the rules of the guide.

Keywords: Péter Koháry; Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627); territorial negotiations at Szécsény and Buda (1628–1629); Habsburg–Ottoman diplomatic affairs; quantitative analysis of a collection of an exchange of letters; guideline for publishing sources in Hungarian

Rezumat: Scopul acestei lucrări este să ofere un tur ghidat prin teza de doctorat a autorului în termenii structurii acesteia, a metodei folosite, a abordării și a conținutului. Articolul își propune să prezinte rezultatele cercetării autorului asupra tratatului de pace de la Szőny, punând accentul asupra negocierilor teritoriale subsecvente, în lumina corespondenței lui Péter Koháry. Articolul conține o trecere în revistă a relațiilor Habsburgo–Otomane și a tratatelor de pace, pe lângă un sumar al negocierilor deja menționate. În acest articol putem găsi un sumar al documentelor deja colectate, atât editate cât și inedite. Datele din aceste documente au fost integrate într-o bază de date care a permis o analiză cantitativă a acestui schimb de scrisori. Scopul celei de a doua părți a studiului este să ofere un ghid pentru documentele în maghiară și să-l illustreze prin exemple. Exemplele sunt alese pentru a demonstra cum ar putea fi publicate aceste surse, în conformitate cu regulile stabilite în acest ghid.

Cuvinte cheie: Péter Koháry; tratatul de pace de la Szőny (1627); negocierile teritoriale de la Szécsény și Buda (1628–1629); relații diplomatice Habsburgo–Otomane; analiza cantitativă a unei colecții de scrisori; ghid pentru publicarea unor documente în limba maghiară

Inquiry into Habsburg–Ottoman diplomatic history is not a novel trend in historical research. Investigation of Habsburg–Ottoman diplomatic history as well as research on the topic of peace treaties of the early modern period has flourished in recent decades in Hungary and elsewhere.¹

¹ See more (non-exhaustive collection):

Zsuzsanna Cziráki, '„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister” – Wissenstransfer unter kaiserlichen Gesandten an der Hohen Pforte in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts', *Chronica*, 19 (2019): 42–83; Krisztina Juhász, '„...gyümölcsé pedig semmi nem volt”. Esterházy Miklós véleménye 1642. február 28-án a szőnyi béke(tervezet) pontjairól' [“...and its fruit was nothing”. Miklós Esterházy's Opinion about the Points of the Peace Treaty of Szőny on 28 February 1642], *Levélári Közlemények*, 89 (2020): 353–366; Papp Sándor, 'A pozsareváci békekötés és a magyarok' [The Treaty of Passarowitz and the Hungarians], *Aetas*, 33/4 (2018): 5–19; Szabados János, 'Habsburg–Ottoman Communication in the Mid-17th Century – The Death of Imperial Courier Johann Dietz. A Case Study', *Osmanli Arastirmalari*, 54/2 (2019): 119–140; Hajnalka Tóth, 'Mennyit ér egy magyar lovas hadnagy? Egy rabkiváltás története diplomáciatörténeti

From the late Middle Ages till the eighteenth century, several peace treaties were made between the Kingdom of Hungary (later Habsburg Empire) and the Ottoman Empire which could be divided into five major categories in a chronological order,² which are worth mentioning.

kontextusban a 17. század közepéről [How much is a Hungarian Cavalry Captain Worth? Prisoner Ransoming and International Diplomacy in the Mid-17th Century], *Századok*, 152/2 (2018): 247–284; Hajnalka Tóth, 'The circumstances and documents of the Peace of Vasvár', *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 34 (2017): 243–256; Zsuzsanna Nagy: *Bethlen Gábor külpolitikája és a francia diplomácia a harmincéves háborúban (1619–1629)* [Gábor Bethlen's Foreign Politics and French Diplomacy in the Thirty Years War (1619–1629)]. PhD Dissertation, Manuscript, Doctoral School of History, Pázmány Péter Catholic University. Budapest, 2020; Gábor Kármán, 'Zülfikár aga portai főtolmács' [Grand Dragoman Zülfikar Aga], *Aetas*, 31/3 (2016): 54–76; Gábor Kármán, 'Gábor Bethlen's Diplomats at the Protestant Courts of Europe', *Hungarian Historical Review*, 2/4 (2013): 790–823; Arno Strohmeyer, 'Trendek és perspektívák a kora újkori diplomáciatörténetben. A konstantinápolyi Habsburg diplomaták esete' [Trends and Perspectives in Early Modern Diplomatic History. The Case of Habsburg Diplomats in Constantinople], *Történelmi Szemle*, 59/2 (2017): 177–198; Frank Castiglione – Ethan L. Menchinger – Veysel Şimşek (eds), *Ottoman War and Peace. Studies in Honor of Virginia H. Aksan* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2019); Colin Heywood – Ivan Parvev (eds), *The Treaties of Carlowitz (1699). Antecedents, Course and Consequences* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2020); Gábor Kármán – Kees Tszelszky (eds), *Bethlen Gábor és Európa* [Gábor Bethlen and Europe] (Budapest: ELTE BTK – Transylvania Emlékeiért Tudományos Egyesület, 2013); Gábor Kármán – Lovro Kunčević (eds), *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2020); Gábor Kármán (ed), *Tributaries and Peripheries of the Ottoman Empire* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2020); Gábor Kármán, *A Seventeenth-Century Odyssey in East Central Europe. The Life of Jakab Harsányi Nagy* (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016); Articles of the following volume: Zsuzsanna J. Újváry (eds), *Oszmán-magyar viszony a 16–18. században. Tanulmányok a Magyar Királyság és az Oszmán Birodalom népeinek – magyarok, törökök, rácok, tatárok, zsidók, görögök és egyéb népek – hétköznapijairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya* [Ottoman–Hungarian Relations in the 16th–18th Centuries. Studies on the Everyday Life of the Peoples of the Ottoman Empire – Hungarians, Turks, Rascians, Tartars, Jews, Greeks and Other Peoples; the Relationship of Individual and Community] (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 2020). Especially: Gergely Brandl – János Szabados, 'A megbízás terhe. Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein báró konstantinápolyi nagykövetségének előkészítése 1628-tól' [The Burden of a Mandate. The Preparation of the Embassy of Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein to Constantinople in 1628], pp. 149–170; Krisztina Juhász, 'A második szőnyi béke margójára. Adalékok az 1642. évi szőnyi békekötés történetéhez' [Additional Data to the History of the Peace Treaty of Szőny in 1642], pp. 171–188; Gellért Ernő Marton, '„Szőnyből tudatjuk...”. Három magyar diplomata – Rimay János, Tassy Gáspár és Tholdalagi Mihály – követnaplójának összehasonlító elemzése az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés kapcsán' [“We Inform You from Szőny”. Three Hungarian Diplomats. A Comparative Analysis of the Emissary Diaries of János Rimay, Gáspár Tassy and Mihály Tholdalagi in the Context of the 1627 Peace Treaty of Szőny], pp. 135–148.

(See further literature in the footnotes below.)

² See more: Sándor Papp, 'Az Oszmán Birodalom, a Magyar Királyság és a Habsburg Monarchia kapcsolattörténete a békekötések tükrében (Vázlat és adatbázis)' [The History of

Sigismund of Luxemburg (r. 1387–1437) was the first Hungarian king who had to face the Ottoman conquest, so the first period starts from his reign, more precisely from the beginning of the fifteenth century, till 1519. The second one is from 1528, when John Szapolyai (King John I or Szapolyai János) became the vassal of the Ottoman Empire, till 1540 when John Sigismund Szapolyai (King John II or Szapolyai János Zsigmond) was acknowledged as king by Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent. The third one is until the outbreak of the so-called Long Turkish War (1591/1593).³ The fourth category means the period from the Peace Treaty of Zsitvatorok (1606) until the Peace Treaty of Várad (1664). As a matter of fact, the fifth category includes the Peace of Várad as its starting point and this period lasts until the Peace Treaty of Sistova (1791).⁴

As it was mentioned above, from a methodological and chronological point of view, the period between 1606 until 1664 (here it is worth emphasising that the Peace of Vasvár is not part of this category, meaning the fourth category. The Peace of Zsitvatorok (1606) made it possible that the further negotiations would be in a Hungarian venue. This peace treaty was a turning point because with this peace a relatively peaceful period began between the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empire.⁵ Moreover, after 1606, the two emperors recognised each other as equal parties.⁶ Therefore, after the Peace Treaty of Zsitvatorok, the subsequent treaties (except the Peace of Vienna in 1615/16) of this period were negotiated on the common border zone of the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empire,⁷ close to

the Relations of the Ottoman Empire, the Hungarian Kingdom, and the Habsburg Monarchy in the Light of the Peace Treaties (draft and database)], *Aetas*, 33/4 (2018): 86–99.

