

**A 17<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY ODYSSEY IN EAST CENTRAL EUROPE  
A BIOGRAPHY OF JAKAB HARSÁNYI NAGY**

**Gábor Kármán**

**A DISSERTATION**

**in**

**History**

**Presented to the Faculties of the Central European University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy**

**Budapest, Hungary**

**2010**

**Supervisor: Professor Katalin Péter**

---

Copyright in the text of this dissertation rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained by the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

I hereby declare that this dissertation contains no materials accepted for any other degrees in any other institutions and no materials previously written and/or published by another person unless otherwise noted.

## Abstract

This PhD thesis is a biography of a 17<sup>th</sup> century petty nobleman from Transylvania, Jakab Harsányi Nagy, who fulfilled a variety of roles in his rather adventurous life. The first information shows him as visiting student at Western European universities, after which he became the Rector of the Nagyvárad College of the Reformed Church, where he was accused of sympathizing with the Puritans. After a short intermezzo as a Scribe in the Greater Chancellery of Transylvania, he became a diplomat of the Principality at the Sublime Porte. After seven years of service as an interpreter (“Turkish Scribe”) – during which he spent one year in the prison of the Seven Towers – he left Istanbul. In the following years, he became first a member of the court of Mihail Radu, Voievod of Wallachia, later a secretary to the exiled Voievod of Moldavia, Gheorghe Ștefan. In the company of the latter, he traveled through Hungary, Moravia and Muscovy, and represented his employer in the courts of Brandenburg and Sweden. In the last fifteen years of his life, he was the Court Counselor of Frederick William, the Great Elector of Brandenburg. It was also during his stay in Berlin that he wrote a book under the title *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico-Latina*, a textbook of Ottoman Turkish, which also functions as a description of the Ottoman Empire. The versatile character of his activities, as well as his relative insignificance for the “Great History” of his age, qualify him as a model protagonist for a “micro-historical” analysis.

The first part of the dissertation (chapters I–IV) offer a detailed reconstruction of Harsányi’s activities. Through his person, an analysis of the contexts in which he lived – some of which have received meager attention so far from earlier historiography, such as the micro-societies of the Transylvanian embassy at the Sublime Porte or the court of exiled Romanian Voievods – became possible. His contribution to 17<sup>th</sup> century Oriental Studies is also analyzed in this part of the thesis.

The second part (chapters V–VI) is dedicated to analysis of Harsányi’s writings from the perspective of questions related to his identity. First, his self-fashioning is described along two major elements: the “bureaucrat” (that is, the faithful, diligent and humble servant of the various princes under his career) and the intellectual (his attempts to gain higher prestige through an emphasis on his Latin education and intellectual skills). Connected to this, his adherence to Puritanism – a general assumption in the earlier historiography – is also put under scrutiny and inferences are traced between his rhetoric and debating methods and those of the contemporary Puritans in Hungary. Lastly, the question of Harsányi’s attitude towards the Turks in his writings is addressed. The difference between the image of the Turk in the *Colloquia* and the one drawn by his diplomatic correspondence is explained through changes in the circumstances in international affairs, in his authorial position as well as in his political agenda.

## Acknowledgments

This thesis could not have come to be without the help of numerous people and institutions, which I wish to acknowledge here. In the first place, I thank my supervisor, Katalin Péter for the unwavering support I enjoyed from her ever since I first mentioned the idea of this biography to her some eight or nine years ago, still as a graduate student. The constructively critical comments I have received from her on the drafts of the chapters were just as important for my research as her enthusiasm about the often rather unexpected turns in Jakab Harsányi's career that helped to keep my spirits high during the lengthy writing process.

During the years of research I have enjoyed the financial support of two research institutions. Without the scholarship and various grants I was awarded by the Central European University this work could have never been done, and I owe special thanks to László Kontler, who had been head of the Department of History during most of my studies, for all the support I have received from him both institutionally and personally. Since the Fall 2007, I have had the opportunity to work with the project "Ottoman Orient and East Central Europe" at the Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas in Leipzig. I am largely indebted to the head of the project, Robert Born, for including my dissertation in the scholarly program of the project, tolerating my applications to visit manuscript collections in unexpected places, and also for being constantly ready to carry in his backpack the piles of books I needed from the Berlin libraries. During my first research trip to German archives, I also enjoyed the financial support of Klebelsberg Kuno Foundation.

Parts of the text had been read by Radu Păun, Lovro Kunčević, Susan Zimmermann and my colleagues at the doctoral seminar of CEU – I am grateful to them for all their comments as well as for the feedback I received at various workshops and conferences where I had the opportunity to present some of my findings. I owe gratitude to all those who helped my writing process in all kinds of ways, including Meinolf Arens, Wendy Bracewell, Domagoj Madunić, Sarah McArthur, Alastair Hamilton, Ildikó Horn, Gáspár Katkó, Mária Pakucs-Willcocks, Matthias Riedl, Teodora Daniela Sechel, Nataša Štefanec, András Péter Szabó, István M. Szijártó, Gerald J. Toomer and Márton Zászkaliczky.

I have received valuable help from the staff of the libraries and archives I have visited. I am especially grateful for the staff of the Teleki Téka (Biblioteca Teleki-Bolyai, Târgu Mureș), who sent me a copy of the *Colloquia*, and Zsolt Simon, who mediated this arrangement for me. György Gömöri and Maxim Mordovin, in a very generous way, shared with me their own copies of archival materials otherwise not available for me. Many colleagues were helpful in tracking down the available copies of the *Colloquia* (see their names in Appendix I), for which I am very grateful. I could always count on the help of my colleagues Maria Falina and Nedim Zahirović with texts in Russian and Turkish respectively.

I strongly hope that Kati will also like this book after having had to share so much of her time as well with Jakab Harsányi Nagy.

## Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Biography and Social History	2
Earlier Historiography and Sources	8
<b>I. Beginnings of an Ecclesiastical Career</b>	<b>12</b>
I.1. Before Peregrination	14
I.2. Peregrination	24
I.2.1. <i>Franeker and Leiden</i>	25
I.2.2. <i>Cambridge and Edinburgh</i>	34
I.2.3. <i>Experiences During Peregrination</i>	44
I.3. The Puritan Rector?	51
<b>II. In the Service of the Prince</b>	<b>62</b>
II.1. The Office of the Turkish Scribe at the Sublime Porte	66
II.2. The Micro-Society of the Transylvanian Embassy in Constantinople	84
II.3. Living Conditions in Constantinople	102
<b>III. Years of Turmoil</b>	<b>112</b>
III.1. The Last Years in Transylvania	116
III.2. Hungary, Moravia, Muscovy	125
III.3. Stettin	136
III.4. Court Society by the Side of the Exiled Voievod	148
<b>IV. The Court Counselor of the Great Elector</b>	<b>162</b>
IV.1. In the Service of the Elector	168
IV.2. The <i>Colloquia Familiaria</i> : Genre and Sources	178
IV.3. The Afterlife of the <i>Colloquia Familiaria</i>	186
IV.4. A Hungarian Emigrant in Berlin	196

<b>V. The Bureaucrat and the Intellectual</b>	<b>211</b>
V.1. The Bureaucrat	216
V.2. The Intellectual	225
V.3. Harsányi, the Puritan?	239
<b>VI. Harsányi's Changing Image of the Turk</b>	<b>250</b>
VI.1. "A Turk" or "various Turks"?	251
VI.2. Elements of the Image	258
<i>VI.2.1. Greed</i>	259
<i>VI.2.2. Treachery</i>	263
<i>VI.2.3. Discipline</i>	266
<i>VI.2.4. Infidelity</i>	270
VI.3. A Positive Image of the Turks and Its Conclusions	274
<i>VI.3.1. What Made Harsányi's Image of the Turks Change?</i>	274
<i>VI.3.2. Different Conclusions: The Legate and the Interpreter</i>	280
<i>VI.3.3. Harsányi's Conclusions: A Plea for an Anti-Ottoman War</i>	285
<b>Instead of a Conclusion</b>	<b>294</b>
Appendix I: Known copies of the Colloquia	297
Appendix II: Eastern European Place Names	300
Bibliography	302

## Introduction

Visiting student at Western European universities. Rector of the distinguished College of Nagyvárad, accused of Puritan sympathies. Scribe at the Greater Chancellery of the Principality of Transylvania. Interpreter and diplomat at the Transylvanian embassy in Constantinople. Captive in the dreaded fortress of the Seven Towers. Chancellor of a Voievod of Wallachia. Secretary of an exiled Voievod of Moldavia, his representative at the Diet of Hungary and a member of the retinue during his journey to Muscovy. Diplomat at the court of the Crown of Sweden. Court Counselor of the Elector of Brandenburg and promoter of the Hungarian students in Berlin. Author of the only Early Modern treatise on the Ottomans written by a Hungarian.

So many roles, widely spread socially, professionally and geographically seem to be surely far too much to be included in a single person's lifetime, even in the troubled years of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. And yet, this list of occupations belonged to one historical character, Jakab Harsányi Nagy. The rather exceptional versatility of his career makes him an intriguing object of a biography. However it is not only his many adventures that draw attention, but also the opportunity he provides for a historical survey with his multiple careers and the various milieus surrounding him. Biographies of people from the second or third ranks of social elites (or those outside the elite) have always been very useful tools to learn about the history of more than just one person. The relatively smaller influence of these people on the course of Grand History rendered it possible to see how they fitted into the world of their contemporaries – instead of towering over them, as in the case of the classic biographies of Great (usually) Men. The extraordinary career of Harsányi provides the

opportunity to multiply this approach and get a deeper insight into various spheres of 17<sup>th</sup> century Central European social environments.

### ***Biography and Social History***

In recent historiography a growing interest is devoted to micro-historical attempts for interpreting fundamental questions of a period through biographies of people who were not leading members of the social elite. Although never pushed in the background in the market for historical books, biography has always been seen with suspicion from the side of historians. The differentiation between history – which explains events, developments or structures of the past – and biography – with its focus on a single person, and dedication to using naïve psychological theories to understand his actions – has never really disappeared, and the question whether biography (primarily that of leading politicians) can be accepted as academic history at all is still frequently raised today.<sup>1</sup>

The rising interest in the topics and methods of social history, marked by the influence of the Annales school only added to the doubts concerning the old style grand narratives about outstanding personalities. The members and followers of this movement, interested mainly in long-term structural changes have long been discrediting biography as a valuable tool of historical inquiry. In the 1980s, however, this was about to change, as one of the leading members of the third Annales generation, Jacques Le Goff demonstrated that biography, in a re-interpreted form, can

---

<sup>1</sup> Bo G. Hall, “Kan biografisk metod vara vetenskap?” (Can a biographic method be academic?), *Historisk Tidskrift* 126 (2007): 433–456. For a strict separation of the tasks of the historian and the biographer, see Alan John Percivale Taylor, “The Historian as a Biographer,” in *Biographie und Geschichtswissenschaft: Aufsätze zur Theorie und Praxis biographischer Arbeit*, Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit, no. 6, ed. Grete Klingenstein, Heinrich Lutz and Gerald Stourzh (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1979), 254–261.



indeed provide useful contributions for social history.<sup>2</sup> This development inside the Annales school was then reinforced by the appearance of various historiographic trends, usually summarized under the term microhistory.

From the 1970s on, microhistory established itself as a legitimate branch of social history. In the early years it had a strong character of counter-history to the grand narratives of traditional social history: by reducing the scope of research, it provided accounts that were more concrete and therefore made a more realistic impact, through being closer to the “small facts” and providing concrete possibilities of falsification. By focusing on individuals, it introduced the experience of ordinary people into history. This focus also rendered the many-sided analysis of a single phenomenon possible: while traditional social history always had to choose one or two aspects as an interpretative framework for explaining phenomena of decades, centuries or an even more *longue durée*, microhistory could afford to introduce actors and occurrences through more of the coordinates that specified their places in society.<sup>3</sup>

During the following years, the counter-history character of microhistory disappeared, and a *modus vivendi* was elaborated, in which neither microhistory nor traditional, long-term analyses have precedence. Bernard Lepetit used a metaphor borrowed from geography to describe this development: large-scale maps obviously contain more reduction than small-scale ones and therefore are further away from reality, but that does not mean that they are less real. They are useful for answering

---

<sup>2</sup> Jacques Le Goff, “Wie schreibt man eine Biographie?“, in *Der Historiker als Menschenfresser: Über den Beruf des Geschichtsschreibens*, Wagenbach Taschenbuch, no. 187 (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1990), 103–112. (Originally published in 1989).

<sup>3</sup> These three characteristics – with a completion of the readability and its ability to reach a broader public – were emphasized recently by István Szijártó, “Four Arguments for Microhistory,” *Rethinking History* 6, no. 2. (2002): 209–215.

different questions, and complete each other successfully in reaching a more nuanced knowledge on past centuries.<sup>4</sup>

The emancipation of biography can best be illustrated by the fact the Giovanni Levi, a well-known promoter of the Italian school of *microstoria* published a discussion of its methodological problems in the *Annales*, the very same journal that played such an important role in ruining its credits earlier.<sup>5</sup> From the four models of biography described by him it is “biography and context” which is most important for Harsányi’s case. Context has a double function in a biography. First, it serves to clarify the reasons of the protagonist’s activities which otherwise could seem unintelligible for historians of today and helps to avoid misunderstandings: by contrasting the case of the individual to those of his contemporaries, the relevance of his individual solutions becomes clearer. A famous example of this function is *The Return of Martin Guerre* by Natalie Zemon Davis, where the author has to discuss the elements of identity in 16<sup>th</sup> century rural France in order to understand how it was possible for somebody to play the role of someone else for years with the acceptance of the community.<sup>6</sup> Second, context can help in filling the gaps left by lack of sources: if no sources exist about a certain period of the protagonist’s life, suggestions can be offered by reference to his contemporaries. Although some historians call the attention that Early Modern lives, much more than Modern ones, show such a high level of dissimilarities which make it almost impossible to talk about an “average, representative career”, this should not deter the historian from making use of this

---

<sup>4</sup> Bernard Lepetit, “Architecture, géographie, histoire: usages de l’échelle,” *Genèses* 13 (1993 Automne): 118–138.

<sup>5</sup> Giovanni Levi, “Les usages de la biographie,” *Annales ESC* 44 (1989): 1325–1337. See also the methodological considerations about biography as an alternative to “historische Sozialwissenschaft”: Andreas Gestrich, “Einleitung: Sozialhistorische Biographieforschung,” in *Biographie – sozialgeschichtlich*, Kleine Vandenhoeck-Reihe, no. 1538, ed. Andreas Gestrich, Peter Knoch and Helga Merkel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 5–28.

<sup>6</sup> Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983).

second function of the context.<sup>7</sup> What is more, an awareness of the relativity of this approach can help him to avoid one of the pitfalls of this method: the risk that through an extensive reliance on context, the individuality of his protagonist would be faded away.

At the same time, as Levi points out, context does not have to be presumed as rigid, schematic and unchanging. Assuming a dynamic relationship between the individual and her context renders it possible to study how the protagonist of the biography tried the limits provided for him by his social environment and contributed to re-shaping them. The study of exceptional cases – and Harsányi's is certainly one of them – is very useful for pointing out not only the individual solutions of various historical actors to deal with problems surrounding them, but also to define the limits of action provided by the context, and show which were the ones that could be transgressed and which proved to be irresolvable. When these people, such as Menocchio, a 16<sup>th</sup> century miller from Friuli who through the rather individual interpretation of his readings created his own world-view,<sup>8</sup> come under the investigation of the historian, they present examples of what the most extreme possible activities were in their own society. When testing the limits offered by their contexts, they were reshaping it simultaneously. The case of Jakab Harsányi Nagy, with his great ambitions and frequent conflicts during his years in various services, provides an ample opportunity for this kind of enquiry. In addition, his biography also provides the opportunity to get some insight into micro-societies that largely remained

---

<sup>7</sup> Arthur E. Imhof, *Die verlorenen Welten: Alltagsbewältigung durch unsere Vorfahren – und weshalb wir uns heute so schwer damit tun* (Munich: Beck, 1985). The author reached the conclusion through prosopographic methods in historical demography: each case that he reconstructed had such individual features that generalization and averaging were meaningless, as nobody from the peasants he studied lived a life that would have at least been close to the average.

<sup>8</sup> Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (London: Routledge, 1980).

unstudied so far, such as that of the Transylvanian embassy in Constantinople, or the one surrounding Moldavian rulers in exile.

Connected to the problem of missing documentation and methods of filling in the gap is the other most important development in the writing of biography that took place in the last decades. Poststructuralist theories and the developments in the methodology of interpreting life-narratives – primarily transmitted to historiography by feminist authors – called the historians' attention on the constructed and dynamic character of the self.<sup>9</sup> Avoiding the “biographic illusion”, that is the presupposition of a ready-made, stable and consequent core of the personality which can be used to interpret the individual's entire career, came to be seen as one of the most important tasks of a biographer. For this purpose, there has been a growing interest in the analysis of the self-understanding and self-representation of historical agents, also understood as a dynamic process, with a special attention on its changing elements and emphases. The usual way of approaching this topic is through ego-documents, such writings of the individual from which the historian can derive information about his thoughts, physical or spiritual development and changes in his self-representation.<sup>10</sup> In most instances, diaries, memoirs, family correspondence are used – none of which are available in Jakab Harsányi Nagy's case. However, alternative sources have also been used as ego-documents: both types of sources that survive from the pen of the Hungarian intellectual – diplomatic reports as well as

---

<sup>9</sup> The impacts of the Annales' social history, and poststructuralist theory are highlighted as dominant influences on recent biography-writing by A. Lloyd Moote, “New Bottles and New Wine: The Current State of Early Modern Biographical Writing,” *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996): 911–927. See also Gestrich, “Einleitung,” 14–18.

<sup>10</sup> Benigna von Krusenstjern, “Was sind Selbstzeugnisse? Begriffskritische und quellenkundliche Überlegungen anhand von Beispielen aus dem 17. Jahrhundert,” *Historische Anthropologie* 2 (1994): 462–471.

supplications – have already been demonstrated to be useful for the purpose of such surveys.<sup>11</sup>

On the other hand, the theoretical approaches of poststructuralism also contributed to a stylistic change: the historians writing biographies, who traditionally tried to hide behind an authoritative voice of neutral story-teller, were successively allowed to come forward and gain an authorial voice of their own. The historiographic commonplace that the personality of the historian has just as much impact on the biography as that of the protagonist was thus becoming more and more represented in the text. This does not necessarily have to lead to the solution – which was nevertheless attempted by some – that the author herself appeared on the pages of the biography. The discussions around *The Return of Martin Guerre* by Natalie Zemon Davis aptly demonstrate the scope of conclusions to be drawn from this historiographical change.

In her famous book, the American historian claimed that “what I offer you here is in part my invention, but held tightly in check by the voices of the past.”<sup>12</sup> Provocative as “invention” sounds, it is misleading at the same time. As the later debate on the pages of *American Historical Review* made it clear, this does not mean that the historian has the right to force the interpretation created by her own fantasy on the source material. Instead, when the source material does not give a clear answer, she has the right to invent her own interpretation, which has to be not only self-

---

<sup>11</sup> Otto Ulbicht, “Supplikationen als Ego-Dokumente: Bittschriften von Leibeigenen aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts als Beispiel,” in *Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte*, Selbstzeugnisse der Neuzeit, no. 2, ed. Winfried Schultze (Berlin: Akademie, 1996), 149–174; Sven Externbrink, “Das Selbstporträt eines Diplomaten im 17. Jahrhundert: Giustiniano Priandis Memorandum für Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin aus dem Jahre 1644,” in *Formen internationalen Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Frankreich und das Alte Reich im europäischen Staatensystem: Festschrift für Klaus Malettke zum 65. Geburtstag*, Historische Forschungen, no. 71, ed. Sven Externbrink and Jörg Ulbert (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2001), 227–243.

<sup>12</sup> Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*, 5.

consistent, but also consistent with the existing sources.<sup>13</sup> As Carlo Ginzburg put it, the main distinction in the research and narrative of Davis is not centered around the categories of “true” and “invented,” but around “truths” and “possibilities,” which are nevertheless always clearly segregated.<sup>14</sup> Or, as Nina Rattner Gelbart put it: if the historian lacks the sources, she cannot do anything else than thinking aloud on paper, “ask questions and guess”. This would then obviously be *her* guess; nevertheless, it cannot be a free guess – it has to be “a very informed kind of wondering.”<sup>15</sup> The surviving sources about Harsányi’s career also leave some questions open, but when writing the biography, I have seen it as my task not to stop before at least attempting to find an answer to them, with extensive use of contexts – even if many of these answers I had to leave in conditional mood.

### ***Earlier Historiography and Sources***

Scholarly literature so far has not dedicated much attention to Jakab Harsányi Nagy’s person. It was mainly due to two reasons that he gained some fame in specialist circles. Hungarian historians have mentioned him frequently in connection with the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian Puritan movement, as he was generally regarded as a member of the group who, after returning from their studies at Western universities, propagated reform in church administration and liturgy in their home country.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Robert Finlay, “The Refashioning of Martin Guerre,” *American Historical Review* 93 (1988 June): 553–571, and Natalie Zemon Davis, “On the Lane” *ibidem* 572–603.

<sup>14</sup> Carlo Ginzburg, “Proofs and Possibilities: In the Margins of Natalie Zemon Davis’ *The Return of Martin Guerre*,” *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 37 (1988): 114–127.

<sup>15</sup> Nina Rattner Gelbart, “The Monarchy’s Midwife Who Left No Memoirs,” *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996): 1014–1015.

<sup>16</sup> See for instance: Jenő Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak a magyar református egyházban* (Puritan movements in the Hungarian Reformed Church), A Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság kiadványai, no. 28 (Budapest: Hornyánszky, 1911), 144; László Makkai, *A magyar puritánusok harca a feudálizmus ellen* (The struggle of Hungarian Puritans against Feudalism) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1952), 115; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *Erdélyi változások: Az erdélyi fejedelemség a török kiűzésének korában 1660–1711* (Changes in Transylvania: The Principality of Transylvania in the age of the

Among scholars of 17<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman Studies, however, Harsányi is known for an entirely different reason: the bilingual (Latin and Ottoman Turkish) treatise he composed about the state of the Ottoman Empire and published under the title *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico-Latina* in 1672.<sup>17</sup> This book became well-known especially after a modern edition of György Hazai in 1973.<sup>18</sup> The Hungarian Turcologist provided a linguistic analysis of the Turkish text of Harsányi's book – however, despite the keen interest of Ottomanists in the work, a historical interpretation of the text was not yet attempted.<sup>19</sup>

Also, the rather complex biography of Jakab Harsányi Nagy raised very little interest among historians so far. In most cases, he is introduced in footnotes and reference book entries, with short and unreliable summaries of his life. Even in the introduction of the *Colloquia*'s modern edition, György Hazai provided a rather fallacious and fragmentary account.<sup>20</sup> The longest existing biographical survey on Harsányi is János Herepei's ten page-long summary in his work about the teachers of

---

expulsion of the Turks from Hungary 1660–1711), *Nemzet és emlékezet* (Budapest: Magvető, 1984), 271.

<sup>17</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy, *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina seu Status Turcicus Loquens* (Cölln an der Spree: Schultz, 1672).

<sup>18</sup> György Hazai, *Das osmanisch-türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1973), 15–19. It seems that even on the linguistic field, the last word is not said about Harsányi's oeuvre, see the review of András J.E. Bodrogligeti, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 8, no. 2 (1977): 251–265.

<sup>19</sup> For the appreciation of the *Colloquia* in Ottomanist circles, let me quote two examples. Bernt Brendemoen refers to the “famous *Colloquia*” of Harsányi in his “Some Remarks on Claes Brodersson Rålamb and his Contemporaries,” in *Turcica et Orientalia: Studies in Honour of Gunnar Jarring on His Eightieth Birthday 12 October 1987*, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul Transactions, no. 1, ed. Ulla Ehrensverd (Stockholm: Svenska Forskningsintitutet Istanbul, 1987), 15, note 14. Cemal Kafadar is even more explicit in the assessment of the *Colloquia*: „the book that Harsany later penned on the Ottoman empire can easily be characterized as one of the most knowledgeable and perceptive works ever written on the subject in early modern Europe. It reflects not only the rigorous humanist education of its author but also the extraordinarily nuanced perspective that a Hungarian could have on the Ottoman world, partitioned and squeezed as his political space was between competing imperialisms, of which the Ottomans represented only one.”, see Cemal Kafadar, “The City That Rålamb Visited: The Political and Cultural Climate of Istanbul in the 1650s,” in *The Sultan's Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Rålamb Paintings*, ed. Karin Ådahl (Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2006), 61–62.

<sup>20</sup> Hazai, *Das osmanisch-türkische*, 15–19. His information is adapted by other scholars such as Ion Matei, “Contributions aux débuts des études de turcologie en Roumaine, XVI<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles,” *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 26 (1988): 103.

Nagyvárad College in the middle of 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>21</sup> Despite his mistakes, he has important contributions to Harsányi's life story, especially concerning the years he spent in Transylvania. However, due to the reference-like character of the volume, this article could obviously not make the claim of analysis or understanding the career in its context.

This meager earlier scholarly interest in Harsányi's biography is all the more remarkable, as a considerable amount of the sources, the correspondence from his years of duty in Constantinople, have already been available in printed form since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The source editions published by Sándor Szilágyi concerning the foreign policy of György Rákóczi II contain not less than sixty letters that bear Harsányi's signature.<sup>22</sup> Szilágyi and his co-operators made a good job, as re-visiting the relevant collections in the Hungarian State Archives (Magyar Országos Levéltár) produced no further findings.<sup>23</sup> For the later period of Harsányi's career, I was able to find eight letters he wrote to Swedish aristocrats at the State Archives (Riksarkivet) in Stockholm, and fifteen letters to Frederick William, the Elector of Brandenburg and his Secret Counselors at the Secret State Archives (Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz) in Berlin-Dahlem, together with numerous sources that shed new light

<sup>21</sup> János Herepei: „Adatok a Rákócziak váradi kollégiumának történetéhez” (Data concerning the history of the college of the Rákóczi in Nagyvárad), in *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keszérű (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966), 52–63.

<sup>22</sup> Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Okmánytár II. Rákóczy György diplomáciai összeköttetéseihez* (Documents on the diplomatic connections of György Rákóczi II), Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Ser. I. Diplomataria, no. 23 (Budapest: Eggenberger, 1874) (in the following: MHHD XXIII), and Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Erdély és az északkeleti háború* (Transylvania and the Northeastern war) (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1890–91) (in the following: EÉKH I/II).

<sup>23</sup> Magyar Országos Levéltár (in the following: MOL), Magyar Kamara Archivuma E 190 Acta familiae Rákóczi 43–44. d. The only surviving letter which was unknown from Harsányi's years in Constantinople had been preserved in the personal collection of Szilágyi, now available in the University Library of Budapest (ELTE Egyetemi Könyvtár) and was published by Edit Izsépy in *II. Rákóczi György levelezéséből 1646–1660* (From the correspondence of György Rákóczi II 1646–1660), Bibliotheca Universitatis Budapestiensis Fontes et Studia, no. 8 (Budapest: Egyetemi Könyvtár, 1992) (in the following: BUBFS VIII), 46–49.



on the environment around him. On the basis of these – with the addition of the possibly widest contextual evidence – the writing of Jakab Harsányi Nagy’s biography became feasible at last.

At the end of my introduction, I have to dwell a bit on technical questions as well. First of all, the name of the protagonist: although in the title page of the *Colloquia* the Latin version of his name (Jacobus Nagy de Harsany) is written, he used this form very rarely. Even in his international correspondence, he uses the Hungarian form (Harsányi Nagy Jakab) or, even more frequently, its abbreviated form (Harsányi Jakab or a Latinized version, Jacobus Harsányi). Therefore, I also decided to use the Hungarian form throughout the book, even if – due to György Hazai’s decision in the modern edition of the *Colloquia* – his name is better known for the Ottomanist scholarship in the Latin version. For the problem of place names in the Eastern part of Europe – always an individual and combatable decision to make – I opted for choosing only one version in the text and give all relevant variations in other languages in the appendix. I am using the chronology according to the Gregorian calendar in the main text – which has already been in use in Transylvania in the period of our concern, but not in Sweden or Brandenburg – and give it in brackets in the dating of those letters in the footnotes, which originally used the Julian calendar.

## I. Beginnings of an Ecclesiastical Career

From the period between 1521 and 1700, there are more than 2854 names of those Transylvanian young men known, who spent more or less time at Western European universities.<sup>1</sup> The only data we have about a majority of them is the date of their enrollment; but even if we have some knowledge about their later career, the only information at our disposal about their university years is the dry entries in the university *matricula*. There are little traces left about their studies, living conditions, experiences abroad; most of the letters they sent home are lost; the diaries they kept during their journeys and their *alba* – in which the scholars and fellow-students they met under their peregrination were requested to write wise gnomes and sentences – were in the meantime largely destroyed.

The case of Jakab Nagy de Harsány is not much different from that of the contemporary, non-aristocratic students visiting foreign universities. From the first thirty years of his life, we have a minimal amount of contemporary information related to his person, and no ego-documents whatsoever. The knowledge about his visits at universities can be distilled – apart from three entries at university registers – from later book dedications, memoirs, and indirect deductions. We can only be sure that Jakab Harsányi enrolled at the University of Franeker on the 19<sup>th</sup> of June, 1640, and later, on the 21<sup>st</sup> of July same year, at the University of Leiden, where he

---

<sup>1</sup> Miklós Szabó and Sándor Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a korai újkorban 1521–1700* (Early Modern Transylvanians visiting universities, 1521–1700), *Fontes rerum scholasticarum*, no. 4. (Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem, 1992). This register is, obviously, not complete: it mirrors the state of historiography in 1992. It was also not clearly defined by the authors what did they understand under the term “Transylvanian young man”, as the list includes also those people who went to peregrination from the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, although with a Transylvanian patron, therefore after their return, they held ecclesiastical offices in the Principality, see the note of András Péter Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja” (The peregrination of Gábor Haller), *Kút* 3, no. 3–4 (2004): 20, note 118.

matriculated once more, on the 6<sup>th</sup> of October 1642.<sup>2</sup> Even the information that he visited England and Scotland in the company of Pál Tarczali, comes not from a university matricula, but from a later reference.<sup>3</sup> After his return to Hungary, he taught at the college of Nagyvárad,<sup>4</sup> where he was reprimanded by the national synod of the Reformed Church in Szatmárnémeti in 1646.<sup>5</sup>

However, we don't have to be content with this rather lexicon-like enumeration. Although there was hardly any standardized career path among 17<sup>th</sup> century young men imagining their lives in the frames of the church and visiting Western European universities – that is, there is no ideal peregrination from which Harsányi's individual case could be deduced –, some regularities can nevertheless be drawn from contemporary sources. Taking into consideration secondary information about the circumstances of the places visited and the experiences of other

<sup>2</sup> „Jacobus Harzani, Ungarus, theol” Entry on the 19<sup>th</sup> of June 1640: Mr.S.J. Fockema Andreae and Drs.Th.J. Meijer, ed., *Album studiosorum Academiae Franekeriensis (1585–1811, 1816–1844)*, vol. 1, *Naamlijst der Studenten* (Franeker: Wever, 1968) (in the following: ASAF I.), 117. „Jacobus N. Harsanyinus Ungarus. 26, T.” Entry on the 21<sup>st</sup> July 1640, and „Jacobus Horsani Transylvanus. 27, T.” entry on the 6<sup>th</sup> of October 1642: *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae MDLXXV–MDCCCLXXV, accedunt nomina curatorum et professorum per eadem secula* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1875) (in the following: ASALB) vol. 1, 315, resp. 335. See also: Árpád Hellebrant, “A franekeri egyetemen tanúlt magyarok” (Hungarians who studied at the University Franeker), in *Történelmi Tár 1886* (in the following TT 1886), 605; resp. Friedrich Teutsch, “Die Studierenden aus Ungarn und Siebenbürgen an der Universität Leyden 1575–1875,” *Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* n.s. 16 (1880) (in the following AVSL XVI): 210.

<sup>3</sup> Pál Tarczali's son (under the same name) dedicated his dissertation in 1672 among others to Harsányi, with the following words: „generoso ac vere nobili viro D. D. Jacobo Harsanyi Ung. Quondam studiorum gratia in Germania, Anglia, et Scotia, unacum meo Parente peregrinanti; nunc vero Serenissimi Ducis Brandenburgici, etc. S. R. Imperii Electoris, Consiliario intimo, Domino, benevolo plurimum honorando.” Pál Tarczali, *Brevis dissertatio de vocatione gentium et conversione Judaeorum...* (Oxford: Lichfield, 1672). The book is listed in the register of the early Hungarian books (RMK) under the number III. 2596.

<sup>4</sup> His position as a teacher in the Nagyvárad college is testified by the dedication of two disputations, written by Hungarian students in the University of Utrecht: „D. Jacobo Harsanyi, D. Johanni Szeoleosi, in Celeberrima Schola Varadiensi Praeceptoribus diligentissimis, & admodum honorandis” Mihály Tofaeus, *Quaestio historico-theologica de Translatione Imperii a Grecis ad Francos* (Utrecht, 1647) (RMK III. 1691.); and „D. Iacobo Harsanyi, D. Johanni H. Szolosi, In Schola Illustri Varadina, Praeceptoribus assiduus amore & favore singulari mihi devinctis.” Péter Szatmári Baka, *Disputationum Theologicarum de signis. Pars VI.* (Utrecht, 1648) (RMK III. 1711.).

<sup>5</sup> „Jacobus Harsani conceditur ut in scholis, vocatus, doceat, hoc modo tamen, ut chirographo suo seu reversali obliget se, deinceps pastoribus ecclesiarum et senioribus, in omnibus honestis rebus obtemperatum et obtreactionibus valedicturum, neque quiquam innovatum contra disciplinam ecclesiasticam et ritus ecclesiae antiquitus receptas; si vero aliquid attentaverit ab ecclesia abscindatur.” Imre Révész, “A szatmár-németi zsinat végzései, eddig ismeretlen eredeti szerkezetökben” (The decisions of the synod of Szatmárnémeti, in a form unknown so far), *Sárospataki Füzetek* 4 (1860) (in the following SF IVa): 245.

contemporary university students, some hypotheses can therefore be constructed about the years of Harsányi in the academia, his living conditions and the motivations of the decisions made by him.

### ***1.1. Before Peregrination***

Similar to many of his contemporaries, even the name of Jakab Harsányi Nagy provides a riddle for posterity. In the early modern practice – leaving aside the aristocrats this time – it was usually only one of double last names that could be considered as family name. Names deduced from place names (“Harsányi” means “from Harsány”) usually designate place of origin: that is, where the person was born or at least started his adult life.<sup>6</sup> There are however cases from the 17<sup>th</sup> century when the designation “Nagy” (“Great”) is not the family name, rather a cognomen, used to differentiate between generations in a family. The situation is even more confusing as most contemporary sources referred to Jakab Harsányi Nagy only with the first part of his double last name: there is only one among the three matricula entries that includes also “Nagy”, and even in that case in an abbreviated form.

In Harsányi’s case, however, it is not very hard to interpret his name. The cognomen “Nagy” is only received when someone already has descendants to differentiate him from. In Harsányi’s case, it is rather unlikely: according to our knowledge, he never had children, and the first appearance of “Nagy” in his name would surely be too early for such a cognomen. What is more, many examples show from his Brandenburg period – among them, the title page of the *Colloquia* – that Harsányi consistently referred to himself as “Jacobus Nagy de Harsány”, which is

---

<sup>6</sup> The latter reservation is important because of people like Mihály Székelyhídi Tofaeus, whose family, according to János Herepei, must have moved from the village Tófő (in Baranya) or Tófej (in Zala) to the rather faraway Székelyhíd when Mihály has already been born, see Herepei: „Adatok”, 75–79.

again an argument for identifying Harsányi as a place of his origin and Nagy as his family name.<sup>7</sup>

In order to find out the year of Harsányi's birth, we have to turn to the university registers. It is a bit confusing that the register made in the summer 1640 states that he is twenty-six, while in October 1642 he is still only written to be twenty-seven, but this problem can be solved by assuming that the first data refers to it that he was turning twenty-six in that year, while the second shows that he already had turned twenty-seven. Thus the year of his birth can be pinned at 1615.<sup>8</sup> The place of his birth is not transmitted by any source, however, János Herepei is most probably right when he claims that Harsányi was born in the so-called Partium region, the Eastern part of the Kingdom of Hungary, ruled by the Prince of Transylvania.<sup>9</sup> All the more so, as Harsányi claims in the foreword of the *Colloquia* that he lost his goods, as well as his paternal house due to the Ottoman conquests in the late 1650s; and it was the territories at the Western–Southwestern part of the Principality which were affected by the Ottoman conquest.<sup>10</sup> If we take the “Harsányi” from his last name to designate a place of origin, his birthplace must be found in Körösnagyharsány (Bihar county).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See, with similar argumentation: Herepei, “Adatok”, 52.

<sup>8</sup> János Herepei, although he also uses the data of the university registers, does not discuss the problem provided by them, and defines 1614 as Harsányi's year of birth, see Herepei, “Adatok”, 52.

<sup>9</sup> Herepei, “Adatok”, 52–53. Herepei argues for a place of origin in the Partium with a reference to the fact that Harsányi is described sometimes as “Ungarus”, sometimes as “Transylvanus” in the university registers. This uncertainty may however also have another reason than the border position of the place of origin: János Apáczai Csere, who was Szekler and came from the territory of Transylvania proper, also was entered into the matricula of Franeker as “Ungarus”, see AVSL XVI, 212.

<sup>10</sup> The *Colloquia* is known in two versions, the description of his escape from Transylvania can be found in both, although in different forms: “per barbarorum tyrannidem, omnibus bonis, mediisque vivendi orbatum” (version A, dedication, 3.) and „relictis in manu hostis penatibus patriis” (version B, dedication, 2.).

<sup>11</sup> Herepei, “Adatok”, 52–53. A part of Romanian historiography claimed that Harsányi was a Romanian from Transylvania; Nicolae Iorga – who gave the “original” Romanian form of his name as „din Hârșani” – even suggested that he was a boyar from the Fogaras region. It is however not clear what they based their claim upon – most probably they assumed that going in exile with Gheorghe Ștefan was only possible for a Transylvanian Romanian. This is contradicted by the fact that Harsányi defined himself in every occasion as “Ungarus”, as it was already noted by Franz Babinger in Conrad Jacob Hildebrandt, *Dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise nach Siebenbürgen, der Ukraine und Constantinopel (1656–1658)*, ed. Franz Babinger (Leiden: Brill, 1937), 226. Cf. Nicolae Iorga,

As Körösnagyharsány was burned to ashes during the two sieges of Nagyvárád between 1658 and 1660 – so that the village that had been situated before on both shores of the Sebes-Körös, was rebuilt only on one –, the information from the dedication of Colloquia supports Herepei's identification.<sup>12</sup>

No further information is however available on Harsányi's family.<sup>13</sup> All that is sure is that they were noblemen, as many sources are known where Jakab Harsányi indicated his social position. It was not only the title page of his book where he labeled himself as “Nob[ilis] Ung[arus]”, but he also added this title to his signature on the letters to Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg in his first Berlin years.<sup>14</sup> Körösnagyharsány was one of the so-called *hajdú* settlements, where the irregular soldiers of the border zone were given land and nobility in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century on a massive scale. In the diploma, in which Prince György Rákóczi I confirmed the rights of the inhabitants, there are no less than five people noted with the family name of Nagy – any of these could have been Harsányi's relative, but it is also possible that his nobility derived from some other source.<sup>15</sup>

In Early Modern Hungary, where, in European comparison, a prominently high percent of the society was noble (especially in the *hajdú* towns), this title did not

---

“Scriitori domnești din arhivele dela Stockholm” (Voievodes' letters from the Stockholm archives), *Academia Română Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice Seria III* 10 (1929) (in the following ARMSI X): 512.

<sup>12</sup> János Csomor, *Körösnagyharsány krónikája* (The chronicle of Körösnagyharsány), Bibliotheca Bekesiensis, no. 19, ed. Lajos Köteles (Békéscsaba: Rózsa Ferenc Gimnázium, 1980), 17–23.

<sup>13</sup> Iván Nagy, the author of the classic work of Hungarian genealogy, identified the name “Harsányi” as family name, and mistakenly entered Jakab into the genealogy of the Harsányi family of Sárospatak and Nagyharsány, see his *Magyarország családai czimerekkel és nemzedékrendi táblákkal* (The families of Hungary with coats of arms and genealogical tables), vol. 5 (Pest: Ráth Mór, 1859), 58–59. Cf. Herepei, “Adatok”, 52.

<sup>14</sup> See the title page of Colloquia and Harsányi's letters to Frederick William (9 July 1667, and *sine dato*) Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (in the following GStA PK) I. Hauptabteilung Geheimer Rat, Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung, J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 2v, resp. Fasz. 2. fol. 11r. Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievod-in-exile of Moldavia, when he sent Harsányi to Sweden, referred to him also as „nobilissimus”, see his letter to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie: Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, ed., *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor* (Documents for the history of the Romanians), vol. 9, part 1 (Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1897) (in the following: DIR IX/1), 205. This edition followed the copy available of the Moldavo-Valachica collection at the Riskarkivet (Stockholm, in the following: RA), that has no address – there is however also one copy addressed to De la Gardie in RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500.

<sup>15</sup> The diploma (dated Nagyvárád, 5 May 1631) is published by Csomor, *Körösnagyharsány*, 14–16.

indicate wealth, not even a livelihood for a family with more than one children. For talented young men from the lower strata of nobility, the ecclesiastical career meant a chance for social advance just as well as for their fellows with a peasant or burgher origin. The rather adventurous career of Harsányi, his long stays abroad even before 1660 render it rather unlikely that he would have been a single heir of his family's estate, who would have lost his chance of living off the land's revenues only with the Ottoman conquest. A nobleman's estate would have suffered quite a lot of the seven years absence of its owner even if he would have been replaced by an extraordinarily reliable prefect. It is however remarkable that from the years of Harsányi's service as a diplomat we do not know any petition in which he would apply for a license to return from the Ottoman capital with a reference to his neglected estates – for which there are enough examples in his colleagues' correspondence.<sup>16</sup> It can thus be concluded that if there were some family lands at all, they were used by someone else, and Jakab Harsányi Nagy had to rely on his talent instead of family heritage in order to make his living: this is how he must have turned towards the career as a Reformed minister.

Nevertheless, I do not want to claim that he started his studies being aware of his talent, and in the hope of an ecclesiastical career; this must have been the result of his school-years. It is very likely that there was an elementary (so-called trivial) school in Körösnagyharsány, where the children from the town and its surroundings

---

<sup>16</sup> There are many examples in the letters of the resident envoys of Transylvania, see Gábor Kármán, “‘Átkozott Konstantinápoly’: Törökkép Erdély XVII. századi portai követségén” (“Damned Constantinople”: The image of the Turks in the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian embassy at the Porte), in *Portré és imázs: Politikai propaganda és reprezentáció a kora újkorban* (Portrait and image: Early Modern political propaganda and representation), ed. Nóra G. Etényi and Ildikó Horn (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2008), 47. Among others, the case of Boldizsár Sebessi can be quoted who petitioned to be replaced in his duty as resident envoy referring to, apart from his wife and child, also to the situation that “I suffer an inexpressible amount of losses and detriments”, see his letter to Prince György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 21 August 1635) Antal Beke and Samu Barabás, ed., *I. Rákóczy György és a Porta* (György Rákóczi I and the Porte) (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1888) (in the following: RGyP), 210.

could learn the catechism and the basics of reading and writing – that is, when they were lucky enough to have a teacher who was competent in these issues.<sup>17</sup> In the region it was customary that the children with noble titles but small estates (or no estates at all) went to elementary school together with the peasant children – which habit was fiercely castigated by Kelemen Mikes, who grew up in the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and saw one of the reasons of the general ill-breeding of Transylvanian noblemen in this habit.<sup>18</sup>

Harsányi, it seems, fell into lucky circumstances and his studies did not fail already at the first step: having learned to read and write, he could proceed to secondary school. According to the historiographic tradition – such as the editor of the great 18<sup>th</sup> century *Gelehrtenlexikon* of the Hungarian church and cultural history, Péter Bod – Harsányi was the student of the college of Nagyvárád. Although there are no direct data about this – the lists of the students in Nagyvárád, contrary to those of Sárospatak and Debrecen, are lost – it is still acceptable that the young man must have chosen the school of the nearby town, which is only 23 kilometers away from Körösnagyharsány.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> This was far from obvious, which is clear from the examples quoted by István György Tóth, *Literacy and Written Culture in Early Modern Central Europe* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2000), 5–46. The contemporary documents from the Bihar diocese did not survive until today, however, it is clear from data from the nearby dioceses of Abaúj, Borsod-Gömör-Kishont, Ung and Zemplén, that settlement similar in size to Körösnagyharsány did have elementary schools, see Dénes Dienes, *Minthogy immár schola mestert tartanak... Református iskolák Felső-Magyarországon 1596–1672* (As they already keep a schoolmaster... Schools of the Reformed Church in Upper Hungary, 1596–1672), Acta Patakina, no. 4 (Sárospatak: Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, 2000). From this volume it seems that the entirely incompetent schoolmasters – of whom there were so many in Vas county, analyzed by István György Tóth's study – were rather uncommon in the Protestant schools of the Eastern part of Hungary.

<sup>18</sup> See the „Turkish letter” of Mikes Kelemen dated Tekirdağ, 11 June 1725 in Kelemen Mikes, *Törökországi levelek és misszilis levelek* (Letters from Turkey and missiles), Mikes Kelemen összes művei, no. 1, ed. Lajos Hopp (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1966), 107.

<sup>19</sup> Péter Bod, *Magyar Athenas, avagy az Erdélyben és Magyar-Országban élt tudos embereknek, nevezetesebben a' kik valami, világ eleibe bocsátott írások által esmértesekké lettek, 's jó emlékezeteket fen-hagyták historiájok* (Hungarian Athenae, that is, the history of those erudite people, who lived in Transylvania and Hungary, and became known through a published work of theirs and left their good memory) ([Pozsony]: n. p., 1766), 351. With similar conclusions: Herepei, „Adatok”, 53.



There are no direct data about the curriculum of the college of Nagyvárád, but most probably it did not differ much from the one followed in contemporary Transylvania. The school-work was divided into five or six *classes*, which did not however mean that the entire curriculum had to be finished in the same amount of years: it was common to go to the same *classis* again in order to deepen the knowledge taught there, but outstanding students could also finish it faster than one year. The curriculum is best known from the college of Gyulafehérvár, the elite school of the Principality; and although it varied from place to place, there were always the linguistic and philological studies, and in the higher classes formal logics and rhetoric in its focus.<sup>20</sup> The only goal of this education that entirely neglected the realia – not only the natural sciences, which went through a speedy development in this age, but also history and geography – was that the graduating student would be able to read and write in Latin and would have basic skills in understanding (primarily Biblical) Greek texts.<sup>21</sup> It could however not been easy to achieve these goals: the methodology of contemporary education was mainly to let students learn complex grammatical systems by rote, through making them repeat them again and again, without providing any opportunity for the practical use of language. Many important educators of the age raised their voices against this practice; however, the system was rather slow to

<sup>20</sup> Károly Szabó, “A gyula-fehérvári Bethlen-féle főtanoda szervezeti szabályzata” (The by-laws of the high school founded by Bethlen in Gyulafehérvár), in *Történelmi Tár 1879* (in the following TT 1879), 797–805. From a comparative point of view, important data are provided by József Koncz, *A marosvásárhelyi evang. reform. kollégium története* (The history of the Ev. Reformed college of Marosvásárhely) (Marosvásárhely: Sztupjár, 1896), 599–600. The philosophical subjects of the highest, academic classes in the curriculum of Gyulafehérvár were not taught anywhere else in the Principality. On the different levels of schooling generally, see István Mészáros, *Középszintű iskoláink kronológiája és topográfiája 996–1948 (Általánosan képző középiskolák)* (A chronology and topology of secondary schools in Hungary 996–1948: Secondary schools with general curriculum) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1988), 30–47.

<sup>21</sup> According to Béla Csernák, even Hebrew was taught in the Nagyvárád school, but it is not clear on what source does he base this claim. The credibility of this information is rather questionable, as the language of the Old Testament was not even the part of the curriculum in Gyulafehérvár. Cf. Béla Csernák, *A református egyház Nagyváradon 1557–1660* (The Reformed Church in Nagyvárád 1557–1660) (Nagyvárád: Nagyváradi Református Egyház, 1934), 160. Imre Bán provides an excellent overview on the curricula and conditions of the Transylvanian colleges in his *Apáczai Csere János, Irodalomtörténeti könyvtár*, no. 2 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1958), 42–59; on Hebrew, see *ibidem*, 51.

change and this methodology surely continued to make the lives of students hard well into the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>22</sup> In addition, the success of a student depended on the personality of his teacher not only in the elementary, but also in the secondary level: a good schoolmaster or a talented *collaborator* – that is, a senior student who was commissioned to teach in the lower classes – could mean a lot of help.

It is probable that Harsányi, when he became a senior student, also proved to be talented enough to work as a *collaborator* in Nagyvárád. The above quoted Péter Bod claims even that “when he stayed in the college of Nagyvárád, he was the teacher of Prince Mihály Apafi I in his child years.”<sup>23</sup> This information, however, can hardly be accepted as credible, as Apafi never studied in the college of Nagyvárád: he started his school years in college exactly when Harsányi left for his peregrination – however, instead of Nagyvárád, he visited the college of Kolozsvár, later on Gyulafehérvár.<sup>24</sup>

The information given by the 18<sup>th</sup> century church historian is derived from the memoirs of Miklós Bethlen – or rather from misunderstanding it –, where the following can be read about Harsányi: “in his child years, he was the *praeceptor* of the Prince for a long time.”<sup>25</sup> If it was not in the college of Nagyvárád, where could

<sup>22</sup> The best known proposal for reform in Hungary and Transylvania, that of János Apáczai Csere, suggested a change in the methodology of teaching languages and the extension of the curriculum towards realia in the 1650s, see his inaugural speech in the academy of Gyulafehérvár in 1653: A bölcsesség tanulásáról (On the learning of wisdom), in *Magyar gondolkodók 17. század* (Hungarian philosophers, 17<sup>th</sup> century), Magyar remekírók, ed. by Márton Tarnóc (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1979), 609–655. Many other pedagogical works also advocated certain corrections in the teaching methods, see Dénes Dienes, *Keresztúri Bíró Pál (1594?–1655)* (Sárospatak: Author’s edition, 2001), 52–64.

<sup>23</sup> „[...] váradi kollégiumban laktában volt az első Apafi Mihály fejedelemnek tanítója gyermekkorában.” Bod, *Magyar Athénás*, 351. It is also clear that he was the source for Elek Horányi’s information: “Varadiensi in Collegio dum studeret, Michaelem I. Apaffium, Transilvaniae postea Principem, praestantibus disciplinis erudit.” Alexius Horányi, *Memoria Hungarorum et provincialium scriptis editis notorum*, pars 2 (Vienna: Loew, 1776), 675.

<sup>24</sup> Ernő Tóth, ed., *I. Apafi Mihály és II. Apafi Mihály erdélyi fejedelmek naplója* (The diaries of Mihály Apafi I and Mihály Apafi II, Princes of Transylvania) (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum, 1900), 2–3.

<sup>25</sup> Miklós Bethlen, “Élete leírása magától” (A description of his life by himself), in *Kemény János és Bethlen Miklós művei* (The works of János Kemény and Miklós Bethlen), Magyar remekírók, ed. by Éva V. Windisch (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1980), 663. In a similar way, Harsányi is addressed as “noster in tenerioribus annis praeceptor” in a letter written by Mihály Apafi I, dated Fogaras, 25 April 1672 (Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction), vol. 15, 1669–1674, Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1892) (in the following EOE XV), 270).

Harsányi be a teacher of the young Transylvanian nobleman who eventually – rather unexpectedly – became Prince of Transylvania? The term used by Bethlen, *praeceptor*, did not necessarily refer to a teacher in a college – sometimes it was also used for teachers in the elementary school.<sup>26</sup> Theoretically it would therefore be possible that Harsányi taught Apafi after finishing the Nagyvárad college but before starting his peregrination, in the elementary school. The would-be Prince was only eight years old in 1640; therefore he would have really met Harsányi “in his child years” in this case. However, in this period Apafi visited school in the family estate of Ebesfalva, which is located far away from Nagyvárad. Even if there was an elementary school in this rather small settlement, the village-owner’s son was certainly not sent to the same school as his peasants (the claim of Mikes, quoted earlier, sounds highly unlikely when applied to the aristocracy). Therefore Apafi must have referred to his private teachers when he wrote in his diary: “I learned under the hands of masters Suri and Csernátoni.”<sup>27</sup> We can even risk the assumption that he mentioned two names because the first one had died before he finished the elementary studies.<sup>28</sup> Apafi surely did not need more private teachers than these two, which suggests that Harsányi met him not under his elementary, rather under his secondary school studies, after the alumnus of Nagyvárad returned from peregrination. We will

---

This is however less surprising as Miklós Bethlen claims in his memoirs that the letter was written by him in the name of the Prince (see the page quoted above).

<sup>26</sup> Tóth, *Literacy and Written Culture*, 6.

<sup>27</sup> AMN 3.

<sup>28</sup> „Suri”, whose first name is not known, is referred to as “Mr Suri of good memory” by István Tolnai in his letter to György Rákóczi I (Sárospatak, 15 April 1641) Sándor Szilágyi, “I. Rákóczy György fejedelem levelezése Tolnai István sárospataki pappal” (The correspondence of Prince György Rákóczi I with István Tolnai, minister in Sárospatak), *Protestáns Egyházi és Iskolai Lap* 18 (1875) (in the following: PEIL XVIII): 1446. The identification of “Csernátoni” is not less problematic. The only person known from this decade with this last name, a student called István, enrolled at the University of Leiden on the 21<sup>st</sup> August 1641, which excludes him from the circle of eligible solutions, because – if Suri really died – there would have been no one left in Ebesfalva to finish the elementary studies with Apafi until June 1642, when he left for the college of Kolozsvár. Cf. Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, 262 (Nr. 2630).

come back later to this deduction, which is rather important from the point of view of the biography.

Even if he did not teach Apafi in this period, Harsányi surely had a lot of students under his years in the college – and probably even directly after them. People graduating from colleges could in most cases not go and visit academies abroad immediately: they had to prove their diligence as schoolmasters in elementary schools – as well as returning thereby the services they received from the Church and their patrons during their studies. István Tolnai, minister of Sárospatak, who, because of his office had a major influence on the selection of the students the Prince of Transylvania would send abroad, explained to György Rákóczi I exactly in this period: “I, Your Highness, always found an *academicus* more useful who had earlier been tried in a town school.”<sup>29</sup> This was not a universal practice – Tolnai mentions a student who was sent to peregrination immediately despite his reservations – but it seems to have been rather common in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century.

If we also consider the age of Harsányi when he started his peregrination, it also suggests that he must have served as a schoolmaster somewhere before going abroad. For a student with a great talent – and if Harsányi was allowed to peregrinate, he had to be one – twenty-five years was a relatively high age for having spent all of his life in the college before. There are some known cases when students changed colleges, which could lengthen the study years – Apáczai, for instance, visited Gyulafehérvár after the first years in Kolozsvár –, but in Harsányi’s case we have no data about his studies anywhere else. The most obvious interpretation would therefore

---

<sup>29</sup> “Én kegyelmes uram mindenkor több hasznát vettem az olyan *academicus*nak, az kik elsőben valamely városi scholában próbáltattak meg.” See the letter of István Tolnai, quoted in the previous note (p. 1446.). On this practice, see also Réka Bozzay, “Der finanzielle Hintergrund der “peregrinatio academica” der ungarländischen Studenten an den niederländischen Universitäten,” in *Studiosorum et librorum peregrinatio: Hungarian–Dutch Cultural Relations in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century*, ed. August den Hollander, István Monok and Ferenc Postma (Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam; Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 2006), 26.

be that he also had to teach some years in an elementary school before getting a scholarship for starting his peregrination.

This, that is, the scholarship was the last important step to take: the talented student also had to have a patron who would finance his university studies. It had to be covered from domestic sources: while 18<sup>th</sup> century Dutch universities provided scholarships from their own budget for Eastern European students, hundred years before this was not yet in practice.<sup>30</sup> 17<sup>th</sup> century students still had a variety of options at hand. Some colleges had a separate pay-box dedicated to this purpose: the college of Debrecen, for instance, used some salt revenues, granted to them by the Prince of Transylvania, to fill this budget.<sup>31</sup> If he could not get a stipend from these funds, the student still had the option to turn to private persons or the councils of various towns.<sup>32</sup> Often, however, it was the teachers of the college or – in the case of István Tolnai, quoted above – influential ministers who decided the allotment of scholarships offered by aristocrats, taken into consideration the earlier progress and diligence of the applicant, and also their own long-term preferences.<sup>33</sup> Harsányi must have received

<sup>30</sup> Ödön Miklós, “Magyar diákok a leydeni Staten Collegeben” (Hungarian students in the Staten College of Leiden), *Theologiai Szemle* 4 (1928): 290, 295; Bozzay, “Der finanzielle Hintergrund”, 27–28; Réka Bozzay, “Leiden, a gondoskodó egyetem: Magyarországi diákoknak nyújtott juttatások és kiváltságok a leideni egyetemen a 17–18. században” (Leiden, the university that takes care: Benefits and privileges given to students from Hungary at the University of Leiden in the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), *Századok* 160 (2006): 986–993.

<sup>31</sup> László Makkai, “Debrecen iskolájából az ország iskolája (1660–1703)” (From the school of Debrecen to the school of the country (1660–1703), in *A debreceni református kollégium története* (History of the Reformed College of Debrecen), ed. József Barcza (Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1988), 51. Makkai supposed that the Rector of the college, György Martonfalvi Tóth asked Apafi to give them the donation in 1664 on the basis that the college of Debrecen was united with that of Nagyvárád – earlier supported by the Princes of Transylvania – after the Ottoman conquest of Nagyvárád in 1660 (the rector himself came also from Nagyvárád). This must have misled Réka Bozzay to write (Bozzay, “Der finanzielle Hintergrund”, 26.) that the Transylvanian salt revenues were already used by the college of Nagyvárád thanks to Apafi’s donation. It is not possible, as Apafi became prince only after the closing-down of the college.

<sup>32</sup> Stipends given by the council of Debrecen are quoted by Bozzay, “Der finanzielle Hintergrund”, 27.

<sup>33</sup> Tolnai writes about one of the students (in his letter quoted in note 28, p. 1446.) that “I sent him with the money of the late Mr. Herczeg” – which means that the student, Mihály Szentpéteri received a scholarship from someone’s bequest to visit academies abroad, that was however allotted to him by the minister of Sárospatak. In the same letter, Tolnai writes in a despondent tone that one of the students going to foreign universities will be selected by his personal opponent, János Tolnai Dali, which implies that the student will surely not be of his taste.

his scholarship from the Nagyváradi college – this can be deduced by the fact that he taught some years in the college after his return, supposedly as a repayment of the sums given to him for his journey.<sup>34</sup>

## 1.2. Peregrination

Visiting universities abroad was necessary for Hungarian and Transylvanian students from the Middle Ages until the 19<sup>th</sup> century because their home country lacked the institutions which would have provided higher education. Although the first university in Hungary that survives until today was founded in 1635 in Nagyszombat, this was a Catholic seminary supervised by the Jesuit Order, and therefore had no appeal to Protestant students – and the Prince György Rákóczi I did everything to keep even the Catholic youth from his country away from it.<sup>35</sup> The Gyulafehérvár college had academic classes and some of its professors did not shy away from calling their working place “universitas”; however, this institution had no right to give higher academic titles: those young men from Hungary and Transylvania who wanted to participate in university education, had to leave the country.<sup>36</sup> The traditional goals of

<sup>34</sup> The information we have about students teaching in colleges after their return from the peregrination, comes mostly from the case of Sárospatak: in the 1630–40s it was István Tolnai who supervised the delegation of the alumni to various posts. He was keen on keeping the manpower planning at the college in sight when deciding about the allocation of stipends: in 1638, he advised the Prince not to send anyone for peregrination, as the needs of the college had already been covered by those who already were abroad. See his letter to György Rákóczi I (Sárospatak, 23 April 1638) PEIL XVIII: 1348.

<sup>35</sup> Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction), vol. 10, 1637–1649, Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1884) (in the following EOE X), 383.

<sup>36</sup> Isaac Basire, for instance, who taught at Gyulafehérvár between 1655 and 1658, wrote in the *album amicorum* of C.J. Hildebrandt: “Isaacus Basirius, S. S. Theol. D: ac publicus Professor in *Universitate Albensi Transylvaniae*.” *Conrad Jacob Hildebrandt's Dreifache Schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise nach Siebenbürgen, der Ukraine und Constantinopel (1656–1658)*, ed. by Franz Babinger (Leiden: Brill, 1937), 51 (italics added). The general assumption that Gábor Bethlen wanted to found a university in Gyulafehérvár, is questioned by Katalin Péter, who describes the college not as an academy, rather as a secondary school with extraordinarily good circumstances, see her “Az erdélyi magyar iskolázás a 16. és a 17. században (Hungarian schools in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvania), *A Ráday Gyűjtemény évkönyve* 7 (1994): 8–10. On the conditions and motivations of the peregrination, see István Rácz, “A magyarországi protestáns peregrináció szükség szerűsége és lehetőségei” (The necessity and opportunities of Hungarian Protestant peregrination), in *Politikai gondolkodás – műveltségi áramlatok: Tanulmányok Irinyi Károly professzor születésének 60. évfordulója tiszteletére* (Political thought –

Protestant peregrination, formed in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, were in the German lands, but the Lutheran university of Wittenberg was, from all Transylvanians, visited only by the Lutheran Saxons in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. For the Calvinists of Transylvania, the focus was replaced under the Thirty Years War – and especially after 1622, when Heidelberg, that had had outstanding importance until then, was occupied by Catholic Bavarian and Spanish troops – to the universities of the Netherlands, and, in a certain level, England.<sup>37</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy, who visited exactly these countries during his peregrination, followed thus the route of many of his contemporaries – apart from his rather surprising detour to Scotland.

### *1.2.1. Franeker and Leiden*

It was not only in a metaphorical sense that Harsányi had to walk a long way before he could enroll at the University of Franeker: after he had finished his studies at the college, spent some time teaching in an elementary school and secured the financial background of his peregrination, the physical distance also presented serious obstacles for the would-be theologian. In 17<sup>th</sup> century terms, the route between the Partium and Friesland would have been enormously long even if the travelers would not have been forced to make detours. In the times of the Thirty Years War ravaging in the Holy Roman Empire, Hungarian and Transylvanian students however seldom risked to expose themselves to the incalculable changes of military situation: instead, they

---

intellectual movements. Studies for the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of Professor Károly Irinyi) (Debrecen: Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem Történelmi és Klasszika-Filológiai Intézet, 1992), 133–142.

<sup>37</sup> On the shift of the location of universities visited by Transylvanian students, see Sándor Tonk and Miklós Szabó, “Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a középkor és a koraujkor folyamán” (Transylvanians visiting universities in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period), in *Régi és új peregrináció: Magyarok külföldön, külföldiek Magyarországon* (Old and new peregrination: Hungarians abroad, foreigners in Hungary), ed. Imre Békési et al. (Budapest: Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság; Szeged: Scriptum, 1993), vol. 2, 494–496.

chose a long diversion and reached the Netherlands on sea.<sup>38</sup> We have some counterexamples as well: János Apáczai Csere crossed the territories of Brandenburg in 1648, just before the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia, in order to follow the Elbe and reach the Dutch Republic through Hamburg.<sup>39</sup> Then the Electorate of Brandenburg had however no longer been participating in the war since seven years, and most of the military activities took place in Southern Germany and Bohemia – Apáczai therefore did not have to fear any more dangers than a usual 17<sup>th</sup> century traveler.<sup>40</sup>

For Harsányi however, this continental route was not an option, as Brandenburg was in this period still one of the major battlefields between the Swedish and Imperial troops.<sup>41</sup> The students known from this age chose almost exclusively the sea route; they boarded the ships usually in Danzig. There were however several ways to reach this most important port of Royal Prussia. It was a popular solution to travel to Breslau through Upper Hungary, and from there to follow the line of the Oder. One of the advantages was that this route led through Frankfurt an der Oder, and many students also matriculated at the university of this town, which, after the fall of Heidelberg, was probably the most prominent Calvinist academy in Germany. Frankfurt was however repeatedly occupied by various troops after the 1630s, and in February 1640, another Swedish garrison settled in the town.<sup>42</sup> No wonder that in

<sup>38</sup> On the various routes used under the Thirty Years War, see A.P. Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja,” 12–14.

<sup>39</sup> Bán, *Apáczai*, 83–87. The same route was followed later by János Horváti Békés, see his *Diáknaplója* (Student diary), *Peregrinatio Hungarorum*, no. 6, ed. Gábor Pintér and Hedvig Gácsi (Szeged: JATE BTK, 1990), 33–35.

<sup>40</sup> On the dangers awaiting Early Modern travelers, see Antoni Mańczak, *Travel in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995); Holger Thomas Gräf and Ralf Pröve, *Wege ins Ungewisse: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Reisens 1500–1800*, Fischer Taschenbücher, no. 15081 (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2001).

<sup>41</sup> On the role of Brandenburg in the Thirty Years War, see Ernst Opgenoorth, *Friedrich Wilhelm: Der Grosse Kurfürst von Brandenburg* (Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1971–1978), vol. 1, 72–89.

<sup>42</sup> Wolfgang Jobst, “Kurze Beschreibung der Alten Löblichen Stat Franckfurt an der Oder...,” in *Memoranda Francofurtana*, ed. by Johann Christoph Becmann (Frankfurt an der Oder: Eichhorn, 1676), 70. On the relevance of the university in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, see Günter Mühlhpfordt, “Die Oder-



1639–40, we find only two Hungarians in the university matricula.<sup>43</sup> It would therefore be not surprising if Harsányi would not have chosen this way – in any case, he did not matriculate at the University. He followed probably rather the route of the author of the only Hungarian travelogue published in the Early Modern period, Márton Szepsi Csombor, who sailed north along the Vistula, visiting also Warsaw on his way.<sup>44</sup>

After the students left Danzig, they only had to survive the boat trip around Denmark to reach the Netherlands. The sea meant generally a great discomfort for Hungarian students: those travelogues that mention crossing the sea at all, usually dedicate some passages to the shock the storm at open sea meant for them. It is all the more relevant, because they usually do not complain about the hardship of continental journey: it was most probably the extraordinariness of the experience, having survived a danger unknown till then, that released their loquacity. András Csehi summarized the experience of many students when he wrote:

It is thus so that as long as I was out in the roaring sea, I was much shaken for three weeks by the huge ship because of the labor of the merciless waves, but as soon as I reached mainland, all my previous miseries were just gone, as if they would have never existed, or as if I would have been born again.<sup>45</sup>

---

Universität 1506–1811,” in *Die Oder-Universität Frankfurt: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*, ed. Günther Haase and Joachim Winkler (Weimar: Böhlau, 1983), 47–53. On the peregrination of the Hungarian students to Frankfurt generally, see Sándor Ladányi, “Ungarische Studenten an der Universität Frankfurt an der Oder,” in *Iter Germanicum: Deutschland und die Reformierte Kirche in Ungarn im 16.–17. Jahrhundert*, ed. András Szabó (Budapest: Kálvin, 1999), 214–220.

<sup>43</sup> In 1639, it was István Szilágyi Benjámín (who will show up again later on in this chapter) who enrolled, while in 1640, János Patai was matriculated, see Ernst Friedlaender, ed., *Aeltere Universitäts-Matrikel I. Universität Frankfurt a. O.*, vol. 1, 1506–1648, Publicationen aus den K. Preußischen Staatsarchiven, no. 32 (Stuttgart: Hirzel, 1887) (in the following: PKPS XXXII), 744–745.

<sup>44</sup> Márton Szepsi Csombor, *Europica varietas*, ed. Péter Kulcsár, (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1979), 103–122.

<sup>45</sup> “Ugy van mindazáltal, hogy míg a zugó tengeren voltam, eléggé megrostált az a nagy otromba hajó a kegyetlen habok hánykodásai miatt közel három hétig, de mihelyt a szárazra kaphattam csak olyan lön mind ezelőtt való nyomorúságom, mintha soha nem is lett volna, avagy mintha ujjonnan születtem volna”. András Csehi’s letter to the Council of Nagybánya ([1648]) Lajos Kaposi, “A régiek” (The ancients), *Magyar Protestáns Egyházi és Iskolai Figyelő* 6 (1884) (in the following: MPEIF VI), 268.

We don't know whether Harsányi had to face similar woes, but surely it was also a comforting feeling to have reached the first goal of his journey, Franeker. The university of Friesland – founded in 1585, second only to Leiden in the row of early Dutch university foundations – counted as the “most Hungarian” institution of higher education in the period: between 1623 and 1794, a yearly average of ten Hungarian students enrolled to it. Their numbers were the highest exactly in the decade of Harsányi's visit, the 1640s: one eighth of the 110–120 students per year that the university had, came from Hungary and Transylvania.<sup>46</sup> The rate of Hungarians is even higher if we only take the faculty of theology into account: from all the students enrolled as “Ungarus” between 1640 and 1649, 115 came to this faculty, and only two to the others (to liberal arts, respectively law).<sup>47</sup> During the years from 1638 to 1640 – directly before the arrival of Harsányi – 98 students enrolled at the faculty of theology, of which a third, 37 students were Hungarians.<sup>48</sup> This condition certainly rendered the adaptation of the newcomers to the new circumstances easier, as they

---

On the phenomenon generally, see András Péter Szabó, “Haller Gábor naplójának forrásai” (The sources of the diary of Gábor Haller), in *Emlékezet és devóció a régi magyar irodalomban* (Memory and devotion in the old Hungarian literature), ed. Mihály Balázs and Csilla Gábor (Kolozsvár: Egyetemi Műhely – Bolyai Társaság, 2007), 416–417.

<sup>46</sup> J. A. H. Bots and W. Th. M. Frijhoff, “De studentenpopulatie van de Franeker academie: Een kwantitatief onderzoek (1585–1811)” (The student population of the Academy of Franeker: A quantitative analysis 1585–1811), in *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), Fryske Akademy, no. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985), 57–62. The data related to the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries is from Sándor Ladányi, “Magyar diákok a franekeri egyetemen” (Hungarian students at the Franeker University), *Confessio* 10, no. 4 (1986): 71.

<sup>47</sup> Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, “Buitenlandse studenten aan de Franeker universiteit 1585–1811” (Foreign students at the Franeker University 1585–1811), in *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), Fryske Akademy, vol. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985), 74–76, charter nr. 1. As we have seen in Harsányi's case, even students coming from the Principality of Transylvania could be registered as “Ungarus”. It is therefore regrettable that the author grouped those enrolled as “Transylvanus” together with the Bohemians and Moravians, separating them from Hungarians. Without doing her research once more, it remains unclear how many of the ten theologians and one student of arts in this category should be added to the number of Hungarians.

<sup>48</sup> ASAF I: 109–119.

already found a massive student body of their compatriots, who could help them getting through the first problems.

This informal help also stood at Harsányi's disposal. Just like the majority of the Hungarian students, he arrived to the Netherlands during the summer: although the academic year started in February, most of them were reluctant to endure the hardships of travel at winter.<sup>49</sup> Harsányi did not arrive alone: there were another two "Hungarus" students enrolling on the same day with him, Mátyás Gönczi and Péter Redmetzi.<sup>50</sup> They must have traveled together most of the way, all the more so, because Redmetzi seems to have gone abroad from the college of Debrecen, which is very close to Nagyvárád; while Gönczi – whose last name suggests an Upper-Hungarian origin – probably joined somewhat later.<sup>51</sup> Harsányi however did not grasp the opportunities offered by the "Hungarian colony" at Franeker: his stay there was not even enough for starting to accommodate himself, as after a month, he was already signing the Leiden matricula.

We do not know what the reason for Harsányi's speedy departure was. Although three fourths of the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian students enrolled only at one university, it was not uncommon that a student, after having spent one or two semesters at one institution, decided to visit another one. Compared to these, Harsányi's stay in Franeker was rather short – nevertheless, it was by no means a record: more than twenty-five cases are known from the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries, when

<sup>49</sup> Réka Bozzay, "Debreceni diákok a leideni egyetemen a XVII. században" (Students from Debrecen at the 17<sup>th</sup> century University of Leiden), *Debreceni Szemle* 10 (2002): 311.

<sup>50</sup> ASAF I: 117., their names are written in the form of "Matthias Gunzi" and "Petrus Redmetzi".

<sup>51</sup> A certain Péter Redmetzi was enrolled at the college of Debrecen in 1631, see Etele Thury, *Iskolatörténeti adattár* (Database for school history), vol. 2 (Pápa: Országos Református Tanáregyesület, 1908), 112. We know even less about Mátyás Gönczi: he cannot be found either in any database of church history, or in the lists of the students of the Debrecen, Sárospatak, and Szatmár colleges. Cf. Thury, *Iskolatörténeti adattár*; Richárd Hörcsik, *A sárospataki református kollégium diákjai 1617–1777* (Students of the Reformed Church of Sárospatak 1617–1777) (Sárospatak: Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, 1998); László Bura, *Szatmári diákok 1610–1852* (Students in Szatmár 1610–1852), *Fontes rerum scholasticarum*, no. 5 (Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem Régi Magyar Irodalom Tanszék, 1994).

there was less than one month between the matriculations of Transylvanian students at different universities.<sup>52</sup> Hypothetically, it can be supposed that Harsányi went through Franeker only because of his fellow travelers, and then he left for his original goal, Leiden. In this case however, it would have not been necessary to pay the expenses of the *immatriculatio* in the Frisian university. The only feasible explanation therefore seems to be that he wanted to study in Franeker, but in a short time after his enrollment he changed his mind due to a reason unknown to us.

It is very unlikely that his sudden change of mind would have been caused by concerns against the quality of the training in Franeker, as the faculty of theology at the Frisian academy enjoyed an outstanding reputation. It was seven years ago then that the best known teacher of the university, the English William Ames – who had to leave his home because of his Puritan ideas, and who had many Hungarian students, participating in the disputation of his work written against the Jesuit Robert Bellarmino – had left the town and died shortly afterwards. Ames was not satisfied with the results he achieved in Franeker – primarily concerning the transformation of the life of the university community in a Puritan manner, with special attention on keeping the Sabbath –, but the theologians he educated nevertheless continued to spread his practical theology, based on a deeply experienced faith.<sup>53</sup> As it is clear from

---

<sup>52</sup> The record is most probably held by Ferenc Bányai, in whose case the difference between his enrollment in Leiden and Franeker was only five days (!). See Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, nr. 550. According to the research of these authors, 75.8 % of the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian students visited one university, 16% two, 5.5% three and only the very small remaining rest attended more than that. See Szabó and Tonk, “Erdélyiek egyetemjárása”, 497. There were nevertheless some who did not find it necessary to sign the university matricula: Dávid Bethlenfalvi, who tutored Gábor Haller in his peregrination, knew that the young aristocrat had planned to send him back to Transylvania some days after their arrival to Franeker, therefore he did not matriculate there, see A.P. Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja,” 18.

<sup>53</sup> Keith L. Sprunger, “William Ames and the Franeker Link to English and American Puritanism,” in *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), Fryske Akademy, no. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985), 266–270. On the relations to the Hungarian students to Ames, see Imre Czegle, “Amesius korai magyar tanítványai” (The early Hungarian students of Amesius), *Acta Historiae Litterarum Hungaricarum* 10–11 (1971): 107–123; also Dienes, *Keresztúri Bíró Pál*, 37.

the numbers quoted above, the popularity of the university did not decrease among the Hungarian students after Ames left; and they continued to be present in the public life of the academy as well: still in the year of 1640, Mátyás Gönczi, who arrived with Harsányi, was already a respondent at two disputations. He decided not to leave Franeker afterwards either: in 1642, he received his doctorate there.<sup>54</sup>

The fellow traveler, with whom Harsányi arrived in Leiden, had already spent one and a half years in Franeker before, and even his disputation was published there in 1640. It is thus more understandable in the case of János Debreceni Balyik, why he followed the general custom of – Dutch as well as foreign – Franeker students to leave the academy and go to the much bigger Leiden University, which was regarded as the best institution for higher education in the Netherlands.<sup>55</sup> Although the two students were approximately the same age, it is unlikely that they had stood in contact earlier: the data known about their early career do not seem to coincide, as Balyik, who was the descendant of one of the most important artisan families in 17<sup>th</sup> century Debrecen, studied in the college of that town and started his peregrination earlier than Harsányi.<sup>56</sup> Therefore we can only assume that it was after his arrival that Harsányi

<sup>54</sup> Mátyás Gönczi features with two pieces (“De officio Christi” and “De sanctificatione et cultu Dei per bona opera lege morali praecepta”) in the collection published in 1640 under the title *Collegium Hungaricum*, that contains the Franeker disputations of fifty-one Hungarian students, see Ferenc Postma and Jakob van Sluis, *Auditorium Academiae Franekerensis: Bibliographie der Reden, Disputationen und Gelegenheitsdruckwerke der Universität und des Athenäums in Franeker 1585–1843*, Fryske Akademy, no. 760 (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1995) Nr. 51/1640.9a/36, 50. His doctoral thesis was also published in Franeker under the title „Theses theologicae ex nono Decalogi praecepto depromptae” (Ibid. Nr. 28/1642.2). On the practice of disputations, see Czeglé, “Amesius”, 122–123.

<sup>55</sup> The name of Balyik is found in the matricula in the following form: “Johannes Balyick Debrecinus Ungarus. 27, T[eologus]” ASALB I: 315. He enrolled at Franeker University on the 18<sup>th</sup> of November 1638 (“Johannes Debrecen, Hungarus, theol[ogus]” ASAF I: 112. His disputation (“Disputatio theologica de Deo”) was also published in the collection *Collegium Hungaricum* (Postma and van Sluis, *Auditorium*, Nr. 51/1640.9a/5). Most of the students who left Franeker went on to study in Leiden, see Bots and Frijhoff, “De studentenpopulatie”, 66. The same trend can be seen among foreign students, see Ridder-Symoens, “Buitenlandse studenten”, 83.

<sup>56</sup> Bozzay, “Debreceni diákok”, 313. On the role of the Balyik (or Balyk) family in the secular elite of Debrecen, see István Szendrey, “Debrecen, a mezőváros” (Debrecen, the market town), in *Debrecen története 1693-ig* (The history of Debrecen until 1693), Debrecen története öt kötetben, no. 1, ed. István Szendrey (Debrecen: n. p., 1984), 182; Dávid Csorba, “A’ sovány lelket meg-szépíteni”: *Debreceni*

got acquainted with Balyik, who was about to leave to Leiden, and the alumnus of the Nagyváradi college decided to give up his earlier enrollment and join the other student.

If the motivation of his decision was to find a town that is larger and more vibrant than Franeker, then Harsányi chose well: Leiden, called “Paradisus terrestris”, a Paradise on Earth by Márton Szepsi Csombor, was the second largest town of the United Provinces, with around 50.000 inhabitants.<sup>57</sup> Although it was an important centre of textile industry as well, its economy was mainly built on the university, the oldest in the Netherlands. The students of the academy – four times as many in number as those of Franeker – had just as versatile backgrounds as those of the Frisian academy. At the same time, while there were many Hungarians there, the 10–15 matriculations in the better years did not make up to a significant percentage of the yearly 450 enrollments during the years 1640 and 1645.<sup>58</sup> 1640 did not excel from the perspective of Hungarian students: Harsányi and Balyik were the first “Ungari”, and there were only three more until the end of the year (while none arrived in the next one).<sup>59</sup> As in Franeker, also here the faculties of theology and arts were the most international, from the perspective of the students as well as of the professors.<sup>60</sup>

The faculty of theology where Harsányi matriculated to, was one of the most important educational centers in Calvinist Europe, even if its relevance did no longer lay in embracing interesting new ideas and initiating fresh theological debates: the focus of attention was rather to deepen the students’ knowledge in doctrines already

---

*prédikátorok (1657–1711)* (“To embellish the poor soul”: Preachers in Debrecen 1657–1711), *Nemzet, egyház, művelődés*, no. 5 (Debrecen: Hernád, 2008), 40.

<sup>57</sup> Szepsi Csombor, *Europica varietas*, 171.

<sup>58</sup> On the number of the students, see Bots and Frijhoff, “De studentenpopulatie”, 57. On the number of Hungarians, see Bozzay, “Debreceni diákok”; Bozzay, “Leiden”; A.P. Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja,” 20.

<sup>59</sup> ASALB I: 311–329; AVSL XVI: 210.