³ The Long Turkish War or the Fifteen Years' War, from 1591/1593 to 1606.

⁴ See more: Papp, 'Az Oszmán Birodalom', pp. 86–99.

⁵ As Géza Pálffy wrote: "In 1606 another long period of peace, or more precisely an era of 'skirmishes' or *Kleinkrieg* on the borders, begun. This period lasted for more than half century in the Hungarian theatre of war." Géza Pálffy, "The Origins and Development of the Border Defence System Against the Ottoman Empire in Hungary (Up to the Early Eighteenth Century)", in Géza Dávid – Pál Fodor (eds), *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe. The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest*, especially: p. 56. Concerning this topic, see more: Mahmut Halef Cervioğlu, 'Ottoman Foreign Policy During the Thirty Years War', *Turcica*, 49 (2018): 195–235, especially: pp. 195–196; Gábor Ágoston, 'Defending and Administering the Frontier. The Case of Ottoman Hungary', in Christine Woodhead (ed), *The Ottoman World* (London – New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 220–236, especially: p. 233.

⁶ Gergely Brandl et al., 'Kommunikáció és híráramlás. A Habsburg-oldal tárgyalási stratégiája az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés során' [Communication and Information Flow. The Negotiation Strategy of the Habsburg Party during the 1627 Peace Treaty of Szőny], *Aetas*, 33/4 (2018), pp. 108–124, especially: p. 110.

⁷ Concerning the Habsburg–Ottoman common frontier and questions in connection with it, see the following non-exhaustive collection: William O'Reilly, 'Border, Buffer and Bulwark.

Esztergom and Komárom (1606, 1618, 1625, 1627, 1641/42).⁸ For the negotiations during this time period, the Palatine of Hungary and the local Ottoman dignitaries (including the Pasha of Buda as the head of the affairs of the Ottoman ruled part of the country) were responsible. The negotiations took place mostly in Hungarian and in Turkish; the transcriptions were made in Hungarian, in Ottoman-Turkish and in Latin, as one can see it in the case of the Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627) as well.⁹ The Peace Treaty of Szőny is crucial because it became a pattern for the further treaties between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs.¹⁰

Before examining the peace process of Szőny, it is worth looking at the first half of the seventeenth century from the point of view of the question of war and peace concerning the Habsburg and the Ottoman

The Historiography of the Military Frontier, 1521–1881', in Steven G. Ellis – Raingard Eißer (eds), *Frontiers and the Writing of History, 1500–1800* (Hanover: Wehrhahn Verlag, 2006), pp. 229–244; Géza Pálffy, 'The Border Defense System in Hungary in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in László Veszprémy – Béla K. Király (ed), *A Millennium of Hungarian Military History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), pp. 111–135; Ferenc Szakály, *Magyar adóztatás a török hódoltságban* [Hungarian Taxation in Ottoman Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981), especially: A hódoltság XVI–XVII. századi határváltozásainak vázlata [The Draft of 16th–17th-century border changes of the Ottoman Ruled Hungary], pp. 30–43; Antal Molnár, *Magyar hódoltság, horvát hódoltság. Magyar és horvát katolikus egyházi intézmények az oszmán uralom alatt* [Ottoman Hungary – Ottoman Croatia. Hungarian and Croatian Catholic Ecclesiastical Institutions Under Ottoman Rule] (Budapest: Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2019) (See further literature in the footnotes.)

⁸ Papp, 'Az Oszmán Birodalom', p. 91.

⁹ Papp, 'Az Oszmán Birodalom', p. 91. An example for the treaties on these languages, see: Antal Gévay, *Az 1627-dik évi szeptember 13-dikán költ szőnyi békekötés cikkelyei, deákül, magyarul és törökül* [The Articles of the Peace Treaty of Szőny, originated on September 13, 1627, in Latin, Hungarian and Turkish], (Wien: 1837)

¹⁰ Papp, 'Az Oszmán Birodalom', pp. 91–92. Concerning the Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627) and the further parts of the process, see more: Gergely Brandl et al., 'Válogatott források az 1627. évi szőnyi békeszerződés történetéhez' [Selected Sources to the History of the 1627 Peace Treaty of Szőny], *Lymbus. Magyarástudományi Forrásközlemények*, 15 (2017): 151–203; Brandl et al., 'Kommunikáció és híráramlás'; Gergely Brandl et al., 'Kommunikation und Nachrichtenaustausch – Verhandlungsstrategie der habsburgischen Seite bei der Friedensverhandlung von Szőny 1627', *Chronica*, 19 (2019): 113–140; Mahmut Halef Cervioğlu, 'The Peace Treaties of Gyarmat (1625) and Szőny (1627)', *Ege ve Balkan Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3/2 (2016): 67–86; Cervioğlu, 'Ottoman Foreign Policy', especially: pp. 214–215; Brandl – Szabados, 'A megbízás terhe'; Marton, '„Szőnyből tudatjuk...“', József Stessel, 'Adatok az 1628. évi szécsényi alkudozás történetéhez I–II' [Data to the History of the Negotiations of Szécsény in 1628, I–II], *Magyar Történelmi Tár*, 3 (1902), pp. 430–452, pp. 481–510; Gellért Ernő Marton, 'On the Question of the Negotiations Between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans at Szécsény and Buda (1628) through Palatine Miklós Esterházy's letter to the head of the Hungarian negotiators', *Rocznik Przemyski*, 55, *Historia*, 22/1 (2019): 79–91, especially: pp. 80–81; Gellért Ernő Marton, 'Péter Koháry's Life and Correspondence – Outline for a Greater Synthesis', *Rocznik Przemyski*, 56, *Historia*, 25/1 (2020): 25–36.

Empire. The Habsburg Empire was engaged in the western theatre of war because of the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648).¹¹ The Ottomans had intermittent problems with the Safavids in the first half of the century on the eastern frontiers of their empire.¹² In the mid-1620s, on the Ottoman–Safavid frontier in 1624, Shah Abbas the Great (r. 1588–1629) captured Baghdad, and then his troops forced the Ottoman army to retreat when they marched to liberate it.¹³

For these reasons, the two empires' common interest was to avoid the two-front war, namely, as Arno Strohmeyer wrote, "conflict with third powers".¹⁴ In addition to this, Strohmeyer underlined that "[t]he most important tool of conflict management was diplomacy". Therefore, unsurprisingly, dozens of peace treaties and ceasefire agreements were signed during the centuries between the Habsburg (formerly the Kingdom of Hungary) and the Ottoman Empire.¹⁵

After outlining the context, it is worth examining the peace process of Szőny. It could be divided into three parts, starting on December 18, 1626 with the declaration of a 3-month-long armistice which was renewed in March, 1627. The first period included the appointment of the delegations, the basis of the negotiations and the ceremonial procedures.¹⁶ The second part of the negotiations began in mid-June, 1627, when the delegations arrived in Szőny. This period ended on September 13, when the treaty was signed and attested by the negotiators (the conclusion of some questions was postponed, e.g., the question of the villages on (and near) the borderland; or the duration of the peace).

¹¹ Concerning the engagement of the Habsburg Empire, see: Brandl et al., 'Kommunikáció és híráramlás', p. 110.

¹² "[T]he intermittent wars against the Safavids between 1603 and 1639 kept the Ottomans busy on their eastern front." Cervioğlu, 'Ottoman Foreign Policy', p. 195.

¹³ Brandl et al., 'Kommunikáció és híráramlás', pp. 110–111. Concerning the Safavids, see more: Hans Robert Römer, 'The Safavid Period', in Peter Jackson – Laurence Lockhart (eds), *The Cambridge History of Iran* (7 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006 reprint), vol. 6, 'The Timurid and Safavid Period', pp. 189–350, especially: pp. 266–268.

¹⁴ Arno Strohmeyer, 'The Theatrical Performance of Peace. Entries of Habsburg Grand Embassies in Constantinople (17th–19th Centuries)', in Marinos Sariyannis (ed), *New Trends in Ottoman Studies. Papers Presented at the 20th CIÉPO Symposium Rethymno, 27 June – 1 July 2012*. (Rethymno: University of Crete, Department of History and Archaeology, 2014). pp. 486–494, especially: p. 486.

¹⁵ For an exhaustive list of the peace treaties between them, see: Papp, 'Az Oszmán Birodalom', pp. 86–99. In addition to this question, see: Strohmeyer, 'The Theatrical Performance of Peace', p. 486; Cervioğlu, 'Ottoman Foreign Policy'.