<sup>60</sup> According to Jan Juliaan Woltjer, the reason for this was that the badly paid jobs of minister and teacher meant no lucrative career choice for Dutch young men, see his “Introduction,” in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*, ed. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurler and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes (Leiden: Universitaire Pers – Brill, 1975), 15–16.

accepted and provide them with the erudition necessary for defending them. The University was – thanks to its by-laws which secured the influence of the burghers instead of the Church in the self-government – the stage of formation of the Arminian movement: Jakob Harmenszoon (Arminius) wrote most of his theological works focusing on the free will of the humans as a theology professor in Leiden. After 1618 however, when the synod of Dordrecht condemned Arminianism as heresy, orthodox Calvinism got the upper hand in Leiden also. From the perspective of theological thought, Leiden made the impression of an orthodox and rather calm place by the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, without major debates or convulsions. This “frozen” state of the academy however did not imply that students would have not received the best education of the philological knowledge necessary for theology: they could learn the best traditions of Biblical source criticism and scriptural theology in Leiden.<sup>61</sup>

From the summer of 1640 on, Harsányi stayed approximately twelve to sixteen months in Leiden. He most probably visited the university lectures and disputations diligently – even if, according to our knowledge, he never played the role of a respondent to any of the professors; at least, a published version of his disputation did not survive.<sup>62</sup> Apart from the colloquia in theology, Leiden provided many opportunities for education and self-instruction: the observatory of the university was built in 1632, and the library – which also held a huge manuscript collection – largely exceeded that of Franeker in size; the botanical garden and anatomy theatre were both excellent means for the illustration of the new results of natural sciences that went

<sup>61</sup> On the change in the university’s profile, see Woltjer, “Introduction”, 1–7. Harsányi however did not have the chance to meet the two most important persons who taught in Leiden during the 17<sup>th</sup> century: Joseph Justus Scaliger was professor there before the 1640s (and he also was exempted from teaching assignments), while Johannes Coccejus started teaching Hebrew, Talmud and New Testament exegesis in Leiden only since the 1650s.

<sup>62</sup> From the period of Harsányi’s stay in Leiden, there is not a single disputation by a Hungarian known: after 1639, the first one came out of press in 1645, although in the years to follow, disputations by Hungarians were rather frequently published, see RMK III: Nr. 1550–1688.

through a revolutionary development in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>63</sup> Although necropsies were mostly visited by students of medicine, they meant public events also for other faculties: Gábor Haller, who enrolled at the faculty of arts, visited the *Theatrum Anatomicum* twice, although he never studied medicine. It is less likely that Harsányi, like the young Transylvanian aristocrat, would have taken classes of dance and fencing, although the latter could prove to be useful knowledge with regard to the problems of public safety in contemporary Leiden, and was therefore advocated by the university that also provided a special room for this practical training.<sup>64</sup> It is also very likely that the students made excursions sometimes: from the centrally located Leiden, the most important towns of the Netherlands were easy to reach. Harsányi however took upon himself an even longer trip than those, when he decided to visit England.

### 1.2.2. Cambridge and Edinburgh

England, similarly to the Netherlands, appeared on the horizon for the Hungarian students after the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. If they had to travel as far as to the Dutch Republic, many took the opportunity to cross the Channel: a significant number of Hungarian students started to board the ships to Britain in the 1620s. Their exact number is not known, and even an approximation is hard to give, because – contrary to the academies of Netherlands – the Hungarian students almost never enrolled at English universities. Even those failed to sign the matricula about whom it is known that they did not only go to England to “see the provinces”, as a

<sup>63</sup> On the various “auxiliary” buildings of the university, see R.E.O. Ekkart, *Athenae Batavae: De Leidse Universitaet / The University of Leyden 1575–1975* (Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1975); A.P. Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja,” 25–27. The library of Franeker, according to its register of 1644, had 550 books, see M. H. H. Engels, “De Franeker academiebibliotheek 1626–1694” (On the Academy Library of Franeker 1626–1694), in *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), Fryske Akademy, no. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985), 165.

<sup>64</sup> A.P. Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja,” 26–27.



contemporary, István Szilágyi Benjámin put it, but also to study.<sup>65</sup> Therefore information about Hungarian students in Britain can only be gathered from a variety of alternative sources – the survival of which, however, is far from obvious.

The trip of Harsányi to England and Scotland is documented by a far later source, the dedication of Pál Tarczali Junior's dissertation, published in 1672: the young theologian noted that the former student – who then already had been living in the Brandenburg court – visited these places.<sup>66</sup> We also know from the same dedication that Harsányi traveled together with the Tarczali's father, who had the same name. It is thanks to the research of György Gömöri that we know more than this: he called attention on the previously unknown published thesis of Pál Tarczali Senior about the Holy Communion, which he defended in July 1642, in Edinburgh.<sup>67</sup> He also tried to identify the place they visited in England: he found an entry in the account book of the University of Cambridge from the second trimester of 1642 – that traditionally is from January to Easter –, according to which a stipend was given to a “James, Hungarus”.<sup>68</sup> As there is no other Hungarian student with the surname Jakab (the Hungarian version of James) known from those years, Gömöri's identification can be accepted as valid.

<sup>65</sup> The quote is from István Szilágyi Benjámin's *Acta synodi nationalis hungaricae...* (1646), see Pál Finkei, “Magyar prot. egyháztörténeti kútforrások” (Sources for Hungarian Protestant church history), *Sárospataki Füzetek* 1 (1857) (in the following SF I): 167. On the source problems, see György Gömöri, *Magyarországi diákok angol és skót egyetemeken 1526–1789* (Hungarian students at English and Scottish universities 1526–1789), *Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban*, no. 14 (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Levéltára, 2005), 5–8.

<sup>66</sup> The exact text of the dedication is quoted in note 3. This data was taken into account rather early by the researchers of Hungarian peregrination in England, see József Pongrácz, *Magyar diákok Angliában* (Hungarian students in England) (Pápa: n. p., 1914), 5; Berta Trócsányi, *Magyar református teológusok Angliában a XVI. és XVII. században* (Theologians of the Hungarian Reformed Church in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century England), *Debreceni angol dolgozatok*, no. 11 (Debrecen: Tisza István Tudományegyetem Angol Intézete, 1944), 14–15.

<sup>67</sup> Pál Tarczali, *Theses theologiae de sacra Domini coena, quas Divina favente gratia Sub praesidio Reverendi, & Clarissimi Viri D.D. Joannis Scharpii S.S. Theologiae in inclita Edinburgensium Academia Professoris ordinarii dignissimi Publico examini subiicit Paulus Tartsali Hungarus Ad diem 7 Julii horis locoq[ue] solitis* (Edinburgh: Brison, [1642]).

<sup>68</sup> György Gömöri, “Magyar peregrinusok a XVII. századi Cambridge-ben” (Hungarian students in 17<sup>th</sup> century Cambridge), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 79 (1985): 196; Gömöri, *Magyarországi diákok*, 51.

Visiting England became much easier for Hungarian students in the 1630s and '40s than it was earlier, because in these decades there were some people already there on whose help they could count on. There were many English refugees in the 17<sup>th</sup> century who found shelter in the Netherlands: in Leiden, there were no less than two English–Scottish congregations that maintained close relations to their home countries, in order that the products of their printing presses would find the way there.<sup>69</sup> The surviving data – which is however rather scarce – shows that the Hungarian students did not use these, rather obvious channels. Márton Szepsi Csombor crossed the channel from Vlissingen (Friesland) to England on his own initiative and tried to find his way in London alone: it was mainly due to his lack of a local guide that when he wanted to go to Cambridge (Latin: Cantabrigia), he ended up in Canterbury (Cantuaria) instead.<sup>70</sup> It is not clear why Szepsi Csombor did not take contact with the person on whose support an increasing number of visiting students could count upon since the 1620s, John (János) Bánfihunyadi.

The Hungarian alchemist, born in Nagybánya, had been living in London since 1608, and although he planned several times to return home, he could leave town only for shorter periods because of his English wife and teacher's position in Gresham College (it was during one of these trips that he died in Amsterdam, in 1646).<sup>71</sup> We know some examples when he was visited by students from Hungary and

<sup>69</sup> Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, no. 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 123–141.

<sup>70</sup> Szepsi Csombor, *Europica varietas*, 192–193.

<sup>71</sup> There has been an increasing attention on the activities of John Bánfihunyadi in the last twenty years. A selection on the studies about him: György Gömöri, "Bánfihunyadi János – alkimista és vegyész" (John Bánfihunyadi – alchemist and chemist), in Idem, *Angol–magyar kapcsolatok* (English–Hungarian contacts) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1989), 66–73; Idem, "Bánfihunyadi János eszmevilága és alkémista kapcsolatai" (The intellectual world and alchemist contacts of John Bánfihunyadi), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 106 (2002): 93–100; Idem, "Bánfihunyadi János egy skót–lengyel polihisztor műveiben és leveleiben" (John Bánfihunyadi in the works and letters of a Scottish–Polish polihistor), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 110 (2006): 61–66; Martyn Rady, "A Transylvanian Alchemist in Seventeenth-Century London," *Slavonic and East European Review* 72 (1994): 140–151.

Transylvania, and it is very likely that he also got acquainted with more of them, and helped them during their stay in London. In the case of Gábor Haller it could be assumed that the alchemist had future advantages in mind when he saw the young aristocrat as a guest (and even lent him some money), but it was hardly possible to predict the future successes of Pál Medgyesi and Pál Keresztúri as court preacher, respectively the leader of the court school of György Rákóczi I, in the time of their peregrination.<sup>72</sup> It is thus possible that, like other students, Harsányi and his company was also hosted by Bánfihunyadi, all the more so, as their journey had to go through London.

If Harsányi was in Cambridge in the second trimester of 1642, he most probably had to arrive to England in the second half of 1641 and in this case he must have met Péter N. Szerencsi as well. This alumnus of the Sárospatak college, later schoolmaster at Szatmár, started his peregrination not long before Harsányi: they hardly missed each other in Franeker.<sup>73</sup> Szerencsi visited Cambridge before October 1641, where he was the guest of Emmanuel College. Later on, he lived in London until late spring 1642 – and we also happen to know that he stayed in Bar Lane, close to the Tower of London. György Gömöri suggests that he did not rent his lodgings alone, rather together with other Hungarian students, probably with Benedek Nagyari, who came from Leiden, but earlier also had been a Sárospatak student.<sup>74</sup> Harsányi, arriving in England exactly in this time, may also have been among the lodgers there – he surely must have known Nagyari at least, who was his fellow student in Leiden.

<sup>72</sup> On the visit of Haller, see A.P. Szabó, “Haller Gábor peregrinációja,” 28; on Medgyesi’s, Dienes, *Keresztúri Bíró Pál*, 42.

<sup>73</sup> Szerencsi enrolled in Franeker on the 19<sup>th</sup> of July 1640, two days before Harsányi signed the matricula of Leiden, see ASAF I: 117.

<sup>74</sup> On the stay of Péter N. Szerencsi in England, see György Gömöri, “Egy magyar peregrinus levele William Sancroft-hoz” (A letter of a Hungarian student to William Sancroft), *Erdélyi Múzeum* 62 (2000): 14–18. It is also Gömöri who assumes that Benedek Nagyari visited Britain, with a reference on his book from 1651, *Orthodoxus Christianus*, for which Nagyari used English authors – and it was obviously the easiest to learn the language in the country itself.

Harsányi's acquaintance with Szerencsi might also be the reason why the former asked at the University of Cambridge for a stipend to study there.

England at the turn of 1641 and 1642 had to mean a very interesting, but also startling experience for the Hungarian students. Harsányi probably has not seen the mass movements around the arrest and conviction of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford – according to contemporary reports, 200.000 people gathered around the Tower Hill on the day of his execution, the 12<sup>th</sup> of May 1641. The growing tension between the King and the Long Parliament was however omnipresent on the streets also during the following months. It would have been impossible for Charles I to accept the Grand Remonstrance that contained the demands of the Parliament concerning government and church politics, without the pressure of the masses; and the King's failed attempt on a coup d'état also caused a general outcry in the beginning of January 1642. The students must have met everywhere commoners discussing actual political questions and probably heard the exaggerated news about massacres of the Protestants in Ireland with horror.<sup>75</sup> They probably found the theory of a “Papist menace”, which determined the contemporary political life of England, worthy of attention, all the more so because on the vigil of György Rákóczi I's campaign in Hungary in 1644–45, they could also hear quite a lot at home about the grievances of Protestants and the insecure position of their denomination.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>75</sup> A general overview on the political history of these years, with a special focus on the public debates, is provided by Godfrey Davies, *The Early Stuarts 1603–1660*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, The Oxford History of England, no. 9 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959) 99–159.

<sup>76</sup> On the debates about confessional politics see recently Tatyana Gusarova, “A vallási kérdések vitáinak légköre a magyar országgyűléseken a 17. század első felében” (The atmosphere of the debates on confessional questions at the Hungarian diets in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century), in *R. Várkonyi Ágnes emlékkönyv születésének 70. évfordulója ünnepére* (Festschrift for Ágnes R. Várkonyi on the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of her birth), ed. Péter Tusor (Budapest: ELTE Bölcsészettudományi Kar, 1998), 308–319. More focused on the turn of the 1640s, see István Hajnal, *Esterházy Miklós nádor lemondása (Székfoglaló értekezés)* (The abdication of Miklós Esterházy: Inaugural dissertation) (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1929).

They could hardly have avoided to get acquainted with the debates that kept the public in London agitated even if they surely did not speak English after their arrival, and their Latin skills – as it was noted by Márton Szepesi Csombor earlier – were not of a great help in the British Isles.<sup>77</sup> Even if they could not follow the discussions on the conflict between King and Parliament in the inns, there were quite enough intensive fights going on in the more Latin-oriented communities of universities as well. The 17<sup>th</sup> century Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were frequently condemned by later historiography for not becoming the flagships of the revolution in natural sciences and initiators of related teaching activities.<sup>78</sup> However, they participated eagerly in the great theological debates of the age. The University of Cambridge, that Harsányi visited, had been divided in many questions already since the mid-1630s. The liturgical reforms initiated by William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, which were later found suspect of Popery and abandoned by the Long Parliament, were accepted by a number of colleges and professors, while others chose to resist rigorously. After 1640, lawsuits started against many Laudian instructors, and although none of them were convicted until the outbreak of the Civil War, their cases were nonetheless in the focus of public interest. If Harsányi – following the path of Szerencsi – was the guest of Emmanuel College, he could get acquainted to the most

---

<sup>77</sup> According to Szepesi Csombor, in London “it was primarily to lack of Latin among the population that surprised me, because walking up the street among merchants, fur-dressers, tailors and others, I have not found a single person who could have been able to talk with me in Latin”; see his *Europica varietas*, 184. If they stayed for a longer time, the students obviously had to learn at least to read in English, and 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian publications include a huge amount of translations and adaptations from English, see Pál Berg, *Angol hatások tizenhetedik századi irodalmunkban* (English influences in 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian literature), *Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár kiadványai*, no. 21 (Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 1946), 80–161.

<sup>78</sup> See the debate of Christopher Hill with Mark H. Curtis in Hill’s *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 301–314.

Puritan milieu in Cambridge: it was one of the three colleges where even the committee sent by the Parliament could find no “Papist transgressions” in 1641.<sup>79</sup>

Jakab Harsányi Nagy, who stayed in Cambridge in the second trimester of 1642, could most probably see the ceremonial entry of Charles I to the town in March 1642, and the crowd greeting him with acclamation. He also could hear (although it is a question whether he understood) how Richard Holdsworth, Master of Emmanuel College and Vice-Chancellor of the University, known as the most consistent enemy of Laudianism used theological arguments in his speech at Great St. Mary’s Church for supporting the King nevertheless – which decision determined which side the University would take until its “purification” by another Parliamentary committee in 1643. Harsányi could also feel the tension growing between “town and gown”, the Parliamentary town of Cambridge and the Royalist university.<sup>80</sup> He did not wait though until the armed conflict started in August 1642.

It was probably the shadow of the Civil War, the news about gathering troops that motivated the rather unconventional step of Jakab Harsányi Nagy and his fellow traveler, Pál Tarczali to go northwards after leaving Cambridge, to the academy of Edinburgh. While Scotland was also not a particularly peaceful place in the period – during the previous five years, Scottish armies had two major battles with the troops of Charles I in the so-called “Bishop’s Wars” –, military activities took place both times mainly in English territories. At the University of Edinburgh, quite close to the border between England and Scotland, the title-awarding ceremonies had to be staged without the usual celebrations (as they put it, “privately”) in 1640, but in the next two

<sup>79</sup> David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1690–1644*, The History of the University of Cambridge. Texts and Studies, no. 6 (Woodbridge: Boydell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 2007), 209–215. On the various inner and outer conflicts of the University, see also John Twigg, *The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution*, The History of the University of Cambridge: Texts and Studies, no. 1 (Woodbridge: Boydell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1990), 42–65.

<sup>80</sup> Twigg, *The University of Cambridge*, 56–58, 66–87; Hoyle, *Reformation*, 207–209, 216–217.

years order was re-installed.<sup>81</sup> Although the Scottish estates followed the developments in England with great interest, contrary to their Southern neighbors, in their country there were no military activities in 1642. Visiting the town with peaceful conditions must have been more appealing to the Hungarian students than to return to the tumultuous London. It also might have proved interesting to visit a country where the Presbyterian system was practiced, a system that meant the most intriguing phenomenon of church politics for 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian students in Britain (even if it was not necessarily welcomed by every one of them).<sup>82</sup>

Although the college of Edinburgh, established in 1583, had already been more popular than the traditional Scottish universities of Glasgow and St. Andrews by this time, it was mainly due to the fact that it was located in the capital: on one hand, many of its students came from the town itself, on the other, it provided excellent networking opportunities for a career after finishing the school.<sup>83</sup> The institution that had a curriculum of a secondary school and where children started their studies in the age of fourteen, was officially not called university until 1685, although in the symbolic field it functioned as such (for instance, its Rector had a scepter since 1640), and its instructors were given the title of professors.<sup>84</sup> This ambiguity is also seen at the title page of Tarczali's theses: his dissertation about the Holy Communion was disputed under the presidency of Professor John Sharp at the "academia" of

<sup>81</sup> Thomas Craufurd, *History of the University of Edinburgh, from 1580 to 1646* (Edinburgh: Neill, 1808), 137–144. On the Scottish–English relationship at the turn of the 1640s, see Allan I. Macinnes, *The British Revolution 1629–1660*, British Studies Series (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 111–151.

<sup>82</sup> On the reception of the Presbyterian system of church government in Hungary, still the most useful is the classic work of Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*.

<sup>83</sup> The matriculation fee for the children of the burghers of Edinburgh was smaller (two pounds) than for others (who paid three), see Michael Lynch, "The Creation of a College," in Robert D. Anderson, Michael Lynch and Nicholas Philipson, *The University of Edinburgh: An Illustrated History* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003), 24.

<sup>84</sup> Lynch, "The Creation of a College", 41. On the curriculum in detail, see Christine Shepherd, "University Life in the Seventeenth Century," and Eric G. Forbes, "Philosophy and Science Teaching in the Seventeenth Century," both in *Four Centuries: Edinburgh University Life 1583–1983*, ed. Gordon Donaldson (Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 1983), 1–3, resp. 28–29.

Edinburgh.<sup>85</sup> The high school of Edinburgh did not thus differ too much from the college of Gyulafehérvár. The University of Cambridge was approximately ten times its size, and even the student–instructor ratio was much better, so the English school had a serious advantage in the number of established teachers as well. Generally it can be said that a single college at the University of Cambridge offered more opportunities than the entire academy of Edinburgh. The same is valid for the library: although it contained 3000 books in 1636 (the Bodleian in Oxford held 7500 volumes in 1615), but until 1635, there was no librarian and a library room was also not opened for public access till 1646.<sup>86</sup> The most important advantage of the Scottish town, that still made it worth to go there, were beyond doubts the peaceful conditions in the country.

The name of Jakab Harsányi Nagy and Pál Tarczali is not only missing from the matricula, but we would look in vain for them also in the book the users of the library had to sign in order to get access, promising to keep the rules concerning the handling of the books.<sup>87</sup> This suggests that the two Hungarian students probably did not spend a lot of time in Edinburgh (even if the register of the readers seems to be incomplete).<sup>88</sup> Even if from the point of view of prestige, it was better to dispute in Cambridge than in Edinburgh, it is likely that it was much more expensive. Pál Tarczali could count not only with the lower prices of the Scottish capital, but probably even a subsidy from the college – at least the fact that the *De sacra Domini coena* was dedicated to the professors and minister of Edinburgh, seems to suggests

---

<sup>85</sup> Tarczali Sr, *Theses theologicae*, title page.

<sup>86</sup> Lynch, “The Creation of a College”, 36–39. On the library in detail, see Jonquil Bevan, “Seventeenth-Century Students and Their Books,” in *Four Centuries: Edinburgh University Life 1583–1983*, ed. Gordon Donaldson (Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 1983), 16–27.

<sup>87</sup> Edinburgh University Library Ms Da.2.1. (EUA–A–16).

<sup>88</sup> From the period between 1640 and 1649, there were altogether 32 people signing it, in 1642 only five. It seems to be a general trend that no new signatures appear in the second half of the year, see *ibid.* 11–14.



this.<sup>89</sup> The disputation of Tarczali was in any case not much different from the events organized for granting master's titles, where texts written by the professors were rehearsed by students for practice's sake ("exercitii gratia"). This is also suggested by the disputation's date, the 7<sup>th</sup> of July, as these graduations were always held in the end of the school-year, the beginning of July.<sup>90</sup>

One or two weeks after Tarczali's disputation, summer holidays started at the Edinburgh Academy, which usually lasted at least one month, not rarely even till mid-October. The Hungarian students most probably left Scotland; however, it is not easy to say which way they went. If they had left Cambridge because of the conflicts between King and Parliament towering above them, it is very unlikely that they would have hazarded a trip across England from North to South during July and August – when the actual military activities started – and cross the route of first the Royal and then the Parliamentary armies. They could leave Edinburgh by sea towards Leiden – but in this case it is hard to say why Harsányi enrolled at the university again only on the 6<sup>th</sup> of October.

What is more, the alumnus of Nagyvárad was not alone when he returned to Leiden: in his company we find János Gidófalvi Csulak as well as a medical student from Cambridge, John Southcott.<sup>91</sup> The Transylvanian student, who was the same age as Harsányi, had been staying abroad for quite a time then: after his studies in the college of Gyulafehérvár, he started his peregrination in 1640, in Franeker, and enrolled at the universities of Groningen (1640) and Leiden (1641) later on. There is no direct information about his visit to Britain, but György Gömöri seems to be

<sup>89</sup> Tarczali Sr, *Theses theologicae*, 1–2. The dedication lists the names of Alexander Henrison, John Adamson, John Sharp and Julius Conrad Otto. Unfortunately, in the text of the dedication, there is no concrete reference on their sponsorship – apart from their general goodwill and benevolence towards the Hungarian student.

<sup>90</sup> Shepherd, "University Life", 3–4. The author also calls attention on the fact that the theses read on these graduations were not the works of the student, but the regent.

<sup>91</sup> ASALB I: 335.

justified to suggest that he had to matriculate again in Leiden in 1642, because he also spent some time somewhere else between the two registrations.<sup>92</sup> Hypothetically it would also be possible that he also came back from Edinburgh, together with Harsányi, but the presence of John Southcott renders it unlikely: as the Scottish academy did not have a medical faculty at this time, there is no reason why the twenty-four years old student would have made the detour from Cambridge to Scotland. It is more probable that Harsányi returned to London somehow – perhaps by sea in order to avoid meeting the troops – and moved back to the Netherlands from there in early October.

### *1.2.3. Experiences During Peregrination*

Peregrination was a formative event for Early Modern Hungarian students not only because of the university courses they visited. Being far away from home, visiting unknown regions, getting acquainted with cultures different from their own were important experiences in themselves. Some students paid eager attention even on skills of everyday life if they seemed to be useable back home. István Kocsi Csergő left some notes behind at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which – based on examples from England and the Netherlands – elaborate on topics such as how to make “the bread to have white crust so that nothing is lost from it”, or “how to milk the cow that likes to kick in an easy way.” He even noted some procedures which were otherwise already known in Hungary, such as brewing beer, noting that “the English beer is really

---

<sup>92</sup> The biography of Gidófalvi was compiled by János Herepei, “Gidófalvi Csulak István,” in *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966), 324–332. See also Gömöri, *Magyarországi diákok*, 50.

famous.”<sup>93</sup> It was however expected even from less enthusiastic students to follow the instructions of the travel methodology (the so-called apodemics) that blossomed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and take notes about the places visited. In the works of David Frölich, there was even a Hungarian version of the handbooks that helped to register everything they have seen with the assistance of the Ramist methodology of logic. Even if no traveler could follow the complexity of aspects in all peculiarities of this elaborated system, many of them kept their diaries according to the principles suggested by them.<sup>94</sup>

The travel diary of Harsányi did not survive, and neither did his *album amicorum*, the booklet where the signatures of professors and fellow students were collected with whom he got acquainted during his peregrination. It is however very likely that Harsányi shared the opinion of his fellow Hungarian and Transylvanian travelers: through the rather dry style of contemporary travelogues one finds again and again the signs of admiration towards the places in Western Europe. In the writings of 17<sup>th</sup> century students, we frequently come across appreciative comments about the regions they visited, even if their perspective was somewhat different from that of a tourist of today. They felt much less awe towards the artistic value in a modern sense, similarly to their Western contemporaries: even if they noted what kind of artifacts they have seen, they hardly wasted any words to their author – rather they focused on

<sup>93</sup> The collected manuscripts of István Kocsi Csergő, Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, Nagykönyvtár, Kézirattár 403, 747–791.

<sup>94</sup> On apodemic literature generally, see Justin Stagl, “Der wohl unterwiesene Passagier: Reisekunst und Gesellschaftbeschreibung vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert,” in *Reisen und Reisebeschreibungen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert als Quellen der Kulturbeziehungsforchung*, Studien zur Geschichte der Kulturbeziehungen im Mittel- und Osteuropa, no. 6, ed. Boris I. Krasnobaev, Gert Robel and Herbert Zeman (Berlin: Camen, 1980), 353–384; Sándor Iván Kovács, “A régi magyar utazási irodalom az európai utazáselméleti művek tükrében” (Old Hungarian travel literature in the mirror of European works on the theory of travel), in *Szakácsmesterségnek és utazásnak könyvecskéi: Két tanulmány* (Booklets of cookery and travel: Two studies) (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1988), 95–200. On Frölich, see ibid., 126–134; Ilona Pavericsik, “David Frölich sajátkezű feljegyzései műveiről” (The autograph register of David Frölich about his works), *Magyar Könyvszemle* 112 (1996): 292–319, 429–450; József Hajós, “Frölich Dávid,” *Magyar Könyvszemle* 113 (1997): 16–32.

their estimated cost. They were generally much more interested about great and expensive things, be it a splendid public building, or the Dutch and English cows that Márton Szepsi Csombor praised.<sup>95</sup> In their writings, everyday phenomena were mixed with extraordinary sights, such as the Early Modern forerunners of museums: the rarity collections and cabinets of curiosities. The travelers tried to get the possibly most complex impression of the *Europica varietas* that the often quoted Márton Szepsi Csombor referred to in the title of his book.

It is nevertheless remarkable that one element is missing from the accounts of 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian students, which would dominate those of the later centuries: the frequent comparisons made with the circumstances at home and the laments over the not very flattering results of these.<sup>96</sup> Differences were obviously registered, and where they saw an opportunity for the improvement of the situation at home, they did not shy away from taking it, as the quoted example of István Kocsi Csergő show. It was however alien to their way of thinking to place Western Europe and Hungary/Transylvania on different levels of a civilizational scale – as it was done in later centuries. Sometimes they even felt the need to play on the stereotypes existing about them in the Western part of Europe, thereby implying that they did not interpret their otherness also as inferiority. The best example of this attitude comes not from a commoner student, but from a young aristocratic traveler, Pál Esterházy. He, on one

<sup>95</sup> Szepsi Csombor, *Europica varietas*, 191. On the question, more in detail, see my “Identitás és határok: 17. századi magyar utazók nyugaton és keleten” (Identity and borders: 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian travelers in West and East), *Korall* 26 (2006): 77–78. From the earlier historiography, see Imre Bán, “Korai felvilágosodás és nemzeti műveltség” (Early Enlightenment and national culture), in *Európa és a Rákóczi-szabadságharc* (Europe and the Rákóczi resurrection), ed. Kálmán Benda (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980), 239–240; Sándor Iván Kovács, “Magyarok Rómában Janus Pannoniustól Zrínyi Miklósig” (Hungarians in Rome from Janus Pannonius to Miklós Zrínyi), *Vigilia* 47 (1982): 194; Hedvig Gácsi, “A XVII. századi erdélyi főúri peregrinációs irodalom művészettörténeti vonatkozásairól” (On the art historical aspects of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian aristocratic travelogues), *Aetas* 5, no. 1 (1987): 5–30; S.I. Kovács, “A régi magyar utazási irodalom”, 184.

<sup>96</sup> On this question in detail, see Kármán, “Identitás”; Graeme Murdock, “‘They Are Laughing at Us’? Hungarian Travellers and Early Modern European Identity,” in *Under Eastern Eyes: A Comparative Introduction to East European Travel Writing on Europe*, ed. Wendy Bracewell and Alex Drace-Francis (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2008), 121–145.

occasion during the coronation ceremonies of Ferdinand IV of Habsburg as a King of Rome, drank one liter of wine at one breath from the goblet circulated around the table, slapped it down contentedly on the table, and vaulted his “horse of exceptional wildness” among the impressed distinguished guests “to show the glorious Hungarian nation”.<sup>97</sup> It was much more popular in the circle of the students to be exceedingly critical towards at least some phenomena in the territories visited, which also could show that they did not feel inferior. It was not only their concerns about the morals of the locals that they shared with their readers, but they even described their conditions sometimes as rather pitiful. What is more, sometimes their critique was pronounced indeed on a “civilizational” level, such as in the case of László Sennyey, who had many sarcastic remarks about a French priest picking lice from his trousers during a Holy Mass in Rome.<sup>98</sup> The problem noted by Szepsi Csombor, that he could not find anyone in London, who could speak Latin, was also a typical complaint for a student visiting foreign universities. This seemingly innocent remark reveals a deeper meaning if we know how little reputation the so-called “deáktalan” (“Latin-less”) people had in the works of 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian rhetoricians, who often concluded that the persons who were lacking education must have also had serious moral deficiencies.<sup>99</sup>

It was however also characteristic for students returning from Western Europe that they had a more critical attitude towards the situation in their home country

<sup>97</sup> Ildikó Horn, “Esterházy Pál: Itinerarium ad Germaniam, 1653,” *Sic Itur ad Astra* 4–5 (1989), 46. For other examples, see Kármán, “Identitás”, 84–85.

<sup>98</sup> László Sennyey, “Római utazása (1687)” (Journey to Rome, 1687), in *Magyar utazási irodalom 15–18. század* (Hungarian travel literature, 15<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), Magyar remekírók, ed. Sándor Iván Kovács and István Monok (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1990), 551. For more examples, see Kármán, “Identitás”, 82–83.

<sup>99</sup> Szepsi Csombor, *Europica varietas*, 184. On the Early Modern interpretation of being „deáktalan”, see István Bartók, “A casa rustica és a mechanici: Az „alacsony stílus” ismérvei a XVII. századi magyar irodalomelméletben” (The casa rustica and the mechanici: The criteria of “low style” in the 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian theory of literature), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 96 (1992): 569–578.

afterwards.<sup>100</sup> It surfaced especially in some situations, such as the one of János Apáczai Csere, who argued for his plans for reforming education through castigating the situation in Transylvania on the one hand, and referring to the circumstances at foreign academies on the other.<sup>101</sup> The same pattern can be found in the letters of János Pálóczi Horváth, who added a remark when describing the universities of Cambridge and Oxford: “I wish our country would at least have a single one of these colleges!”<sup>102</sup> His remark was necessary because the addressee of his letter was István Bethlen, the brother of the ruling Prince; Pálóczi did not make a secret of it that his main goal in this letter was to influence the Transylvanian policies of education.

There are no such remarks known from Jakab Harsányi Nagy: from the time of his peregrination, as mentioned earlier, there is not a single document which would mirror his opinion or personal experiences, and there are also no sources in which he would refer back to the time of his peregrination. The rather critical tone in his later writings can surely be regarded as a consequence of his university years – however, as I will elaborate in more detail in chapter V, it was the product of a variety of factors. We can however state that much that during his university years Harsányi got acquainted to two kinds of situations that reoccurred in later phases of his life: the feeling of being a foreigner and the lack of money.

Concerning the first one: experiencing to be alien was a part of going to peregrination, even if only in such everyday elements of life as clothing. The importance of changing clothes was noted to the Hungarian Palatine, György Thurzó

<sup>100</sup> József Jankovics, “A magyar peregrinusok Európa-képe” (The Hungarian students’ image of Europe), in *Régi és új peregrináció: Magyarok külföldön, külföldiek Magyarországon* (Old and new peregrination: Hungarians abroad, foreigners in Hungary), ed. Imre Békési et al. (Budapest: Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság; Szeged: Scriptum, 1993), vol. 2, 556–564.

<sup>101</sup> Apáczai Csere, „A bölcsesség tanulásáról”, 618–619; see also Murdock, „They Are Laughing at Us?”.

<sup>102</sup> Letter of János Pálóczi Horváth to István Bethlen (Paris, 13 April 1628) Pál Binder, ed., *Utazások a régi Európában: Peregrinációs levelek, útleírások és útinaplók (1580–1709)* (Travels in old Europe: Peregrination letters, travelogues and diaries, 1580–1709), Téka (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979) (in the following: URE), 88. (based on the Hungarian translation of Magda Kiss).

by John George, Elector of Saxony, who warned the Hungarian aristocrat that in order that his son would not be laughed at in Wittenberg, he should let German clothes be made for him.<sup>103</sup> It could however not have been an easy decision to change the Hungarian clothing that, through its Oriental elements, differed fundamentally from the Western fashion (which was nonetheless quite fragmented itself): in contemporary texts, one frequently comes across metaphors that connect changing clothes with changing character and loyalties.<sup>104</sup> Harsányi also surely had to face the experience that was the share of the majority of Hungarian students visiting foreign universities: to say temporarily good-bye to his familiar clothing.

It was also done by Ferenc Pápai Páriz, who, leaving the Hungarian border towards Silesia, noted in his diary that he “let a German cloth be made, for a very expensive price, a rather bad one” – which leads us to the other question, that of the financial situation.<sup>105</sup> The topic most frequently occurring in the correspondence of the students is the one of money that never proved to be enough. Apart from the prices, which were incredibly high compared to those in Hungary and Transylvania, it was also a shock for the students visiting universities abroad that – as András Csehi put it – “there is very little or no friendship” among the people living there, meaning that “for every small thing in the world, even for showing you a street, they want to have one or two coins.”<sup>106</sup> Therefore, students ran frequently out of money and had to rely on the loans from their newly arrived colleagues. It happened however rarely that they would have been without money for a longer time: although the documentation is relatively

<sup>103</sup> Letter of John George to György Thurzó (Neusorg, 31 July 1615) Edit Dományházi et al, ed., *A Thurzó család és a wittenbergi egyetem* (The Thurzó family and the University of Wittenberg), *Fontes rerum scholasticarum*, no. 1 (Szeged: JATE, 1989), 83.

<sup>104</sup> In detail, see József Jankovics, “Régi magyar irodalmunk ‘viseletképe’” (The “image of clothing” in old Hungarian literature), in *Régi erdélyi viselet: Viseletkódex a XVII. századból* (Old Transylvanian attire: Codex of clothing from the 17<sup>th</sup> century) (Budapest: Európa, 1990), 5–21.

<sup>105</sup> See the diary of Ferenc Pápai Páriz, *Békességet magamnak, másoknak* (Peace for myself and others), ed. Géza Nagy (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1977), 144–145. Many examples of buying clothes are listed by Bozzay, “Der finanzielle Hintergrund”, 29.

<sup>106</sup> Letter of András Csehi to the Council of Nagybánya ([1648]) MPEIF VI: 268.

well preserved, we know only about very few cases when Hungarian students in Leiden would have been dragged in front of the *forum academicum*, the court with authority in questions of the students' debts.<sup>107</sup>

The Prince, it seems, took good care of his own scholarship-holders and tried to find every means to send their allowance to them: we know for instance a document from two years after Harsányi's return, in which an officer of the Swedish army, then allied to György Rákóczi I, obliged himself to transfer 1100 dollars to the Transylvanian students visiting foreign universities.<sup>108</sup> This is how János Tolnai Dali, who was the holder of the princely stipend, could help out Gábor Haller, who back home was much richer than him, in his financial crisis during peregrination.<sup>109</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy was however – according to the hypothesis mentioned above – traveling not on the money of the Prince, but on that of the Nagyváradi College. It is very likely that his financial conditions did not allow him to spice up his student years with a lot of entertainment; but this was also generally characteristic for his Hungarian colleagues: apart from the atmosphere at the Dutch universities, which was much more modest than in Germany, they were also predestined to this by their age when they entered university, which was much higher than that of their Western European colleagues. Harsányi nevertheless proved to be creative in finding alternative sources to his stipend from home: this is clearly shown by the scholarship he received from

<sup>107</sup> Also, there was not a single case when they would have been charged for anything else than their debts, see Ödön Miklós, "Magyarok perei a leideni rektor előtt" (Processes against Hungarians at the court of the Rector in Leiden), *Theologiai Szemle* 3 (1927): 163–165; Bozzay, "Leiden", 1002–1006.

<sup>108</sup> Recognizance of Alexander Erskine for György Rákóczi I (Camp near Brünn, 8 July 1645) Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Okmánytár I. Rákóczy György svéd és francia szövetségeseinek történetéhez* (Documents for the Swedish and French alliances of György Rákóczi I), Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Ser. I. Diplomataria, no. 21 (Budapest: Eggenberger, 1873) (in the following: MHHD XXI), 324–325.

<sup>109</sup> János Herepei, "Tolnai Dali János hazatérésének ideje" (The time of János Tolnai Dali's return), in *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 1, *Polgári irodalmi és kulturális törekvések a század első felében: Herepei János cikkei* (Bourgeois movements in literature and culture in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keszérű (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1965), 413., A.P. Szabó, "Haller Gábor peregrinációja," 23.



Cambridge in a period when English universities did not yet regularly sponsor Hungarian and Transylvanian students.<sup>110</sup>

### *1.3. The Puritan Rector?*

Harsányi's second stay in Leiden that started in October 1642, did not last very long. He returned to his homeland sometimes in 1643: his entry in the album amicorum of Ludwig Müller written in Thorn attests that he most probably took the journey by sea through Danzig also this time – if he would have chosen the land route, the West Prussian town would have meant a detour.<sup>111</sup> This time it is not clear whether he traveled alone or was accompanied by another Hungarian student in Leiden. There is a consensus in historiography that after his return from peregrination, Harsányi became a Rector of the college of Nagyváradi; the timely frames of this office is however debated. It is not only the accuracy of the biographical account that makes a precise determination of these frames important, but also that the ending point of his activities as a Rector is crucial in defining Harsányi's place in the debates around church government and the spread of Puritan ideals in Hungary of the late 1640s.

The Calvinists in Hungary and Transylvania had already been in a state of excitement for ten years because of the arrival of Puritan ideas, connected to the activities of János Tolnai Dali. The young theologian founded a “league” in 1638 with some of his fellow students in London, in order to work together back home for spreading the new ideas – the sheer news of which caused a turmoil in the circle of

<sup>110</sup> Giving stipends to Hungarian and Transylvanian students by locals for studies in England seems to have been much more frequent in the period of the Ottoman wars in Transylvania at the end of the 1650s, and then in the “decade of misery for Protestants” in Hungary of the 1670s, see György Gömöri, “Thomas Barlow magyar kapcsolatai és egy ismeretlen Tarczali Pál-levél” (The Hungarian contacts of Thomas Barlow and an unpublished letter from Pál Tarczali), *Magyar Könyvszemle* 124 (2008): 181–185.

<sup>111</sup> Album of Ludwig Müller, Książnica Kopernikańska (Toruń), KM 5. R 8<sup>8</sup>, fol. 53. The attention was called on this source by György Gömöri: Gömöri, “Magyar peregrinusok”, 196; Gömöri, *Magyarországi diákok*, 51. I owe gratitude to György Gömöri personally also, for having sent me a photocopy of the entry.

church authorities, who found it hard to tolerate any attempts at reform. After his return to Hungary, the dynamic young man became a Rector in Sárospatak, where he attempted to introduce a revised curriculum; however, his quite aggressive and controversial character proved rather counter-effective for the reception of his opinions. Tolnai and his colleagues provided a rock of offence during the entire 1640s, especially when, apart from powerful enemies, he also managed to get strong supporters: when the young theologian, according to the plea of the Calvinist bishop, was released from his job in Sárospatak by György Rákóczi I, he gained the title of the court preacher of Zsigmond Rákóczi, the younger son of the Prince, and later on he also became rural dean of the Abaúj diocese. The national synod of Szatmárnémeti in 1646 meant a very important step in this ongoing fight. Although the synod was pronouncedly concerned with questions of liturgy –Tolnai was accused to have restricted baptism to specific days –, it was clear for everyone that the decisions to be made there had a much broader relevance: it was generally assumed that the small liturgical changes pathed the way for larger reforms, for instance in the method of church government.<sup>112</sup>

As I mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, this synod also incurred a reprimand against Jakab Harsányi Nagy. László Makkai, writing the history of Hungarian Puritanism, built upon this information when he presented Harsányi as the consistent representative of Puritan ideas, who “did not make a compromise, rather left the ecclesiastical field and started a secular career.”<sup>113</sup> He was even more specific in a later work: he claimed that Harsányi, who had been the teacher of the college

<sup>112</sup> On the preparations of the synod and its process, see Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 20–173; Imre Révész, *A szatmárnémeti zsinat és az első magyar református ébredés* (The synod of Szatmárnémeti and the first Hungarian Calvinist awakening), *Theologia*, no. 5 (Budapest: Református Traktátus Vállalat, 1947). Recently summarized by Graeme Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 170–180.

<sup>113</sup> Makkai, *A magyar puritánusok*, 115.

since 1642, could have remained in this position if only he would have not been forced to choose a secular career instead as a consequence of the decision at the synod.<sup>114</sup> Makkai did not define the date when Harsányi left the college, but it is obvious that – in the vein of a heroic stand-up for Puritanism – it had to take place in the period immediately following the decision of the synod, that is in 1646, but in 1647 the latest.

This assumption is however hardly defensible, because there are disputations from December 1647 and July 1648, which were dedicated by their authors to Harsányi as their tutor in the quality of teacher at Nagyvárad.<sup>115</sup> Although both students, Mihály Tofaeus and Péter Szatmári Baka started their peregrination in 1646, the flow of information was relatively good among the students abroad: they would have therefore heard about it if their former teacher had to resign, and they would most probably have noted it in the dedication (if by no other means than by adding the word “quondam”). Even if we consider that news needed approximately three months to get from Nagyvárad to the United Provinces, we can clearly state that Harsányi was still a Rector of Nagyvárad in April 1648. This however excludes the possibility that he would have resigned as a consequence of the decision of the Szatmárnémeti synod, as it was taken almost two years before, in June 1646.

Moreover, it seems that Harsányi did not stop teaching in 1648 either. As I noted earlier, he was the *praeceptor* of Mihály Apafi I, but they could not possibly meet before Harsányi's peregrination; and it is also clear that he taught the would-be Prince somewhere else than Nagyvárad, as Apafi never visited that college. When Harsányi returned from his peregrination, Apafi had been learning in the college of

<sup>114</sup> Makkai, “Debrecen”, 49–50. In a similar way, the decision of the synod is presented as a compelling measure by Várkonyi, *Erdélyi változások*, 271.

<sup>115</sup> See the exact quotes in note 4. It was János Herepei who called attention of these sources that prove beyond doubt that Harsányi was still a teacher in the college during 1647–1648, see Herepei, “Adatok”, 56.

Gyulafehérvár for a year; according to a letter sent to his mother in 1647, he was also quite enthusiastic about it, and would have been happy to go to peregrination himself.<sup>116</sup> He had no chance for this however: until the 2<sup>nd</sup> of May 1649, when he left school for good, he continued to be a student of Gyulafehérvár, even if his stay in the Transylvanian capital was interrupted time and again by journeys to Upper Hungary.<sup>117</sup> This means that if Harsányi was the teacher of the young Transylvanian aristocrat, it could only be possible if he worked as a *praeceptor* in Gyulafehérvár for a while. The dating of this change was made possible by János Herepei: he quoted a passage from the account book of the Tax Master of Kolozsvár, which refers to three students who were taking the belongings of a “master from Nagyvárad” after him in direction Nagyenyed. As there is no data about Harsányi’s activities in Nagyvárad after 1649, but there are proofs about all of his colleagues being in town, we can accept Herepei’s conclusion that the above-mentioned “master” can only be Harsányi.<sup>118</sup> And if Harsányi moved to Gyulafehérvár (which is in the direction of Nagyenyed from Kolozsvár) in the turn of 1649, he could still, for a few months be a teacher of Mihály Apafi. His activities as a Rector in Gyulafehérvár, earlier unknown in the literature, are thus the final argument against the assumption of Makkai that Jakab Harsányi would have given up teaching because he was unwilling to abandon his Puritan convictions.

Also, the sanction concerning Harsányi among the decisions of the synod of Szatmárnémeti does not seem to be overly strict: it prescribed the young teacher to give his signature that he would conform to the magistrates and not spread any

---

<sup>116</sup> Letter of Mihály Apafi to his mother, Borbála Pettki (Gyulafehérvár, 1 September 1647) Arhivele Naționale Direcția Județeană Cluj (in the following ANCIJ), Colecția Sámuel Kemény nr. 11. fol. 70r.

<sup>117</sup> AMN 3. His diary lists a trip to Lőcse in 1647, and one to Bártfa in 1648.

<sup>118</sup> Herepei, “Adatok”, 56.

innovations contrary to the accepted dogma of the church.<sup>119</sup> It is also not extraordinary that the decisions prescribe that in case he would act contrary to his recognizance, he would lose his ecclesiastical office. This passage was namely also part of the oath that was prescribed by the synod for every student coming home from peregrination.<sup>120</sup> More surprising is that the decisions of the synod mentioned him in a specific point, also adding his name: his case must have been dealt with rather shortly, separated from the process against Tolnai. This is also suggested by the fact that, according to the list of the participants, Harsányi was not present in Szatmárnémeti.<sup>121</sup>

We thus have to assume that the synod considered the fault of Harsányi less important than it would have been the case if he would have been accused of openly siding with Tolnai. There is a remark in the protocols of the Diocese of Zemplén, according to which the senior of Nagyvárád (that is, a distinguished student from the higher classes) got into trouble in the years preceding the synod: he added in his sermon that “True religion would have started to rise, if it would not have been obstructed by some.” This could be easily understood as a reference to the synod of Tokaj that condemned Tolnai in 1645, so the utterance of the student caused a minor scandal: “Which worked out almost pretty bad for him as well as for his master, he

<sup>119</sup> See the Latin text in note 5. Péter Bod, who probably used another version of the decisions, adds in his summary that “and he does not befoul and defame others”, see Bod, *Magyar Athénás*, 351.

<sup>120</sup> Protocols of the Diocese of Zemplén, Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Levéltár (in the following: SRKLT.) Kgg. I.2. fol. 178v.

<sup>121</sup> Contrary to him, the preachers and teachers involved in the Tolnai case (István Keresztúri, Mihály Köleséri, István Győri and Péter Kovásznai) did personally go to the synod. The list of participants is available in Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 150–154. The contemporary Latin report on the synod also does not mention Harsányi, although the reason for this might also be that István Szilágyi Benjámin’s *Acta Synodi Nationalis Hungaricae* was preserved in a fragmentary form that only touches upon the first few days of the event (SNK Kt. 21, 22/a). Due to this, Harsányi was also not mentioned in the 18<sup>th</sup> century church history, which built its presentation of the synod of Szatmárnémeti on the narrative of Szilágyi Benjámin: [Pál Debreceni Ember and] Friedrich Adolph Lampe, *Historia ecclesiae reformatae in Hungaria et Transylvania, inter perpetua certamina & afflictiones a primordiis praecipue repurgatorum sacrorum ad recentiora tempora per dei gratiam conservatae* (Utrecht: Jacobus van Poolsum, 1728). In any case, these data reinforce my conclusion that Harsányi’s case was dealt with separately from the Tolnai affair.

was even put into chains for it” – as the anonymous author of the report put it.<sup>122</sup> The source does not give the name of the master, but it is possible that it was Harsányi (as suggested by Jenő Zoványi), what is more, it cannot be excluded that this was the reason for his condemnation at the synod: the boldness of his student might have put him also into suspicion, while it did not authorize his accusers for more harsh measures.<sup>123</sup> It can thus be assumed with good reason that Harsányi was not the outspoken supporter of Puritan ideas, liturgical changes and reforms of church government. This however does not mean that his thinking and way of life was not influenced from the ideas coming from England – this will be the topic of a later chapter.

Harsányi thus started to teach in Nagyvárád immediately after returning from his peregrination in 1643, and moved to Gyulafehérvár at the end of 1648. Changing schools was a phenomenon rather uncommon among the theologians who spent some time as teachers after their peregrination.<sup>124</sup> Most of them would not have had time for this as they tried to leave their unwillingly taken teacher’s posts and get a position as a minister as soon as possible. The church authorities responsible for filling up the ranks of teachers often had to face the same situation as the frequently mentioned István Tolnai did in 1637, who had to write to his Prince: although he was very satisfied with the work of Rector Ferenc S. Veréczi in Sárospatak, and “would be happy if he stayed

<sup>122</sup> Both quotes are taken from the anonymous and undated short treatise “An Joannes Tolnaeus juro merito privatus?”, SRKLt. Kgg. I.2. fol. 180v.

<sup>123</sup> Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 144. At the same time, János Herepei had professed doubts about the credibility of the protocols of the Diocese of Zemplén concerning an event that happened in another diocese, at Nagyvárád; especially because it was mentioned in the context of a topic seriously tainted with ungrounded rumors, see Herepei, “Adatok”, 55.

<sup>124</sup> Apart from Harsányi’s, there are only five known cases. In two of them, the change was due to the abolishment of the school itself: Dávid Szentgyörgyi moved from Gyulafehérvár to Marosvásárhely, while György Martonfalvi went from Nagyvárád to Debrecen for this reason. In another two, the teacher could not stay in their first place of work due to some serious conflicts with the college: the Saxon Andreas Graf had to leave Medgyes to continue his work in schools in Hungary because of a mock-poem he wrote; while János Apáczai Csere was forced to leave Gyulafehérvár because of his Presbyterian convictions – he got another job in Kolozsvár later on. We have no information what the motivation of Daniel Klein was to leave the college of Brassó for that of Nagyszében. See Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, Nr. 122, 391, 435, 782 and 1256.

another year, but he was invited to be a minister in Szatmárnémeti, and if his year is over here, I do not know how he will decide.”<sup>125</sup> There were only a few young men who felt the vocation to dedicate their entire life to teaching (such as János Apáczai Csere or Pál Keresztúri Bíró), and, if we are to believe the bitter remarks of the former, their decision was not generally appreciated.<sup>126</sup> Those people whom Harsányi met during his peregrination, also tried to become ministers in the following few years: Benedek Nagyari got a post in Tállya, later in Nagyvárád, János Gidófalvi Csulak in Kolozsvár, Mátyás Gönczi in Felsőbánya, and Pál Tarczali had a minister’s post already two years after his return from his studies abroad (although it is not entirely clear, where). The latter two also had a relatively successful ecclesiastic career: they eventually became Deans in the dioceses of Nagybánya and Zemplén respectively.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>125</sup> Letter of István Tolnai to György Rákóczi I (Sárospatak, 6 July [1637]) PEIL XVIII: 1123. We do not know whether Veréczki went to be a minister of Szatmárnémeti in that year; he became a minister at Tállya in 1638 and later on at Sárospatak, and became famous in church historiography as one of the most ardent opponents of Puritanism (Jenő Zoványi, *Magyarországi protestáns egyháztörténeti lexikon* (Lexicon for Hungarian Protestant church history), 3. ed, ed. Sándor Ladányi (Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1977), 684.

<sup>126</sup> See János Apáczai Csere, “Az iskolák felettébb szükséges voltáról és a magyaroknál való barbár állapotuk okairól” (On the foremost necessity of schools and the reasons of their barbaric state among Hungarians), in *Apáczai Csere János válogatott pedagógiai művei* (The selected pedagogical works of János Apáczai Csere), Neveléstörténeti könyvtár, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, ed. by Lajos Orosz (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1976), 198–200. The case of Keresztúri shows exactly the opposite: his career and influence at court was built upon his pedagogical skills. It is also clear nevertheless, that the post of the educator of the princely offspring was only open to one person at a time. See Dienes, *Keresztúri Bíró Pál*, 65–104.

<sup>127</sup> On Nagyari, see János Herepei, “Nagyari Benedek,” in *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkek* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keszérű (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966), 137–148. On Gidófalvi, see Herepei, „Gidófalvi”. Due to his Puritan sympathies, Gidófalvi had to give up his post as a minister, therefore it cannot be excluded that he is identical with the teacher “János Gidófalvi” recorded in the village school of Bodrogszentés in the years 1656, 1659 and 1660, see Dénes Dienes, ed., *Zempléni vizitációk 1629–1671: Miskolczi Csulak István zempléni esperes és hivatali utódainak feljegyzései* (Visitations in Zemplén 1629–1671: Records by the dean of Zemplén, István Miskolczi Csulak and his successors in the office), Acta Patakina, no. 21 (Sárospatak: Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, 2008) (in the following: AP XXI), 247, 263, 292. The surviving data about Gönczi are rather confusing. According to János Soltész (*A nagybányai reformált egyházmegye története* (History of the Reformed diocese of Nagybánya) (Nagybánya: Molnár, 1902), 26), he was the Dean of the diocese – the same person is referred to as *Mihály* Gönczi by Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 426. There is a minister at Kozma in the years of 1655 and 1657, a schoolmaster

Harsányi, it seems, did not want to abandon teaching as quickly as his contemporaries. In his case, however, it is not hard to find a reason for his change of college, as the Gyulafehérvár College was, as mentioned earlier, the most important and most prestigious institution of education in Transylvania. To teach there must have seemed to be a lucrative position even if the school of Nagyvárád also gained some fame under the rule of György Rákóczi I and became the second best school of the Principality. The donation of the Prince that enabled the college to pay for two or three “academicus” *praeceptors* (that is, those who came back from peregrination) brought the Nagyvárád College into prominence among the colleges that usually could not hire more than one adult teacher; and it seems that these available positions were regularly filled in.<sup>128</sup> At the same time, Nagyvárád had good facilities for education: the building of the college, rebuilt after the old school burned down in 1598, was one of the largest edifices of the town. In the downtown of Nagyvárád (on the street called Péntekhely), it really grew to be one of the centers of Transylvanian intellectual life.<sup>129</sup>

At the same time, Nagyvárád must have looked rather small compared to the places visited during peregrination. Contemporary engravings show that the territory

---

at Szécskeresztúr from 1660, 1661 and 1663, and another schoolmaster from 1664 in Lasztóc registered under the same name. These however not necessarily refer to the same person: it happened rather seldom that an “academicus” minister (that is, someone who already peregrinated) would have gone back to teach in village schools, especially as in Lasztóc there was no minister in the same year. Cf. AP XXI: 234, 254, 278, 299, 312, 323. On Tarczali, see Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 104, who refers to him as a minister at Tállya in 1645. Dénes Dienes does not know about his service in Tállya, according to him, he was minister at Gönc and during his service as a Dean (1653–1669) in Olaszliszka, see the short biography of Tarczali in AP XXI: 219. A memorial that he signed as Dean was published by László Hegedűs, “A zempléni helv. hitv. egyházmegye jegyzőkönyvéből” (From the registers of the Reformed diocese of Zemplén), *Sárospataki Füzetek* 4 (1860) (in the following: SF IVb): 664–679.

<sup>128</sup> Herepei, “Adatok”, especially 20–22.

<sup>129</sup> The most important period in the architectural history of the College was however the 1650s, when, thanks to a donation of Zsuzsanna Lorántffy, the building was extended and each *classis* could have its own teaching room. See the contemporary account in János Szalárdi, *Síralmas magyar krónikája* (Hungarian chronicle of laments), Bibliotheca historica, ed. Ferenc Szakály (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1980), 422–423. On the place of the college in the town, see Zoltán I. Péter, *Nagyvárád 900 éves múltja és épített öröksége* (The 900 years past and architectural heritage of Nagyvárád) (Budapest: Noran, 2005), 75–76. The Nagyvárád of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century is presented as “a Protestant Athens” by Jenő Horváth, *Várad fresco: Nagyvárád története* (Fresco of Várád: The history of Nagyvárád) (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1940), 77–78.



of the town was not really large, and it had also no city walls – although next to it stood the most important fortification of the Principality, nearly as large in size as the town itself. The contemporary chronicle of János Szalárdi reinforces this impression as his very detailed description of the town also shows the image a very versatile and lively town that however consists only of a few streets.<sup>130</sup>

Although it was the center of Transylvanian government, Gyulafehérvár also did not excel in size. The townscape was dominated by the medieval cathedral and the Prince's palace. Apart from these, the square-like territory inside the city walls was relatively loosely built in: there were hardly any buildings except for those of the magistrates and court office-holders.<sup>131</sup> The college of Gyulafehérvár was nevertheless the leading educational institution in Transylvania: the only one that had an academic *classis*, and some of whose teachers were therefore also given the title of professor. The donation of Prince Gábor Bethlen that provided the eminent financial situation of the college, was also maintained by György Rákóczi I. Only half of the buildings in the rather ambitious plan of Bethlen were actually finished, but even so, the college with its thirty rooms provided excellent circumstances for its students and teachers.<sup>132</sup>

<sup>130</sup> Szalárdi, *Síralmas magyar krónikája*, 414–423. Several contemporary illustrations are published by Jolán Balogh, *Varadinum: Várad vára* (Varadinum: The castle of Nagyvárad), *Művészettörténeti füzetek*, no. 13 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1982), vol. 1. On the 17<sup>th</sup> century building process of the castle, see *ibid.*, 55–71.

<sup>131</sup> On the buildings of Gyulafehérvár, see András Kovács, “Az építkező Bethlen Gábor és székvárosa” (Gábor Bethlen, the commissioner of buildings and his residence town), in *Emlékkönyv Jakó Zsigmond születésének nyolcvanadik évfordulójára* (Festschrift for the 80<sup>th</sup> birthday of Zsigmond Jakó), ed. András Kovács, Gábor Sipos and Sándor Tonk (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 1996), 230–246; *Idem*, *Késő reneszánsz építészet Erdélyben 1541–1720* (Late Renaissance architecture in Transylvania 1541–1720) (Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány; Kolozsvár: Polis, 2006), 43–44, the ground-plan of the town from 1711 is published on page 43; on the palace, see pages 75–83. On the cathedral that in this period belonged to the Calvinists, see *idem*, “A gyulafehérvári Szent Mihály székesegyház” (The Saint Michael cathedral in Gyulafehérvár), in *Épületek emlékezete: Nevezetes épületek Erdélyben* (Memory of buildings: Famous edifices in Transylvania) (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2007), 11–39.

<sup>132</sup> On the later development of Bethlen's donation, see János Herepei, “A fehérvári kollégiumi alapítvány sorsa Bethlen halála után” (The history of the donation for the Gyulafehérvár college after Bethlen's death), in *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila

In the end of 1648, when Harsányi most probably arrived in Gyulafehérvár, there was only one of those three professors alive, who were invited from the academy of Herborn by Gábor Bethlen in the late 1620s. This one however enjoyed quite a reputation: apart from his academic activities, Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld also had influence on the foreign policy of György Rákóczi I.<sup>133</sup> Apart from the professor, who taught theology, there were four academicus Hungarian teachers responsible for the training in syntax, poetics, rhetoric and logic (at least in the late 1650s, when Miklós Bethlen was a student of the college).<sup>134</sup> Harsányi must have been one of these pedagogians, who held the title of Rector.<sup>135</sup> We do not know the names of his colleagues, contrary to Nagyvárad, where he worked together with István Técsi Joó, János Hercegszőlősi and János S. Tölcséki.<sup>136</sup>

It is not clear how the opportunity to change his teacher's post in Nagyvárad to that in Gyulafehérvár opened for Harsányi. It might have even been in connection with the death of György Rákóczi I in 1648: the new Prince, György Rákóczi II had been earlier the holder of the most important military post in the Principality, the Captain of Nagyvárad; which meant that he spent a lot of time in the castle of Nagyvárad in the pre-1648 period. During this time, he might have become acquainted

---

Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966), 7–18. On the building of the college, see A. Kovács, “Az építkező Bethlen Gábor”, 242–244; idem, *Késő reneszánsz építészet*, 43.

<sup>133</sup> His biography was summarized by János Kvacsala, “Bisterfeld János Henrik élete” (The life of Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld), *Századok* 25 (1891): 447–478, 545–577.

<sup>134</sup> Bethlen, “Élete leírása”, 547. In the lower classes of the college, it was also possible that the teachers were still prior to their peregrination. Mihály Apafi, for instance, studied under the tutorship of Imre Pápai Páriz, who only matriculated later, in 1645, at the Universities of Leiden and Utrecht. See AMN 3; Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, 49 (Nr. 473).

<sup>135</sup> The conclusion would offer itself that as Harsányi was the *praeceptor* of Apafi in the latter's last year of study, he had to be the teacher of the graduating class (of logic). This is however less than obvious: Apafi noted also the teachers of his classes in his diary, Harsányi is however not among them. It is therefore possible that the later Prince was not a member of Harsányi's class and they knew each other as the teacher and graduating student of the same college.

<sup>136</sup> Herepei, “Adatok”, 64–74. There is no study about the teachers of the Gyulafehérvár college that could be compared with that of Herepei's on Nagyvárad. The most detailed work remained unfinished: Ferenc Váró, *Bethlen Gábor kollégiuma* (The college of Gábor Bethlen) (Nagyenyed: Nagyenyedi Könyvnyomda, 1903). A more recent work concentrates on the period of the college after 1662, when it has been transferred to Nagyenyed: Zsigmond Jakó and István Juhász, *Nagyenyedi diákok 1662–1848* (Students in Nagyenyed 1662–1848) (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979).

with the Rector, who was only five years older than him, and when there was a need for a new teacher in Gyulafehérvár, he might have promoted him to this position. Even the suspicion about Harsányi's Puritan connections might not have been a serious obstacle, as – according to the rather few surviving data – György Rákóczi II had some sympathy towards the church reformers that time (only to become a rigid opponent of Presbyterianism as a Prince, mainly due to the developments in England, such as the execution of Charles I).<sup>137</sup> Whether it was due to the commendation of the new Prince, or not, Harsányi surely made a good career move, because the teachers at the Gyulafehérvár college received an exceedingly high salary, many times the one that could be received in a smaller secondary school: while in Kolozsvár, their salary was 45 florins, in the capital they could get as much as 250 florins, and some extra allowances in kind. Their income thus came close to that of a minister in a well-off town.<sup>138</sup> It seemed that there is a successful career waiting for Harsányi within the pale of the Church.

---

<sup>137</sup> Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 142–143; Makkai, *A magyar puritánusok*, 118.

<sup>138</sup> According to Imre Bán's calculations, the allowances in kind were the following: 36 vats ("köből") of wheat, 200 buckets ("veder") of wine, 15 sheep, 1 swarm of bees and firewood worth 16 florins. The comparative data also come from his account: Bán, *Apáczai*, 395–196.

## II. In the Service of the Prince

In the context of the precedents and the hopes of an ecclesiastic career, it is rather surprising that we find the name of Jakab Harsányi Nagy among the scribes of the Greater Chancellery in a document from 1650, preserved in the archives of the Saxon community of Transylvania.<sup>1</sup> It is very unlikely that he could have had the post of scribe as a part-time job besides his office as a teacher at the Gyulafehérvár college – there are no other examples known from the period that would suggest this, and the work load of the teacher, as far as we can see from contemporary accounts, would not have enabled such an option either. This means then, that Harsányi spent less than two years in the Gyulafehérvár college after he had left Nagyvárad. There is no surviving data about his motivation to leave the teacher's post and change the ecclesiastical career for a secular one. We cannot even rely on other contemporary examples, as there are very few people known who would have done the same in this period. In a few cases, “academicus” rectors in Saxon towns accepted the post of the scribe at the same place – no one else however chose state service instead of that of the church, apart from Harsányi and Gáspár Bojti Veres. Their motivation must have been different however, as Bojti, who came from a peasant family and served as the educator of the nephew of the Prince for a while, left the college of Marosvásárhely in order to return to court and be a court historiographer of Prince Gábor Bethlen.<sup>2</sup> In any

<sup>1</sup> Zsolt Trócsányi, *Erdély központi kormányzata 1540–1690* (The central administration of Transylvania 1540–1690), Magyar Országos Levéltár kiadványai. III. Hatóság- és hivataltörténet, no. 6 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980), 260.

<sup>2</sup> In any case, apart from becoming the historiographer and the *requisitor* of the archives at the court, Bojti also remained preacher (the so-called *concionator*) beside Gábor Bethlen, see Sándor Makoldy, *Bojthi Veres Gáspár élete és történetírói munkássága* (The life and historiographic activities of Gáspár Bojthi Veres) (Nagykároly: Róth, 1904), 10–11; Emma Bartoniek, *Fejezetek a XVI–XVII. századi magyarországi történetírás történetéből* (Chapters from the history of 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century historiography in Hungary) (Budapest: MTA Könyvtár, 1975), 327–338. From the Saxon cases, Gaspar Weis Solitarius and Georg Pistriensis made his double career in Beszterce, and Johannes Funk in Nagyszeben (Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, Nr. 605, 633, 1156).

case, there was no official obstacle for Harsányi to make this decision, even if it was generally expected that students returning from their peregrinations would remain in the service of the Church: in 1582, a synodical decree prescribed that those who did otherwise had to pay back the money spent on them.<sup>3</sup> As Harsányi had served the Reformed Church as teacher for almost seven years after his return home, he did most probably not need to count with such retributions.

As mentioned earlier, the seven years he spent as a teacher makes the impression that Harsányi enjoyed his office and found it important, otherwise he would have left much earlier and looked for a ministry. In this case, however, it would be very hard to believe that he simply had enough of teaching and therefore would have had to look for other ways to support himself. At the same time, there is no information about a conflict in the Gyulafehérvár college that would have been so serious that they would have had to expel one of their teachers. The easiest would be to think about his Puritan contacts again, all the more so, as he had to acknowledge after the synod of Szatmárnémeti that he would lose his ecclesiastical office if he became involved in “innovation” of faith again. A conflict of such proportions would however not only have had to leave trace in the documents of the college (that did not survive until today, which would explain the silence), but also in the correspondence of the contemporaries who followed with eager attention the inner politics of the Reformed Church. The period of 1649–1650 counted however as a remarkably peaceful one: the great convulsions of the 1650s have already been in preparation, but Puritan reformists needed more time to get over their defeat on the Szatmárnémeti

---

<sup>3</sup> On this decree, see Gusztáv Bölcskei, “A kezdetektől a váradi iskola beolvadásáig (1660)” (From the beginnings to the incorporation of the school of Nagyváradi, 1660), in *A debreceni református kollégium története* (History of the Reformed College of Debrecen), ed. József Barcza (Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1988), 33.

synod.<sup>4</sup> Another important argument against the Puritan connection as the motivation for Harsányi's decision is that he joined the service of the Prince later on: György Rákóczi II, who, due to the developments of the English Civil War, felt less and less empathy for the Puritans of Hungary and Transylvania, would not have trusted a person involved in scandals of this kind such a confidential office as that of the "Turkish Scribe", which Harsányi gained in 1651.

The interpretation of the most peculiar event in Harsányi's career must therefore be left open: on the basis of the information we have today, it is not possible to say why Jakab Harsányi exchanged the ecclesiastical career to a secular one. After leaving his post as a teacher however, it could seem obvious to take up scrivenery instead. In the first years of György Rákóczi II's rule, the number of scribes grew remarkably – from the average of fifteen in the 1640s to around thirty at the beginning of the next decade – and it seems that his post was chosen by many for a short term, as a "springboard" for future career.<sup>5</sup> Also, it was an advantage that in order to join the state administration, Harsányi did not have to move from Gyulafehérvár.

Even if we cannot answer the question why he abandoned his post as a Rector, we have much better chances to describe how he became a Turkish Scribe. There is namely a well-documented case of such an appointment from a decade later. Dávid Rozsnyai appeared at the court of the newly established Prince Mihály Apafi I as a twenty-two years young man in the hope, as he writes, that "I can struggle myself into a service."<sup>6</sup> He found a patron in the person of Mihály Csepregi Turkovits, who

<sup>4</sup> The book that prepared the way for the greatest debate of the 1650s about the introduction of the Presbyterian system of church government, Pál Medgyesi's *Dialogus politico-ecclesiasticus* was published in 1650; the debate around it (most importantly between János Tolnai Dali and Ferenc S. Verécsi) started only during the year 1651, see Zoványi, *Puritánus mozgalmak*, 247–269.

<sup>5</sup> On the scribes of the Chancellery, see Zs. Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 188–205.

<sup>6</sup> Dávid Rozsnyai, "Önéletrajza (1663, 1669–73)" (Autobiography, 1663, 1669–73), in *Rozsnyay Dávid, az utolsó török deák történeti maradványai* (The historical monuments of the last Turkish Scribe, Dávid Rozsnyai), ed. by Sándor Szilágyi, Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Ser. II. Scriptores, no. 8

introduced him to a relative of the Prince's consort, Gergely Gilányi. It was he who recommended Rozsnyai to Mihály Apafi, who – after having seen a sample of his handwriting and judged it to be decent – imposed only one more condition for his consent: that the future Turkish Scribe had to find someone to guarantee that he would not “turn Turk,” that is, not convert to Islam and join the service of the Sultan, once he is in Constantinople. In the case of Rozsnyai, this guarantee was given by the Calvinist Bishop Gáspár Veresmarti, his brother-in-law.

Similar elements must have played a role in Harsányi's introduction to the post of the Turkish Scribe. It is however a fundamental difference that while Rozsnyai was only twenty-two when he accepted the hardships of the diplomatic service, Harsányi was over thirty-five years old. In his case, there was obviously no need for a writing test, as he could already prove several times how decently he could write all the documents in the authority of the Greater Chancellery, which practically covered the entire area of state administration.<sup>7</sup> Even the person, who in all likelihood recommended Harsányi for the Prince, can be identified. The envoy (so-called Orator) sent to the Sublime Porte in the fall 1651, Márton Boldvai, was Deputy-Lieutenant (*alispán*) of the county of Bihar in Nagyvárad: the two dedications that prove Harsányi's position as a teacher in the college, quoted in the previous chapter, also name Boldvai as the supporter of the students.<sup>8</sup> The exact date when Harsányi became a Turkish Scribe is not possible to determine but some data suggest that he arrived at the Sublime Porte in the second half of 1651.<sup>9</sup> It is thus likely that the Deputy-

---

(Budapest: Eggenberger, 1867) (in the following: MHHS VIII), 318. See the entire account on his appointment on pages 317–320.

<sup>7</sup> On the competences of the Greater Chancellery, see Zs. Trócsányi, Erdély, 213–253.

<sup>8</sup> See the dedications of Mihály Tofaeus and Péter Szatmári Baka in note 4 of the previous chapter. An approximate date when Boldvai took the Orator's post is given by Vencel Bíró, *Erdély követei a Portán* (The envoys of Transylvania at the Porte) (Kolozsvár: Minerva, 1921), 127.

<sup>9</sup> In the dedication of version B of the *Colloquia*, Harsányi claimed that he spent seven years at the Porte. As we will see later on, he left Constantinople in the fall 1658, which would point at 1651 as his year of arrival. Also, he wrote to Prince György Rákóczi II in 1656 that he had been serving him at the

Lieutenant of Bihar, who could have been acquainted with Harsányi from the years of the latter in Nagyvárad, drew the attention of the Prince upon him and the former Rector arrived in Constantinople in the retinue of Boldvai. Before he left, he most probably also had to come up with a bailor and, as any office-holder sent to the Sublime Porte, sign an obligatory document in which he swore allegiance to the Prince.<sup>10</sup> Even if he probably did not express his fears as eloquently as Dávid Rozsnyai did later on – who referred to himself as “Joseph sold to a foreign country” when leaving to the Porte, and asked for the help of God to fulfill “this office of his, taken with high hopes” – we can be sure that Harsányi was also anxious when he started his new journey, this time to get acquainted with the world eastwards from the Principality.<sup>11</sup>

### ***II.1. The office of the Turkish Scribe at the Sublime Porte***

The novelty of early modern diplomacy was the establishment of permanent embassies. During the 16<sup>th</sup> century, there was a growing number of examples even

---

Porte since three and a half years (Constantinople, 3 February 1656) EÉKH I: 218. He is last mentioned as a scribe of the Chancellery on the 25<sup>th</sup> April 1651, see MOL Erdélyi Kancelláriai Levéltár F 1 28. k. fol. 607–614, from the following edition: Éva Gyulai, ed., *Erdélyi királyi könyvek* (The Royal Registry of Transylvania), vol. 3, 20–29. kötet: 1630–1656: I. és II. Rákóczi György oklevelei (tomes 20–29, 1630–1656, the documents issued by György Rákóczi I and II) (Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kara Magyar Középkori, Kora Újkori és a Történelem Segédtudományai Tanszék; Budapest: Arcanum, 2004) (CD-ROM) [= EKK III]. See also Zs. Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 260.

<sup>10</sup> Although many of the obligatory letters signed by Transylvanian office-holders at the Sublime Porte are preserved, none of them are related to Turkish Scribes. Their “reverzális” could most probably be similar to that given by the interpreters of the ambassadors (on the difference between the two offices, see the next subchapter). See for example the two oaths of János Mózes, dated Gyulafehérvár, 5 October 1681 (Áron Szilády and Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age), vol. 6, *Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek*, no. 8 (Pest: Eggenberger 1871) (in the following: TMÁO VI), 167–168), and Fogaras, 29 April 1687 (Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction), vol. 19, *1686–1688*, Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1896) (in the following EOE XIX), 160–161). Due to their difference in religion, the oath of the interpreter Zsidó Juda (“Judah the Jew”) from 1671 is less appropriate for drawing conclusions, see Áron Szilády and Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age), vol. 5, *Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek*, no. 7 (Pest: Eggenberger 1871) (in the following: TMÁO V), 68–69.

<sup>11</sup> Márton Kaposi and Sándor Iván Kovács, “Rozsnyai Dávid kiadatlan kéziratol imádsága” (An unpublished autograph prayer of Dávid Rozsnyai), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 64 (1960): 487.



outside Italy for a ruler stationing agents in several power centers of Europe. Naturally, the Ottoman Empire, which became a more and more important actor in the scene of European politics, was among the more frequented destinations of these missions. During the 16<sup>th</sup> century, French, English and Habsburg representatives joined the Venetian *bailo* at the Sublime Porte, and in the 17<sup>th</sup>, the Netherlands also established their permanent embassy in Constantinople.<sup>12</sup> The Transylvanian state – presumably due to its limited income – did not follow this transformation of the system of foreign policy, and established only one permanent embassy, in the seat of its overlord, the Sultan.<sup>13</sup> Just as it was the case with the two Romanian Voievods, it was rather the obligation than the right of the Prince of Transylvania to keep an envoy at the Sublime Porte. This person functioned as a representative of the interest of the Principality as well as the first target of the Sultan to call to account in times of conflicts – as a matter of fact, a hostage.

<sup>12</sup> The classic work about the changes in the system of early modern diplomacy is Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1955); also informative on the 17<sup>th</sup> century is Matthew Smith Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450–1919* (London and New York: Longman, 1993). There is no general overview of the history of embassies in Constantinople; the most important works focusing on single national embassies are George Frederick Abbott, *Turkey, Greece and the Great Powers: A Study of Friendship and Hate* (London: Scott, 1916); Alexander H. De Groot, *Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic: A History of the Earliest Diplomatic Relations 1610–1630*, Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, no. 43 (Leiden and İstanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1978); Daniel Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire 1642–1660*, Publications on the Near East (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998); Michael Hochedlinger, “Die französisch-osmanische „Freundschaft“ 1525–1792: Element antihabsburgischer Politik, Gleichgewichtsinstrument, Prestigeunternehmung – Aufriß eines Problems,” *Mitteilungen des Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 102 (1994): 108–164. Recent overviews of the peculiarities of the Ottoman diplomatic activities are Bülent Ari, “Early Ottoman Diplomacy: Ad Hoc Period”; and G. R. Berridge, “Diplomatic Integration with Europe before Selim III,” both in *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?*, Studies in Diplomacy, ed. A. Nuri Yurdusev (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 36–65, resp. 114–130; Gábor Ágoston, “Az oszmán és az európai diplomácia a kölcsönösség felé vezető úton” (Ottoman and European diplomacy on their way to mutuality), in *Híd a századok felett: Tanulmányok Katus László 70. születésnapjára* (Bridge over centuries: Studies for the 70<sup>th</sup> birthday of László Katus), ed. Mariann Nagy (Budapest: MTA TTI; Pécs: JPTE, 1997), 81–96.

<sup>13</sup> The single systematic study on the structure of Transylvanian foreign policy is focusing on the period of Prince Gábor Bethlen (1613–1629): Kálmán Benda, “Diplomáciai szervezet és diplomaták Erdélyben Bethlen Gábor korában” (Diplomatic organisation and diplomats in Transylvania in the period of Gábor Bethlen), *Századok* 125 (1981): 725–730.

The structure of the Transylvanian embassy was relatively constant during the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>14</sup> Its most prestigious post was that of the Chief Ambassador (*főkövet*). The task of these diplomats – who were frequently of high noble origin, but in any case coming from the higher administration of the Principality – was to deliver the tribute of Transylvania to the Sublime Porte. They were also taking care of the most important negotiations in issues concerning the entire country. One grade lower on the administrative – and also, social – scale stayed the permanent envoys, or “Orators”: an office, whose Hungarian name (*kapitiha*) comes from the distortion of the Ottoman Turkish term “deputy” (*kapı kethüdası / kapı kehayası*), used for any resident envoy at the Sublime Porte by Ottoman authorities.<sup>15</sup> They resided in Constantinople, or – following the move of the Sultan’s court – in a considerable part of the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, in Adrianople; their task was to keep the Prince informed and to administer minor issues. The office was generally filled with persons of a more humble social origin than that of the Chief Ambassador. The prestige of the post was much lower than the Chief Ambassadors, who had representative functions, and the Orators had to face rather severe conditions during their stay in the Ottoman capital; therefore, it is no wonder that they did not strive to lengthen the one-year period they were assigned to serve. Exactly on the contrary, we know a significant amount of letters in which the Orators petition their Princes not to make them stay for a long time

---

<sup>14</sup> The structure of the Transylvanian embassy and the everyday of the representatives of the Principality in Constantinople are described by Bíró, *Erdély követei*. His overview is still very important, despite the fact that he conveys a rather static image, neglecting to take the subtle changes of the structure into account. In spite of the title of his book, István Molnár also concentrates his attention on mainly the questions of the Transylvanian embassy’s organisation in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century; see his *Rozsnyai Dávid török deák* (The Turkish Scribe Dávid Rozsnyai), *Művelődéstörténeti értekezések*, no. 33 (Budapest: Stephaneum, 1909), 39–128.

<sup>15</sup> Viorel Panaite, “Reprezentanța diplomatică a Țării Românești la Poarta Otomană în epoca lui Constantin Brâncoveanu” (The Diplomatic Representation of Wallachia at the Ottoman Porte in the Period of Constantin Brâncoveanu), *Revista de Istorie* 41 (1988): 878; Ari, “Early Ottoman Diplomacy”, 47; Dóra Kerekes, “A császári tolmácsok a magyarországi visszafoglaló háborúk idején” (The Imperial interpreters during the expulsion of the Ottomans from Hungary), *Századok* 148 (2004): 1193.

“in this hateful land of pagans without God, where there are no relatives, no Christianity and no mercifulness.”<sup>16</sup> So, unlike the representatives of the Western European powers, among whom it was not uncommon to stay in the Porte for more than ten years, the Transylvanian Orators replaced each other quite frequently, usually after one year.<sup>17</sup> A more long-term connection was characteristic more to the auxiliary personnel of the embassy: the so-called “Post Envoys” (*posták*), who administered the correspondence between Gyulafehérvár, the seat of the Princes, and Constantinople, served in their offices for decades, as well as the Transylvanian interpreters and the so-called Turkish Scribes.

Like most of the Christian embassies at the Porte, the Transylvanian embassy had to face the problem of communication with the overlord, as the vast majority of the diplomats – Chief Ambassadors as well as Orators – did not speak the Ottoman Turkish language. There was always a variety of interpreters offered by the Porte: in the 16<sup>th</sup> century these were mostly of renegade origin, and later the so-called Phanariots, Greeks coming from the quarter Fener of İstanbul. However, the reliability of these people was, to say the least, questionable: their loyalties lay primarily with the Sultan and there was always a high risk that they would transfer any important

<sup>16</sup> László Kubinyi's letter to Mihály Apafi I (Constantinople, 2 October 1677) TMÁO V: 452. For good measure, one has to add that it was not unusual, either, for an orator to return to Constantinople after having spent some time at home after his first year in the Ottoman capital. Occasionally, one can even find “diplomat families”, such as in the case of the Szalánczis, several members of which family had a function in the Transylvanian foreign policy towards the Porte. See Klára Jakó, “A Szaláncziak (Egy fejezet az erdélyi fejedelemség keleti diplomáciájának történetéből)” (The Szalánczis: A chapter from the history of the Eastern diplomacy of the Principality of Transylvania), in *Emlékkönyv Imreh István születésének nyolcvanadik évfordulójára* (Festschrift for the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of István Imreh), ed. András Kiss, Gyöngy Kovács Kiss and Ferenc Pozsony (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 1999), 199–210. The phenomenon of diplomat families occurs also at other embassies in Constantinople, such as in the case of the French Jean De la Haye, from whom the office was taken over by his son, see Abbott, *Turkey*, 30–31; Hochedlinger, “Die französisch-osmanische ‘Freundschaft’”, 124. The English Thomas Bendyshe also called the attention of his son, John, to follow the French example and try to become his successor in the post, see his letter dated Pera, 15 March 1658 (Essex Record Office (in the following: ERO) D/DHf O37).