¹⁶ Concerning the ceremonial procedures, see more: Marton, '„Szőnyből tudatjuk...“', p. 141. Furthermore, here it is worth mentioning Krisztina Juhász's new, promising investigation on the topic of the ceremonial procedure of the Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties of the 17th century.

Finally, the third part ended on December 8, 1629, which involved, besides the process of the ratification, the territorial negotiations, hence the question of the villages on the common frontier of the two empires. By the end of 1627, the delegations of the territorial negotiations had been appointed and at the beginning of 1628 the negotiations started. One of the questions worth mentioning was where the negotiations would be. The parties spent months until they could agree on this question.

In the case of the territorial negotiations at Szécsény, Péter Koháry was appointed as the head of the Hungarian delegation. It is worth mentioning that at the time of the peace talks, one can find Baron Péter Koháry among the negotiators. He was added to the commissioners upon the Hungarian Palatine's proposal, after the death of a commissioner, Mózes Cziráky.¹⁷ It should be noted that the negotiations at Szécsény ended fruitlessly. The question of the villages on the borderland was solved after Muharrem, the Bey of Szolnok, and Gáspár Tassy, Palatine Miklós Esterházy's secretary had concluded an agreement in Buda on April 6, 1629.

The author's aim in his dissertation in progress, as it has been pointed out above, is to present an overview of the peace process of Szőny, with a focus on the territorial negotiations (i.e. the question of the villages on (and near) their common frontier) at Szécsény and Buda through Péter Koháry's correspondence. However, a question arises, who Péter Koháry was. Several data can be found concerning his life and activity. So, if one examines his life, it can be easily recognised that his career and role were not limited only to these episodes. He was in his early 40s when he fought on the battlefields of the Long Turkish War.¹⁸ Baron Koháry was among the royal commissioners at the time of the Peace Treaty of Vienna made between the rebel Hungarians, led by István Bocskai, and the Habsburgs (1606). A couple of years later, in 1611 he was appointed as the vice-captain of Érsekújvár (present day Nové Zámky, in Slovakia) and vice-general of the border-fortress zone of the Cisdanubian district and mining region.¹⁹ He was in office until his death in 1632.²⁰

¹⁷ Brandl et al., 'Kommunikáció és híráramlás', p. 120.

¹⁸ One could find him on the battlefields at Fülek (present day Fil'akovo (Sk)) in 1593, at Esztergom in 1595, at Mezőkeresztes in 1596 as well as at Győr in 1598.

¹⁹ In Hungarian: Dunáninnyi kerületi és bányavidéki végvidéki főkapitány-helyettes. In Latin: supremus vicecapitaneus/vicegeneralis partium regni Hungariae Cisdanubianarum et confiniorum antemontanorum supremus vicecapitaneus. Géza Pálffy, 'Kerületi és végvidéki főkapitányok és főkapitány-helyettesek Magyarországon a 16–17. században' [Borderfortress-captain-generals, District-captain-generals and Vice-captain-generals on the

The monographic elaboration of the vice-captain's life and correspondence has not been carried out so far. As it has been mentioned above, several data can be found in the historical literature about him, but unfortunately, not only nineteenth-century publications, but also twenty-first-century works contain some inaccurate and incorrect information concerning him and his life. So, in the author's dissertation in progress, a separate chapter will be dedicated to summarising Péter Koháry's life and activity.²¹

In the following, it is worth presenting the research into Koháry's exchange of letters. No comprehensive collection of his correspondence has been published thus far, only a few parts of it are available and the only systematic collection which focuses on Péter Koháry was published in 1911.²² Additionally, another source collection is worth mentioning, namely József Stessel's work on the topic of the negotiations at Szécsény.²³ In his work he published letters written by Koháry during the territorial negotiations, but it did not include the Palatine Miklós Esterházy's responses to him. It should be noted that, according to Stessel, one can find the aforementioned part of the sources in the Koháry-Coburg family's archive.²⁴ In 2020, 14 letters were published, which were addressed to Péter Koháry by the Esterházy's and another one in 2019. These letters contain the abovementioned responses of the Palatine.²⁵ Inside the framework of a project 20 further documents from the Koháry-Coburg Archive will be

Hungarian Frontier of the Habsburg Empire in the 16th and 17th Centuries], *Történelmi Szemle*, 39/2 (1997): 271.

²⁰ Pálffy, 'Kerületi és végvidéki főkapitányok', p. 272.

²¹ More about his life and activity, see: Marton, 'Péter Koháry's Life', pp. 25–36.

²² András Komáromy, 'Koháry Péter érsekújvári kapitány levelei Thurzó György nádorhoz 1611–1616' [Letters of Péter Koháry, the Captain of Érsekújvár to Palatine György Thurzó 1611–1616], *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 12 (1911): 77–109. (It contains 30 letters.)

²³ Stessel, 'Adatok az 1628. évi', pp. 430–452, pp. 481–510.

²⁴ They can be found in original: Štátny Archív v Banskej Bystrici (ŠA BB) [State Archive in Banská Bystrica]. Koháry-Coburgovské archívy, Rodový archív Koháry-Coburgov, Časť I, Listiny, korešpondencia a rôzne písomnosti [Koháry-Coburg Family's Archive, Class I, Diplomas, correspondence, and various documents] box nr. 40575., No. 861–913. Briefe an Peter Koháry 1616–1632; Also, they can be found in microfilm: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára (MNL OL) [National Archives of Hungary], X 1045 (Koháry család [Koháry Family]), microfilm Nr. 40575, Nr. C 1228, Nr. C 1229.

²⁵ Gellért Ernő Marton, '„Az mint Isten tudunk adja, oltalmazzuk vérünkkel is szegény hazánknak bástyáját...” Magyar nyelvű Esterházy-levelek a Koháry-Coburg család levéltárából [“As God grants us strength, we are defending our poor motherland's bastion with our blood...” Esterházy-letters in Hungarian from the Koháry-Coburg Family's Archive]', *Aetas*, 35/3 (2020): pp. 126–150. In 13 cases the sender is Miklós Esterházy, in one case it is Pál Esterházy. Marton, 'On the Question of', pp. 85–87.

published.²⁶ In addition to source collections mentioned previously, one can find several additional letters concerning Péter Koháry in different source publications.²⁷

The most of Péter Koháry's correspondence, as it has been pointed out above, is unpublished. Over 200 letters have been assembled, most of them by the author of this article. The letters cover the years from 1610 to 1632 and in the case of Koháry's widow, Borbála Balassa of Gyarmath, a few letters have been collected from the period 1632–1637 until her death.²⁸ The unpublished letters which have been mustered can be found in Hungarian²⁹ and foreign³⁰ archives.

All the data of these sources were entered into a database which could help the quantitative analysis of these exchanges of letters. The quantitative analysis also illuminates two things.³¹ On the one hand, the

²⁶ Title of the project in English: Diplomatic sources concerning the Ottoman contacts of the Kingdom of Hungary (16th–17th centuries); principal investigator: Gábor Kármán. All of these letters are sent by Mürteza, the Pasha of Buda, 18 of them are addressed to Péter Koháry, in two cases the addressee is Pál Esterházy, the captain of Nógrád. The transcription and the elaboration of these documents have been made by the author of this article.

²⁷ E.g., with regard to Cardinal Péter Pázmány, Palatine Miklós Esterházy, and the Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627). Ferenc Hanuy, *Pázmány Péter bibornok, esztergomi érsek, Magyarország prímása összegyűjtött levelei* [Collected Letters of Cardinal Péter Pázmány, the Archbishop of Esztergom, Primate of Hungary] (2 vols, Budapest, 1911), vol. 2 (1629–1637), p. 213 (Nr. 684), p. 232 (Nr. 702); Tibor Martí, 'Pázmány Péter bíboros, esztergomi érsek nemzetközi és hazai kapcsolatrendszeréhez: három kiadatlan Pázmány-levél' [Details to the Hungarian and International Network of Relations of Cardinal Péter Pázmány, the Archbishop of Esztergom: Pázmány's Three Unpublished Letters], in Alinka Ajkay – Rita. Bajáki (eds), *Pázmány nyomában. Tanulmányok Hargittay Emil tiszteletére* [Following Pázmány. Studies in Honor of Emil Hargittay] (Vác, 2013), pp. 315–322, especially: pp. 318–320 (Nr. 2); Ferencz Salamon – László Szalay, Galánthai Gróf Eszterházy Miklós. Magyarország nádora [Miklós Eszterházy Count of Galántha. The Palatine of Hungary] (3 vols, Pest, 1863–1870), vol. 3 (1627–1629) (Pest, 1870). pp. 378–384, pp. 391–393, pp. 466–468; Pál Jászay, 'A' szőnyi béke. 1627' [The Peace Treaty of Szőny. 1627], *Tudománytár, Értekezések* 4 (1838): pp. 195–197; Brandl et al., 'Válogatott források', pp. 165–168, pp. 174–176, p. 189.