<sup>17</sup> The list of the known members of the Transylvanian embassy was compiled by Vencel Bíró, *Erdély követei*, 113–137. Although his register could be updated with more (and more precise) data, it still remains very useful up-to-date.

information they become aware of to the Ottoman administration.<sup>18</sup> The diplomats of the smaller embassies, such as that of Transylvania, could be sure that their interpreters will be paid by greater powers hostile to them, in order to find out their secrets.

The Transylvanian embassy tried various solutions for the communication problem. Apart from using the services of the renegade Dragomans of the Porte, and occasionally hiring Jewish interpreters, there were also sometimes Transylvanians appointed for an ad hoc task of translation: in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Post Envoys, who learned some Turkish during their long journeys were recurrently used as interpreters.<sup>19</sup> At the same time, the Principality created the office of the Turkish Scribe that solved the problem in a way many other embassies also applied: the holders of the post were interpreters specialized on diplomatic tasks and trained in Constantinople on the cost of the Prince.

It was the Venetian embassy which first established an institution for educating interpreters in the Ottoman capital: the students, called *giovanni della lingua*, were introduced to the Ottoman language and political culture, while at the same time they maintained their adherence to the Serenissima. The Venetian example was followed

<sup>18</sup> On the dragomans as sources of information in general see Gábor Ágoston, “Bírodalom és információ: Konstantinápoly, mint a koraújkori Európa információs központja” (Empire and information: Constantinople as an information centre of Early Modern Europe), in *Az értelem bátorsága: Tanulmányok Perjés Géza emlékére* (The valor of the mind: Studies in the memory of Géza Perjés), ed. Gábor Hausner (Budapest: Argumentum, 2005), 31–60. On the dragomans of the Habsburg embassy, see Peter Meienberger, *Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn als kaiserlicher Resident in Konstantinopel in dem Jahren 1629–1643: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und der Türkei in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Geist und Werk der Zeiten, no. 37 (Bern and Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1973), 94–95. On the dragomans at the 17<sup>th</sup> century Dutch embassy, see Alexander H. De Groot, “The Dutch Nation in Istanbul, 1600–1985: A Contribution to the Social History of Beyoğlu,” *Anatolica* 14 (1987): 131–150. On the dragomans at the French embassy, see Marie de Testa and Antoine Gautier, “Les drogman au service de la France au Levant,” in Eidem, *Drogmans et diplomates européens auprès de la Porte Ottomane*, *Analecta Isisiana*, 71 (İstanbul: Isis, 2003), 17–39. – On the office of the Chief Dragoman, created in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, see Nestor Camariano, *Alexandre Mavrocordato le Grand Dragoman: Son activité diplomatique* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balcan Studies, 1970).

<sup>19</sup> On more details, see Gábor Kármán, “Translation at the 17<sup>th</sup> Century Transylvanian Embassy in Constantinople,” in *The Ottoman Orient and East Central Europe*, ed. Robert Born and Stephan Conermann (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010) (forthcoming).

after a century by the French, with the introduction of the institution of *jeunesse de langue*, their trainees were also educated in the earlier period in Constantinople, and later, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, in Paris. The *Sprachknaben* of the Habsburg embassy had a similar development: there were initiatives as early as 1616 to train future interpreters in Constantinople, but the question was finally solved by the establishment of the college for teaching oriental languages by Johann Baptist Podestà in 1674.<sup>20</sup> Even the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth sent people regularly to Constantinople in order to learn the language and serve as interpreters from the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, in spite of the fact that the state did not have a permanent representative at the Sublime Porte until the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The attempts to establish an institution for teaching oriental languages, however, were only successful after 1700. The Ragusan interpreters had their initial teaching in the Republic, and were sent to Constantinople only after a longer stay in one of the major Ottoman provincial centers, Thessaloniki, Adrianople, Smyrna or Plovdiv.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> See an overview of the question in Ágoston, “Az oszmán és az európai diplomácia”, 94–95; Kerekes, „A császári tolmácsok”, 1196–1202. On the Venetian and French institutions for training interpreters see Isabella Palumbo Fossati Casa, “L’École vénitienne des ‘giovanni di lingua’,” and Andrei Pippidi, “Drogmans et enfants de langue: La France de Constantinople au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle,” both in *Istanbul et les langues orientales: Actes du colloque organisé par l’IFEA et l’INALCO à l’occasion du bicentenaire de l’Ecole des Langues Orientales: Istanbul 29–31 Mai 1995*, Varia turcica, no. 31, ed. by Frédéric Hitzel (Paris and Montréal: L’Harmattan, 1997), 109–122, resp. 131–140. See also Robert Mantran, *La vie quotidienne à Constantinople au temps de Soliman le Magnifique et de ses successeurs (XVI<sup>e</sup> et XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Paris: Hachette, 1965), 171; also de Testa and Gautier, “Les drogmans”, 41–51. – On the Imperial education of interpreters, see Kerekes, “A császári tolmácsok”; on the early attempts Meienberger, *Johann Rudolf Schmied*, 95–96. On the problems of translation in mid-17<sup>th</sup> century Imperial administration, see also István Hiller, “A tolmácsper” (The Interpreters’ lawsuit), in *Perlekedő évszázadok: Tanulmányok Für Lajos történész 60. születésnapjára* (Centuries in quarrel: Studies for the 60<sup>th</sup> birthday of the historian Lajos Für), ed. Ildikó Horn (Budapest: ELTE BTK Középkori és Korai Magyar Történelmi Tanszék, 1993), 147–186.

<sup>21</sup> Tadeusz Majda, “L’École polonaise des langues orientales d’Istanbul au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle,” in *Istanbul et les langues orientales: Actes du colloque organisé par l’IFEA et l’INALCO à l’occasion du bicentenaire de l’Ecole des Langues Orientales: Istanbul 29–31 Mai 1995*, Varia turcica, no. 31, ed. Frédéric Hitzel (Paris and Montréal: L’Harmattan, 1997), 123–128. See also Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *Ottoman–Polish Diplomatic Relations (15<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> Century): An Annotated Edition of ‘Ahdnames and Other Documents*, The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, no. 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 178–179. On the Ragusan methods, see Vesna MIOVIĆ, “Dragomans of the Dubrovnik Republic: Their Training and Career,” *Dubrovnik Annals* 5 (2001): 83–84.

Transylvania could not provide such an elaborate, multiple-stage system for the training of its Turkish Scribes. We have very little information about the procedure of their education: most of the information comes again from the fragments of Dávid Rozsnyai's autobiography. His case is however less than typical: although he started his journey in 1663 to the Porte in the company of the Chief Ambassador and the Orator, he arrived in Constantinople only two years later, due to the military and political situation of the period. The Transylvanian envoys met the Grand Vizier, making his way with the army towards Hungary, in Eszék, and after the negotiations, the Chief Ambassadors wanted to return to Transylvania immediately. The Orator however wanted to take only one of the two Turkish Scribes to the Ottoman capital, and since György Brankovics knew some Turkish already, he was chosen for the task. Rozsnyai should have returned to the Principality if only the Grand Dragoman of the Porte, the Greek Panagiotis Nikusios (or, in the better known Turkish form of his name, Panayoti) would not have needed someone to translate for him from Latin to Hungarian. This is how Rozsnyai stayed in the retinue of the Grand Dragoman; he spent almost the entire next year in Belgrade, and that is where he learned the basics of Ottoman Turkish – a skill that he later on used in the service of Princes for five decades.<sup>22</sup> Rozsnyai however followed the example of other Turkish Scribes at least in one element: to learn the basics, such as the Arabic script, he hired an Ottoman instructor, a so-called *hoca*. It was also a general phenomenon in his individual career that he was not exempted from other duties under his training: he was frequently given various orders by the Transylvanian hostage at the Grand Vizier's side, Gábor Haller and other diplomats from the Principality, who visited the camp.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> MHHS VIII: 276–278; 320–330.

<sup>23</sup> Molnár, *Rozsnyai*, 20–21.

It is highly unlikely that, just like Brankovics, Jakab Harsányi Nagy would have had some elementary knowledge of Ottoman Turkish when he arrived at the Sublime Porte. He hired a *hoca* most probably already in the beginning of his stay in Constantinople, although the first information about him dates from rather late (1654).<sup>24</sup> We have nevertheless data from an earlier period that János Romosz, another Turkish Scribe at the Porte – who started his studies probably somewhat earlier – did have a *hoca*.<sup>25</sup> In any case, Harsányi found an excellent instructor, as his *hoca* was also the one who taught Nikousios to write in Turkish: and as it is obvious from the later career of the Greek, who was by that time only the interpreter of the Habsburg embassy, the education was rather successful.<sup>26</sup>

It would be hard to tell with any precision how long the training period was, that is: how much time was needed to learn the language in a level that was good enough for the interpreter's tasks. The first letter, from which it is obvious that Harsányi translated a part of the Transylvanian documents to be submitted to the Porte, dates from January 1655, but the passage there suggests that it was not the first time it happened.<sup>27</sup> After a bit more than three years of learning, Harsányi was thus judged to be able to translate diplomatic correspondence of high relevance, and to participate at the negotiations of the Orator as an interpreter. The same letter however also informs us that the Turkish Scribe was not “ready” and did not give up taking lectures yet: he was visited each day by his *hoca*, although Harsányi had enough free time to go on with the training only twice per week. He asked the Prince several times

<sup>24</sup> Letter of Ferenc Thordai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 19 May 1654) MHHD XXIII: 349.

<sup>25</sup> Letter of Ferenc Sebesi to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 14 September 1653) MHHD XXIII: 129–131. On Romosz, see Kármán, “Translation”; and later subchapters. It is very likely that the reason why there is no data about the stay of Romosz in Constantinople prior to 1651, is that the correspondence from the years between 1649 and 1651 is preserved only in fragments.

<sup>26</sup> See the letter of Ferenc Thordai, quoted in note 24. On the career of Nikousios, see Damien Janos, “Panaïotis Nicousios and Alexander Mavrocordatos: The rise of the Phanariots and the office of Grand Dragoman in the Ottoman administration in the second half of the seventeenth century,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005/6): 177–196.

<sup>27</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 4 January 1655) EÉKH I: 539.

to be exempted from other duties, so that he could dedicate himself only to learning.<sup>28</sup> It was probably this dissatisfaction with his skills, the intention to perfect his command of the language that motivated him not to leave the Ottoman capital after a few years. In the other known cases of Turkish Scribes, the practice seems to have been that after the years of their training, they worked at the princely court in Gyulafehérvár, and returned to Constantinople only irregularly, in the retinue of Chief Ambassadors or other diplomatic missions not longer than one year. Apart from Brankovics and Rozsnyai, this was also how Romosz acted: he was back in Transylvania already in December 1655.<sup>29</sup>

Jakab Harsányi Nagy had thus a multitude of other issues to keep in mind apart from learning Ottoman Turkish, and later on making translations and working as an interpreter for the embassy. Also, it seems that he put a lot of energy into these extraordinary tasks: the reader of his correspondence sometimes gets the impression that he always took upon himself new assignments out of his free will – or even, that he tried, at least partly, to re-define the function of the Turkish Scribe. There is no other known example for a Turkish Scribe working as a general scribe beside the Orator, whereas we have a number of letters bearing the signature of both the Orator and Harsányi, in the handwriting of the Turkish Scribe. Harsányi even aimed for more than simply fulfilling a scribe's task. These letters were not dictated by the Orator: it was Harsányi who penned them, probably after having agreed upon the content with the envoy.<sup>30</sup> Apart from these, there are other letters to the Prince that were written by

<sup>28</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 27 June 1656) MHHD XXIII: 398.

<sup>29</sup> On other Turkish Scribes, such as András Majtényi and János Váradi Házi, there are only data about this later period of their lives which they spent in Transylvania or traveling between the Principality and the Porte, see Kármán, "Translation".

<sup>30</sup> This method for writing the reports of the embassy is obvious from the following letters, bearing the signature of Máté Balogh and Harsányi: Constantinople, 22 January 1656 and 30 July 1656 (MHHD XXIII: 296–299, 421–423). Harsányi also refers to it in his own letter dated 3 February 1656: EÉKH II: 216.



Harsányi in his own name. This was not altogether extraordinary: several other examples are also known about Turkish Scribes visiting the Prince with their letters and informing them about questions which may have been left out from the Orators' reports.<sup>31</sup> There are however no less than thirty-three such letters written by Harsányi from the period between 1654 and 1656, and even references to some more which have not survived.<sup>32</sup> It seems that his reports meant a serious competition to those of the Orator after a while; especially to those which were not penned by the Turkish Scribe. What is more, in some cases Harsányi explicitly noted that he shared some information with the Prince the Orator did not know about.<sup>33</sup>

The innovations of Harsányi in the communication with the princely court were not limited to a multiplication of the reports (and the information included in them) sent to Gyulafehérvár. The technical characteristics of his correspondence also differed widely from the one applied by his direct predecessors: his reports namely include a fair amount of text in ciphers. Cryptography was certainly not introduced to the administration of Transylvanian foreign policy by Harsányi: since the beginning of the 1640s, there are a lot of letters known from the Porte which apply the code used by him as well, to exchange letters to others according to a scheme.<sup>34</sup> At the same time, this practice seems to have been forgotten in the early 1650s: it is a letter from the

---

<sup>31</sup> Letter of Péter Bakó to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 9 March 1636) Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Levelek és okiratok I. Rákóczy György keleti összeköttetései történetéhez* (Letters and documents to the history of the Eastern contacts of György Rákóczi I) (Budapest: Knoll, 1883) (in the following: RGyKÖ), 292–296; letter of János Romosz to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 7 July 1651) MHHD XXIII: 79–80.

<sup>32</sup> For instance, the first information that Harsányi wrote his own report refers to a letter unknown today: Ferenc Thordai informed the Prince that the Turkish Scribe had a deeper knowledge about some questions, therefore he asked him to write about them to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 13 May 1654) MHHD XXIII: 144.

<sup>33</sup> Letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 22 July 1655 and 22 February 1656) Sándor Szilágyi, "Levelek és okiratok II. Rákóczy György fejedelem diplomáciai összeköttetései történetéhez" (Letters and documents for the history of the diplomatic connections of György Rákóczi II), in *Történelmi Tár 1889* (in the following: TT 1889), 669; resp. MHHD XXIII: 319.

<sup>34</sup> Many examples can be found in RGyP and RGyKÖ.

Orator of 1654, Ferenc Thordai that includes parts in cipher for the first time again.<sup>35</sup> Harsányi might have learned cryptography from him, as the technique is present in his letters from this period: while in a letter written in July 1654, there is only one word in cipher, two years later a huge part of another report with similar contents is written in code.<sup>36</sup> By this time Harsányi saw cryptography as such an integral part of diplomatic correspondence that he noted: he cannot inform the Voievod of Moldavia about some things “because he does not have any scribes who would be a bit acquainted to ciphers”; therefore the Prince had to forward the information to Iași with his own post.<sup>37</sup> It seems that Harsányi was especially eager to use cryptography in the cases when the letters were sent not through the Post Envoys of the Prince, but through the service of the Voievods of Moldavia or Wallachia: in such instances, Harsányi did not even sign his name under the fully ciphered text, only noted his monograms.<sup>38</sup> He was clearly proud of his newly achieved skill, which was all the more understandable as cryptography was hard to master; and while the autographic letters of Harsányi prove that he developed quite a routine – for the first sight, it is impossible to separate the coded words from the non-coded, as they flow in the same handwriting –, in the letters personally written by Orator Máté Balogh, one comes across incomprehensible words due to mistakes of the ciphering.<sup>39</sup>

There is another method for preserving the secrecy of the diplomatic correspondence, the use of which at the Transsylvanian embassy in Constantinople is

<sup>35</sup> Letter of Ferenc Thordai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople 7 July 1654) MHHD XXIII: 148–150. As it is clear from the original, the letter is an autograph of Thordai, see MOL E 190 Nr. 8781.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. for instance the letters of 7 July 1654 and 10 June 1656 (MHHD XXIII: 146–147, resp. EÉKH II: 221–222).

<sup>37</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 12 May 1656) EÉKH II: 221.

<sup>38</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 20 July 1654) BUBFS VIII: 48.

<sup>39</sup> See for instance the letter of Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 443. He was not the only Orator who had troubles with cryptography; István Rác summarized his problems in a letter to György Rákóczi I with the following words: “I had struggled a lot, Your Highness, but I cannot grasp a thing from it; whether it is the fault of the key or of myself, I do not know.” RGYKÖ 655.

known only from Harsányi's letters. A short letter from March 1655 was preserved in his handwriting, in which he informs Prince György Rákóczi II that the missions for purchasing jewellery, which he bestowed upon his envoys in Constantinople, are progressing well, and that everything is silent in the Ottoman capital. The last line, in cipher, however makes it clear that this was not all the Turkish Scribe wanted his ruler to know: "I only wrote this letter, Your Highness, so that, would the Post Envoy meet Siavuş Pasha, he should show this to him."<sup>40</sup> This extra caution was necessary because the powerful Pasha of Silistria did not agree with Rákóczi on the policy to follow concerning the ongoing revolts of Wallachian soldiers: it was thus to be expected that he would want to take the letters from the Post Envoy crossing his territory. There was surely a real letter (which is unfortunately not known), reporting important issues at the Porte, sent simultaneously with this fake one. I do not want to suggest that this solution was Harsányi's invention. Only a year later, a similar method was used by another Transylvanian diplomat: Ferenc Sebesi presented some fake documents to the King of Poland when he arrested him to ask some questions about the contents of the ongoing negotiations between Transylvania and Sweden.<sup>41</sup> Even if the solution was not introduced by Harsányi, its application proves that the Turkish Scribe was familiar with the tools available for contemporary diplomacy, and did everything in his power to solve the tasks given to him in the most effective way.

Harsányi did not only serve as scribe and interpreter: his above-mentioned information monopoly, that there was some information he did not share with the Orator, could not have developed, if he limited himself to these activities. The reports

<sup>40</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Constantinople, 10 March 1655) EÉKH I: 540–541.

<sup>41</sup> Ferenc Sebesi's points created for the King of Poland: MHHD XXIII: 305–306. On his diplomatic activities, see Ildikó Horn, "Sebesi Ferenc – egy erdélyi diplomata" (Ferenc Sebesi – A Transylvanian diplomat), in *Scripta manent: Ünnepi tanulmányok a 60. életévét betöltött Gerics József professzor tiszteletére* (Studies for the honor of professor József Gerics, after filling his 60<sup>th</sup> year), ed. István Draskóczy (Budapest: ELTE Középkori és Kora Újkori Magyar Történeti Tanszék, 1994), 199–205.

written by earlier Turkish Scribes were transmitting information in the frames available for an interpreter: they let the Prince know what they learned at the negotiations of the Orator, giving sometimes more details or placing the focus somewhere else than the envoys themselves. Harsányi did a fundamentally different thing: he did not only complete the news reported by the Orator, but also used entirely different channels of information. In his letters from the period between 1654 and 1656, there are no less than thirty names with whom Harsányi talked about the issues of his Prince, or at least received important information from. In some cases what happened was simply that Harsányi met the office-holders of the Porte who were important for the foreign policy of Transylvania more often than the Orator. This was the case of the Valide Kihaya (the representative of the mother of the Sultan), the “younger Jusuf Pasha”, whose function is unknown, and the Nakib Effendi, who – one of the most important magistrates of Islam and a direct descendant of Prophet Mohammed – was one of the most stable allies of the Prince of Transylvania in the quickly changing political life of the 1650s.<sup>42</sup> The same is true about the Christian envoys at the Sublime Porte who frequently appear in the diplomatic correspondence of the Principality. In 1656, Oliver Cromwell commissioned his ambassador in Constantinople to help the endeavors of György Rákóczi II; therefore, Harsányi came into contact with Thomas Bendyshe.<sup>43</sup> Apart from him, Harsányi also had temporary contacts with the French, Dutch, Polish and even Habsburg ambassadors, with the

<sup>42</sup> All of them appear for the first time in Harsányi’s reports from 14 August 1654 (MHHD XXIII: 156–158), to become standing protagonists of the Transylvanian diplomatic correspondence in the next two years. They maintained this contact even after they have lost their offices (in contemporary terms: became *mazul*), see the letter of Máté Balogh and Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Constantinople, 16 October 1656) MHHD XXIII: 390, resp. 484. The post of the Nakib Effendi is presented by Harsányi in the *Colloquia* as an office that enjoys higher respect than that of the Mufti (p. 497–499).

<sup>43</sup> The first appearance of the English ambassadors is in the letter from Harsányi and Balogh ([without day] October 1656) EÉKH II: 223. On Bendyshe’s activities, see Goffman, *Britons*; on the support of the Lord Protector to Transylvania, see Dávid Angyal, “Erdély politikai érintkezése Angliával” (Transylvania’s political contacts with England), *Századok* 34 (1900): 502–503; Sándor Márki, “Cromwell és Erdély” (Cromwell and Transylvania), *Erdélyi Múzeum* 18 (1901): 16–37.

latter primarily because – for the first time in the rather stormy history of Transylvanian–Habsburg relations – one copy of his reports were transmitted by the Transylvanian Post Envoys towards Vienna.<sup>44</sup>

There were however many people in the social network of Harsányi at the Sublime Porte who were connected to the Transylvanian embassy only through his person. He was the one to win over Nikousios for the Transylvanian information system in the beginning of 1656; what is more, the interpreter of the Habsburg embassy committed himself to György Rákóczi II only under the condition – apart from a yearly salary of 150 dollars – that no one can know about his oath of allegiance other than the Turkish Scribe and the Prince.<sup>45</sup> There are also other sources of information appearing in Harsányi's correspondence: he refers to “a Greek priest”, or even “my friend, an Ağa.”<sup>46</sup> The latter deserves special attention, as it seems that Harsányi managed to get into intimate contacts with Ottoman office-holders (even if we can assume that they were not of the highest rank), which must have proved very useful in collecting information. For the Orators, who did not speak Turkish, this option was not available. It was not only Harsányi who noted that he cannot take the Orator with him to some negotiations, because “no matter how he would disguise himself, someone talks to him from the crowd, he cannot speak Turkish, everyone points fingers at him, that these are gjaurs;” the Nakib Effendi also sent word to Rákóczi: in confidential cases, he should write to him in Turkish, in order to avoid the involvement of a third party who would then forward the information to others.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup> On the “Gallic” ambassador: EÉKH I: 146; MHHD XXIII: 423; EÉKH II: 228; on the Dutch: MHHD XXIII: 399; on the Polish: EÉKH I: 545; on the “German Orator”: TT 1889: 668; MHHD XXIII: 315, 400.

<sup>45</sup> Letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February, resp. 26 April 1656) EÉKH II: 216, resp. MHHD XXIII: 362.

<sup>46</sup> Letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 19 March, resp. 23 July 1655) TT 1889: 660, resp. MHHD XXIII: 214.

<sup>47</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 23 May 1655) EÉKH I: 544, and the letter of 22 July, quoted in note 33, 699.

We do not know of any other Turkish Scribe who would have masterminded an information network of similar size earlier, and even if we have to count with the loss of sources from some periods, the Harsányi's practice seems to be extraordinary. It was obviously an important element of this development that he stayed at the Porte for a long time: János Romosz could not have created a similar network, because as soon as he had learned the language, he returned to Gyulafehérvár. We therefore only know about one source who provided the Transylvanian embassy through his contacts with Romosz: his *hoca*, the only Ottoman from Constantinople, with whom he surely stood in daily contact.<sup>48</sup> In short, we can say that Jakab Harsányi Nagy played a far more important role in the service of the Transylvanian embassy at the Sublime Porte than Turkish Scribes usually did. He did not only solve the usual tasks in a high level but also took upon himself new ones. What is more: he often overstepped the frames of his office in his reports: he did not only concentrate upon gathering and transferring information, but also frequently gave advice to his ruler about the policies to follow.

In the 1650s, the Ottoman Empire went through one of the greatest political crises of its history.<sup>49</sup> The court of the infant Sultan was characterized by the constant struggle of various factions and frequent political changes. The Grand Viziers, replacing each other in an accelerated pace, had to face a series of acute problems: the financial problems led to irregularities in the payment of the armies and thus often to revolts. The war against Venice brought serious defeats in the second half of the decade: the fleet of the Serenissima almost managed to cut off Constantinople from the Mediterranean in 1656.<sup>50</sup> In the rather chaotic situation, the Porte did not really

<sup>48</sup> See the letter of Ferenc Sebesi, quoted in note 25, 129–131.

<sup>49</sup> On the crisis, see Jozef Matuz, *Das Osmanische Reich: Grundlinien seiner Geschichte* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985), 165–178.

<sup>50</sup> Ekkehard Eickhoff, *Venedig, Wien und die Osmanen: Umbruch in Südosteuropa 1645–1700* (Munich: Callwey, 1970), 138–149; Kenneth M. Setton, *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1991), 172–189.

have means to practice a strong control upon its tributary, the Prince of Transylvania. The usual tasks for the Transylvanian diplomats in Constantinople, the debates with the Pashas of neighboring *eyalets* about the taxation of the border zone, or the building of new fortifications, required only a smaller amount of their energy in this decade. A new challenge came from the Tatar Khan, whose envoys called Rákóczi upon the payment of a tribute to him as well in 1656. However, the network of the Prince at the Porte functioned well this time, and there was a strict order sent in the name of the Sultan to Mehmed Girey IV, also an Ottoman vasall, that he should abandon these attempts.<sup>51</sup>

It was much more the active foreign policy of György Rákóczi II that provided the diplomats with work in this decade.<sup>52</sup> Between the years 1653 and 1655, the Prince succeeded to bring the two neighboring tributary states of the Ottoman Empire, Moldavia and Wallachia under his protection: the Voievods of both countries owed Rákóczi their thrones, had military alliance with him and paid a yearly tax to the Prince. The military actions leading to this situation gave rather complicated tasks to the Transylvanian diplomats in Constantinople, as the Sublime Porte had to acknowledge the new Voievods in order that their rule would be legitimate. Working for the establishment and confirmation of the new Voievods' rule and finding the effective counter-maneuvers against the attempts of Vasile Lupu and other pretenders of these two thrones provided the diplomats with a constant assignment in the middle of the decade. Besides these, we find surprisingly little in the diplomatic correspondence about the most ambitious plan of the Prince: the attempt to take the

<sup>51</sup> There are numerous references to the debates with neighboring Pashas in contemporary diplomatic correspondence. On the issue concerning the Tatar Khan, see the reports of Máté Balogh and Harsányi (Constantinople, 22 January, 4 February and 29 May 1656) MHHD XXIII: 297, 309 and 704; and Harsányi's own report from April 1656 (day unknown) EÉKH II: 218.

<sup>52</sup> The most recent accounts on the foreign policy of György Rákóczi II: Sándor Gebei, *II. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem külpolitikája (1648–1657)* (The foreign policy of György Rákóczi II, Prince of Transylvania 1648–1657), Acta Academicae Pedagogicae Agriensis. Nova series, sectio historiae, no. 23 (Eger: EKTF–Liceum, 1996).

Polish throne. Even when this question was raised by Ottoman dignitaries, the diplomats denied that their lord would have anything like this in mind: clearly, György Rákóczi II thought that he would be able to act without the involvement of the Sublime Porte.<sup>53</sup>

The analyses of the political situation and advice sent by Jakab Harsányi have probably contributed to it that György Rákóczi II started to feel secure from the side of the Sublime Porte – only to be proven wrong later on, with dire consequences. The Turkish Scribe could observe for years how the internal political life at the Constantinople court functioned, watched the games played by various factions and it was because of his personal experiences that he joined the camp of those advertising the theory of the fall of the Ottoman Empire. “Here, Your Highness, there is no constancy, what they like today, will abandon tomorrow” – experiences similar to this motivated Harsányi to draw general conclusions:

This Porte is not like in the old days, so that it would gain something with power and sense; she crumbles, grabbles for everything like a drowning man, fawns and aggravates her anger as she sees her own impotence. The good advice is scarce here; even they do not predict a good future for themselves any more.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> See the letter of Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 16 October 1656), in which Balogh says that he spread the news at the Porte that the Prince did not even think about going to Poland (letter quoted in note 44, 482.) The report well-known in Hungarian historiography as the one that would describe the opinion of the Grand Vizier on the question, mirrors not the thoughts of Köprülü Mehmed, but the interpreter given to the Transylvanians by the Porte, Zülfikār Ağa, see the letter of Máté Balogh and Jakab Harsányi to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 21 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 471. Cf. Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “A ‘kereszténység Achillese’” (The “Achilles of the Christianity”), in *Europica varietas – hungarica varietas* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1994), 79.

<sup>54</sup> “Itt, kegyelmes urunk, állandóság nincsen semmi, az mi ma tetszik nekik, holnap elbontják.” Letter of Harsányi and Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 29 May 1656). “Ez az porta nem az régi, hogy erővel, ésszel valamire mehetne már, mindenfelé sántikál, kap, mint az vízbe haló ember, hízelkedik, csak növeli az mérgét, látván maga tehetetlenségét. Az tanács valóban szűkös, itt is magok sem jövendőlnék magok felől már igen jól.” Letter of Harsányi to the Prince (Constantinople, 4 June 1655) MHHD XXIII: 704, resp. 191.



It did not happen often that he openly motivated the Prince for action – this was too much even for his extended interpretation about the frames of his office –, but there are even examples for that: “if Your Highness knows what You intend to do, just start doing it, because the Turk will always side with the winners.” At the same time, he also noted that this strategy can backfire: “(God forbid) if luck would not serve Your Highness, the tongues and arms of the Turks would, believe me, lengthen against Your Highness; but if God helps the endeavors of Your Highness, their tongues go numb and their arms shorten.”<sup>55</sup> It is very unlikely that Prince György Rákóczi II would have heard the expression – otherwise very popular in Transylvania – that the Turk is the son of luck (*fortunae filius*) from Harsányi for the first time, but the reports of the Turkish Scribe must have reinforced his conviction concerning this theory.<sup>56</sup>

With his strongly put opinions and consequently implied image about the politics of the Sublime Porte, Harsányi must have contributed to the Prince’s faulty appraisal of the situation. With the hindsight of posterity, it is quite ironic to read how the Turkish Scribe, in a letter written together with the Orator, informed György Rákóczi II about the inauguration of Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmed, who later on devastated Transylvania with his troops and dethroned the Prince: “it was a happy event [that he became the Grand Vizier], as the other one [that is, the previous holder

---

<sup>55</sup> “[...] ha nagyságod aránzza, hogy az mire céloz, véghez viheti, csak hozzá lászson, mert az török mindenkor az győzedelmes féllal tartja”; “[...] (kit isten ne adjon), ha az szerencse nem talál nagyságodnak szolgálni, nyelvek, karjok az törököknek, minden bizsonnyal elhiggye, nagyságod ellen meghosszabbodik; egyébként ha isten nagyságodnak dolgát szerencsésíti, nyelvek megnémul, karjok megrövidül.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 16 October 1656), quoted in note 42, 484.

<sup>56</sup> This well-established metaphor of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian language appears in the letters of György Rákóczi II already before the time when Harsányi wrote his first report, at least according to the surviving material. See the Prince’s letters to his mother, Zsuzsanna Lorántffy (Földvár, 1 June and Radnót, 6 August 1653) Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *A két Rákóczy György családi levelezése* (The family correspondence of the two György Rákóczis), Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Ser. I. Diplomataria, no. 24 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1875) (in the following: MHHD XXIV), 459, resp. 470.

of the office] wanted to have gifts and got involved in many bad issues.”<sup>57</sup> At the same time, no contemporary could possibly know that the seventy-years old Grand Vizier, the eighteenth in ten years, would be the one to settle the political crisis of the Porte with an iron hand: it would be unjust to blame the ill-qualified Transylvanian diplomats in Constantinople for the eventual fiasco of Rákóczi’s politics, as some historians of the epoch did.<sup>58</sup> The breadth of the information network masterminded by Jakab Harsányi Nagy was extraordinary in the history of Transylvania, and some letters that indicate how much money was supposed to be spent for various persons in order to support the Transylvanian politics in Constantinople, make the impression that the ambitions of the Turkish Scribe did not take the capabilities of the Principality into consideration: the expenses of such an active diplomacy would have meant a serious burden even for a much richer ruler than the Prince of Transylvania.

## ***II.2. The Micro-Society of the Transylvanian Embassy in Constantinople***

Harsányi thus excelled in taking care of his duties, but for the effective functioning of the embassy, it was not enough to maintain his contacts with office-holders at the Porte and other personalities in Constantinople: he also had to create concord with his closest colleagues. And this was rather problematic sometimes: there was practically no member of the embassy with whom the hyper-active Turkish Scribe would not have had a quarrel for some reasons, during the seven years of his stay at the Sublime

<sup>57</sup> “[...] jól esett, mivel ez másik ajándékot kíván vala, és egyéb sok rossz dolgokban is avatta magát.” Letter of Máté Balogh and Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 16 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 710.

<sup>58</sup> Ignác Acsády, *Magyarország története I. Lipót és I. József korában (1657–1711)* (The history of Hungary in the age of Leopold I and Joseph I (1657–1711), A magyar nemzet története, no. 7 (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1898) 25–39. It is quite ironic that Acsády quotes Harsányi’s devastating remarks about the incompetence of his colleagues, while his argumentation about the diplomats spreading a false idea about the fall of the Empire, could best applied to the Turkish Scribe. The list of the eighteen Grand Viziers between 1646 and 1656, see in İsmail Hâmi Danişmend, *Osmanlı Devlet Erkâni* (The pillars of the Ottoman State), İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, no. 5 (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971), 37–42.

Porte. The reason for these conflicts was only partly that Harsányi – according to the letters of him, and also of his contemporaries – was not a particularly pliable character; in many cases, his problems originated in structural problems of the embassy.

With some after-wisdom, we could say that it was inevitable that Harsányi had to come into conflict with those who held an office similar to his. It was however not only him who ended up in controversies with the above mentioned János Romosz: it seems that the other Turkish Scribe trained in the 1650s, also wanted to gain more importance than just becoming an interpreter. In May 1654, Romosz was still at the Sublime Porte and must have enjoyed the special attention of his Prince, as he was given individual commissions to obtain documents from the Ottoman chancellery and buy stately horse-equipment for György Rákóczi II.<sup>59</sup> He was trying to be secretive about these tasks which attitude annoyed his colleagues, especially that he also made several mistakes: because of his delays, the embassy forfeited the opportunity to get some important information. What was worse: he had little sense for protocol, which was proven in the following occasion. People from the retinue of the Orator once had a burst-up with some Turks on the street, who then came in large groups to the lodgings of the Transylvanian embassy. Ferenc Thordai, the Orator tried to calm them, but Romosz mistranslated his words, and his utterances made the crowd even angrier. When he was called to task for it by the Orator, he started to quarrel with him in front of the entire crowd, so that Thordai, in order to win back his dignity, slapped the face of the Turkish Scribe publicly. No wonder that Romosz left Constantinople during the next one year.<sup>60</sup> Harsányi did not have a high opinion about the language skills of his

<sup>59</sup> Letter of Ferenc Thordai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 28 May 1654) EÉKH I: 352.

<sup>60</sup> On the incident, see the letter of Ferenc Thordai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 2 May 1654) TT 1889: 490. During this conflict, Romosz had a quarrel with Harsányi as well, see the latter's report (Constantinople, 7 July 1654) MHHD XXIII: 146. Jakab Harsányi writes in his letter, dated 17

colleague either: “it is written in a childish style” – he claimed about a letter penned by Romosz in Turkish; which could well be taken as a result of his bias, if only he would not have noted that his judgment can be reinforced by András Majtényi, who had been serving the Prince as a Turkish Scribe since the 1620s.<sup>61</sup> Romosz nevertheless was given assignments later on as well: in 1657, he negotiated in Bakhchisaray with the Tatar Khan who held the Transylvanian army as his captive.<sup>62</sup>

If it can be suspected that there was a competition of competences in the background of Harsányi’s conflict with János Romosz, this is very clear in the case of the Dragoman assigned for the Transylvanian embassy by the Sublime Porte, Zülfikār Ağa. He already was regarded as an old man in the 1650s: the first information about him dates from 1618, and since the 1620s he had continuously been in the service of the Principality.<sup>63</sup> Although he did not speak any language apart from Hungarian and Ottoman Turkish, he did not only serve the Transylvanian embassy as an interpreter: he often received the letters coming from the Habsburg Empire, Poland or Muscovy to translate them. Thereby, he was an excellent information source for the Transylvanians, because in some cases Zülfikār let the Orator translate the Latin texts into Hungarian, in order to put it into Ottoman Turkish later on.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand,

---

December 1655, that Romosz had written a letter to the Porte – which implied that he must have already been in Transylvania by that time (EÉKH I: 565).

<sup>61</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 22 July 1655), quoted in note 33, 672. For a short biography of Majtényi, see Kármán, “Translation”.

<sup>62</sup> Letter of Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Bakhchisaray, 20 October 1657) EÉKH II: 468. After this, he disappears from the sources.

<sup>63</sup> Zülfikār was recommended to Prince Gábor Bethlen in several of the reports of his Orator Tamás Borsos in the late 1610s, as a possible solution for the problems of translation at the Transylvanian embassy. In this epoch, the Ağa was only ready to take ad hoc assignments, see Tamás Borsos, *Vásárhelytől a Fényes Portáig: Emlékiratok, levelek* (From Vásárhely to the Sublime Porte: Memoirs and letters), ed. László Kocziány (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1972), 164–165, 326–327. On the 1620s, see János Kemény, “Önéletírása” (Autobiography), in *Kemény János és Bethlen Miklós művei* (The works of János Kemény and Miklós Bethlen), Magyar remekírók, ed. by Éva V. Windisch (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1980), 87.

<sup>64</sup> On the language skills of Zülfikār Ağa, see the report of Johann Rudolf Schmied (12 November 1643) Meinenberger, *Johann Rudolf Schmied*, 268–269. On the letter of the Holy Roman Emperor, that the Transylvanian Orator translated to Hungarian for Zülfikār, see the letter of István Rác to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 7 February 1642) RGyP 576.

Zülfikār also transmitted the information he could get at the Transylvanian embassy: one comes across Zülfikār's name frequently in the correspondence of Simon Reniger, Habsburg resident ambassador in Constantinople during the 1650s, because of the news provided by him, and also because of the salary given to him. Even the Transylvanian diplomats were aware of his relations to the Habsburg embassy, as Zülfikār sometimes participated at Reniger's audiences as an interpreter and shared the novelties with the Orator of the Principality later on.<sup>65</sup>

For the Transylvanian embassy, this filtering out of the news was much less important than the suspicion frequently emerging about Zülfikār Ağa, that he would be secretly helping the political opponents of the Prince. In the beginning of the 1650s, this conjecture was raised regarding the Transylvanian pretender, kept imprisoned in Constantinople, Mózes Székely: however, the Orator could not prove that he too stood in contact, and the Ağa obviously fiercely denied the accusations.<sup>66</sup> Later on, however, the suspicion around him thickened: in any case, it was he himself that complained how much of his income was gone with the fall of Vasile Lupu. In the following years, many diplomatic letters reported Zülfikār's negotiations with Greek circles in Constantinople and Ottoman dignitaries in favor of the ex-Voievod of Moldavia, who was overthrown with the active help of György Rákóczi II. What is more, he was rumored to be supporting anti-Rákóczi pretenders for not only the throne of Moldavia, but also for that of Wallachia: Radu Leon, the son of the former Voievod, who lived in Constantinople.<sup>67</sup> The Dragoman was in need of these incomes

<sup>65</sup> In his letter to Emperor Ferdinand III (Constantinople, 16 June 1653), Simon Reniger reports that he held back a part of the 100 ducats dedicated to Zülfikār, because he had not received any useful information from him since the previous fall (Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (in the following: HHStA) Staatskanzlei Türkei I. Kt. 126. Fasz. 62/b. Konv. D. fol. 168v. On Zülfikār being an interpreter at the Habsburg ambassador's audience, see the report of Márton Boldvai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 26 June 1652) EÉKH I: 239–240.

<sup>66</sup> Letter of Ferenc Gyárfás to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 20 December 1648) EÉKH I: 21.

<sup>67</sup> On the complaints of Zülfikār, see Ferenc Thordai's letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 19 May 1654), quoted in note 24, 348. On his connections to the Greeks, see among others the report of

from various channels, as he tried to maintain a relatively high living standard for himself and his family: apart from his house in Constantinople, he also had a small estate two miles from the city, and a garden on the shores of the Black Sea, although he had four sons and one daughter to look after.<sup>68</sup>

It was obviously very important for the Ağa in order to maintain his income and living standards that any exchange of information between the Transylvanian ambassadors and the dignitaries at the Sublime Porte should go through him. It is no wonder then, that his contacts with Harsányi were not the most amicable. There is no information about an open conflict; nevertheless, the Turkish Scribe wrote several times to his Prince: “Your Highness knows, that [Zülfikār] has not been my friend since the beginning; he was offended that I went to the high dignitaries secretly, without his company.”<sup>69</sup> In spite of the animosity, which was probably mutual, Harsányi supported the Ağa in various occasions. When it seemed that Zülfikār gave up on supporting Vasile Lupu and translated the words of the Transylvanian Orator against the ex-Voievod accurately at the Grand Vizier’s audience, the Turkish Scribe asked the Prince to send the Dragoman the clothes he was asking for. Harsányi did not keep silent about the ambiguousness of the situation, but he – according to his own words – practiced Christian mercy and recommended Zülfikār even to the new Voievod of Moldavia:

---

Máté Balogh and Harsányi (Constantinople, 22 January 1656), quoted in note 30, 298. Radu Leon was the son of Leon Tomşa, and later became Voievod of Wallachia himself (1664–1669); on Zülfikār’s support to him, see Harsányi’s report to the Prince (Constantinople, 7 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 460. On the years of Vasile Lupu’s imprisonment, see Constantin Şerban, *Vasile Lupu, Domn al Moldovei (1634–1653)* (Vasile Lupu, the Voievod of Moldavia, 1634–1653) (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1991), 213–221.

<sup>68</sup> On the living standards of Zülfikār, see Bíró, *Erdély követei*, 97.

<sup>69</sup> “Nagyságod tudja, [Zülfikār] eleitől fogva nekem nem volt barátom, az bántá, hogy nála nélkül titkon az nagy rendekhez jártam”. Letter of Harsányi to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 16 August 1656) MHHD XXIII: 434. In a similar tone, in his report of the 27 June 1656: “he was up to it from the very beginning, that Your Highness should have no servant knowing the situation at the Porte in here, so that everything would take place through him” (quoted in note 28, 397–398). He explicitly stated in his report from 17 December 1655: Zülfikār wanted the Prince to remove him from Constantinople, because he was afraid that “I become the interpreter instead of him” (quoted in note 60, 565).

Your Highness, I, God knows, not being jealous and ill-wisher and seeing [Zülfikār's] miserable conditions, was moved into compassion (although he never showed the same towards me), wrote honorably to the Voievod on his behalf, even if I know the many broken pots of his [that is, the mischief of Zülfikār].<sup>70</sup>

The Turkish Scribe could not count with a similar good-will from the part of the Ağa, who unambiguously turned against him in the most critical period of Harsányi's career at the Porte: his quarrel with Orator Máté Balogh.

As we could see in the example of Ferenc Thordai and János Romosz, the contacts between the Orators and Turkish Scribes were not automatically good. As in the case of Romosz one has to assume that the Orator was upset about the Turkish Scribe's attempts to broaden the frames of his office – that is, being simple auxiliary personnel to the embassy – it was almost avoidable that the extraordinarily active Harsányi would get into conflict with his direct superiors. Thordai did not have a bad opinion about him; what is more, he even recommended Harsányi to the attention of the Prince, as someone who “does not spend his time in vain, and does not spare himself in the service of Your Highness.” By the time he left Constantinople, however, some tension had developed between the two. Its content is not known to us, contrary to his feuds with the Orators of the following two years, István Váradi and Máté Balogh of Alpestes.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>70</sup> “Én, kegyelmes uram, irigy és senkinek gonosz kívánó ember nem lévén, kit tud az isten, látván az az ő megnyomorodott állapotját, szánakozásra indúlván (noha ő engemet nem szánt és szán), böcsülettel írtam az vajdának mellette, noha sok törött fazekát tudom.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February 1656), quoted in note 9, 307. On Zülfikār's turn against Vasile Lupu, see the report of Máté Balogh and Harsányi (Constantinople, 4 February 1656), quoted in note 51, 311; on Harsányi's intercession for the presents to be given to Zülfikār, see his report from April 1656, quoted in note 51, 219.

<sup>71</sup> “[...] idejét hiában nem tölti, az nagyságod szolgálatjától is magát nem kíméli.” The quote is from Ferenc Thordai's letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 28 May 1654), quoted in note 61, 354.

We do not have much information about István Váradi and his rather common name does not help the identification either.<sup>72</sup> The Orator, who probably came from a petty noble family, arrived in Constantinople on the turn of the year 1655, and seems not to have aimed to make diplomatic service a part of his long-span career strategies – contrary for instance to István Réthy who spent more than nine years (with intervals) in the Ottoman capital between 1634 and 1646.<sup>73</sup> It seems that he did not find it necessary to be very active in fulfilling his duties; in any case, he had not even been in the Ottoman capital for half a year, when Harsányi noted to the Prince: Váradi “only sits at home”, because he is an “incompetent sluggard.” His laziness was not the only problem with the Orator for Harsányi: his servants brought prostitutes to the Transylvanian house “before the eyes of the neighbors”, and when the Turkish Scribe reprimanded them, they threatened him with murder. Harsányi knew that Váradi had accused him in front of the Prince that he wasted his allowance to eat at inns; however, he refuted it claiming that he only needed to do so, because he often came to

---

Harsányi wrote the following opinion on the Orator some time after his return to Constantinople, when the Turkish Scribe had already ongoing quarrels with the new Orator: “there is enough legitimate critique to say against the Orators of two successive years”, see his report of the 17 December 1655 (quoted in note 60), 566. Máté Balogh also knew that the Turkish Scribe had had quarrels with two Orators before him, see his report from the 8 September 1655 (EÉKH I: 555).

<sup>72</sup> István Domján suggested that the Orator of the mid-1650s is identical with István Gyulai of Váradi (“váradi Gyulai”) who was sent to the Porte as a resident ambassador in 1668 by Mihály Apafi I. His argumentation is however seriously challenged by the fact that although there are several donation letters given to Gyulai after 1660s, none of them mentions that he would have held a position at the embassy before. The instruction given to Gyulai in 1668 also does not refer to earlier assignments. This István Gyulai died during his time in the office – while there is a good reason to assume that an István Váradi, whom Pál Béldi recommended to be a member of the embassy sent to the Ottomans in 1672, can be identical with the Orator of the 1650s (see Zs. Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 141). Cf. István Domján, “Adatok váradi Gyulai István portai követségéhez” (Data about the embassy of István Gyulai of Váradi at the Porte), in *Történelmi Tár 1894* (in the following: TT 1894a), 508–521. The quoted documents are also published in this article. According to the above considerations, it is also unlikely that Váradi would be identical with the István Gyulai, who stayed in Constantinople as a servant of the Orator Boldizsár Sebessi in 1636, and for whom the Orator asked György Rákóczi I for a donation of a small estate (Constantinople, 22 September 1636) Antal Beke, “Adalék Rákóczy György és a Porta összeköttetései történetéhez” (Contributions to the history of the contacts between György Rákóczi and the Porte), in *Történelmi Tár 1894* (in the following: TT 1894b), 491. There is however an István Váradi among the assessors of the Princely Tribunal from 1667 (Zs. Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 361).

<sup>73</sup> On the first mission of Réthy, see his letter to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 18 September 1646) RGyP 782; resp. Bíró, *Erdély követei*, 123–126. Apart from him, the office of Orator was accepted more than one time also by Boldizsár Sebessi in the same decades (Ibid). We do not know when exactly did Váradi arrive in Constantinople: very few letters survived from the turn of 1655, therefore not even an approximation is possible.



the Transylvanian lodgings quite late – due to his arduous work for the Principality –, and he received no share from the common dinner any more.<sup>74</sup>

Due to the loss of documents, we only know Harsányi's version of the situation and have no possibility to check on him – but many elements from his complaints are known from different periods of the Transylvanian embassy's activities. The Transylvanian House (the so-called Erdel Sarayı) that stood in Balat, the Jewish quarter of Constantinople, was a source of many problems. It was most probably a simple Turkish house with two stories.<sup>75</sup> It was almost continuously in need of reconstruction, but the lack of it was not the only obstacle why it could not fulfill a representative function – many diplomats did not spend much energy for the preservation of its actual state either. A report from the 1630s noted that so much horse-dung had been accumulated on the court during the service of the previous Orator that no other horse than the envoy's could find a place there any more.<sup>76</sup> It would not have been without precedents then, if the representative character of the embassy lodgings would not have been respected by Váradi's servants.

It also would not have been the first case in the history of the Transylvanian embassy if Váradi – as Harsányi put it – turned his position as an envoy into profiteering. Although the Orators had to give in a financial account of their activities after their return to Transylvania, the truth value of this was, due to the long distances, very hard to control. The accusation was raised against many of them that they stole a

<sup>74</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 13 May 1655) EÉKH I: 543–544.

<sup>75</sup> Contrary to the embassy palaces built during the 18<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> centuries, in this period even the representatives of Western European states lived in the same kind of building, as it can be seen on the painting made of the house of the Venetian *bailo*, preserved in an Ottoman costume album, see Franz Taeschner, *Alt-Stambuler Hof- und Volksleben: Ein türkisches Miniaturenalbun aus dem 17. Jahrhundert* (Hannover: Lafaire, 1925), vol. 1, nr. 48.

<sup>76</sup> See the letter of Boldizsár Sebessi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 21 February 1636) RGyKÖ 345. Generally on the Transylvanian House, see Sándor Mika, “Az erdélyi ház Konstantinápolyban” (The Transylvanian House in Constantinople), *Budapesti Szemle* 103 (1907): 1–21. The topographic identification of the house was made by Imre Karácson, “Az erdélyi ház Konstantinápolyban” (The Transylvanian House in Constantinople), *Budapesti Hírlap* 27 (1907), no. 125, 31.

part of the sums given to them by the Prince with specific purposes. A part of the Orators was also blamed for selling the allowance received from the Sultan in kind (the so-called *ta'yin*, or according to the Transylvanian usage, *praebenda*), and expecting the Prince to make up for the deficit.<sup>77</sup> It seems that György Rákóczi II gave credit to Harsányi and rebuked the Orator, as the Turkish Scribe noted in the summer 1655: “Mr. Váradi has no open quarrel with me now, because he is afraid of Your Highness.”<sup>78</sup> In any case, there could have been no remarkable development, as Harsányi continued to complain about the same problems.

Although it was not easy to handle the tension with Váradi – especially if the Turkish Scribe really had to face death threats –, but the period of the next Orator, Máté Balogh brought even deeper misery for Jakab Harsányi Nagy. The new resident, who must have been in his early thirties, but surely had a family already – and who was later on going to gain fame as the defender of Nagyváradi in 1660, and get positions in the second line of the Apafi administration in the 1670s – arrived at the Porte in September 1655, and Váradi prepared him in good time that the co-operation with Harsányi was not going to be without problems. Probably this was the reason why Balogh asked the Prince in his letters that he should order the Turkish Scribe to work on a peaceful coexistence.<sup>79</sup> This seems to have been successful for a while: in

<sup>77</sup> The *ta'yin* consisted not only of food and money given for food, but also of forage, firewood, candles and similar goods. Several Orators during the 17<sup>th</sup> century reported home that their ratios were cut by the Ottomans; see the notes of Tamás Borsos from 1618 (Borsos, *Vásárhelytől*, 101–102), or Boldizsár Sebessi's report (Constantinople, 21 October 1640) RGyP 529. It was also Sebessi who had to face severe reprimands from the Prince for allegedly having turned his allowance into money for private use, see his undated letter (from the summer of 1640) to György Rákóczi I: RGyP 548–549. The phenomenon of the Orators' accountability is proven by Zsigmond Boér's calculations, submitted after his return to Transylvania in 1671, see EOE XV: 208–209.

<sup>78</sup> “Én velem nyilván most Váradi uram nem veszekedik, mivel tart nagyságodtól.” Letter of Harsányi to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 22 July 1655), quoted in note 33, 672.

<sup>79</sup> See the letters of Máté Balogh (Constantinople, 8 September 1655), quoted in note 71, 555; repeated in his report of 30 December 1655 (MHHD XXIII: 280). The known data of Balogh's biography are summarized by the note of Sándor Vogel in Georg Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika 1608–1665* (Transylvanian chronicle 1608–1665), ed. and trans. Sándor Vogel (Budapest: Ómagyar Kultúra Baráti Társaság, 1994), 719; and Zs. Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 392. He refers to his four children in his letter of 1 October

February 1656, Harsányi wrote that “we do not have a quarrel with Mr. Máté Balogh, we reach good concord, as our unity in the service of Your Highness expects it from us”, and he even added that the Orator – contrary to his predecessor – was “a quick and busy man”.<sup>80</sup>

This idyllic state did not however last long. In June 1656 Harsányi let György Rákóczi II know in an indignant letter that Máté Balogh did not share the information coming from Transylvania with him, what is more, he obstructed the Turkish Scribe’s work wherever he could and antagonized the representatives of the two Romanian Voievods towards him. According to the report of the Turkish Scribe, when he called the Orator into account for not involving him into the business of the embassy, although he was the expert in finding his way through the labyrinth of the politics at the Porte, he answered that “he would not go after a bad scribe; I am not an Orator so that he should tell me about the issues of Your Highness.” After this – Harsányi continued – “he reprimanded me, calling me names, what is more, grabbed a stick and called for his servants to chase me out of the house of Your Highness; because, as he says, I have nothing to do with that house, because I am nothing else than a bad scribe.”<sup>81</sup> The Turkish Scribe could send similar complaints to Rákóczi in the rest of the year as well: the Orator blocked all information from him, and even told the Orators of the two Romanian Voievods that Harsányi no longer was in the service of the Prince. These news were later on completed by Harsányi with characterizing

---

1656: MHHD XXIII: 479. On Váradi’s contribution to the initial tension between Balogh and Harsányi, see the latter’s report to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 22 December 1655) EÉKH I: 568.

<sup>80</sup> “Balogh Máté urammal én nem veszekedem, mi jól alkuszunk, azt kívánván az nagyságod szolgálatjában való egyezés tőlünk.”; “gyors, serény ember” Jakab Harsányi Nagy’s letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February 1656), published in two pieces, the first quote comes from EÉKH II: 218, the second from MHHD XXIII: 306.

<sup>81</sup> “[...]Jegy rossz diák után ő nem jár; nem vagyok én kapikihája [kapitihá], hogy az nagyságod dolgait velem közölje.” and “megszidogata rútul az lélekével, sőt, fát fogván, a szolgálait előkiáltá, hogy üzzenek ki az nagyságod udvarából; mert, ezt mondja, nincsen nekem semmi közöm ahhoz az házhoz, mert én csak egy rossz deák vagyok.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 15 June 1656) MHHD XXIII: 707.

Balogh as a man who would put his own interests before that of the ruler, and intrigued together in a league with Zülfikār Ağā.<sup>82</sup> The situation was so bad after a while that when Máté Balogh's period as an Orator was reaching its end – which was the time, when most Orators wrote eloquent applications to the Prince to let them return home – he put the emphasis not on the usual motivation, of getting free from Constantinople, rather on getting free from Harsányi at last.<sup>83</sup>

A characteristic example for their conflicts is provided by the issue of the renovation of the Transylvanian House in Constantinople, started by Balogh in summer 1656. The Orator gave frequent accounts on the developments of the work: by October, the new rooms were ready (out of which the one belonging to the Chief Ambassador was especially pompous), the court got new pavement and the fence was also remade.<sup>84</sup> It seems that the result was satisfactory, but Harsányi was indignant because Balogh did not let him become involved: “he says I have nothing to do with it, as he was commissioned with it.” Although he could not relate any concrete abuses, he called the attention of the Prince that Máté Balogh was easy to fool as he did not speak Turkish. Just for safety's sake, he also reminded György Rákóczi II that it was thanks to him that two years before it was not another master builder – who in the meantime went bankrupt – who got the commission for the renovation.<sup>85</sup> Even the last brushstrokes gave ground for a quarrel because Harsányi claimed that the Orator let a

<sup>82</sup> See the letters of Jakab Harsányi from 7 and 27 September 1656; the first quoted in note 67, 457–459; the second MHHD XXIII: 474–475.

<sup>83</sup> “I will let Mr. Harsányi write more; I wish the grace of Your Highness and God would free me from his company.” Letter of Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 15 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 467.

<sup>84</sup> On the process of the work, see the report of Harsányi and Balogh (Constantinople, 10 June 1656), quoted in note 38, 375; and Balogh's letters (Constantinople, 29 July, 19 August and 3 September, 1656) MHHD XXIII: 419, 435; the last one quoted in note 39, 443–444.

<sup>85</sup> “[...] azt mondja, nincsen semmi gondom reá, ő reá bízták.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 27 June 1656), quoted in note 30, 398.

wrong version of the epigraph, compiled by him and including the names of György Rákóczi II and the Sultan, be carved on the marble plate.<sup>86</sup>

If Máté Balogh did not want to give insight to the Turkish Scribe into the business of the renovation, he must have had a good reason for it. Time and again there were bigger sums sent by the Prince for the building of the Erdel Sarayı, which led several diplomats into temptation: the Orator Tamás Borsos, for instance, complained in 1619, that the Prince – according to his letters – had already sent him money for the renovation three times, but it was never given to him by the Chief Ambassadors. No wonder that György Rákóczi I did not give the commission to supervise the building to the Orator, but he sent a special envoy, counting on it that the two diplomats will also work as a control to each other.<sup>87</sup> Balogh also could count on it that if he had involved Harsányi, the Turkish Scribe would have discovered anomalies. All the more so, as the latter liked to monitor his colleagues anyway: when the Prince told him to help Mihály Száva, who had been serving the Transylvanian embassy as a Post Envoy for fifteen years, to buy pompous Turkish tents and horse equipment, it stroke Harsányi that Száva was not willing to buy anything in his presence. After the Post Envoy left, he went back to the merchants and found out that Száva lied about the price, and kept one fifth of the money to himself.<sup>88</sup> It is probable that Balogh thought: if Harsányi once broke the collegial agreement of deluding the

<sup>86</sup> We know about the case from a report written by Balogh, and it is not exactly clear whether it was the text carved on the marble place which was faulty, or only the copy of it that was sent to Gyulafehérvár, see Balogh's letter from the 1 October 1656 (quoted in note 79, 479).

<sup>87</sup> It is nevertheless a question whether this method proved to be efficient: Mihály Maurer, as well as Boldizsár Sebessi reported that the renovation of the house was a success, the latter even claimed that "there will be no need to spend any money on it for 10–16 years now (see their letters from 30 August, resp. 5 September 1640, RGyKÖ 622, resp. 520). In spite of this, the Orator György Hajdu wrote only four years later, that "I see a great need for renovation, the ceiling, loft, walls and roof of the house are in a quite damaged state" (letter of 30 December 1643, RGyP 662). On the complaints of Borsos, see his, *Vásárhelytől*, 305.

<sup>88</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 17 December 1655), quoted in note 60, 566. Száva appears for the first time in the register of the Transylvanian diplomats at the Sublime Porte in 1642 (Bíró, *Erdély követei*, 125); while the last information about him dates from 1664, when he declared the election of Mihály Apafi as a Prince in Vienna (Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika*, 504).

faraway center of power, then he should be kept at a distance from transactions involving a bigger amount of money.

The unpopularity of Harsányi, derived from similar cases, was also the reason why his most ambitious enterprise at the Porte, trying to put his own political plans into practice, eventually failed. The person behind the scandal was this time another pretender of the Wallachian throne in Constantinople, Mihnea, who was known as the son of an early 17<sup>th</sup> century Voievod, Radu Mihnea, although some had the suspicion that he was the descendant of Greek merchants instead. He nevertheless had excellent contacts at the Sublime Porte, primarily in the circles of Kinan Pasha and one of the most important power center of the 1650s, the mother of the Sultan (the so-called Valide Sultana); but he also maintained a good relationship to the Habsburg ambassador.<sup>89</sup> He must have appeared on the horizon of the Transylvanian embassy some time during the summer 1654, and he proved to be a very useful contact. Mihnea, who was referred to by Harsányi – for reasons unknown – as “the man of God” – provided a continuous influx of information, and he even opened his social network for the Transylvanians: the support of Nakib Effendi and Jusuf Pasha was won through his person for the Prince.<sup>90</sup> After a while, Harsányi was ready to write

<sup>89</sup> The literature concerning the Voievod to take the throne later under the name Mihnea III (Mihail Radu) did not address the question of his network at the Porte yet – I would like to discuss it in more detail in a later article. Cf. Alexandru Ciorănescu, “Domnia lui Mihnea III (Mihail Radu) 1658–1659” (The rule of Mihnea III (Mihail Radu) 1658–1659), *Buletinul Comisiei istorice a României* 14 (1935): 88–93; Ștefan Andreescu, *Restitutio Daciae*, vol. 2, *Relațiile politice dintre Țara Românească, Moldova și Transilvania în răstimpul 1601–1659* (Political relations between Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania in the period 1601–1659) (Bucharest: Albatros, 1989), 245–250; Radu G. Păun, “Pouvoir, Croisade et Jugement Dernier au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle,” in *Ius et ritus: Rechtshistorische Abhandlungen über Ritus, Macht und Recht*, ed. Ivan Biliarsky (Sofia: Iztok, 2006), 213–281. The chronicle of Georg Kraus, notary of Szászsebes claims that Mihnea was raised by the Valide Sultana; this must, however, be taken as one of the many exaggerations of the author, see Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika*, 335. See also the report of Simon Reniger and the memorial of Rudolph Schmied zum Schwarzenhorn (both about Mihnea’s relations to the Habsburg embassy): Eudoxius de Hurmuzaki, ed., *Fragmente zur Geschichte der Rumänen*, vol. 3 (Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1884) (in the following, FGR III), 237–245. Radu Mihnea, the supposed father of Mihnea III, was the Voievod of Wallachia and Moldavia consecutively between 1601 and 1626, with four intervals.

<sup>90</sup> Mihnea’s first appearance in the documents is in Harsányi’s letter of 7 July 1654 (quoted in note 35, 147). Although the text does not mention his name, only “the Voievod’s son mentioned before”, the

about him – more than once –, that “he serves better than any Orator or protecting patron, he is the Chief Orator of Your Highness.”<sup>91</sup>

Mihnea, obviously, did not act out of sheer altruism. From the events of 1653, when Gheorghe Ștefan replaced Vasile Lupu in the throne of Moldavia, due to the active by-stand of György Rákóczi II, he could easily draw the conclusion that the weakness of the Porte rendered the Prince of Transylvania to become a “Voievod-maker”. The first opportunity to use this showed itself in 1655, when a military revolt forced the Voievod of Wallachia, Constantin Șerban leave his country. Rákóczi hesitated a lot whether he should respond the pleas of the Voievod and support his return to the country. In this situation, Mihnea turned to the topic in one of his conversations with Harsányi, whether it would be right to help Constantin Șerban back to the throne, as he is “not suitable for being a Voievode, he supports the Cossacks, Greeks and Muscovites; he cajoles Your Highness in his misery, but his heart belongs to somewhere else.” The Voivode-son did not only recommend himself – he also called Rákóczi’s attention on one of the Wallachian dignitaries who escaped to Transylvania –, but he nevertheless assured the Prince that “he would, as long as he lived, be a true well-willing servant of Your Highness.”<sup>92</sup>

---

information (that he swore loyalty to Rákóczi) clearly refers to him, as suggested by later documents. Another argument for the identification is that not much later it was he who organized the first audience with Jusuf Pasha, see the letter of Harsányi of 14 August 1654 (quoted in note 42, 157). It was made possible to identify Mihnea with the “man of God” through the letter of 7 September 1656: in this one, Harsányi reports that the “man of God” was pondering upon leaving the Porte; which information was not much earlier connected to “the son of Voievod Radu” (quoted in note 67, 458).

<sup>91</sup> “[...]minden kapikiháinál, jóakaróinál többet szolgált, az volt az nagyságod főkapikihája.” Harsányi’s letter of 7 September 1656 (quoted in note 67, 458).

<sup>92</sup> “[...]nem vajdának való ember, kozákos, görögös, muszkás, hízelkedik ugyan nyomorúságában nagyságodnak, de másutt jár a szíve”; “ő mindazáltal, míg él, nagyságodnak igaz jóakaró szolgálja leszen” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 14 June 1655) TT 1889: 668. On the conflict in Wallachia, see Lidia A. Demény, Lajos Demény and Nicolae Stoicescu, *Răscoala seimenilor sau răscoală populară? 1655, Țară Românească* (The revolt of the *seimens* or a popular revolt? 1655, Wallachia), *Pagini din istoria patriei* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1968); Lajos Thallóczy, “II. Rákóczy György és az oláh személyek” (György Rákóczi II and the Wallachian *seimens*), *Századok* 26 (1892): 449–456.

The conflict was then solved shortly and the support of the Pasha of Silistria helped Constantin Șerban back to his throne, but he remained unpopular, and Harsányi could start his campaign in favor of Mihnea: he regularly called the attention of his ruler at the services provided by the Voievod's son, his faithfulness and reliability. In one of his letters, he told György Rákóczi II that "Voievod Constantin could never be a help for Your Highness against any of your enemies, because his country would abandon him; I hear it to be said even now, that the country would not need him, but Your Highness forces him upon them." This reasoning led to the obvious solution: "But, Your Highness, if your neighbor could be the son of Radu, you could freely go to become a king [of Poland]; you could believe him as you believe your own eyes."<sup>93</sup> These attempts to gain the throne of Wallachia for Mihnea Radu were stopped around February 1656, when he suggested that for a given sum he would be ready to take an oath that he would not try to deprive Constantin Șerban of his throne as long as he lived, and would even support the Voievod's cause at the Porte. This vow was taken some time during the spring, in spite of the fact that even Harsányi's arduous attempts could not convince Constantin Șerban to pay: the Voievod left no less than seventeen letters of the Turkish Scribe unanswered.<sup>94</sup> In any case, György Rákóczi II seems to have had an unconditional trust towards Mihnea: he even asked his opinion about the

<sup>93</sup> "[...]soha nagyságodnak Konstantin vajda semmi ellensége ellen segítségére nem lehet, mert az országa eláll mellőle; most is hallok olyan szokat, hogy az országnak nem kellene, de nagyságod erővel tartja rajtok." Harsányi's post-scriptum to a letter signed together with the Orator (Constantinople, 6 January 1656) EÉKH II: 213. "Bezzeg kegyelmes uram, ha Radul fia lehetne az nagyságod szomszédja, bátorságosan elmehetne nagyságod az királyságra, mint maga szemének, úgy hihetne." Harsányi's letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 2 October 1655) MHHD XXIII: 254. These maneuvers of Harsányi remained largely unnoticed by historiography, only Alexandru Ciorănescu mentioned the attempt to make Mihnea a Voievod of Wallachia already in 1655 – although he thought that Máté Balogh was also a supporter of the issue, see Ciorănescu, "Domnia", 96.

<sup>94</sup> The idea of the oath appears in the letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Constantinople, 22 February and 23 March 1656), quoted in note 33, 320, resp. MHHD XXIII: 342–344. A reference that the oath had been taken is found in Harsányi's letter of 10 June 1656 (quoted in note 36, 320–321; therefore it had to have taken place some time between the two dates. On the unilateral character of the correspondence between Harsányi and Constantin Șerban, see the letter of the former of 7 September 1656 (quoted in note 67, 459).



possible reaction of the Sublime Porte on his negotiations with Swedish diplomats that he otherwise kept strictly in secret.<sup>95</sup>

That is why it is remarkable that Máté Balogh showed a massive resistance towards Mihnea, whom he only referred to as “the Bey”.<sup>96</sup> As mentioned earlier, the Orator was able to accomplish that the representatives of the two Romanian Voievods refused to talk to Harsányi, that contributed in its turn to the fiasco of gaining some advantages for Mihnea Radu. At the same time, during the summer of 1656, Balogh himself was already using the services of Mihnea and he even wrote to his Prince. “if only this one [that is, Harsányi] would not incite him, the Bey would be a good person.” It is clear from his letter that he had less problem with the Wallachian pretender than with the Turkish Scribe. All the more so, as he did not shy away from accusing Harsányi that he supports Mihnea so much because – as he is incapable of learning to write a decent Turkish – he wants to get away from the Porte and get the position of a “Chief Vornic”, that is, the post of the major-domo (*vornic mare*) of the Wallachian court. And then, if he was anyway into the insinuation already, he also added that Harsányi had an extremely foul smell because of some disease: “if he sits down, I have to sit to the way of the wind, so that it would blow away his stench.” His letter makes the impression that Harsányi must have had some kind of a skin-disease, as the Orator says: “It is clear that when he scratches and the stench is spreading, I feel sick.” The illness of the Turkish Scribe would be hard to identify, as Balogh also adds

<sup>95</sup> See the opinion of Mihnea, related by Harsányi in his letter to the Prince of 16 October 1656, quoted in note 42, 483–484.

<sup>96</sup> Through this, he managed to successfully confuse György Rákóczi II: it had to be explained to the Prince by Harsányi that “the Bey” and “the son of Voievod Radul” actually refer to the same person, see his post-scriptum to their common report of 6 January 1656 (quoted in note 93, 213). Mihnea is mentioned as “Goian-Bei” also by the reports of the Habsburg ambassador, Simon Reniger (FGR III: 237). According to Ștefan Andreescu, this must be a distortion of the term *Civân bey* („young man”), see Andreescu, *Restitutio Daciae*, 246; which interpretation is reinforced by Máté Balogh, who also used the form “Cșivân bék” once (in his report of 22 July 1656, MHHD XXIII: 418).

to the diagnosis – remarkably, as a blame – that Harsányi only eats food cooked in water.<sup>97</sup>

This last remark shows how hard it is to take the arguments of both sides in the debate into account when reconstructing the conflict of Harsányi and Balogh. The Turkish Scribe sent long complaints to his Prince, which focus on concrete problems and put them into a more general context of his views about the duties of a diplomat. Contrary to this, the Orator did not feel it necessary to say more than a remark time and again that contained accusations of a not particularly high standard, and which were not even always coherent. Balogh noted several times that Harsányi was unwilling to come when he called for him, once even added that he gave himself to drinking, which would then hardly be reconcilable with the diet he was also blamed for.<sup>98</sup> While in the recently quoted letter Balogh suggested that Harsányi was interested in getting high offices in Wallachia, in other cases he made the insinuation – placing the words into the mouth of Zülfikār Ağa – that he wanted to “turn Turk”, that is, convert to Islam.<sup>99</sup> He even alluded to a supposed defrauding by Harsányi – even if not very luckily, because he accused the Turkish Scribe that he was saving up for a horse; while that was only needed because the Orator refused to give him one of the embassy’s mounts, with which he could have gone quicker for his business.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>97</sup> “[...] csak emez ne izgatná, bizony oly jó volna a bég”; “ha leül, mind a szél felől ülek, hogy elverje a szagát”; “Bizony dolog, hogy amint vakaródik, ha az szaga érzik, rosszul vagyok.” Letter of Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 16 July 1656) MHHD XXIII: 410.

<sup>98</sup> Letters of Máté Balogh (Constantinople, 19 June and 19 August 1656) MHHD XXIII: 383, resp. quoted in note 84, 436.

<sup>99</sup> Letter of Máté Balogh (Constantinople, 19 June 1656), quoted in the previous note, 381. When Harsányi heard that Mihály Száva, referring to Zülfikār Ağa, transmitted this information to the Prince, he immediately thought that this happened because of the instigation of Balogh, see his letter of 21 December 1656: MHHD XXIII: 508.

<sup>100</sup> The text is the following: “of lion dollars (“oroszlányos taller”), we gave 200 to Jusuf Pasha; although Mr. Harsányi wrote 200 (!), he probably meant that it would be good for a horse” (the report of Balogh of 29 July 1656, quoted in note 84, 418). As it also stroke the 19<sup>th</sup> century publisher of the text, Balogh must have meant that Harsányi reported a more precious gift to the Prince and kept the difference to himself, but unfortunately he made a mistake with the numbers. Harsányi, in his turn, accused the Orator for keeping not less than four horses on the expenses of the embassy that he wanted

When weighing their mutual accusations against each other, one also has to consider that for Harsányi it was a part of his job to produce well-composed texts: in his original office as a theologian–teacher, as well as in his new position as a scribe, it was crucial that he had the skill to give an appropriate form to his thoughts. In this respect Balogh, who was more inclined to a military career, was certainly disadvantaged (some of his letters contain completely unintelligible sentences) and he was also aware of this.<sup>101</sup> Even so, Harsányi’s perspective seems to be better justified. While it would be impossible to understand the motivation of Harsányi’s activities from the letters of Balogh, the image drawn by him about the Orator is easy to interpret: the latter was jealously trying to defend his position and competences – and princely grace deriving from them – against the very ambitious and extraordinarily active Turkish Scribe. Also, while the Orator’s activities are described in similar ways by both of them – let us recall that, contrary to Váradi, Balogh was never blamed for his laziness by Harsányi –, the image of feverish activity Harsányi drew about himself stands in exact contrast to Balogh’s information about him neglecting his duties. The lack of details in the latter does certainly not support his argumentation. Harsányi may have also had his own interests in mind when supporting Mihnea, but he surely caused less damage with it for the Prince than Zülfikār when he stood up for Rákóczi’s sworn enemy, Vasile Lupu. What is more, as the connection with the Voievod’s son was strengthened, his social network also opened up for the embassy of Transylvania, thereby successfully helping the representation of the Principality’s interests.

---

to sell and pocket their price for himself; that is why he would not let the Turkish Scribe to use them for his everyday activities, see his letter of 7 September 1656, quoted in note 67, 475.

<sup>101</sup> He referred to his “bad writing” in several of his autographic letters, see his reports of 16 July and 19 August 1656 (quoted in notes 97, 409; and 84, 435). After his return to Transylvania, although the Orator expressed his wish to stay in the service of the Prince, he specifically said that he does not want to be in the administration of the Rákóczi estates; see the letter of Ákos Barcsai to Zsuzsanna Lorántffy (Kolozsmonostor, 1 June 1657) MOL E 190 Nr. 7242.

In sum, it can be said that the most important elements behind Harsányi's conflicts with the Orators – Váradi as well as Balogh – derived from the nature of their offices. The Orators were sent to Constantinople only for one year and there were few of them during the 17<sup>th</sup> century who would have found this post lucrative in the long run. For most of them it was enough if they did not make huge mistakes during their one-year stay in the Ottoman Empire, and they could count on the appreciation of the Prince afterwards. They also were ready to take the opportunities that – due to the weak control potential of the court because of the long distance – offered some financial gains. Turkish Scribes, on the contrary, made a career choice when accepting this post, therefore it was their personal interest to fulfill it the most precise way possible. It also did not hurt if by doing so, they could continuously demonstrate their importance for the Prince, even by pointing out the contrast between them and their colleagues and becoming the self-appointed tools of Princely control over the activities of the embassy. The conflicts were thus deriving from the peculiarities of the situation; however, for such an intensive outbreak of hostilities two more elements were also necessary: the uncompromising style of Harsányi and the persistence of Balogh. The Prince, in any case, did not want to decide for any of them: not many of his letters sent to the Porte are known, but it is clear from them, as well as from the reactions of his two correspondents, that he did not do much more than admonished the snarling diplomats for establishing a peaceful concord.

### ***II.3. Living Conditions in Constantinople***

While he most probably had a healthy amount of distrust towards his Orator, it was also not hard for György Rákóczi II to assume that his Turkish Scribe would misuse the money sent to him. When Harsányi complained about the high living costs and the

relatively modest allowance received from the Prince, Rákóczi wrote on the margins of the letter with his own hands: “it is a lie, he spends it [that is, his salary] for lemon and orange.”<sup>102</sup> It would be hard to find a reliable source whether the Turkish Scribe really spent his allowance on luxury goods (although in Istanbul tropical fruits were less considered so, than in Gyulafehérvár). Harsányi’s own reports, in a less surprising way, state the opposite, and it is also hardly a wonder that Máté Balogh called the attention of the Prince that the Turkish Scribe was lavishly spending money – it is all the more surprising that he wrote it only once.<sup>103</sup> Taking indirect sources into account, the conclusion can nevertheless be reached that Harsányi did not have enough money at his disposal to throw much away.

It seems that any office-holder assigned with the job of translation at the Transylvanian embassy received a salary of a yearly 100 florins (200 dollars) from the Prince, regardless whether they were Dragomans of the Porte or interpreters of Transylvanian origin. This was the yearly allowance for Zülfikār Ağa, as well as for Dávid Rozsnyai in the 1670s.<sup>104</sup> It is very likely that Harsányi also received this amount of money; at least, he notes in one of his letters that he received 200 dollars from György Rákóczi II. In the same letter however, he called the attention of the Prince that his expenses were higher than 300.<sup>105</sup> We also learn from other letters that his income was not enough to make a living: according to the above mentioned

<sup>102</sup> “Hazugság, czitromra, narancsra költi.” Marginal comment of György Rákóczi II on Harsányi’s report of 4 January 1655, quoted in note 27, 540.

<sup>103</sup> Letter of Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 29 July 1656), quoted in note 84, 420.

<sup>104</sup> On the salary of Zülfikār, see Bíró, *Erdély követei*, 97. On Rozsnyai’s, see Mihály Elekes, *Rozsnyai Dávid élete és művei* (The life and works of Dávid Rozsnyai) (Szeged: Traub, 1905), 24. Zsidó Juda (“Judah the Jew”), also known as Juda Mehmet, an Turkish interpreter in Transylvania, was paid 124 guldens in 1664, however, this sum might have included arrears from the earlier years, see Mihály Apafi’s instruction to Demeter Logofet, (Gyulafehérvár, 4 June 1664) MOL Erdélyi Kormányhatósági Levéltárak F 12 Lymbus 11. cs. 6. sz. The Orator Zsigmond Boér owed 60 dollars (30 gulden) to his interpreter for his payment in money and clothing, the reference does not, however, refer necessarily to a full yearly salary, see his letter to Mihály Apafi I (5 August 1670) TMÁO V: 499.

<sup>105</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 4 January 1655), quoted in note 27, 540.

passage of Balogh about Harsányi's lavish spending, he stated that the Turkish Scribe had accumulated a debt of 150 dollars. In a letter from 1654, Ferenc Thordai also mentioned the debts of Harsányi.<sup>106</sup>

The Turkish Scribe himself listed all the commodities he had to cover from his allowance: “my table, clothing, learning and other expenses in the service of Your Highness” – and then Harsányi did not even mention the rent he had to pay for his lodgings; probably because when he wrote this letter, he already had been staying at the Transylvanian House.<sup>107</sup> In the first phase of his service, it meant a special expense that he had his own lodgings, because, for the benefit of the language training, Turkish Scribes rented rooms for themselves in Constantinople, so that they could spend the most time possible in the native speaking environment. Not long after his arrival at the Ottoman capital, Harsányi also rented “a house” (which could also mean only a room) for himself, and lived separated from the other members of the embassy for a while. This segregation was however not easy to maintain: for instance, although János Romosz could afford to pay for his own lodgings, there was no money left for eating separately. As the Prince was informed by Orator Márton Boldvai: “the poor thing has to come home to my table to eat, that I do not regret, but speaking only Hungarian among us, he cannot learn anything.”<sup>108</sup> We do not know whether Harsányi decided to give up his separation because his language skills were already good enough, or because of the lack of money, but it is certain that in 1656 he had already been living in the Erdeli Sarayı. Through this, however, he could only save the rent, not the

<sup>106</sup> See the letter of Balogh quoted in note 84, 420; and the report of Ferenc Thordai from 28 May 1654, quoted in note 59, 354.

<sup>107</sup> “[...] asztalomat, ruházatomat, tanulásomat s egyéb Nagyságod dolgaiban való költségemet” Report of Jakab Harsányi Nagy of 4 January 1655, quoted in note 27, 540.

<sup>108</sup> “[...] haza kell ide az én asztalomhoz járni nyavalyásnak enni (kit én nem bánok ugyan), de itt miközöttünk magyarul beszélvén, semmit nem tanulhat.” Letter of Márton Boldvai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 27 July 1652) MHHD XXIII: 111. The data about Harsányi renting his own lodgings is from the same letter. It is clear from the letter of Romosz to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 20 July 1654) that the house which he rented stood next to that of Zülfikār Ağā (MHHD XXIII: 152).

expenses of food: I quoted earlier the letters in which the Turkish Scribe complained that he often missed dinner because of his duties, and had to eat at an inn. Also, his illness that he was reproached for by Balogh, forced him to take a special diet (at least on the summer of 1656), and although he stayed at the embassy, he had to let his servant cook separately for him; therefore, his food could not be covered from the *ta'yin* designed for the alimentation of the Orator and his retinue.<sup>109</sup> The rent and the alimentation were most probably a significant financial burden – even if other items such as the payment of the *hoca* could not have been very expensive: if we conclude from the example of Rozsnyai, Harsányi must have paid approximately 3–5 dollars a year for his teacher. Apart from this, Rozsnyai also spent a serious amount of money on buying documents issued by the Sultan, which were important for him probably as they were useful in learn the language used in the Chancellery.<sup>110</sup> We have no concrete data about such expenses in the case of Harsányi, but he also must have needed similar tools for his studies.