²⁸ ÖStA HHStA, Fa. Pálffy, Kt. 11., A. I., Lad V., Fasc. 1–4; Fasc. 3., Fr. 8, 78, 81, 83, 84.

²⁹ Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Egyetemi Könyvtár és Kézirattár [Eötvös Loránd University, University Library and Archives] (ELTE EKK); MNL OL [National Archives of Hungary].

³⁰ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv [Austrian State Archives] (ÖStA) Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA); ÖStA Kriegsarchiv (KA); Štátny Archív v Banskej Bystrici [State Archive in Banská Bystrica] (ŠA BB)

³¹ Here, it is worth emphasising that these numbers represent the first partial results based on the already assembled letters which had been collected from the even now available ones. These numbers show that on the basis of the great number of unpublished sources the research of this topic would be productive, on the one hand, because of the collection and publication of new diplomatic history sources, and on the other hand, because with the help

aim of the author in the long run is to collect and publish Péter Koháry's whole correspondence. On the other hand, in the short run, the author intends to collect and publish his exchange of letters concerning the peace process of Szőny in 1627, also paying attention to the territorial negotiations in 1628–1629. At this moment, the database³² contains 287 records from the period of 1610–1632. In 139 cases (89 of them are unpublished letters and 6 of them are letter references) Péter Koháry is the sender and in 148 cases he is the addressee (130 of them are unpublished letters and 4 of them are letter references).³³ With the help of this database, one can examine his relationship with the dignitaries of the two parties. The quantitative analysis can inform us about the network of relations and the intensive periods as well as the gaps in the collection of the sources.³⁴ However, it is only the qualitative analysis that can show us what the most important points and problems were during the negotiations. Besides, it can shed light on the quality of the dignitaries' relationship. In several cases, the documents contain information about them. For instance, in document Nr. 1, the following sentence can be found. *“Isten engedelmeiből holnapi napon vadászni megyek, az mi vadat fogunk, nagyságodnak részt teszek belőle!”* This points to the fact that over the simple official relationship, an informal one can be assumed between them. Another note can be taken based on the note of Graeme Murdock concerning the forms of address. It is worth emphasising that they are mostly stylised and conventional, but these formal parts convey further pieces of information while analysing the participants' (personal) relations.

As the author's dissertation will contain a chapter on source publishing, here it seems useful to show examples how the sources will be elaborated. Therefore, the following part consists of a guideline (the rules of the modernisation of the texts), two elaborated documents³⁵ and the examples for the items which can be found in the appendix.

of them one can better understand the peace process and the role and importance of each participant. See more: Marton, 'Péter Koháry's Life', pp. 31–34.

³² The database reflects the status of the research as of June 22, 2020.

³³ Concerning the time period of the negotiations, 133 records can be found in the database regarding Koháry (90 records from the period from mid-June, 1627, to April, 1629, further 38 items from May to December, 1629, and 4 from the first half of 1627). See more: Marton, 'Péter Koháry's Life', pp. 31–32.

³⁴ Concerning this question, see more: Marton, 'Péter Koháry's Life', pp. 32–33.

³⁵ Both of them discuss the taxation of the villages on the two empire's common borderland. The taxation of the villages on the two empires' common borderland as well as the question of the "open border" are mentioned among the most interesting questions of this period. Concerning the second one, see: István Czigány, 'A „nyitott határ” – egy hadtörténelmi paradoxon hatása. Néhány gondolat a Magyar Királyság 16–17. századi oszmánellenes

Rules of modernisation

Because these texts date back to the first third of the seventeenth century, a couple of remarks should be made as regards the guidelines of the source publication. There is not any consensus-based guideline for source publications in Hungarian related to the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries.³⁶ In this case, the author has chosen the guideline and style sheet of the Research Group of the Ottoman Age.³⁷

It is worth discussing these rules briefly. The texts in Hungarian are not letter-perfect transcriptions. In every case, these texts are partially modernised versions in order to offer an easier understanding. During the centuries, the Hungarian language (the orthography and the spelling rules in particular) changed a lot. Therefore, these texts contain font errors, spelling, grammatical (in some cases because of the crudeness of the grammatical rules) and punctuation mistakes. What is more, there are some letters which are now missing from the Hungarian alphabet. All these circumstances necessitate the modernisation of the texts. What does the afore-mentioned partial modernization mean? This is an alphabetic, narrow phonetic transcription (e. g. the double vowel “*eö*” > “*ö*”³⁸), which pays attention to the linguistic and dialectological characteristics. (Here it should be noted that this source publication will not be designed as a

védelmi rendszerének sajátosságairól [An “Open Border” – the Impact of a Military History Paradox. A Few Remarks on the Characteristics of the Defence System of the Kingdom of Hungary against the Ottomans in the 16th–17th Century], *Aetas*, 33/4 (2018): 73–85.

³⁶ Delineate the guidelines: Borbála Bak, ‘A XVI–XVIII. századi magyar nyelvű források kiadásának kérdései. Ajánlás a magyar nyelvű források közreadásához’ [The Issues of the Publication of 16th–18th-century Sources in Hungarian. Recommendations for the Publishing of Sources in Hungarian], *Fons*, 7/1 (2000): pp. 91–137; For the guidelines of the most recent, extensive volume on missilis sources in Hungarian, see: Péter Tusor (ed and pub), “*Írom kegyelmednek, mint igaz magyar igaz magyarnak...*” Lippay György veszprémi és egeri püspök, esztergomi érsek levelei magyar arisztokratákhoz, nemesekhez, 1635–1655, [“I hereon write to Thee, Your Lordship, as a true Hungarian to another true one... The Letters of György Lippay, the Bishop of Veszprém and Eger, the Archbishop of Esztergom to Hungarian Aristocrats and Nobles, 1635–1655] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2015). Working out the rules was also facilitated by: László Glück: *Mürteza pasha magyar nyelvű levelezésének kiadására vonatkozó javasolt szabályok* [Suggested Guidelines for the Publication of the Hungarian Correspondence of Pasha Mürteza] (working title; unpublished manuscript); Sándor Papp, *A Sárkőzyek. Egy magyar származású francia államszéki családjának története a 18. század végéig* [The Sárkőzys. The Family History of a French Statesman of Hungarian Origin Until the End of the 18th Century] (Szeged: Universitas Szeged Kiadó, 2012), p. 81.

³⁷ MTA–SZTE (Hungarian Academy of Sciences – University of Szeged) Research Group of the Ottoman Age. Together with his colleagues, Hajnalka Tóth and Krisztina Juhász, the author of this article is currently working on the publication of the Research Group’s Guidelines of Hungarian source publication. This article will be published soon.

³⁸ (letter-perfect transcription) teoreok > (with the correct spelling) teőreök > (the form used today) török ‘Turkish’.

philological or linguistic publication, the main aim of the chapter on the source publication is to present the sources of the discussed topic, hopefully facilitating further research on this period.)

Special characters are modernised (e. g. “*w*” or “*y*”), except in the case of names, as mentioned below. On the one hand, these characters are not available in the written Hungarian language; on the other hand, they could be replaced (e. g. they could be written and pronounced in the following ways: “*w*” → ‘*v*’ / ‘*u*’; “*w*” → ‘*ü*’; “*y*” → ‘*i*’ ‘*y*’ (‘*j*’). Let us see two examples: “*teorökwl irt*” → *törökül írt* ‘*written in Turkish*’; “*ualamelyket*” → *valamelyiket* ‘*either [of them]*’).

Based on the “*teorökwl irt*” → *törökül írt* example, it should be noted that scribes regularly fail to draw a distinction between the short and long counterparts of the Hungarian vowels.³⁹ Therefore, in the case of the short and long counterparts, the transcriptions follow the Hungarian spelling rules, but these do not affect the archaic and dialectal characteristics of the texts. Thus, “*vigezes*” will be “*vígezés*” (but not *végezés*), the suffixes (“-*rul*” / “-*rül*” will be “-*rúl*” / “-*rül*” (not “-*ról*” / “-*röl*”).