It is worth to mention the question of clothing again – not as if it would have been a major item in Harsányi's budget, rather because it offers an important contribution to the Constantinople-experience of Transylvanians (which will be discussed in more detail in chapter II.2). In the letter of Márton Boldvai, in which he informs the Prince about the final decision of Harsányi to take the office, he mentions that the new Turkish Scribe would want to have his payment in money (the sum is

<sup>109</sup> See the complaints of Harsányi to György Rákóczi II in his letter of 27 September 1656, quoted in note 82, 475. Máté Balogh referred to it already in a latter from May that year that Harsányi ate in the Transylvanian House. Characteristically, however, he reproached Harsányi on the 16 July for having his servant cook separately for him; while on the 29<sup>th</sup>, he already used the argument for his claims of Harsányi's lavish spending, that the Turkish Scribe did not have to use money for his alimentation, as he ate at the embassy's table (see the references in notes 97 and 84, 410, resp. 420).

<sup>110</sup> According to his diary, Rozsnyai hired a *hoca* for 2 *akçes* per day in May 1664, and then in August he chose another one who demanded 4 *akçes* per day. If we consider that Harsányi met his *hoca* twice a week (104 times in a year), he could not have paid more even for a better (and more expensive) teacher than 500 *akçes* (approximately 5 dollars) a year. Concerning the purchase of the Sultan's documents: Rozsnyai noted once in his diary that "I bought a donation of the Turkish Emperor from the *hoca*", and this costed him 206 *akçes*. See MHHS VIII: 276–277.

undefined), and in a set of clothes.<sup>111</sup> The fact that Harsányi wanted to have his clothes from Transylvania would suggest that – contrary to their 18<sup>th</sup> century Western European colleagues who frequently let themselves be painted in caftan and turban – Transylvanian diplomats of the 17<sup>th</sup> century did not dress according to the Ottoman fashion in Constantinople. A later remark in one of Harsányi's letters shows however that the situation was far from unambiguous. The Turkish Scribe namely called the attention of his ruler that the green fabric he sent would only be enough for a pelisse and a dolman if they would be made according to the example of the “robes by the Danube”. This is however “not suitable for me”, Harsányi writes, because “here [in Constantinople] a longer one should be worn.”<sup>112</sup> Does this mean that Harsányi indeed wore Turkish costumes? It is not likely, because in that case he would not have emphasized in another report that – as it was utterly complicated to organize a meeting with the Valide Kihaya because of the spies of the Grand Vizier – “I met him dressed up in Turkish costumes.”<sup>113</sup> It is therefore most probable – and is reinforced by the images of Hungarians in contemporary Ottoman costume books – that Harsányi modified his clothing according to the local customs, but, contrary to his Western European peregrination, this time did not change his clothes entirely: the mental border towards the East proved to be much more solid.<sup>114</sup>

<sup>111</sup> Letter of Márton Boldvai to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 27 July 1652), quoted in note 108, 111.

<sup>112</sup> “Dunamellyéki formán való köntös”; “én hozzám nem illik”; “itt hosszabbat kell viselni.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 21 December 1656), quoted in note 99, 508. On the fashion followed by 18<sup>th</sup> century ambassadors from Western Europe, see Philip Mansel, *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453–1924* (London: Murray, 1995).

<sup>113</sup> “[...] török köntösben öltöztvén voltam vele szemben.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 14 August 1654), quoted in note 42, 156.

<sup>114</sup> The two “Ungarus” characters in the Ottoman costume book purchased by Claes Rålamb during 1657–58, evidently depict the contemporary Hungarian–Transylvanian fashion, contrary to the more Oriental patterns of the Wallachian, who wears a caftan and altogether looks very similar to the depictions of the Greek in the same album. As the booklet was made in Istanbul, the illustrations obviously show the Hungarians–Transylvanians living there, that is: the members of the embassy. See Tadeusz Majda, “The Rålamb Album of Turkish Costumes,” in *The Sultan's Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Rålamb Paintings*, ed. Karin Ådahl (Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2006), 256–258.



The diffuse data about Harsányi's allowance all in all make the impression that the salary of 100 florins would have been enough only if the Turkish Scribe would have got it regularly and if nothing extraordinary would have happened to him – which was actually never the case. Harsányi frequently had to petition for the payment of his allowance, and he did not have much support for this, because of his quarrels with the Orators. On the other hand, there were always events that raised his expenses: either an illness or the boom of the prices in the Ottoman capital due to the chaotic military and political situation. These problems multiplied during the year 1657.

The year had a promising start for Harsányi: during the fall, with the arrival of the tribute of the Principality to the Sublime Porte, the Turkish Scribe got rid of Máté Balogh at last. The next Orator, István Tisza, assured György Rákóczi II at length in a letter of his, that he would do everything he could to create concord and good working atmosphere with Harsányi.<sup>115</sup> From the following period we really have no data about an eventual quarrel between the two of them – although it remains unclear in what extent was this unanimity due to the critical situation that developed around the Transylvanian embassy at the Porte.

In 1657, György Rákóczi II started the most ambitious enterprise of his rule: in alliance with the King of Sweden and the Hetman of the Zaporogian Cossacks, he turned his army towards the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, aiming to become King of Poland. He did not only fail to ask for the consent of the Ottoman dignitaries for this, but, as I noted before, any information concerning his Polish plans were blankly denied by his diplomats at the Porte. It was just natural that Köprülü Mehmed, who became Grand Vizier half a year before and had already introduced serious measures to end the political crisis of the Porte, called the Transylvanian diplomats to

---

<sup>115</sup> Letter of István Tisza to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 13 December 1656) EÉKH II: 225–226.

account for the deeds of their ruler on consecutive audiences.<sup>116</sup> There was no practical retaliation as long as the news about Rákóczi's defeat had not reached Istanbul in late summer, together with the information that most of his army was taken hostage of the Tatar Khan. The diplomats of the Principality nevertheless had to endure severe pressure during the first half of the year, especially as no Chief Ambassador, not even a letter arrived from Rákóczi in this period. The Locum-Tenens of the Prince in Transylvania, Ákos Barcsai, did not respond to the questions sent to him by the Orator and the Turkish Scribe either.<sup>117</sup> Their situation became worse as the Porte abandoned the granting of the *praebenda* for the Transylvanian embassy for the duration of the conflict: the diplomats had been eagerly waiting for information from Gyulaféhevár, as well as for money to cover their living costs.<sup>118</sup>

Until it arrived, however, they tried to map up the attitude of the Porte as precisely as they could. From the relatively small corpus of the surviving correspondence it is nevertheless clear that the network built up during the previous years worked much less efficiently this time: no one would have dared to stand up for Transylvania against the hard-handed Köprülü Mehmed.<sup>119</sup> Harsányi was not wasting

<sup>116</sup> There are data about at least two audiences during the course of January–February. According to the chronicle of János Szalárdi, the Transylvanians were told by Köprülü Mehmed that the Prince should return home, on the 24<sup>th</sup> of January; in his dispatches, the Dutch resident, Levinus Warner, mentions an audience some time in February. See Szalárdi, *Siralmas magyar krónikája*, 355; Willem Nicolas Du Rieu, ed., *Levini Warneri de rebus Turcicis epistolae ineditae* (Leiden: Brill, 1883) (in the following: *LWE*), 34. On Rákóczi's Polish campaign, see recently Sándor Gebei, "II. Rákóczi György lengyelországi hadjárata, 1657" (The Polish campaign of György Rákóczi II, 1657), *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 105, no. 2 (1992): 30–64.

<sup>117</sup> Letter of István Tisza and Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Ákos Barcsai (Constantinople, 30 April 1657) *EÉKH* II: 360. On the situation of the Transylvanian diplomats at the Porte, see Gábor Kármán, "Svéd diplomácia a Portán 1657–1658: Claes Rålamb és Gotthard Welling konstantinápolyi követsége" (Swedish diplomacy at the Porte, 1657–1658: The embassy of Claes Rålamb and Gotthard Welling), *Sic Itur ad Astra* 13, no. 1–2 (2001): 63–64; Sándor Papp, "II. Rákóczi György és a Porta" (György Rákóczi II and the Porte), in *Szerencsének elegyes forgása: II. Rákóczi György és kora* (The alternating turns of fortune: György Rákóczi II and his age), ed. Gábor Kármán and András Péter Szabó (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009), 147–157.

<sup>118</sup> On cutting the *praebenda*, see the letters of István Tisza and Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Constantinople, 18 May and 6 June 1657) *EÉKH* II: 362, 364.

<sup>119</sup> It is quite remarkable that, contrary to the previous correspondence, the letters from this period almost never refer to specific Ottoman dignitaries. The only person whom we hear about is a *çavuş* named Ali, who had been in Transylvania several times in diplomatic missions: he went to have a lunch

his time however: his fervent activities can best be followed through the diary of a Swedish envoy, Claes Rålamb, who was sent to Constantinople by his King to support the cause of the Transylvanians. Two days after his arrival, Harsányi had a detailed discussion with Rålamb and introduced him into the ceremonial order of the Sublime Porte. The Turkish Scribe must have made an impression on the otherwise quite critically-minded Swede, because, although he had a Turkish interpreter of his own, he petitioned the Grand Vizier that Harsányi could be the interpreter at his audience: he judged that he should rely on the experience of the latter in the rather sensible questions of politics and protocol. Harsányi, together with other members of the Transylvanian embassy, was also present at the audience of Rålamb at the Sultan's chambers.<sup>120</sup> The Swedish envoy does not mention whether the question of interpretation at his audience was solved in the manner he asked for; in any case, a quite absurd solution was found for the same problem one month later on the audience of another envoy of Charles X Gustav, that well illustrated the competence struggle and the problems deriving from the price of information, described earlier. Thus, the Latin speech of Gotthard Welling in front of the Sultan was translated by Harsányi, but to Hungarian, which was then translated to Turkish by Zülfikār Ağa.<sup>121</sup>

The Turkish Scribe would not have been true to himself though, if he would have considered his tasks finished with the interpretation. From the beginning of June until mid-August, there are entries in Rålamb's diary in each third to fifth day, relating that he was visited by Harsányi, who brought him news or negotiated with him about the policies to follow. The Turkish Scribe did not only help the Swedish ambassador

---

at the Transylvanian House in mid-May and entertained the diplomats with some good news. See their letter of 18 May 1657, quoted in the previous note, 361.

<sup>120</sup> Claes Rålamb, *Diarium under resa till Konstantinopel 1657–1658* (Diary on his journey to Constantinople 1657–1658), *Historiska handlingar*, no. 37/3, ed. Christian Callmer (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1963), 99, 103–105. On the mission of Rålamb in detail, see Kármán, “Svéd diplomácia”.

<sup>121</sup> Hildebrandt, *Dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise*, 115–116.

personally, but also through his network: Mihnea visited Rålamb several times, and although it is not clear from the diary that he was introduced to the Swede by Harsányi, it seems rather unlikely that their acquaintance would have been a sheer coincidence. The Turkish Scribe definitely tried to maintain his earlier contacts: he brought good news to the Swedish envoy from Nikousios, and it was most probably him who mentioned the Nakib Effendi as a potential supporter of their cause.<sup>122</sup> One can assume that Harsányi also frequently visited the English ambassador, Thomas Bendyshe, who was the most open in his support given to the Swedish diplomats; however, due to the irregular communication between London and Constantinople, Bendyshe could not be sure whether the Lord Protector would want him to stand up for Transylvania, therefore the co-operation did not become very intimate.<sup>123</sup>

This very active period came to an abrupt end. On the 14<sup>th</sup> of August, Rålamb still noted that Harsányi had visited him and informed him about the speedy spread of the news in Constantinople about György Rákóczi II's defeat; the next day, the Turkish Scribe was imprisoned together with Zülfikār Ağa. The Swedish envoy, who had a well-developed sense for law and justice – later on he became known as one of the most important Early Modern legal theorist of his country –, tried to pull every string immediately to file an official complaint at the Sublime Porte. Bendyshe, who had been in Constantinople already for fifteen years then, cooled down his expectations, saying: it seemed that the Turkish Scribe was arrested on the personal

<sup>122</sup> In the diary, Rålamb only notes that he asked Mihnea Radu whether it would not be worth to request the Nakib Effendi to visit the Sultan with a letter of support, see Rålamb, *Diarium*, 135–136. On the period (with the data about Harsányi and Mihnea Radu), see *ibid.*, 103–146.

<sup>123</sup> See the letter of Bendyshe to John Thurloe, in which he complains that it was already October when he received an order of the Lord Protector written in May – which was then already impossible to follow, due to the changing circumstances in the meantime (Pera, 22 October 1657) Thomas Birch, ed., *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, esq: Secretary, First, to the Council of State, and afterwards to the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell* (in the following: TP), vol. 6, (London: Gyles – Woodward – Davis, 1742), 571. On similar problems from the first half of the year, see his letter to John Thurloe (Pera, 16 April 1657) Bodleian Library (Oxford) Rawlison Mss. A 37 fol. 391r. Unfortunately, the diary of Bendyshe from this period has rather fragmentary entries, cf. ERO D/DHf O4. On the problems of communication, see Goffman, *Britons*, 196–201.

orders of the Sultan, so it would be probably good to wait some days. In a short while however, on the 19<sup>th</sup> August, the Grand Vizier let the entire Transylvanian embassy be arrested and put – together with Harsányi and Zülfikār, who were kept in an unknown place until then – into the Seven Towers, the infamous prison fortress of Constantinople. The Swedish envoy managed to learn as much that the official reason for their arrest was a letter of Harsányi in which he would have described the Ottoman war against Venice in unfriendly terms.<sup>124</sup> It clearly was only a pretext however: Köprülü Mehmed started the retaliations against György Rákóczi II who fell into disfavor with arresting his diplomats. After these events, the Swedish envoy gave up his plans to call the Sublime Porte to account for not observing the right of diplomats for immunity – and for Jakab Harsányi Nagy, a period of being the Turkish Scribe of the Prince of Transylvania ended, only to give way to a decade of uncertainty of existence.

---

<sup>124</sup> According to another, hardly understandable information, Harsányi would have been imprisoned because of a letter by Ferenc Rákóczi I, the son of György II and elected Prince of Transylvania (only 12 years old by that time), in which he spoke unfavorably about the Sultan. See Rålamb, *Diarium*, 148; on the entire period, 146–149. On the biography of Claes Rålamb, see the article by Björn Asker in *Svenst biografiskt lexikon* (vol. 31, 168–173.), and Sten Westerberg, “Claes Rålamb: Statesman, Scholar and Ambassador,” in *The Sultan’s Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Rålamb Paintings*, ed. Karin Ådahl (Istanbul: Svenska Forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul, 2006), 26–57. On his career as a legal theorist, see Jan Eric Almqvist, “Clas Rålamb som rättsvetenskaplig författare” (Claes Rålamb as an author of legal sciences), in *Svensk juridisk litteraturhistoria* (A history of Swedish literature on law) (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1946), 150–162.

### III. Years of Turmoil

Sultan Mehmed II let the fortress of Yedikule be built with the inclusion of the formidable-looking city walls of Byzantium, in the inner side of the former main gate (the so-called Porta Aurea) during the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Its visitors can even today experience their preconceptions reinforced: since the Early Modern period, the Seven Towers, the fearful prison of the Ottomans served as a metaphor of utter hopelessness. It is true that under the centuries many important personalities who became a nuisance for the Porte were kept in the fortress, specifically in its most Eastern tower, that had served as a treasury until the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Executions also took place inside the walls: the best known among them was the strangulation of Sultan Osman II in 1622, in the part of the building known today as the “bloody well”.<sup>1</sup> The prison had already been infamous in 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvania: according to the account of the Transylvanian Orator, the aristocrats who revolted against the Prince in 1677 and then fled to the Porte, “were immediately taken to the Yedikule on foot, and now they are being kept there at the bottom of a dark tower, so that they cannot see even during daylight without a candle; they are really in a narrow place and in a troubled situation.”<sup>2</sup> The contemporaries could however be well aware that not everyone who got there was kept in such a strict arrest. Although the Orator could write with satisfaction that a Transylvanian pretender, Mózes Székely was put to a place in the Seven Towers, “where he can not see anything else than the sky and the white sea”, his colleagues in

<sup>1</sup> On the architecture history of, and the executions at the Seven Towers, see Wolfgang Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls: Byzantion, Konstantinopolis, Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jh.* (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1977), 339–341; Halil Ethem, *Yedikule Hisarı* (The fortress of the Seven Towers) (İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1932), 28–33.

<sup>2</sup> “[...] menten gyalog Jediculában hurczolák, ott egy torony fenekén felette sötét helyen tartják, úgy hogy nappal is gyertya nélkül nem látnak, szoros helyben és állapotban vadnak.” Letter of Farkas Bethlen to Mihály Teleki (Constantinople, 28 April 1678) Sámuel Gergely, ed., *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki), vol. 7, 1675–1677, *A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára*, no. 7 (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1916) (in the following: TML VII), 178.

the following years had to invest much energy in keeping track on who visited Székely there, or even whether the pretender did not leave the building himself time and again.<sup>3</sup> The bare inner court of the fortress, as it can be seen today, suggests a parallel to the empty courtyards of modern prisons, which can be observed from any place on the wall; however, it made an entirely different impression in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. As it can be seen in a very detailed contemporary drawing, the territory in the circle of the seven towers was densely built in, it had a Mosque of its own, and there was even a small garden in the Northwestern corner.<sup>4</sup> The captives had to face widely different fates, depending on their social prestige, political relevance and the intentions of the Ottoman Empire towards them: from sitting in chains in a dark cell to a form of house-arrest, when the person in detention was not allowed to leave the fortress, but could move freely inside its walls, and even could have his own house and poultry-yard there.<sup>5</sup>

It seems that Harsányi and the other Transylvanian diplomats also did not spend their period of imprisonment in fetters. The Habsburg ambassador in Constantinople noted that they had to face a rather embarrassing welcome: Vasile Lupu, ex-Voievod of Moldavia – who had been an inhabitant of the Seven Towers since 1654, and whose keeping in prison was one of the most important task for the embassy in the recent years – greeted them “with frequent vilification and sarcastic

<sup>3</sup> “[...] egyebet az égnél és az fejei tengernél nem lát” Letter of Boldizsár Sebessi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 29 July 1635) RGyKÖ 319. On later developments, see his letter dated Constantinople, 10 November 1635 (RGyKÖ 325), and the reports of István Réthy and István Rác to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 1 May 1639, and 30 April 1642) TT 1894b: 497, RGyKÖ 668.

<sup>4</sup> A reproduction of the original, held by Museo Correr, Venice, is published in Müller-Werner, *Bildlexikon*, 339; and in Stéphane Yerasimos, *Constantinople: De Byzance à Istanbul* (Paris: Éditions Place des Victoires, 2000), 210.

<sup>5</sup> On the latter, see the examples quoted by Sándor Takáts, “A török és magyar raboskodás” (Turkish and Hungarian captivity), in *Rajzok a török világból* (Sketches from the Turkish world), vol. 1 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1915), 188–190. From the diary of Johann Ferdinand Auer, one also gets the impression of a house-arrest: *Auer János Ferdinánd pozsonyi nemes polgárnak hétértoronyi fogságában írt naplója 1664* (The diary of the noble burgher of Pozsony, János Ferdinánd Auer, written in his captivity at the Seven Towers), *Magyarország törökkori történetének forrásai*, ed. Imre Lukinich (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1923), 193–206.

words.”<sup>6</sup> It seems however that it did not get worse than this. In September, they received a letter from the Prince in the Seven Towers, which they forwarded to the Grand Vizier, petitioning him for their release from the prison.<sup>7</sup> The Transylvanian diplomats described the life in prison as “*turpis et sordidus*”, this however is not necessarily to be understood literally: instead of the bad conditions and filth in the prison, it can also refer to the humiliating state of captivity. The fact that they received their correspondence in the Yedikule, and they also had the chance to answer it, shows that they were not closed away from the world outside.<sup>8</sup> This is also reinforced by the fact that Claes Rålamb, who was not permitted to leave Constantinople until January 1658, turned twice during November and December to Harsányi, then sitting in the Seven Towers, to have his petitions for Ottoman dignitaries translated.<sup>9</sup> The imprisonment of the diplomats was therefore more like a house-arrest: Ferenc Sebesi, the Chief Ambassador coming from Transylvania during the fall, not only visited them there before his departure from Constantinople, but even slept over once in the Yedikule.<sup>10</sup> Even so, taking the diplomats to custody was a very radical move from Köprülü Mehmed: as it was emphasized by them in their September petition, there was no example for anything like this in the history of the Principality.<sup>11</sup> The Grand

<sup>6</sup> “[...] mit villen iniurien vnd schmachwordten” Letter of Simon Reniger to Leopold I, King of Hungary (Constantinople, 3 September 1657) HHStA Türkei I. Kt. 128. Fasc. 63/b. Conv. D. fol. 63r.

<sup>7</sup> See the memorial of the Transylvanian diplomats to Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmed ([September 1657]) *ibid*, fol. 68–70. The letter of György Rákóczi II can also be found there, in Latin translation (fol. 67).

<sup>8</sup> György Rákóczi II wrote to his mother, Zsuzsanna Lorántffy on 11 October 1657, that he received a letter from his diplomats at the Porte, in which they reported about the conditions of their captivity, EÉKH II: 436.

<sup>9</sup> Rålamb, *Diarium*, 161, 165.

<sup>10</sup> See the entry of 18 October 1657 in the diary of Ferenc Sebesi, MHHD XXIII: 519. In a similar vein, the letter of György Pünkösztö to his wife, Kata Apor, written a year later from the Yedikule also shows a rather relaxed atmosphere (Constantinople, 22 June 1659) *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age), vol. 7, ed. by Áron Szilády and Sándor Szilágyi, *Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek*, vol. 9 (Pest: Eggenberger 1872) (in the following, TMÁO VII), 391–393. According to this document, the Transylvanian diplomat could send his men out of the Seven Towers without much problem to go about their business in the city.

<sup>11</sup> Transylvanian diplomats usually protested vehemently even when a suspicion could be raised that the Grand Vizier intended to keep them in house-arrest. For instance, they ardently remonstrated against



Vizier however used this procedure not only against the Transylvanians: in 1660, not long after Harsányi and the others left the Seven Towers, Köprülü Mehmed sent there the ambassador of the King of France, Jean de la Haye – even if he had to stay in custody only for three days, as a premonition.<sup>12</sup>

We do not know how Harsányi and the others spent the period in arrest: it was most likely the news from Transylvania that brought variety in their rather eventless days. These news could nevertheless be the source of much anxiety, as the political life of the Principality was turned upside down since the fall of 1657. In November, due to the pressure coming from the Sublime Porte, György Rákóczi II abdicated and gave the princely title to Ferenc Rhédey; but he returned as early as January 1658. As a consequence, the Principality was invaded by several Ottoman armies, and one of the most important Transylvanian fortifications, the castle of Borosjenő was lost to them. The greatest devastation was however caused by the Tatars during the summer 1658: the troops of Mehmed Girey IV set the seat of the Prince, Gyulafehérvár on fire and the earlier working place of Harsányi, the college was also burned to ashes. Köprülü Mehmed declared repeatedly that he would not tolerate Rákóczi to stay on the Transylvanian throne. Therefore, in August 1658, he gave the princely power to Ákos Barcsai, the former Locum-Tenens of Rákóczi, who arrived at his camp as the leader of a delegation begging for mercy. Apart from neglecting the country's traditional right for the free election of Princes, the Grand Vizier also dictated further conditions: he agreed to withdraw his armies only if the Transylvanians were ready to hand over some fortified places, pay a higher yearly tribute and also a considerable

---

the Grand Vizier in 1637 when he sent two Janissaries to the Erdel Sarayı, justifying this move with the security of the envoys. See the memorial of Boldizsár Sebessi (without dating), and the letter of Mihály Tholdalagi and his colleagues to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 25 January 1637) RGyP 289, resp. RGyKÖ 462–463.

<sup>12</sup> Gérard Tongas, *Les relations de la France avec l'Empire Ottoman durant la première moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Toulouse: Boisseau, 1942), 40–42.

sum as war indemnity. The new Prince, as well as the diet that confirmed his inauguration in October, saw no other option than to accept all this, as the Transylvanian attempt to oppose the Ottoman power failed miserably.<sup>13</sup>

The settlement between Barcsai and the Grand Vizier, which had dire consequences for the Principality, meant however a positive turn in the personal story of Jakab Harsányi Nagy: it was due to this agreement that he was released from the Seven Towers. Most probably, Köprülü Mehmed judged that after having punished Rákóczi, his most important task was to keep Barcsai in check; and therefore it was much more useful to replace the embassy of 1657 with those diplomats who were taken to Constantinople as hostages from the negotiations with the new Prince. Therefore, the members of the Transylvanian embassy, who were imprisoned in August 1657, were released from the Yedikule in the beginning of November 1658 (with the exception of Zülfikār Ağā), and in the end of the month, Harsányi – in the company of István Tisza and Ferenc Thordai – could leave Constantinople after seven years.<sup>14</sup>

### ***III.1. The Last Years in Transylvania***

We do not know whether Harsányi had the chance to send reports to Transylvania in the more than one year he spent in custody (considering the circumstances, it is not

<sup>13</sup> See recently on the military activities in 1658: János B. Szabó, “II. Rákóczi György 1658. évi török háborúja” (The Turkish war of György Rákóczi II in 1658), *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 114 (2001): 231–278; Idem, “Erdély katasztrófája 1658-ban: A védelem összeomlásának politikai és pszichológiai okai” (The catastrophe of Transylvania in 1658: Political and psychological reasons of the defense’s collapse), *Aetas* 21, no. 2–3 (2006): 204–218. The diplomatic steps towards the Ottoman Empire are described in detail by Papp, “II. Rákóczi György”, 162–169.

<sup>14</sup> Letter of Simon Reniger to Leopold I (Constantinople, 21 October, 7 November and 27 November 1658) HHStA Türkei I. Kt. 130. Fasc. 64. Conv. D. fol. 9r, 24v–26r, resp. 34v. The different position of Johannes Lutsch, István Váradi and Bálint Szilvási, who arrived at Constantinople as hostages, was also clear from the fact that the Grand Vizier did not put them into custody in the Seven Towers: they were kept in house-arrest at the Transylvanian House. See Johannes Lutsch, “Diarium,” in *Johannes Lutsch – Jurnal de captivitate la Istanbul (1658–1661) / Johannes Lutsch – Tagebuch seiner Gefangenschaft in Istanbul (1658–1661)*, ed. by Cristina Feneşan and Costin Feneşan (Timișoara: Editura de Vest, 2006), 166–167. Quite remarkably, Lutsch does not mention that the captives of the Seven Towers left the city not much after their arrival.

out of question), but he did engage in politics again immediately after he had been released. It was probably still in Constantinople that he wrote a report which then became known for both major political camps of Transylvania. In his debate with György Rákóczi II, who stayed out of the borders of the Principality, in Szatmár, the minister of Kolozsvár, István Csengeri referred to the information coming from Harsányi that the flag of the Prophet Mohammed had been put out in Constantinople against the Christianity, and also against Rákóczi if he would continue to show resistance.<sup>15</sup> Apart from renewing his correspondence, the Turkish Scribe also attempted to revitalize his network. The diplomats released from the Seven Towers arrived in Transylvania around the New Year's Eve of 1659, but Harsányi most probably was not among them; the route of Transylvanian envoys to and from the Porte led through Târgoviște, and Harsányi could meet an old friend in a new role in the Wallachian capital, in the person of the new Voievod, Mihnea Radu.<sup>16</sup>

Although it was clear that Köprülü Mehmed could not tolerate the Voievods of Moldavia and Wallachia – both allies to György Rákóczi – to stay the rulers of their countries in 1657, it was nevertheless a great surprise that it was Mihnea, with all his contacts to the Transylvanian embassy, who won the competition of the pretenders at the Ottoman court. It was probably due to the support received from his earlier patron, Gürce Kenan Pasha, who had an important office, that of the Pasha of Buda this time, that Mihnea succeeded in taking the throne. In any case, at the beginning of 1658, he chased away Constantin Șerban with the help of Ottoman troops, and assumed power in Wallachia. It was already clear from his inauguration festivities that his ambitions

<sup>15</sup> Letter of István Csengeri to György Rákóczi II (Dés, 9 January 1659) Sándor Szilágyi, "II. Rákóczy György és Csengeri István levelezése," (The correspondence between György Rákóczi II and István Csengeri), *Sárospataki Füzetek* 10 (1866) (in the following: SF X): 305.

<sup>16</sup> The wife of János Teleki informed his son, Mihály about the return of István Tisza to Transylvania in her letter (Nagyvárad, 8 January 1659) Sámuel Gergely, ed., *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki), vol. 1, 1656–1660, A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára, no. 1 (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1905) (in the following: TML I), 315. On the route of the Transylvanian ambassadors to the Porte, see Bíró, *Erdély követei*, 14–26.

did not stop here. The revival of the Byzantine traditions were not only expressed through several momentums of the ceremony, but Mihnea also started to use a new name: he let himself to be called Mihail, as a reminiscence upon Michael Palaeologus, who re-united the Byzantine Empire.<sup>17</sup> Although he replaced a pro-Rákóczi Voievod, he was also quite quick to take contact with the abdicated Prince of Transylvania – nevertheless, during 1658 there was no actual political or military co-operation between them. This is less surprising if we consider how problematic the legitimacy of Mihnea's rule was for his boyars; and also that even after the army of the Pasha of Silistria left Wallachia, a major Ottoman “life-guard” stayed behind, mainly to secure the faithfulness of the Voievod.

At the diet of Beszterce, on the 28<sup>th</sup> of February 1659, a letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy, sent to Prince Ákos Barcsai from Târgoviște was read aloud. It is not entirely clear what the official function of the Turkish Scribe was in the capital of Wallachia. Theoretically, he could have received a mission from the new Prince on his way home, that he should represent his interests in Târgoviște; but the tone of his letter to Barcsai was – as far as it can be seen from the protocols of the diet – not characterized by a subject's submissiveness. As the Latin summary reports, Harsányi “admonished the Prince that he should act in union and concord with the parts of Hungary annexed to us [that is, the Partium, that refused to take the oath for the new Prince and stayed under Rákóczi's rule], otherwise a fatal decline [is awaiting us].”<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> A part of the Romanian historiography supposed that the name was rather a reference to the early 17<sup>th</sup> century Voievod Michael the Brave (Mihai Viteazul), who also conquered Transylvania and Moldavia for a short time; this claim was however convincingly refuted by Radu Păun, “Pouvoir”, cf. Andreescu, *Restitutio Daciae*, 246–250. It was not uncommon among the Voievods of the Romanian Principalities to change their names when they came to power, see Daniel Ursprung, *Herrschaftslegitimation zwischen Tradition und Innovation: Repräsentation und Inszenierung von Herrschaft in der rumänischen Geschichte*, Veröffentlichungen von Studium Transylvanicum (Kronstadt: Aldus; Heidelberg: Arbeitskreis für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, 2007), 64–84, 141–144.

<sup>18</sup> “[...] ammonent eundem [Barcsai], ut in unionem et concordiam trahat partes Hungariae nobis annexas, alioquin ultimum excidium etc.” Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction), vol. 12, 1658–

The protocols of the same diet also preserved another data about Harsányi: Panayoti informed Barcsai from Constantinople that Mihnea Radu had been keeping contacts with György Rákóczi II through the Turkish Scribe. According to this letter, Harsányi forwarded the conditions of Mihnea for co-operation: what protective measures would be due if the Porte would want to dethrone him.<sup>19</sup>

It is thus highly likely that Jakab Harsányi Nagy acted of his own initiative, but in any case, he was not the official envoy of the Prince.<sup>20</sup> He could not have been one of Rákóczi, only for the reason that the presence of an envoy from the person who was regarded as a traitor in the Empire would not have been tolerated in the court of Mihnea by the leader of his Ottoman “life-guard”, Besliak Pasha. But a letter of Ákos Barcsai proves that his representative at the Wallachian court was still the Hungarian scribe (and Transylvanian informant) in Târgoviște of the past decade, Péter Budai. The Prince, according to the same letter, also planned to send an extraordinary envoy, which means that it was not Harsányi whom he chose to keep the contact with Mihnea through.<sup>21</sup> The Turkish Scribe must have decided that it would be best to stay by the side of the Wallachian Voievod, using his earlier contacts to him. Through this, he could provide services to the Prince (both of them), as they could get more precise information about the intentions of the Voievod; and increase his own importance, as

---

1661, Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1887) (in the following EOE XII), 162.

<sup>19</sup> Entry of 23 March 1659, *ibid.*, 188.

<sup>20</sup> Another letter of Panayoti to Barcsai (Constantinople, 13 March 1659) reinforces this conclusion, because he mentions Harsányi as a person who stayed back by Voievod Mihnea’s side (“remorans”), which would mean that Harsányi did not return to Transylvania from Constantinople, see MHHD XXIII: 646.

<sup>21</sup> Letter of Ákos Barcsai to György Rákóczi II (Beszterce, 14 March 1659) EOE XII: 207. See the biography of Péter Budai in Susana Andrea, *Din relațiile Transilvaniei cu Moldova și Țara Românească în sec. al XVII-lea* (On the relations of Transylvania with Moldavia and Wallachia in the 17<sup>th</sup> century) (Cluj-Napoca: n. p., 1997), 67–76; Klára Jakó, “Budai Péter: Egy újszerű értelmiségi pálya előfutára a hanyatló erdélyi fejedelemségben” (Péter Budai: The forerunner of a new career type for intellectuals in the period of decline at the Principality of Transylvania), in *Studii de istorie modernă a Transilvaniei / Tanulmányok Erdély újkori történelméről: Omagiu profesorului Magyari András / emlékkönyv* (Studies on the modern history of Transylvania: Festschrift for professor András Magyari), ed. Judit Pál and Enikő Rüszt-Fogarasi (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2002), 132–137. Ironically, the person selected by Barcsai as an envoy to Mihnea was no one else than Máté Balogh.

he would have new opportunities to reach knowledge unavailable for others, and thereby be able to give political advice.

In late March we find Harsányi in Transylvania, spreading news from Constantinople and Wallachia among the leading politicians of the country.<sup>22</sup> He did not stay long in the Principality however: at least, we read in one of the letters of Ákos Barcsai that he “expedited” (“expediálja”) Harsányi – a term which referred to sending someone as an envoy in the vocabulary of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian chancellery.<sup>23</sup> The Prince does not mention the goal of the mission: Harsányi might have returned to Wallachia, but it is also possible that – similarly to István Tisza – he was sent to negotiate to a neighboring Pasha.<sup>24</sup> It was less surprising that Tisza accepted new assignments from Barcsai, because he was given a new estate by the Prince after his return to the Principality and told everyone that “Rákóczi would have never liberated him from the captivity.”<sup>25</sup> The decision of Harsányi, however, to inform György Rákóczi II from Wallachia, and to be in the service of Ákos Barcsai one month later, seems to be self-contradictory. Due to the political situation in the beginning of 1659 however, it was not surprising at all. Seeing their inability to

<sup>22</sup> A letter of Farkas Bethlen to Mihály Teleki (Buza, 29 March 1659) refers to Harsányi as someone who “recently came from Wallachia”, TML I: 374.

<sup>23</sup> Letter of Ákos Barcsai to György Lázár (Szamosújvár, 31 March 1659) EOE XII: 230.

<sup>24</sup> A rather uncertain data suggests that the Turkish Scribe returned to Constantinople in the company of István Tisza. In the letter of László Básti to János Rácz and Pál Csongrádi (Constantinople, 18 May 1659; EÉKH II: 536), he explains that he had escaped Tatar captivity only to be captured once again by Turks and be sold in Constantinople as a galley slave. When he learned that Tisza and Harsányi are in the city, he turned to them and asked for their help; at the point when he wrote the letter, negotiations were still going on. Farkas Deák, who quoted the letter of Básti, is surely wrong in claiming that the diplomats were still in the Seven Towers, therefore they were unable to help (cf. his “Adalékok a török-tatár rabok történetéhez” (Contributions to the history of the Tatar and Turkish captives), *Századok* 19 (1882): 589). The dating of the letter is however suspicious due to several reasons. Johannes Lutsch, who was kept in house-arrest at the Transylvanian House of Constantinople by this time, and noted any Transylvanian diplomat who arrived in the Ottoman capital, seems to know nothing about the journey of Harsányi. On the other hand, we know about István Tisza, that he was expected back from a diplomatic mission to the Pasha of Buda in the beginning of June 1659, and he could not have gone back to Transylvania from Constantinople and then further on to Buda in such a short time. Therefore, until new data surface, the information on the visit of Tisza and Harsányi in Constantinople in May 1659 can be given no credit.

<sup>25</sup> “[...] hogy soha űtet Rákóczy György meg nem szabadította volna.” See the letter of Ms János Teleki (Nagyvárad, 8 January 1659), quoted in note 16, 315.

withstand the Ottoman attack, even the last pro-Rákóczi politicians of Transylvania took the oath for Barcsai, who promised the abdicated Prince in the agreement of Szatmár that he would promote his return to the throne in his turn. The pact of the two Princes brought some calm to the divided country, even if it proved to be fragile later on.<sup>26</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy could serve on György Rákóczi II, even if he accepted a diplomatic mission from Ákos Barcsai.

The Turkish Scribe appears again in the rather fragmentary sources in September 1659. We find him again at the side of Mihnea Radu; János Kemény, one of the most important politicians of the Principality refers to it in a letter that Harsányi stayed in Wallachia.<sup>27</sup> If we are to believe the information in the contemporary chronicle of János Szalárdi, the Turkish Scribe was the one who convinced the Wallachian Voievod to take Rákóczi's side eventually.<sup>28</sup> By this time, it was again relevant that Harsányi chose Rákóczi's political camp, as the agreement of Szatmár was already past and forgotten. György Rákóczi II, who was not eager to fulfill the obligations of the pact for himself anyway, returned to the country during the summer of 1659 and was re-elected as a Prince of Transylvania by the diet of Marosvásárhely in September, which led to a civil war.<sup>29</sup> Kemény, who returned from the Tatar captivity through Wallachia in June 1659, also had high hopes that Mihnea Radu

<sup>26</sup> Alajos Erdélyi, "Barcsay Ákos fejedelemsége" (The rule of Ákos Barcsai), *Századok* 40 (1906): 494–495. Very informative on the period: Maxim Mordovin, "Petki István, II. Rákóczi György főudvarmestere" (István Petki, major-domo of György Rákóczi II), in *Szerencsének elegyes forgása: II. Rákóczi György és kora* (The alternating turns of fortune: György Rákóczi II and his age), ed. Gábor Kármán and András Péter Szabó (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009), 405–408. The agreement of Szatmár is published in EOE XII: 146–149.

<sup>27</sup> Letter of János Kemény to Ferenc Kornis (Balázsfalva, 23 September 1659) Andrei Veress, ed., *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării-Românești* (Documents for the history of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia), vol. 10, *Acte și scrisori (1637–1660)* (Documents and letters 1637–1660) (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1938) (in the following: DIAMTR X), 336.

<sup>28</sup> Szalárdi, *Síralmas magyar krónikája*, 511.

<sup>29</sup> See Mordovin, "Petki", 409–410.

could be won for the cause of Rákóczi – and probably got personal experiences of Harsányi's diplomatic activities.<sup>30</sup>

It is exactly the scope and effect of these activities that is hard to define concerning Harsányi's stay in Wallachia. At a dinner, held at the 14<sup>th</sup> of September, the Voievod let the leaders of his Ottoman "life-guard" be killed, and it is clear that this bloody event was the result of the activity of the Turkish Scribe – or, at least the result of the contacts with Rákóczi – as it signaled the beginning of the anti-Ottoman war of Mihnea Radu. Notwithstanding, we have no information whether Jakab Harsányi Nagy played any role in the other radical step the Voievod took earlier in 1659, that he ordered a bloody cleansing among the boyars of the country in mid-June. Although later analysts claimed that this was necessary for the change of direction in his foreign policy later on, it is unclear whether the brutal method was suggested by the Prince of Transylvania or Mihnea acted of his own initiative.<sup>31</sup>

In any case, not long after taking a stand against the Ottoman Empire, Mihnea met György Rákóczi II personally on the border between Transylvania and Wallachia, by Töröcsvár, and their treaty was ratified by the diet of Marosvásárhely on the 4<sup>th</sup> of October.<sup>32</sup> The Voievod started a campaign against the Ottoman troops in his territory,

<sup>30</sup> On Kemény's arrival to Wallachia, see Erdélyi, "Barcsai", 509. It is however remarkable that there is no mention about Harsányi in Kemény's other letters written in September – not even in the one that reports the massacre of the Ottoman soldiers in Wallachia, noting "as I have told Your Highness, I did not fail my words, that this Voievod of mine has good intentions towards Christianity in his heart, and he only acts as if he would be for the pagans, which he also proved this Sunday." (Fogaras, 17 September 1659) Sándor Szilágyi, "Kemény János leveles tárczájából" (From the briefcase of János Kemény), *Történeti Lapok* 2 (1875) (in the following: TL 1875): 1217. The reference of an earlier letter of Kemény (Balázstelek, 14 September 1659) on Harsányi is much too laconic to lead to any conclusion ("Harsányi uram elkésék, féltem." can mean several things: "I was afraid that Mr. Harsányi would be late."; "I was afraid because Mr. Harsányi was late"; "I was anxious for Mr. Harsányi, because he was late." or even "I was anxious for Mr. Harsányi, not to be late.").

<sup>31</sup> Both events are described with much disgust by the Moldavian historiographer Miron Costin, *Grausame Zeiten in der Moldau: Die Moldauische Chronik des Miron Costin 1593–1661*, Rumänische Geschichtsschreiber, no. 1, ed. and trans. Adolf Armbruster (Graz: Styria, 1980), 269–271. The precise date of the massacre of the Ottomans was given by Andreescu, *Restitutio Daciae*, 247.

<sup>32</sup> See the diary of the diet of Marosvásárhely: EOE XII: 388–389. The treaty is published in Áron Szilády and Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the



and the successes of the first month bade fair prospects for his more ambitious plans to raise the Balkan Christians against the Ottoman rule. The attack of the Pasha of Silistria could however not been held back: the armies of Mihnea suffered a crushing defeat south of Bucharest on the 19<sup>th</sup> of November and the Voievod fled to Transylvania.<sup>33</sup>

Civil war was raging in the Principality: it tells a lot that when the Transylvanian auxiliary troops sent to Mihnea were passing by the town of Nagyszeben, the Saxons, who were on the side of Barcsai, shot on them with cannons. Ákos Barcsai also issued a warrant against the fallen Voievod, who stayed in Fogaras for a while, from there he tried to get to the pro-Rákóczi territory of the Székelyföld.<sup>34</sup> Mihnea Radu reached the town of Szatmár, which was supposed to provide safety for him, as it was the estate of the Rákóczis outside Transylvania, in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary – therefore, theoretically neither the Ottoman troops, nor those of Barcsai could follow him there. Ironically, the town meant no haven for the ex-Voievod: it was here that he met his former rival, Constantin Șerban. The situation did not seem to be dangerous, as their earlier conflict over the throne of Wallachia was settled in October 1659: both of them swore allegiance to Rákóczi and as Mihnea was then the actual Voievod of Wallachia, Constantin was offered the throne of Moldavia instead. The meeting of the two Voievods was celebrated with a dinner on the 5<sup>th</sup> of April 1660; the next day Mihail Radu was dead. Although some talked about a stroke of apoplexy, it is more likely that Constantin Șerban got rid of his rival with poison.<sup>35</sup>

---

Turkish-Hungarian age), vol. 3, Török-magyarok történelmi emlékek, no. 5 (Pest: Eggenberger 1870) (in the following: TMAO III), 456–457.

<sup>33</sup> Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika*, 347–350. In order to organize an anti-Ottoman front, Mihnea Radu sent envoys to Venice and Rome in the summer of 1659, see its documents in Alexandru Ciorănescu, “Documente privitoare la domnia lui Mihail Radu (1658–1659)” (Documents concerning the rule of Mihail Radu 1658–1659), *Buletinul Comisei Istorice* 13 (1934) (in the following: BCI XIII): 9–94.

<sup>34</sup> Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika*, 357.

<sup>35</sup> This assumption is also supported by the authors of his biographies. On the last months of Mihnea Radu, see Ciorănescu, „Domnia”, 220–222; Marin Matei Popescu and Adrian N. Beldeanu, *Mihnea al*

I followed the path of Mihnea Radu in a so detailed way in the previous paragraphs, because Jakab Harsányi Nagy, who disappears from the sources after September 1659 re-appears right after the Voievod's death in Szatmár as one of the signatories of the catalogue of the valuables of the deceased Mihnea.<sup>36</sup> Most probably, he spent the period in between also in the company of the Voievod. All the more so, as when Harsányi summarized various stages of his life for Carl Gustaf Wrangel, Chief Governor of Pomerania, he also informed the Swedish aristocrat that he was once a “Cancellarius et Consiliarius” of Mihail Radu, Voievod of Wallachia.<sup>37</sup> This claim is quite surprising: there is no data that Mihnea would have taken Harsányi among his counselors – although the surviving documentation from his period is rather scarce.<sup>38</sup> The credibility of the former Turkish Scribe's claim is also problematic because of its context: from the letter written to Wrangel, it seems as if he would have held these positions beside Rákóczi as well as Mihnea – which is a clear overstatement regarding his position in Transylvania.<sup>39</sup> It is however likely that he served as an adviser of Mihnea during his rather short anti-Ottoman campaign and exile (or even before that). His activities as a “Chancellor” (but at least as a scribe) of Mihnea are proved by the fact that we know a letter of Mihnea Radu from December

---

*III-lea (1658–1659)*, Domnitori și voievozi (Bucharest: Editura militară, 1982), 234–236. According to the chronicle of Miron Costin, some of the contemporaries had suspicion against György Rákóczi II as well, but it is not clear what the motivation of the Prince of Transylvania could have been to have Mihnea killed, cf. Costin, *Grausame Zeiten*, 281–282.

<sup>36</sup> The register of the valuables of the deceased Mihnea Radu (Szatmár, 6 April 1660) DIAMTR X: 346.

<sup>37</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 28 April/[8 May] 1666) Riksarkivet (Stockholm, in the following: RA) Skoklostersamlingen E 8184 (Moldau) [fol. 1v]. In the collection, where no folio pages are indicated, specific letters can be found according to authors and dates; however, Harsányi's letters are placed among those of Gheorghe Ștefan under the letter M (Moldau). János Herepei suggests that Harsányi was still in the Sublime Porte at the end of 1659, but there is no proof that the letter he refers to would have been written by the Turkish Scribe, cf. Herepei, “Adatok”, 59.

<sup>38</sup> In the beginning of his rule, Mihnea Radu got rid of the Chief Chancellor (*logofăt mare*), Constantin Cantacuzino, but there is no data suggesting that his post would have been filled with Harsányi instead, see Nicolae Stoicescu, *Dicționar al marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova* (Dictionary of the major dignitaries of Wallachia and Moldova) (Bucharest: Editura enciclopedică română, 1971), 135–136; Ciorănescu, “Domnia”, 138. A list of the counselors of Mihnea Radu is provided *ibid*, 101–102.

<sup>39</sup> The precise quotation is: “Fui postea et Celsissimi Principis Rakoci, itemque [sic!] Michaelis Radul, Valachiae Principis Cancellarius et Consiliarius”, see note 37.

1659 that was preserved in Harsányi's handwriting.<sup>40</sup> His familiarity with the Partium and Transylvania must have been important for the ex-Voievod who had never been to the Principality before – and, as we will see later, the exiled Voievods were not shying away from giving elegant titles to people at their “court.” So, even if Harsányi did not become a Wallachian dignitary – that is, contrary to Máté Balogh's accusation, did not use his contacts to Mihnea to become a “Chief Vornic” – the claims he presented to Wrangel were not necessarily entirely the products of his imagination.

If we summarize the role of Harsányi in the period of civil war in Transylvania, it seems that his activities were the direct continuation of his services as a Turkish Scribe in the 1650s. Although there are very few sources preserved about him, and none written by him (at least in his own name), we still have the impression that he was very active in diplomatic missions related to the Principality: he was continuously on his way, made arrangements and – if there was a chance – provided the various rulers of Transylvania with political advice. His choice of camps in the civil war was not only in line with his personal sympathies – that is, did not only choose Rákóczi's side because Mihnea Radu also ended up there after his conflicts with Barcsai –, but also with the idea repeated several times during his years in Constantinople, that the Ottoman Empire was in crisis and there was a realistic hope for resistance.

### ***III.2. Hungary, Moravia, Muscovy***

To account for what Harsányi did in the one-and-a-half years after the death of Mihnea Radu is even harder than it was to reconstruct his activities between 1658 and 1660. The task is even more difficult, because in this period a great change occurred

---

<sup>40</sup> Letter of Mihnea Radu to István Lázár (Görgényszentimre, 26 December 1659) ANCIJ Fond familial Lazar din Mureşeni I/91. fol. 2.

in the life of the former Turkish Scribe that is not easy to explain: we have the first document from August 1661 that mentions him as the secretary of Gheorghe Ștefan, the exiled Voievod of Moldavia.<sup>41</sup> We do not know any documents about Harsányi from the period in between, and the interpretation is further complicated by the fact that no other examples are known from the history of the Principality for Harsányi's action to change the service of the Prince for that of another one, even if that one is an ally.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, on the basis of the source material available at the moment, only hypotheses can be formed about the steps leading to his decision as well as about its motivation.

It seems to be certain that Harsányi was in Hungary in August 1660: the Court Captain and Equery of the late Voievod Mihnea visited Palatine Ferenc Wesselényi with the claim that the former Turkish Scribe took 500 ducats, two horses and other things to himself from the Voievod's legacy and used them for unknown purposes.<sup>43</sup> If they considered the Palatine to have the authority in the question, then they must have had the information that Jakab Harsányi stayed in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. It is thus likely that the former Turkish Scribe did not get involved again in the civil war raging in Transylvania: anyways, the army of the Rákóczi party, which he belonged to, suffered a crushing defeat near Szászfenes on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May, and the Prince died of the wounds he got in the battle on the 7<sup>th</sup> June, in Nagyvárad.<sup>44</sup> His earlier supporters tried to restore their ranks during June and July outside the borders of the Principality, in the Rákóczi estates at Eastern Hungary, Munkács and

<sup>41</sup> Letter of Safta, the consort of the Voievod to the town of Bátfá (Homonna, 1 August 1661) Antal Doby, "A moldvaországi vajdáné magyar levele 1661-ből" (A Hungarian letter of the consort of the Voievod of Moldavia from 1661), *Adalékok Zemplén-Vármegye Történetéhez* 5 (1899) (in the following: AZVT V): 151; also in R. A., *Néhány okmány szabad királyi Bátfá városa levéltárából* (Some documents from the archives of the Royal Town of Bátfá), vol. 1 (Bátfá: Blayer, 1895), 32.

<sup>42</sup> Obviously, excluding here those "wondering diplomats" of Western European origin, who were chosen by Gábor Bethlen to maintain his contacts with the Protestant Europe, see Benda, "Diplomáciai szervezet", 729–730.

<sup>43</sup> Protocol made by Ferenc Wesselényi (Rakamaz, 9 August 1660) DIAMTR X: 357–358.

<sup>44</sup> János Kósa, *II. Rákóczi György* (Budapest: Franklin, 1942), 172–174.

Nagybánya; their command was taken over by János Kemény. Ákos Barcsai thus remained the only Prince of Transylvania; this, however, was hardly a reason to celebrate for him, because he had to witness, almost as a hostage of Cengizade Ali Pasha of Buda, that the Ottoman army took the fortress of Nagyvárád in August 1660, and started to attach it, together with the surrounding counties, to the Ottoman Empire. These territorial losses, together with other harsh demands of the Ottomans showed the failure of Barcsai's pro-Turkish policy for many in the Transylvanian elite: therefore, when János Kemény entered the Principality with his armies, he was quick to win their support. Jakab Harsányi, who lost his family heritage with the Ottoman conquest of Nagyvárád, most probably belonged also to the anti-Barcsai party: he perhaps spent the period between April and November around Szatmár, by the side of János Kemény, whom, as I mentioned earlier, he must have got personally acquainted to in Wallachia. It is nevertheless unlikely that he would have gone back to Transylvania with the army. As he was no soldier, he could probably have been of little use, and his engagement as a diplomat was also untimely at that moment: János Kemény did not negotiate with any representative of the Ottoman Empire as long as he could not strengthen his rule in the Principality.<sup>45</sup>

It would theoretically be possible that Jakab Harsányi Nagy joined the retinue of Gheorghe Ștefan already in 1660. This Prince of Moldavia, as mentioned earlier, had to thank György Rákóczi II for his support in getting to the throne and he also lost it because of the Prince of Transylvania in early 1658. Similarly to Mihnea Radu and Constantin Șerban, he fled to Transylvania, but he soon had to realize that he could

<sup>45</sup> Zsolt Trócsányi, *Teleki Mihály (Erdély és a kurucmozgalom 1690-ig)* (Mihály Teleki: Transylvania and the Kuruc movement until 1690) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1972), 23–24; János Bethlen, *Erdély története 1629–1673* (The history of Transylvania 1629–1673), trans. Judit P. Vásárhelyi, ed. József Jankovics (Budapest: Balassi, 1993), 83. On the direct consequences of the conquest of Nagyvárád, see also Pál Tóth-Szabó, *Nagyvárád az erdélyi fejedelmek s a török uralom korában* (Nagyvárád in the age of the Transylvanian Princes and the Turkish rule) (Nagyvárád: Sebő, 1904), 102–103.

not trust Rákóczi: the Prince, as it was also mentioned earlier, attempted to help Constantin Șerban to the throne of Moldavia in the fall of 1659 (even if only for a month). The exiled Voievod fled the domestic warfare to Hungary, where – after several temporary stops – he found shelter from the end of 1660 in Szinna, a small settlement in Zemplén county, close to the Transylvanian border.<sup>46</sup>

It is almost certain that the Turkish Scribe did not take Gheorghe Ștefan's service immediately after Mihnea Radu's death; among other things, because the Moldavian ex-Voievod had at that moment been trying to get the support of the Emperor in Vienna.<sup>47</sup> Most probably, Harsányi became the secretary of Gheorghe Ștefan some time between May and August 1661.<sup>48</sup> It is easier to understand why the exiled Voievod needed the services of the former Turkish Scribe. As it seemed that he would have to settle in Hungary, at least temporarily, he had to have some staff who spoke the language of the country. Even if he did not need the special skills of

<sup>46</sup> Szinna must be the estate near Homonna that the literature refers to, wrongly identifying the place name found in the sources as Abaújszina, close to Kassa, see Petronel Zahariuc, *Țara Moldovei în vremea lui Gheorghe Ștefan voievod (1653–1658)* (Moldavia in the period of Voievod Gheorghe Ștefan, 1653–1658), *Historica*, no. 30 (Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2003), 514–520; Idem, “Gheorghe Ștefan moldvai vajda és II. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem kapcsolata” (The contacts between Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievod of Moldavia and György Rákóczi II, Prince of Transylvania), in *Szerencsének elegyes forgása: II. Rákóczi György és kora* (The alternating turns of fortune: György Rákóczi II and his age), ed. Gábor Kármán and András Péter Szabó (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009), 61–96. There is a solid amount of data about his stay in Szinna. For the first information, from December 1660, see Zahariuc, *Țara Moldovei*, 521. He wrote from here many letters to the Royal Counselor Johann Rottal. From one of these (Szinna, 13 May 1662) it is also clear that he had rented the estate temporarily, and the contract ran out on the 16<sup>th</sup> of May 1662: MOL P 507 Nádasdy család levéltára Fasc. 14. Levelezések A.V. nr. 527. fol. 570r.

<sup>47</sup> See the reports of Aloise Molin, Venetian ambassador in Vienna (Vienna, 3, 24 and 28 April 1660) BCI XIII: 131, DIR IX/1: 173 and BCI XIII: 132. The envoys of Gheorghe Ștefan had already visited Vienna in March 1659, and received encouragement, even if not help; see the recommendation of Ferenc Wesselényi to the envoys (Murányváralja, 27 March 1659), and the opinion of Chancellor György Lippay on the question (sine dato), Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, ed., *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor* (Documents for the history of the Romanians), vol. 5, part 1, 1650–1699 (Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1885) (in the following: DIR V/1), 56, resp. 62. Manfred Stoy is however surely wrong to suggest that Gheorghe Ștefan stayed in the *Kaiserstadt* between his visits in 1660 and 1662, see his, “Rumänische Fürsten im frühneuzeitlichen Wien,” *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* 46 (1990): 171. After leaving Vienna, on the 20<sup>th</sup> of June 1660, the Voievod already wrote a letter from Pozsony to Johann Rottal (MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 601r).

<sup>48</sup> The known letters of Gheorghe Ștefan until May 1661 are not the handwritings of Harsányi; afterwards, all are, see MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. There is however no letter survived from the period between 9 May and 26 November 1661, the *terminus ante quem* is therefore provided by the letter quoted in note 41.

Harsányi (his mastery of the Turkish language), it must have seemed to be useful to have an experienced diplomat in his service. In any case, Harsányi had already been known for Gheorghe Ștefan before they met in Hungary: the Turkish Scribe had regularly sent him letters from Constantinople and the Voievod had very much appreciated his help in getting protectors at the Porte – or at least, so he wrote to György Rákóczi II.<sup>49</sup>

It is much harder to answer the question why Jakab Harsányi Nagy took the office by the side of the exiled Voievod of Moldavia. Later, when he was accounting for the turns of his life, he always introduced this phase with referring to losing his wealth because of the Ottoman conquest.<sup>50</sup> There is some logic to this: with the fall of Nagyvárad, the birthplace of Harsányi also became Ottoman territory. This in itself does not however explain Harsányi's decision, as the main source of his income had earlier also not been his estates – which were probably very small –, rather his salary as a teacher and interpreter. However, after he had chosen the openly anti-Ottoman side and left Transylvania, Harsányi probably saw very little chances that he would be able to use his language skills in the service of the Prince soon. The party of Rákóczi, and later of Kemény, did not keep contacts with the Ottoman power during 1660, which seemed to be all the more justified, as Ottoman dignitaries were arresting even those Transylvanian diplomats and aristocrats, who were from the other political camp, seeking compromise with the overlords of the Principality. If he would have been in situ, he could have had chances to reintegrate to the administration of Transylvania: another Turkish Scribe, András Majtényi, who had been faithful to Rákóczi until 1659, was already the member of the embassy Ákos Barcsai sent to the

<sup>49</sup> Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to György Rákóczi II (Iași, 4 January 1654) DIAMTR X: 302.

<sup>50</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to the Swedish Chancellor, Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 11[21] December 1666) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500 Moldau [fol. 1]. As in the case of Skoklostersamlingen, the letters of Harsányi are also placed in chronological order among those of Gheorghe Ștefan.

Pasha of Buda in November 1660.<sup>51</sup> It would however been all too risky to return from the Rákóczi estates in Eastern Hungary.

At the same time, Harsányi had to make a living. We do not know whether he really took five hundred ducats (that is, one thousand dollars) from the legacy of Mihnea Radu: we do not know any other documents about the issue, and, as we will see later on, there were often scandals around the bequest of Voievods deceased in exile, where unfounded accusations were frequently voiced. But even if he did take some money, sooner or later he had to secure that he had a constant source of income. It is thus easily imaginable that he meant the solution of taking the service of the Moldavian Voievod only as a temporary one. If Harsányi could have chosen freely, he would most probably have not decided for Gheorghe Ștefan: as a diplomat in Constantinople, he followed the orders of his ruler and worked also in the interest of the Voievod, but he complained several times about him – among other things, he condemned Gheorghe Ștefan's oppression towards the Armenian merchants in his country.<sup>52</sup> It was not only his politics that Harsányi disapproved of concerning Gheorghe Ștefan: he also found the morals of the Voievod questionable. According to a letter to Rákóczi, the ruler of Moldavia let his agents in Constantinople search for girls to be taken to him, which was commented upon by the Turkish Scribe with the following words:

so does he take care of his honor, his reputation is horrible, abominable, that he lets such unclean persons to be taken to him, as if he could not found

<sup>51</sup> At the diet of Marosvásárhely that re-elected Rákóczi as a Prince, the translation of official Ottoman letters were trusted upon Majtényi, so that “the fraud of Ákos Barcsai” could not distort their meaning (EOE XII: 393). Majtényi was taken to Belgrade by the Pasha of Buda in November 1660, and could return only in May, see Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika*, 415, 436.

<sup>52</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February 1656) MHHD XXIII: 307–308.



them in Moldavia; I wish His Highness would not act like this, because our faces also have to blush because of him.<sup>53</sup>

It is very likely that after these precedents, Harsányi took the service of Gheorghe Ștefan out of necessity and did not plan it to be a life-long commitment.

Gheorghe Ștefan did everything in his power that this co-operation could end as soon as possible and he could return to his country. He tried to get help for this in many places, sometimes even from powers that stood in open conflict, such as Sweden and Poland-Lithuania, which had just been in the process of peace-making after several years of warfare against each other.<sup>54</sup> In December 1661, he managed to convince the Palatine of Hungary that his return would be warmly welcome in Moldavia – however, he still did not get the troops he was asking for.<sup>55</sup> Several of the missions he assigned to Harsányi were also connected to this task, for instance the visit at the Hungarian diet, which opened in Pozsony, in May 1662. Although Gheorghe Ștefan acquired the status of a Hungarian aristocrat since 1659, it seems that Harsányi was not his official envoy at the diet, only an ad hoc visitor, who had to represent the interest of the Voivod in personal negotiations.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> “[...] így visel ő nagysága maga böcsületire gondot, rút, gyalázatos híre vagyon, afféle tisztátalan személyeket hordat, nem talál Moldvában; bár ő nagysága azt ne cselekedné; mert az mi orczánk is pirúl miatta” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 10 June 1656) MHHD XXIII: 376.

<sup>54</sup> In the latter case, asking for support was a rather surprising move, because Gheorghe Ștefan, as an ally of György Rákóczi II, sent auxiliary troops to the Polish campaign in 1657. He nevertheless denied this in his correspondence with the Polish dignitaries and referred to his status of indigena that he received in 1654, as a result of his military co-operation with the Rzeczpospolita during the overthrow of Vasile Lupu's rule. See his letter to Mikołaj Prażmowski (Szinna, 26 February 1661) Ilie Corfus, “Pe urmele lui Moise Movilă și ale lui Gheorghe Ștefan” (On the track of Moise Movilă and Gheorghe Ștefan), *Anuarul de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D. Xenopol”* 15 (1978): 304–305. The interests of Gheorghe Ștefan were represented at the court of Charles X Gustav and later on, of the Regency Government of Charles XI by Ludwik Biała Bielski, but he was not even able to get an answer out of them; see his petitions (February, and 10 April 1660) ARMSI X: 514–515, resp. 516–518.

<sup>55</sup> On the hopes of the Voievod, see his letters to Johann Rottal (Szinna, 26 November, resp. 9 and 23 December) MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 582r, 580r, resp. 578r. On the support of Ferenc Wesselényi, see the concept of his letter to unknown (perhaps also Rottal) (Murányváralja, 27 December 1661) MOL E 199 Archivum familiae Wesselényi 8. cs. IV/4. Nr. 353.

<sup>56</sup> Harsányi refers to his participation at the diet in his letter to Carl Gustaf Wrangel, quoted in note 37, fol. [1v]. Also, see the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Johann Rottal (Szinna, 16 April 1662) MOL P 507

The former Turkish Scribe did not spend much time on the diet that anyway turned out to be quite stormy and less effective, especially due to the confessional problems which led to a war to the knife between the Protestant and Catholic estates. He had to prepare the move of the Voievod, as a Royal Counselor, Johann Rottal offered Holešov, one of his estates in Moravia, close to the Hungarian border, to Gheorghe Ștefan; his court arrived there in early June 1662. This Moravian episode did not last long either: the place proved to be too tight, and the administrator of the estate unready for co-operation.<sup>57</sup>

Gheorghe Ștefan thus decided already in September that he would look for another solution and try to mobilize another patron of his, Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich. It was probably in Vienna that he got acquainted to a Dominican friar, Felix Mondvid, who wanted to travel to the Crimea as a missionary and planned to free 40.000 Christian captives there. They traveled together to Moscow in order to win the support of the Tsar to the ambitious plan, and also for the recuperation of the Moldavian throne.<sup>58</sup> His expectations about getting help from Alexei were not an altogether haphazard idea, because in 1654, as a consequence of diplomatic negotiations, the

---

Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 574r. Gheorghe Ștefan's recommendatory letter for Harsányi, written to Prince Lobkowitz (Szinna, 16 April 1662), is also preserved: Corfus, "Pe urmele lui Moise Movilă", 530. However, neither his name, nor that of Gheorghe Ștefan appears in the official register of the participants of the diet: Tatyana Gusarova, "A 17. századi magyar országgyűlések résztvevői" (Participants of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian diets), *Levéltári Közlemények* 74, no. 2 (2005): 134–139. The legal act granting the *indigena* status to Gheorghe Ștefan in Hungary is 1659: CXXXIII, 4. §, see Dezső Márkus, ed., *Corpus Juris Hungarici: Magyar törvénytár 1657–1740* (The collection of Hungarian laws 1657–1740) (Budapest: Franklin, 1901) (in the following CJH 1657–1740).

<sup>57</sup> See the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Johann Rottal (Holešov, 12 July and 12 September 1662) MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 599, 595.

<sup>58</sup> No surviving document discusses the details of the plans: see the petition of Gheorghe Ștefan to Archduke Leopold William (sine dato) Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Hofkammerarchiv (in the following: HKA) Reichsakten fasc. 113. fol. 1r; and his letter to the Republic of Venice (Vienna, 6 September 1662) Andrei Veress, ed., *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării-Românești* (Documents for the history of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia), vol. 11, *Acte și scrisori (1661–1690)* (Documents and letters 1661–1690) (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1939) (in the following: DIAMTR XI), 26–27. Felix Mondvid, who published his poetic work about the deeds of Leopold I under the title *Classicum novi Hannibalis, incolas europaeos excitans*, in the same year, indeed reached Crimea in 1662. His missionary activities there are documented until 1664. I owe my gratitude to Meinolf Arens for this information.

Tsar officially took Moldavia and Gheorghe Ștefan under his protection.<sup>59</sup> It is also possible that he was motivated by the failure of the Hungarian diet in 1662. Due to the confessional conflicts, the Protestant estates left the assembly, thereby forfeiting the possibility to organize an anti-Ottoman war, which postponed the fulfillment of Gheorghe Ștefan's hopes for a longer period.<sup>60</sup>

If Jakab Harsányi Nagy had not taken the route northwards along the Oder by the time of his peregrination, he had a chance to see the region this time: after having left Breslau, the Voievod sent him from Frankfurt an der Oder to pay homage to the ruler of the territory, Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg.<sup>61</sup> One asks oneself: if Harsányi really had accepted the service by the side of Gheorghe Ștefan only as a temporary commitment, why did he go with him to his journey to Muscovy? His tasks until that point, his missions in Western Hungary, but even the settlement in Moravia did not bring him so far away from home that it would not have been possible in any moment to leave the office and return to Transylvania – Moscow was, however, in a considerable distance. It can easily be assumed that Harsányi was under the pressure of necessity again: returning to Transylvania would have not been easy in September 1662. János Kemény, who forced Barcsai to abdicate, and later on had him executed, died in January 1662, in the battle of Nagyszőlős, leaving Mihály Apafi, put on the throne in the meantime by the Ottomans, as the only legitimate Prince of

<sup>59</sup> Gebei, *II. Rákóczi György*, 159–162.

<sup>60</sup> On the developments at the diet, see Mihály Zsilinszky, *A magyar országgyűlések vallásügyi tárgyalásai a reformatiótól kezdve* (The negotiations on Hungarian diets concerning the confessional issue from the Reformation), vol. 3, 1647–1687, *A Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság kiadványai* (Budapest: Hornyánszky, 1893), 186–267; Jean Bérenger and Károly Kecskeméti, *Országgyűlés és parlamenti élet Magyarországon 1608–1918* (Parliament and parliamentary life in Hungary 1608–1918) (Budapest: Napvilág, 2008), 81–85.

<sup>61</sup> Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Frederick William (Frankfurt an der Oder, 1 October 1662), and his answer (Kolberg, 27 September [7 October] 1662) Alexandru Papiu Ilarianu, ed., *Tesauru de monumente istorice pentru Romania atâtu din vechiu tiparite cătu si manuscripte cea mai mare parte straine* ((Thesaurus of historical documents concerning Romania, edited from old prints as well as manuscripts, mostly of foreign origin), vol. 3 (Bucharest: Rasidescu, 1864) (in the following: TMIR III), 80–82. On their stay in Breslau, see the letters of Erhard Truchtes to Count Dohna and Frederick William (Breslau, 23 September 1662) GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Moldau und Wallachei Fasz. 3. fol. 4–5.

Transylvania. Nevertheless, the party of Kemény did not give up and recommended his son, Simon as a candidate for the title. Apart from the Ottoman armies, Habsburg troops were also present in the country (some fortresses had Imperial garrisons, invited by Kemény), while the civil war was going on, and taking especially bloody turns since November 1660: political murders were frequently on the agenda.<sup>62</sup> For Jakab Harsányi Nagy, returning to Transylvania could thus not seem to be possible in a close future, but even Hungary, on the threshold of an Ottoman military attack, did not seem to be a safe place. In this case, the former Turkish Scribe was forced to go away in the company of the Voievod. It is however also not excluded – taking into consideration his earlier, rather adventurous career – that Harsányi did not mind to see new lands and people that were waiting for him on his way to Muscovy.

Gheorghe Ștefan and his retinue boarded a ship in Kolberg, a Western Pomeranian small port under the control of the Elector, and arrived in Libau, Kurland, in a few days.<sup>63</sup> Their journey went through Riga, then under Swedish control towards Muscovy, but they had to face an unexpected obstacle in Livonia.<sup>64</sup> The governors of the Russian border provinces did not even answer their request to be allowed to go through the border, and when Gheorghe Ștefan nevertheless entered the Russian territory at Neuhausen on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, he was sent back to Swedish Livonia

<sup>62</sup> On the situation between 1660 and 1662, see Várkonyi, *Erdélyi változások*, 17–36; Zs. Trócsányi, *Teleki*, 23–35. On the roughening of the political games, see the dissertation of András Péter Szabó, “Haller Gábor – egy 17. századi erdélyi arisztokrata életpályája” (Gábor Haller: Career of a 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian aristocrat) (Ph.D. diss., ELTE BTK, 2008), 228–229.

<sup>63</sup> On boarding the ship in Kolberg, see the letter of Paul Würtz to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 4[14] October 1662) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8526; and to Charles XI, King of Sweden (Ueckermünde, 8[18] October 1662) RA Pommeranica vol. 262. From Libau, Gheorghe Ștefan wrote a letter to the Kolbergians on the 11<sup>th</sup> of October (probably according to the old system, so according to the new one, on the 21<sup>st</sup>), see Georg Haag, “Das stettiner Exil eines moldavischen Woiwoden,” *Baltische Studien* 31 (1881): 161–162.

<sup>64</sup> It was most probably his longer stay in Riga that made it necessary that Gheorghe Ștefan sent letters of apologies to important members of the Swedish Regency Government, such as Per Brahe and Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Riga, 24, resp. 25 November[4, resp. 5 December] 1662) ARMSI X: 518–519, resp. RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500. It is also likely that by this time Harsányi, who penned the letters of the Voievod, had already changed from new style (Gregorian) dates to the old (Julian) style.

by the Voievod of Pskov, according to the orders received from Moscow. The exiled Moldavian Voievod was allowed to get into the Great Principality of Muscovy not earlier than March 1663. He reached the capital on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, and got an audience only at the end of the month.<sup>65</sup> Even this time, he could not state his demands: the audience was exclusively a ceremonial one. As he received no answer for his requests submitted in a written form either, Gheorghe Ștefan had to ask for a leave-taking audience in June 1663 and depart from Moscow.<sup>66</sup>

Jakab Harsányi Nagy was most probably by the side of the Voievod throughout this entire journey: at least, he refers to his trip to Russia in the dedication of the *Colloquia*.<sup>67</sup> We have information neither about his experiences, nor about his opinion on the sights he has seen. There could have been no lack of experiences, though: it was not only the physical conditions of the Great Principality, the horrible state of the road that rendered it almost impossible to travel by the spring showers, but also the ceremonial order in Moscow, similar in some elements to the one in Constantinople, but in other aspects radically different from it, that meant serious obstacles. In Muscovy, the state guests were segregated from the local society: they were accompanied by armed guards who had to prevent that the diplomats – or in this case, Gheorghe Ștefan and his retinue – would talk to anyone apart from people designated for this purpose.<sup>68</sup> Notwithstanding, we do not know any other personal

<sup>65</sup> The hardships of Gheorghe Ștefan's journey to Moscow were reconstructed on the basis of Russian archival sources by Yuriy Arsen'ev, "Moldavskiy gospodar' Stefan-Georgiy i ego snosheniya s Moskvoyu" (The Moldavian Gospodar Gheorghe Ștefan and his relations to Moscow), *Russkiy Arkhiv* 34, no. 2 (1896): 161–186. It is remarkable that Gheorghe Ștefan later wrote to Johann Rottal that he spent nine months in Russian territory (Dorpat, 1 August 1663) MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 591r. It is however possible that he only claimed this in order to explain why did he not contact his earlier patron for such a long time.

<sup>66</sup> Gheorghe Ștefan summarized the failure of his visit to Moscow for the Swedish government in October 1664: see the details of the audience in this writing: DIR IX/1: 217–219. Also, see Arsen'ev, "Moldavskiy gospodar'", 182–185.

<sup>67</sup> *Colloquia*, B version, dedication, [2].

<sup>68</sup> On the road conditions and the segregation from the local society, see Arsen'ev, "Moldavskiy gospodar'", 181–182; and Gheorghe Ștefan's letter to Johann Rottal, quoted in note 64, fol. 591r. On the latter phenomenon, see also Gabriele Scheidegger, *Perverses Abendland – barbarisches Russland:*

remark about Muscovy than those in a later writing, submitted to the Swedish court: in this, he wrote about a barbaric nation, whose most important characteristics are their doggedness and their inclination to change their given words.<sup>69</sup> Although this characterization is similar to the one applied by contemporary Hungarians towards Russians, we still cannot be sure that it was also Harsányi's opinion.<sup>70</sup> The letter mentioned above, although it is preserved in Harsányi's handwriting (and was probably also penned by him) was written in the name of Gheorghe Ștefan, and we do not know in what extent the Turkish Scribe was responsible – apart from its rhetorical formulation – for the elements of its content.

### III.3. Stettin

Thus, Gheorghe Ștefan had to leave Muscovy empty-handed. It was most probably during August that he reached Swedish Livonia again: in mid-September he was met by the governor of the province, Bengt Oxenstierna, in Dorpat. On the orders of the Regency Government of Charles XI, the Swedish aristocrat provided the exiled Voievod with a pension and accommodation.<sup>71</sup> It seems that Gheorghe Ștefan decided not to return to the Habsburg Empire, at least temporarily: apart from the support he already had been receiving from the Swedish Crown, he also counted with the possibility that his issues might be raised on the Swedish–Russian diplomatic

---

*Begegnungen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im Schatten kultureller Missverständnisse* (Zurich: Chronos, 1993), 15–20.

<sup>69</sup> „[...] barbarae illius gentis, obstinatum animum, ac fidei datae lubricitatem noti...” Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to unknown (Per Brahe?) (Stettin, 24 December 1664[3 January 1665]) DIR IX/1: 217. With the same text to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie in manuscript: RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500. Similar words can be found in Gheorghe Ștefan's letter to Johann Rottal (Stettin, 3[13] September 1664) MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 584r.

<sup>70</sup> On the image of Russia among Early Modern Hungarian and Transylvanian authors, see Ágnes Dukkon, “Egy mondat az oroszokról: Irodalom és politika kapcsolatai Kelet-Európában a 17. század derekán” (A sentence about Russians: Connections of literature and politics in Eastern Europe in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 106 (2002): 334–349; Kármán, “Identitás”, 85.

<sup>71</sup> Letter of Bengt Oxenstierna to Charles XI (Dorpat, 4[14] September 1663) RA Livonica vol. 81. A pension is donated for the costs of the Voievod by the order of the Regency to the Swedish Chambers (Stockholm, 30 May[9 June] 1663) RA Riksregistraturet (in the following: RR) Vol. 351. fol. 287r–v.

negotiations by the Scandinavian envoys.<sup>72</sup> Although Oxenstierna did not permit the Voievod to travel to Stockholm personally, Jakab Harsányi Nagy could board a ship, provided with several letters of recommendation to the prominent members of the Swedish court, to represent the Voievod's interests there.<sup>73</sup> The mission of Harsányi – apart from saying thanks for the benevolence they had enjoyed until then – aimed at asking for an accommodation for the Voievod in the territories of the Swedish Crown in the Holy Roman Empire. It was clear that Gheorghe Ștefan wanted to practice a very active diplomacy, because through Harsányi he also asked for several passes for himself and his servants.<sup>74</sup>

Harsányi must have arrived in Stockholm approximately at the end of September, but he did not seem to have received an audience from the Regency Government until early December and no action was taken concerning the requests of Gheorghe Ștefan until the beginning of next year.<sup>75</sup> The former Turkish Scribe proved to be a successful diplomat this time, because the Swedish Crown did not only give the Voievod the passes, but also ordered the Chambers to give a yearly pension of 2000 dollars to him. The task of Harsányi was nevertheless made easier by the fact that during the year 1663, one of the most important problems of European politics was the Ottoman expansion towards Hungary; what is more, in the fall of 1663, the Pomeranian estates – similarly to other territories of the Holy Roman Empire – had it on the agenda to offer an anti-Ottoman financial support (a so-called *Türkenhilfe*) to

<sup>72</sup> At least that is what he wrote to Johann Rottal, see his letter quoted in note 65, fol. 591r.

<sup>73</sup> See the letters of recommendation for Harsányi, written by Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel, Charles XI, and Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Dorpat, 11[21], resp. 12[22] September 1663) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422; DIR IX/1: 207–208.; resp. *ibid.* 205–206.

<sup>74</sup> The writing submitted by Harsányi to the Swedish court under the title “Praecipua Commissionis meae fundamenta” is published in DIR IX/1: 206–207.

<sup>75</sup> The letter of Carl Gustaf Wrangel to Gheorghe Ștefan, acknowledging the receipt of his greetings, is dated Stockholm, 26 November[6 December] 1663 (RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422, attached to the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan, quoted in note 73). See the actions of the Regency Government concerning Gheorghe Ștefan's requests (Stockholm, 23 December 1663[2 January 1664]) in RA RR vol. 358. fol. 970r–971r, 987v–988v.

the Emperor: therefore it must have been a popular move to give shelter to a ruler who had been forced to leave his country by the Ottomans.<sup>76</sup>

Simultaneously to the decisions upon the requests of Gheorghe Ștefan, the Chambers also received orders to give Harsányi a medallion with a golden chain necklace, depicting the King and worth 100 ducats, as an acknowledgement for his good service, and also 300 dollars for his travel expenses. In spite of this, Harsányi did not leave Stockholm until the late July 1664.<sup>77</sup> We do not know how he could explain this delay of almost half a year to the Voievod. It is possible that he received new tasks from Gheorghe Ștefan, but its contents are unknown and it seems also that the Regency Government did not reach any new decision in the first half of 1664 concerning the requests of the Voievod. The stay in Stockholm was nevertheless very useful for Jakab Harsányi Nagy from his personal perspective: in May he received a Latin diploma, which prescribed that he should be given a 200 dollars pension for three years, as an acknowledgement for his services done for the Swedish Crown. The document did not explicate on the content of these services, but the protocol of the session where the decision to issue the diploma was reached, makes it clear that it was his activities as a Transylvanian diplomat in Constantinople, and his captivity there that was honored by the Swedish Crown in this way.<sup>78</sup>

One could assume that it was the old acquaintance of Harsányi, Claes Rålamb who stood behind the decision which provided him with an income independent from

<sup>76</sup> On the general European situation, see Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *Török világ és magyar külpolitika* (Turkish world and Hungarian foreign politics), Gyorsuló idő (Budapest: Magvető, 1975). On the question of Türkenhilfe on the Pomeranian diet, see the documents of fall 1663 in RA Pommeranica vol. 6. Many orders concerning the organization of the troops for the anti-Ottoman warfare were sent from the Regency Government to Carl Gustaf Wrangel in this period, see for instance the one dated 5[/15] September 1663.

<sup>77</sup> Letter of the Regency Government to Gheorghe Ștefan on the return of Harsányi (Stockholm, 27 July[/6 August] 1664) RA RR vol. 360. fol. 245r. See also the order given to the Chambers (Stockholm, 23 December 1663[/2 January 1664]) ibid, vol. 358. fol. 990v–991r.