Modernisation affects “*cz*”, “*ch*”, “*ts*” character (consonant) pairs. These should be modernised after pronunciation, so “*czaszar*” will be “*császár*”, “*chalard*” will be “*csalárd*” as well as the so-called “silent h”, so “*megh*” will be “*meg*”, “*jr*h” will be “*ír*”. The slips of the pen in the case of voiced and voiceless consonant pairs (e. g. b-p, g-k, etc.) will not be corrected, except if the literal mistake alters the meaning (e. g. *bor* ‘*wine*’ > *por* ‘*powder*’). In the texts, one can find the word “*bég*” ‘*bey*’ in the following form: “*bék*”. If the letter-writer uses it consistently, it will be in the same form in the modernised transcription. The same way will be followed if the mistake can be traced back to dialectal characteristics, like “*karácson*” ‘*Christmas*’ will not be “*karácsony*” or “*kapitán*” ‘*captain*’ will not be “*kapitány*”. But in connection with the double consonants, like -*tt*- in “*hattalmas*” > “*hatalmas*” ‘*mighty*’, -*ss*- in “*passa*” > “*pasa*” ‘*pasha*’, but in spite of this, “*hatta*” will not be transformed to “*hagya*” ‘*let / left*’ according to preserving the “feeling” of the texts.

In connection with the proper names (personal names and places as well) the original, written form is adhered to and a footnote is added with the presently used form (e. g. Es[t]erhazj – Esterházy; Eztergam – Esztergom (H); Posonj – Pozsony, present day: Bratislava (Sk)). The same method is applied in the case of adjectives derived from proper names.

³⁹ In the Hungarian language, there are 14 vowels, which means 7 short-long counterparts (a-á; e-é; i-í; o-ó; ö-ő; u-ú; ü-ű)

The initials of proper names are written with upper case letters. The name of feasts (e. g. húsvét ‘Easter’ or pünkösdhétfő ‘Whit Monday’) following the Hungarian spelling rules are written with lower case initials. It should be noted that capital initials are used not only for proper names but also in the case of the initial of the first word of sentences.

As for the foreign language expressions (at this time these are mostly Latin words), the original form with spelling mistakes is retained and the correct form and meaning are added in a footnote (e. g. “inclusákkal” inclusum (Lat.) – ‘*annex*’).⁴⁰ In addition to this, the translation of the Latin form of addresses regarding their formulary character is dispensed with.

As for the punctuation currently used, spelling rules are applied by simultaneously aligning them with the meaning of the text. Wherever it is possible, the original punctuation is retained (e. g. round brackets ()). Round brackets are used only where the original document contained that, furthermore, usage of dashes (-...-) is avoided in this publication (in the latter case commas are used).⁴¹ Also, the officially used present alphabet is administered. It should be noted that the modernised punctuation serves the better understanding. The original hyphenation is disregarded, too, because of the easier reading and understanding.

In the case of the additions (e. g. marking the pages of the original document [1r], indicating an unreadable part or that a document is damaged [--], to separate a text [I] the abstract’s points which follow these points), the square brackets ([/]) are used.

All of the abbreviations are unfolded (“m. p.” → “manu propria”; “kegtek” → “kegyelmetek” – ‘Your Excellencies’; “tudvá[n]” → “tudván” – ‘knowingly’) without remarks because this is not a philological work and from the point of view of the understanding it is rather irrelevant. It should be noted that the Latin abbreviations are unfolded with the usage of square brackets, but the Hungarian ones (included the so-called nasal abbreviations) are unfolded without remarks, as one can find above.

⁴⁰ The meanings of the words and/or the expressions are written mostly based on the following works. Henrik Finály, *A latin nyelv szótára* [Dictionary of the Latin Language] (Budapest: Franklin Társulat

Magyar Irod. Intézet és Könyvnyomda, 1884, reprinted: 2002, 2005); Béla Kovács (ed): *Syllabus latino-hungaricus* (Eger: Heves Megyei Levéltár 1990); László Makkai (ed, int, and notes), *Bethlen Gábor krónikásai* [The Chroniclers of Gábor Bethlen] (Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 1980), especially: *Idegen szavak jegyzéke* [The Catalogue of Foreign Words], pp. 271–277; László Makkai, *Bethlen Gábor emlékezete* [The Memory of Gábor Bethlen] (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1980), especially: *Idegen és magyarázatra szoruló szavak jegyzéke* [Dictionary of Foreign and Explainable Words], pp. 307–315; Antal Bartal, *A magyarországi latinság szótára* [Dictionary of Latin in Hungary] (Budapest: Históriaantik Könyvesház, 1901).

⁴¹ Glück, ‘Mürteza pasa’.

The page breaks of the original documents, as it has been mentioned above, are indicated (e. g. [1r] or [p. 1]), but the catchwords are not. If the text is not continuing on the next page with the same word, this is indicated in a footnote, included the catchword.

Concerning the question of the translation of the sources from Hungarian to English, a note has to be taken. The documents will not be translated, but abstracts in English are added to the transcriptions. It should be noted that a full English translation could be found only in one case in the dissertation, in the following publication it is not necessary. That sample serves as an example to show another possibility for source publication.⁴² It helps the understanding, so that is a modern translation which shows the content of the Hungarian original; however, it is not simply a long summary, as it follows the form and the structure of the letter. In this case, the Latin expressions, except for the formal parts of the text, and the Latin form of addresses were translated into English as well because of the small differences between the correct Latin form and the English one (e. g. in originali - 'in the original'). In the case of the names, the currently used forms are applied. In connection with the punctuation, the present standard spelling rules are used in compliance with the meaning of the text.

The notes (including the philological ones) can be found in footnotes. All the footnotes are entered into the text with Arabic numerals which are continued from text to text. These notes will be as short as possible. In the case of personal names and places, notes will contain their currently used form. The meaning of Latin language expressions will be given in notes, as it has been referred to above. If it is necessary, further footnotes will be added (e. g. events, terms, etc.).

An appendix will be added to the dissertation which will contain a name catalogue with notes about people who could be found in the texts. A glossary of the places with their currently used names in Hungarian and a note about where they could be found at present are included, if it is necessary, with their current, officially used name. Furthermore, a glossary of the Latin expressions which were used in these texts is also added.

In every case, the heading of the documents will contain the following elements (1) who wrote to whom; (2) place and date of issuing; (3) about originality (original, copy, etc.); (4) special added information if it is relevant (e. g. in the case of a mentionable scribe, *Habib Agha's handwriting*); where the original and the copies (if it is relevant) could be found; (5) data of edition if relevant.

⁴² For the sample to English translation, see: Marton, 'On the Question of', pp. 88-90.

In each case, the heading will be followed by an abstract in English. It is worth pointing out that in the case of the already-published documents only the abstracts will be published in the dissertation. If a document had already been published but was found wanting, a transcription of its text will be published from the original manuscript or the copy of the document. This summary will be ordered by points. Those will be marked in the original text (e. g. [I]). The points follow the content of the texts. The points aim to help the orientation of the reader because most of the texts contain various topics.

After the abstract, the outside of the document will be published, followed by the contemporary note(s) (if relevant). Here it should be noted that this source publication will dispense with the transcription of the nineteenth-century archivists' notes.

This source publication will be divided into two parts basically, (1) unpublished documents; (2) abstract of the already published ones.⁴³ Within the two main parts, the letters will be selected by the correspondents (e. g. Exchange of letters between Pasha Mürteza and Péter Koháry; Exchange of letters between Miklós Esterházy and Péter Koháry). Within the framework of these subchapters the documents will follow a chronological order, with letters without a date at the end.

⁴³ In the case of the already published documents, it is worth noting that those abstracts will not be divided by abstract points.

[Nr. 1]

(Tatar) Ibrahim Bey of Esztergom to Péter Koháry

Esztergom, December 31, 1627

ŠA BB Kohary-Coburgovské archívy. Rodový archív Koháry-Coburgov. Č. I. No. 12140

MNL OL X 1045 (Koháry family) microfilm No. C1228, No. 12140

Original document

Abstract

[I] *On account of the lack of paying taxes, the Bey of Esztergom files a complaint. He writes that he is demanded to pay in the tax, but the villages do not comply with paying in either the emperor's or the sipahi's taxes. He expresses that he is at a loss on how to proceed and he points out that they adhere to the Peace Treaty of Szőny, namely that they do not coerce the peasants. For this reason, they are responsible for them not turning in the taxes. [II] He lists the villages that did not pay in their taxes. [III] He also adds that he sent some of his men to the villages. [IV] Ibrahim Bey reminds Koháry of the obligation of the peasants by the treaty to pay their legally levied taxes; he asks Koháry to take care of that. [V] In the postscript Ibrahim says that there are villages that claim they duly turned in their taxes, but the Turkish side states the opposite. He spells out his request that the judges of the villages should appear in person to clarify the issue. [VI] He emphasises that the inhabitants of Újbars failed to pay their taxes (400 forints); what is more, he also adds that he has remitted 100 forints from the sum of the annual tax, so their complaints are discreditable. [VII] He goes hunting the next day, and he will send part of the game to Koháry too.*

[**Outside:**] Az tekéntetes és nagyságos úrnak, Koharÿ Péternek⁴⁴, az felséges római császárnak az Dunán⁴⁵ túl való végházainak és Ersek Wÿvarnak⁴⁶ vice generalis capitányának, énnekem jóakaró, úr szomszéd barátomnak adassék.