<sup>78</sup> Diploma of Charles XI to Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Stockholm, 4[/14] May 1664) RA RR vol. 359. fol. 511v–512r. See also the protocol of the council session (14[/24] March 1664): RA Rådsprotokoll vol. 40a. fol. 85r.



the Voievod. Yet, the former ambassador to Constantinople was at this time the governor of Uppland, and although the province is close to Stockholm, it seems that he did not visit the capital in this period; in any case, he surely was not present at the council session.<sup>79</sup> The initiative for honoring Harsányi's services came from another Swedish aristocrat, Bengt Skytte, who had also visited Constantinople before. He spent some time in the Ottoman capital simultaneously to the beginning of Harsányi's career there, in the spring of 1652, and kept good contacts with the Transylvanian embassy. He probably got acquainted to the Turkish Scribe personally back then, and may have learned about his activities, and his promptitude towards the Swedish embassy during 1657 and 1658 either from Rålamb or from the Hungarian diplomat himself.<sup>80</sup> Besides renewing his earlier contacts, Jakab Harsányi Nagy also managed to make new ones that proved to be useful in the following few years. Apart from Lord High Steward (*riskdrotsen*) Per Brahe and Chancellor Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, he also met Admiral Carl Gustaf Wrangel, who held the title of Chief Governor of Pomerania as well, and was thus the main authority in the territory where Gheorghe Ștefan was about to settle.

During the period of Harsányi's stay in Stockholm, Gheorghe Ștefan found shelter in Livonia, in a small place called Tackerort, close to Pernau. Although the document that permitted him to move to Pomerania had already been issued in January, he only arrived in Wolgast in June 1664 to move on to Stettin by the first

<sup>79</sup> All the known letters of Claes Rålamb from this period were written from Uppsala to Chancellor Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie; Harsányi does not appear in any of them, see RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1540. The archive of the Rålamb family, unfortunately, survived only in fragments, and there are no available data from there about this period. The list of the participants at the council meeting is in RA Rådsprotokoll vol. 40a. fol. 79r.

<sup>80</sup> On the journey to Bengt Skytte to Transylvania and Constantinople, see Nils Runeby, "Bengt Skytte, Comenius och abdikationskrisen 1651" (Bengt Skytte, Comenius and the crisis of abdication), *Scandia* 29 (1963): 360–382; Gábor Kármán, "Kísérlet a misztikus alapú külpolitikára: Bengt Skytte útja a Rákócziakhoz 1651–1652" (An attempt for foreign policy on mystical grounds: The journey to Bengt Skytte to the Rákóczi), *Aetas* 23, no. 4 (2008): 65–82.

opportunity.<sup>81</sup> The town, where he spent the next few years, underwent a critical period in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In the former capital of the Principality of Pomerania, a Swedish garrison had been stationed since the 1630s, but officially they were attached to the Scandinavian kingdom only after the death of the last Prince, Bogislav XIV, on the peace congress of Westphalia. The Swedish administration that governed the province was placed to Stettin, despite the repeated requests of the estates to have it moved to Wolgast; at last Wrangel, as Chief Governor, arbitrarily decided to choose the latter town in 1665 as his seat, because his estates were closer to it and it was also the place where he had his representative castle be built. The flourishing harbor town that had around 15.000 inhabitants in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, suffered severely during the wars: in 1631, it lost one third of its population due to a plague. The division of Pomerania in the Peace of Westphalia handicapped the merchants of Stettin: the newly drawn borders between the territories belonging to Sweden and Brandenburg cut the town from its hinterland, and the custom politics of the Electorate did everything to disadvantage the Stettiners.<sup>82</sup> The border situation was also not beneficial for the town from a military point of view: it became the primary goal of any invasion from Brandenburg. Although in the siege of 1659, the Brandenburgian and Imperial troops caused much less damage than they did eighteen years later (when most of the town

<sup>81</sup> Tackerort was assigned to him as a temporary place of residence by the order quoted in note 71, fol. 287v. In his letter to Johann Rottal, however, he clearly states that he had been living in Pernau until June 1664 (quoted in note 69, fol. 584r). On his arrival to Wolgast, see his letters to Charles XI and Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Wolgast, 5[/15] June 1664) DIR IX/1: 219–220, resp. RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422. The document permitting him to move to Pomerania (quoted in note 75, fol. 988r) suggests Wolgast or Stettin as a place of residence – it seems that the final decision was left to Gheorghe Ștefan himself.

<sup>82</sup> An excellent overview of the Early Modern history of Stettin is provided by Bogdan Wachowiak, “Stettin in der Neuzeit (1478–1805),” in Jan M. Piskorski, Bogdan Wachowiak and Edward Włodarczyk, *Stettin: Kurze Stadtgeschichte*, trans. Eligiusz Janus and Andreas Warnecke (Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1994), 55–96. On moving the seat of the Chief Governor, see Helmut Backhaus, *Reichsterritorium und schwedische Provinz: Vorpommern unter Karl XI. Vormündern*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, no. 25 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 81–83; Ivo Asmus, “Das Amt des Generalgouverneurs und der Herrschaftsstil Carl Gustav Wrangels,” in *Der Westfälische Frieden von 1648 – Wende in der Geschichte des Ostseeraums: Für Prof. dr. Dr. h. c. Herbert Ewe zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Horst Wernicke and Hans-Joachim Hacker (Hamburg: Kovač, 2001), 191–195.

was destroyed), the register of the houses of Stettin from 1664 still listed a considerable amount of buildings in ruin.<sup>83</sup>

Gheorghe Ștefan and his retinue had their lodgings in the castle, that was rebuilt in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century in Renaissance style. The Voievod however did not stay there continuously: he left the Pomeranian town several times during the next few years for shorter or longer journeys. Not long after moving in, he traveled to Hamburg, and in December 1666 he visited the Northern German merchant city once more: while at the first time he had financial business to take care of, the second time he was going to meet Queen Christina, the abdicated ruler of Sweden, who was trying to organize her return to Scandinavia at that time.<sup>84</sup> He visited some neighboring German princes for support several times: in 1665, he met Gustav Adolph, Prince of Mecklenburg-Güstrow in his residence twice, and in the beginning of December 1666, he paid visit by Elector Frederick William in his palace at Berlin (more precisely, in Cölln an der Spree).<sup>85</sup> His longest stay away from his residence was nevertheless his journey to Stockholm, where he managed to negotiate with the Regency Government personally this time: he left Stettin at the end of July 1665, and returned only in January 1666.<sup>86</sup> With so many personal journeys, it is no wonder that the diplomatic

<sup>83</sup> Lustration der Stadt Alten Stettin de anno 1664, Landesarchiv Greifswald (in the following: LA Greifswald), Rep. 40. III. Nr. 207. A detailed account on the siege: Martin Wehrmann, *Geschichte der Stadt Stettin* (Stettin: Saunier, 1911), 288–291.

<sup>84</sup> Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Frederick William (Stettin, 1[/11] August 1664) Neculaș Iorga, ed., *Acte și fragmente cu privire la istoria românilor* (Documents and fragments for the history of the Romanians), vol. 1 (Bucharest: Imprimeria Statului, 1895) (in the following: AF I), 270–271, resp. to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Hamburg, 18[/28] December 1666) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8184.

<sup>85</sup> The first visit to Mecklenburg are mentioned by the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 24 January[/3 February], resp. 4[/14] February 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422; the second is documented by his letter to Wrangel (Stettin, 17[/27] June 1665), and also by the letter of Ștefanida Mihailova, the consort of Gheorghe Ștefan to Magdalena Sibylla, Princess of Mecklenburg-Güstrow and her answer to it (Stettin, 28 June[/8 July] 1665, resp. Güstrow, 1[/11] July 1665) Landeshauptarchiv Schwerin (in the following: LHAS) 2.11–2/1 Auswärtige Beziehungen... Nr. 4972. fol. 4–5. On his audience in Berlin, see its protocol (Berlin, 4[/14] December 1666) TMIR III: 92–94. Four days later, he was still in Berlin, see his letter to Andreas Neumann (8[/18] December 1666) AF I: 281.

<sup>86</sup> His intentions to set on the journey are documented by the letter of the Castellan of Stettin, Franz Horn to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 17[/27] July 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8380. In the

activities of Gheorghe Ștefan were extraordinary in every respect: his envoys were going to the four winds to gain support for the exiled Voievod.

In the beginning of his stay in Stettin, Gheorghe Ștefan paid much attention on not losing his Viennese contacts, and getting new supporters in the Holy Roman Empire who would make sure that in case of a peace agreement with the Ottomans, his interest would not be forgotten. In 1663, the war that had been limited to the territory of Transylvania before, was extended to Hungary as well, and the fall of Érsekújvár, together with other losses forced Leopold I to start an offensive anti-Ottoman campaign in coalition with several European rulers; and the hopes for success were running high after the victories during the winter campaign of Miklós Zrínyi.<sup>87</sup> In this context, it becomes understandable why Jakab Harsányi Nagy had to mention in Stockholm in 1663 that the Swedish diplomats should intervene at the Imperial court in the interests of Gheorghe Ștefan.<sup>88</sup> On the 1<sup>st</sup> of August 1664, the troops of Grand Vizier Köprülü Ahmed suffered a crushing defeat against a Habsburg army, and the news of the battle spread quickly through Europe, giving fuel to the enthusiasm and hopes for pressing back the European borders of the Ottoman

---

beginning of August, the exiled Voievod already wrote from Stralsund to Frederick William (Stralsund, 25 July/[4 August] 1665) GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 47–48. Gheorghe Ștefan returned to Stettin on the 30<sup>th</sup> of January 1666, see his letter to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 30 January/[9 February] 1666) DIR IX/1: 237.

<sup>87</sup> Géza Perjés, *Zrínyi Miklós és kora* (Miklós Zrínyi and his age) (Budapest: Gondolat, 1965), 343–354; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “Országgyesítő kísérletek (1648–1664)” (Attempts to unite the country, 1648–1664), in *Magyarország története 1526–1686* (The history of Hungary 1526–1686), Magyarország története tíz kötetben, no. 3, ed. Zsigmond Pál Pach and Ágnes R. Várkonyi (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1985), 1103–1146.

<sup>88</sup> See his petition quoted in note 73, 206–207. Early in the year 1664, Gheorghe Ștefan even suggested that he may would want to take contact with the Rhenish League which was supporting the anti-Ottoman war, and the ruler behind it, Louis XIV of France – this, however, did not yet happen. See the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Charles XI (9/[19] April [1664]) DIR IX/1: 209–210. On the role of the Rhenish League in the anti-Ottoman war, see recently Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “Európai játéktér – magyar politika 1657–1664” (European field of action – Hungarian politics 1657–1664), in *Az értelem bátorsága: Tanulmányok Perjés Géza emlékére* (The valor of the mind: Studies in the memory of Géza Perjés), ed. Gábor Hausner (Budapest: Argumentum, 2005), 577–614.

Empire.<sup>89</sup> It was probably due to the news about the victory that Gheorghe Ștefan sent envoys to Brandenburg and Dresden and asked both Electors to represent his interests in the Imperial court.<sup>90</sup> All in vain: by this time, the representatives of the Emperor, who gave up the hope to mobilize the financial means necessary for the continuation of the campaign, signed the peace treaty in Vasvár. With the document that was made public on the 27<sup>th</sup> of September, the Habsburgs bewildered the public opinion of Europe: after a glorious victory, they made great concessions to the losing side; and the peace of Vasvár also meant the end of Gheorghe Ștefan's hopes to ever return to the throne of Moldavia with the help of the Habsburgs.<sup>91</sup> In his later years in Stettin, the exiled Voievod tried other ways to prepare his return home. He contacted the two most important European kings who, besides the Emperor, had their representatives in Constantinople: Louis XIV of France and Charles II of England.<sup>92</sup> However, by the time of these ambitious embassies, Harsányi was not in Stettin any more.

<sup>89</sup> Nóra G. Etényi, *Hadszintér és nyilvánosság: A magyarországi török háború hírei a 17. századi német újságokban* (The theatre of war and the public opinion: The news of the Turkish wars in Hungary in the 17<sup>th</sup> century German press) (Budapest: Balassi, 2003), 234–240.

<sup>90</sup> The Saxon Elector, John George II fulfilled the Voievod's request and asked Leopold I in a letter that, if it would be possible, the claim of Gheorghe Ștefan on the throne of Moldavia should be vindicated at the upcoming negotiations of the peace treaty. See the letters Gheorghe Ștefan and his consort to John George II and his wife (Stettin, 5/[15] September 1664), and their responses ([Dresden], 13/[23] September 1664), and the letter of John George II to Emperor Leopold I (with the same dating) Neculai Iorga, ed., *Studii și documente cu privire la istoria românilor* (Studies and documents for the history of the Romanians), vol. 4, *Legăturile principatelor române cu Ardealul de la 1607 la 1699* (Contacts of the Romanian Principalities with Transylvania from 1607 to 1699) (București: Socec, 1902) (in the following: SD IV), 108–109. On the request for support from Brandenburg, see the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Frederick William (Stettin, 5/[15] September 1665) TMIR III: 84–85.

<sup>91</sup> On the echo of the peace of Vasvár, see Várkonyi, “Országgyesítő kísérletek”, 1139–1140; Béla Köpeczi, *Staatsräson und christliche Solidarität: Die ungarischen Aufstände und Europa in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna, Cologne and Graz: Böhlau, 1983), 116–125; Etényi, *Hadszintér*, 243–256.

<sup>92</sup> The documentation of the embassy to England were edited by Eric Dietmar Tappe, “Charles II and the Prince of Moldavia,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 28 (1949/50) (in the following: SEAR XXVIII): 406–424, and idem, “Charles II and the Prince of Moldavia: Addenda,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 31 (1952/53) (in the following: SEAR XXXI): 528–529. The papers of the envoys sent to Louis XIV, see in Grigore George Tocilescu and Alexandru I. Odobescu, ed., *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor* (Documents for the history of the Romanians), Supplement, vol. 1, part 1, 1518–1780 (Bucharest: Socec & Teclu, 1886) (in the following: DIR Suppl. I/1), 249–254. Charles II even sent letters to the Grand Vizier and the Sultan to request the re-installation of Gheorghe Ștefan to the Moldavian throne (Whitehall, 15/[25] June 1666) ARMSI X: 522–523.

Gaining back his rule over his Principality could in any case only be a long-term plan for Gheorghe Ștefan: most of the diplomatic missions were designed instead to secure the daily bread for the Voievod. Similarly to many other Voievods from the Romanian Principalities, Gheorghe Ștefan took a significant amount of money and artefacts from his country to the exile, but a considerable part of it he had to leave behind already when he had to flee Transylvania.<sup>93</sup> Although in the correspondence of the exiled Voievod from the 1660s, still many valuables appear, Gheorghe Ștefan did everything to secure an alternative source of income rather than selling and hypothecating these. The Crown of Sweden, as mentioned earlier, promised a yearly 2000 dollars for him as a pension. The Voievod found the sum rather small, although in Pomerania only the allowances of the Chief and Vice Governors were higher than this and the same amount of money was given to the Royal Gymnasium in Stettin as a yearly budget.<sup>94</sup> Gheorghe Ștefan petitioned a raise of this allowance frequently, but without success – and after a while even the payment of these 2000 dollars became irregular.<sup>95</sup>

It was clear for Gheorghe Ștefan that he could have a more calculable income than the pension, highly dependent on the rather unstable financial position of the Chambers of Swedish Pomerania, if he could get an estate in the territory of the Holy Roman Empire.<sup>96</sup> His first attempt for this was when he tried to rent some demesnes

<sup>93</sup> The treasury that Gheorghe Ștefan left in the Mikó castle of Csíkszereda, was divided by Ákos Barcsai among his supporters, see Mordovin, “Petki István”, 407. According to Georg Kraus, Mihnea Radu also took many valuables with him during his escape, see Kraus, *Erdélyi krónika*, 350.

<sup>94</sup> Carl Gustaf Wrangel received an allowance of 4000, Paul Würtz one of 3000 dollars yearly due to their office – obviously, the lavish lifestyle of the former one was kept up not from this money, rather from the income of his huge estates. See their salary lists from 1662: LA Greifswald Rep. 40. VI. 4. fol. 287. On the 2000 dollars budget of the Gymnasium of Stettin in 1655, see LA Greifswald Rep. 40. II. 53. fol. 72.

<sup>95</sup> See for instance the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 6[16] September 1664, 24 December 1664[3 January 1665], 7[17] February 1665) DIR IX/1: 213, 216–217, RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500; and to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 24 January[3 February], 7[17] February, 4[14] April 1665) RA Skoklostersamligen E 8422.

<sup>96</sup> It was due to similar considerations that he purchased the castle of Solyomkö not long after moving to Transylvania, see Zahariuc, *Țara Moldovei*, 517; Zahariuc, “Gheorghe Ștefan”, 92.

from Gustav Adolph, Prince of Mecklenburg-Güstrow, but it was counteracted by the official complaint of a relative of the Prince, Christian Louis of Mecklenburg-Schwerin.<sup>97</sup> During his stay in Stockholm in the fall of 1665, Gheorghe Ștefan petitioned the Regency Government several times for the same reason: before his departure, the estate of Ueckermünde in Pomerania was promised to him, but eventually he never succeeded to get the letter of donation.<sup>98</sup> At last, he turned to Frederick William with a similar request during the winter of 1667, but it was refused by the Elector – even if only with the pragmatic reasoning that Wartzig and Saatzig, the estates that the Voievod asked for, were strategically important because of their border position, therefore were not to be alienated.<sup>99</sup>

The finances of the exiled Voievod remained confusing in any case. He asked help from his princely supporters as well as Wrangel in order to collect various debts: he claimed about many people that they owed him money from Peter Samson, merchant in Zamość, through some draymen from Kurland, even to the Tsar of Russia. He wanted to collect not less than 30.000 dollars for the damages done to him by Stanisław Potocki, Grand Hetman of the Polish Crown, but also his assets against others were not much more modest.<sup>100</sup> Although the Voievod urged rather radical steps sometimes – he suggested to Wrangel confiscating the sum of the debt of

<sup>97</sup> See the correspondence between Christian Louis and Hans Heinrich Wedemann, Chancellor of Mecklenburg-Schwerin from June 1665, LHAS 2.11-2/1 *Auswärtige Beziehungen* (Acta externa) 4973. fol. 1–3.

<sup>98</sup> See the petitions of Gheorghe Ștefan to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stockholm, 26 October[5 November], and 8[18] November 1665) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500, the second is published in DIR IX/1: 231–232. On the promise for the donation, see the note published in ARMSI X: 521. The Voievod still complained to Lord High Stewart Per Brahe in late 1666 that he did not receive the donation: ARMSI X: 525.

<sup>99</sup> Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Frederick William (Stettin, 2[12] February 1667) and his answer (Cölln an der Spree, 8[18] February 1667) TMIR III: 95–96.

<sup>100</sup> On his claims against Potocki, see his petition to the Regency of Charles XI ([October 1665]) DIR IX/1: 235. He also mentions the debt of Peter Samson (25.000 dollars) in the same writing. On the debt of the draymen from Kurland, see the letter of Frederick William to James, Prince of Kurland (Cölln an der Spree, 3[13] June 1665) GStA PK HA I., Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 41., partly published in AF I: 275. On the financial demands against the Tsar, see the memorial quoted in note 66, 217.

Samson from the wealth of his business partners, who traveled through Pomerania – the justice of his claims were not always unambiguous: the Voievod's demands against the Tsar were, for instance, were rejected as entirely ungrounded by Harsányi in a later letter.<sup>101</sup> The general confusion is well illustrated through the example of the best documented business affair of the Voievod in exile, the developments around some jewels pawned in Vienna in 1662 by a Jewish merchant, Jacob Fränkl. Gheorghe Ștefan asked for the help of Frederick William several times for getting extensions, later for the tradition of the pawn, which provided the Brandenburg ambassador in Vienna, Andreas Neumann with new tasks each year. In January 1668, when the Voievod died, there was a huge chaos around the jewels: Gheorghe Ștefan had wanted Frederick William to redeem the pawn in his name and sell the artifacts – from which money he could have paid back the expenses of the Elector and got some income as well. However, the price he wanted to have for the jewels was three times as much as their actual price. What is more, Christoph Marianowitz, a Turkish interpreter at the Viennese court asked the help of local authorities that, in exchange for some services of his that the Voievod failed to pay for, the jewels should be confiscated and delivered to him.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>101</sup> See the letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, quoted in note 50. On the suggestion about confiscating the wealth of Samson's partners, see Gheorghe Ștefan's petition to Charles XI ([1665]) DIR IX/1: 246. The document was dated 1666 by the publisher of the volume, but there are notable overlaps in its content with the petition quoted in the previous note that was written during the stay of Gheorghe Ștefan in Stockholm: therefore, should probably be dated to 1665.

<sup>102</sup> We do not know how the rather obscure case ended: it is not clear who did finally get the jewels after the death of the Voievod. The contract between Gheorghe Ștefan and Jacob Fränkl (Vienna, 5 September 1662) was published in DIAMTR XI: 25–26. On the last known developments in the question of the jewels, see the memorial of Gheorghe Ștefan ([Berlin], 7/[17] December 1666), and the correspondence between Frederick William and Andreas Neumann (Cölln an der Spree, 8/[18] December 1666; resp. Vienna, 21/31 December 1666) GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 86–90, partly published in AF I: 282–283. On the problems concerning the value of the jewels, see the letter of Andreas Neumann to Frederick William (Vienna, 2/12 March 1667) Ibid, fol. 98 (summary in AF I: 284). On the activities of the Fränkl family, see also Hans Tietze, *Die Juden Wiens: Wirtschaft, Kultur* (Vienna and Leipzig: Tal, 1933), 74–75. Marianowitz raised his demands at the first time in April 1665, see Gheorghe Ștefan's letter asking for the support of Prince Wenzel Lobkowitz (Stettin, 9/[19] April 1665) ARMSI X: 533–534, also published in DIAMTR XI: 57–58. Marianowitz, who had been living in Vienna, was an interpreter of the Habsburg embassies to



Jakab Harsányi Nagy was an active member of all these maneuvers aiming at getting diplomatic and financial help. It seems that he had a dominant position among the men of the Voievod. He drafted the contract with Jacob Fränkl and he supervised the communication of the Voievod towards the Swedish aristocrats and also the Brandenburg court. It did not only mean that the letters sent in the name of Gheorghe Ștefan survived in the handwriting of Harsányi, but also that in several cases, he had to visit the office-holders important for the Voievod personally. He went to Wolgast twice (in November 1664 and in May 1665) to negotiate with Wrangel, but he also consulted with the ambassador of the Swedish Crown to Poland-Lithuania, Matthias Palbitzki, in March 1665.<sup>103</sup> After his journey to Stockholm in 1663–1664, he visited the Swedish capital again in the company of Gheorghe Ștefan, in the fall of 1665. We have no information, whether he could interfere with the content of the diplomatic missions and correspondence, but penning every official document issued by the Voievod surely counted as a confidential post. In May 1666, however, after having returned from the second journey to Stockholm, Harsányi decided to quit the service of the exiled Voievod.<sup>104</sup> In order to understand the reasons for his decision, we have to have a closer look upon the micro-society of the colony of emigrants around Gheorghe Ștefan in Stettin.

---

Constantinople in 1644–45 and to the Ukraine in 1657. Gheorghe Ștefan was not the first Voievod, with whom he stood in contact: according to a petition of his of 10 April 1656, he also knew personally Mihai Pătrașcu, the grandson of Michael the Brave (ÖStA HKA Hoffinanz Ungarn Rt. Nr. 198. Konv. 1656 April fol. 106–117).

<sup>103</sup> See the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel about Harsányi's trip in November 1664 (Stettin, 5[/15] November 1665), in May 1665 (Stettin, 30 April[/10 May] and 16[/26] May 1665), and about his negotiations with Palbitzki (Stettin, 4[/14] March 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422. Unfortunately, the issues of Gheorghe Ștefan are not mentioned either in the surviving documentation on Palbitzki's mission, or in his letters to Wrangel, cf. RA Diplomatica Polonica vol. 53–54, resp. RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8444.

<sup>104</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 6[/16] May 1666) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500 (Moldau).

### ***III.4. Court Society by the Side of the Exiled Voievod***

Gheorghe Ștefan gave prominent titles to Jakab Harsányi Nagy when he was sent to diplomatic missions: in 1662, he called him his Secretary and Marshal (“secretarium meum, Aulaeque Magistrum”), in 1663 his Counselor (“consiliarium meum”) in letters sent to various dignitaries.<sup>105</sup> We do not know whether these offices were actually held by Harsányi, or Gheorghe Ștefan thought that it could grow the respect in the eyes of the prominent people visited, if he sent a higher office holder at the court, rather than just a simple secretary to negotiate with them. It however has to be noted that when Carl Gustaf Wrangel had been acquainted to Harsányi for several years, the Voievod found it sufficient to refer to him as “Dominus Harsanyius” or as his “minister” at the highest, in the letters written to the Governor.<sup>106</sup> There were however also other signs that Gheorghe Ștefan wanted to keep up the impression that his lodgings in Stettin actually functioned as a ruler’s court – even if the circumstances for this were far from ideal.

The Voievod was housed in the Renaissance castle, which – according to the illustration in Merian’s *Topographia Germaniae* – was in a very good condition around 1650: theoretically it could have lived up to the highest expectations of Gheorghe Ștefan.<sup>107</sup> This happened otherwise: only a few months after Gheorghe Ștefan had moved in, the exiled Voievod already complained to Wrangel that the more comfortable rooms in the castle were reserved for others by the local administration. His retinue was given only rather cold rooms, some without a furnace, or with an unusable one, which meant a great problem with the coming of the winter, especially

<sup>105</sup> See the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan from October 1662 and September 1663, quoted in notes 61 and 73.

<sup>106</sup> See the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan quoted in note 103.

<sup>107</sup> Martin Zeiller and Matthäus Merian, *Topographia Electorat. Brandenburgici et Ducatus Pomeraniae, das ist Beschreibung der Vornembsten und bekantisten Stätte in Plätz in dem ... Churfürstenthum vnd March Brandenburg; vnd dem Hertzogtum Pomeran...* ([Frankfurt am Main]: Merian, 1652).

because there were problems with the delivery of firewood as well. This complaint was repeated after a month, but it seems that later on the question of the firewood for the year 1664 was solved – only to resurface in the next ones.<sup>108</sup> Gheorghe Ștefan spent the fall of 1665 in Stockholm, but it also worsened the situation for his consort left in Stettin, because the Pomeranian authorities listened to her even less than to her husband.<sup>109</sup> These circumstances probably contributed to the Voievod's continued requests to the Regency Government that he would be allowed to move to Wismar; or if it would not be possible, at least to get permission to move down to the town from the castle. This, apart from the probably better conditions, also would have meant that he would have been saved from climbing stairs, which caused a serious problem for the Voievod who was tortured by gout.<sup>110</sup> This move would have been supported also by the Castellan of Stettin, Franz Horn, who wrote to Wrangel about the health condition of the Voievod in a very compassionate tone. The sincerity of his feelings is somewhat questioned by the fact that the Chief Governor of Pomerania had to reprimand him next year for his behavior towards the Gheorghe Ștefan: according to the Voievod's account, he felt almost like being imprisoned by that time, as every door in the castle – except for his own apartments – remained closed in front of him.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>108</sup> See the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 6[/16] September 1664, and 15[/25] October 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422.

<sup>109</sup> See the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan and Ștefanida Mihailova to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stockholm, 28 October[/7 November] 1665; resp. Stettin, 7[/17] and 18[/28] November 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422.

<sup>110</sup> On the plan to move to Wismar, see Gheorghe Ștefan's petition to Charles XI ([1665]) DIR IX/1: 219. On moving to the town: letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel ([between 15 and 30 April 1665], and 20[/30] November 1666) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422, resp. E 8184. See also his letter from 17[/27] June 1665, quoted in note 85. It seems that Gheorghe Ștefan had already been sick when he arrived in Stettin: in October 1664, he informed Wrangel that his *chiragra* (the gout attacking his fingers) is getting better, but only to give way to his *podagra* (that is, the gout in his legs) (Stettin, 17[/27] October 1664) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422. His condition only worsened later on.

<sup>111</sup> See the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 3[/13] October 1666), his answer and order to Franz Horn (Camp by Bremen, 12[/22] November 1666) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8184. The Castellan was also reprimanded by the Regency Government (Stockholm, 24 March[/3 April]

Franz Horn was not the only one from the Swedish administration in Pomerania with whom Gheorghe Ștefan ran into some problems. It is hardly surprising that the other person frequently appearing in the complaints of the exiled Voievod was Philipp Rotlieb, the person responsible for the financial issues in the province: time and again, the Voievod had to report that he did not pay the allowances granted to him. It was however not only the good-will of Rotlieb that was missing; the financial possibilities of the province also proved to be limited. The Voievod was not the only person who had to face the situation of not getting the promised sums: in many cases, even the Pomeranian government had to ask several times to get money from the treasury.<sup>112</sup> It is thus less likely that the “recalcitrance” of Rotlieb towards the orders for payment was a result of his personal aversion – contrary to the problems with Horn, who probably had a hard time tolerating a group staying in the castle supervised by him, which did not owe him allegiance.<sup>113</sup>

How big was this group? We have several data about the size of Gheorghe Ștefan’s retinue during his emigration. The Russian administrative sources noted that the exiled Voievod wanted to enter the territory of the Great Principality of Muscovy in 1662 with seventy-five people, twenty horses and ninety-two carriages; out of which only twenty-one people were permitted to go to Moscow in March 1663. Contrary to this rather high number, the Voievod illustrated his poverty with claiming

---

1667) RA RR vol. 377. fol. 425. On the compassion of Horn towards the Voievod, see his letter quoted in note 86. On him as Castellan of Stettin, see Backhaus, *Reichsterritorium*, 70–71.

<sup>112</sup> See the letter of Carl Gustaf Wrangel to Gheorghe Ștefan (Stade, 7/[17] May 1666), and his reply (Stettin, 16/[26] June 1666) RA Skoklostersamligen E 8184. On Rotlieb’s role in the financial administration of Pomerania, see Backhaus, *Reichsterritorium*, 88.

<sup>113</sup> Surprisingly, there is no data surviving about the possible contacts between Gheorghe Ștefan to the two most important persons in the Pomeranian administration who actually stayed in Stettin, Chancellor Heinrich Coelestinus von Sternbach and Vice Governor Paul Würtz. The latter appeared only once in the Voievod’s correspondence, when Gheorghe Ștefan asked Wrangel to concede the Royal Garden in the suburbs of Stettin to him, that had been used by Würtz by that time. See the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 14/[24] February 1665) RA Skoklostersamligen E 8422. On Sternbach and Würtz, see Backhaus, *Reichsterritorium*, 73–80. Heinrich Coelestinus von Sternbach had visited Transylvania in the 1650s as an envoy of the King of Sweden; however, he did not have the chance to get acquainted to Harsányi in that period, as the latter had been staying at the Sublime Porte as a Turkish Scribe.

to Carl Gustaf Wrangel that he had no more than five-six *famuli*, a minimum number of people he needed.<sup>114</sup> The difference between the two data is less if we consider that these “famuli” referred only to the people directly connected to Gheorghe Ștefan, and who also had their personal servants, cooks, stable-boys and some of them perhaps even a family. Through this, the five to six (together with Gheorghe Ștefan and his consort, eight) people can go up to thirty; which is nevertheless still far away from the seventy, mentioned by Russian authorities. Gheorghe Ștefan wrote to Johann Rottal in 1662 that he had to maintain more than forty horses – it is thus likely that the Voievod started his emigration with a pretty large retinue, which was continuously losing in size until it reached the number known from the Stettin years.<sup>115</sup>

Petronel Zahariuc, in his biography of Gheorghe Ștefan, presented a document from 1660, which listed the office-holders in the court of the Voievod. From the twenty names mentioned in this writing, we know only about two that they were in Stettin with Gheorghe Ștefan: Gheorghe Cherchez died there during 1664–1665, while Ștefan Andrieșan was still alive in December 1667.<sup>116</sup> The name of Constantin Nacu is missing from the list, although this important personality of the Voievod’s court claimed that he had left Moldavia with Gheorghe Ștefan.<sup>117</sup> Nacu (or, in some of the sources: Nakolovitz), who was referred to by the Voievod as his colonel (“colonellus” or “Obrist”) took upon himself several diplomatic missions, similarly to Harsányi: he

<sup>114</sup> Arsen’ev, “Moldavskiy gospodar”, 177, 180; resp. the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 4/[14] April 1665), quoted in note 95.

<sup>115</sup> See Gheorghe Ștefan’s letter to Johann Rottal, quoted in note 57, fol. 599r.

<sup>116</sup> Zahariuc, *Țara Moldovei*, 515–516. The members of the court in the 30<sup>th</sup> December 1660, were, according to a manuscript, the following: former Chief Stall-Master Ionașco Caraman (*comis*) and his brother, Gavril Caraman; former Cup-Holder (*cupar*) Gheorghiiță and his son former Store-Keeper (*jimicer*) Pavăl; Former Castellan (*pârcălab*) of Galați, Toader Ungureanu; former Judge (*vornic*) of Rădeana, Dumitrașco Comșa and his son, Grigore; former Purveyor (*stolnic*) Ion; Ionașco and his son, Draghie; Vasile din Sipoteni and his son, Grigorcea; Andonie Hadâmbul; Ștefan Andrieșan and his son, Neculai; Ionașco Grama; Năcuță din Rădeni; Valet (*cihodar*) Mihai Rusu; Gheorghe Cerchez and a monk named Antoni from Moldovița.

<sup>117</sup> Petition of Constantin Nacu to Charles XI (Stockholm, 20/[30] November 1665) DIR IX/1: 233. Nacu’s absence is also the reason why this document from December 1660 is not decisive in the question whether the former Turkish Scribe had already been in the service of the Voievod by this time, or joined it only later.

represented Gheorghe Ștefan at the court of the Saxon Elector in September 1664, in Brandenburg in the summer of 1665 and in London, in the summer of 1666.<sup>118</sup> Slightly one year after Harsányi, he also left the service of the Voievod and returned to Moldavia.<sup>119</sup>

It is remarkable that the document from December 1660 includes only Romanian names, as the list of the “famuli” from the Stettin years shows a rather international company. It might be surprising, but Jakab Harsányi Nagy was not the only Hungarian emigrant in the Voievod’s retinue: László Nagy, a Transylvanian (bearing the title of his “Equitum Magister”, that is, Equerry) was sent to Wrangel in October 1664 by Gheorghe Ștefan. “Caspar Hidi”, who visited the Elector of Brandenburg in August 1665, was perhaps also Hungarian (in this case, the original Hungarian form of his name must have been Gáspár Hídi).<sup>120</sup> The consort of the Voievod also had a German scribe – he took over the task of penning the official letters to the members of the Swedish administration in Harsányi’s absence –, who might be identical with a certain Johannes Wagner who was sent to Wrangel to negotiate in August 1665.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>118</sup> He started his journey to Dresden in mid-September 1664, and he already got his answer on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, see the recommendation of Gheorghe Ștefan to John George II and his answer (Stettin, 5[/15] September 1664, resp. [Dresden], 13[/23] September 1664) SD IV: 108–109. For the mission to Brandenburg, approximately the same amount of time was needed: there was only ten days between the dating of Gheorghe Ștefan’s recommendation and the answer of the Elector (Stettin, 26 June[/6 July] 1665; resp. Cölln an der Spree, 6[/16] July 1665), see GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 39, 42. (an extract from the latter one is published in: AF I: 276.). Obviously, the journey to London took a longer time: the recommendation of Gheorghe Ștefan is dated from 16[/26] March 1666, while the answer of Charles II of England was written on the 5[/15]<sup>th</sup> June, see SEAR XXVIII: 410, 418–419.

<sup>119</sup> Pass written in the name of Charles XI to Constantin Nacu (Stockholm, 23 March[/2 April] 1667) RA RR vol. 377. fol. 419r.

<sup>120</sup> About “Ladislaus Nagy Transylvanus”, see the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 17[/27] October 1664), quoted in note 110. On „Caspar Hidi”, see the post-scriptum to the letter of Frederick William to Lorenz Georg von Krockow (Cölln an der Spree, 8[/18] August 1665) GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 52, partly published in AF I: 277. From the period of the Voievod’s stay in Hungary, there is another Hungarian servant of him known, under the name István Székely, he nevertheless disappears from the later sources; see the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Johann Rottal (Szinná, 27 February 1662) MOL P 507 Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. fol. 572.

<sup>121</sup> Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (“ad Daler”, 2[/12] August 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422.

From the perspective of Harsányi however – and also from that of the character of the Voievod's court – these were not the most important people in Gheorghe Ștefan's retinue. It was rather those two who joined the Voievod's service after his arrival to Stettin: the one introduced himself as Alexander Iulius Torquatus a Frangepani, the other used the name Nicolae Spătarul Milescu. Both of them were similar to Harsányi in many respects: they had an excellent classical training and huge erudition, but had to emigrate at a certain point of their lives and face the problem of sustaining themselves. A conflict was, as it were, bound to take place.

Although Torquatus a Frangepani wandered many ways and fulfilled several roles (or exactly because of this), it is very hard to find reliable information about him. According to the 18<sup>th</sup> century *Gelehrtenlexikon* of Christian Gottlieb Jöcher, the Dalmatian-born Baron was in the service of the Swedish King as a soldier and a diplomat in the 1650s. His excellent Latin education is proven by the satire he wrote in the style of Menippus (published in 1663), and a panegyric obituary about the Swedish General Hans Christoph Königsmarck.<sup>122</sup> We do not know how he had met Gheorghe Ștefan and come to Stettin, but in December 1664, he was already sent by him to visit Frederick William. In January 1665, the Voievod issued another recommendatory letter to him, this time to Louis XIV of France. However, Torquatus did not get to Paris – in March he was in North Germany, from where he sent several

<sup>122</sup> Christian Gottlieb Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrter-Lexicon...*, vol. 4, S–Z (Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1751), col. 1256. In the dedication of his *Panegyricus Aeternitatis Gloriam [...] Joanni Christophoro Königsmarckio* (1663) he provides the following information about himself: „L[iber] B[aro] in Novy Dominus in Monostyr, & Cirquenic. Quondam S.R. Majestatis Sueciae, ab expeditionibus Scythicis, Vallachicis, & Transylvanicis Commissarius & Ablegatus”. In 1655, he really represented Charles X Gustav by the Cossack Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (see Bohdan Kentrschynskyj, “Ukrainska revolutionen och Rysslands angrepp mot Sverige 1656” (The Ukrainian revolution and Russia's assault on Sweden 1656), *Karolinska Förbundets Årsbok* 1966, 42–43); we have however no data that he would have also visited Transylvania and Wallachia (or Moldavia). The *Satyricon Asini Vapulantis* was published with dating under the pseudonym „Redivivus Menippus”; according to the literature, it was probably printed by a North German or Dutch printer in 1663, see Ingrid A. R. Smet, *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters, 1581–1655*, Travaux du Grand Siècle, no. 2 (Geneva: Droz, 1996), 59, note 4; and, with a detailed summary of the contents of *Satyricon*, Jozef IJsewijn, “The Neo-Latin Satirical Novel in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century,” *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch / Journal of Neo-Latin Language and Literature* 1 (1999): 133–134.

letters to Wrangel.<sup>123</sup> The exiled Voievod must have also given him a recommendation to represent him in Vienna in the problems around the jewels hypothecated by Fränkl – at least, Gheorghe Ștefan found it important that the ambassador of Brandenburg in Vienna should be notified that these credentials should be disregarded and the artifacts should by no means be given to Torquatus.<sup>124</sup> We do not know what the reason for losing the trust of Gheorghe Ștefan was: no details are conveyed by contemporary sources. In any case, Torquatus did not go to Vienna, but also did not return to the Voievod: in the 5<sup>th</sup> October 1665, he was present at the foundation of the University of Kiel as a guest of the court of Holstein-Gottorp and wrote a panegyric relation about it, later published by Prince Christian Albert.<sup>125</sup>

Even if we have no direct source on the fall of Torquatus a Frangipani, we still have some traces of who might have stood behind losing the trust of the Voievod: the same person who managed to make Harsányi leave the service of Gheorghe Ștefan as well, Nicolae Spătarul Milescu. Namely, when the Voievod and his retinue returned from Stockholm in early 1666, a scandal broke out around Harsányi. A letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel from May 1666 – the first one that we know from a handwriting other than Harsányi's – includes long complaints how badly the Voievod was served by the Hungarian *secretarius* in the Swedish capital. There is also

<sup>123</sup> See the recommendatory letter to Frederick William (Stettin, 14[/24] December 1664) in TMIR III: 85. In the same publication (on page 86) fragments of the memorial submitted by Torquatus to the Elector were also published, see its original at GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 30. The letter to Louis XIV (Stettin, 15[/25] January 1665) is known in two editions: DIR Suppl. I.1: 249, and Corfus, “Pe urmele lui Moise Movilă”, 305. On the stay in North Germany, see the letters of Torquatus to Wrangel, which however do not mention Gheorghe Ștefan at all (Hamburg, 3[/13] March 1665; Stada, 9[/19] March 1665; Bremen, 20[/30] March 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8361.

<sup>124</sup> Letter of Frederick William to Andreas Neumann (Cölln an der Spree, 3[/13] July 1665), and Neumann's letter to his ruler (Vienna, 22 July/1 August 1665) GStA PK HA I. Geheimer Rat, Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 43–44.

<sup>125</sup> On his stay in Holstein and the *Inaugurationis panegyrica descriptio*, see Carl Rodenberg and Volquart Pauls, *Die Anfänge der Christian-Albrechts Universität Kiel*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins, no. 31 (Neumünster: Wachholtz, 1955) 50–52. It is not clear on what source did the authors base their claim that Torquatus had been living in Flensburg during 1660 and 1665. On the arrival of Torquatus to Holstein, see his letter to Wrangel (Glücksburg, 6[/16] November 1665) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8361.



a reference in it that his machinations with Torquatus had already become known earlier.<sup>126</sup> Jakab Harsányi, in his turn, wrote a detailed account to Chancellor De la Gardie of why he left the service of the Voievod in December 1666. Most of his complaints were dedicated against Miclescu, whom he presented as a “deceitful and false-hearted” person and reproached for his not altogether spotless past as well as for his present.

The biography of Nicolae Spătarul Miclescu had already been rich in surprising turns, although the great event of his life, that placed him into the focus of later historiography, his journey to China in the service of the Tsar, was still to come.<sup>127</sup> He was born around 1636, from a partly Greek family, and educated not only in Iași, but also had the chance to visit the Patriarchate’s school in Constantinople. He started his career as a scribe of lower rang (*gramatic*) during the rule of Gheorghe Ștefan, and was given the office of the *spătar* (Princely Armiger) by his successor, Gheorghe Ghica – a title that he used as a name during his entire later life. The life of Miclescu was then for the next half-of-a-decade connected to the Ghica dynasty: he followed Voievod Gheorghe to Wallachia – as, having lost the throne of Moldavia, he was compensated with the other Romanian state by the Porte – and remained a dignitary also under the rule of his son and successor, Grigore Ghica. He even followed his lord to the emigration in 1664, when the latter fled to the Habsburgs after the battle of Szentgotthárd; in late February 1665, Grigore Ghica was going to send him to Vienna

<sup>126</sup> Letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 24 April/[4 May] 1666) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8184. Instead of „Torquatus”, the source mentions „Torquator”, obviously as a lapse of the pen.

<sup>127</sup> An early but still useful biography of Miclescu is Petre P. Panaitescu, “Nicolas Spathar Miclescu (1636–1708),” *Mélanges de l’École Roumaine en France* 1 (1925): 33–180. The results of the new research were summarized for the Romanian edition of Panaitescu’s biography by Ștefan Gorovei, “Studiu introductiv” (Introductory study), in P. P. Panaitescu, *Nicolae Miclescu Spătarul (1636–1708)* (Iași: Junimea, 1987), 3–50. See also Zamfira Mihail, “Nicolae Miclescu, le Spathaire – un « encyclopédiste » roumain du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 18 (1980): 265–285. On his later career and journey to China, see Beate Hill-Paulus, *Nikolaj Gavrilovič Spatharij (1636–1708) und seine Gesandtschaft nach China*, Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens: Mitteilungen, no. 71 (Hamburg: Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens, 1978).

as an envoy.<sup>128</sup> It is not clear why he left the Voievod of Wallachia and joined the retinue of Gheorghe Ștefan instead; nevertheless, this must have taken place during the spring of 1665. By this time, he did not only have a past as a politician, but also as an intellectual: apart from some religious treatises and historical pieces, the first Romanian translation of the Old Testament can also be connected to his name.<sup>129</sup>

It can hardly be a mistake to see a competence fight between two intellectuals as a reason of the tensions between Harsányi and Miclescu: it was not only their erudition, background and situation that was similar, but also that none of them had an easy character. It is rather difficult to reconstruct their debate, as there is no personal account of Miclescu known about it: it is however very likely, taken into consideration Harsányi's reactions, that the complaints of Gheorghe Ștefan about his Hungarian *secretarius* mirror his views. According to this, Harsányi mobilized his contacts in Stockholm not primarily for the interests of the Voievod, but for those of his own; what is more, he even offered his services to the Crown of Sweden. Harsányi's accusations were less concrete, but all the more passionate: he blamed the Romanian diplomat for being fraudulent and impudent, in such a grade that he was not ashamed to claim for himself the title of Baron in front of the Emperor, although it is not even in use in Moldavia.<sup>130</sup> He even added a remark that Miclescu bore on his face the undeletable marks of his mendacity and a lese-majesty committed in Moldavia, because his opponent had a "cut nose": he had to suffer this penalty, usually

<sup>128</sup> Andrei Veress, "Pribegia lui Grigorașcu vodă prin Ungaria și aiurea (1664–1672)" (The exile of Voievod Grigorașcu in Hungary and other places, 1664–1672), *Academia Română Memoriile Secțiunii Istorie Serie III*. 2 (1924) (in the following: ARMSI II): 316–318.

<sup>129</sup> On the translations of Miclescu in detail, see Virgil Căndea, "Nicolae Miclescu și începuturile traducerilor umaniste în limba română" (Nicolae Miclescu and the beginnings of Humanist translations in Romanian), in *Rățiunea dominantă: Contribuții la istoria umanismului românesc* (Dominant reason: Contributions to the history of Romanian Humanism) (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1979), 79–223.

<sup>130</sup> The letters of credence issued by Gheorghe Ștefan, but earlier even the Habsburg diplomats indeed used the title Baron in connection with Miclescu, see the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 17/[27] October 1666) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500. For the mutual accusations, see the letters quoted in notes 126 and 50.

administered on pretenders of the throne (cutting the tip of his nose) some time in 1661, under unknown circumstances.<sup>131</sup>

A new front was opened by Harsányi when he presented his opponent as an abuser of the Lutheran faith, and the follower of Beelzebub. In any case, the religious difference must have played an important role in their conflict. Gheorghe Ștefan was interested in questions of faith himself – a book of prayers was edited by him under his exile –, Miclescu's knowledge of theology is however shown not only by the Bible translation, but also by a short Latin summary about the Orthodox interpretation of transubstantiation that he compiled in 1667 on the request of the French ambassador in Stockholm, Marquis de Pomponne. The Marquis, who had already been impressed by the erudition of Miclescu, invited the Romanian diplomat to a mass kept at his lodgings and was pleased to see that “apart from the *Credo*, where he left out the *Filioque*, he was not less Catholic than me.” It was thus not surprising that the *Enchiridion* written by Miclescu – which supported the view also professed by the Catholics that the body of Christ is present in the eucharist “vere, realiter et substantialiter” – was enthusiastically published by Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole in their bulky work on the topic, designed to be the monumental refutation of the Protestant interpretation.<sup>132</sup> The accusations of Harsányi, who received an education in Calvinist theology, were most probably motivated by a number of fierce debates between the two.

<sup>131</sup> On the cutting of the nose of Miclescu, see Eric Dietmar Tappe, “An English Contribution to the Biography of Nicolae Miclescu,” *Revue des Études Roumaines* 1 (1953), 152–160, and Gorovei, “Studiu introductiv,” 32–37.

<sup>132</sup> *Enchiridion sive Stella Orientalis Occidentali splendens*, in *Recueil contenant divers actes qui font voir la créance des Eglises Orientales*, published as an annex to the third volume of Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, *La perpétuité de la foy du l'Eglise Catholique touchant l'Eucharistie* (Paris: Savreux, 1669), 50–54. The original of the quotation from Pomponne: „à l'exception du Credo, où il oublie la Filioque, il n'y a pas un meilleur Catholique”: *ibid.*, vol. 2, 301. An edition of the prayer collection of Gheorghe Ștefan: Nicolae Drăganu, “Codicele pribeagului Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievodul Moldovei” (Codices of the exiled Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievod of Moldavia), *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională Cluj* 3 (1924–25): 183–254.

In any case, it is also likely that the accusations against Harsányi were also not ungrounded. We have no direct information whether the Hungarian *secretarius* offered his services to the Crown of Sweden during his stay in Stockholm in the fall of 1665, but, considering the context, it would not be surprising. Especially because after leaving the service of the Voievod, in May 1666, Harsányi did volunteer for an office by De la Gardie, and he repeated his offer in December.<sup>133</sup> During his stay in Stockholm in 1663–1664, as mentioned earlier, he did not only arrange the settlement of the Voievod in Stettin, but also built up his own network in the Swedish court, and received a yearly pension from the Crown of Sweden: the same amount that he also got earlier from the Prince of Transylvania as a Turkish Scribe. What is more, Harsányi was the only person in the retinue of the Voievod, who wrote to the Chancellor in his own name. There was no apparent reason for sharing his commentaries about the peace of Vasvár and its consequences with Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie; it is very likely that Harsányi's only goal was to reinforce the impression the Swedish aristocrat might have had about him earlier as an expert in political questions.<sup>134</sup> The separate allowance Harsányi received did not automatically question his loyalty towards the Voievod: Constantin Nacu petitioned for a similar pension in Stockholm in 1665.<sup>135</sup> It is feasible that Harsányi, who had seen the financial situation of the Voievod deteriorating, indeed tried to find service in Sweden – which could then easily be used by Miclescu against him in front of Gheorghe Ștefan. We have, at the same time, no reason to think that Harsányi would have done this against the interests of the Voievod: this would have also been unfavorable to him, as

---

<sup>133</sup> See his letters quoted in note 101 and 50.

<sup>134</sup> Letter of Harsányi to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 4[/14] October 1664) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500.

<sup>135</sup> See his petition, quoted in note 117.

the Swedish office was only a vague possibility, while his co-operation with Gheorghe Ștefan more or less had been securing his salary already for years.

The above mentioned letter from December 1660, however, included not only accusations against Milescu, but also pleaded against his former lord, Gheorghe Ștefan, for various reasons. Harsányi systematically deconstructed the rhetoric that the Voievod used in his correspondence with the Swedish court, claiming that Gheorghe Ștefan had actually never been an ally of Charles X Gustav, even more: he was downright a traitor of the Swedish interests in 1657, when he recalled his troops from Poland. He also blamed the Voievod to have asked the Tsar for the repayment of a fictive debt, and having even asked for the help of the Crown of Sweden in this endeavor. He even found the morals of the Voievod faulty, pointing out that Gheorghe Ștefan had left the woman he had been legally married to and was living together with a former lady-in-waiting of hers. Apart from these, he also repeated what he had already presented to the Chancellor earlier: that although he had served the Voievod faithfully through years, his master refused to reimburse his costs during the journey to Stockholm.

Some of the accusations certainly had a core of truth in them. There was really no formal alliance between Gheorghe Ștefan and Charles X Gustav: the troops of the Voievod were present in the Polish campaign only as an ally of the Prince of Transylvania. Since the late summer of 1657, Gheorghe Ștefan really did everything to distance himself from Rákóczi and be allowed to keep his throne: the letter he sent to the Porte, proving his volte-face, occurs not only in Harsányi's argumentation, but also in the contemporary diary of Claes Rålbamb.<sup>136</sup> The Voievod did leave his wife when he left Hungary, and introduced everywhere one of her ladies-in-waiting,

---

<sup>136</sup> Rålbamb, *Diarium*, 145–146.

Ștefanida Mihailova as his consort.<sup>137</sup> Ratting on his former employer at the Swedish court – without which the Voievod could not have made his living – was in any case a rather uncommon way to treat their conflict. Not even a similar remark is known from Torquatus, who had also been let down, even if he had stayed only a shorter period at the Voievod's court and had probably been less prominent there than Harsányi. The latter was, in his turn, clearly offended when the newly arrived Nicolae Mănescu, who was also twenty years younger than him, ousted him from his position – even if his service at the Voievode's court had only started as a temporary commitment.

More than a general frustration, it is clear that Harsányi wrote this letter of December 1666 in a state of despair, otherwise he would have not been very likely to put on paper these lines burning with anger. It must have caused him serious distress that the Swedish Chancellor had not answered his letter for half a year, and the Hungarian emigrant did not get any response about his plea for the extension of his pension either. He must have felt that Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, who had supported him earlier, did not reply to him in order to avoid the impression that he would be taking his side against Gheorghe Ștefan. It was perhaps naïve to assume that he can accomplish with his insinuations that the Regency Government, disappointed by the exiled Voievod, would stand up for him. His chances were also decreased by the fact that Bengt Skytte was deprived from his membership at the State Council in 1664, therefore Harsányi could not count on his help any more.<sup>138</sup> In order to

<sup>137</sup> The biography of Ștefanida Mihailova is summarized by A.I. Yatsimirskiy, “Domna Ștefanida, nevasta Alekseya Mikhaylovicha” (Domna Ștefanida, the bride of Alexei Mikhailovich), *Istoricheskiy Vestnik* 15 (1904): 825–843. According to the account of the Moldavian chronicler Ion Neculce, Safta, the wife of Gheorghe Ștefan did not want to live with him abroad, that is why their ways parted; and he took a servant girl as concubine afterwards, see Ion Neculce, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei și o samă de cuvinte* (Chronicle of the land of Moldavia and a collection of events), Scriitori români, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, ed. Iorgu Iordan (Bucharest: Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, 1959), 23.

<sup>138</sup> Fritz Arnheim, “Freiherr Benedikt Skytte (1614–1683), der Urheber des Planes einer brandenburgischen ‘Universal-Universität der Völker, Wissenschaften und Künste’,” in *Festschrift zu Gustav Schmollers 70. Geburtstag: Beiträge zur brandenburgischen und preußischen Geschichte* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1908), 81–83.

understand his state of mind better, we also have to consider that the Hungarian diplomat stayed a guest of the castle of Stettin even after leaving the service of Gheorghe Ștefan. He probably did not leave Pomerania because he expected a positive answer from the Crown of Sweden for his offers. This however also meant that he regularly met with the men of the Voievod, and these meetings must have been rather unfriendly: one of the servants of Gheorghe Ștefan asked Wrangel in September not to tolerate Harsányi in the castle of Stettin any more, as the Hungarian emigrant was reprimanding and humiliating them without any apparent reason.<sup>139</sup> It must have been then to everyone's satisfaction when Jakab Harsányi Nagy announced – thanking for the support received from the Swedes so far – that he offered his services to the Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William, who also accepted them, and therefore the Hungarian emigrant could start his journey towards his new home, Berlin, in the spring of 1667.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Anonymous attachment to the letter of Gheorghe Ștefan to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 28 August[/7 September] 1666) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8184.

<sup>140</sup> See the letter of Harsányi to De la Gardie (Stettin, 26 February[/8 March] 1667), RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500. He sent another letter with the same text and under the same date to Per Brahe, RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8164.

#### IV. The Court Counselor of the Great Elector

Jakab Harsányi Nagy, according to a later petition of his, was informed in January 1667 that Frederick William was ready to take him into his service. In early March, he was still in Stettin, and arrived in Berlin sometimes in mid-April – however, the charter of his appointment was not ready until the end of May.<sup>1</sup> We have no information about what could be the reason of this one-and-a-half-months delay that caused serious problems for the Hungarian emigrant in the later part of the year, because thereby he missed the date of payments that took place only four times a year at the Electoral treasury, and was left without money until the end of summer.<sup>2</sup> The Elector spent quite a lot of time away from Brandenburg during his rule, but exactly in this period he stayed in Berlin and the nearby castles – this could thus not have been the reason behind the delay. There was however another guest with Swedish connections in the court of Frederick William during the Spring of 1667, and he might have played a role in why Harsányi was not taken into service right away.

Bengt Skytte, Baron of Duderhoff traveled a lot compared to his contemporaries. As his father, Johan Skytte, coming from a burgher origin, was elevated to the nobility, later into aristocracy as the educator of King Gustav II Adolph and the founder of the University of Dorpat, it came as no surprise that the young Bengt took part in the *peregrinatio academica*, which was almost regarded compulsory for contemporary higher nobility and visited universities abroad after his studies in Uppsala. Even taking upon himself diplomatic missions – among other

<sup>1</sup> Diploma of Frederick William about the appointment of Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Cölln an der Spree, 20[30] May 1667) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 2. fol. 10. For dating the offer of the Great Elector and Harsányi's arrival in Berlin, see his petition to Frederick William (Berlin, 9[19] July 1667) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 2r.

<sup>2</sup> See Harsányi's petition quoted in the previous note (fol. 2.), and the order given by Friedrich von Jena to Michael Matthias about the payment of Harsányi's money (Cölln an der Spree, 9[19] July 1667) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 1.



places to Moscow – did not count as extraordinary. But Bengt Skytte was not prone to stay at home for a longer time even after the initial phase of his career: apart from shorter periods when he played an important role in Swedish politics as the confidant of the ruler in the late 1640s and during the rule of Charles X Gustav (1654–1660), he was out of the country most of his life. As mentioned in the previous chapter, he visited Transylvania and Constantinople during the 1650s, and in the 1660s, after he had lost his influence in Sweden, he got permission – after submitting many supplications – to leave to the territory of the Holy Roman Empire, theoretically in order to visit baths and get treatment for his rheumatic pains. His stay in Berlin in 1667 however shows that he had more high-reaching aims than this.<sup>3</sup>

Skytte visited the Counselors of Brandenburg with his plan for the first time in the Autumn of 1666, and it was discussed in a wider public of the court in the Spring of the next year. It was a rather ambitious idea about funding the “university of the entirety of the most prominent people and sciences of the world” (“Universitas Universitatum Hominum et scientiarum praeciparum Mundi”). According to Skytte’s proposal, the Elector of Brandenburg would have had to give an opportunity to found an exterritorial “Republic of Savants”, where learned people from every corner of the world could have gathered, pursued their research freely, exchanged their ideas and accumulated the results of their work. For this purpose, Skytte chose the town of Tangermünde at the shores of the Elbe, in the lands of the Elector.<sup>4</sup> At the same time, he knew how difficult it would be to get support for his endeavor, especially as he had

<sup>3</sup> His biography was written by Arnheim, “Freiherr Benedikt Skytte.”

<sup>4</sup> The most detailed presentation of these plans from the pen of Skytte is a memorial from early 1667: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung K lit. m II. Fasz. 1. fol. 5. His first letter mentioning the plan was written to the Counselor and doctor of the Elector, Nicolaus von Bonnet, under the date Zwingenberg, 18/28 September 1666, *ibid.* fol. 1b–2.

already presented similar plans in London and Paris.<sup>5</sup> It was not at all without precedents that a 17<sup>th</sup> century German Prince founded a school of higher education, but the institution dreamt of by the Swedish Baron would have not been an ordinary university. After having secured the financial background of the *Universitas*, its exemption from taxes and customs, and its diplomatic neutrality, Frederick William was supposed to step back and have no influence whatsoever on the further development of the establishment. Skytte thus tried to give a detailed representation of all the prestige gains to be expected, and his long elaboration about chronicles of posterity commemorating the founder of this modern version of Salomon's temple seemed to have made an impact on Frederick William. The Elector first issued a general statement of intention, and in April 1667 he signed the foundation charter of the institution already running under the name "Universitas Brandenburgica Gentium, Scientiarum et Artium," which also was printed shortly afterwards.<sup>6</sup>

Skytte could leave Berlin at the end of April with the foundation charter in order to start recruiting the prospective inhabitants of the *Universitas*. The ambassador of the Swedish Crown in Brandenburg, Heinrich Wolfradt – who kept a suspicious eye on Bengt Skytte's activities in the court of the Elector, as this ruler had been developing an exceedingly hostile attitude towards Sweden – noted however already in this period, that the plan seemed to be doomed to failure. On one hand, the diplomat

---

<sup>5</sup> On his earlier plans, see Arhheim, "Freiherr Benedikt Skytte", 84–85; Marcia Keith Scuchard, "Leibniz, Benzeliuss, and Swedenborg: The Kabbalistic Roots of Swedish Illuminism," in *Leibniz, Mysticism and Religion*, Archives internationales d'histoire des idées, ed. Allison P. Coudert, Richard H. Popkin and Gordon M. Weiner (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998), 88.

<sup>6</sup> See the statement of Frederick William and the foundation charter (in one printed and two manuscript copies) *ibid.* fol. 25–28., resp. fol. 54–68. Skytte's memorial from the second half of March 1667 is *ibid.* fol. 43. The attempt to found a university in Tangermünde was repeatedly discussed in the literature: Johann Carl Conrad Oelrichs, *Commentationes historico-literae quarum prior consilium Friderici Wilhelmi M. Elect. Brand. condendi novam universitatem omnium gentium, scientiarum et artium exponit, posterior historiographos Brandenburgicos recenset* (Berlin: Haude et Spener, 1751), 12–40; Arnheim, "Freiherr Benedict Skytte", 85–99; Stephanie Irrgang, "Gründungsvisionen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Das gescheiterte Bemühen um eine Universitätsgründung in Tangermünde," *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte* 9 (2006): 113–132.

reported that Frederick William did not seem to be entirely sure whether the foundation had been a good idea: as the leading position of the establishment would have been reserved for Skytte, the prestige of being a patron would have also been shared between Brandenburg and Sweden. On the other hand, Wolfradt doubted whether any respected scholar would have been ready to join the new institution. The ambassador's grasp on the developments seems to have been realistic: we have no information that idea of the *Universitas* planned by Bengt Skytte would have re-emerged any more after April 1667.<sup>7</sup>

The question that concerns us at the moment is obviously whether there was any connection between the invitation of Harsányi and Bengt Skytte's plans for the *Universitas*. As we have seen in the previous chapter, the Swedish aristocrat was acquainted to Harsányi and he even promoted the interests of the Hungarian emigrant in the State Council of Stockholm. As neither Skytte's, nor Harsányi's personal correspondence survived, we cannot know whether they stood in contact in the period between 1664 and 1667. The greatest supporter of Harsányi in the Brandenburg court – according to the writings of the Hungarian emigrant – was the same Otto von Schwerin, whose negotiations with Skytte did at the end make issuing the foundation charter for Skytte's project possible. This does not however necessarily has any special relevance, as Schwerin, being the Chair of the Secret Council (*Oberpräsident des Geheimen Rates*) and the most important politician of the Electorate, must have kept his finger on most of the developments in Brandenburg and his contacts with these two persons do not automatically indicate a connection between them. Also,

---

<sup>7</sup> Letters of Heinrich Wolfradt to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Berlin, 27 March/[6 April] 1667), and to Charles XI (Berlin, 17/[27] April 1667), RA Diplomatica Borussica vol. 16. According to Johann Carl Conrad Oelrichs, whose aim was to glorify Frederick William, the blame for the plan's failure goes unanimously to Skytte, see Oelrichs, *Commentationes*, 26–27. The modern biographer of the Elector, Ernst Opgenoorth, calls attention that according to the surviving sources, Frederick William seems to have had doubts right from the beginning, Opgenoorth, *Friedrich Wilhelm*, vol. 2, 60–61.

Harsányi had received the invitation to Brandenburg already in January 1667, while the first documented meeting between Schwerin and Skytte took place only in March – although this does not exclude that they could have been in contact earlier.<sup>8</sup>

It is also a question whether Jakab Harsányi Nagy would have suited Skytte's ideas about the ideal members of the *Universitas*. Although the Hungarian emigrant had visited institutions of higher education, his later career clearly did not follow a classic academic path. His knowledge was also more of a practical than of a philological kind that played a much more important role in the contemporary world of learning (I will get back to this question with a more detailed discussion in chapter II.1). His Ottoman Turkish language skills could however seem to be useful for Bengt Skytte who tried to enter the hall of academic fame with writing an essay on the philosophy of language. We also know that the Swedish aristocrat kept his interest in the Ottoman Empire after having returned from Constantinople: some of his autograph excerpts made of Middle Eastern travelogues survived.<sup>9</sup> The foundation charter of the Universitas also stated that the institution will be a “refugium et asylum” for exiles, which referred primarily on those expelled for confessional reasons – in accordance

---

<sup>8</sup> Harsányi refers to Schwerin as his inviter in his writing quoted in note 1 (fol. 2r). On the negotiations between Skytte and Schwerin, see the petition of the former quoted in note 6 (fol. 43r). On the career of the Counselor of Brandenburg in detail, see Ferdinand Hirsch, “Otto v. Schwerin,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 71 (1893): 193–259; and Peter Bahl, *Der Hof des Großen Kurfürsten: Studien zur höheren Amtsträgerschaft Brandenburg-Preußens*, Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Beiheft, no. 8 (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 584–585. Unfortunately, I have not found any data on Harsányi in the surviving correspondence of Otto von Schwerin in the rather fragmentary family archives: Archiwum Państwowe w Olsztynie 381. Zbiór rodziny Schwerinów nr. 160., 161., 180., 242., 243.

<sup>9</sup> Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek (in the following UUB) Ihre 183. On Skytte's work of language theory, which was preserved in a manuscript fragment under the title *Sol praecipuarum linguarum*, see Anders Grape, “Riksråd – språkforskare: Med anledning av ett par nyfunna brottstycken av Bengt Skyttes etymologiska verk” (State Counselor – Researcher of languages: On the occasion of discovering some fragments of the etymological work of Bengt Skytte), in *Uppsala Universitets Biblioteks minnesskrift 1620–1921*, Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis, no. 1 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1921), 329–372.

with the religious tolerance practiced by Frederick William –, but in a wider sense can also be applied on Harsányi.<sup>10</sup>

Apart from these considerations, there is also a negative argument for assuming a connection between the invitation of Harsányi to Brandenburg and Skytte's project: that it would be hard to find any other reason why the Elector would have invited the former Turkish Scribe into his court. Harsányi only met Frederick William once before, when Gheorghe Ștefan took contact with the Elector for the first time; later on, the rather frequent diplomatic missions to Brandenburg were always given to someone else by the Voievod. This single occasion could hardly have made such an impact on the politicians of Brandenburg that would have been enough five years later for Harsányi's invitation to Berlin. It is all the less likely because Frederick William was one of the greatest supporters of Gheorghe Ștefan in his exile; by taking Harsányi in his service, he committed exactly the same insult against him that the Crown of Sweden – in spite of the good contacts of the Hungarian emigrant in Stockholm – was unwilling to do. On the basis of all this, it seems likely that the plans of Bengt Skytte to establish the *Universitas Gentium, Scientiarum et Artium* must have played an important role in the invitation of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Berlin. When it then became clear that the institution was not going to start its actual functioning any time in the near future, the Elector granted the title of Court Counselor and an allowance for the Hungarian emigrant, who had been staying in his court already for one-and-a-half months.

---

<sup>10</sup> See the foundation charter quoted in note 6 (fol. 54v). It is characteristic of the confessional neutrality of the proposal that it would have left participation open even for Jewish, Arab and "other infidel" scholars (fol. 55v). a excellent summary about the debate on the religious tolerance in Frederick William's politics is provided Derek McKay, *The Great Elector, Profiles in Power* (Harlow: Longman, 2001), 146–155.

#### *IV.1. In the Service of the Elector*

The office of the Court Counselor (*Hofrat*) was probably the most formless office at the electoral court of Brandenburg. Frederick William donated it in most cases as a title without actual task or salary, and appointment charters usually only mentioned what an honor it was for the person in question, who was in the future bound to live in a way so that he would not cause the Elector any shame. Out of the seven charters known from the period of the reign of Frederick William, there are only two (issued for the keepers of the Electoral archives) that assign any specific tasks, and it is also these two which promised a payment for the services, 300 dollars a year. It is characteristic that this non-obliging title was also given to Otto von Guericke, former mayor of Magdeburg and well-known physicist of the time when he moved to Hamburg – and Frederick William also opened a perspective of a yearly allowance to him if he were willing to come back to the territories under his rule.<sup>11</sup> It can come as no surprise that the electoral charter issued for Jakab Harsányi Nagy also did not provide much detail on the future tasks of the Hungarian emigrant: as obligation, it was only prescribed that eventually he had to take upon himself diplomatic missions to Poland, Muscovy, Hungary and the Ottoman Empire if it pleased Frederick William. His yearly salary – similarly to that of the archivists – was fixed at 300 dollars, which was then completed by an allowance covering daily provision (under the name of “Kostgeld”).<sup>12</sup>

It seems that Harsányi received ad hoc tasks from his ruler. In a petition submitted at the end of 1672, he complained – apart from the irregular payment of his

<sup>11</sup> See the appointment charter for Otto von Guericke from 1681: GStA PK, I. HA Geheimer Rat, Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung, J 16 Fasz. 2. fol. 14–15. The two documents issued for the archivists, Christoff von Franck (1658), and Georg Adam von Schlieben (1660): *ibid.* fol. 1–3, resp. 4–6. The meager relevance of the office is clearly shown by the fact that it was not mentioned in the bulky monograph about the 17<sup>th</sup> century court of Brandenburg, cf. Bahl, *Der Hof*.

<sup>12</sup> See the appointment charter quoted in note 1.

salary – that the Elector had not given him tasks, therefore he felt that his presence at the court of Frederick William was actually superfluous.<sup>13</sup> Although the Hungarian emigrant exaggerated a bit, it is true that from the period before 1670, we do not have much information what kind of services were expected from him by the Elector. Much more sources attest that he was trying to take care of some older private issues that had been pending.

On the 18<sup>th</sup> of January 1668, Gheorghe Ștefan died in Stettin, and Ștefanida Mihailova found herself in a difficult position, as several people announced their claim on the Voievod's legacy.<sup>14</sup> Grigore Ghica, an exiled Voievod of Wallachia staying at the Viennese court thought that he must be the rightful heir, as his wife was related to Gheorghe Ștefan; he ruled out the claims of Ștefanida with pointing out that she could not have been the legal wife of the Voievod, as his actual wife was still alive in Moldavia. He must have notified Ștefanida as well, but it is clear that he wrote to Jakab Harsányi Nagy, whom he asked to travel to Stettin, seal up the legacy and prepare its transmission.<sup>15</sup> We do not know whether Harsányi had any intention to proceed in the interest of Grigore Ghica: his letter nevertheless came handy when applying for a short leave from the Elector in order to travel to Stettin and make arrangements concerning the heritage of Gheorghe Ștefan. He nevertheless did not conceal that he also had personal interests at stake: it was his last chance to recuperate any of the remaining debts of the Voievod towards him.<sup>16</sup> The court of Brandenburg which consistently stood by Ștefanida Mihailova, among other things in the question

<sup>13</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William (Berlin, 19[/29] November 1672) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 21r.

<sup>14</sup> On the date of Gheorghe Ștefan's death, see Zahariuc, *Țara Moldovei*, 535.

<sup>15</sup> Letter of Grigore Ghica to Jakab Harsányi Nagy (Vienna, 12 April 1667) TMIR III: 101–104, republished in AF I: 286–288.

<sup>16</sup> Memorial of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William ([end of April 1668]) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 118, partly published in AF I: 285–286.

of the jewels hypothecated by Jakob Fränkl, grudgingly gave him the pass he asked for, and even a letter of recommendation for Carl Gustaf Wrangel.<sup>17</sup>

It is not clear whether there was anything to expect from the legacy of Gheorghe Ștefan. The exiled Voievod had regularly been writing letters to all neighboring princes in the last two years of his life, with eloquent descriptions of his miserable living conditions. The fact that Jakab Harsányi Nagy, who had first-hand knowledge about the Voievod's finances until 1666, saw a chance to collect the debts, suggests a somewhat different conclusion. He asked Ștefanida about two diamonds in May 1668; the widow claimed however that one was left in Hamburg, the other in Moscow, and neither of them were available any more.<sup>18</sup> It is thus clear that Harsányi contacted Ștefanida, but it remains a question whether he traveled to Stettin personally: it is also possible that he gave up his plans, because Milescu appeared in Brandenburg at the end of April 1668, and Frederick William confirmed once more his willingness to support the widow.<sup>19</sup> We do not know what the fate of the legacy was: although the widow informed the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony not much after Gheorghe Ștefan's death that she wanted to take his body back to Moldavia, this surely did not happen until August. From 1669, we have information about Ștefanida staying in a monastery in Kiev; what happened to her later is unknown.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> On asking for the pass and letter of recommendation, see the memorial quoted in the previous note, and the letter of Harsányi to Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz (Berlin, 13[/23] April 1668) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 123. According to the note Somnitz wrote on the petition, he only let a pass be issued for him, so Harsányi had to ask once more, for the recommendation to Wrangel (Berlin, 17[/27] April 1668), AF I: 290. These credentials, written in the name of Frederick William, were only give to him on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of May: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 134. In the meantime, Frederick William assigned his ambassador in Vienna, Andreas Neumann, with helping the case of Ștefanida (Potsdam, 20[/30] April 1668) *ibid.* fol. 131r.

<sup>18</sup> Letter of Ștefanida Mihailova to Frederick William (Stettin, 17[/27] May 1668) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 132.

<sup>19</sup> The credentials for Milescu were signed by Ștefanida on the 16[/26]<sup>th</sup> April, the letter of Frederick William acknowledging the visit is dated Potsdam, 20[/30] April 1668: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 178. Fasz. 3. fol. 126, resp. 131.

<sup>20</sup> It is clear from the letter of Ștefanida Mihailova to Charles XI (Stettin, 11[/21] August 1668) that the body was not transferred to Moldavia until that time (RA Diplomatica Turcica bihang Moldavo-Valachica vol. 1). From the Russian territory, Ștefanida tried once more to return to the lands of Charles



In the Spring 1668, Harsányi was thus busily trying to collect the debts of the deceased ex-Voievod towards him. Nevertheless, it remains unknown what he did in the rest of the year, and even from a following one we only have a vague reference according to which he was in Prussia, the second most important country under the rule of Frederick William.<sup>21</sup> In 1670, however, he had the chance to prove his skills to his employer: Frederick William was visited by a Tatar envoy, sent by the second most important man of the Crimean Khanate, the Kalga Sultan Kerim Giray. The embassy of Shah Gazi Aga – an interesting sign of the wakening interest of the Tatars towards diplomatic missions to the West in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century – provided an excellent occasion for Harsányi to prove himself useful. On one hand, he could exhibit his language skills by translating the diplomatic correspondence and leading the negotiations with the Tatar envoy. It was namely his task (in the company of a lesser Brandenburg officer) to lead the detailed parley with Shah Gazi Aga after the ceremonial audience, and – in spite of the fact that the mission was clearly a complimentary one – learn about the Tatars' standing point in specific questions such as that of the captives taken into the Crimea ten years before, during the First Northern War, from Brandenburg and Prussian territories.<sup>22</sup>

Apart from leading the actual negotiations, it was most probably also Harsányi who designed the ceremony for welcoming the envoy, because it imitated the imperial audiences in Constantinople – obviously, in the limits provided by the local circumstances. As a reminiscence of the three courtyards of the Seraglio, both the

---

XI, see her letter in Russian (with Swedish translation), the next letter of the same collection. On her stay in Kiev, see Yatsimirskiy, “Domna Stefanida”, 826.

<sup>21</sup> The reference is from an undated memorial written by Jakab Harsányi Nagy, presumably in October 1674: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 46r.

<sup>22</sup> See the documentation of the negotiations held on 30 June/[10 July] 1670: GStA PH I. HA Rep. 11. 271a. Tartarien Fasz. 3. Apart from Harsányi, it was the Castellan of Berlin, Otto Wilhelm von Barlips present at the negotiations. The role of the Hungarian emigrant at the Tatar envoy's audience was earlier noted by Klaus Schwarz, “Vom Krieg zum Frieden: Berlin, das Kurfürstentum Brandenburg, das Reich und die Türken,” in *Europa und der Orient 800–1900*, ed. Gereon Sievernich and Hendrik Budde (Berlin: Berliner Festspiele and Bertelsmann, 1989), 272.

outer an inner courtyard of the palace at Cölln an der Spree (today Berlin) were used, where the electoral guard stood in full arms. Going up the stairs to the electoral chambers, Shah Gazi Aga also had to go between two lines of guards – just as an envoy going to the audience of the Sultan, where the lines were made up by various Pashas. Frederick William – again, similarly to the head of the Ottoman Empire – waited for the envoy on the top of a pulpit, three steps high, with his head covered; at the feet of the pulpit there stood the manifestation of the Grand Vizier in Brandenburg, Otto von Schwerin. Even if some elements were dropped – such as that, contrary to the Sultan, Frederick William did speak to the envoy who approached him after having made a bow three times and kissed his hands –, it was obvious that the audience of Shah Gazi Aga was designed in the “Oriental way”, and must have been choreographed by Harsányi.<sup>23</sup> One element of the audience however showed the limits of the Hungarian Counselor’s services: the words of the envoy were translated to Latin by Harsányi, which was then further translated to German by Otto von Schwerin for the Elector. It would be absurd to suppose that, after having spent six years in the language area, Harsányi still could not have been able to make himself understood in German. This is also contradicted by a German sentence quoted in the preface of the *Colloquia*.<sup>24</sup> However, it is quite possible that he had no opportunity to learn the complimentary forms and chancellery vocabulary used in diplomatic events. It must be no coincidence that he continued to write his petitions in Latin; which, on the other hand, must have been a drawback in Brandenburg, where the language of administration was already almost entirely German.

<sup>23</sup> There is a very detailed German account on the audience: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 271a. Tartarien Fasz. 3. The last time when a Tatar envoy had been received before that in Berlin was in 1632, that time in the absence of the Elector. The report on that audience does not mention any peculiarities concerning the etiquette. See: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 271a. Tartarien Fasz. 1. On the ceremonial order followed at the Sultan’s court, see Gülru Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (New York: The Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1991).

<sup>24</sup> *Colloquia*, praefatio, 3r.

The welcoming audience of another Tatar envoy, sent by other members of the Khan's family, Nureddin Sultan Dövlət Giray and Sultan Takti Giray, in March 1671, followed the same lines as the 1670 embassy. The ceremony was staged in the same manner and it was again Harsányi and Otto von Schwerin who provided translation. This time we even know that the Hungarian Counselor stayed with the envoy during his one-week stay in Brandenburg.<sup>25</sup> This was the last occasion – at least according to our present knowledge – when the former Turkish Scribe played an active part around the welcoming events of envoys coming to Brandenburg. This however did not also mean that it would have been his last chance to prove himself useful in the court. Although according to his appointment charter, he should have been helping Frederick William in questions concerning Poland, there is no data that he would have ever been involved into discussing the questions concerning great Eastern neighbor of the Electorate. In 1672, however, time has come for him to show his expertise in the questions related to the Ottoman Empire, as Brandenburg had to get involved in the Ottoman–Polish war, which started in that year.

The Sublime Porte was drawn into the ongoing conflict between the Rzeczpospolita and the Cossacks of Ukraine by Hetman Petro Dorošenko: the Sultan proclaimed war against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the end of 1671. Frederick William, in his quality as Prince of Prussia had been earlier a vassal of the King of Poland, this relationship was however cancelled in 1657 by the treaties of Wehlau and Bromberg. Nevertheless, he was still bound by the treaties to send auxiliary troops and King Michael Wiśniowiecki did everything in his power to make sure that no excuse would be found by the Elector: during 1672, 1500 Brandenburgian

---

<sup>25</sup> See the documentation of the embassy: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 271a. Fasz. 4.

soldiers appeared in the Polish theatre of war.<sup>26</sup> The Ottoman troops were exceedingly successful: they conquered the key fortress of Kamieniec Podolski and after having overswarmed Podolia, laid a siege on Lemberg. In the meantime, the political life of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth turned into chaos: the King and the nobility immersed in heated debates at the diet, and the *sejm* failed at last to reach a final decision to summon an army for defense.<sup>27</sup> It was not clear how long the Grand Vizier aimed to expand the territory of the Empire; on the other hand, whether the Rzeczpospolita would be able to show resistance. Jakab Harsányi Nagy was requested in this situation to elaborate on his opinion what the Elector of Brandenburg should do about the Ottoman advance, primarily whether he should send an envoy to the Sultan.<sup>28</sup>

The long memorial written on this occasion by Harsányi – that I will refer to with the general contemporary term *Opinio*, as none of its surviving copies has a title – shows a much more unified image of his political thinking than any of his earlier writings. The Hungarian emigrant found sending an envoy necessary in any case from the perspective of the security of the Elector: according to his argumentation, it would by no means cause damage, and can produce important results for Frederick William in many respects. He will thus get a timely opportunity to avert the dangers that might follow from a crushing Ottoman victory: if he appeared at the Sublime Porte before their final success, he had better chances to explain that it was not a feeling of hostility, only some earlier treaties that compelled him to send troops for helping the

<sup>26</sup> [Lehmann], Brandenburgisch-polnische Türkenzüge von 1671–1688, in *Kriegsgeschichtliche Einzelschriften*, no. 5 (Berlin: Mittler, 1884), 1–29; Opgenoorth, *Friedrich Wilhelm*, vol. 2, 118–119.

<sup>27</sup> Gerda Hagenau, *Jan Sobieski: Der Retter Wiens* (Vienna and Munich: Amalthea, 1983), 300–315.