Wÿvar⁴⁷

[*p. 1*] Én, Tattar Ibrahim Bék⁴⁸, az hatalmas és győzhetetlen török császárnak fő szandzsákbéjke és Eztergomnak⁴⁹ fő helytartója etc. Minden hozzám illendő tisztességbeli barátságos köszönetemnek ajánlásának utána Istentül nagyságodnak jó egészséget kívánok.

⁴⁴ Koháry Péter.

⁴⁵ Duna. The River Danube.

⁴⁶ Érsekújvár, present day Nové Zámky (Sk).

⁴⁷ Újvár, i.e. Érsekújvár.

⁴⁸ (Tatar) Ibrahim Bey of Esztergom.

⁴⁹ Esztergom (H).

Tekéntetes és nagyságos úr szomszéd barátom! [I] Noha nagyságodnak úri fejét ez dolog miatt nemcsak egészen fájlaltam és mostan is fájlalnom kell, nagyságod megbocsásson, ha az kéntelenség volna nem cselekedtetne, nem cselekedném. De látja Isten, az miatt egy nap énnekem nyugodalmam nincsen. Az egész sereg éjjel-nappal fizetéseket és búzájokat én túllem kívánják, az faluk pedig nem jönnek, nem hozzák az császár búzáját, az mely faluiba jön, egy pálcával [?] ⁵⁰ jön, sem császár búzáját nem hozza, sem iszpajájának oda adózó summáját, adóját nem hozzák. Én nem tudom, mik eképpen kell ennek legjobb módjával eleit találnom, mivel az szőni végezésben ⁵¹ az vagy, hogy egy jobbágyin is sem fogjunk, sem szidjunk, sem vonjunk, mi is ahhoz tartván magunkat, azzal mind az jobbágyságot rosszá, szófogadatlaná töttük, így sem császár summája, adója, búzája, iszpaják adóit be nem k[ú]dik, bíznak az végezéshez, mit akármennyit írunk, izenjük, parancsról nekünk semmit sem gondolnak. Mindeneket Fulek ⁵² mellől bocsátnak, és hogy nagyságod inkább elküdjé, itten mindenik falut nevezet szerint felírtam az mely császár búzáját, adóját, summáját be nem hozná. [II] Verebelj ⁵³, Levai ⁵⁴, [--] ⁵⁵ tartomániban, az mint itten regisztromban ⁵⁶ töttem, úgy mint Szebedinj ⁵⁷, Thely ⁵⁸ [?], Fedemös ⁵⁹, Bankeszeö ⁶⁰, Kiskeszeö ⁶¹, Varad ⁶², Egihaz Szegh ⁶³, Nagy Szegh ⁶⁴, Malom Szegh ⁶⁵, Andra ⁶⁶, Felseö[-], Also Szeöleös ⁶⁷ Felseö[-], Also Chiornok ⁶⁸,

⁵⁰ Uncertain reading.

⁵¹ The Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627).

⁵² Füle, present day Filakovo (Sk).

⁵³ Verebely, present day Vráble (Sk).

⁵⁴ Léva, present day Levice (Sk).

⁵⁵ Illegible word.

⁵⁶ Registrum (Lat.) – ‘record, list’.

⁵⁷ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Szebedin, later Szebedény (in Slovakian: Sebedín), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Sebedín-Bečov (in Hungarian: Szebedénybecsó) (Sk).

⁵⁸ Uncertain reading. It could be Tild (present day in Slovakian: Telince) (Sk).

⁵⁹ Fedémes, later Ipolyfödémes, present day Ipeľské Úľany (Sk).

⁶⁰ Bánkeszi, present day Bánov (Sk).

⁶¹ Kiskeszi, present day Malé Kosihy (Sk).

⁶² Várad, i.e. Kisvárad (in Slovakian: Malý Varad), the formerly independent settlement is part of the city of Šurany (in Hungarian: Nagysurány) (Sk).

⁶³ Egyházzszeg, later became part of Egyháznagyszeg (in Slovakian: Kostolný Sek), the formerly independent settlement is part of the city of Šurany (in Hungarian: Nagysurány) (Sk).

⁶⁴ Nagyszeg, later became part of Egyháznagyszeg (in Slovakian: Kostolný Sek), the formerly independent settlement is part of the city of Šurany (in Hungarian: Nagysurány) (Sk).

⁶⁵ Nyitramalomszeg, present day Lipová (Sk).

⁶⁶ Uncertain reading. It could be Ondrohó (in Slovakian: Ondrochov), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Lipová (in Hungarian: Nyitramalomszeg) (Sk). A settlement name can be found in the text of the Agreement of Újbars (1618). On the list of the villages, it was written after “Malomszegh” and before “Felseö Zeöleös”, as in this letter. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), Kriegsarchiv, Hofkriegsrat Akten (HKR) 1617–1619.

Ezdeöke⁶⁹, Giarak⁷⁰ S. Mýhalj [Ur]⁷¹, Martin falu⁷², Vaik⁷³, Diczke⁷⁴, Aniala⁷⁵, Lule⁷⁶, Lehotka⁷⁷, Giarmat⁷⁸, Mohi⁷⁹, O Bars [?]⁸⁰, Toth keszeö⁸¹, Nagy Sary⁸², Taina⁸³, Nevid⁸⁴ Veres Var⁸⁵, Nagy Vezekenj⁸⁶ Kis Vezekenj⁸⁷ Rosnicza⁸⁸, Nemczénj⁸⁹, Kis[-] és Nagy Valkoczi⁹⁰, Chiarad⁹¹, Kisfalu⁹²,

fol. 9r–19v., especially fol. 10v–11r. The Agreement of Komárom contains the same order, but with the following note: “Ondroch. Malom Szeg melleth.” MNL OL, P 108, Rep. 71, Fasc. 26a, pp. 220–224., especially: p. 221.

⁶⁷ Felsőszőlős (in Slovakian: Horný Vinodol), Alsószőlős (in Slovakian: Dolný Vinodol), the formerly independent settlements are parts of the municipality of Vinodol (in Hungarian: Nyitraszőlős) (Sk).

⁶⁸ Felső- és Alsócsomok, present day Čemík (in Hungarian: Csomok) (Sk).

⁶⁹ Özdöge, present day Mojzesovo (Sk).

⁷⁰ Gyarak, present day Kmeťovo (Sk).

⁷¹ Szentmihály, present day Liptovský Michal (Sk).

⁷² Martonfalva, later Nemesmartonfalva, present day Martinová (in Hungarian Martonfalva) (Sk). The annex of the Agreement of Komárom contains these settlements in the same order. In that document can be found “Marton falua”. MNL OL, P 108, Rep. 71, Fasc. 26a, pp. 220–224., especially: p. 222.

⁷³ Vajk (in Slovakian: Vajka nad Žitavou), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Lúčnica nad Žitavou (in Hungarian: Vajkmártonfalva) (Sk).

⁷⁴ Dicske, later Nemesdicske (in Slovakian: Dyčka), the formerly independent settlement is part of the city of Vráble (in Hungarian: Verebély) (Sk).

⁷⁵ Anyala (in Slovakian: Aňala), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Nesvady (in Hungarian: Naszvad) (Sk).

⁷⁶ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Uncertain reading. It could be Lüle, present day Lula (Sk).

⁷⁷ Lehotka (later Lehota-Gyarmath), The formerly independent settlement present day is part of the municipality of Žitavce (in Hungarian: Zsitvagyarmat) (Sk).

⁷⁸ Gyarmat (later Lehota-Gyarmath), The formerly independent settlement present day is part of the municipality of Žitavce (in Hungarian: Zsitvagyarmat) (Sk).

⁷⁹ Mohi (in Slovakian: Mochovce), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Kalná nad Hrodóm (in Hungarian: Kálna) (Sk).

⁸⁰ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Uncertain reading. It could be Óbars, present day Starý Tekov (Sk).

⁸¹ Tótkesző, present day Hronské Kosihy (in Hungarian: Garamkeszi) (Sk).

⁸² Nagysáró (in Slovakian: Veľké Šarovce), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Šarovce (in Hungarian: Sáró) (Sk).