<sup>28</sup> The memorial of Jakab Harsányi Nagy was preserved in two versions, both of them without a date; however, from the contents it is clear that it must have been written between the occupation of Kamieniec Podolski (26 August 1672) and the treaty of Buczacz (16 October 1672). Version “A” provides answers to five questions: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 7–11. Version “B” touches upon only the first one, but gives a much more elaborate answer: GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 276. Türkei fol. 290–293.

Rzeczpospolita. Harsányi also confirmed in his personal meeting with the Secret Counselors that the Sultan would not automatically take sending the auxiliary troops, an obligation for Brandenburg according to its treaties with Poland, as a sign of the open hostility of the Electorate.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, according to the *Opinio*, an envoy from Brandenburg, if his mission would be harmonized with those of the Polish King and the Emperor, might be helpful during the negotiations of the peace treaty for Poland, or at least can gather useful information about the intentions of the Porte.

Harsányi tried to avoid the impression that his suggestion would be to abuse the dire necessity of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in Brandenburg's interests. He dedicated long and elaborate passages to stating that the most desirable solution would be to expel the Ottoman Empire from Europe. However, as there seemed to be very meager chances for it because of the discord among Christian powers, he counted with the presence and advance of the Ottomans as a fundamental assumption for *Realpolitik*, and calculated the possible results from various aspects (I will get back to discuss the image of the Turks in the *Opinio* in chapter II.2).

One of the most important of these is his considerations about the government of the Rzeczpospolita. Harsányi describes the attitude of the Polish nobility in a unanimously negative vein, similarly to many of his contemporaries from Hungary and Transylvania: according to him, it is only their "pertinacity towards the King that disguises itself in the robe of standing up for the liberties of the homeland."<sup>30</sup> The

<sup>29</sup> Letter of Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz and Johann Koeppen to Frederick William (Cölln an der Spree, 1[11] October 1672) Reinhold Brode, ed., *Urkunden und Actenstücke zur Geschichte des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg*, vol. 13, *Politische Verhandlungen*, vol. 9 (Berlin: Reimer, 1890) (in the following: UA XIII), 337.

<sup>30</sup> „[...] contra Regem audendi licentia, quae sub pallio patriae libertatis tuendae latitat”. The entire deliberation about the government of the Rzeczpospolita is only found in version B, fol. 291v–292r. János Kemény described the sejm confuting the anti-Ottoman plans of King Władysław IV as “a bumptious and factious nation” and Márton Szepesi Csombor also did not spare the blames about the Poles in his travelogue, as they were “presumptuous, disdainful, fond of showing off in gaudy dress, short-tempered and lascivious.” Kemény, “Önéletírása,” 290; Szepesi Csombor, *Europica varietas*, 104, also Kármán, “Identitás és határok”, 84.

Hungarian Counselor saw a good opportunity in the Ottoman advance for breaking the tradition of noble anarchy: according to him, if the Rzeczpospolita would have become the tributary state of the Ottoman Empire, the Sultan would have introduced the idea that the King is his representative, which would have meant a serious increase in the respect due for him from his nobility. Harsányi even risked the assumption that if the King of Poland had good counselors, he could personally initiate the establishment of such a system. Establishing a tributary status similar to that of Transylvania – where the rule of the monarch, elected by the estates, was legitimized by the consent of the Sultan – would have obviously been unrealistic in the case of the enormous Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Harsányi, nevertheless, could well count on it that it would please his employer to read blames on recalcitrant nobilities, and suggestions for the establishment of a stronger monarchical power, as Frederick William had also been involved in long fights against the Prussian estates that were keen on preserving their privileges against the Elector.<sup>31</sup>

Harsányi had ample opportunity to show his expertise for the Brandenburg Counselors in several passages of the *Opinio*. He repeatedly referred to his own experiences in Constantinople, such as in the case when he claimed that he had already heard about the Ottoman plans to conquer Nagyvárad and Kamieniec back at the Sublime Porte in the 1650s. In some instances, he used parallels with Transylvanian history: when he described the risks that if Poland turned a tributary state, it would not only be forced to let Ottoman armies marching against the Holy Roman Empire through its territory, but also could start its own war against Brandenburg with auxiliary troops from the Sultan, as Bocskai, Bethlen or György Rákóczi I did against the Habsburgs. Obviously, he also used the opportunity to be on

---

<sup>31</sup> Opgenoort, *Friedrich Wilhelm*, vol. 2, 113–123; Ludwig Hüttl, *Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg der Große Kurfürst 1620–1688: Eine politische Biographie* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1981), 260–295.

familiar ground when he gave advice on the costs and personnel of a perspective embassy to Constantinople, and on the presents to be sent to various dignitaries at the Sublime Porte. The passages about the importance of having aides beside the ambassador, who are well acquainted with the Ottoman world, suggest that the then fifty-seven years old Harsányi would not have minded to be sent to Constantinople by Frederick William, if not as an ambassador, then at least as a member of his retinue.<sup>32</sup>

The question whether Harsányi should at least be sent to Poland as an envoy to observe the negotiations with the Ottomans was indeed raised in the Secret Council of Brandenburg, and the Elector also proclaimed that it would be necessary unless the peace would be concluded between Poland and the Ottomans soon.<sup>33</sup> In October 1672 however, one-and-a-half months after the fall of Kamieniec, the representatives of the Rzeczpospolita concluded peace with the Ottoman Empire in Buczacz, in which they gave up the territories of Ukraine West from the River Dnieper (the so-called Right-Bank Ukraine) and Podolia, and also promised the yearly payment of a tribute of 22.000 ducats. This was not to last – as the *sejm* of the next year was not ready to ratify these conditions, military activities started again – but Harsányi's mission did not take place anyway. Although Brandenburg troops still took part in the military activities from 1673 on, in this period the Hungarian Counselor was not asked again to give his opinion about the developments – about which he even complained later to Frederick William.<sup>34</sup> The *Opinio* thus did not have any political significance – the circumstances simply changed too quickly for it – and Harsányi's plans about taking upon himself another diplomatic mission have also failed. 1672 was however still a

<sup>32</sup> The passages about the technical questions of the embassy are only available in version A (fol. 10r–v); the parallels to Transylvania and the reminiscences from the 1650s are in both.

<sup>33</sup> Letter of Somnitz and Koeppen to Frederick William, quoted in note 29, 337–338; and Frederick William's letter to his Secret Counselors (Bergen, 19[29] October 1672) UA XIII: 347–348.

<sup>34</sup> Petition of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William (Berlin, 10[20] August 1673) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 27r. A háttérrel lásd: Hagenau, *Jan Sobieski*, 316. On the Brandenburgian participation, see Schwarz, "Vom Krieg", 272.

successful period for the Hungarian emigrant: the book that made him at least relatively known for posterity was published in this year.

#### ***IV.2. The Colloquia Familiaria: Genre and Sources***

The *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina, seu Status Turcicus Loquens* (“Informal Turkish-Latin conversations, or the state of the Turks speaking [that is: in a speaking manner]”) is the only known book of Harsányi. Its content is made up by conversations about the Ottoman Empire, with the most important topics of the ranks of the Empire, its officials inside and outside the Imperial Court, their government, powers on land and sea, their nature and various customs, religion and sects – as it is summarized by the long description on the title page.<sup>35</sup>

The book even has a sketchy “plot”: the two main characters, the Traveler (*Viator*) and the Interpreter (*Interpres*) get acquainted to each other and they find a Guide (*Dux viae*), who is willing to lead them to Constantinople. On their way, they have a detailed conversation about important information concerning travel, and also about the alarming changes in the international situation. They also meet some soldiers (who have the simple name of *Obvii* (Passers-by) in the script), who try to turn them back, claiming that a new war is about to start and the roads of the Empire are swarmed by the troops of the Sultan. This also gives an excellent opportunity to dedicate long passages to the structural questions of the Ottoman army.

The travelers however do not turn back; they spend the night in an inn, where they talk to the Inn-Keeper (*Diversitor*) about food, drink and lodgings. The Traveler takes this occasion to unveil his real identity: he has a diplomatic mission to

<sup>35</sup> The full Latin title is the following: *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina Seu Status Turcicus Loquens, In quo omnes fere Turcici Imperij ordines, ministrorum cujuscunque conditionis, extra vel intra Aulam Regiam, inque Gubernaturis dignitas, qualitas; regimen, gentis robur terrestre & maritimum; item natura, more ritus & consuetudines variae; religio, sectae, & religiosi, &c. &c. per Colloquia, velut in Speculo quodam, ad vivum repraesentantur, ac notis necessarijs illustrantur.*



Constantinople (from this point on, he is referred to as the Legate (*Legatus*)). He also interrogates the Interpreter about the diplomatic customs at the Ottoman Empire. When they arrive in Constantinople, the Interpreter shows him the most important sights and also helps him with shopping. After their dialogue about the hierarchy of dignitaries of the Empire, the last topics of the book are the nature and morals of the Ottomans, as well as their religion.

The book serves a twofold aim: on one hand, it is a quarry for information about the state and everyday life of the Ottoman Empire, on the other, as the dialogues run parallelly in Turkish and Latin, it also helps to study the former language. Harsányi claimed in the foreword that he originally had wanted to write two books: the *Colloquia* would have been a textbook for learning the language, while he would have left the detailed description of the Ottoman Empire for a later volume. But when he showed the first version to Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz – who was by that time the leading personality in the Secret Council of Frederick William – the politician encouraged him to share the information with the readers already in the *Colloquia*. It is probably due to this quick revision of the manuscript – that had already been in the printing press – that some of the lexicon-like parts of the *Colloquia* concerning the dignitaries of the Empire, the various movements in Islam and similar information, appear only in Latin in the book.<sup>36</sup>

The *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina* was thus primarily constructed to be a textbook for Turkish language, which, according to Harsányi's foreword, he decided to write it for the encouragement of his friends. The form he chose was a rather popular one in this period, although its application for non-European languages was a novelty. The appearance of “talk-books” was a late medieval development in language

---

<sup>36</sup> *Colloquia*, præfatio, 1r–1v.

pedagogy, and became popular first in the teaching of Latin. Contrary to the Scholastic method of learning the grammatical system by heart and then memorizing classic texts, these textbooks meant a novelty by simulating real life situations and conversations. Even if they did not fully replace collections of excerpts, these “talk-books” became useful and popular means of education: the golden age of their production for Latin lasted from the late 15<sup>th</sup> to mid-16<sup>th</sup> century. The best known piece of the tradition, the *Colloquia Familiaria* of Erasmus of Rotterdam is also a product of this age: this book, especially in its later editions, also aimed at the moral education of the students by castigating the anomalies of the world in its satirical dialogues.<sup>37</sup> This tradition of *colloquia* played however not only a role in the teaching of Latin, but also of the vernacular languages that became more and more important during the 16<sup>th</sup> century. In order to help the earlier “natural method” of language education, a series of textbooks were published, many of which were bilingual and could be used in both ways. The specialization of these books also took place quite early: books designed for persons of distinguished origin, depicting the details of a nobleman’s every-days could hardly been replaced with those deliberately written for travelers – the tradition of these phrase-books, popular even today, can also be traced back to the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> It may be surprising, but this book, known today primarily as a moralistic treatise, was frequently used in the Early Modern period in its original function of teaching the language, see Aloys Bömer, *Die lateinischen Schülergespräche der Humanisten: Auszüge mit Einleitungen, Anmerkungen und Namen- und Sachregister*, Texte und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts in den Ländern deutscher Zunge, no. 1 (Berlin: Harrwitz, 1897), 83–94. On the tradition of 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> century „talk-books” see also Manfred Fuhrmann, *Latein und Europa. Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts in Deutschland von Karl dem Großen bis Wilhelm II.* (Cologne: DuMont, 2001), vol. 2, 70–71. On the medieval methods, see Bömer, *Die lateinischen Schülergespräche*, 9; Holger Klatte, “Fremdsprachen in der Schule: Die Lehrbuchtradition des Sebald Heyden,” in *Die Volkssprachen als Lerngegenstand im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Akten des Bamberger Symposions am 18. und 19. Mai 2001*, Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, no. 3, ed. Helmut Glück (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), 80–81.

<sup>38</sup> Helmut Glück and Libuše Spáčilová, “Einleitung,” in *Deutsche Sprachbücher in Böhmen und Mähren vom 15. Jahrhundert bis 1918: Eine teilkommentierte Bibliographie*, Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, no. 2, ed. Helmut Glück et al. (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), IX–XI. The difference between the books used in public education and by the personal tutors of

No one has ever written such a book for the study of Turkish before. What is more, until the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, Turkish language received a rather meager interest from Western European scholarship, at least compared to Arabic. Apart from the attempts that remained in manuscript, there were only three significant works written till the end of the 1660s: the grammars of Hieronymus Megiser and André Du Ryer (Leipzig, 1612 and Paris, 1630), and the dictionary of Giovanni Molino (Rome, 1641). It is however characteristic of their prevalence that the French scholar did not seem to have known the work of his German predecessor. At the turn of the 1670s, however, the study of Turkish language underwent a quick development: in Italian and English territories a series of dictionaries, vocabularies and grammars were published; and the peak of this trend was provided by Franz Mesgnien von Meninski, with the four volumes of his *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium* (published between 1680 and 1687) and the grammar annexed to it.<sup>39</sup> Although some manuscript phrase collections are known, the solution similar to that of Harsányi – that is, to order the linguistic material in a continuous dialogue with a plot – counted as a novelty concerning Turkish language.<sup>40</sup>

---

nobleman is illustrated by the two case studies of Zdeněk Oprava, “Bestseller in der frühen Neuzeit: Die verschiedenen Ausgaben des Gesprächsbüchleins von Ondřej Klatovský (1540)”; and Barbara Bruzzone, “Fremdsprachen in der Adelserziehung des 17. Jahrhunderts: Die Sprachbücher von Juan Angel de Sumarán,” both in *Die Volkssprachen als Lerngegenstand im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Akten des Bamberger Symposions am 18. und 19. Mai 2001*, *Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache*, no. 3, ed. Helmut Glück (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), 57–66, resp. 37–45. On the phrase-books for travelers, see Maćzak, *Travel*, 35–40.

<sup>39</sup> Franz Babinger, “Die türkischen Studien in Europa bis zum Auftreten Josef von Hammer-Purgstalls,” *Die Welt des Islam* 7, no. 3–4. (1919): 103–116; Alastair Hamilton and Francis Richard, *André Du Ryer and Oriental Studies in Seventeenth-Century France* (London: The Arcadian Library; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 59–71.

<sup>40</sup> A phrase collection was compiled for instance by a contemporary of Harsányi, the Polish renegade Wojciech Bobowski (also known as Albertus Bobovius or Ali Ufki), see Kenan Akyüz, “Paris Milli Kütüphanesi’nde İlk Türkçe-Fransızca ve Fransızca-Türkçe Yazma Eserler” (The first Turkish–French and French–Turkish manuscripts of the national library in Paris), *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* (1959): 289–292. In his manuscript there are also parallel Ottoman Turkish and French texts, there is however no trace of thematic ordering, characters or a plot in it – therefore, his manuscript cannot be regarded as part of the *colloquia* tradition.

The Hungarian emigrant was consistent in applying the formal rules of “talk-books”. As he declared in the foreword of the *Colloquia*, his goal was not to teach the readers an eloquence that would have overshadowed the orators of classical Antiquity – rather, he wanted to present the everyday spoken language to them. This was also supported by printing the Ottoman Turkish text in the *Colloquia* transcribed to Latin characters: as Harsányi illustrated on several examples, the regular pronunciation of the Arabic characters differed in many cases from the one used in practice. With this method, however, the Hungarian emigrant tried to make a good thing out of necessity, as he also had to face the problem of early Oriental studies, that is that most of the publishing houses did not have characters for printing in Arabic letters, and it would have been extremely expensive to let a set be cut. Megiser had good reason to use only Latin characters in his above-mentioned Turkish grammar, and Harsányi also limited the Arabic characters to the foreword. This, at the same time, made the usage of the book somewhat cumbersome: as there were no accepted rules for transcribing Arabic characters by that time, Harsányi used in some cases the orthographic rules of Hungarian – the consonant [s] was transcribed by him as *sz*, [č] as *cs* –, which must have confused his German readers.<sup>41</sup> He also seems to have come to a self-contradiction when, after explaining the advantages of using Latin characters for his purposes, also promised in the foreword to try to re-publish the book with Arabic script if he had a chance.<sup>42</sup>

The genre of “talk-books” is actually useful if there is also a descriptive grammar attached to it to further the learning of the language, but this is missing from

<sup>41</sup> On the peculiarities of phonography in the *Colloquia*, see György Hazai, *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsányi*, Bibliotheca orientalis hungarica, vol. 18 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1973), 319–324.

<sup>42</sup> *Colloquia*, praefatio, 2v–3r. On the grammar of Megiser, see Hamilton and Richard, *André Du Ryer*, 63–64. Many cases of problems with printing Oriental characters are reported by Gerald J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

Harsányi's *Colloquia* – most probably he had already known of the existence of at least one of the above quoted books, even if he did not mention them in his work.<sup>43</sup> He does not give any information about the eventual sources of the linguistic material either – and, in the lack of a similar forerunner, we have to see the text as his own invention.<sup>44</sup> Harsányi is also not very verbose when he should refer to the sources of the factual material of the *Colloquia*: all that he gives away is that he based his writing on one hand on his own experiences from the Constantinople years, on the other on his notes “made from the works of better known, ancient and recent authors concerning the state of the Turks.” But which statements were taken from which author from “the enormous ocean of the things concerning Turks”, is never specified.<sup>45</sup> Only one suggestion was proposed by the literature so far, that Harsányi used a common Latin source with Paul Rycault, the author of the very popular contemporary description of the Ottoman Empire; the philological analysis did not however get any further than that.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> This may however also come from the simple fact that most “talk-books” were published without a grammar, see Glück and Spáčilová, “Einleitung”, X.

<sup>44</sup> The question of authorship was addressed in the literature about Harsányi only by a Bulgarian Turcologist, Mefküre Mollova. According to her thesis, the *Colloquia* was not created by one, rather by two persons: the lines of the characters referred to by her as “guide” and “messenger” would have thus be written by two different persons. This theory is however rather unlikely. It is disaffirmed not only by Harsányi's own claims – which were otherwise most probably unknown to Mollova, as she did not consult the original copy, only the modern edition of the Turkish parts by György Hazai –, but it is quite hard to imagine how the work would have been produced if she was right. The one option, that Harsányi noted everything from memory in Berlin, taking care even to signify dialectal variants, sounds just as unrealistic as the other one, that Harsányi had already written the *Colloquia* in Constantinople and then managed to keep it by himself during almost fifteen years of turmoil, waiting five years even in Berlin before its publication. Furthermore, the *Colloquia* has more than two characters and the Guide is not even one of the protagonists (although when Mollova describes the role of the “guide” she seems to mean the Interpreter). It is thus not clear that if her thesis would be right, who would have been the author of the minor characters' text. The credibility of the thesis of the Bulgarian Turcologist (and her analysis of Hazai's edition in which she claims to have found 1048 mistakes) is actually not furthered by the fact that she misspelled not only the title of the *Colloquia*, but also that of Hazai's modern edition. See Mefküre Mollova, “Sur les ‘Qulloquia [sic!] Familiaria Turcico-Latina,’” *Linguistique Balkanique (Academie Bulgare des Sciences)* 12, no. 4 (1979): 53–83.

<sup>45</sup> The exact quotes are: „antiquis et recentioribus melioris nota authoribus de Statu Turcico”; „vastissimum rerum Turcicarum oceanum”, both in *Colloquia*, præfatio, 1v.

<sup>46</sup> See Victor L. Ménage, review of Hazai, *Das Osmanisch-Türkische*, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies University of London* 38 (1975): 162–164. The author based his assumption on the fact that both works have some very similar mistakes: the name Sivas, for instance is misspelled as “Livias” by Harsányi, and “Liwas” by Rycault; the founder of the Naqshbandī sub-order (Emīr

If there is no direct reference to any source that Harsányi would have used when writing about the Ottoman Empire, the *Colloquia* does offer a proof that he was aware of the production of the Oriental studies of his age. At the end of his book, he annexed the will of the Prophet Mohammed, which was a great discovery of the Early Modern Arabic studies: it was published not less than five times – apart from that of Harsányi – until Thomas Christian Tyschen proved it to be a forgery in 1804.<sup>47</sup> This fictive document, in which the Prophet encourages his followers to keep the treaty he concluded with the Christians about tolerance and peaceful coexistence, arrived in France in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, and was also published there for the first time in 1630: the Arab text was completed with a Latin translation by the famous Maronite scholar, Gabriel Sionita. Later editions of the text (a bilingual in Leiden and a Latin in Rostock) used the same translation as well as Harsányi, who seems to have used the original Paris edition.<sup>48</sup>

---

Buk<sup>ḥ</sup> (Bukhārī) is mentioned as “the Holy Emir Ebruhar” by Rycault, while Harsányi calls him “Ebruh” and his followers “Ebruhii”. Ménage is well justified to assume that Harsányi did not directly use Rycault’s text (which was first published in 1666, but only in English, a language the Hungarian emigrant most probably did not understand), but a Latin original is suggested by the superfluous double *is* in the Turkish words “Mevleviiler”, „Kadriiler” and „Hizreviiler” that must originate from the mistaken translation of Latin *nominativus pluralis* forms („Mevlevii”, „Kadrii”, „Hizrevii”). There is however no direct data that Harsányi knew the manuscripts of Albertus Bobovius, used by Rycault, as Ménage suggested.

<sup>47</sup> The history of the edition of the Testamentum – without a reference to Harsányi – was compiled by Christian Friedrich Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica* (Halle an der Saale: Hendelius, 1811), 442–445. Recently see Hamilton and Richard, *André Du Ryer*, 46–47.

<sup>48</sup> The most important difference between the various editions is in the Latinized form of the name of Mohammed and the term “Muslim”: while the form used in the Paris edition („Mahomed”, „Muslemannus”/“Moslemannus”) is also used by Harsányi, the Leiden and Rostock editions use another form („Muhamed”, „Muslemanus”/“Moslemanus”, respectively „Muhammed”, „Muslimicus”). In this respect, there are only two cases (both in the title) when there is a difference between the Paris edition and that of Harsányi’s. Although the forms used by the Leiden edition are quite close to the ones used by Harsányi, there are also some other small differences between the two texts: for instance, instead of „ne oneretur”, he writes „nec oneretur” ([5], resp. 7), „contra” instead of „econtra” ([6], resp. 9; this nevertheless is also a difference between the Paris edition and that of Harsányi, see there on 11), and „excipiant” instead of „recipiant” ([8], resp. 11). Another difference between the editions is the Latinization of the names of the signers of the will, which are however transcribed in a different way by every edition. See *Al-‘Ahd wa-š-šurūḥ allatī šaraḥā Muḥammad rasūl Allāh li-ahl al-milla an-naḥrāniya* / *Testamentum et pactiones initae inter Mohamedem et Christianae fidei cultores* (Paris: Antonivs Vitray, 1630); *Testamentum sive Foedus inter Muhammedem, & Christianae Religionis populos initum*, ed. by Johann Georg. Nisselius (Leiden: Nisselius, 1661); *Muhammedis testamentum sive pacta cum Christianis in Oriente inita*, ed. by Johannes Fabricius (Rostock: Hallervord, 1638).

As shown by the example of re-publishing the *Testamentum*, the factual material of the *Colloquia* is certainly not without faults: the text that plays an important role in the message to be conveyed by the book – which I will touch upon in chapter VI – proved later to be a forgery. These cases, such as that of the text, accepted by contemporary Oriental studies as authentic, where the Hungarian emigrant was in no position to check its credibility, may occur. It is however clear that in the key topics of the book, the fields of everyday life and diplomacy in Constantinople, Harsányi had enough experience during the seven years of his stay in the Ottoman capital to be able to correct the claims of others and – according to his own words – he also was keen on doing it.<sup>49</sup> As we have seen before, it was not alien to Harsányi to correct the mistakes of others. We hear the following from the mouth of the Interpreter in the *Colloquia*:

a learned friend of mine, who traveled a lot in these Ottoman regions, came to me, and showed a book of a well-known, and in many sciences famous person. When I looked into the book, I have seen, that this learned man, taking from other authors' books, has written many things without fundament. If they are good or bad, true or false, it does not concern me too much. Not to hurt anybody, I will keep my tongue silent. But about the things I know, I will not tell anything contrary to the truth for pleasing them. Disdainful and inexperienced minds can write as much as they want, I am not responsible for them. ... People with experience are going to see who was right in due time.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Mefküre Mollova, in order to support her thesis of double authors, claims that it would be impossible for a Hungarian who only lived seven years in Constantinople to have such a deep knowledge about the Ottoman Empire, see Mollova, "Sur le 'Colloquia'", 54. I believe, the picture drawn up in chapter II proved well enough that six years of diplomatic service (and one year of inaction in the Seven Towers) could provide Harsányi with enough experience so that he would not have to rely on others' knowledge about the functioning of the Sublime Porte. This however does not apply to other fields, not very close to his expertise, such as the history and customs of the Dervish orders (cf. note 44).

<sup>50</sup> „[...] doctus, & qui in Turcicis regionibus peregrinatus est. amicus me conveniens, celebris cuiusdam, & in variis scientiis clarissimi viri librum ostendens, postquam in librum illum introspexissem, vidi doctum illum virum, de multis rebus, ex aliquot scriptorum libris excerpens, multa

The Interpreter plays the role of the expert on questions concerning the Ottoman capital and the Sublime Porte throughout the book: he is the one who corrects – sometimes in a rather sarcastic manner – the superficial information the Legate has, who bases his judgments on the common knowledge in Western Europe. It is thus clear that the Interpreter should be seen as the spokesman for Harsányi himself, and this is also supported by a slip of the pen of the Hungarian author: the Interpreter speaks once about event that took place “in my time”, despite the lack of any reference in the plot for the earlier service of the character as a diplomat at the Porte – contrary to Harsányi, on whose years in Constantinople the reference alludes at.<sup>51</sup> The critique towards earlier literature, put into the mouth of the Interpreter, must thus mirror the opinion of the Hungarian emigrant. Although Harsányi certainly used the data of others, we have no reason to believe, especially in light of the quotation above, that the *Colloquia* would not be the original work of the Hungarian emigrant, mirroring his own perspective: just as in the case of his formal innovation, the application of the *colloquia* tradition on the Turkish language, Harsányi also managed to create novelty in the content of the *Colloquia* (which will be discussed in detail in chapter II.2).

### ***IV.3. The afterlife of the Colloquia Familiaria***

Franz Babinger, writing the early history of Turcology, presented the *Colloquia* as a prominent proof that the publication of the grandiose work of Meninski, while

---

sine fundamento scripsisse; quae num bona vel mala? vera an falsa sint? non multum mea refert; ut qui nullius honorem lacessere velim; nullius animum tristitia afficere, linguam continebo; interim, in rebus mihi cognitis, in eorum gratiam, contrarium veritati, aut mendacium non proferam, elata & inexperta ingenia, quantum velint scribant, pensi non habeo. ... viri experientia clari, cum tempore iudicabunt.” *Colloquia*, 403–404.

<sup>51</sup> *Colloquia*, 260–261. The text here concerns the changes of the tax paid by the Principality of Transylvania to the Sublime Porte.



opening up the field for a blossoming of Turkish studies, overshadowed other “not useless and original” works published in the age.<sup>52</sup> True, it seems that the work of Jakab Harsányi Nagy did not enjoy a high reputation in his period: even in the correspondence of scholars interested in Oriental studies, we do not find any trace that they would have seen a copy of it.<sup>53</sup> Similarly, the *Colloquia* was not reviewed by the first scholarly journal, the *Journal des Sçavans* that was started a few years before the publication of Harsányi’s work. It can be found in the bibliography of the books concerning the Turks, published in 1717, but it is very likely that its compiler did not see the book itself – he also noted in the foreword that some works were entered in the list as *desiderata* –, because not only the name of the Hungarian emigrant was misspelled, but also the title was simplified in an awkward way to “Status Turcicus”, which does not represent the book’s peculiarities.<sup>54</sup>

Even more telling are the complaints of the Orientalist who did at last had Harsányi’s work in his hands and also used it. The professor of Arabic at the University of Leipzig, Johann Christian Clodius produced the synthesis of Turkish linguistics in his *Compendiosum Lexicon Latino-Turcico-Germanicum*, published in 1730. To the Turkish dictionary and the bulky indices, Clodius also annexed his grammar, published separately in the preceding year, in which the difficulties of the

<sup>52</sup> “[...] eine übrigens nicht unverdienstliche und selbständige Arbeit,” wrote Babinger about the *Colloquia*, see Babinger, “Die türkische Studien,” 116–117.

<sup>53</sup> Hiob Ludolf, founder of the Early Modern Ethiopian studies, and Christoph Arnold informed each other regularly about the novelties of the book market. Arnold wrote excitedly about “a certain Pole” who planned to publish a Turkish dictionary in Vienna already in 1676 (two years before the first volume came out), and in the next year he already knew the name of Meninski, and also reported about the works of his greatest scholarly opponent, Gianbattista Podestà. There is however no trace of Harsányi in his letters, see Universitätsbibliothek Johann Christoph Senckenberg, Frankfurt am Main [= UB Frankfurt], Ms. Ff. Ludolf Nr. 43–87. (the letters I referred to are found under the numbers 57, and 62). It is very likely that Ludolf has not read the *Colloquia* later either; it is at least indicative that he did not borrow any of Harsányi’s argumentation for his own pamphlet written in 1686 in support of the anti-Ottoman war (for Harsányi’s agenda, see chapter VI). Cf. *Iobi Ludolfi Sac. Caes. Maj. necnon ser. Ducum Sax. Consil. De Bellico Turcico feliciter conficiendo, accedunt Epistolae quaedam Pii V. Pont. Max. & alia nonnulla ejusdem argumenti* (Frankfurt am Main: Zunner, 1686).

<sup>54</sup> Johann Heinrich Boeckler, *Commentarius Historico-Politicus de rebus Turcicis*, ed. by N.C.J. (Bautzen: Richter, 1717), nr. 230.

languages were not only overcome by giving detailed descriptions of the rules, but also illustrated by dialogues which were taken from Harsányi's book.<sup>55</sup> He found it important to express his thankfulness in the foreword of the grammar to Crozius, the Keeper of the Royal Library in Berlin, who sent him this book, which is so rare that it was worth to republish parts of it.<sup>56</sup>

The number of the copies available today also shows that the *Colloquia* was probably produced in a limited edition. I could track down not more than fifteen copies, the most of which (8) is in Germany, 2 are in England, Poland and Hungary each, and one in Romania.<sup>57</sup> Printing scholarly books was not the main focus of the publisher of the *Colloquia*, Georg Schultze, and he perhaps also did not have the necessary network for its distribution.<sup>58</sup> Although Frederick William originally promised to support the publication, no money was dedicated to this purpose at the

<sup>55</sup> Johannes Christian Clodius, *Grammatica Tvrca necessariis regvlis praecipuas lingvae difficultates illvstrans, ac aliquot colloqvii et sententiis Tvrccicis avcta* (Leipzig: Wolfgang Deer, 1729). Republished as a part of idem, *Compendiosum Lexicon Latino–Tvrccico–Germanicum, in quo non solum voces et phrasae vistatae continentvr, sed etiam illarum lectio, adjectis vbiqve observationibus variis, ad statvm ecclesiasticvm, politicvm, et militarem pertinentibvs cvm praefatione de lingva et litteratvra tvrcarvm, corrvptisqve vvlgari pronvntiatione, nominibvs ministrorvm avlae Tvrccicae* (Leipzig: Wolfgang Deer, 1730). On Clodius, generally, see Babinger, "Die türkischen Studien," 122–123; Holger Preissler, "Orientalische Studien in Leipzig vor Reiske," in *Johann Jacob Reiske – Leben und Wirkung*, Beiträge zur Leipziger Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Reihe B, no. 6, ed. Hans-Georg Ebert and Thoralf Hanstein (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005), 19–43. According to György Hazai (*Das Osmanisch-Türkische*, 18), Harsányi dialogues would have also been used by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century Turkish grammar of Joseph von Preindl; however, it is a mistake: the examples given there show no similarities with those of the Hungarian author, cf. his *Grammaire turque d'une toute nouvelle methode...* (Berlin: n. p., 1791).

<sup>56</sup> Clodius, *Grammatica*, 7–8. This copy of the Royal Library in Berlin got lost in the meantime: the volume now available in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (the successor of the Royal Library) comes from the Dietz collection, which was brought to the library after 1804 (its call number is Bibl. Dietz Oct. 1301). There is no copy in the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig, where it could have perhaps been placed if Clodius would have failed to return it.

<sup>57</sup> See the detailed list in the appendix.

<sup>58</sup> The safest income for Schultze was provided by printing the official documents of the Elector, which explains why he had a long struggle for its rights with the other printer in Berlin, Christoph Runge. The works of Andreas Müller, another Orientalist in Berlin, were printed by Runge; however it is not clear whether these became better known for the *Respublica Litteraria* because of the better distribution or the fame enjoyed by Müller already by the time of the publication. On the struggles between Schultze and Runge, see Ernst Consentius, *Die Berliner Zeitungen bis zur Regierung Friedrichs des Großen* (Berlin: Hande & Spener, 1904), 30–34.

end: and if Harsányi had to take all the expenses, it is no wonder if only a small number of copies were published.<sup>59</sup>

The usual forums of reception, learned works, journals and correspondence thus do not offer any apparent information about the welcoming of Harsányi's work, and the volumes themselves are also mostly silent about the opinions of their readers. The marginal notes, which usually prove to be so useful tools for the history of ideas, are absent in most of the copies of the *Colloquia* – in the majority of the cases, only the name of the possessor is noted. In this respect, the copy held by the University Library at Warsaw is unique, because its owner did not only note his name, but also a pronunciation guide on the very first pages: apart from the letters used by Harsányi for specific voices, he also listed the German and the Arabic graphemes and even an example for their usage. The volume also contains some other linguistic commentaries, such as the versions in Arabic characters written to several Ottoman Turkish words; and there are even some objections against the factual material: beside the claim of Harsányi, that the title Emir is given to those who are the descendants of Mohammed, the owner of the book noted: “fals[us]”.<sup>60</sup>

The copy now in Warsaw was once owned by a certain Andreas Müller, who, according to his possessor's note, got the book from Harsányi himself.<sup>61</sup> Müller himself had a much more typical career for an intellectual than his Hungarian

<sup>59</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy refers to it in an undated petition (most likely from the early October 1676) that, contrary to earlier promises, he did not get support for the publication of the *Colloquia* (GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 59r). The archival material from Brandenburg concerning Georg Schultze includes several documents in which the printer is given financial support for the publication of various works, but the *Colloquia* is not mentioned in any of them, cf. GStA PK, I. HA, Geheimer Rat, Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung, F 3 Fasz. 2. fol. 68–93, and F 3a Fasz. 1. fol. 25–59.

<sup>60</sup> Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie 28.20.3.3986 (old call number: Obce-XVII-4°-16°-1046). The quoted emendation is on page 499. In a similar way, Arabic transcriptions of some Ottoman Turkish words are found in the copy in the Herzog-August-Bibliothek of Wolfenbüttel (Xb 3116), but these notes are most likely from a later period.

<sup>61</sup> „Ex donatione Dni Autoris possid. M Andr. Müllerus Griffenhagius”, runs the possessor's note in the copy quoted in the previous note. It was because of his rather common family name that Müller got used to specify his place of birth, the Pomeranian town of Greiffenhagen in his name.

contemporary. He became a committed Orientalist already during his university years, and when he came back from England in the early 1660s, he won the favor of Frederick William, who gave him the post of a minister first in Bernau, later in the St. Nicholas Church of Berlin, a position that he also held during the Brandenburg years of Jakab Harsányi. Besides his ecclesiastical duties, Müller regularly found time to use his knowledge of Turkish, Persian, Syrian and Arabic languages as the expert of the Electoral Library concerning Oriental manuscripts. His most ambitious endeavor was however connected not to these languages: it was in the early 1670s when he published several books concerning China and announced to Frederick William that he managed to develop a method with which the Chinese script can be learned in a very short time. The news of this, taken with excitement by the *Respublica Litteraria*, was however not followed by the much-expected publication of the *Clavis Sinica*: Müller denied sharing details about his innovation, and two days before his death burned all his manuscripts. Therefore, it remained an open question until today whether Müller, who proved his versatile linguistic expertise several times, did not try to seem something more this time than he actually was.<sup>62</sup>

It would be obvious to suppose that the two experts of the Orient living in the court of the Elector cultivated a good relationship; from the possessor's note of the Warsaw copy of the *Colloquia* it is at least clear that they knew each other personally. It was however not easy to get on friendly terms with Andreas Müller: some debates indulging in personalities were noted in his biography and it was most probably due to his controversial nature that he lost Frederick William's favor in the mid-1670s, and even his post in 1685, after which he moved to his wife's native town of Stettin. Hiob

---

<sup>62</sup> The biography of Müller was compiled by Lothar Noack, "Der Berliner Probst, Orientalist und Sinologe Andreas Müller (1630–1694)," *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 157, no. 1 (1995): 1–39. See also Lothar Noack and Jürgen Splett, *Bio-Bibliographien: Brandenburgische Gelehrte der Frühen Neuzeit: Berlin–Cölln 1640–1688*, Veröffentlichungen zur brandenburgischen Kulturgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit (Berlin: Academia, 1997), 272–293.

Ludolf, the first Early Modern European expert on Ethiopia, who stayed in contact with him for a long time, wrote about Müller after his death: “Too often was I irritated by his sharp letters, his aphoristic and enigmatic writings; I broke off my correspondence with him. [...] It is simply too bad that so much linguistic learning was packed into such a heteroclitite mind.”<sup>63</sup> This sullenness of Müller would have not necessarily led to the result that he had no friendly contact with Harsányi, but no data survived about this. It is probably less surprising that Müller did not involve the Hungarian emigrant to projects that provided him with financial gains – at least, he is mentioned nowhere in the documents concerning the cataloguing of the Oriental manuscripts in the Electoral Library.<sup>64</sup> It is much more indicative that Harsányi was not used by Müller even when he needed Hungarian-related information for his own research. In his booklet that includes the Lord’s Prayer in more than hundred languages, the Hungarian version was taken from Albert Szenci Molnár’s *Nova grammatica Ungarica* (with some mistakes); and the letters of the Szekler script were sent to him by a Hungarian theologian in Vienna for his collection of alphabets.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Letter of Hiob Ludolf to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (Frankfurt/Main, 7 September 1695) John T. Waterman, ed., *Leibniz and Ludolf on Things Linguistic: Excerpts from Their Correspondence (1688–1703)*, University of California Publications on Linguistics, no. 88 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 35–36. I changed the term in the translation of Waterman “perverse mind” back to the one suggested by the original Latin “mentem heteroclytum”, to render the meaning of the pun. cf. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Allgemeiner politischer und historischer Briefwechsel*, vol. 11, *Januar–Oktober 1695*, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz sämtliche Schriften und Briefe, ser. 1, no. 11, ed. Wolfgang Bungies, Albert Heinekamp and Franz Schupp (Berlin: Akademie, 1982), 673. On the vicissitudes of Müller, see Noack, “Der Berliner Probst,” 12–20. It seems that Müller was not aware of the antipathy of Ludolf, because one month before his death, he wrote him a letter discussing various academic questions and calling him an old friend (“amico veteri”) (Stettin, 14[24] September 1694) UB Frankfurt Ms. Ff. Ludolf nr. 514.

<sup>64</sup> See the documents concerning the purchase of the legacies during Harsányi’s lifetime, such as that of the late Orientalist and professor from Königsberg, Theodor Petraeus in Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Handschriftenabteilung (= SBB PK) Acta III.B.2. és Acta III.C.1.

<sup>65</sup> The edition of the versions of the Lord’s Prayer was published during Harsányi’s lifetime, see *Oratio orationum SS Orationis Dominicae versiones praeter Authenticam fere Centum eaeque longe emendatius quam antehac et e probatissimis Auctoribus potius quam prioribus Collectionibus, Jamque singulae genuinis Linguae suae characteribus*, ed. by Barnim Hagius (= Andreas Müller) (Berlin: Runge, 1680). The Hungarian version is on page 58; the pages containing the alphabets are unnumbered. Beside the „Szekelicum Alphabetum” one finds the following source quotation: „Szekelicum Alphabetum Vienna ad me misit Franc. Sakius, Hungarus, Theol. Doct. Qvod & anno 1674. d. 18. Febr. Berolini accepi.” The rest of the explanations about this alphabet are taken from Albert

There is however a single point where the contacts with Andreas Müller might have played a role in the life of Jakab Harsányi Nagy: it is the plans for re-publishing the *Colloquia*. As mentioned before, in the foreword of his work Harsányi floated the possibility that “when the storms of the war calm down, these colloquia would be republished in a more exquisite form, expanded and put in a better order, in the Netherlands or England, where the cutters and Arabic characters abound.”<sup>66</sup> The Hungarian emigrant did not talk at random: from the second part of 1676, there are several data known that he asked permission from Frederick William to leave his court, so that he could travel to England through the Netherlands, and try to get his book re-published. It is also very likely that he could not collect money for his travel expenses until the winter of 1676–1677, so he stayed in Berlin in this period.<sup>67</sup> One year later, however, he surely had not been in the capital of the Elector. Namely, in December 1677 another Tatar envoy came to Frederick William, who was by that time laying siege on Stettin; and he brought some letters from the Khan that had to be translated. Otto von Schwerin turned to Andreas Müller first, but when the Orientalist excused himself – claiming that he had not practiced the language for a long time, therefore he could not take upon himself a task of so huge responsibility – the letters were translated by an interpreter who had no direct connections to the court of

---

Szenci Molnár's book. Cf. Albert Szenczi Molnár, *Novae grammaticae ungaricae libri duo / Új magyar grammatika két könyvben*, A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság kiadványai, no. 222, trans. Zsuzsa C. Vladár (Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 2004), 426.

<sup>66</sup> „[...] tempestatibus belli sedatis, nostra haec Colloquia, aucta, ac in ordinem meliorem redacta, in Batavia, vel Anglia, ubi et Amanuenses et typi Arabici commodiores, nitidius recudentur.” *Colloquia*, praefatio, 3r.

<sup>67</sup> About this, he informed the members of the Secret Council in his memorial quoted in note 59 (fol. 59). Frederick William gave permission for Harsányi to leave on the 31 July[/10 August], but on the 15/25 October he still had to give orders for the payment of the debts of the Chambers towards Harsányi so that the Hungarian Counselor could start his journey. During his absence, Harsányi was supposed to get his salary, but he had to renounce his daily allowance (the so-called *Kostgeld*). See the quoted letters in GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 52–61.

Brandenburg.<sup>68</sup> Harsányi's name does not appear at all in the correspondence; the idea did not even emerge that the letters could have been translated by him – which, taken into account the role he played during the previous two Tatar embassies, must mean that he was not in Brandenburg by that time. As we have no data at all about the Hungarian Counselor from the year 1677, we do not know when he started his journey, neither when he came back: the next information that indicates that he was in Berlin, comes from December 1678.<sup>69</sup>

We have no direct data on where Harsányi was during this period, but it is possible to formulate some hypotheses about it. It is obvious that organizing the republication of his book was not supposed to be started on the spot, as travel expenses must have been rather high, and Harsányi was not in the financial position to risk investing them in vain if he would have tried to map up the available printers and the interest of the public only after his arrival to England. An excellent opportunity was on the other hand offered by the ways the *Respublica Litteraria* functioned: the ongoing correspondence between scholars was useful not only for informing each other about novelties on the book market and new results of research, but also for a newcomer in the academic world with specific interests to find the person who would have been most helpful for his endeavors.<sup>70</sup> And Harsányi knew a person who could

---

<sup>68</sup> The documents of the Tatar embassy of 1677 are in GStA PK Rep. 11. 271a. Tartarei Fasz. 5. On the questions of translation, see primarily the letter of Frederick William to Otto von Schwerin (Camp by Stettin, 9[19] December 1677), and his response (Cölln an der Spree, 12[22] December 1677). The letters were at last translated by a certain „Giesius”, who earlier served as interpreter in the court of the Saxon Elector; he was paid 12 dollars in exchange.

<sup>69</sup> Although the order of Frederick William to Michael Matthias (Cölln an der Spree, 1678. dec. 7[17].., GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 63r) does not explicitly state that Harsányi would have been in Brandenburg again, it nevertheless implies the presence of the Hungarian Counselor: orders regarding the payment of arrears from his were always the results of his personal complaints.

<sup>70</sup> On this function of the *Respublica Litteraria*, see Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters 1680–1750* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 12–53.

provide him with a contact to the network of the *Respublica Litteraria*: Andreas Müller.

Müller visited England before 1660 and co-operated with Edmund Castell, who later, as a professor of Arabic in Cambridge, contributed to Oriental studies with the enterprise of *Lexicon Heptaglotton*. For the preparatory works of this dictionary, that represented simultaneously the Hebrew, Chaldean, Syrian, Arabic, Samaritan, Ethiopian and Persian languages, Castell relied on the help of many English and foreign colleagues; and although there is no direct data suggesting that Müller would have been among them, it seems that the two scholars remained in contact – even if only indirectly – after the departure of the German Orientalist from England. Müller dedicated a book, published in 1671, to Castell, praising the Cambridge professor for the *Lexicon*, that left the press one year earlier, and mentioning that ten years before he had had the pleasure to enjoy the hospitality of the English scholar together with his compatriot, Martin Murray.<sup>71</sup> Although there is no data about the existence of a correspondence between Müller and Castell later on, it is possible that Harsányi tried to use the contacts between the two scholars for his own purposes. If no other way would have been possible, they nevertheless could get into contact through Murray, who had been one of the most assiduous assistant of the Cambridge professor during the works of the *Lexicon* (they stood in permanent contact between 1658 and 1669),

---

<sup>71</sup> Andreas Müller, *Disquisitio Geographica & historica, de Chataja, in qua I. Praecipue Geographorum nobilis illa Controversia: Quenam Chataja sit, & an sit idem ille terrarum tractus, quem Sinas, & vulgo Chinam vocant, aut pars ejus aliqua? latissime tractatur; 2. Eadem vero opera pleraque rerum, quae unquam de Chataja, deque Sinis memorabilia fuerunt, atque etiam nunc sunt, compendiose enarrantur* (Berlin: Runge, 1671). On Edmund Castell, see Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom*, 251–265; H.T. Norris, “Professor Edmund Castell (1606–85), Orientalist and Divine, and England’s Oldest Arabic Inscription,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 29 (1984): 155–167; Idem, “Edmund Castell (1606–86) and His *Lexicon Heptaglotton* (1669),” in *The ‘Arabick’ Interest of the Natural Philosophy in Seventeenth-Century England*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, no. 47, ed. G. A. Russell (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 70–87.



while his name also reoccurs in Müller's surviving correspondence, even as late as in 1683.<sup>72</sup>

We do not know whether Harsányi really tried to find a new publisher for his *Colloquia* through Castell (eventually with the mediation of Murray). It is not even clear whether he did go all the way to England, or stopped already in the Netherlands – although it would have been even more problematic to find support for his project there: Oriental studies were exactly in that time experiencing a stagnation, as after the death of the main actor of the first upheaval, Jacobus Golius, no able successor was found to fill his post in Leiden.<sup>73</sup> If Harsányi wanted to get to English publishers through Castell, it might not have been a perfect choice anyway: the preparations of the *Lexicon Heptaglotton* took so much time that Thomas Roycroft, the printer who had earlier volunteered to sponsor the project, gave up on it, and although the Cambridge professor managed to find the financial means for the publication, the distribution proved to be a failure and several hundreds of copies remained unsold in his possession.<sup>74</sup> It is clear that, if the re-publication of *Colloquia* was planned in co-operation with him, the endeavor must have failed on the question of finances. Beyond all the hypotheses above, one thing remains a fact: the *Colloquia Familiaria*

<sup>72</sup> On Murray, see Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom*, 259. He is mentioned for the first time in Castell's correspondence in a letter written to Samuel Clarke (s. l., 6[16] April 1658) British Library (in the following: BL) Ms Add. 22905 fol. 11–12. Castell referred to his assistant as “amicus intimus” in a letter to Hiob Ludolf (London, 27 March 1664) UB Frankfurt Ms. Ff. Ludolf Nr. 154. Andreas Müller referred to Murray in a letter to James Pragestus (Berlin, 30 January[9 February] 1683) BL Ms Sloane 1381. fol. 88.

<sup>73</sup> Jan Brugman, “Arabic Scholarship,” in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century – An Exchange of Learning*, ed. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurler and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes (Leiden: Universitaire Pers and Brill, 1975), 203–215.

<sup>74</sup> Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom*, 262–264. It has to be mentioned nevertheless that some data weaken the hypothesis about the contact between Harsányi and Castell: in the library of the Cambridge professor – according to the auction catalogue compiled after his death – there was no copy of the *Colloquia*, see *Bibliotheca Castelliana, sive Catalogus variorum librorum plurimis facultatibus insignium, R. Doct. V. Edm. Castelli, D.D. Nuperrime Linguae Arabicae Professoris in Academia Cantab. Quos ingenti Sumptu, et Summa Diligentia ex ultimis Europae partibus sibi procuravit, quorum Auctio habenda est (in Gratiam, et Commodum Eruditorum Academ. Cantab.) Aedibus Rob. Skyrings, apud insignum Aquilae et Infantis ex adverso Ecclesiae S. Benedicti, Cantab. 30 die Junii 1686*. (London: Edward Millington, 1686) (in the following: BC).

*Turcico Latina* was not re-published and – surely partly due to this – its reception also remained limited.

#### ***IV.4. A Hungarian Emigrant in Berlin***

The *Colloquia* was – not altogether unexpectedly – dedicated to Frederick William: Harsányi elaborated on how grateful he was for having been accepted at the court of the Elector and given the possibility to anchor after all the vicissitudes of his earlier life. It is then all the more surprising that in two of the fifteen known copies, this text is missing, and its place is filled with a laudation to Gustav Adolph, Prince of Mecklenburg-Güstrow in the same length as given by the Hungarian Counselor to the praise of the Elector. This phenomenon is understandable from the technical point of view of printing – the alternative dedication was not supposed to restructure the further pages –, but from the perspective of prestige, it produced a rather remarkable situation. The solution itself, that a book was published with two different dedications, is very uncommon, and we do not know how the Hungarian emigrant could persuade the printers, whose main source of existence was provided by commissions from the court, to participate in this disrespectful act. The text of the dedication for Gustav Adolph also does not make it clear why he was given the same laudation by Harsányi as the person who gave the Hungarian emigrant his salary: Harsányi unveiled only the motivation that he had never been welcomed in a friendlier manner during his travels anywhere than in Güstrow.<sup>75</sup>

The interpretation of this phenomenon becomes possible if one takes into consideration Harsányi's petitions to the court of Brandenburg from the same period. In November 1672, the Hungarian Counselor wrote a desperate memorial to Frederick

---

<sup>75</sup> See the dedication to Gustav Adolph, registered in earlier research as the B version of the *Colloquia*, in the copies of Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, and Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Jena (signatures RMK III. 2586; respectively 8 Gl. II, 175).

William and his Secret Counselors, in which, although he secured the leading politicians of Brandenburg of his gratefulness and allegiance, he also noted that if he would not get the arrears of his salary, he was bound to leave the service of the Elector. From a later reference, it also becomes clear what he did not mention by that time: that he had received “honest invitations from other Princes.”<sup>76</sup> It is then not hard to identify that the invitation must have come from Gustav Adolph, whom the Hungarian emigrant had met in 1665, still in the service of Gheorghe Ștefan; and it seems he must have made a good impression on the Prince of Mecklenburg, under whose rule Güstrow was built out to be a decent princely residence – even if its relevance obviously remained much smaller than that of the Elector’s court. Unfortunately, no documentation survives about the contacts between the two of them, therefore we cannot know in what quality was Gustav Adolph about to employ Harsányi: the limited political horizons of the Principality of Mecklenburg-Güstrow certainly did not render the employment of an expert in Ottoman issues necessary.<sup>77</sup> Frederick William, on the other hand, insisted that in such a politically dangerous situation, when Turkish, Tatar and Russian envoys were expected to come to the Brandenburg court, Harsányi was not permitted to leave, and he ordered the payment of the remainders of his allowances.<sup>78</sup>

It seems however that this question remained the permanent problem of Jakab Harsányi Nagy’s stay in Berlin. The Hungarian Counselor frequently had to besiege

<sup>76</sup> “[...] vocationem honestam ab aliis Principibus habens” Petition of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William ([Berlin, October–November 1674]) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 46. Cf. his memorials to Frederick William and the Secret Counselors of Brandenburg (Berlin, 19[29] November 1672) *ibid.* fol. 21–24.

<sup>77</sup> On the person and court of Gustav Adolph, see Steffen Stuth, *Höfe und Residenzen: Untersuchungen zu den Höfen der Herzöge von Mecklenburg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Studien aus den Landesarchiven Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, no. 4 (Bremen – Rostock: Temmen, 2001), 230–267. Although some documents from the Prince’s correspondence with contemporary intellectuals survive, letters to or from Harsányi are not among them, see LHAS 2.12–1/24. nr. 242.

<sup>78</sup> Order of Frederick William to his Counselors (Rüsselsheim, 30 November[10 December] 1672) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 47.

the Elector and the Secret Counsel with his petitions: in 1670 he could report an arrear of 650 dollars, which grew to 834 till 1672, and the residue overstepped one year later even 900 dollars, the equivalent of three years' salary.<sup>79</sup> The petitions did not remain unanswered: Frederick William and his Counselors sent in each occasion order to the Chamberlain Michael Matthias to make up the arrears and pay regularly in the future.<sup>80</sup> Alas, as the Chamberlain explicated in a letter from 1673, he could not pay the money that was not in the treasury, and Harsányi could get his salary only after the payment of all those who were essential for the functioning of the court, if there was anything left. Matthias could thus only promise that the next time he will favor Harsányi and then one of the Counselors of the Chambers' Court (*Kammergerichtsrat*) would remain unpaid.<sup>81</sup> It seems that Harsányi's next step in 1673, when he did not even ask the Elector to pay his arrears, only petitioned for his release from the court, turned out to be more effective. Frederick William, with respect to the ongoing Polish–Ottoman war, did not let his Counselor go, and it is very likely that he took the advice of his Secret Counselors and let the arrears be paid from an alternative budget instead of the *Hofrentei*, that was supposed to cover the expenses of the court.<sup>82</sup> Even if the entire sum may have not been made up for, it seems that the situation was stabilized, as no further complaints are known from Harsányi in the next years.

---

<sup>79</sup> The growing sum can be well followed from the petitions of Harsányi to Frederick William and the Secret Counsellors (Berlin, 30 September[/10 October] 1670, 19[/29] November 1672, respectively Werder, 11[/21] September 1673) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 6, 21, resp. 39.

<sup>80</sup> Postscript to the letter of Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz to Frederick William (Cölln an der Spree, 1[/11] October 1670); order of Frederick William to his Counselors (quoted in note 78); order of Frederick William to Michael Matthias (Oranienburg, 19/29 September 1673) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 4, 47, resp. 41.

<sup>81</sup> Letter of Michael Matthias to Frederick William (Cölln an der Spree, 29 August[/8 September] 1673) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 34.

<sup>82</sup> Letter of Somnitz, Blumenthal, Köppen and Meinders to Frederick William (Cölln an der Spree, 15[/25] September 1673) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 36.

There are data about tumultuous scenes in the documents concerning the court's debts towards Harsányi: according to the petition of the Hungarian Counselor, Matthias did not only refuse to pay for him, but also let his servant be thrown out from the office, using rather harsh language, and even told the guards not to let him in ever again.<sup>83</sup> Although this probably was the result of the aggressive attitude of the solicitant, the episode illustrates quite well the tension caused by the lack of money: Harsányi must have had serious problems in the early 1670s with keeping his creditors at bay. When his landlord between the November of 1669 and August of 1670, the goldsmith Andreas Molin turned to the electoral authorities to collect the arrears of Harsányi's costs of quarter and boarding, the Hungarian Counselor – who readily acknowledged the debts, pointing to the irregular payment of his salary as a reason for it – also noted in an indignant tone the scenes made by Molin's wife, who used to address him in these occasions as the “old dog”.<sup>84</sup> It is hardly surprising that Harsányi left this lodging after less than one year. It is not clear whether he moved immediately to Friedrichswerder, the newly built part of the Electoral seat, but some data show that he lived there during 1672.<sup>85</sup>

Brandenburg suffered considerable damages during the Thirty Years War. Its center, which lost one third of its population, was from the administrative point of view actually two towns: Cölln that was situated on the island in the river Spree, and Berlin, to the Northeast, on the right side of the river. When, after the Peace of Westphalia, Frederick resettled his electoral residence from Königsberg, which was in a safe distance from the military activities, the twin towns underwent a quick

<sup>83</sup> Petition of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to the Secret Counselors (Werder, 11[/21] September 1673), quoted in note 79, fol. 39r.

<sup>84</sup> Petition of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William ([Berlin, October–November 1674]), quoted in note 21, fol. 46r.

<sup>85</sup> The foreword of the *Colloquia* is dated from there (from 1[/11] August 1672), as well as one of his petitions to the Counselors of Brandenburg from September 1673, quoted in note 79.

development. This was pivoted primarily by the court itself: the state administration, in order to support an effective management of the issues of the Elector, grew continuously in size and thereby contributed, both in a direct and indirect way – through the artisans and merchants flowing to satisfy the emerging demand of consumption – to the population growth of the town. The number of inhabitants from the years before the Thirty Years War (around 10.000) was nevertheless only reached around 1680 again. Although their most important influx took place from the second half of the 1680s, Harsányi could still see the first group of Huguenots arriving to Berlin from France.<sup>86</sup>

The growing numbers of the population also resulted in the growth of the town's territory. On the marshy fields at the Southwestern shores of the Spree, there had already been some houses even before 1658, but its actual settlement started only in that year, together with the fortification of the twin towns. In the 1660s, many houses were built in the suburb that even received the right of self-government under the name of Friedrichswerder in 1662: it was mainly people connected to the court that moved here. Although some of them were of high rank – such as the field marshal Otto Friedrich von Sparr, or Secret Counselor Johann von Hoverbeck – the townscape may have not been very elegant in the lifetime of Harsányi. Although frequent orders were given for paving the streets, in the late 1670s it was still not done; also, services were held in the town hall, finished in 1672, because the suburb did not have a church of its own. It must not have helped the comfort of the population that some parts of the territory were still unpopulated and marshy. Considering the financial circumstances

---

<sup>86</sup> On Berlin in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, see Eberhard Faden, "Festung und Hauptstadt unter dem Großen Kurfürsten und dem ersten König," in Max Arendt, Eberhard Faden and Otto Friedrich Gandert, *Geschichte der Stadt Berlin: Festschrift zur 700-Jahr-Feier der Reichshauptstadt* (Berlin: Mittler, 1937), 171–229; Felix Escher, "Die brandenburgisch-preußische Residenz und Hauptstadt Berlin im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert," in *Geschichte Berlins*, vol. 1, *Von der Frühgeschichte bis zur Industrialisierung*, ed. Wolfgang Ribbe (Munich: Beck, 1987), 343–403.

of the Hungarian Counselor, it is unlikely that he would have let his own house be built in the new suburb – several data suggest that houses were built or purchased for a sum of 700–800 dollars –; which means that he must have rented his lodgings.<sup>87</sup>

This fact does not however suggest that Harsányi would have lived a retired life: various sources show that the Hungarian Counselor was regularly visited by his peregrinating compatriots and he played an important role in maintaining the contacts of these people at foreign universities and their home country. We do not know whether he had any contacts with Transylvania during the 1660s, when he had been in the service of Gheorghe Ștefan, but it is clear that in a very short time after becoming the Court Counselor, still during the year of 1667, he got acquainted to a Hungarian student in Berlin.<sup>88</sup> Pál Csernátoni was by this time an experienced traveler – he left Transylvania almost six years before as the tutor of Miklós Bethlen –, but it must have been useful for him as well that the Hungarian Counselor “welcomed him with joy, as a compatriot its compatriot”, and probably helped him find his way in the Electoral residence town.<sup>89</sup> In the next years, many of his colleagues also visited the Hungarian emigrant. We do not exactly know, how many they were, but even the number of

<sup>87</sup> The data about Friedrichswerder are taken from the very thorough monograph about the settlement of the suburb: Erika Schachinger, *Die Berliner Vorstadt Friedrichswerder 1658–1708*, Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven preußischer Kulturbesitz, Beihefte, no. 4 (Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau, 1993).

<sup>88</sup> His entry to the album of Pál Csernátoni (under the date “1667. Berolini”) survived in a rather extraordinary way. The original album is not known, but in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, István Kocsi Csergő annotated for himself those entries he considered most important, and this selection survived in the manuscript collection of the Sárospatak theologian: SNK Kt. 403. 666.

<sup>89</sup> “Nob. ac Cl. Dno P. Cs. in Hungariam redituro lubens meritoque Conterraneo Conterraneus grat. lubensque apposuit”, *ibid.* Csernátoni started his peregrination as the tutor of Miklós Bethlen, matriculated at the University of Heidelberg in 1661, and later in Utrecht and Leiden during 1662 and 1663, in his company. He most probably followed the young aristocrat also to England, but not to France: he returned to Leiden instead with Miklós’ younger brother, Pál. In 1665, he was the student of the University of Basle. See Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, nr. 2229; Bethlen, “Élete leírása”, 566–588; János Herepei, “Az öreg Comenius néhány magyar hive (Magyar diákok Amszterdamban)” (Some Hungarian followers of the old Comenius: Hungarian students in Amsterdam), in *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 3, *Művelődési törekvések a század második felében: Herepei János cikkei* (Cultural movements in the second half of the century: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1971), 400–403.

those who are known by name, is considerable. Sándor Felvinczi visited him most probably in 1668, Pál Tarczali Junior supposedly in 1670, while János Horváti Békés and his co-travelers met him in Berlin in 1671, Ferenc Pápai Páriz, Pál Viski and Péter Gyöngyösi in 1672, whereas Sámuel Hodosi in 1679.<sup>90</sup>

From the travel diaries of Horváti Békés and Pápai Páriz, we also learn what kind of help the students could expect from Harsányi. The former reported that the Hungarian Counselor did not only get accommodation for him and his co-travelers, but even gave them money for their expenses in Berlin. He also showed them – and also to Pápai Páriz – the important sights of the Electoral residence: the cabinet of curiosities, the armory, the library and the *Lustgarten*, established next to the palace in the previous decade, which, apart from being a pleasant park, also served the education of the students in its quality as an arboretum. Both travelers noted that after their one-week stay, Harsányi even invited them for a feast to himself before their departure.<sup>91</sup> The help he gave to the students did not end here, however: several data suggests that the contacts between the students at German, Dutch and English universities, and Transylvania were kept through him. Horváti Békés, by that time at the University of Marburg, noted twice during 1672 that letters from home reached him through Harsányi and he also made a deal with Pál Hunyadi, a student returning

---

<sup>90</sup> In the cases of both Tarczali and Felvinczi, it is the dedications of their books that refer to their acquaintance with Harsányi. Sándor Felvinczi, *Disputationum theologicarum absurditates Papisticas ex Concilio Tridentino, & aliis Prontificiis Doctoribus exhibentium septima et octava...* (Leiden: Elsevir, 1669), A1v. See the dedication of Tarczali's book quoted verbatim in chapter I, note 3. Felvinczi matriculated at a foreign university in 1668 for the first time (in Groningen), whereas Tarczali in October 1671 in Leiden – their meetings with Harsányi in Berlin must have taken place in the same year, cf. Szabó and Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása*, nr. 37; Zoványi, *Magyarországi protestáns egyháztörténeti lexikon*, 197, 620. The visits of Horváti Békés and Pápai Páriz are documented by their travel diaries; the former travelled together with Ferenc Otrokócsi Fóris, Pál P. Pányoki and Péter Selyki. On Viski and Gyöngyösi, also see the latter: Horváti Békés, *Diáknaplója*, 5, 33; Pápai Páriz, *Békességet*, 145. Pápai also mentioned a certain „Adam Scemnicus” whom he met at Harsányi's, but it is not clear whether he also was a student on his peregrination. On Sámuel Hodosi, see the entry of Harsányi in the student's album amicorum: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (in the following: OSZK) Oct. Lat. 777. fol. 45v.

<sup>91</sup> Horváti Békés, *Diáknaplója*, 33; Pápai Páriz, *Békességet*, 145.



from his peregrination that he will repay the money borrowed from Horváti Békés through the Hungarian Counselor at the Brandenburg court.<sup>92</sup>

Unsurprisingly, several of the students who visited Harsányi commemorated him gratefully later on. When Pápai Páriz received his doctoral title in Basle, he sent one copy of his dissertation – and also his funeral oration over Horváti Békés, who died in Switzerland in the meantime – to the Hungarian Counselor. The way he did it deserves attention from the perspective of Harsányi's network and interests: Pápai Páriz namely sent the books to his former professor, Paul Ammann, who taught botany in Leipzig and asked him to give them to the Hungarian emigrant who was going to visit the fair – probably the famous book fair, which had already been organized regularly in this period – in the beginning of next year.<sup>93</sup> The greatest appreciation was given to Harsányi from Sándor Felvinczi, who greeted him with an eloquent laudation in the dedication of his printed disputation: he presented the Hungarian emigrant as the solidest warrior of the Reformed religion and the ancient virtues, a man committed to scholars and scholarship, also – through the help given to students – the pillar of the cause of God and a true patriot.<sup>94</sup>

There are some earlier examples for Hungarians living abroad and helping the students from Hungary and Transylvania who visited universities in their domiciles. If Harsányi did meet János Bánfihunyadi during his peregrination, his personal example

<sup>92</sup> Horváti Békés, *Diáknaplója*, 58, 79.

<sup>93</sup> Letter of Ferenc Pápai Páriz to Paul Ammann (Basle, 1 November 1674) Pápai Páriz, *Békességet*, 405. Paul Ammann became the professor of botany in Leipzig in that year: the first great epoch of the botanic garden at the university is connected to his name, see Werner Reißer, "Botanik," in *Geschichte der Universität Leipzig 1409–2009*, vol. 4, *Fakultäten, Institute, Einrichtungen*, ed. Ulrich von Hehl, Uwe John and Manfred Rudersdorf (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2009), 1125. Unfortunately, his legacy did not survive, therefore it is not possible to say whether his contacts with Harsányi were limited to this book transfer: in any case, their diverging scholarly interests did not predestine them for a more intimate friendship.

<sup>94</sup> "Reformatae Religionis, avitaeque virtutis propugnatori constantissimo; ad Magnalia Regnorum Christianorum, ac Principum Praepotent. ab ipsis cunabulis educato: Heroico erga literas, & literatos spiritu induto: causam Dei in Peregrinis studiorum causa peregre proficientibus (maxime vero Patriae filii) zelose promovere annitenti," Felvinczi, *Disputationum theologicarum absurditates*, A1v.

could have provided the motivation to offer his assistance to the future theologians traveling through Berlin. There are also some people known from contemporary London who helped students on their peregrination: Pál P. Jászberényi, who supported Miklós Bethlen during his stay in London was not alive any more, but the students traveling there could surely count on the assistance of György Szilágyi (Sylvanus), Péter Almási and other Hungarians, who made a living mainly as Latin teachers.<sup>95</sup> The situation of Jakab Harsányi Nagy was somewhat different, because he lived in Berlin, a place much more central for the communication of the students with each other and home than London, which was usually the furthest station of the journey for those who visited it. At the same time, Harsányi is depicted as a remarkably unselfish person by the data, which prove that, although his financial conditions were far from untroubled due to the irregular payment of his salary, he gave money to the students from his own pocket. It seems that, just as in the case of his other services, such as that of the Turkish Scribe or political counseling for the Elector, Harsányi did not spare the effort in this self-imposed role of assistance to the students either.

His activities seem to have been well known in Transylvania. Before starting his peregrination, János Horváti Békés was given detailed instructions – probably by the Reformed Bishop Péter I. Kovásznai – about the technical details of his journey, in which he was directed to Harsányi. We also know that he gave a letter of Prince Mihály Apafi to the Hungarian emigrant.<sup>96</sup> The leading politicians of the Principality were thus counting on Harsányi, and not only as a guardian of the students, but also, as it turns out, as a politician. His name was mentioned for the first time in the

<sup>95</sup> György Gömöri, “Nagy utazók és emigránsok: Magyarok a Restauráció-korabeli Londonban” (Great travelers and emigrants: Hungarians in London of the Age of the Restoration), *Forrás* 34, no. 2 (2002): 64–72; Idem, “Magyar tanárok a 17. századi Londonban” (Hungarian teachers in 17<sup>th</sup> century London), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 108 (2004): 456–465.

<sup>96</sup> Horváti Békés, *Diáknaplója*, 28, 33.

correspondence of the Transylvanian elite in 1670, to resurface several times during the next two years.

The foreign policy of the Principality of Transylvania traditionally followed the events in the Kingdom of Hungary, especially the relationship between the King and the Protestant estates, with great interest: the Princes led several campaigns against the Habsburgs in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, legitimizing their actions with references to the dire state of their co-religionists. Their interference in the issues of their direct neighborhood was completed with far-flung international orientation: until the crisis of the late 1650s – during which the Principality lost a third of its territory and the Sublime Porte strengthened its dependence – Transylvania was an active member of the European political scene, primarily through its contacts to the Protestant system of alliances. After an interval of more than ten years, in 1670, it seemed that a renewal of these connections would be necessary, because – after a longer period of calm – the Court of Vienna used a failed revolt of the leading politicians of the Kingdom as a pretext and gave free way to violent Counter-Reformation movements.<sup>97</sup>

For the foreign policy of Transylvania, whose main occupation in the preceding ten years had been to resist the recurring claims of the Sublime Porte and the Pashas of the bordering provinces, this renewal of the Protestant system of alliances proved to be not feasible. Chancellor János Bethlen, and his son Miklós tried

---

<sup>97</sup> László Benczédi, *Rendiség, abszolutizmus és centralizáció a XVII. század végi Magyarországon (1664–1685)* (Estates, absolutism and centralization in late 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungary), *Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből*, n. s., no. 91 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980), 24–57. On the argumentation providing the ideological reasoning behind the attempts for Counter-Reformation, see Tamás Esze, “Bársony György ‘Veritas’-a” (The “Veritas” of György Bársony), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 75 (1971): 667–693; Joachim Bahlcke, “‘Veritas toti mundo declarata:’ Der publizistische Diskurs um Religionsfreiheit, Verfassungsordnung und Kirchenrecht in Ungarn im letzten Drittel des 17. Jahrhunderts – eine Fallstudie,” in *Konfessionelle Pluralität als Herausforderung: Koexistenz und Konflikt in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit: Winfried Eberhard zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke, Karen Lambrecht and Hans-Christian Maner (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2006), 553–574.

in 1670 and again two years later to convince Prince Mihály Apafi to send an envoy, or at least a letter to the Electors of the Holy Roman Empire to mobilize them.<sup>98</sup> In organizing the protest against the Emperor's activities, the two Bethlens intended to give a key role to the Elector of Brandenburg – being an exceedingly important Calvinist Prince of the Empire – and in this context planned to use Harsányi as a mediator.

The Hungarian Counselor of Brandenburg was first mentioned in Miklós Bethlen's project in 1670. His importance was emphasized by another letter of the Transylvanian aristocrat from the next year: according to Bethlen, as Jakab Harsányi was a “man who had seen, heard and learned a lot”, he could give precise information to the Transylvanian politicians concerning the news circulating in the Holy Roman Empire about the miseries of the Protestants in Hungary, and also authentically judge the perspective reactions of various European Princes. In order to use Harsányi's knowledge, Bethlen suggested that the Hungarian emigrant should be invited to Transylvania and be sent some money for his travel expenses – as he explained it would have been unfair to expect that the Elector, whose political assistance was to be won, should have provided the necessary expenses as well. All the more so, because, as Bethlen emphasized, Harsányi's journey was not meant to look like an official mission (which would have caused complications in the relationship with the Emperor), rather like a private visit back home.<sup>99</sup> On the spring of 1672 it seemed that

<sup>98</sup> On the plan of informing the Electors and its failure, see Zs. Trócsányi, *Teleki*, 100–101, 110–112. The passages from sources that are relevant for the question were republished in the notes of József Jankovics, ed., *Bethlen Miklós levelei (1657–1698)* (The letters of Miklós Bethlen, 1657–1698), vol. 1, Régi magyar prózai emlékek, no. 6/1 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987) (in the following: BML I), 646–647, 656–658.

<sup>99</sup> Letter of Miklós Bethlen to Mihály Teleki (Torda, 22 October 1671) BML I: 239–241. According to Zsolt Trócsányi, Harsányi had written to Prince Mihály Apafi himself about his intentions to go home. However the above quoted source, that he also refers to, only suggests that the Hungarian Counselor sent a letter to Apafi (without the specification of its contents), and that it was Bethlen who proposed that he should be invited to Transylvania. Cf. Zs. Trócsányi, *Teleki*, 110. On the first appearance of

there was no obstacle left to taking the contact with Brandenburg. As Apafi did not like the idea to dedicate a larger sum for sending the envoy, Bethlen completed the money to be sent to Harsányi (50 dollars) from his own budget and the letters were given to a Saxon student going to foreign universities. According to the correspondence of the Transylvanian aristocrat, he counted upon Harsányi to build up an information network for the Principality: he did not only want to send him ciphers for the security of their communication, but also was going to ask him to find a diplomatic agent in Cracow who could transfer the letters.<sup>100</sup> The project however failed: the letters written to various European rulers were revised several times by Transylvanian Counselors in order to weed out any remarks that could have been insulting for the Emperor or the Sultan and lead to diplomatic complications, but then they were not sent anyways.<sup>101</sup>

We do not know whether the request from Transylvania to intervene in the interest of the Protestants of Hungary had reached Harsányi at last. Ironically, the only concrete information we have about the Hungarian emigrant's connection to the “decade of misery for Protestants” shows that his planned involvement had only a negative influence on the events, as the letter of Apafi to him was used as a proof in the legal process against Protestant preachers in 1674.<sup>102</sup> The Hungarian Counselor could obviously intervene out of his own initiative by Frederick William for the cause

---

Harsányi on the horizon of Miklós Bethlen's plans, see his letter to János Bethlen, Dénes Bánffy and Mihály Teleki (Bethlenszentmiklós, 13 October 1670) BML I: 231.

<sup>100</sup> Letter of Miklós Bethlen to Mihály Teleki (Bethlenszentmiklós, 14 March 1672) BML I: 251–252. Bethlen also emphasized in his autobiography that Apafi was not ready to send money to his former teacher, therefore he had to complete it from his own pocket, see Bethlen, “Élete leírása”, 663.

<sup>101</sup> On the news about various revisions, see the letters of Dénes Bánffy and László Székely to Mihály Teleki (Szentmárton, 5 April 1672; resp. Fogaras, 6 April 1672) Sámuel Gergely, ed., *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki), vol. 6, 1672–1674, A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára, no. 6 (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1912) (in the following: TML VI), 152, 157. On the final outcome of the plans, see Bethlen, “Élete leírása”, 664.

<sup>102</sup> Katalin S. Varga, ed., *Vitetnek ítélőszékre... Az 1674-es gályarabper jegyzőkönyve* (We are taken to court... The protocol of the “galley-slave process” in 1674) (Pozsony: Kalligram, 2002). The letter, which is undated in the protocol, is also preserved in another copy with the date Fogaras, 25 April 1672 (see EOE XV: 270), but it is unclear whether it was ever sent.

of the Protestants in Hungary, however, I found no trace of such activity in the rather rich documentation concerning them, preserved in the Berlin archives. In May 1672 the Elector of Brandenburg made official complaint to Leopold I in this issue, it should however not automatically be seen as the impact of Harsányi: according to the surviving documents, it was originally Heinrich von Friesen, Chancellor of Saxony who proposed a joint petition to the Emperor in this issue, which was also realized on the Imperial Diet at Regensburg, in June 1672, as a common act of the *Corpus Evangelicorum*.<sup>103</sup> It is also not necessarily of high relevance that Lorenz Christoph Somnitz, who was otherwise, as we have seen, in contact with Harsányi, offered his protection to thirty Hungarian refugee ministers in 1676. The Brandenburg politician had been the leading personality in the Secret Counsel in the second half of the 1670s, therefore he had the authority to comment on the issue even without the interference of Harsányi – who is not mentioned by the petition of the ministers to Frederick William, despite the fact that he still had been in Berlin at that time.<sup>104</sup> In any case, we can guess that the refugees – similarly to the students – could count on the practical help and advice of Harsányi after their arrival to Berlin. The Hungarian Counselor did

<sup>103</sup> Letter of Frederick William to Emperor Leopold I (Cölln an der Spree, 24 May[/3 June] 1672) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 278. Ungarn Fasz. 9. fol. 93–94. See Heinrich von Friesen's proposal in his letter to the Chancellor of Brandenburg (Dresden, 19 February[/1 March] 1672) *ibid.* fol. 58–59. Frederick William's argumentation differs in one point from that of the others: he depicts the persecution of Protestants dangerous also because they could turn to the Turks in their despair, see his letter to John George, Elector of Saxony (Cölln an der Spree, 27 February[/9 March] 1672) *ibid.* fol. 60. Although it would be tempting to suggest that this argument must have come from his expert in Turkish issues, Jakab Harsányi, however, this thesis would be hard to defend, as it was one of the most popular topics of the contemporary public discourse concerning the Protestants of Hungary, whether their persecution would not lead them to seek contacts with the Ottomans, see Köpeczi, *Staatsräson*, 128–142. On the protestations in 1672, see also Bahlcke, “Veritas”, 568.

<sup>104</sup> Intercession of Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz for the Protestants exiled from Hungary (Cölln an der Spree, 17[/27] February 1672), and the petition of the Protestant ministers to Frederick William (*sine dato*) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 278. Ungarn Fasz. 9. fol. 123, resp. 126–127. We know even less about the fate (and eventual contacts to Harsányi) of those two refugees, Petrus and Johannes Sixtius, who petitioned for Frederick William's help on the 1 August 1672, *ibid.* fol. 119. On the career of Somnitz, see Ferdinand Hirsch and Hans Saring, “Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz, ein Staatsmann des Großen Kurfürsten,” *Baltische Studien* n. s. 35 (1933): 134–173; Bahl, *Der Hof*, 592–593. Unfortunately, only a very small fragment of the Somnitz family archives have been preserved, which does not enable us to draw conclusions on the exact nature of the contacts between the Brandenburg politician and Harsányi: Archiwum Państwowe w Szczecinie, Archiwum Książat Szczecińskich I/1769.

not have chances to induce Frederick William to more radical steps in favor of the Protestants in Hungary, as he concluded an alliance with Leopold I against Louis XIV of France exactly in 1672, and in the next six years, the Emperor was one of his most reliable allies.<sup>105</sup>

We thus lack the direct data to be able to affirm the claim by Jenő Zoványi in his lexicon of church history that Jakab Harsányi Nagy “efficiently intervened for his persecuted Hungarian co-religionists.”<sup>106</sup> His political weight in the political life of Brandenburg would have been much too little for this. Even if as a politician he could not decisively influence the echo of the persecution of the Protestants in Hungary of the 1670s – which in any case was strong enough – the Calvinist church of his homeland had nevertheless a lot to thank for him as the patron of students on their peregrination.<sup>107</sup>

Considering all this, it is hardly a coincidence that one of the documents that help to establish the date of Harsányi’s death is closely connected to peregrination. We can be sure that the Hungarian emigrant was still alive on the 11<sup>th</sup> of October 1679, because that is when he signed the *album amicorum* of Sámuel Hodosi.<sup>108</sup> The *terminus ante quem* is, on the other hand, provided by a decree of Frederick William

<sup>105</sup> It was hardly a coincidence that in 1677, when a direct contact was at last established between the rulers of Brandenburg and Transylvania, Frederick William found it necessary to warn Apafi not to trust the French and seek compromise with the Emperor instead; he also let the Prince’s answer be presented to Leopold I. See his letter (Stettin, 10/20 July 1677), the answer of the Prince (Ebesfalva, 15 December 1677) and the order of Frederick William to Lorenz Georg von Krockow (Cölln an der Spree, 4/14 February 1678) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 255. Siebenbürgen nr. 19. fol. 2, 4–5, and 8. On the foreign policy of the Elector in the 1670s, see Opgenoorth, *Friedrich Wilhelm*, vol. 2, 106–197; Hüttl, *Friedrich Wilhelm*, 367–428; McKay, *The Great Elector*, 206–228.

<sup>106</sup> Zoványi, *Magyar protestáns egyháztörténeti lexikon*, 242. It is nevertheless surely a mistake that he claims before this: that Frederick William would have used Harsányi as a “correspondent” in his contacts with Oriental countries. This is however not only the mistake of Zoványi: since Péter Bod, every lexicon repeated it, cf. Bod, *Magyar Athénás*, 351.

<sup>107</sup> On the echo of the persecutions of the 1670s, especially the so-called “galley-slave process” in 1674, see László Makkai, “Bevezetés” (Introduction), in *Galeria omnium sanctorum: A magyarországi gályarab prédikátorok emlékezete* (Memory of the Hungarian galley-slave ministers), ed. László Makkai (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1976), 7–28; Graeme Murdock, “Responses to Habsburg Persecution of Protestants in Seventeenth-Century Hungary,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 37–52.