⁸³ Tajna (in Slovakian: Tajná), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Tajná (in Hungarian: Tajnasári) (Sk).

⁸⁴ Néved or Nived, present day Nevidzany (Sk).

⁸⁵ Veresvár, later Barsvörösvár, present day Červený Hrádok (Sk).

⁸⁶ Nagyvezekény, present day Veľké Vozokany (Sk).

⁸⁷ Kisvezekény, present day Malé Vozokany (Sk).

⁸⁸ There is not clear about which settlement could be. The Agreement of Komárom (1618) contains this settlement's name as “Roznicza”. (MNL OL, P 108, Rep. 71, Fasc. 26a, pp. 220–224., especially: p. 223.), the Agreement of Újbars (1618) contains “Rokosnica”. (ÖStA, Kriegsarchiv, HKR Akten 1617-1619. fol. 8r–20v., especially fol. 10r. Based on the settlements which were recorded before and after (Vezekény, Nemcsény), this settlement might be close to them. In Samu Borovszky's work “Roznicza” can be found as which is belonged to “Szent-Benedek” (i.e. Garamszentbenedek, present day Hronský Beňadik (Sk)). Samu Borovszky (ed. in ch.), *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai* [The Counties and the Cities of Hungary] (25 vols, Budapest: Országos Monografia Társaság, 1896–1914), Bars vármegye

Szent Peter⁹³, Kovaczi⁹⁴, Nemethj⁹⁵, S. Kereszt⁹⁶, Kelczenj⁹⁷, Almás⁹⁸, Badinka⁹⁹, Peszer¹⁰⁰, Lehotka¹⁰¹. Sőt, ezen kívül tegnapi napon Leva¹⁰², Nograd¹⁰³, Dregelj¹⁰⁴ tartományban 25 falu ugyanaz, melyek be nem jüttenek, melyekre [p. 2] [III] kéntelenségibül tegnap öt gyalogot küldtem, hogy beküldjék, melyek sem veréssel, sem szidással nem cselekedik, hanem szép szóval, sőt, lovasokat sem küldtem, hanem gyalogokat, hogy annál inkább bizonyosak legyenek benne mindenek, hogy gonoszságban nem járnak, de faluról falura, kocsival császár dolgában, az mely penig az jobbágyságról legrosszabb, Diczke¹⁰⁵, Also[-], Felseő Chiornok¹⁰⁶, innen magam jószágom, nagyságotat hívassa eleiben, ez egész esztendőben szemek fényét sem láttam sem bírójoknak, sem adóikat nem láttam. Azért nagyságod ezeket hívassa be és mindeneknek jól végire menjen, mi ennek utána, ha valakit behozni summát, adót kiküldetek és minékünk azban vétünkünk nincsen, mivel az búzát be nem

[Bars County], p. 349. At this moment there are no more available, much more punctual data to this question.

⁸⁹ Nemcsény, present day Nemčiňany (Sk).

⁹⁰ Kisvalkóc (in Slovakian: Závada), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Valkovce (in Hungarian: Valkóc) (Sk).

⁹¹ Csarad, present day Čaradice (Sk).

⁹² Kisfalud, later Barskisfalud, present day Vieska nad Žitavou (Sk).

⁹³ Szentpéter, later Komáromszentpéter, present day Svätý Peter (Sk).

⁹⁴ Kovácsi, later Garamkovácsi, present day Kozárovce (Sk).

⁹⁵ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Németi, later Garamnémeti, present day Tekovské Nemce (Sk).

⁹⁶ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Szentkereszt, later Garamszentkereszt, present day Žiar nad Hronom (Sk).

⁹⁷ Kelcsény, present day Hronské Kľačany (in Hungarian: Garamkelecsény) (Sk).

⁹⁸ Almás. Alsóalmás (in Slovakian: Dolné Jabloňovce) and/or Felsőalmás (in Slovakian: Horné Jabloňovce), the formerly independent settlements are parts of the municipality of Jabloňovce (in Hungarian: Hontalmás) (Sk). The Agreement of Komárom contains Alsóalmás and Felsőalmás as well. MNL OL, P 108, Rep. 71, Fasc. 26a, pp. 220–224., especially: p. 223.

⁹⁹ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Badinka (Badin). Ferencz Salamon, *Két Magyar diplomata a tizenhetedik századból* [Two Hungarian Diplomats from the Seventeenth Century] (Pest: Ráth Mór, 1867), p. 280. It could be Felsőbágyon (in Slovakian: Horný Badín), Algyóbágyon (in Slovakian: Dolný Badín). These settlements are close to Levice (in Hungarian: Léva). But it could be Badín (in Hungarian: Erdőbádony), close to Zvolen. All of the mentioned settlements are situated in present-day Slovakia.

¹⁰⁰ Peszer (in Slovakian: Psiare), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Hronský Beňadik (in Hungarian: Garamszentbenedek) (Sk).

¹⁰¹ Crossed out by the scribe in the manuscript. Uncertain reading. It could be Lehotka. Later Abaszállás, present day Lehotka (Sk).

¹⁰² Léva, present day Levice (Sk).

¹⁰³ Nógrád (H).

¹⁰⁴ Drégely, the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Drégelypalánk (H).

¹⁰⁵ Dicske, later Nemesdicske (in Slovakian: Dyčka) (Sk). See more: footnote 74.

¹⁰⁶ Alsó- és Felsőcsornok, present day Černík (in Hungarian: Csornok) (Sk).

hozzák. [IV] Az szöni végezés¹⁰⁷ penig az, hogy az mely jobbágy [az] mivel tartozik, behozzák, se[m] verjük, sem szidjuk, sem fogjuk, mi is ahhoz tartjuk magunkat, de az adóssal az adósságát mindenét megkívánják, meg is kérjük azért nagyságodat. Nagyságodnak erre gondja leszen, sem mi reánk, sem nagyságodnak panasza nem leszen. Ezzel Istennek ajánljuk nagyságodat!

Datum Eztergom¹⁰⁸, 1627. ultima die [Dece]mbris

Választ várok nagyságodtúl!

Nagyságodnak úr barátja,

Idem qui supra

P[ost]s[criptum]

[V] Ezek az faluk között némelyek vadnak, az kik azt mondják, megadták, az császár deákja mondja, nem adták, azért kívánom, hogy előmben jüjjön minden falu bírása, szemtől szemben szóljanak. Leszen, ki hozza, ki nem hozza. [VI] Wý barsiak¹⁰⁹ már nagyságodnak az panaszom, hogy summájok az békeknek f[orint] 400 tavaly is semmit nem attanak ez idei ez enim [?] egy pénzeket sem láttam.

Nagyságodnak hírről legyen, én feljebb semmit nem kívánok, még ez idein is f[orint] 100 elengedtem, ha az többet nem hozzák, az mint megveszem, elég az engedelem, hogy ha valami panaszt tennének nagyságodnak, méltatlan panaszolkodnak.

[VII] Isten engedelmből holnap napon vadászni megyek, az mi vadat fogunk, nagyságodnak részt tesztek belőle!

[Nr. 2]

Ibrahim Bey of Esztergom to Péter Koháry

Esztergom, April 5, 1628

ŠA BB Kohary-Coburgovské archív. Rodový archív Koháry-Coburgov. Č. I. No. 12141

MNL OL X 1045 (Koháry család) microfilm Nr. C1228, No. 12141

Original document

Abstract

[I] *The Bey of Esztergom informs Koháry that he sent letters to villages in relation to the annual works needed for castle maintenance in which villages were instructed on how many people they had to send to burn lime. He mentions that they called for people only via letter, and that neither cavalrymen nor footmen were sent to the villages. He asks for Koháry's help in ensuring the compliance of those who are the*

¹⁰⁷ The Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627).

¹⁰⁸ Esztergom (H).

¹⁰⁹ Újbarsiakra. Újbars, present day Nový Tekov (Sk).

subjects of the Sultan. [II] He also mentions that he sent a regestum [register] earlier of the villages which are in arrears in their payment of taxes. [III] He writes about Koháry's earlier promise to send outstanding taxes from those villages within two weeks. He is at his wits end as to what to do, because he has not dispatched his men to the villages, but cannot otherwise collect due taxes. [IV] In his letter he lists all those villages which have not yet paid their annual taxes.

[Outside:] Az tekéntetes és nagyságos úrnak, Kohary Pethernek¹¹⁰, szentelt vitéz, az felséges római császárnak familiárisa, Magiar Orszagh¹¹¹ az Dunantul¹¹² való részinek vicegenerálisa és Ersek Wiuarnak¹¹³ vicecapitánya etc. Énnem jóakaró, régi, vitéz, úr szomszéd barátomnak adassék. Wiuar¹¹⁴

[p. 1] Én, Ibrahim bék¹¹⁵, hatalmas és győzhetetlen török császárnak fő szandzsákbéke és Estergomnak¹¹⁶ fő helytartója etc.

Minden hozzám illendő köszönetemnek és szolgálatomnak ajánlásának utána Istentől jó egyszíges, hosszú életet kívánok nagyságodnak, mint énnem jóakaró, régi úr szomszéd [5] barátomnak.

Tekéntetes és nagyságos, régi, jóakaró, úr vitéz barátom! [I.] Nagyságodnak ezt akarom megjelentennem, hogy az régi szokás és törvény szerint minden esztendőben hatalmas, győzhetetlen császár várának épületire meszet égettünk, ez idén is immáron Isten az üdőt előhozván az mi szandzsátságunkban levő falukra, az szegínsígre leveleket küldtünk, kitűl egy, az ki jobb falu, két gyalogot kívánunk, az melik legnagyobb vár is, három-négy gyalogot. Írtunk, hogy meszet égetni küldjenek, az melyet nagyságodnak azért akarok hírré tenni, hogy én reájok sem lovas, sem gyalogot ki nem küldtem, hanem egyedül levél által hívtam és nagyságod is ne mondja, hogy nagyságtoknak hírt nem töttem. Sőt, kérem is nagyságodat, hogy nagyságod megparancsolja, hogy beírjenek, mivel mostan az jobbágyság igen szófogatatlanná lött, parancsolatinknak kevés helyt adnak, ne kellésék lovasokat vagy gyalogot érettök kiküldenünk, mivel hatalmas¹¹⁷ császár vára épületire el kell vinniek, az ki császár jobbágya. Attűl senki magát meg nem vonhatja, császár művinek meg kell lenni. [III] Ez felől is akarok nagyságodnak emlékezni, hogy még ennyi faluk maradtanak el, az mint registrumot elküldtem nagyságodnak, az kik császár

¹¹⁰ Koháry Péter.

¹¹¹ Magyarország, 'Hungary'.

¹¹² Duna, 'river Danube'.

¹¹³ Érsekújvár (Sk).

¹¹⁴ Újvár, i.e. Érsekújvár.

¹¹⁵ (Tatar) Ibrahim Bey of Esztergom.

¹¹⁶ Esztergom (H).

¹¹⁷ Inserted in the manuscript by the same hand: "Hlmas", i.e. hatalmas.

adóját meg nem hozták, azokon kívül, az kik pusztán állnak, az sereg mindennap éntülem kívánja, én pedig mindennap azzal bíztatom őket és olvastatom generalis őnagysága levelit előttek, [III] mely leveliben őnagysága azt írta volt énnekem, nem szükség az falukra kiküldenem, őnagysága két hét alatt mind beküldi. Immár Szent György napja¹¹⁸ is eljött, nem tudom, immár mit kell cselekedni, az falukra is ki nem küldünk, ő magok is be nem jönnek, az vitézek az fizetést minden órában kérik, az császár deákja mostan is fogva vagyon. Nagyságodat kérem, nagyságodnak fejit ne fájlaljam ennyit, immár ne nevedjen meg az ilyen sok bútúl! Nagyságod is énnekem parancsolja minden illendő dologbúl, ím, most kedveskedem nagyságodnak.

Ezzel Istennek ajánlom nagyságodat!

Datum Estergom¹¹⁹, 1628. die 5 Aprilis.

Nagyságodnak régi jóakaró úr szomszéd barátja,

Idem qui supra

[p. 2] [IV] Az faluk ezek, az kik még császár adóját be nem hozták ez esztendőben: Kis Keszeő¹²⁰, Andra¹²¹, Also[-] és Felseő Szeöleös¹²², Malom Szegh¹²³, Nagy Sarj¹²⁴, Rosnicza¹²⁵, Toth Keszeő¹²⁶, Peszer¹²⁷, Kis Varad¹²⁸, Bankeszeő¹²⁹, Kisfalu¹³⁰, Kis Walkoczia¹³¹, Gi[me]s¹³², Poczioual¹³³ [?], Borfű¹³⁴, Kis Thur¹³⁵, Kis Szeömere¹³⁶, Wiszoka¹³⁷, Podlusaný¹³⁸, Mere¹³⁹, Szeögincze¹⁴⁰, Nagýfalu¹⁴¹, Bori¹⁴², Lehotka¹⁴³.

¹¹⁸ I.e. April 24.

¹¹⁹ Esztergom (H).

¹²⁰ Kiskeszi, present day Malé Kosihy (Sk).

¹²¹ Uncertain reading. It could be Ondrohó (in Slovakian: Ondrochov) (Sk). See more: footnote 66.

¹²² Felsőszőlős (in Slovakian: Horný Vinodol), Alsószőlős (in Slovakian: Dolný Vinodol) (Sk). See more: footnote 67.

¹²³ Nyitraalmomszeg, present day Lipová (Sk).

¹²⁴ Nagysáró (in Slovakian: Veľké Šarovce) (Sk). See more: footnote 82.

¹²⁵ Unidentified settlement. See more: footnote 88.

¹²⁶ Tótkesző, present day Hronské Kosihy (in Hungarian: Garamkeszi) (Sk).

¹²⁷ Peszér (in Slovakian: Psiare) (Sk). See more: footnote 100.

¹²⁸ Várad, i.e. Kisvárad (in Slovakian: Malý Varad) (Sk). See more: footnote 62.

¹²⁹ Bánkeszi, present day Bánov (Sk).

¹³⁰ Kisfalud, later Barskifalud, present day Vieska nad Žitavou (Sk).

¹³¹ Kiswalkóc (in Slovakian: Závada) (Sk). See more: footnote 90.

¹³² Uncertain reading. It could be Gímes, present day Jelenec (Sk).

¹³³ Uncertain reading. Unknown settlement name.

¹³⁴ Borfő, present day Brhlovce (Sk).

¹³⁵ Kistúr (in Slovakian: Dolné Turovce), the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Veľké Turovce (in Hungarian: Nagytúr) (Sk).

¹³⁶ Kiszsemere (Szemere), present day Semerovo (in Hungarian: Komáromszemere) (Sk).

¹³⁷ Viszoka, later Magaslak, present day Vysoká (Sk).

¹³⁸ Podlusán, present day Podlužany (Sk).

¹³⁹ Mere (in Slovakian: Merovce), the formerly independent settlement is part of the city of Dudince (in Hungarian: Gyúgy) (Sk).

¹⁴⁰ Szőgyén, present day Svodín (Sk).

Appendix

An example to demonstrate the shape of the entries of the *Name catalogue*

Koháry, Péter (Baron of Csábrág): (1564–1632) held his military and later diplomatic offices from the time of the Long Turkish War (1591/93–1606) to the end of the first third of the seventeenth century (1632). contributed to the peace talks at Szőny (1627) and played a decisive role during the territorial negotiations at Szécsény and Buda (1628–1629). He was in office as the vice-captain of Érsekújvár (present day *Nové Zámky*, in Slovakia) and vice-general of the border-fortress zone of the Cisdanubian district and mining region from 1611 to 1632.

See more concerning his life and activity: Marton, ‘Péter Koháry’s Life’, pp. 25–36.

Instances to show how the *Glossary of the places* will look like

| <i>Currently used name in Hungarian</i> | <i>In which state is it located now?</i> | <i>The current, officially used name</i> | <i>In which forms does it appear in the documents?</i> | <i>In which document(s) can it be found?</i> |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Dicske | Slovakia | Dyčka; the formerly independent settlement is part of the city of Vráble (in Hungarian: Verebély) (Sk) | Diczke | Nr. 1 |
| Esztergom | Hungary | Esztergom | Estergom Eztergom | Nr. 1; Nr. 2 |
| Fülel | Slovakia | Fíľakovo | Fulek | Nr. 1 |
| Léva | Slovakia | Levice | Leva | Nr. 1 |
| Nyitramalomszeg | Slovakia | Lipová | Malom Szegh | Nr. 1; Nr. 2 |

¹⁴¹ Nagyfalu, i.e. Nyitranagyfalu, the formerly independent settlement is part of the municipality of Branč (in Hungarian: Berencs) (Sk).

¹⁴² Bori, present day Bory (Sk).

¹⁴³ Lehotka, later Abaszállás, present day Lehotka (Sk).

Example for the *Glossary of the expressions in Latin*

Inclusum (Lat.) – ‘*annex*’

Registrum (Lat.) – ‘*record, list*’.