<sup>108</sup> See the source quoted in note 90.

issued in June 1684, in which he ordered that the creditor of his late Counselor, Jakab Harsányi, a certain Anna Langin, should be satisfied from the arrears of his allowance by the treasury.<sup>109</sup> The text of the document offers no reference to whether the death of the Hungarian Counselor happened in the recent past or some time during the preceding four years. The reception of another Tatar envoy in 1681 was organized by the Electoral Interpreter Adam Styla, but it does not necessarily mean that Harsányi would have no longer been alive: it is also possible that Frederick William preferred to award his recently appointed new expert with the task.<sup>110</sup> Harsányi most probably died in his lodgings in Berlin – otherwise the Electoral decree perhaps would have made a remark about the circumstances of his passing. As he never seems to have established a family, it must have been his servant, mentioned several times in his petitions, who was by his side in his last hours; also, he must have organized the Hungarian emigrant's funeral and taken care of his legacy, the further fate of which is unknown.

---

<sup>109</sup> Decree of Frederick William concerning the debts of the late Harsányi (Potsdam, 27 May[/6 June] 1684) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 65.

<sup>110</sup> See the documentation of the mission in GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 11. 271a. Fasz. 6. The Danziger Adam Styla, the author of a Polish–Italian and a Polish–German grammar, who also could speak Turkish and Russian, was employed by Frederick William as his Electoral Interpreter on the 8/18 March 1679, that is, surely before the death of Harsányi (GStA PK I. HA Rep. 9. Allg. Verwaltung L 21 Fasc. 2. fol. 3.).



## V. The Bureaucrat and the Intellectual

The death of Jakab Harsányi Nagy put an end to a versatile life of many shifts and changes – and this can be said even if many facets of it remain in shadow. It is not only that many important events of his career, such as his decision to leave the ecclesiastical career, cannot be fully explained due to the lack of sources, but also that we are left without any insights at all into many spheres of his life. This is a regular situation regarding the second- or third-rank agents in the world of Early Modern politics: as the sources about them usually stem exclusively from archival collections of administrative authorities or from the private correspondence of their patrons, the authors of their biographies cannot but concentrate on the public sphere of their lives, as they have no data about anything else.<sup>1</sup> Characteristically, we do not know anything about the family of Harsányi either: we can only assume that he did not get married as there is no reference either in his letters from Constantinople or in his later correspondence that would suggest that he had a wife; which nevertheless does not exclude the possibility that he wedded as a college Rector after his peregrination but was widowed early. Although some parts of the *Colloquia* refer to family life – such as the detailed presentation of Turkish nuptial customs –, these however offer no basis for any hypothesis about Harsányi's own experiences or ideas.<sup>2</sup>

Even if his private life remains in obscurity, the sources at hand render it possible to make Harsányi's biography a bit more personal: we should not be content with reporting what happened to him, but also ask how he experienced all that. In this chapter I will make an attempt to present his ideas about the social roles he filled – or

<sup>1</sup> Similar problems, concerning the writing of biographies of Early Modern non-royal personalities are reviewed by Axel Gotthard, "Benjamin Bouwlinghausen: Wie bekommen wir die „Männer im zweiten Glied“ in den Griff?", in *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Erlangen Studien zur Geschichte, no. 3, ed. Helmut Altrichter (Erlangen and Jena: Palm & Enke, 1997), 69–103.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Colloquia*, 409–411.

in any case, how he represented them to others. The analysis of his self-fashioning, a well-established field of enquiry in the last thirty years' Anglo-Saxon historiography, aims to show how historical agents built up the image shown about themselves to the public, with an individual combination of the identity elements available in their age, and what kind of changes can be registered diachronically among these representations.<sup>3</sup> The working mechanisms of self-fashioning are well represented in the case of Harsányi by his noble status; which at the same time throws light upon the fact that the elements of the image made available for the public are not necessarily the ones which actually determined the identity of the self.

If we take the nobility of Jakab Harsányi Nagy as an objective status, it has precedence among the elements of his identity, as this was the one he had the earliest: this quality he inherited from his parents. At the same time, if we look at the subjective side of his nobility – that is, if he found his status important or at least worth mentioning –, the chronological order is far from obvious. Not a single source exists from the period before 1660 which would suggest that Harsányi found it important to call attention of his noble status: it seems that this identity element received emphasis only during his years of emigration. The fact that the recommendatory letters Gheorghe Ștefan provided him with, when he sent his secretary to foreign notabilities, entitled him as “Generosus and Nobilis” would not mean much even if we know that they were penned by Harsányi himself, as the title

---

<sup>3</sup> The term of self-fashioning was first used in the works of Stephen J. Greenblatt, who remains the great classic of the field: *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980). The dynamic, changing character of the self-fashioning in a single individual's life is emphasized by Margo Todd, “Puritan Self-Fashioning: The Diary of Samuel Ward,” *The Journal of British Studies* 21 (1992): 236–264. On Hungarian material, see the study of Zsombor Tóth, “EGOizmus: Az énreprezentáció mint én-performancia (self-fashioning) Bethlen Miklós emlékiratában” (EGOism: Self-representation as self-fashioning in the memoirs of Miklós Bethlen), *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 4 (2003): 57–85. See also Martin Mulsow, “Kulturkonsum, Selbstkonstruktion und intellektuelle Zivilität,” *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 35 (1998): 529–547.

“generosus” was generally used for diplomats in this epoch.<sup>4</sup> It is more relevant that there is a letter from 1666 known which bears the signature “Jacobus Nagy de Harsany Nob[ilis] Ungarus”.<sup>5</sup> After having moved to Berlin, Harsányi still found it important to note his noble title in his letters to the Elector, which however disappeared after a while, and the abbreviation “Nob. Ung.” re-appeared only at the title-page of the *Colloquia*.<sup>6</sup> That is to say, the Hungarian emigrant only found it important on the turn of the 1670s, for some years, to make his noble status an emphatic part of his publicly shown self-image.

Another characteristic of Harsányi’s letters suggests similar conclusions. The Hungarian emigrant closed his letters written to prominent Swedish aristocrats with his own seal: the field, with a lion rampant as charge, is furnished with helmet and crest, and is surrounded by the script “JACOBVS DE HARSAN”.<sup>7</sup> There is however no data of the usage of this sigil from earlier times. The letters sent by the Constantinople embassy were sealed with a variety of signets: on the dispatches sent by Harsányi, we find at least four of them, none of which are similar to the one used

<sup>4</sup> For the usage of “generosus” see e.g. the letters of Gheorghe Ștefan to Wenzel Euseb Lobkowitz (Szina, 16 April 1662) ARMSI X: 530; to Frederick William (Frankfurt an der Oder, 1 October 1662) TMIR III: 80; to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Dorpat, 11[/21] September 1663) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422; and to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 6[/16] September 1664) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500. In a letter written in Hungarian to Johann Rottal (Rosenberg, 25 June 1662) MOL P 507 Nádasdy család levéltára Fasc. 14. Levelezések A. V. nr. 527. 605r., the Hungarian version of „generosus”, „nemzetes” is used. There is only one case when the title „generosus” is not used next to his name: the travel pass written to him by the Brandenburg administration in 1676 entitled him only as „nobilis”, as in this case he started his journey not as a representative of a ruler, only in private matters, in order to re-publish his book (GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 52r.). On the use of the title “generosus” or “nemzetes” in Transylvania, see András Péter Szabó, “A magyar Hallerek nemzetségekönyve: Egy különleges forrás keletkezésének társadalomtörténeti háttere” (The ancestry book of the Hungarian Hallers: The social historical background of the origins of a peculiar source), *Századok* 142 (2008): 927–931.

<sup>5</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 11[/21] December 1666) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500.

<sup>6</sup> Among the letters written to the Elector, the noble title can be found in the signature on the one sent from Berlin, 9[/19] July 1667 (GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 2r.).

<sup>7</sup> The seal is preserved on several letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy: to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 6[/16] May 1666, resp. 26 February[/8 March] 1667) RA Delagardiska samlingen E 1500; to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 28 January[/7 February] 1665, resp. 28 April[/8 May] 1666) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8422, resp. E 8184; and to Per Brahe (Stettin, 26 February[/8 March] 1667) RA Skoklostersamlingen E 8164.

by him in the 1660s. What is more, they were in all likelihood not the property of the Turkish Scribe: in many cases it is obvious that even the letters written by the Turkish Scribe in his own name were closed with the signet of the Orator – such as in a case from the early period of Máté Balogh’s embassy.<sup>8</sup> The seal with his coat of arms, and his name, not known from the earlier epoch, was thus in all likelihood first used in Harsányi’s years of emigration, in the same period when he also found it important to frequently add the title “Nobilis Ungarus” to his signature.

This phenomenon becomes easier to understand if we take into consideration what the relevance of Harsányi’s noble status was in the society of Transylvania. As I mentioned earlier, the belonging to this rather broad social group in the societies of Hungary and Transylvania did not necessarily mean wealth, sometimes not even secure livelihood. It is especially true about Harsányi who came from a hajdú town and his kin must have been one of the collectively ennobled families that were characteristic for these: which means that even if they played any role in the local society, they certainly had no relevance on the country level. If the family had any estates at all, they must have been quite small: there is no sign in Harsányi’s correspondence that they would have played any role in earning his bread. It is thus no wonder that the Turkish Scribe did not find it important to emphasize his noble status, as the addressee of his letters from this period, the Prince, was well aware of its irrelevance.

Quite another situation was waiting for Harsányi when he left Transylvania and Hungary. In the territory of the Holy Roman Empire, noble title played a much

---

<sup>8</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 18 November 1655) MOL E 190 Nr. 8947. While there is only one seal on the letters signed by both of them during the embassy of István Váradí (probably that of the Orator, with an indistinguishable image; see MOL E 190 Nr. 8860, 8873, 8874, 8893), on those penned in 1655, two seals are visible. The superscription of one indicates that that one belonged to Máté Balogh, which could theoretically mean that the other was Harsányi’s (MOL E 190 8976, 8978, 9004). However, the image of the seal shows an angel probably holding a violin, and bears the monograph “HM” above her, which could by no means refer to the Turkish Scribe.

more important role, especially if its contents were not explained by its holder. It is no surprise that several members of Gheorghe Ștefan's court emphasized their status. We can recall that Harsányi blamed Nicolae Mănescu Spătarul for introducing himself everywhere as a baron, whereas this title does not exist in Moldavia. Although strictly seen the Hungarian emigrant was right, Mănescu nevertheless did not fake a title for himself, as he was a boyar, and – according to the early 18<sup>th</sup> century description of Moldavia by Dimitrie Cantemir – this title was usually translated as *baro* in the countries using Latin terminology.<sup>9</sup> Contrary to him, the Croatian noble title of Alexander Iulius Torquatus a Frangepani was in all probability fabricated by himself; at least, the title he used, “Liber Baro in Novy, Dominus in Monostyr & Cirquenic” is quite evidently a forgery. It could have been convincing in German territories due to the Slavic-sounding place names, but it is exactly its Germanized form that makes it very suspicious. Contrary to the nobility of the Holy Roman Empire – but similarly to that of Hungary – the baron titles were just starting to be attached to estates in 17<sup>th</sup> century Croatia, and it was never indicated in titles which territories were ruled by the person in a simple noble right. Compared to these two examples, Harsányi was more modest, but it is clear that in order to gain higher prestige, he also put forward his Hungarian noble status and made it to a part of his self-fashioning. Nevertheless, his use of the noble title remained restricted even in this epoch: there is, for instance no trace that he would have referred to it in his debates with the Chambers in Berlin or his landlord, whereas he could have blamed their behavior as impertinence towards the member of the social elite as well. The fact that he did not do it suggests that this identity element, which became temporarily important in the self-fashioning, did not actually play an important role in his self-image.

---

<sup>9</sup> Dimitrie Cantemir, *Beschreibung der Moldau* (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1973), 186.

From all the social roles filled by Harsányi during his versatile career I will emphasize two in this chapter: the first I will – for the lack of better word – denote as “the bureaucrat”, the other as “the intellectual”. Choosing them were not only motivated by the fact that the sources make these the easiest accessible: there is good reason to believe that they indeed played the most important part in his self-image, at least in that concerning the public sphere.

### ***V.1. The Bureaucrat***

One of the most important Early Modern developments in state administration is usually found in the multiplication of the personnel participating in it: this was a natural precondition of centralization, the growth of the ruler’s control over his territories: in 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvania, as well as in Brandenburg the role of secular “bureaucracy” serving the princes grew considerably compared to the earlier centuries. Parallel to this development, the service of the ruler was shown to have gained a growing role in the self-image of the social elites in analyses from several European countries.<sup>10</sup> Ever since he left the ecclesiastical career, Jakab Harsányi Nagy had always been in the service of various rulers, he followed their orders and also received his salary from them: obviously, in his letters to his employers this situation set the frames of how he related his own activities.

During his years as a Turkish Scribe, Harsányi used each opportunity to reinforce the impact on his Prince that the two key values of his service are his diligence and faithfulness. “Your Highness can recall, whatever others might insinuate, how it has been, that I had not only been in guard in these two and a half

---

<sup>10</sup> Jay M. Smith, *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600–1789* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996); Peter Englund, *Det hotade huset: Adliga föreställningar om samhället under stormaktstiden* (The house in peril: Noble ideas of the society in the 17<sup>th</sup> century) (Stockholm: Atlantis, 1989).

years, going here and there, getting patrons for myself [...], but also I have been an interpreter and a scribe” – he wrote as an answer to the insinuations of István Váradi, and later, during the debate with Máté Balogh also was keen to point out how active he had been in the representation of the Prince’s interests: “I go around the town until the sundown, neglecting even the food, guarding the service of Your Highness.”<sup>11</sup>

Diligence and faithfulness were obviously the basic requirements concerning an office in princely service. Dávid Rozsnyai, the Turkish Scribe who summarized the principles of Transylvanian diplomatic service at the Porte mentioned the same values – nevertheless, not in connection with his own office, rather concerning that of the Orator.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, they were integral part of the obligatory letters diplomats going to Constantinople had to sign. None of those signed by Turkish Scribe preserved, but they must have been similar to those of the Transylvanians, who were time and again commissioned with ad hoc interpreting. These put much emphasis on it that the interpreter was not supposed to share the secrets of the Prince with anyone else, if he learned important information he was bound to transmit them to his superiors and had to translate truly what was said in front of them – all in all, they had to promise that “I will attend any issue trusted to me in a true and strenuous way.”<sup>13</sup> This phrasing however does not coincide with the essence of the service as described by Harsányi. While the most important task of the Interpreters would have been to exquisitely

<sup>11</sup> „N[agy]s[á]god eszében veheti, akárki mint ízetlenkedjék, mint vagyon az dolog, két harmadfél esztendő alatt nemcsak vigyáztam, imitt-amott tekeregvén, forgolódván, jóakarókat magamnak szerezvén [...] hanem tolmács s író deák voltam”, letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February 1656), published in two parts: EÉKH II: 218, MHHD XXIII: 306; „én napestig étlen-ítlan imitt-amott járok, vigyázok az nagyságod szolgálatjában” letter of Harsányi to the Prince (Constantinople, 27 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 475.

<sup>12</sup> Rozsnyai called the attention of the Orators to go to the Sublime Porte at least three times a week and to always write the truth to their Princes. See MHHS VIII: 259–260.

<sup>13</sup> „[...] minden reám bízott dologban igazán és serényen eljárók” See the obligatory letter of István Boros, Post Envoy entrusted also with the task of interpreting (Gyulafehérvár, 16 October 1671) TMÁO V: 72–74; and the three surviving obligatory letters of János Mózes: Fogaras, 16 April 1675 (TMÁO V: 332–333, this is the source of the quotation); Gyulafehérvár, 5 October 1681 (TMÁO VI: 167–168), and Fogaras, 29 April 1687 (EOE XIX: 160–161).

fulfill the tasks given to them by their superiors at the embassy, from the dispatches of the Turkish Scribe of the 1650s it is clear that he aimed for more: to guard the interests of the Prince through his personal initiatives. This freedom of choice was however theoretically only granted to the Orators: “if I see anything that could further the advantage, promotion or survival of His Highness, I will try to advance and effectuate it with all my might.”<sup>14</sup> With putting much emphasis on his diligence, Harsányi thus not only showed that he took care of his duties according to the expectations, but also that he was capable of exquisitely fulfilling tasks of a broader scale, those of an Orator. And if the accentuation of his own accomplishments would not have been enough for this, he also applied another rhetorical strategy of blaming the Orators for their negligence towards exactly these two key values. While he blamed Váradi – as I mentioned before – for his idleness, Balogh he presented, especially at the peak of their conflict, as a man of deceit: “he has such a false and intriguing mind that he would be able to get the Patriarche and the Pope in Rome married.”<sup>15</sup>

In order to understand the aims of the ambitious Turkish Scribe, we also have to take into consideration what he asked from his Prince in return for his services. It was not a rarity among the diplomats sent to Constantinople who noted in his dispatches sent home that he would not mind if the Prince gave them a smaller

---

<sup>14</sup> „[...] valamiből ő nagysága hasznát, előmenetelét, megmaradását eszemben veszem, azt teljes erőmm szerint promoteálni, végben vinni igyekezem.” obligatory letter of Boldizsár Sebessi (Fogarasz, 5 February 1635) RGyP 190. The same text (or very similar to it) is preserved with the signatures of various Orators from the 1630–1640s, see that of István Kőrössi (Gyulafehérvár, 6 February 1633), István Rácz (Gyulafehérvár, 3 October 1641), or György Hajdu (Gyulafehérvár, 1 November 1643) RGyKÖ 113, RGyKÖ 500–501, RGyP 573–574, RGyKÖ 760–761. It is characteristic for the changed political atmosphere after the 1660s, that in this period Orators did not swear the oath for the promotion of the interests of the Prince, rather for trying to resist should anything occur that would hurt them. See the obligatory letter of Orator Zsigmond Boér (Gyulafehérvár, 16 October 1671) EOE XV: 85–86.

<sup>15</sup> „[...] az minemű színes praktikás elmével bír, az patriarchát és az római pápát is meg tudná nőtetni, feleségesíteni.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 21 December 1656) MHHX XXIII: 508.



donation or exempt one of their estates from taxes as a reward.<sup>16</sup> We know about several of the Turkish Scribes that they had some smaller estates, although it is only in the case of Dávid Rozsnyai that we can be sure that he got some as a return for his service.<sup>17</sup> Considering that he spent most of his active years at the Sublime Porte or on the road between Constantinople and Gyulafehérvár, it is remarkable that the letters of Rozsnyai show him as a careful manager of his estates, who also did not shy away from more radical means to acquire new ones. In a quite irregular fashion, after having corresponded with the Transylvanian elite from the Sultan's court, asking for an estate donation, he presented the following choice to them: "[if I get it,] I shall commit myself to the country and His Highness for my entire life, but if not, I shall take care of myself otherwise."<sup>18</sup>

Nothing of the sort can be found in Harsányi's correspondence. As it was mentioned already in chapter II, the Turkish Scribe had to ask his Prince several times to send his salary that was coming late or supplement it, if it was not enough for the

<sup>16</sup> See for instance the letter of Simon Péchy to Mihály Tholdalagi (about the Orator Dániel Sövényfalvi) (Gyulafehérvár, 5 September 1615) Sándor Szilágyi, "Bethlen Gábor és a Porta" (Bethlen Gábor and the Porte), in *Történelmi Tár 1881* (in the following TT 1881–82), 599; the letter of Tamás Borsos to István Bethlen (Constantinople, 28 October 1626) Samu Gergely, "Adalék „Bethlen Gábor és a Porta” című közleményhez" (Contributions to the publication „Gábor Bethlen and the Porte"), in *Történelmi Tár 1883* (in the following: TT 1882–82), 615–616; and the letter of István Kőrössi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 4 September 1633) RGyKÖ 135.

<sup>17</sup> Rozsnyai had estates in Marosvásárhely, Nyárádtó, Remet, Jedd, Marosjára, Magyarherepe and Rusor – on the last two it is also known that he got them for his services –, and even some serfs in Szamosújvár, see József Perényi, *Rozsnyai Dávid* (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Híradó, 1895), 36; Elekes, *Rozsnyai*, 17; Miklós Bittenbinder, "Adatok Rozsnyai Dávid életéhez" (Data for the biography of Dávid Rozsnyai), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 20 (1910): 344, 348. András Majtényi counted as a wealthy man (see Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 267), and he used some of his money for purchasing estates, see the letter of György Rákóczi II to Gergely Nápolyi's widow, Katalin Kun (Algyógy, 28 July 1651) Károly Torma, "Okiratok Erdély történetéhez a XVII-ik század elején" (Documents for the history of Transylvania in early 17<sup>th</sup> century), in *Történelmi Tár 1885* (in the following TT 1885), 329. See also the document, according to which the estates of Bogártelke (Kolozs county), Felőr and Sztojkafalva (both in Szolnok county) go to the possession of Majtényi (29 February 1652) MOL F 1 28. k. 563–566. On the estates of György Brankovics, see Lajos Thallóczy, "Az ál-Brankovicsok" (The Pseudo-Brankovics), *Századok* 32 (1888): 698.

<sup>18</sup> „[...] mind az országnak s mind ő nagyságoknak holtig kötelezem magamat, de ha nem, bizony gondot viselek magamra", letter of Dávid Rozsnyai to Mihály Teleki (Adrianople, 18 April 1672) TML VI: 183. On the questions concerning the management of Rozsnyai's estates, see his letters to his wife: József Koncz, "Oklevelek Rozsnyay Dávid fogsága történetéhez" (Documents concerning the history of the imprisonment of Dávid Rozsnyai), in *Történelmi Tár 1883*, 155–169. (in the following: TT 1883).

circumstances in Constantinople. It also cannot be excluded that, after his return from many years of duty and imprisonment suffered in the service of the Prince, he also received a small estate donation from Ákos Barcsai in 1659, similarly to István Tisza. If this however was in the surroundings of the castle Borosjenő – as that of the Orator –, he must have lost it in the same year due to the advances of the Ottoman armies.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, in the surviving correspondence there is no trace that Harsányi would have asked for it.

Contrary to this, it occurs quite often in his letters written during the conflicts with the Orators, that Harsányi asks his Prince, “I beg Your Highness to discipline the Orator so that he would not befoul my little honor.”<sup>20</sup> He found it especially prejudicial that “taking the burdens and service was mine, but they [that is, the Orators] collected the advantages and honors from it.”<sup>21</sup> As these quotations show, Harsányi referred to the honors, the acknowledgement of his services and the prestige deriving from it, as the main reward of his efforts: as a synonym, he sometimes also used *fame*: “Your Highness should not think that I would bring eternal disgrace to my little fame by wasting three or four years idly here.”<sup>22</sup> Thus, according to his letters, Jakab Harsányi Nagy expected from his employer – apart from his daily bread – only that his achievements would be acknowledged and he would be treated accordingly.

<sup>19</sup> On the estate of Tisza, see Mrs. János Teleki to Mihály Teleki (Nagyvárad, 8 and 26 January 1659) TML I: 315, 324–325.

<sup>20</sup> „Nagyságodnak könyörgök, fenyítse meg [a követet], ne mocskoljon továbbra is böcsületecskémben”, letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 21 December 1656), see note 15, 508.

<sup>21</sup> „[...] az tereh viselés, szolgálát enyim volt; de a hasznót s böcsületet magoknak kuporitották”, letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February 1656) see note 11, 306.

<sup>22</sup> „[...]„nagyságod ne gondolkodjék, hogy itt három-négy esztendőig való heverésemmel holtig való gyalázatban keverném kicsiny hírecskémet”, the letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi (Constantinople, 7 July 1654) MHHD XXIII: 146. The word Harsányi uses for honor, “becsület”, nowadays means rather “honesty”, that is, an internal characteristic of moral integrity. The Early Modern Hungarian usage was more related to “honor”, that is, a phenomenon depending on the reaction of others upon one’s activities and character. The same usage is documented by the foreword of Miklós Bethlen’s “Élete leírása”, 411–432.

His ambitions originated nevertheless from the frequently mentioned fact that the office of the Turkish Scribe did not enjoy a high prestige: although its holders had much more experience in the political life of the Sublime Porte than the Orators, they were treated as auxiliary technical personnel. The Orators repeatedly reminded the more ambitious Turkish Scribes of the division of labor, represented by the oaths, which was then reported indignantly by Harsányi to György Rákóczi II: “because if these people can say that they are the Orators and I am only a contemptible scribe and I do not have a say in the issues of Your Highness, so I cannot use my sense of judgment and experience; I do not know, how this could proceed.”<sup>23</sup> This was probably the best summary for the Prince about the core of the conflict, that is, that the auxiliary role was not enough for the Turkish Scribe who wanted to get an insight into the actual political issues – that is, he wanted to take over some part of the Orator’s role.

As I noted in chapter I.2, it was quite hard for Máté Balogh – despite all his best efforts – to entirely exclude Harsányi from the more important tasks of the embassy: the indefatigable Turkish Scribe kept on going after his business, getting new information, hearing the opinion of the supporters of the Principality and even sending his advice to the Prince. This latter was all the more remarkable as influencing the Prince’s foreign policy with such direct methods was not only rare among the Turkish Scribes, but even among the Orators there are very few cases, mostly from critical periods of the Principality: the correspondence of the Orators should have generally been restricted to transmitting news and reporting about their negotiations at the Porte. Those who decided to share their individual ideas with their

<sup>23</sup> „[...] mert ha azt ki tudják az emberek mondani, hogy ők az kapikihák, én csak deák per contemptum s nincsen az N[agy]s[á]god dolgaiban voxum s itiletemmel s experienciámmal nem élhetek, én nem tudom, mint leszen az dolog.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi (Constantinople, 22 December 1656) EÉKH I: 568–569.

rulers, also had to mobilize a special rhetorical strategy to avoid that the Prince would get the impression that they aim to infringe his rights. The introduction of the advice thus regularly followed the same pattern: “I am not worth to persuade Your Highness as much as a single point” – wrote Tamás Borsos, but the forms “according to my handful of little mind”, or “according to my limited sense of judgment” were also popular.<sup>24</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy also tried to introduce (“I am not worth, Your Highness, to give advice to such a wise royal person”) or close his advice with similar formulas (“But all these are, Your Highness, in your disposition; you should act as you please”).<sup>25</sup> Thus, as a third element besides diligence and faithfulness, humility towards the ruler was added to the self-fashioning of Harsányi’s correspondence from the Sublime Porte.

Harsányi was not the only Turkish Scribe with ambition during the history of the Principality of Transylvania, and although he must have spent quite a lot of energy on his struggles with the Orators, his frustration, luckily, did not lead him to any careless move. There was such an example as well, that of Péter Bakó, who appeared in the correspondence of the Transylvanian embassy in 1635 exactly because of a conflict with the Orator: the young man, who had only recently started his studies in Constantinople, complained that Boldizsár Sebessi was not taking him to the negotiations and did not introduce him into the internal affairs of the embassy. The young Turkish Scribe, who had a rather factious nature, opted for a radical step in 1637: he left the service of Prince György Rákóczi I and continued his activities as the

<sup>24</sup> „[...] arra méltó nem vagyok, hogy Nagyságodnak csak egy punctomnyit is persvadeáljak”, letter of Tamás Borsos to Gábor Bethlen ([Constantinople, 8 September 1618]) Borsos, *Vásárhelytől*, 124; „én maroknyi elmécském”, letter of István Kőrössi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 14 August 1633) RGyP 65; „én vékony itéletem szerint”, letter of Boldizsár Sebessi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 18 December 1640) RGyP 540.

<sup>25</sup> „Nem vagyok arra méltó kegyelmes uram, hogy tanácsot adhassak olyan bölcs, királyi embernek” letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 27 September 1656) quoted in note 11, 476; „De mindezek kegyelmes uram az Nsgod dispositiójában vagynak; azt cselekedje, amit akar.” letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 4 June 1655) TT 1889: 669.

diplomat of a pretender for the Transylvanian throne, Mózes Székely.<sup>26</sup> Contrary to him, Jakab Harsányi Nagy stayed in the service of György Rákóczi II – and if my reconstruction of the period between 1659 and 1660, of which the sources are rather scarce, is accurate, he even did not join any of his opponents during the civil war of Transylvania.

During his years in Constantinople, the self-fashioning of Jakab Harsányi Nagy seems to have been successful: even if the Prince did not stand up for him in his conflicts with the Orators, György Rákóczi II did not seem to have had strong doubts concerning the diligence and faithfulness of his diplomat, or the respect he paid to him. It is less surprising if we take into consideration – as I pointed out in chapter II – that Harsányi could report a remarkable amount of achievements and multiplied the scope and activity of the Transylvanian information system at the Sublime Porte. It is actually rather surprising that György Rákóczi II did not fulfill the wish of Harsányi – which, according to our present knowledge anyway remained unspoken – and did not appoint him as Orator.<sup>27</sup> This would not have been entirely without precedents: there were cases before and after this, when the Princes commissioned those people who obviously had to have the most experience in Ottoman issues to be their

<sup>26</sup> On the feuds at the embassy, see the letter of Péter Bakó, resp. Boldizsár Sebessi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 29 June 1635, resp. 9 March 1636) RGyKÖ 320, resp. 292–296. Bakó's desertion is mentioned in György Rákóczi I's letter to Sebessi (Gyulafehérvár, 2 May 1637) RGyKÖ 403. The formulation of the Prince („hitit ide hagyta”/“he left his faith”) mislead the publisher of the source, Sándor Szilágyi, to think that Bakó accepted the Islam (RGyKÖ 292.). “Faith” referred however in this case to the oath the young man took before leaving to Constantinople, not his denominational allegiance. Bakó represented Székely by the Pasha of Buda as well, see the letter of István Réthy to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 8 April 1639) RGyP 413. His activities were last mentioned in the correspondence of the Transylvanian embassy in the letter of Ferenc Gyárfás to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 20 December 1648) TMÁO III: 415.

<sup>27</sup> In the address of his letter from 22 March 1657 written to István Tisza and Harsányi, the Locum-Tenens Ákos Barcsai did not differentiate between the two persons: both of them were addressed as the Orators („oratoribus”) of the Prince (EÉKH II: 359). Conrad Jacob Hildebrandt, in his travelogue from the same period also called Harsányi a „Gesandter”, that is, envoy (Hildebrandt, *Dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise*, 115) – although he differentiated him from the „Orator”. At the same time, Claes Rålamb clearly calls Harsányi a „Secretarius” in his diary (Rålamb, *Diarium*, 97), and György Rákóczi also makes a difference in the address of his letter from 15 January 1657 between Tisza, whom he calls Orator, and Harsányi, for whom he uses the rather general title „familiarius noster” (EÉKH II: 357). It is thus very likely that Harsányi was not appointed as an Orator in 1657 either.

representatives in Constantinople for a year. After János Váradi Házi, also György Brankovics served as Orator in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>28</sup> This opportunity was however not given to Harsányi.

During his years of exile, Harsányi repeatedly had to reassure various rulers about the virtues he had shown in their service. The faithfulness towards his employer and the diligence practiced in his duties both played an important role in the letters which the Hungarian emigrant wrote about his conflicts with Gheorghe Ștefan to Swedish aristocrats.<sup>29</sup> In these reports however the third element of the Transylvanian dispatches, that of humility, did not play a role, obviously because Harsányi was no longer in the Voievod's service when he wrote them, and the tone applied towards György Rákóczi II could not have been reconciled with the mutual accusations. Contrary to this, humility was an integral part of the memorials submitted to Brandenburg, completed with the gratitude of the Hungarian emigrant towards the Elector for the accommodation. In these writings, it is the emphasis on diligence that is missing – that is, Jakab Harsányi Nagy complains frequently that he would be happy to put his expertise to Frederick William's service, but the latter does not provide him with tasks.<sup>30</sup>

The most important difference between how Harsányi seen and represented his role as a “bureaucrat” in the Transylvanian service, and later on, is not in the rhetorical elements. His contacts with Gheorghe Ștefan and later Frederick William were built on an entirely different basis than the service he offered to György Rákóczi II. When he had to see that he could not expect the Voievod to provide his bread for

<sup>28</sup> On the appointment to the Orator's office as the peak of the Turkish Scribes' career, see my “Az erdélyi török deákok: Kora újkori értelmiségiek állami szolgálatban” (The Turkish Scribes of Transylvania: Early Modern Intellectuals in State Service), *Sic Itur ad Astra* 18, no. 1–2 (2006): 169.

<sup>29</sup> Letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Carl Gustaf Wrangel (Stettin, 28 April/[8 May] 1666); and to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 6/[16] May 1666, and 26 February/[8 March] 1667) all quoted in note 7.

<sup>30</sup> Memorial of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William (Berlin, 10/[20] August 1673) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 27r.

him, and he was also forced into the background in his court, Jakab Harsányi Nagy did not only leave his service but also tried to supplant his earlier employer at the Swedish royal court, when it was in his interest. He did not do anything similar towards Frederick William, but when he had to experience that the salary was not coming, he made preparations for another change and dedicated some copies of his book to another ruler, Gustav Adolph of Güstrow-Mecklenburg. His contacts with the exiled Voievod and the Elector of Brandenburg can thus be labeled as contractual: these rulers could count on Harsányi's service only as long as there seemed to be a chance that they would fulfill their part of the deal.<sup>31</sup> There are no traces of anything similar from the years at the Sublime Porte. No matter how many frustrations he had to face in the conflicts against the inimical Orators, or how much time his salary was delayed, there is nothing in the surviving sources that would suggest – similarly to the threats of Dávid Rozsnyai – that he planned to leave Constantinople or offer his expertise to other embassies. The nature of his service as a “bureaucrat” changed after he had to leave his home country, the Principality of Transylvania: it was then that his unconditional loyalty turned into a contractual one, and he became – like Miclescu and Torquatus – an “intellectual sans frontières”.<sup>32</sup>

## ***V.2. The Intellectual***

The literature about Early Modern Hungarian intellectuals uses two different, usually implicit definitions of the term. Generally, it is used for any person who earned his bread through marketing his literacy skills: this approach renders the entire spectrum

<sup>31</sup> In Frederick William's case, also a written version of this contract is available – even if formally it was not a mutual agreement, but a unilateral appointment charter –, but it cannot be excluded that the co-operation with Gheorghe Ștefan had also been regulated by a similar document.

<sup>32</sup> The metaphor is taken from the study of Zamfira Mihail on Miclescu; I also use it in a different meaning, as the Romanian author referred to the high level of the emigrant's erudition in international comparison: “Les intellectuels « sans frontières » du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Nicolae le Spathaire Miclescu,” *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 44 (2006): 185–194.

of ecclesiastical offices into this category, and also opens the scope for the secular intelligentsia rather broad, from the prefects of the noblemen's domains to the high-ranking office-holders of the princely administration.<sup>33</sup> If one follows this definition, it obviously does not make sense to ask whether Harsányi belonged to this group, as it is unambiguous not only in his years of teaching, but also during his later career: his office as a Turkish Scribe, as well as a secretary of Gheorghe Ștefan fit into the category that Zsolt Trócsányi labeled as “the office-holder intellectual”.<sup>34</sup>

On the contrary, it is worth to ask the question whether Harsányi would fit the narrower definition of the Hungarian Early Modern intellectuals. As János Heltai pointed out, it is clear that although a majority of the office-holding group that served the Prince or other noblemen, was paid for his literacy skills, they did not have a sense of being an intellectual: there are no traces that they would have been convinced that their offices had any value or relevance in itself, beyond the pragmatic profit deriving from the fulfillment of administrative assignments.<sup>35</sup> Rephrased according to the general question of this chapter, the decisive moment is whether being an intellectual played any role in the individual's self-representation. In this sub-chapter, my analysis aims at tracing the phenomenon of being a proud intellectual in Harsányi's self-fashioning.

As we entirely lack ego-documents from the first period of Harsányi's career that he spent as a teacher, we cannot provide any concrete data concerning this question. In any case, being a teacher was certainly one of the most prominent offices

<sup>33</sup> On questions of definitions, see Katalin Péter, “Az értelmiség és a XVII. század közepének politikai mozgalmái” (The intellectuals and the political movements of the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century), as well as Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “Értelmiség és államhatalom Magyarországon a 17–18. század fordulóján” (Intellectuals and state power in Hungary at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century), both in *A magyarországi értelmiség a XVII–XVIII. században* (Intellectuals in Hungary in the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), ed. István Zombori (Szeged: n. p., 1984), 21–27, resp. 58–65.

<sup>34</sup> Zs. Trócsányi, *Erdély*, 406–413.

<sup>35</sup> János Heltai, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* (Péter Alvinczi and the peregrinates to Heidelberg), *Humanizmus és reformáció*, no. 21 (Budapest: Balassi, 1994), 11–12. On the traces of the existence of an “intellectuals' identity” see also R. Várkonyi, “Értelmiség”, 65–68.



that lead to the establishment of a self-definition as an intellectual in an individual's life. Certainly not everyone shared János Apáczai Csere's opinion, who gave a detailed discussion on the role of knowledge and education in the development of countries in his speech quoted in chapter I.1, but Harsányi spent a long enough time teaching so that we can assume that he attributed great relevance to his learning and erudition.

In the autumn of 1656, close to the end of his conflict with Máté Balogh, Jakab Harsányi Nagy shared his opinion with György Rákóczi II that “Here, all the Christian Ambassadors and Orators are knowledgeable, only the Wallachians are barbarians, whom our Orator does not differ from very much either.”<sup>36</sup> Inhabitants of Wallachia and Moldavia had a rather bad reputation in Early Modern Transylvania – they were frequently blamed for their lack of Latin education –, thus comparing the Transylvanian Orator to those of the Voievods was a rather strong rhetorical figure for Harsányi to convey his message.<sup>37</sup> The Turkish Scribe also explained what he meant under the term “barbarian”: the phenomenon that during his service every Orator was of the sort “who do not know any but the language of their mother” caused rather severe problems in attending their diplomatic duties: “the Christian Orators are surprised that such Orators of Your Highness come here, with whom when they meet, if there would be no one else to take care of things, they would not be able to converse at all, not to mention discussing about something important.”<sup>38</sup> The Orators needed interpreters for the negotiations, which thus could not be kept secret. The compendious comparison of the Transylvanian diplomats with their Western

<sup>36</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 8 September 1656) MHHD XXIII: 458–459.

<sup>37</sup> On the Early Modern Hungarian attitude towards the inhabitants of the two Romanian Voievodates, see Kármán, “Identitás”, 86–87.

<sup>38</sup> “[...] az anyjok nyelvénél egyebet nem tudnak”; “az keresztyén oratorok csudálkoznak, hogy nagyságodnak olyan residensi jönnek be, kikkel szemben levén is, ha más nem volna, ki dolgot helyre vinné, nem is tudnának csak beszélni is; nem hogy valami derék dologról discourálni.” See the letter quoted in note 36, 458–459.

colleagues however suggests more than the exposition of this concrete problem. As I mentioned earlier, being “deáktalan” (Latin-less) was not only a practical question for Early Modern Hungarian mentality – that is whether he could speak Latin or not –, but also served as a basis of further assumptions about the moral character of the person in question.<sup>39</sup> Harsányi noted that while he saw the diplomats at the Western embassies “knowledgeable”, erudite and thus respectable people, his compatriots did not even have a chance to reach this level, as they lacked the minimum basis for further development: the command of the Latin language.

Contrary to them, the Turkish Scribe could write in Latin and he also did not shy away from showing it. The Early Modern Hungarian style tolerated Latinisms, therefore it is not especially remarkable that Harsányi’s letters also contain many. It is however worth our attention that he also inserted entire sentences written in Latin into his reports, otherwise in Hungarian.<sup>40</sup> Such solutions are known from the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian diplomatic correspondence from the Porte only in the cases of highly educated Orators, such as Dániel Sövényfalvi, who was, because of his Latin erudition, also referred to his contemporaries as “Dániel deák”.<sup>41</sup> The propagation of Harsányi’s erudition is even better furthered by those letters in which he quotes classic authors. So did he comment upon the Wallachian soldiers’ revolt in 1655: “Faber compedes, quas fecit ipse gestet.” (“Let the smith wear those chains which he made.”)<sup>42</sup> The Latin proverb is included in the collection of adages by Erasmus of Rotterdam – however, it was not necessarily the source of the Turkish Scribe’s

<sup>39</sup> Bartók, „A casa rustica”.

<sup>40</sup> See for example his report from 21 December 1656 (MHHD XXIII: 509).

<sup>41</sup> Letter of Dániel Sövényfalvi to Simon Péchy (Constantinople, 22 October 1616) TT 1881–1882 [1881]: 615. On the use of the cognomen „deák”, see for example the letter of Simon Péchy to Mihály Tholdalagi (Gyulafehérvár, 5 September 1615) Ibid. 599.

<sup>42</sup> “Faber compedes, quas facit ipse gestat.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 1655. jún. 4.) MHHD XXIII: 191. Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Adages I i 1 to I v 100*, Collected works of Erasmus, no. 31, trans. by Margaret Mann Philips, ed. by R.A.B. Mynors (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 127.

quotation. The fact that Harsányi quotes Virgil is much more remarkable. According to the tradition, the Roman poet, when one of his laudatory poems for Emperor Augustus was stolen by a colleague of his, wrote the following line: “Hos ego versiculos feci, tulit alter honores” (“I wrote this little poem, others are honored for it”); and then improvised four different endings on the half-line “Sic vos non vobis”, which all offered an analogy: the bees do not collect honey for themselves, the ox does not pull the carriage for himself and so on.<sup>43</sup> Harsányi – in a manner quite irregular for diplomatic reports – quoted all five lines, and although he did not keep their traditional order and also missed the name of Virgil’s rival, he did everything in his might to impress his ruler and achieve the highest possible “honores”.<sup>44</sup> Only one slightly similar case is known from the history of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian diplomacy, that of the Orator István Réthy, who also liked to quote his negotiations with the Habsburg ambassador in Latin, also quoted in a letter from 1646 Ovid’s *Amores* – even if without noting the person of the author, only referring to a “wise pagan poet”.<sup>45</sup>

Harsányi had good reasons to boast with his competence in Latin as it was far from general among the Transylvanian diplomats sent to Constantinople. The remark of the Turkish Scribe – according to which no Orator could speak a single foreign language during his years of duty there – should be taken critically, as it was a way for

<sup>43</sup> Hugh Moore, *A Dictionary of Quotations from Various Authors in Ancient and Modern Languages with English Translations, and Illustrated by Remarks and Explanations* (London: Wittaker, Treacher & Co, 1831), 142.

<sup>44</sup> The following four lines– “Sic vos non vobis fertis aratra boves;/ Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes;/ Sic vos non vobis vellera fertis oves;/ Sic vos non vobis nidificatis aves.” – were quoted by Harsányi in the order: 4, 1, 3, 2; and instead of Bathyllus he refers to Mavius as Virgil’s rival. See his letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 8 September 1656), quoted in note 36, 459.

<sup>45</sup> “[...] egy pogány bölcös poéta”. The quote is the following: “Consilium nobis resque locusque dabunt” – et nemo est consiliarius melior quam tempus.” Only the first half of the sentence comes from the *Amores* (I.4,54): “the circumstances and the situation will suggest to us a plan”; the second half is added by Réthy: “and no one gives better advice than time.” Letter of István Réthy to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 24 November 1646) RGyP 878. Cf. Ovid, *Amores I*, edited and translated by John Barsby (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 62. On Réthy’s negotiations with the Habsburg ambassador, see his report from 18 June 1639: Ibid. 421.

Harsányi to emphasize his own importance and aptitude. Nevertheless, shortly before his arrival to Constantinople, there was an Orator who asked the Prince not to extend his mandate at the Sublime Porte with the following argumentation: “I am not sufficient for this service as I do not speak any other language than Hungarian, so I cannot converse either with the Christian Orators or their interpreters; if I want to talk to them through an interpreter, they would say that Constantinople is a place where not even three, but even two people should watch what they speak, and then leave me alone. I am worried night and day of causing problems for Your Highness, making mistakes out of ignorance; I really do not know how could a Latin-less (“deáktalan”) person be fit for this task.”<sup>46</sup> He was also not the only one who confessed that he had such problems: in 1635, the Orator Pál Nagy also referred to his “Latinlessness” in a letter to his Prince.<sup>47</sup>

Even if the Latin education of Harsányi – as the above mentioned, faulty quote from Virgil has shown – was not impeccable, it seems that he could achieve some respect for it among his contemporaries, as it is well illustrated by Isaac Basire, the Rector of the Gyulafehérvár College in the 1650s, whose arrival to Transylvania was prepared among others by the Turkish Scribe. The Jersey-born theologian, whose mother tongue was French, became a court chaplain of Charles I of England shortly before the King’s fall, after which Basire had to leave the country. He went to the Ottoman Empire and preached in various Syrian and Anatolian colonies before his

<sup>46</sup> “[...] erre az szolgálatra nem vagyok elégséges, mivel az magyar nyelvénél egyebet nem tudok, sem az keresztény oratorokkal, sem tolmácsival nem beszélgethetek; ha tolmács által akarok velek szólni, azt mondja, Konstantinápoly oly hely, nem hogy három ember, de csak kettő is jól megnézzé mit beszél, azzal mennek el mellőlem. Éjjel-nappal az nagyságod nehézségétől félek, hogy tudatlanságom miá hiba esik, mert deáktalan ember ezt az állapotot nem tudom mint vihetné végben.” Letter of Ferenc Földvári to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 13 April 1651) MHHd XXIII: 51.

<sup>47</sup> In his case it was however not his deficient Latin skills, but his lack of higher education that was meant by “deáktalanság”, as he mentioned it in connection with his claim that he could not personally check the accounts of expenses compiled by his book-keeper scribe, see the letter of Pál Nagy to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 23 December 1635) RGyP 161.

arrival to Constantinople in 1653.<sup>48</sup> We are not exactly sure when he established his contacts with the Transylvanian embassy, but it had to take place in early 1654 at the latest: in May there were already negotiations going on about the conditions under which Basire would have been ready to move to the Principality.<sup>49</sup> As by that time there had only been one Professor alive of the three that Gábor Bethlen had invited to Gyulafehérvár – and even this one, Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld was going to die in 1655 – the theologian from England was also given tenure in that school. It seems that the mediation between the Prince and Basire was taken over by Harsányi who also informed his Prince that the emigrant chaplain is not only a theologian but also “a good *medicus*”.<sup>50</sup> Even in the following years, it was Harsányi who forwarded Basire’s post which arrived to the English embassy at Constantinople, to the Principality.<sup>51</sup> The Professor of Gyulafehérvár, it seems, had a high respect for the Turkish Scribe: in early 1658, he wrote to the young theologian, Conrad Jacob Hildebrandt, who had by that time been a member of the Swedish embassy at the Sublime Porte: “The captivity of our friends, namely the most outstanding Mr.

<sup>48</sup> Several accounts are available on Basire’s biography, all of which however focus only on one period of his career. An early biography with a selection of his correspondence: W.R. Darnell, *The Correspondence of Isaac Basire, D.D. Archdeacon of Northumberland and Prebendary of Durham in the Reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. with a Memoir of His Life* (London: Murray, 1831). On his Transylvanian period: Frigyes Endrődi, “Basire Izsák Erdélyben” (Isaac Basire in Transylvania), *Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok / Studies in English Philology* 2 (1937): 71–81; Bán, *Apáczai*, 437–439. On his years in the Ottoman Empire: Goffman, *Britons*, 215–218. (he is mistakenly mentioned under the name „Bagire”); Alastair Hamilton, “The English Interest in the Arabic-Speaking Christians,” in *The ‘Arabick’ Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century England*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, no. 47, ed. G. A. Russell (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 40–42.

<sup>49</sup> According to Miklós Bethlen, when Ákos Barcsai was taking the tribute of the Principality to the Sublime Porte in 1655, “to him attached was Basirius, and he took him to Transylvania” (“Élete leírása”, 546). Contrary to this, the Orator Ferenc Thordai had already written in May 1654 that the he had received the Prince’s orders concerning the “Doctor Theologiae” and he would continue the negotiations about the conditions of moving to Transylvania, see his report to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 13 May 1654) MHHD XXIII: 144.

<sup>50</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 20 July 1654) BUBFS VIII: 48. In the letter quoted in the previous footnote, Ferenc Thordai also advised his Prince to ask Harsányi about further information about Basire: “Mr. Harsányi knows more about it, Your Highness, than me, he can inform Your Highness more realistically.”

<sup>51</sup> Letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 4 June 1655, and 16 August 1656) MHHD XXIII: 192, 434.

Harsányi, broke my heart.”<sup>52</sup> Even if Basire had somewhat been indebted to the Turkish Scribe, it is remarkable that he did not use the title “generosus” for him, which would have been appropriate due to his diplomatic function, rather that of “clarissimus” – that could be translated as “most outstanding” –, which was reserved for people respected for their vast Humanist knowledge in contemporary usage.

We have very limited information about how Harsányi might have tried to maintain the image of an intellectual after he had left the Principality. During the one year he spent in Stockholm, he probably had many opportunities – just like Miclescu later on – to build up a positive image in the high-ranking office-holders of the Swedish court; so that they would not only see a secretary of an ill-fated ruler of a small country in him, rather a knowledgeable man of broad erudition. While Miclescu’s successes were documented by the Marquis de Pomponne’s notes, there are no surviving data about the possible similar attempts of Harsányi. From his Brandenburg years, it is again the language of his official papers which very telling: as he wrote each of his supplications in Latin, this provided new opportunities for showing that he was a master of style. It seems that Harsányi was not content with using the subtleties of composition for this purpose: he also sprinkled his *Opinio* with references to Livy and Virgil.<sup>53</sup>

It was also an important element of Harsányi’s self-fashioning that the Hungarian emigrant used a startling rhetorical strategy in two of his letters written to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie. By the end of these letters, Harsányi stopped addressing the Swedish Chancellor in the formal manner, using the second person

<sup>52</sup> “Funestavit animum meum captivitas Amicorum nostrorum, nominatim clar. dni. Harsanyi”, the entire letter is available in Hildebrandt, *Dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise*, 143.

<sup>53</sup> The reference to Livy, which can be found in both versions of the *Opinio* (cf. chapter IV, note 28) is related to an event in the Second Punic War. Harsányi emphasized the urgency of the matter with this remark: „so that, while disputations are going on in Rome, Saguntum would not fall” („ne dum Romæ disputatur Saguntum pereat”). The reference to Virgil is only in version B: again, it is the instant need of action is underlined by stating that the house of Ucalegon is already in fire – the destruction of the Trojan Elder’s home is narrated in *Aeneis* 2.312.

plural form and calling him “Illustrissima Vestra Excellentia”, and started to use second person singular instead. In the first letter, it was only restricted to a single appearance in the term “to your servant” (*servi tui*); however, in the second one, in which Harsányi let the Chancellor know about his new office in Brandenburg, approximately one half of the letter was characterized by the phenomenon that the Hungarian emigrant addressed the Swedish aristocrat – called by him “Illustrissimus Hero” – in the informal, singular form.<sup>54</sup> The only reasonable explanation for the usage of these forms – which would be unimaginable in a diplomatic correspondence – that Harsányi imitated in these instances the letter-writing style of Humanist scholars, who tended to use the informal, singular forms even if they had been writing to their patrons. Both versions of the dedication in the *Colloquia* reinforce this interpretation, as the Hungarian emigrant used the same form to address both the Elector of Brandenburg and the Prince of Mecklenburg. What is more, in some of his letters from the period after the publication of *Colloquia*, he also addressed Frederick William in second person singular – obviously, only after giving him the due respect at the beginning of the letter with the usage of the title “Electoralis Vestra Serenitas”.<sup>55</sup>

It is important to note that this strategy, putting emphasis on Harsányi’s self-fashioning as an intellectual appears towards the Elector only after the publication of the *Colloquia*: writing a book was in itself also an important method of the Hungarian emigrant’s self-representation. In the period before 1672, it was the basic interest of Harsányi to prove his importance to Frederick William, if for no other reason, than because of the rather irregular payment of his salary. In spite of the growing relevance

<sup>54</sup> Letters of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Stettin, 11[21] December 1666, resp. 26 February[/8 March] 1667) quoted in notes 5, resp. 7.

<sup>55</sup> Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to Frederick William (Berlin, 19[/29] November 1672) GStA PK I. HA Geheimer Rat Rep. 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung J 16 Fasz. 3. fol. 21–24.

of Brandenburg in the European theatre of politics, the Ottoman Empire appeared quite rarely in the horizon of the foreign affairs of the Elector, therefore the Hungarian emigrant had to face the fact that he had quite meager opportunities to prove his aptitude. Writing a book – and let us not forget, he originally wanted to write two books – which would then sufficiently represent his expertise must have seemed to offer an excellent solution for this problem.

In any case, it was not a rarity among the diplomats who spent some time in Constantinople to put their experiences on paper later on. In the Transylvanian context, it was the holders of Harsányi's office, the Turkish Scribes, who dedicated an important role to writing Turkish-related books in their careers.<sup>56</sup> János Váradi Házi translated the treatise of a 15<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman theologian; according to the foreword, in order that his readers would be more able – through getting acquainted to Islam – to separate the truth from falsity.<sup>57</sup> Dávid Rozsnyai – apart from collecting copies of Ottoman diplomatic documents – also translated the Turkish version of an Indian story-book. Although his *Horologium Turcicum* – contrary to the translation of Váradi Házi – was not published during his lifetime, Rozsnyai made it sure that many prominent members of the Transylvanian elite would get it in manuscript copies, and thus the skills and dedication of the ageing diplomat would be well-publicized.<sup>58</sup> The

<sup>56</sup> On the role of Early Modern Hungarian translations in the careers of their authors, see Hanna Orsolya Vincze, "The Stakes of Translation and Vernacularisation in Early Modern Hungary," *European Review of History* 16, no. 1 (2009): 63–78. Concerning the careers of the Turkish Scribes, see Kármán, „Az erdélyi török deákok”, 169–173.

<sup>57</sup> János Váradi Házi, *Machumet propheta vallasan levő egy fő irástúdo doctornac irásából törökből magyarrá fordítatot könyw, mellyet Envarvl asikinnac hinac* (A Book Called „Envarul Asikin”, by a Chief Literate Doctor from the Religion of Prophet Mahomet, Translated from Turkish to Hungarian) (Kassa: Sultz, 1626), 2–3. On the book, see Gedeon Borsa and Ferenc Hervay, ed., *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok*, vol. 2, 1601–1635 (Old Hungarian prints) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1983) (in the following: RMNy II), Nr. 1360; Gábor Ágoston, “Muslim Cultural Enclaves in Hungary under Ottoman Rule,” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 45 (1991): 203–204.

<sup>58</sup> The modern edition of the work: Dávid Rozsnyai, *Horologium Turcicum*, Régi magyar könyvtár, no. 38, ed. Lajos Dézsi (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1926). We even have data which suggest that Rozsnyai made at least some of the manuscript copies himself: his diary entry from 31 January 1715 (“I started writing the Turcicum Horologium”) must have referred to copying the work, as



Turkish Scribes of Transylvania also do not stand alone in an international comparison with their dedication to fulfill additional functions beyond their diplomatic activities, through writing books: there were rather many intellectuals on the Christian embassies at Constantinople, ready to reflect on their experiences in the Ottoman Empire. A significant part of the *turcica* literature – which had prospered ever since the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople – was written by people related to the embassies, and it seems that the intellectuals were not only filling the auxiliary ranks at the Western embassies, but many of the authors were envoys themselves. The author of the popular *Turkish Letters* from the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century, Augerius Busbequius, was Habsburg ambassador in Constantinople, but we can just as well mention the author of one of the most important descriptions of Turkey from the next century, Paul Rycaut, who had held the title of the English Consul at Smyrna.<sup>59</sup> Although the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century discourse about scholarly life suggested that one of the most important prerequisites of this lifestyle was a *vita contemplativa*, the practice shows rather that a vast majority of those writing about the Ottoman Empire came from the world of the *vita activa*.<sup>60</sup>

At the same time – as I already discussed it in chapter IV – Harsányi’s attempt to enter the international intellectual circles of his time were unsuccessful: the

---

it has already been finished earlier, see János Simonfi, “Rosnyay Dávid naptári följegyzései” (The diaries of Dávid Rozsnyai), *Erdélyi Múzeum* 9 (1914): 121.

<sup>59</sup> See their short biographies in Zweder von Martels, “In His Majesty’s Service: Augerius Busbequius, Courtier and Diplomat of Maximilian II,” in *Kaiser Maximilian II: Kultur und Politik im 16. Jahrhundert*, Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit, no. 19, ed. Friedrich Edelmayer and Alfred Kohler (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1992), 169–181; Sonia P. Anderson, *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut in Smyrna, 1667–1678* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).

<sup>60</sup> On the Early Modern differentiation between the *vita activa* and *contemplativa*, see Paul Oskar Kristaller, “Active and Contemplative Life in Renaissance Humanism,” and Brian Vickers, “Public and Private Life in Seventeenth-Century England,” both in *Arbeit, Musse, Meditation: Betrachtungen zur Vita activa und Vita contemplativa*, ed. Brian Vickers (Zurich: Verlag der Fachvereine, 1985), 133–152, resp. 257–278. On scholarly habitus, see also Gadi Algazi, “Scholars in Households: Refiguring the Learned Habitus, 1480–1550”, *Science in Context* 16, no. 1–2 (2003): 9–42; and Idem, “Food for Thought: Hieronymus Wolff Grapples with the Scholarly Habitus,” in *Egodocuments and history: Autobiographical writing in its social context since the Middle Ages*, Publicaties van de Faculteit der Historische en Kunstwetenschappen Maatschappijgeschiedenis, no. 38, ed. Rudolf Dekker (Hilversum: Verloren, 2002), 21–44.

*Colloquia* remained mostly unknown for even that part of the *Respublica Litteraria* which was most interested in Oriental languages and scholarship. His career surely did not predestine the Hungarian emigrant to become a well-known scholar. We have no data that would suggest that his Orientalist interests would have been formed already during his university years – they were most likely the results of his pragmatic career choice. Thus Harsányi did not only lose any chance to pursue a classical university career, but even that of a philologist was impossible: the one illustrated by Andreas Müller, who, although also did not have teaching possibilities, but at least could gain and keep the interest of his fellow scholars with his works published regularly. The flourishing of Oriental studies at the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century also diminished Harsányi's chances for establishing himself as a scholar, rather than to increase them.

In the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, careers such as that of Josephus Barbatus were still possible, who was born in an Egyptian Coptic family under the name Yūsuf ibn Abū Dahn and after some years in Rome, he became a teacher at the universities of Oxford, later of Leuven, thanks to his knowledge of Arabic, Turkish and Hebrew.<sup>61</sup> With the upsurge of Oriental studies – primarily that of the Arabic – it was however the Western-born philologists who travelled to the East in growing numbers in order to deepen their knowledge and develop their collections of manuscripts. The most important figure of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Arabic Studies in Leiden, Jacobus Golius was the Consul of the United Provinces in Aleppo between 1623 and 1629, Edward Pococke, the Orientalist of Oxford University was the Chaplain of the English Consul at Aleppo between 1630 and 1635, and their colleagues of a lesser format also spent some time at the Middle East.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Alastair Hamilton, "An Egyptian Traveller in the Republic of Letters: Josephus Barbatus or Abudacnus the Copt," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 57 (1994): 123–150.

<sup>62</sup> For instance, the Dutch H. Harderus was an interpreter at the Dutch embassy of Constantinople after some years of teaching in Leiden, between 1673 and 1675, see Alexander H. de Groot, *De Betekenis*

These philologists travelling to the Ottoman Empire were received there by the ever-growing network of their predecessors. Many people who could be useful for tracking down precious manuscripts were handed on, but also the experts, such as Wojciech Bobowski (alias Albertus Bobovius or Ali Ufki bey), a Polish renegade living in Constantinople, who was willing to take upon various scholarly tasks from Western commissioners: apart from his Turkish grammar, he also wrote an introduction to the Islam and had a lion's share in translating the Bible into Turkish in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>63</sup> From among the Western European diplomats who resided in Constantinople in the time of Harsányi, Thomas Bendyshe was well known for his various ways of assistance given to Orientalist research in his home country;<sup>64</sup> and Levinus Warner, the ambassador of the United Provinces offers the best example for the intertwining of the philological work at universities and the diplomatic representation in Constantinople. The German alumnus of the Leiden University arrived to Constantinople in 1648 with a scholarship, and he took over the office of the ambassador after the death of the Dutch Agent, in 1654. Until his death in 1665, he collected more than a thousand Arabic and Turkish manuscripts, published an anthology of Turkish proverbs, organised the above mentioned translation of the

---

*van de Nederlandse Ambassade bij de Verheven Porte voor de Studie van het Turks in de 17de en 18de Eeuw* (The relevance of the Dutch embassy at the Sublime Porte for the study of the Turks in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries), Oosters Genootschap in Nederland, no. 9. (Leiden: Brill, 1979). Between 1628 and 1639, the Oxford alumnus William Seaman was in the service of Sir Peter Wyche, English ambassador to Constantinople, see Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome*, 116–126.

<sup>63</sup> On Bobovius, see Hannah Neudecker, “Wojciech Bobowski and his Turkish grammar (1666),” *Dutch Studies – Near Eastern Languages and Literatures* 2 (1996): 169–192. He also wrote a description of the Seraglio: C.G. Fisher and Alan W. Fisher, “Topkapi Sarayi in the Mid-Seventeenth Century: Bobovi's Description,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 10 (1985): 5–81. On his activities as a composer, see Ursula Reinhard, “Die Musik am türkischen Hof im 17. Jahrhundert,” in *Höfische Kultur in Südosteuropa: Bericht der Kolloquien der Südosteuropa-Kommission 1988 bis 1990*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen: Philologisch–Historische Klasse, III. Folge, no. 203, ed. Reinhard Lauer and Hans Georg Majer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 176.

<sup>64</sup> On the English network, see Gerald J. Toomer, “John Selden, the Levant and the Netherlands in the History of Scholarship,” and Charles G.D. Littleton, “Ancient Languages and New Science: The Levant in the Intellectual Life of Robert Boyle,” both in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Intersections, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 53–76, resp. 151–171.

Bible – during which he also tried to fulfill the requirements of diplomatic service.<sup>65</sup> Their activities were not only followed by the universities from which they came, but also by the wider *Respublica Litteraria*, even if it was not always the solution of philological problems which drew their attention, as the obviously proselytizing aims of the Turkish translation of the Bible show.<sup>66</sup>

This system worked well only until the deaths of Golius and Pococke – afterwards, a decline of the study of Eastern languages can be registered in the Netherlands as well as in England – but its advantages were felt by contemporary Orientalists even during the period of Harsányi's stay in Berlin: the early career Christian Ravius, who was appointed a Professor of Eastern Languages at the University of Frankfurt an der Oder in 1672, followed exactly the same model, as he had visited the Middle East as an alumnus of the universities of Oxford and Leiden.<sup>67</sup> The experts coming from outside, like those of Barbatus, had by this time already lost ground in the field of Oriental Studies. At the same time, even if we can register a certain level of combination between diplomatic service and scholarly activities in the careers of several Transylvanian Turkish Scribes, it was a huge disadvantage for them that they lacked a university in the background: an intellectual circle where they could return to after their years at the embassy and which would have rendered their contacts

---

<sup>65</sup> On Warner, see G.J.W. Drewes, "The Legatum Warnerianum of the Leiden University Library," in *Levinus Warner and His Legacy: Three Centuries Legatum Warnerianum in the Leiden University Library* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 1–31; de Groot, "De Betekenis", 34–41. On the co-operation of Golius and Warner in tracking down and purchasing manuscripts, see Jan Schmidt, "Between Author and Library Shelf: The Intriguing History of Some Middle Eastern Manuscripts Acquired by Public Collections in the Netherlands Prior to 1800," in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Intersections, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 27–51.

<sup>66</sup> On Robert Boyle's interest in the development in contemporary Oriental studies, see Littleton, "Ancient languages".

<sup>67</sup> For a biography of Ravius, see Johann Christoph Becmann, *Notitia Universitatis Francofurtanae, una cum iconibus personarum aliquot illustrium, aliorumque virorum egregiorum, qui eam praesentia sua ac meritis illustrarunt, professorum denique orindariorum qui anno seculari Universitatis secundo vixerunt* (Frankfurt an der Oder: Jeremias Schrey & Joh. Christoph Hartmann, 1707), 267–269. See also Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom*, 142–145.

to the international *Respublica Litteraria* possible.<sup>68</sup> The differences between the two situations are well represented by the fact that several people who stood in contact with Harsányi – such as Claes Rålamb and Isaac Basire – knew Bobovius personally, but there is no data that would suggest that the Turkish Scribe would have been acquainted with the Polish renegade.<sup>69</sup>

However good Jakab Harsányi Nagy's language skills were, he could not think of a university career: the Turkish language had, as I noted before, very little prestige compared to the Arabic, Hebrew or even Syriac in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>70</sup> The character of his knowledge rendered it possible only to maintain his position as an intellectual in the role of a member of a court and expert available for counseling in pragmatic questions.

### ***V.3. Harsányi, the Puritan?***

When addressing the most important elements of Jakab Harsányi Nagy's self-image, we have to come back to the question of his alleged Puritanism, especially as this was the reason why he was most frequently mentioned by earlier Hungarian historiography. To refer back to my results in chapter I.1: if we define Hungarian Puritans exclusively as supporters of the group who stood up for reforms of church government and liturgy in the 1640–50s of Eastern Hungary and Transylvania, it is

<sup>68</sup> On the disadvantages due to the lack of university, see Tibor Klaniczay, "Értelmiség egyetem nélküli országban" (Intellectuals in a country without university), in *Pallas magyar ivadéka* (The Hungarian progenies of Pallas) (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1985), 77–85.

<sup>69</sup> The possible relevance of Claes Rålamb's connections to Harsányi and also to Bobovius was registered by Cemal Kafadar, "The City," 62. On the contacts between Basire and Bobovius, see Hannah Neudecker, "From Istanbul to London? Albertus Bobovius' appeal to Isaac Basire," in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Intersections, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 173–196.

<sup>70</sup> Harsányi's language skills were judged – apart from György Hazai (17) – also by a reviewer of his edition. According to V. L. Ménage, although the syntax of more complex is sometimes strange, some words are hard to recognize (because of the false etymology used by the author) and Harsányi had some mistakes characteristic for Hungarian-speakers (such as mixing the terms "just as" and "than", both translated to Hungarian with the same word, "mint"); the fluentness of Harsányi's Turkish is in any case beyond doubts, see Ménage, "Review," 162–163.

not evident in what grade the category can be applied to Harsányi. From the decisions of the Synod of Szatmárnémeti it is only clear that contemporary orthodox Calvinist theologians found their young colleague suspicious, but they did not consider exceedingly strict steps necessary; we do not however know which of the debated questions was the one in which Harsányi's position seemed to be worth the attention of church authorities. Nevertheless, he does not seem to have had a very radical stance, as in this case he would have not have a chance to get such a confidential position as that of the Turkish Scribe from Prince György Rákóczi II, who was watching the Puritan movement with an ever diminishing sympathy.

From the moment of leaving the ecclesiastical career, there is even less reason to look for the traces of Harsányi's belonging to this Puritanism which manifested itself in church and educational policy, and opposed the practices of Calvinist orthodoxy. From the beginning of the 1650s, he was moving in secular circles and every document that was preserved from his pen is connected to this sphere; even if some data suggest that his earlier connections to the Calvinist church were known for his contemporaries. Simon Reniger, the Habsburg ambassador at Constantinople, when he reported the imprisonment of the Transylvanian embassy in 1657, noted that one of the Prince's agents was a Calvinist preacher.<sup>71</sup> This could be no one else than Jakab Harsányi Nagy: we have no data that would suggest that István Tisza had any background in theology. The Habsburg ambassador was wrong concerning the rank of Harsányi – the Turkish Scribe might have had the function, but not the office of an agent – but his remark shows that at least hearsay in the world of politics maintained a knowledge about the diplomat's past. And an entry in the diary of János Horváti Békés shows that it was also not forgotten later on: once the student entitled Harsányi

---

<sup>71</sup> Letter of Simon Reniger to Leopold I (Constantinople, 3 September 1657) HHStA Türkei Karton I. 128. Fasc. 63/b. Conv. D. fol. 63r.

not with the usual “generosus”, but as “reverendissimus dominus” – an address usually given to ecclesiastical personalities in the epoch.<sup>72</sup> Although Horváti Békés was surely aware that his Berlin host did not pursue a church career, it seems that he knew about his early office – if in no other way, he could have heard about it from the Hungarian emigrant. There is however nothing to suggest that Harsányi, who fashioned himself as a faithful bureaucrat and an intellectual of vast erudition would have tried to make his earlier theological education or his sympathies for a Presbyterian church politics a part of the image he conveyed about himself.

We are in no easier situation if we leave aside the definition of the Puritans as a more or less unified, Presbyterian faction with well-defined goals in church politics and a troubled history of struggles and instead understand them as a group following a given system of values and cultural practices, primarily in their religious life. This re-interpretation of Hungarian Puritans became – after early attempts in the field of literary history – well established in the historiography of the last twenty years.<sup>73</sup> Using this definition for the case of Harsányi is however not at all easy: for classic studies of literary history the convincing argument for labeling someone as Puritan was if a more or less direct reception of the works of a known English or Dutch Puritan theologian could be found in the oeuvre of the Hungarian author or there were

<sup>72</sup> Horváti Békés, *Diáknaplója*, 58.

<sup>73</sup> On the historiographic trend, see Éva Petrőczy, “Puritán szerzőink mint művészek: A puritanizmus és a művészetek viszonya a magyar szakirodalomban” (Hungarian Puritan authors as artists: The correlation of Puritanism and arts in the Hungarian historiography), in *Puritánia: Tanulmányok a magyar és angol puritanizmus irodalmáról* (Puritania: Studies on the literature of English and Hungarian Puritanism) (Budapest: Universitas, 2006), 7–36; Zsombor Tóth, *A koronatanú: Bethlen Miklós: Az Élete leírása magától és a XVII. századi puritanizmus* (The star witness: Miklós Bethlen: The *Autobiography* and 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism), Csokonai Könyvtár / Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium, no. 40. (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2007), 46–52. The historiography of Puritanism is blamed for the excesses in using the metaphor of struggle by Katalin Luffy, “Medgyesi Pál és a magyar puritanizmus: Historiográfiai áttekintés a kezdetektől 1980-ig” (Pál Medgyesi and Hungarian Puritanism: Historiographical overview from the beginnings to 1980), in *Medgyesi Pál redivivus: Tanulmányok a 17. századi puritanizmusról* (Studies on 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism), ed. Gergely Tamás Fazakas and János L. Győri (Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem and Egyetemi és Nemzeti Könyvtár, 2008), 15–30.

data about a personal acquaintance in their biographies.<sup>74</sup> It remains however a question what criteria can be used for identifying the Puritans connections of those authors who – similarly to Harsányi – did not publish anything related to theology.

The Anglo-Saxon historiography – much more extensive and methodologically more explicit than the Hungarian one – had to face similar problems. Whether they were interested of the Puritans' image about themselves, or that painted of them by their contemporaries, they have found a rather heterogeneous picture; and the theological systems presented by various Puritan authors also proved to be irreconcilable with each other. There are thus many definitions of who should even be regarded as a Puritan. Most of the analyses emphasize the role of the individual's personal, direct and intensive relationship to God, a faith deeply experienced and manifested in action, a certain activist religiosity. A majority of the authors had also seen the constant and accurate self-analysis as an important part of the Puritan way of life: the meticulous registration of their actions and their strict assessment from an ethical point of view helped the faithful to sense whether their souls would reach salvation.<sup>75</sup> Similar criteria also appeared in the Hungarian research.<sup>76</sup> These are however less useful for the case of Jakab Harsányi Nagy, as in order to use them, one

<sup>74</sup> This is the more or less implicit definition used by József Bodonhelyi, *Az angol puritanizmus lelki élete és magyar hatásai* (The spiritual life of English Puritanism and its impact on Hungary) (Debrecen: Pannonia, 1942); József Barcza, "A puritanizmus kutatásának újabb eredményei" (New results in the research of Puritanism), *Theologiai Szemle* n. s. 17, no. 11–12 (1976): 333–336; or from the most recent literature Csorba, "A' sovány lelket".

<sup>75</sup> See the overview of John Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603–1689, Social History in Perspective* (Houndmills: MacMillan, 1998), 1–12. As Margot Todd pointed out, the meticulous self-analysis did not necessarily also mean a sinless life, even in the case of the most devoted Puritans, see Todd, "Puritan self-fashioning."

<sup>76</sup> Attila Molnár, *A „protestáns etika” Magyarországon: A puritán erkölcs és hatása* (The "Protestant ethic" in Hungary: The Puritan morals and their impact) (Debrecen: Ethnica, 1994); Tóth, *A koronatanú*, 46–98. In more general terms: Judit Balogh, "Kérdések, hipotézisek, feladatok a XVII. századi magyar puritanizmus kutatása kapcsán" (Questions, hypotheses, tasks concerning the research of 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian Puritanism), in *Fiatal egyháztörténészek írásai* (Essays of young church historians), ed. Csaba Fazekas (Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem BTK Kora Újkori Magyar Történeti Tanszék, 1999), 47–56; István Ágoston, *A magyarországi puritanizmus gyökerei: Magyar puritánus törekvések a XVII. század első felében* (The roots of Puritanism in Hungary: Hungarian Puritan movements in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century) (Budapest: Kálvin, 1997).



needs a confession of some sort, a memoir, diary, autobiography or other source at least touching upon the psychical or spiritual development of the individual. The ego-documents available from the Hungarian diplomat/intellectual render it possible to uncover various layers of his self-fashioning, but none of them testify his relationship to God or questions of salvation. His letters from Constantinople and Berlin do not attest an extraordinary piety, and Harsányi's references to God do not exceed that of a usual contemporary of his.

There is however a momentum, in which similarities occur between Jakab Harsányi Nagy and the contemporary Hungarian Puritans. In Anglo-Saxon historiography, in the last thirty years a new definition of Puritanism has spread, which does not place the piety or constant self-analysis of the members of the group into focus, rather their attitude towards people outside their own circles. According to this approach, which takes into consideration the self-image of the Puritans and that coined by those who were seeing them from outside the group, the most important characteristic of the members of the group was their sense of exceptionality: that in the world immersed into sin, they are the elect few who practice strict observance of the Bible's prescriptions and one of whose missions is to encourage other people to do likewise.<sup>77</sup> As a consequence, they also develop a style that has a tendency to abound in radical oppositions – which renders their literary production rather monotonous.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Patrick Collinson, "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 483–488; Idem, *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989); Idem, "Antipuritanism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 19–33; Peter Lake, "William Bradshaw, Antichrist and the Community of the Godly," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985): 570–589; Idem, "Defining Puritanism – Again?," in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), 3–29; Idem, "'A Charitable Christian Hatred': The Godly and Their Enemies in the 1630s," in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, Themes in Focus, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (Houndmills: MacMillan, 1996), 145–183.

<sup>78</sup> Patrick Leverenz, *The Language of Puritan Feeling: An Exploration in Literature, Psychology, and Social History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1980), 1–22.

Obviously, this attitude generated a huge amount of conflicts between them and the society surrounding them, which proved to be less dedicated to the cause.

The most obvious example for this attitude can be found among the Hungarian Puritans in the person of János Tolnai Dali. As I noted in chapter I.1, after his return from England, he proved to be a constant stumbling-block for Eastern Hungarian Calvinism in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century. It was not only due to his ambitious plans for continuing Reformation through the transformation of education, liturgy and church administration; but also to his ambiguous and often violent character. It was easy for Tolnai's opponents to find arguments for traducing the choleric theologian. Some of his students at Sárospatak had terrible things to tell about their impatient and partial teacher: "They suffer with the pain of their soul when they are called devil-hearted in his sermon, and bastards in his prayer (that is rather a curse than a prayer), as well as mindless animals, avers, dogs and pigs."<sup>79</sup> After a while, there was a full-fledged campaign for his defamation, going as far as spreading rumors about his alleged affair with his sister-in-law "as it fits his rotten nature".<sup>80</sup>

It was however not necessary to have a nature as controversial as that of Tolnai so that the above described attitude would develop. Pál Medgyesi, who is usually contrasted to Tolnai Dali by the historiography and described as a temperate compromise-seeker with a good sense for politics, also had to explain apologetically the motivation behind his "prophetic nagging": "It there would be nothing to nag about, there would be no nagging either."<sup>81</sup> It was generally characteristic for

<sup>79</sup> "Lelkek fájdalomával szenvedik, hogy prédikációjában ördöglegyeknek, könyörgésében (mely átok inkább, mintsem könyörgés) fattyaknak nevezi őket, oktalán állatoknak, barmoknak, ebeknek, disznóknak." The visitation of István Miskolczy Csulyak at the school of Sárospatak in 1642, published in AP XXI: 144.

<sup>80</sup> "[...] az ő rusnya természeti szerént" note from an unknown hand in the protocols of the diocese of Zemplén, SRKLt. Kgg I.2. 191r.

<sup>81</sup> "Ha nem volnának min zsémbelődnünk, a zsémbek sem lennének." The answers of Pál Medgyesi for the accusations of István Geleji Katona, in his work *Doce nos orare quin predicare* (1650) is quoted by

Hungarian Puritan sermons that they used the method of reprehension (“feddőzés”) much more often than their orthodox Calvinist counterparts.<sup>82</sup> The Hungarian authors and translators of Puritan conduct books referred often to “the many outer and inner deficiencies of our [...] poor homeland”, and even in the case of so generally spread sins such as that of inebriety, they found the opportunity to castigate the circumstances in Hungary: “So, if the flood of this filthy drunkenness has reached any part of the world, woe unto us! in our parts, it has doubly covered every hill of sober life!”<sup>83</sup>

This attitude, the Puritan tendency to call attention on mistakes and sometimes urge their correction through aggrandizing them, did not meet the unambiguous appreciation of the contemporaries. Revolted from the educational reforms of Tolnai, István Geleji Katona, the Calvinist Bishop of Transylvania summarized his impressions to the Prince in the following way:

---

Tóth, *A koronatanú*, 140, note 116. The best-written example for a contrastive description of Medgyesi and Tolnai is offered by Révész, *A szatmárnémeti zsinat*, 16–19.

<sup>82</sup> See the contrastive analysis of the sermons of the Puritan Sámuel Köleséri and the orthodox István Geleji Katona: János L. Győri, “Mártirium, puritanizmus, retorika” (Martyrdom, Puritanism, rhetorics), *Irodalomtörténet* 31 (2000): 51–72.

<sup>83</sup> „akár külső, akár belső számtalan fogyatkozását [...] szegény hazánknak” János Mikolai Hegedűs, *Az mennyei igazságnak tüzes oszlopa, mely ez nyomorúságos élet kerengő pusztájában az Isten szerelmes ellankadt népének a sok tévelygések s eretnkségek setét éccakáján és az sok istentelenségek s megvesztő gonosz példák szövevényi között is világosan megmutatja, mely úton juthatnak bé a mennyei Canahán birodalmába* (The fiery column of the heavenly truth, which would clearly show to the downhearted people loved by God, in the wasteland of this desolate life, in the dark night of many errors and heresies, beyond the labyrinth of many Godlessness and misleading evil examples, in which road they can get to the empire of the heavenly Canaan) (Utrecht: Vasberg, 1648), 2r. „Úgy, hogy ha ez világnak valamely részén [...] ez ocsmány részegségnek árvize elhatott, jaj! a miénkben minden józan életnek halmát kétszerre inkább elborított!” Mátyás Diószegi Bónis, *Az részegesnek gyűlölséges, utálatos és rettenetes állapotja, mely lerajzoltatott szintén úgy, amint vagyon, azoknak kedvéért; kikben még ez undok és ocsmány részegség (mely minden gonoszságnak gyökere és minden jóságnak rothasztója) fészket nem vert, hogy azok, ennek éktelen ábrázatját megtekéntvén, megrettenjenek és az halálnak útjáról visszatérjenek* (The hateful, disgusting and horrible state of drunkenness, which was described as it really is, for the sake of those in whom this abominable and filthy drunkenness (which is the root of all evil and the decomposer of all good) did not yet build a nest, so that these, seeing its foul face would be horrified and return from that way of death) (Leiden: Leffen, 1649), dedication. On the „passionate wailing” as the prominent manifestation of the Puritan author’s experience of Hungarianness, see Éva Petrőczy, “XVII. századi puritán szerzőink magyarságképe” (The image of Hungary among 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian Puritan authors), in *Religió, retorika, nemzettudat régi irodalmunkban* (Religion, rhetoric, national identity in the old Hungarian literature), Csokonai Könyvtár (Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium), no. 31, ed. István Bitskey and Szabolcs Oláh (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2004), 474–480.

I am constantly surprised of the minds of the people who come back from England; not a single one came from there, who would not have picked up something eccentric and who would not be filled with wrong-directed intentions. [...] Now they go there more often and this can be experienced in everything, because none of them wants to be dependent of anyone, just be a free person from their heads to feet.<sup>84</sup>

The point of the Bishop is the latter, that is: the main problem for him was that Tolnai and his colleagues did not respect the church hierarchy and tried to release themselves from under their control. Gáspár Miskolczi Csulyak on the other hand, a student on his peregrination who compiled a description of the *Independentism in England* from Dutch sources, warned his compatriots that the saint-like lifestyle and continuous strive for amelioration among the Puritans serves only the camouflage of their hunger for power:

He [, the Puritan] has benign conversations with everyone, making them like him; does not strive to reach anyone else's status; treats everyone gently with sacred kisses and sweet talk, lifting his eyes full of tears to the heavens and putting his hands upon his chest; until he stabs them with his scimitar under the fifth rib.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>84</sup> "Én nem győzőm eléggé csudálni Angliából kijött uraimnak elméjüket; soha még eddig egy is onnat ki nem jött, a ki valameddig ott lakott, hogy valami singularitást nem imbibált volna és valami félrevaló indulat benne nem volna. [...] Im most szaporábban járnak oda, és tapasztalható képen megtetszik mindenben, mert egyik sem akar senkitől függeni, mind csak főre lábra szabados urak akarnak lenni." Letter of István Geleji Katona to György Rákóczi I (Gyulafehérvár, 22 October 1640) SF I: 178–179. Many similar opinions are quoted by Gergely Tamás Fazakas, "Az imádság testi kifejeződései az angol és magyar puritanizmusban: Az 1643-as *Praxis Pietatis* filológiai és ikonográfiai kérdései" (The corporal forms of prayer in the English and Hungarian Puritanism: Questions of philology and iconography concerning the 1643 edition of *Praxis Pietatis*), in *Medgyesi Pál redivivus: Tanulmányok a 17. századi puritanizmusról* (Studies on 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism), ed. Gergely Tamás Fazakas and János L. Győri (Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem and Egyetemi és Nemzeti Könyvtár, 2008), 127–133.

<sup>85</sup> "Mindenekkel maga kedveltetéssel szelíden társalkodik, senki állapotjára, ha jobbat kaphat, nem vágyakozik, könyvező szemeit az égre emelvén, kezével mellyét illetvén, szent csókkal, édes beszéddel örömet nyájaskodik, míglen az embert, ötödik oldalcsontja alatt hancsarával általüti." Gáspár Miskolczi Csulyak, *Angliai independentismus avagy az ecclesiái fenytékben és a külső isteni tiszteletre tartozó jó rendtartásokban, minden reformáta ecclesiaktól különböző fejtelten lábság* (English Independentism, or anarchy contrasting to any Reformed churches in ecclesiastical discipline as well as the ordinances about the ceremonies of God's worship) (Utrecht: Vasberg, 1654), 148.

It is no wonder that the diverging views in these conflicts sometimes released quite wild emotions. The work published as an answer for Miskolczi Csulyak's book, the *Puritanism in England* by István P. Telkibányai is a rare exception in this respect, as the author, who translated a writing of William Ames for the defense of his standing point, uses a very polite tone to tell his fellow student off in the foreword.<sup>86</sup> The debate between János Tolnai Dali and András Váci was much more typical: it would have theoretically been a theological dispute about the use of the Lord's Prayer but the two participants soon indulged into personalities. Although Tolnai complained that Váci criticized him for his "thundering" speeches "that do not mind the preening people", he showed a carnival of exactly this style when his opponent called him a person "with a heart loaded with fiendish, inexorable hatred and anger."<sup>87</sup>

<sup>86</sup> "The little work of Mr. Gáspár Miskolczi, released at this occasion, which is – pace my friend – very harmful to follow, but important to know" – wrote István P. Telkibányai about his opponent in *Angliai puritanismus, avagy kiváltképpen való tudományok azoknak, kik Angliában a puritánusok között (amint közönségesen neveztetnek) legkeményebbeknek tarttatnak* (Puritanism in England, that is the most outstanding knowledge of those who are held to be the toughest among the Puritans (as they are generally called) in England) (Utrecht: Wasberg, 1654), 4. A possible reason for the moderate tone could be that Telkibányai's book was published immediately after Miskolczi's and its author may not have known the precise content of the *Angliai indepententismus*; see Éva Petrőczy, "Pengeváltás nélkül: Miskolczi Csulyak István és Telkibányai István vitája a puritánizmusról," (Without crossing swords: The debate of István Miskolczi Csulyak and István Telkibányai about Puritanism), in *"Tenger az igaz hitről való egyenetlenségek vitatásának eláradott özöne..." Tanulmányok XVI–XIX. századi hitvitáinkról* ("There is a sea of debates around the problems of the true faith..." Studies on religious debates in 16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> century Hungary), ed. János Heltai and Réka Tasi (Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem BTK Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszék, 2005), 103–114.

<sup>87</sup> "[...] mennydörgő szabású" and "aféle nyalkálkodókkal nem gondoló"; "ördögi megengesztelhetetlen gyűlöléssel és haraggal megrakott szívűnek", János Tolnai Dali, *Dáneus Rácai-i, azaz a Miatyánk felől igaz értelmű tanítóknak magok mentsége Váci Andrásnak uzsorás vádja és szidalma ellen* (Daneus Racai-i, that is, the apology of teachers of right opinion about the Lord's Prayer against the usurer's accusation and invectives of András Váci) (Sárospatak: Renyus, 1654), 148, 153. On the debate, see also Gergely Tamás Fazakas, "'Mesterségükben disputálók' vitája: Hitvitázó irodalomként értelmezhető-e Tolnai Dali János Váci P. Andrásal polemizáló könyve?" (The debate of "those disputing in their craft": Can the book of János Tolnai Dali in polemics with András Váci be understood as literature of religious debates?), in *Religió, retorika, nemzettudat régi irodalmunkban* (Religion, rhetoric, national identity in the old Hungarian literature), Csokonai Könyvtár (Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium), no. 31, ed. István Bitskey and Szabolcs Oláh (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2004), 401–423; Idem, „Mesterségükben disputálók” vitája II. Váci P. András *Replika* című műve és a Tolnai–Váci polémia újraértelmezése (The debate of "those disputing in their craft": The *Replika* of András P. Váci and the re-interpretation of the polemics between Tolnai and Váci), *Studia Litteraria (Debrecen)* 41 (2003): 111–131.

It is not hard to recognize the analogy between the debates around János Tolnai Dali, and the discord around Jakab Harsányi Nagy. The strenuous activities of the Turkish Scribe aimed at making the work at the Transylvanian embassy in Constantinople more efficient, thereby serving his ruler better – this however hurt the interest of those contemporaries who were generally happy with the state of affairs and built their strategies upon maintaining it. The latter could well make use of the unaccommodating character of Harsányi, who not only took upon himself conflicts, but even attracted them. His debates, just like those of the more radical Puritans, often turned into indulging in personalities. This was also valid for the later period of Harsányi's career – even if it would probably be an overstatement to try and find Harsányi's enthusiasm for providing an excellent service and Gheorghe Ștefan's failure to honor it at the root of the conflicts at the Stettin court. Nevertheless, when choosing the stylistic tools for conducting disputes, Harsányi had an excellent opportunity to make good use of his training at preaching: his letters about the struggles in Constantinople, as well as in Stettin, abound in thundering reprehensions. Even his word choice shows affinity to that of the Puritan authors: Harsányi is prone to use the verb “mocskol” (befoul) when quoting the accusations of his adversaries, a word which is also used excessively by Tolnai Dali.<sup>88</sup>

It would be tempting to suggest, based on the stylistic analogies, that the increased activity of Harsányi is a consequence of his Puritan affiliation – in the same vein as Max Weber described in respect to the connections between the Protestant ethics and capitalism: that is, that the individual who had a strong belief in predestination and was anxious about his salvation, but could not do anything for it, was striving with stout work for gaining earthly success, because he hoped to discover

---

<sup>88</sup> “Regarding the befoulments against János Tolnai, written by this befouler” („Ami a mocskolónak Tolnai János ellen írt mocskolásit illeti”); “when you befouled this befoulment” („mikor ezt a mocskot mocskoltad”), and so on, and so forth, see Tolnai Dali, *Daneus Rácai-i*, 147.

God-sent signs concerning his afterlife in it.<sup>89</sup> The Puritans are seen as “an industrious sort of people” also by Marxists – their debate with Weberians is mostly about the motivation of this strenuousness.<sup>90</sup> In Harsányi’s case – due to the lack of suitable ego-documents – it is impossible to say whether his outstanding diligence had any connection to an anxiety about salvation. It can in any case be said that the behavior and debate culture of the Puritans have provided an example for him that determined the development of his personality, his understanding of his own role in society and his attitude towards his contemporaries.

---

<sup>89</sup> Max Weber, *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (London: Routledge, 1930).

<sup>90</sup> The term is used by Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London: Martin Secker & Warburg, 1964), 121–140. An excellent selection on the debate around Weber is provided by Hartmut Lehmann and Guenther Roth, ed., *Weber’s Protestant Ethic: Origins, Evidence, Contexts* (Washington: German Historical Institute (London), 1993). A Marxist critique against the Weberian understanding of Puritanism: C.H. George, “Puritanism as history and historiography,” *Past and Present* 41 (1968): 77–104. The debate with the Weberian thesis is certainly not the privilege of Marxist historians, see recently Graeme Murdock, “Did Calvinists Have a Guilt Complex? Reformed Religion, Conscience and Regulation in Early Modern Europe,” in *Retribution, Repentance, and Reconciliation*, Studies in Church History, no. 40, ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), 138–158.

## VI. Harsányi's Changing Image of the Turks

“Among the Turks, persistent word is rare.”<sup>1</sup> Jakab Harsányi Nagy dropped this remark in a letter written to his Prince in the 1650s. Fifteen years later, on the pages of the *Colloquia*, he dedicated long passages to show how important saying the truth was for the Ottoman culture:

I have heard others recall the proverb often: Sit bent, speak straight, that is: you can sit with a bent body, but to speak false and improper is a great misdeed! It belongs not to rational beings, but to the devil. Because a lie takes away all love, friendship, fellowship and trust among people; the liar cannot the fury of God [...] Shall he find a merciful God! as in both worlds (in this life and the future one) there is no better possession than truth. When he gives his word, he holds it.<sup>2</sup>

As recent research in social sciences suggests, stereotypes and “images of the Other” change historically, following mostly the changing power relations. However, it is most unusual that the image of a specific “Other” radically changes in a single person’s lifetime. Jakab Harsányi Nagy’s changing image of the Turk would thus be of interest even if his relationship towards the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire would not be one of the most important elements of the biography. The relevance of the *Colloquia* in this respect is however beyond doubts: writing this book can be seen

<sup>1</sup> “Az törökben az állhatatos szó ritka.” Letter of Jakab Harsányi Nagy to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 17 December 1655) EÉKH I: 567.

<sup>2</sup> “[...] aliis proverbium illud in memoriam revocasse audivi: Curvus sede, recte loquere; id est, corpore inclinato, seu incurvato sedere possumus, sed falsa, & non recta loqui, magnum scelus est! non creaturae rationali, sed diabolo proprium (mentiri). Quia mendacium, seu verborum falsitas, omnem omnino inter homines charitatem, amicitiam, societatem ac fidem pervertit, tollitque; homo mendax, iram Dei non effugiet [...] Deum misericordem inveniet! cum in utroque mundo (in vita hac & futura) melioris boni possessio, veritate, non detur, dum verba dat, verba data servat.” *Colloquia*, 57.



as the summary of all his activities related to the Ottomans, and this work is also to be thanked for Harsányi's reputation among at least some circles of posterity. In this last chapter I will attempt a comparison between the image of the Turks conveyed by the *Colloquia* with those formulated by his diplomatic correspondence – and where, applicable, by his *Opinio* –, which nevertheless are more fragmentary, due to the genre of the writings; and to offer an interpretation of their differences.

### ***VI.1. “A Turk” or “Various Turks”?***

In the very beginning of the first chapter of *Colloquia*, the reader already faces an incident that illustrates that the Ottoman Empire is different from European lands. The Legate greets the Interpreter with lifting his hat, which meets the other's disapproval. The former tries to excuse his mistake by claiming that all regions have their own customs, but his interlocutor makes the point once more: “True, but among Muslims it is indecent.”<sup>3</sup>

With this entrée it does not surprise anyone if the whole book contains much information about the differences between Europeans and Ottomans. But are there common features one can describe the Turks with? When the question arises what the nature of the Turks is, the Interpreter is reluctant to give a straight answer. The true nature and mind of a people can only be known by God, he claims, especially of these Turks, who are not even a pure nation, but put together of the sons of many other peoples – the Interpreter lists not less than twenty-seven.

Thus, it is so, that if someone would be tempted and wanted to describe the nature and morals of the Ottomans, he has to know the nature of all these nations. What is more, the natural followers of Mahomet, which are of

---

<sup>3</sup> “Verum, quidem; sed Moslemanno indecorum.” *Colloquia*, 3.

Turkish origin, have a nature and morals different from that of the renegades, those made out of Christians; the learned Turks a different one than the ignorant and rude; those who live in the periphery of the Empire have different morals than those living in the center: from the Christians and their neighbors anyone can learn both good or bad. The soldiers, the educated and the stupid, the merchants, the villagers, the town-dwellers, or courtmen, anyone from our regions, live with different morals and customs.<sup>4</sup>

When elaborating upon his remarkably non-essentialist standing point, the Interpreter laid the emphasis on technical problems – that the group of the Ottomans is so heterogeneous that nothing common can be stated about them. The Legate’s argument, on the other hand, takes a more philosophical stance: he claims that God has given humans the ability to learn at least something about everything.<sup>5</sup> He even calls the Interpreter’s attention to the possibility to supplement his own experience with that of other, reliable people – a possibility which the Interpreter will later on all but dismiss, as it was discussed in chapter IV. The Interpreter eventually lets himself be convinced by the Legate to provide at least some generalizing information. Nevertheless, the difference of their attitude is characteristic for them throughout the entire book: while the Legate is ready to offer more – sometimes sweeping – generalizations about the nature and customs of the Turks, the Interpreter does this rather seldom and unwillingly. At one instance, however, he maintains his opinion that it is not possible to generalize about the Turks, due to the radical differences inside the groups: and this is the question of the “born Muslims” and the renegades.

---

<sup>4</sup> “Itaque, opus hoc, quicumque aggressus, Osmannidarum naturam, & mores explanare voluerit, illum omnium nationum naturam oportebit posse. Praeterea naturalis, & ex prosapia Turcica oriundus, Mahometis Assecla, ac renegatus, seu ex Christiano factus, aliam, & diversam habet naturam ac mores: doctus Turca aliam, indoctus & rudis iterum aliam; confiniorum, & mediterranei imperii incola, alios assumit mores: ex Christianis & vicinis, bona pariter ac mala quilibet addiscit. Miles, sapiens, & stupidus, mercator, paganus, oppidanus, vel civicus, atque aulicus, quemadmodum in nostris quoque regionibus, variis ac variis utitur moribus ac consuetudinibus.” *Colloquia*, 365–366.

<sup>5</sup> *Colloquia*, 366–367.

People converted from Christianity to Islam played an important part in the public life of the Ottoman Empire: from the 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> centuries on, they gained a place of growing importance in state administration, regardless of the – sometimes rather violent – protest of the “trueborn Turks” against this development.<sup>6</sup> Renegades were never especially popular among the Transylvanian diplomats in the Sublime Porte, either. An Orator, Tamás Gyulay, complained to the Prince that the Chief Ambassador took his interpreter when he left the Ottoman court: “I am here as a mute, I have no interpreter, and if I could get someone to interpret, he would be, my Lord, a Hungarian turned into pagan. These would not interpret to me for any presents, and even if they would, how could I trust them, if they say the truth or not: pagans side with pagans.”<sup>7</sup> Another Orator, János Dávid simply gave the unflattering title *canis filius* (dog’s son) to a Hungarian renegade interpreter – and he was not the only one to use this term when referring to them.<sup>8</sup>

Gyulay used a term towards the renegades relating to their religious adherence (“pagan”), however, it was much more common to indicate them as “Turks”: when they converted, they “turned Turks”. Changing their religions, these people also changed their natures as well in the eyes of the Transylvanian diplomats. To be precise: whatever ethnic background – and the related “ethnic nature” – they had, they gained Turkish nature in the process. The case of Zülfiqār ağa is indicative: everybody knew that he was born Hungarian, but nobody found his earlier, Hungarian nature relevant. He seemed to have entirely lost it when he converted to Islam: “he is a Turk,

<sup>6</sup> On the social history of the renegades in Ottoman administration, see Pál Fodor, “‘Hivatásos törökök – született törökök’: Hatalmi elit és társadalom a 15–17. századi Oszmán Birodalomban (‘Professional Turks – trueborn Turks’: Political elite and society in the Ottoman Empire in the 15–17<sup>th</sup> centuries), *Századok*, 138 (2004): 773–791.

<sup>7</sup> “[...] itt csak olyan vagyok, mint az néma, tolmácsom, nincsen, ha kit kapnék is, hogy tolmácsoljon, az kegyelmes uram magyarból lett pogány, az is ajándékon nem akar tolmácsolni, s ha mit tolmácsol is mit tudok benne, ha igazán mondja-é vagy nem; pogány pogányhoz szít.” Tamás Gyulay’s letter to Prince Mihály Apafi I (Adrianople, 7 January 1672) TMAO V: 94.

<sup>8</sup> János Dávid’s letter to Mihály Apafi I (Adrianople, 6 May 1667) TMAO IV: 347. János Kemény also called renegades “dogs” in his autobiography, in Kemény, “Önéletírása,” 87.

he would not keep many secrets” – wrote István Rác, when he explained to his Prince that he would not share many information with the ağa.<sup>9</sup> He was accepted with the same reservation as “trueborn Turks”: Ferenc Gyárfás reported, that “from the behavior and words of Zülfikār ağa, it seems as if he would be serving your Lordship with a true heart, however, the Turkish nature is in him, and he loves and seeks his own interest in everything.”<sup>10</sup>

Harsányi is not less critical on the pages of the *Colloquia* towards the renegades either; however, there is a significant difference between him and the fellow Transylvanian diplomats. While the latter seem to suggest, that renegades, by converting, turned to be as bad as any other Turk, Harsányi asserts that a “trueborn Muslim” is a thousand times better than a renegade. He describes the former as reliable and pious men: they keep the prescriptions of their faith, never lie, never get drunk, and all are very generous. They even let their captives free after those spent some years in prison – in case they have not converted in the meantime. At the same time, they would never force anyone to convert. The renegades, quite the contrary, are evil, they lie and break their oaths, even cheat others in their shops. Nevertheless, even the group of the renegades is not homogenous according to Harsányi. The problems are not so huge with the educated ones: they are only drunkards and addicted to drugs. An ignorant renegade, however, hardly differs from an animal. Those, who live in the cities, are a bit more civilized, but even so they cannot reach the politeness and piety of trueborn Muslims, especially those who have already accomplished their compulsory pilgrimage.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> “[...] ő török, nála nem sok titok vagyon.” Letter of István Rác to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 15 August 1642) RGyKÖ 688.

<sup>10</sup> “Zülfikār agának magaviseléséből, szavaiból is úgy látszik, mintha nagyságodnak igen jó szível szolgálna, de az török természet benne vagyon, igen szereti s keresi az maga hasznát mindenben.” Letter of Ferenc Gyárfás to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 24 October 1648) RGyP 902.

<sup>11</sup> *Colloquia*, 372–377.

The positive image of the pious Turk was not unknown in the Western European *turcica* literature. Travelers, especially in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, frequently acknowledged that although Islam was not the true religion, it seemed that its followers were more zealous than their Christian counterparts. Even the most malicious commentators had something good to say about the Ottomans' charity, care of the sick or strict fasting.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, it is less surprising that Harsányi also had good opinions about the Muslims – however, he went sometimes far beyond the praises of other travelers. He even claims that a “trueborn Muslim”, who has already been to pilgrimage, would never drink any liquid that could make him drunk, contents himself with one woman, and “stays away from homosexual contacts, pederasty and other sins.”<sup>13</sup> Homosexual relationships were generally attributed to Turks by his contemporaries; in contemporary Hungarian usage, this form of sexual behavior was even called “living in the Turkish way.”<sup>14</sup> The assumption was deeply rooted in the common knowledge of the time: the Transylvanian orator, Mihály Cserményi, mentioned in his diplomatic report the male lovers of the Sultan without finding it necessary to add any comment to it – he must have thought that well-known facts needed no further elaboration.<sup>15</sup> But this behavior was connected to Turks in general (the above mentioned example concerns the Sultan himself), without the differentiations made by Harsányi – his attitude, attributing this and also every moral failure to renegades, while saving the face of the “born Muslims”, is noteworthy

<sup>12</sup> Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature (1520–1660)*, Études de littérature étrangère et comparée, no. 13 (Paris: n. p., 1940) 335–353.

<sup>13</sup> “[...] a catamitorum consuetudine, adulterio, aliisque peccatis valde sibi cavet.” *Colloquia*, 376.

<sup>14</sup> László Nagy, “Élet a ‘magyar romlásnak századában’” (Life in the “century of the decay of Hungary”), in *Kard és szerelem: Török kori históriák* (Sword and love: Stories from the Turkish age) (Budapest: Gondolat, 1985), 38–39. The assumption was generally spread in Early Modern Europe, see Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 109–127.

<sup>15</sup> Mihály Cserményi's letter to Anna Bornemisza, wife of Mihály Apafi I (Adrianople, 29 August 1665) in TMÁO IV: 280.

indeed, even in the broader context of contemporary European descriptions of the Ottoman Empire.

Quite remarkably, a rare example of another author, who laid special stress on differentiating between renegades and “natural Turks”, visited the Ottoman Empire in the same decade, when Harsányi also resided there.<sup>16</sup> Jean de Thévenot’s description is analogous to that of Harsányi, as he writes:

the Turks are good People, and observe very well that command of Nature; not to do to others, but what we would have others to do to us. When I speak here of Turks, I understand Natural Turks, and not such as turn to their Religion from another who are very numerous in Turkie, and are certainly capable of all sorts of Wickedness and Vice, as is known by Experience, and commonly as unfaithful to Men, as they have been to God.<sup>17</sup>

A direct relation between the two authors cannot be established. Although Thévenot spent two years in Constantinople, in 1655–56, the French gentleman – as his English translator characterises him – was very unlikely to have met the Transylvanian Turkish Scribe: even if Thévenot maintained good relations to the representative of the French Crown in the Ottoman capital, they had hardly any contacts with the Transylvanians in this epoch. Although the first accounts on Thévenot’s journey were published in 1665 – seven years before Harsányi’s own book – the probability that the latter used the *Relation d’un voyage fait au Levant*, is very small: the book was not published in

<sup>16</sup> In the massive amount of English and French descriptions of the Ottoman Empire, analyzed by Aslı Çirakman, there was no other author who would have made the same clear differentiation. See: *From the 'Terror of the World' to the 'Sick Man of Europe': European Images of the Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Nineteenth*, Studies in Modern European History, no. 43 (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 47. The Venetian ambassador from 1592, Lorenzo Bernardo, is one of the few examples, who explicitly comments on the renegades; however, he contrasts them to the Ottomans of the “good old days”, not to their contemporaries, see James C. David, ed., *Pursuit of power: Venetian Ambassadors' Reports on Spain, Turkey, and France in the Age of Philip II, 1560–1600* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970) (in the following: PP), 157–158.

<sup>17</sup> In contemporary translation: Jean de Thévenot, *The Travels of Monsieur de Thevenot into the Levant* (London: Faithorne et al, 1687) 59.

Latin, and we have no reason to suppose that Harsányi would have been able to read it in French.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, there is a fundamental disparity between the function of this differentiation in Thévenot's and Harsányi's work: while the former only touches upon it in this single passage, for the latter, it is a constitutive element of his entire account.

We do not know what the background of Thévenot's judgements were, but Harsányi, in any case, had personal motivation to criticize the renegades. On the one hand, his Calvinist zeal, which resulted in the religious debate with Miclescu, must have had an impact on his ideas about renegades as well: from the moralist attitude, which he was always so keen to represent, he might very well have objected against their conversion, that he clearly interpreted as careerism, faithlessness, and lack of conscience. Considering the fact, however, that other, rather fervent Protestant authors did not find it necessary to condemn the renegades so explicitly, would lead one to the conclusion that in Harsányi's case one has to look for more personal reasons, originating in his individual experiences. The many quarrels he had with Zülfikār ağa would certainly have contributed to it, as well as the accusations the Orator Máté Balogh probably also told him personally, that is that he himself was also suspected of planning conversion.<sup>19</sup> In the *Colloquia*, the following conversation about the personal background of his impersonator, the Interpreter is found:

Legate: As far as I think, you seem to be a Turk.

Interpreter: True, I was born in Turkish territory, but I had Christian mother and father.

<sup>18</sup> The first edition: Jean de Thévenot, *Relation d'un voyage fait au Levant* (Paris: Billaine, 1665). Later the book was printed in many, also extended editions, and also in an English translation (see previous footnote).

<sup>19</sup> Máté Balogh's letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 19 June 1656) MHHD XXIII: 381.

L: You say so. But what you hide in your heart, is only known for God.

I: I swear on the truth of God, that I do not cheat you.<sup>20</sup>

It cannot be excluded that this small dialogue is based on Harsányi's personal experiences. As someone coming from a tributary state of the Ottoman Empire, having lived several years in Constantinople and being familiar with the Ottoman language, he might have raised the suspicion of many people in the Holy Roman Empire. He probably found the explicit condemnation of renegades a proper way to distance himself from them and thereby answer the accusations.

### ***VI.2. Elements of the Image***

Although the Interpreter sees it as his goal to avoid generalizations – and, as in other cases, also here we can suppose that he is representing Harsányi's opinion –, some characteristics are still highlighted in the *Colloquia*, through which the otherness of the Ottoman culture is defined: they are the categories that render the differences between Us and Them clear for the audience. As suggested by modern anthropologists, in the following section I will single out the most important elements of “categorical mismatches” between the Ottomans and Europeans, as presented by Harsányi, and show their interdependences and their context in the writings of the Hungarian author and his contemporaries.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> “V: Quantum mihi coniectari licet, Turca esse videris, videmini, seu Turcae similes estis [all possible translations of the Ottoman term are given]. I: Verum quidem in Turcia natus sum, matrem tamen & patrem Christianos habui. V: Tu ita quidem dicis. Interim, quid in cordi occulti habeas, unice Deo notum, cognitum est. I: Per veritatem Dei loquor, (sit) te non decipiam.” *Colloquia*, 15–16.

<sup>21</sup> For a discussion of “categorical mismatches” as constitutive elements of intergroup stereotyping, see Maryon McDonald, “The Construction of Difference: An Anthropological Approach to Stereotypes,” in *Inside European Identities: Ethnography in Western Europe*, ed. Sharon MacDonald (Oxford: Berg, 1993), 219–236.



VI.2.1. Greed: “*The Emperor of this World is Money.*”<sup>22</sup>

Money has an illustrious place in describing the culture of the Turks in the *Colloquia*. This comes as no surprise as economic questions seemed to play an outstanding role in Ottoman life for contemporary European travelers: all authors of Western origin found it necessary to comment on them. The practice of *rüşvet*, money-gifts regularly given to Ottoman officials in order to further the applicant’s interests, shocked every observer: they interpreted it as an incredibly open form of corruption, a clear sign of immorality.<sup>23</sup>

No wonder that Transylvanian diplomats, who had the everyday experience of distributing gifts to various Ottoman office-holders, and encouraging their Princes to send some new resources for the same, were not enthusiastic about the phenomenon that “this Turkish world works only through donations.”<sup>24</sup> On this theme, many variations were later produced, some of them quite witty, such as the one of Kristóf Paskó: “with money everything can be accomplished, but only with promises, [the Turk] would not let anyone graze.”<sup>25</sup> Harsányi himself, while being diplomat in the Sublime Porte, found the most poetic metaphors about the phenomenon: “The mill of

<sup>22</sup> “Mundi huius Imperator pecunia est.” *Colloquia*, 32.

<sup>23</sup> See among others: Rouillard, *The Turk*, 323; Çirakman, *From the 'Terror of the World'*, 69. Some modern Ottomanists, with an receptivity to anthropology, suggest that the *rüşvet* was such an integral part of the Ottoman everyday, that it makes no sense to see it as corruption – a term that would imply excesses from the practice, rather than the practice itself. See Gábor Ágoston, “Információszerzés és kémkedés az Oszmán Birodalomban a 15–17. században” (Information service and espionage in the Ottoman Empire in 15<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries), in *Információáramlás a magyar és török végvári rendszerben*, ed. Tivadar Petercsák and Mátyás Berecz (Eger: Dobó István Vármúzeum, 1999), 141.

<sup>24</sup> “[...] ez az török világ csak adammal jár.” Zsigmond Boér’s letter to Mihály Teleki (Thessaloniki, 24 February 1670) TML V: 97. János Donáth expressed similar views in his letter written to Gábor Bethlen (Constantinople, 30 May 1629): i.e. the Prince “knows better the state of the Porte”, than him, “that is works only with donations.” in Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Bethlen Gábor fejedelem levelezése* (The correspondence of Gábor Bethlen) (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1887) (in the following: BGL), 386.

<sup>25</sup> “Pénzzel az török előtt mindent végben vihetni, de csak igirettel nem szokott ű legeltetni.” Kristóf Paskó’s letter to Mihály Apafi I (Constantinople, 6 February 1666) TMÁO IV: 303.

the Turk is driven by gifts,” he wrote once, while another time he noted that “without gifts, the eyes of the Turk do not see, their tongue is dumb.”<sup>26</sup>

What is there to find about money in the *Colloquia*? First, given its character as a phrase-book, the reader meets a broad selection of vocabulary designed for shopping, presented at various occasions throughout the book: when the fellow-travelers hire a guide, and also when they visit the market.<sup>27</sup> Harsányi even provides a selection of the most important expressions to be used during bargaining: “To my head. To the truth of God. To the head of the divine Emperor. To the truth of salt and bread. To the truth of Koran. To the truth of the doctrines.”<sup>28</sup> There are many more, Harsányi claims, but he omits them for brevity’s sake. Nevertheless, the reader already has the impression that bargaining is indeed a crucial aspect of Ottoman culture.

Not omitted are other phrases connected to money. There are many proverbs cited by Harsányi, which all repeat the one in the title of this subchapter: “In the world we live in, and the king of these times is money. [...] As much money one has in his chest, that much respect one has. Money accomplishes everything. No one can carry out anything without money. [...] Only God and angels are free of the desire for silver and gold.”<sup>29</sup> These proverbs are not told by either the Interpreter or the Legate, but by the Guide. As he is an Ottoman himself, one can draw the conclusion that his fixation on money qualifies him as an example of Turkish rapacity. Quite different is the mentality of the Legate, who has to be held back by the Guide from lavish spending in

<sup>26</sup> “Az török malmát csak az adom hajtja.” Harsányi’s letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 3 February 1656) in MHHD XXIII: 307. “[...] az török szeme adom nélkül nem lát, nyelve néma.” Letter of Harsányi and Máté Balogh to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, October 1656) EÉKH II: 224.

<sup>27</sup> *Colloquia*, 25, 124.

<sup>28</sup> “Propter, vel per caput. Per vel propter veritatem dei. Per excelsum imperatoris caput. Per salis & panis veritatem. Per vel propter veritatem Alcorani. Per doctrinae veritatem, id est, quam vera est doctrina quam didici.” *Colloquia*, 118–119.

<sup>29</sup> “In mundo sumus, rex est hoc tempore numus. [...] Per Quantum quisque sua numorum possidet arca, tantum habet & fidei. Pecunia perficiuntur omnia. Nullum sine pecunia perficitur negotium. [...] Solus Deus, & Angeli a desiderio vel appetitu argenti & auri, immunes sunt.” *Colloquia*, 32–33.

the inn: although he grudgingly accepts the other's advice that he should not order dancers and beautiful women, because he would need the money for the rest of the journey, he also complains that the world has sunk into a sea of greed in this corrupted century.<sup>30</sup> Quite to the contrary, the Interpreter, who speaks for Harsányi, expresses rather ascetic views about money. The Legate offers him a fortune if he joins him on his way and they both return home safely – but he declares in response that he does not want money, as good friendship cannot be built on that.<sup>31</sup> His moralist attitude is surely designed to be dearer to the reader than the worldly minded perspective of the Guide, however, even the latter is shown in a much more favorable light than the Legate, with his irresponsibly extravagant character.

With this background, it is not easy to interpret the only explicit comment the Interpreter has about the Ottomans' relation to finances. When the Legate asks him if he can expect some gifts from the Sultan when he is leaving Constantinople, he receives the following answer: “Hardly. You have not offered anything to them either, therefore I would not expect it. The Turkish nation has learned to accept, not to give; they think that the entire world is in debt to them. Be content with the two kaftans, you were clothed with: a good answer outdoes any gifts.”<sup>32</sup> It is less surprising that the Interpreter lectures the Legate about the mutuality of the gifts, and the relevance of his official task in his usual moralist manner – nevertheless, his general comment about the “Turkish nation” is somewhat bewildering, as it stands in obvious contrast to his fundamental assumptions. What is more, in the Ottoman text, instead of Turks, he is talking about Muslims, thereby providing an even more sweeping generalization.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> *Colloquia*, 74–77.

<sup>31</sup> *Colloquia*, 29.

<sup>32</sup> “Vix. Nec tu quicquam illis obtulisti, eam ob causam ne speres. Natio Turcica accipere, non dare didicit, illi existimant totum mundum ipsis debere. Duabus kaftanis seu vestibus, quas tibi induerunt, contentus esso: bona responsio omnia superat dona.” *Colloquia*, 112.

<sup>33</sup> “Mußurman tajfaßi,” *Colloquia*, 112.

This remark of the Interpreter is an example of the inconsistencies, which characterize some parts of the *Colloquia*. The “mistake” is even more striking, as the very same assumption is refuted by the Interpreter in another part of the book. The Legate, after listening to the Interpreter’s explanation about the different groups of the Turks, is eager to say that at home he heard many things about them. He enumerates several stereotypes, some of which the Interpreter proved wrong earlier, which calls forth an ironic answer from his partner: “It seems to me, Master Legate, that you know more about the morals and nature of this nation than your servant.”<sup>34</sup> Among these Western stereotypes, listed by the Legate, the same idea is repeated, that this people is so much given to greed that they think that the whole world is in their debt. The Interpreter’s comment in this place clearly ridicules the statement – the same statement that he proposed in another part of the book.

Nevertheless, the reader can generally conclude from the text of the *Colloquia*, that Turks love money; but this characteristic of theirs is not more condemnable than the irresponsible attitude of their European counterparts towards money. Harsányi even leaves obvious opportunities for commentary unexploited such as the inclusion of the money received for purchasing the *paşaliks* into the incomes of the Grand Vizier.<sup>35</sup> He goes as far as to reporting the prices of becoming leaders of various provinces – however, leaves it to the reader to decide whether this practice is a sign of Ottoman corruption, and if yes, how does this relate to the contemporary French system of office-purchase.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> “Mihi ita videtur Domine Legate, quod huius nationis, mores & naturam, servo tuo, melius ipse noveris.” *Colloquia*, 401.

<sup>35</sup> *Colloquia*, 258.

<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, the prices of offices occurring in the descriptions of the Ottoman Empire, is clearly a 17<sup>th</sup> century phenomenon. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, many travelers praised the meritocratic system used in the Sultan’s administration – contrasting it to the lamentable practices of the Christian states. See many examples in Rouillard, *The Turk*, 298–353; Carl Göllner, *Turcica*, vol. 3, *Die Türkenfrage in der öffentlichen Meinung Europas im 16. Jahrhundert* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialista România; Baden-Baden: Koerner, 1978) 305–312; Çırakman, *From the ‘Terror of the World’*, 59–60.

### VI.2.2. Treachery: “Turkish Friendship”<sup>37</sup>

Besides their greed, the Legate notes that the Ottomans are accused by Western European common knowledge of many other things: pride, cowardice, and first of all treachery. He claims that they take oaths very often, but they keep it only as long as they serve their needs. The Turks, according to the Legate’s knowledge, have even developed a hypocritical attitude of explaining why they were not responsible for their oaths: “God is superior to human beings, and his will must be followed. If God wanted, that the oath should be kept, he would not have provided the occasion to break it.”<sup>38</sup>

The topic of the unreliability of the Ottomans – as it is obvious from the fact that it is raised by the Legate – was a frequently occurring theme in the early modern Western European *turcica*. It also enjoyed popularity among the Transylvanian diplomats – even more than that of the Ottoman love of money. On the one hand, many of them claimed that Turks were notorious liars. “One does not have to believe it, it is only Turkish news” – suggested Tamás Borsos to his Prince, but others shared also the same conviction that “for them, lying is not a shame, no matter that they wear big beards as disguise.”<sup>39</sup> Harsányi as a diplomat wrote desperately to the Prince that there is no chance to raise some benevolence in the high office-holders at the Porte towards Transylvania, because sooner or later some people would spread rumors, which will destroy any confidence built up by the diplomats of the Principality. And this is only the consequence of the custom of diffusing haphazard information in the

<sup>37</sup> Comment of the orator Tamás Borsos on an Ottoman political action, interpreted by him as treachery: Borsos, *Vásárhelytől a Fényes Portáig*, 181.

<sup>38</sup> “[...] cum Deus creaturis rationalibus superior sit, eius voluntatem oportebit sequi. Si Deus voluisset, ut circa (prius) pactum maneat, istiusmodi occasionem non suppeditasset”. *Colloquia*, 389.

<sup>39</sup> “Nem kell hinni, mert csak török hír.” Letter of Tamás Borsos to Gábor Bethlen (Constantinople, 28 September 1619) in Borsos, 325; “[...] ő nálok nem szemérem az hazukság, hiába viselik az nagy personatus szakállt.” Letter of Boldizsár Sebesi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 26 August 1635) RGyP 221.

Ottoman capital: “They talk about things that they have not even seen in their dreams.”<sup>40</sup>

The other sign of the unreliability of the Turks was found in the inconsistency of the Ottoman politics. I already quoted Harsányi’s point about the Ottoman instability in the beginning of this chapter. But also his fellow-diplomats expressed their conviction many times that Ottoman office-holders regularly change their opinions – obviously, in close connection to their supposed avarice. In their writings, an unambiguous image can be found, according to which the members of the Ottoman elite would recall their words any time and would not shy away from perfidious schemes in order to receive further gains. “Turkish art” was a metaphor for deceit in many of their letters.<sup>41</sup>

The diplomats used this stereotype of the “sly and perfidious Turk” even in rather dubious situations. István Serédy conducted negotiations in the Sublime Porte in 1649, in order that the Sultan would stay away from his claim for payment for the Hungarian counties conquered by his Prince earlier. The ambassador did his best to explain to the Ottoman notabilities that these counties consist of nothing else than a single castle with their surrounding territories. He called the Grand Vizier an “old scoundrel” in his letters to his Prince despite the fact that his own argumentation was also far from realities.<sup>42</sup> In times of political crisis, hoping for a benevolent decision from the Porte, and frustrated by its failure to appear, the occurrences of this accusation proliferated in the diplomats’ correspondence. Harsányi provides one of the best examples for it, when he reported a situation of complete uncertainty: “Never

<sup>40</sup> “Azt is beszélük, kit még álmukban sem láttak.” Letter of Harsányi to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 27 July 1655) EÉKH I: 549.

<sup>41</sup> “Török mesterség”. See among others the letter of Boldizsár Sebesi to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 24 May 1636) RGyKÖ 369.

<sup>42</sup> “Vén lator”. István Serédy’s letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 12 May 1649) TT 1889: 329.

would anyone see or hear so much inconsistency in the Porte, because they want to do everything out of anger and under treacherous counterfeit, so that one cannot know, what one should believe of their words.”<sup>43</sup>

What is found in the *Colloquia*, fundamentally alters this picture. From the Interpreter, the reader learns – in the passage quoted at the beginning of the chapter – that for a born Muslim there is nothing worse than lying. The text of the *Opinio*, written in the same period as the *Colloquia*, shows that Harsányi did not restrict changing his opinion into his statements in the frames of the academic world, but also drew political conclusions from them. When he supports the idea in this writing that Frederick William should send an envoy to the Sultan, he tries – according to the scholastic argumentative practice – to pre-empt the possible counter-arguments. In this vein, he refers to what he put into the Legate’s mouth in the book: that some might claim “that it is futile for the Christians to conclude alliance or friendship with the Turks, as this one negotiates treaties only for his own profit and maintains friendship only as long as it benefits him.”<sup>44</sup> Although Harsányi admits that many historical examples substantiate this claim, he calls attention that the same amount could be found for the treason of Christians as well. He also quotes a moral speech attributed to Sultan Murad about keeping one’s word as the most important duty of any mortal.

Harsányi thus does not claim that unreliability would not be an intrinsic part of the Ottoman world, but tries to refute the ideas about its prevalence. While on the pages of his political position paper he refers to the not less questionable practices of

<sup>43</sup> “Soha klmes urunk a portának senki ilyen állhatatlanságát nem látta, sem nem hallhatta, mert ezek most minden ex furore és álnak szín alatt akarnak cselekedni, úgy annyira, hogy alig tudhatja ember, mit kelljen hinni szavokban.” Letter of Harsányi and István Tisza to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 23 June 1657) EÉKH II: 366.

<sup>44</sup> “Frustra Christiani cum Turca foedus et amicitiam qualemcunque ineunt. Quia ille ex utilitate sua tractat pacta et amicitiam colit quatenus, et quandiu rebus suis inservit.” *Opinio*, version B, fol. 292r.

Christian states, in the book he claims that only renegades were responsible for perfidy.<sup>45</sup> According to the general strategy of the *Colloquia*, they have to carry the burden of negative characteristics which were ascribed to the entire group of Ottomans in contemporary Western European, and Transylvanian common knowledge.

*VI.2.3. Discipline: "Where a Turkish Soldier Put His Feet, the Grass Grows No More"*<sup>46</sup>

The title of this section is – no wonder – quoted by the Legate as a common view in his homeland. However, in the course of the conversations in the *Colloquia*, he becomes convinced about quite the contrary: that the Ottoman army is exemplary in its discipline. He discusses the organization of the Sultan's forces with his Guide, and when he hears about the enormous numbers of the soldiers, he contemplates on what a terrible damage a territory must suffer, where all these troops cross: "No one receives mercy; everyone steals, plunders and robs, where they can. If you do not want to give your last property, they take it with force; if you resist, they thrash your skin thoroughly with a staff."<sup>47</sup> The Guide is horrified to hear this assumption and explains to the Legate that this would be impossible in Ottoman territories, where the soldier is responsible for the slightest crime with his head. The army of the Sultan is kept in strict discipline, and if a soldier only takes an onion or an egg, he is hanged. He compares this downright to the policies followed by the ancient Romans.<sup>48</sup>

Although the Western European image of the Turk was determined by the violence and cruelty of the Turks, those travelers were also not rare who praised the

<sup>45</sup> *Colloquia*, 373.

<sup>46</sup> "Ubi miles Turcicus pedem posuerit, herba non amplius nascitur." *Colloquia*, 57.

<sup>47</sup> "Parcitur nemini, unusquisque rapit, praedatur, furatur ubicunque potest. Si ultro dare recusas, vi auferunt, si resistas, fuste cutem probe dedolabunt." *Colloquia*, 55.

<sup>48</sup> *Colloquia*, 56.



discipline of the Ottoman army. The military successes of the Sultan needed explanation, and most of the authors were reluctant to accept that the Turks would be better warriors, more skillful or courageous in combat, than the Europeans – so many of them acknowledged that the anarchy of Christian armies could not be compared to the discipline found in the Ottoman armies, especially that of the Janissaries. A 16<sup>th</sup> century Venetian ambassador, Gianfrancesco Morosini claimed that 10,000 Christians would be able to defeat 30,000 Turks, but it is much harder to command 2,000 Christians than 100,000 Turks, especially if they are Italians.<sup>49</sup> Even in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when the concept of the decay of Ottoman Empire was well-spread, there were many travelers, who were amazed by the order they found in Janissary camps.<sup>50</sup>

The remarks Harsányi places in the Guide's mouth about the discipline in the Ottoman army are thus not entirely surprising, even if most of the contemporary authors would have found the comparison with the ancient Roman armies too far-fetched. However, Harsányi did not stop at this point. According to the Interpreter, discipline and orderliness rule not only the Ottoman army, but spheres of the everyday life of the Empire as well. He explains that a strict order is kept at the Constantinople market, where Janissaries ensure calibrated standards and punish anyone who cheats, without respect if he is a Muslim or a Christian. The Legate can hardly believe his ears and he admits that the picture his interlocutor offers is a bit too bright: if he would not hold him a clever and reliable person, he would have to think that the Interpreter was lying.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>49</sup> PP 134. See also Rouillard, *The Turk*, 292–297; Göllner, *Turcica*, 284–298. Even examples for East Central Europe are known for this phenomenon: Edward Tryjaski, “Marcin Bielski (16. Century) on the Turks,” *Journal of Turkish Studies* 17 (1993): 175.

<sup>50</sup> Vincent de Stochove, who was convinced about the decline of the Ottoman power, was fascinated when he visited the Grand Vizier's camp in 1643, see Rouillard, *The Turk*, 292–297.

<sup>51</sup> *Colloquia*, 212–217.

The astonishment of the Legate is quite understandable: the everyday life in Constantinople was hardly ever described as prominently orderly. Harsányi himself had different experiences in the mid-1650s: “Here is [...] really a dreadful situation on the streets, people are killed and robbed by rogues, the Janissaries left some gates of the city without a watch because of the rogues; we do not even dare to go out of the house in the afternoon.”<sup>52</sup> This was the description of an extraordinary situation, the chaos during the Venetian blockade, but the aggressiveness of the Turks was nevertheless a commonplace for Transylvanian diplomats in general. In their reports, one finds many realistic accounts on the horrors in the streets of Constantinople – not only in times of riots, but also in peaceful periods. Even if the judgment of the diplomats is rarely explicit this time, the modes of selecting and narrating the events clearly conveys the image of the wild, unrestrained, blood-thirsty Turks. The reader meets statements like Harsányi’s in several cases: diplomats tell that they are much afraid, as “the death of a human being does not count much here”, or that they hardly dare to leave the house, among “a fierce nation as this one”.<sup>53</sup> There were certainly more peaceful periods in the life of the Ottoman capital, but Harsányi had his experiences in the most chaotic decade of the 17<sup>th</sup> century: compared to the letters of that time, the utterances of the Interpreter clearly mirror a reshaping of the image.

In the *Colloquia*, the description of the Ottoman discipline is not only remodeled compared to the general Transylvanian image of the Turks, but even in the plot of the book, there is a scene that seems to contradict the Interpreter’s statements.

On the way to Constantinople, the Legate and his suite is stopped and interrogated by

<sup>52</sup> “Itt valóban [...] félelmes állapot vagy az utcákon, az embereket is az latrok ölik, fosztják az janicsárok némelyik kapuját a várasnak pusztán hagyták az sok latrok miatt, ki is nem merünk délután járni.” Harsányi’s letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, April 1656) EÉKH II: 219.

<sup>53</sup> “[...] itt az emberhalál igen kicsin dolog”, resp. “az minemű dühös nemzetség ez.” István Réthy’s letters to György Rákóczi I (Constantinople, 1 November, 1634, resp. 27 May 1643) RGyKÖ 213, resp. RGyP 624. Balázs Harasztosi reported that while there was a great fire in the city, the Janissaries began to pillage houses, causing terrible losses: “no enemy would have compared to them, such an infamous, damned and loose nation as this one is.” TT 1881–82 [1882]: 57.

soldiers. They try to discourage him to continue his journey by saying that a great campaign is under way and the roads are full of soldiers: “The people of the army are very bad. They do not know forgiveness or mercy. They are going to think, that you are spies of the infidels. Do not you know that the Emperor is highly furious and offended by the infidels?”<sup>54</sup> Threats like these were enough for some travelers to turn their backs on the Ottoman Empire: the Swedish Erik Dahlberg made his way only to the Hungarian border fortress Esztergom, where he gave up and returned to Habsburg Hungary.<sup>55</sup> But such problems could not keep the Legate away from continuing his journey.

How is it possible that the well-disciplined soldiers of the Interpreter’s description could represent a threat for innocent travelers? Harsányi is aware of the problem, and gives two tentative answers. The first is in line with his usual strategy of replacing blames: the Interpreter claims that these soldiers are probably not of Turkish origin, but renegades. He elaborates on this in the section where he gives a detailed description of the latter group: “I cannot praise the ones who took the profession of a soldier either, as they – here, as well as in our countries – deviate from the right way: they do not know much faithfulness, religiosity or mercy.”<sup>56</sup> And if this argument was not enough, it is the Legate who gives the Ottoman army the ultimate excuse: if the Turkish soldiers behave not in the ideal way, as they did in the Golden Age of the Empire, it is because they learned their bad habits from the Christians.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>54</sup> “Exercitus homines seu qui castra sequuntur, sunt valde mali. Illi cognoscere, misereri nesciunt. Vos pro infidelium exploratoribus habebunt? An ignoras Imperatorem infidelibus maxime iratum, offensum esse?” *Colloquia*, 38–39.

<sup>55</sup> *Erik Dahlbergs dagbok (1625–1699)* (The diary of Erik Dahlberg), ed. Herman Lindström (Uppsala and Stockholm: n. p., 1912) 54–56.

<sup>56</sup> “[...] militiae deditos (seu castrenses proprie) laudare nequeo, quia ut in nostris regionibus, ita ibi quoque a recta via aberrant: fidem, religionem, & misericordiam, non multum norunt.” *Colloquia*, 375–376.

<sup>57</sup> *Colloquia*, 56–57.

VI.2.4. *Infidelity: “But Ours Know the Right Way and Orders of God”*<sup>58</sup>

For most medieval and early modern authors writing about the Ottoman Empire, the main aspect of difference between themselves and the Turks, was their religion. From its beginnings and the first successes, Islam remained a constant problem for Christian theologians. The many dogmatic similarities and the simultaneously existing stark differences between Christianity and Islam created confusion. Many wanted to interpret the new religion as an ephemeral heresy, but its fall, expected by many West Europeans in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, did not occur. With the advance of the Ottoman Empire in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the problem of the Muslims emerged again for Christian authors.<sup>59</sup>

In the Middle Ages, Islam was in many ways analogically treated with Christianity. Most medieval treatises that analyze the Islam deal almost exclusively with the role of Mahomet. Their authors felt that if in Christianity the founder of the religion has a decisive role, it must be the same with the Islam. The faithful of Islam were interpreted as Christians, misled by Mahomet, and their religion being not actually a religion, but a superstition.<sup>60</sup> Some Renaissance scholars dissented from this established view, but in the 17<sup>th</sup> century most commentators still used this medieval framework. C. D. Rouillard, studying the French image of the Turks, found only one traveler, who treated Islam in his account as a religion, not a superstition.<sup>61</sup>

It would be reasonable to expect that in the *Colloquia*, a book describing the Ottoman state, Islam would receive special treatment and several comments. Theological questions are, however, quite shortly settled, and are discussed not even

<sup>58</sup> “[...] nostri autem veram Dei viam, & mandata norunt” *Colloquia*, 474.

<sup>59</sup> Richard William Southern, *Western Views on Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962).

<sup>60</sup> Norman Daniel’s conclusions are cited by Edward W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), 60–63.

<sup>61</sup> Rouillard, *The Turk*, 336.

by the Interpreter, but the Legate. He claims that many erudite books were already written about the religion, of which anybody can acquire sufficient knowledge. The Koran was also translated into many languages, which renders it possible for those interested to become acquainted with the fundamentals of the religion.<sup>62</sup> The Legate however, in a rather easy-going manner declares that the weather is too hot for these topics, and the world is full of news about the coming war, so this is no opportunity to discuss theological questions in detail.<sup>63</sup> However, some practical questions, such as the five pillars of Islam, are introduced by the Interpreter somewhat later – and apart from the description of various Muslim religious groups he also talks a lot about the Dervish orders, the religious office-holders, that is: the practical side of the religion. His text is interrupted time and again by the Latin explanatory notes of Harsányi.<sup>64</sup>

The question of Muslim piety reserves much more attention than the theological background. As already quoted, Harsányi dedicates passages to the god-fearing lifestyle of the born Muslims. When they come back from their pilgrimage, he claims through the words of the Interpreter, they do not only stay away from sins, but even “if they are rich, they erect Mosques, bridges, fountains and other public buildings for the honor of God and their soul’s salvation. If they are poor, they feed the dogs and the birds. If the sun burns, they give water to the thirsty on the streets and from their windows.”<sup>65</sup> And a long description of various pious institutions follows: gratuitous accommodations for pilgrims and educational opportunities for the sons of the poor, alms-houses and soul asylums.

---

<sup>62</sup> The first Latin translation of the Koran was commissioned by Petrus Venerabilis in the 12<sup>th</sup> century; the humanist John of Segovia provided a new in the 15<sup>th</sup>: Southern, *Western Views*, 86–92. Theodore Bibliander published Petrus Venerabilis’ translation at Basle in 1543, and in the next 150 years, some vernacular translations were also published.

<sup>63</sup> *Colloquia*, 445–450.

<sup>64</sup> *Colloquia*, 482–490.

<sup>65</sup> “Divites, in honorem Dei, & animarum salutem, Moschaeas seu templa, pontes, fontes, diversoria publica, etiam gratuita exstruunt; pauperes, canes & aves cibant; in plateis, & fenestris sole fervente, sitientibus aquam impertiunt.” *Colloquia*, 376–377.

This image of the pious Turks is supported – as it happened in the case of the role of money in the everyday life of the Ottoman Empire – by the Turkish proverbs, provided by the Guide for the Legate. They show a devout, however, rather determinist mentality:

Nothing can happen without the provision of God. Without his permission, nothing can hurt us. What can a human or all other creatures do against the will of God? Not even a bird can fall from the skies without his consent. He even knows the number of our hairs. No one can escape his hands. He created us from nothing, took care of us, and he is going to look after us afterwards as well. Our hope is in God. If he, our sins forgiven, has given himself to us as a guide, we do not have to fear anything. He is the Emperor of all armies and creatures.<sup>66</sup>

Harsányi was not alone with his respect towards Muslim piety among his contemporaries: no matter how much they despised of Islam as a religion, many of them praised the zeal of the faithful. Even if they ridiculed their religious rites, many of them expressed their wish that Christians would show the same enthusiasm in following the prescriptions of their religions as the Muslim believers do.<sup>67</sup> The *Colloquia* fits very well into this tradition, in line with its general argument, that the

---

<sup>66</sup> “Nil nisi dispositio divina manifestabitur. [...] Sine permissione eius, nihil damni patiemur. [...] Homo ac omnes creaturae, animalia quid contra voluntatem Dei facient? [...] Una avis sine permissu eius, ex aere non cadet. Ille vel capillos nostros in numero tenet. Manum eius nemo effigiet. Ille nos ex nihilo fecit, creavit, de nostra sustentatione prospexit, deinceps quoque nostri rationem habebit, custodiet scilicet nos. Spes nostra Deus est (in Deo est). Ille iniquitatibus nostris ignoscens, si nobis commitem se praeberit, neminem timebimus. Ille est omnium exercituum & creaturarum Imperator.” *Colloquia*, 41–43.

<sup>67</sup> Mary Hossain, “Seventeenth Century Travellers to the Holy Land,” *Arab Historical Review for Ottoman Studies*, 13–14 (1996): 70; Rouillard, *The Turk*, 342–348; Göllner, *Turcica*, 305–312; Çırakman, *From ‘The Terror of the World’*, 59–60. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it was a rare case to turn an entirely deaf ear to Islam, both its theory and practices, as we can see in the case of Johann Ulrich Wallich, *Religio turcica, Mahometis vita et orientalis cum occidentali Antichristo comparatio...* (Stade: Typis Holvianis, 1659). It is rather suggestive that the Protestant minister – who probably got acquainted to Harsányi personally in Constantinople – did not only dedicate his book to the condemnation of Islam and the Ottoman Empire, but in the same breath connected this to a defamation of the Pope and Catholicism.

trueborn Muslims are exemplary people, who are very unjustly accused by European authors of many moral transgressions. And this is one of the rare cases, when Harsányi is not contradicting the views expressed in his earlier correspondence – as the topic of Muslim piety was actually never in the focus of the Transylvanian diplomats.<sup>68</sup>

The Legate admits that the Koran is already translated into many languages; he wants to buy on in the original nevertheless. This gives an opportunity to the Interpreter to describe the Muslims' attitude towards books. First, he says that there are some inexperienced and ignorant people who claim that the Koran cannot be purchased by a Christian. This is not true, he explains, as “the prophet Mahomet has written the Koran in order that the whole world should know the will of God; that is, God sent it down from heaven, so that people of the world would be taught to avoid infidelity and embrace pure faith.”<sup>69</sup> Therefore, nothing should hinder a Christian from buying a Koran himself. If talking about books, the Interpreter also mentions that Turks only hold four books to be true, but out of those three – the Torah, the Psalms and the Gospel – are superfluous, as the knowledge inside them is covered by the fourth, the Koran.<sup>70</sup> This information leads Harsányi into a smaller self-contradiction, as he frequently – and in the light of the above-mentioned theory, quite inconsistently – gives references to “learned Ottomans” in the mouth of the Interpreter. The Hungarian emigrant also openly refuses the stereotype that the Turks would be so proud, that they refused to follow any other nation's example and learn from them. This idea is namely mentioned by the Legate in his list of all the things he heard about

<sup>68</sup> The reason for this is to be found in the conditions of the genre of diplomatic correspondence – the diplomats are simply not supposed to comment on many spheres of the everyday life of the visited lands. See the more detailed discussion in Kármán, “Átkozott Konstantinápoly”.

<sup>69</sup> “Mahomed Propheta, propterea scripsit Alcoranum, ut totus mundus voluntatem Dei cognosceret, id est propterea Deus e coelo demisit, ut (mundus) homines doceantur infidelitatem abicere, & puram fidem amplecti.” *Colloquia*, 120.

<sup>70</sup> *Colloquia*, 120–121.

the Ottomans back home, which – as already mentioned – is a clear sign of discredit in the *Colloquia*.<sup>71</sup>

Altogether, the discussion of Islam is rather favorable in the *Colloquia*. The only sentence, in which the Interpreter – and through him, Harsányi – gives an evaluative comment on the religion, is quoted in the title of this section. This remark is, however, well hidden and slightly relativized. Its context is a comparison between the Western monks and the *derviş*, and it is the first thing the Interpreter mentions about them: the latter are not Christians and they do not know the right way of God. However, the other comparisons which follow this setting of the theoretical and evaluative framework are not very flattering to the Europeans. His remark that the *derviş* are poor, while Christian monks dispose of great fortunes, is clearly a Protestant rebuff against the much-criticized institution of the Catholic Church, and reinforces his general message: while Muslims may be errant in questions of faith, their religious practices are nevertheless exemplary for the Christians.

### ***VI.3. A Positive Image of the Turks and Its Conclusions***

#### ***VI.3.1. What Made Harsányi's Image of the Turks Change?***

Throughout the preceding pages, we frequently came across the phenomenon that Harsányi's views about the Turks changed in the period between his stay in Constantinople and the writing of the book in Brandenburg. The former image very much complies with that generally provided by Transylvanian diplomats in 17<sup>th</sup> century Constantinople. It follows the assumptions present in the political discourse unfolding in the Principality, which – given the fact that their country was a tributary state of the Ottoman Empire – was not widely publicized, and remained available only

---

<sup>71</sup> *Colloquia*, 389.



to a closed circle of political correspondents. At the same time, the image hardly changed throughout the entire century. Harsányi's views on the Turks are not particular in this respect, even if he found the best forms to the content: his almost poetic metaphors single themselves out from the usually rather clumsy wording of the Transylvanian diplomatic corps. He was also the most diligent to apply the image – at least in the rather fragmented corpus of the surviving correspondence –, due to his specific attitude analyzed in the previous chapter: that he was always eager to provide the Prince with his own counsels on the policy to follow, which he regularly tried to support with “theoretical” considerations, such as the statements about the nature of the Turks. His image during the Constantinople years in any case remained in the general frames of contemporary diplomats.

The image found in the *Colloquia* differs radically from that of the correspondence. The accusations of the Ottomans in the 1650s – primarily for greed, treacherousness and mendacity – are not prominent in the book. Most of them were re-attributed to a distinct group of the Ottomans: the renegades. Others, such as greed, were entirely dismissed as constitutive elements of difference between Turks and Christians. The Interpreter, the representative of Harsányi's own ideas in the text, dismisses the image of the Turks found in Western European common knowledge, and calls for a more balanced understanding of them. What is more, in many cases he does not only attribute an exemplary character to them, but – through explicit comparisons with the Christians – he also implicitly suggests that “trueborn Muslims” set an example for the latter. The possible reasons of this change can be found in multiple levels, taking into consideration the changing circumstances of Harsányi's activities, the changing social roles he was aiming to fulfill, and also the changes in

the political agenda he was about to further with conveying the image. In the following pages, these aspects will be discussed in detail.

The research on stereotypes – that is, characteristics attributed by a group to another – in social psychology has experienced its “historical turn” with the establishment of the groups promoting “social level analysis” in the 1990s.<sup>72</sup> They put much emphasis on the phenomenon that the stereotype is subject to change, according to the changing power relations between the stereotyper and the stereotyped. In Harsányi’s case, the new image could also be a product of the changed circumstances of its fabrication.

In the early 1670s Jakab Harsányi Nagy had very different experiences the power capacities in relation to the Empire, than during his service in Constantinople. During the 1650s he was daily contact with a state administration which showed every sign of crisis: he participated in the first audiences of each newly installed Grand Vizier, and he could know that he would have to wait less than a year for the next one. He also followed closely the ever-changing power relations among the higher officials of the Sublime Porte, the alliances and enmities, the machinations and intrigues. He was also aware, that the chaotic situation in Constantinople makes the state highly inefficient: he had personal experience of the frequent mutinies of Janissaries and – during the Venetian blockade of the Bosphorus – also the Empire’s military weakness in the international scene. All these experiences, however, had to be reassessed in the light of what happened in the end of the decade: the Köprülü restoration’s successes in reinstalling the inner peace, which also resulted in military victories against Venice

---

<sup>72</sup> Russell Spears, Penelope J. Oakes, Naomi Ellemers, and S. Alexander Haslam, “Introduction: The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life,” and Stephen Worchel and Hank Rothgerber, “Changing the Stereotype of the Stereotype,” in *The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life*, ed. Russell Spears et al. (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1997) 1–19, resp. 72–93; Penelope J. Oakes, S. Alexander Haslam and John C. Turner, *Stereotyping and Social Reality* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994). This type of research defined itself primarily in contrast to its immediate forerunner, the cognitive stereotype research, which analyzed the role of stereotypes in the individual’s life.

and Transylvania, later on in an advantageous peace treaty after the anti-Habsburg wars in 1663–64; and made the Ottoman Empire capable to start a very successful war against Poland in the beginning of the 1670s.

The section of the *Colloquia* written on the Köprülü suggests the validity of these considerations that changing circumstances had an important impact upon the establishment of Harsányi's new image. In the dedication of the book, he uses an emotionally loaded explanation of why he had to leave Transylvania: "I was deprived of all my property and the means of living by the tyranny of the barbarians."<sup>73</sup> When reading the passages on the Köprülü family, it is hard to believe that he is talking about exactly the same "barbarians". He mentions with high esteem that they could increase the territory of the Empire – in spite of the fact that this happened on the expense of Transylvania – and were also successful in forcing new taxes upon the Principality.<sup>74</sup> Köprülü Mehmed – who was, ironically, a renegade – is even praised for his skillful strategies that allowed his son to succeed him in the post of the Grand Vizier.<sup>75</sup> The entirely separate treatment of these two segments – the personal losses and the evaluation of the politicians who were responsible for them – shows that it is reasonable to look for one reason of his changing image in the new circumstances created by the Köprülü restoration. Harsányi must have felt that he could not say the same things about the increasingly powerful Ottoman Empire of the 1670s that he claimed to be true in the chaotic 1650s.

Nevertheless, the promoters of the social level analysis emphatically concentrate their attention on stereotypes as shared conjectures that belong not to

<sup>73</sup> "[...] per barbarorum tyrannidem, omnibus bonis, mediisque vivendi orbatum." *Colloquia*, dedicatio (version A), fol. 3.

<sup>74</sup> The treatment of Köprülü Mehmed is also favorable in the *Opinio*: Harsányi there emphasizes that the Grand Vizier would not have attacked Transylvania if only Prince György Rákóczi II, misled by wrong counsel and false promises of foreigners, would not have defied his orders. Version B, fol. 292r–v.

<sup>75</sup> For the entire discussion of the Köprülü, see *Colloquia*, 283–285.

individuals but to groups: while it is clear that changing power relations have impact on specific groups' assumptions about other groups, this development cannot be automatically transferred to the level of individuals. The change in social environment could certainly contribute to Harsányi's change of opinion, but in itself, it is hardly enough to explain such a radical turn. In order to draw a fuller picture, one also has to take other aspects into consideration: the question of audience and the social roles Harsányi aimed to fill when describing his various images.

First, the change of perspective according to distance must be considered. Simply the fact that Harsányi was far away from the Ottoman capital, the fact, that Harsányi was no longer exposed to new experiences, and that he was no longer in everyday discussion with his fellow-diplomats, could contribute to his questioning of their established wisdoms and producing a new vision of the Turks. An analytical attitude is frequently furthered by the distance from the object of analysis – and in Harsányi's case, the Brandenburgian years of relative unemployment could provide the necessary circumstances to a re-evaluation of everything he experienced before.

At the same time, Harsányi's authorial position also changed. In the preceding chapters, we have seen how Harsányi built up his identity as a "bureaucrat". He aimed to present himself as a faithful servant, who is useful for his Prince – among other aspects – because of his outstanding knowledge and his quick mind: the ability to mobilize his knowledge, and provide his ruler with good counsel. Whenever he gave guidelines of how to solve one or another situation, he was building it explicitly on a set of well-known facts. The basis of his arguments was provided in some cases by classical quotes, in other, by common knowledge. In order to achieve his goals, to ascertain his credibility and usefulness, and on the other hand, influence the Prince's foreign policy, he had to build on widely accepted assumptions. He quite naturally

accepted – and further developed – the set of characteristics, of which the image of the Turks was built in the Principality: this had to be his raw material for the counseling. It was also probably more useful in the world of diplomacy and court intrigues of the Ottoman Empire to be suspicious and expect the other negotiators to be sly, treacherous and even greedy, than it would have been to nurse an image of Turks with an exemplary character.

However, when writing the book, Harsányi found himself in an entirely different authorial position. This time, there was no need of the cautions and distrust necessary for diplomatic activities. In the Court of the Great Elector, he could prove his usefulness for his mentors by producing a text of scholarly relevance, a set of knowledge that had been unavailable before. As a textbook for learning Ottoman Turkish, his *Colloquia* would already have fulfilled this requirement, however, as we have seen, Harsányi aimed for more. As his comments about other descriptions of the Ottoman Empire, and established views on the Turks show, he was eager to fashion himself not simply as a language teacher, but as an expert on Ottoman-related questions. After all, that was why he received his salary for. Repeating all the knowledge that has already been available could have not been enough for him: he had to share something new with his readers. It is certainly no accident that the theological questions of Islam were so shortly settled in the book: not being an expert himself, Harsányi could not have presented new results, only would have had to reiterate the work of other authors. Therefore, instead of the theoretical part of religion, he focused on the side that he had experiences about: the practices.

By inventing the difference between renegades and trueborn Muslims, his self-construction as a scholar benefited from two aspects. On the one hand, he presented an interpretative framework, that was not available so far – at least according to his

knowledge. At the same time, this made possible a latent incorporation of previous knowledge in his own analysis. He did not have to claim that all previous descriptions were sharing incorrect information with their readers: their accounts about the terrible Turks might have been true, however, they made a categorical mistake, attributing the horrid deeds of renegades to the entire community of Ottomans. By this method, Harsányi related his own works to those of the others, used their results, while at the same time it provided new knowledge by putting their information into a new interpretative frame.

Apart from the changes in power relations, and in his authorial role, there is a third aspect to consider when one wants to explain the radical shift of the image of the Turk in Harsányi's writings. In both cases, as a diplomat, and as a Hofrat in Brandenburg, his activities did not restrict themselves to communicating information, but he also tried to convey a political agenda as well. As we have already seen in chapter II, during his years in Constantinople, the advice of the Turkish Scribe to the Prince was clear: with reinforcing the image of an Ottoman Empire in crisis, unable to counteract any activity of the Transylvanian foreign policy, he urged György Rákóczi II for bold action. The political agenda of the *Colloquia*, however, requires a longer survey.

### *VI.3.2. Different Conclusions: the Legate and the Interpreter*

The Legate, who came to the Ottoman Empire, having in mind various Western prejudices, is exposed to long explanations by his interlocutor about the discipline of the Ottoman army and everyday life, and the exemplary character of the trueborn Turks. It is no wonder, that after a while he suggests: “if things are like this, can even

Christian people live under the rule of the Turk with a tranquil soul?”<sup>76</sup> The answer given by the Interpreter is cautious, however, it leads the Legate to shocking conclusions. The former explains that the situation is different in various regions of the Empire. The tributary states, which gave themselves to the rule of the Sultan out of their own will, have good conditions: they could keep their own administration and legal system, and as long as they do not break openly with the Ottomans, they can live a peaceful life. In those territories which were conquered by the sword, the system of administration changed and Ottoman lords rule over a Christian population; nevertheless, this also does not produce an unbearable situation. The state tax is never so high that the peasants would not be able to pay it. What is more, “I have seen many *Sipahis* (landholders) who helped their subjects out of their own property with money, oxen, and other ways. They say that if their subjects lost their fortunes, then the owner of the land is necessarily going to lose it as well [...] and he is going to face ruin at last himself, when the subject, having forfeited his abilities, cannot pay his taxes any more.”<sup>77</sup> The logic of this “Ottoman Cameralism” is summarized in a metaphor: if fountains dry out, then the cisterns will also be emptied.

If this enlightened economic policy of the *Sipahis* was not enough, the next question under discussion must have made the Christian readers feel uncertain. The Interpreter begins to explain the religious policy of the Ottomans with the statement that these do not care much about other people’s religion. If somebody is asked three times to accept Islam and refuses, no one is entitled to use force for the conversion, as

<sup>76</sup> “Rebus ita se habentibus, sub Imperatoris Turcici Dominio, cum animi contestatione, populus Christianus habitare poterit?” *Colloquia*, 154.

<sup>77</sup> “Spahios (pagorum dominos) subditis istiusmodi ex bonis propriis, pecunia, bovis, aliisque mediis (auxiliis) succurrisse, vidi multos. Dicunt enim, si subditi facultates deficiant (destruatur proprie) ipse etiam terrae possessor (Dominus) deficiat necesse est [...] extremum denique eum ruina manebit, dum subditi viribus destituti, tributa non amplius erunt solvendo.” *Colloquia*, 158–159.

“they say that faith and religion are the gift of God.”<sup>78</sup> Again, the question is elaborated through a metaphor: although the *Mufti* gave advice to Sultan Süleyman to convert all Christians and Jews, he refused, claiming that the diversity of denominations and sects in his Empire is like flowers of many colors in a garden. As the various colors make the garden more beautiful, the various religions have the same working on the Empire. For this reason he, the Sultan, would not force anyone to convert. However, Harsányi does not refrain from re-telling the well known economic explanation for the lack of forceful conversions to Islam: the Sultan’s interest is to have as many non-Muslim subjects as possible, because he only gets taxes from them. In order to prove his point, the Interpreter refers also to the practice that daughters coming from mixed marriages can keep the Christian faith of their mother.<sup>79</sup>

This level of tolerant behavior seems to be too much for the Legate. He tries to provide counter-arguments, recalling examples when the Ottoman elite acted against Christian religious people: for the first, he mentions the persecution of the Jesuits, then the hanging of the Patriarch of Constantinople by the Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmed. Both arguments are however objected to by the Interpreter, who explains that both events had political backgrounds, therefore they cannot be regarded as actions against other denominations. The Jesuits were suspected of organizing a revolt, while the Patriarch was supposedly having close connections to the Venetians, the enemy of the Empire at that time. It is much harder to explain away the third argument of the Legate – that Köprülü Mehmed banned the reconstruction of the Franciscan church in Constantinople – but the Interpreter is ready with an answer: “perhaps the Turk began to learn these things from the Pope in Rome and his

---

<sup>78</sup> “[...] ait enim fidem & religionem donum Dei esse.” *Colloquia*, 162.

<sup>79</sup> *Colloquia*, 162–164.



servants.”<sup>80</sup> To the argumentative strategy familiar from the section on the soldiers’ behavior – the negative features of Ottoman world come from the bad Christian influence – this time Harsányi adds again a Protestant flavor.

The Legate seems to be entirely convinced. He goes as far as to find arguments for the justification of an element of Muslim everyday life, usually unacceptable for Christian observers: polygamy. He claims that it is very practical in those situations when a wife is confined to bed by a serious illness, and her healthy young husband has a hard time running the household alone. It is also a great solution of the problem, when a man goes to a long journey and takes his wife with him: if he has more wives, those staying at home can take care of the house and the children. Despite these clear advantages, he decides not to suggest polygamy’s introduction to Christian territories: “Notwithstanding, as it is not allowed in our lands, they can follow their own customs, while we will stay with our own.”<sup>81</sup>

His newly born fascination with the Ottoman Empire leads the Legate to a question, which is not unexpected after all the praise the Turks received in the preceding pages, nevertheless, it still remains surprising that he does pose it to his interlocutor:

As one can find so much love for justice in this people, would it not be more recommendable for the Christian rulers, who lost the power to oppose themselves to them, and especially for those who are their neighbors, to conclude a good and firm friendship and alliance with the Ottomans [...],

---

<sup>80</sup> “[...] fortasse Turca etiam a Summo illo Romano Sacerdote, ac eorum famulatio res istiusmodi addiscere occepit” *Colloquia*, 168.

<sup>81</sup> “Interim, quoniam in nostra regione non est concessum, illi suis utantur moribus, nos circa nostros manebimus.” *Colloquia*, 419–420.

than to be once deprived of their country, all their properties and everything dear to them?<sup>82</sup>

Surprisingly, the Interpreter, who dedicated so much energy to the deconstruction of Western stereotypes, and introduced a positive image of the Turks to his partner, is not especially enthusiastic about the other's new ideas. As he explains, it might be useful to have good relations with the Ottomans in the sphere of commerce, and the neighbors of the Empire are certainly entitled to cease hostilities with the Ottomans, in order to defend the welfare of their own subjects. However, for him an alliance with the Turks against Christians seems unadvisable. He does not only have moral objections, but even doubts its usefulness: "You know the old, but true Ottoman proverb: One does not collect strawberries into the other's basket?"<sup>83</sup> The Legate gives two examples for an alliance with the Ottomans – the one of the Byzantine Emperor Joannes Palaiologos and of Francis I of France –, but both support the Interpreter's thesis instead: on the long run, the Christian community lost territories and power to the Ottomans, as a result of their co-operation with them. The Legate does not insist to debate too long, and ends the discussion with a statement that this issue is very complicated and must be left to more erudite people to decide. The Interpreter's point is however quite clear: "For my part, I would better beg for bread

---

<sup>82</sup> "Quoniam in gente ista, tantum aequitatis amor invenitur, num quod consultius, (melius) foret Christianis Principibus, potentia sese opponendi destitutis, praecipue illis qui in eorum vicinia habitant, bonam (honestam) & firmam cum Otthomannis amicitiam foedusque [...] inire, quam regnis, omnibus bonis possessionibus, & quicquid charissimi ac in deliciis habent, uno momento, (semel) exui, privari?", *Colloquia*, 217.

<sup>83</sup> "Nosti Osmannidarum antiquum, sed verum Proverbium. Ille in alienum corbem fraga non colligit." *Colloquia*, 225. The proverb was well-known in 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungary: the Palatin Miklós Esterházy also mentions it in his letter to György Rákóczi I, Prince of Transylvania (Kismarton, 3 February 1644) in Ferenc Toldy, ed., *Galantai gróf Esterházy Miklós munkái* (The works of Count Miklós Esterházy of Galánta) (Pest: Emich & Eisenfels, 1852) (in the following: EMM) 213.

among Christians, than live with high respect and honors a joyful life under the Ottomans' rule.”<sup>84</sup>

### *VI.3.3. Harsányi's Conclusions: A Plea for an Anti-Ottoman War*

In this debate with the Legate, it is very clear that Harsányi speaks through the person of the Interpreter: the same message is not only repeated, but even radicalized at the end of the *Colloquia*. The last pages of the book contain a speech, which comes, in a rather illogical way, after the Interpreter's long and detailed description of the posts in Muslim religious hierarchy. Without even starting a new paragraph, Harsányi begins to summarize the political conclusions, using the plural vocative forms instead of the singular, which was in use until that point. This creates the impression of turning to a wider audience, so to say, “speak out of the book” in order to summarize its most important messages. Later on, he adds vocative exclamations, which make clear that it is not the Interpreter any more, who is talking to the Legate, but the author himself – and the addressee is a quite broad circle of prospective readers: the Emperor, the Kings, Princes, and other potentates of Christian Europe.<sup>85</sup>

In this section, Harsányi turns openly against the Ottoman power. He claims that Mahomet left a will to the Muslims – a fictive document that he attached at the end of the book, as I mentioned in chapter IV –, in which he directed them to maintain peaceful relations with the Christians. This will was however obviously not kept by the Ottomans, as wars are continuously raging between the believers of the two faiths. Harsányi places the emphasis primarily on two regions: Hungary, which suffered from these wars for more than a century, and Poland, the actual victim. In order to be more convincing, he even permits himself to fall into one of his occasional inconsistencies:

<sup>84</sup> “Ex mea parte, malim inter Christianos mendicare, (panem mendicando quaerere) quam sub horum domino, cum magno honore, ac respectu in deliciis vivere.” *Colloquia*, 221.

<sup>85</sup> *Colloquia*, 505–510.

he tries to animate his audience with the image of the multitude of Christians suffering under Turkish yoke – an idiosyncratic argument after having described the “cameralist” attitude of the Sipahis, heartily helping their own serfs. With God’s help – sounds his conclusion – a victory against them is possible.

Harsányi’s speech at the end of the book would leave the reader puzzled, had he not become acquainted earlier with a similar conclusion, coming from the Interpreter’s mouth. Harsányi, it seems, found no contradiction in providing a positive image of the Ottomans and advocating strict measures against them. Despite attributing many exemplary characteristics to them, he still maintained the possibility of seeing them as the arch-foe of Christianity.<sup>86</sup> The simple assumption that Turks were not almost inhuman, despicable creatures, did not exclude the possibility that they could be political enemies. In 1672, the year when the *Colloquia* was published, the European public sphere was already full of discussions about the Polish–Ottoman war, the occupation of Kamieniec Podolski, and the formation of two Ottoman *paşaliks* in Podolia; as well as about the possibilities of a united counterattack in support of the Commonwealth. Perhaps one of the most spectacular examples was a *caroussel* presented at the coronation ceremonies of Charles XI, King of Sweden. Four groups marched up, clothed in different costumes. The first one, wearing Roman clothing, represented ancient virtues; the second were the Turks, threatening these; the third the endangered Poles. The last group represented the unified nations of Europe, that were going to save them from Turkish oppression.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>86</sup> According to Almut Höfert’s thesis, the collection of information on the Ottoman Empire began exactly because of the political interests of various European states, and the two spheres remained related also later on, see *Den Feind beschreiben: „Türkengefahr“ und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450–1600*, Campus historische Studien, no. 35 (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 2003).

<sup>87</sup> David Klöcker Ehrenstrahl, *Certamen equestre cæteraue Solemnia Holmiæ Suecorum Ao: MDCLXXII. M. Decembr: celebrata cum Carolus XI. omnium cum applausu Aviti Regni Regimen capesseret* (Stockholm: Eberdt, 1672).

The idea of a united Christian warfare against the Ottomans had already had a prominent place for several hundreds of years in the public discourse about the Turks before the publication of the *Colloquia*. Practically ever since the first successes of the Ottomans, but with a refreshed intensity since the occupation of Constantinople, Christian thinkers were preaching the revival of the Crusading idea, this time with the claim that fellow Christians under Ottoman rule need to be defended. After the battle of Lepanto, when the image of the undefeatable Empire was shattered, and European intellectuals started to write about the crisis of the Ottomans, the pleas for a co-operation between Christian powers became more and more frequent.<sup>88</sup>

During Harsányi's career as a diplomat, he also did not shy away from drawing his conclusions from what he has seen in the Ottoman capital and shared his opinion with his Prince as well: "It is a pity that Christianity does not really know how much she could achieve, as [the Turk] hides his shame very well with its splendour."<sup>89</sup> As I have already noted in chapter II, Harsányi believed in the coming of the fall of the Ottoman Empire and saw good chances for victory in case of a Christian co-operation. In the chaotic year of 1656, he was very explicit about the possibilities he saw for action: "A fatal period has come to the Ottoman Empire, tyranny, incapacity of the counselors, lack of money, and mutual discord pry it apart. But none of the Christian rulers can see it." This text, written in Latin in the report is followed by a conclusion in Hungarian: "The old strength of the Turks is gone; there are a lot of people, but

<sup>88</sup> On the plans for common European anti-Ottoman war, see Göllner, "Turcica," 35–170 ; Höfert, *Den Feind beschrieben*, 62–78; Trandafir G. Djuvara, *Cent projects de partage de la Turquie (1281–1913)*, Bibliothèque d'histoire contemporaine (Paris: Alcan, 1914) (on the 16<sup>th</sup> century, see 145–239). On the discourse around the "crisis of the Ottoman Empire" see Andrei Pippidi, "La décadence de l'Empire Ottoman comme concept historique de la Renaissance aux Lumières," *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 35, no 1–2 (1997): 5–19.

<sup>89</sup> "Az kár, nem ismeri az kereszténység derekasan mennyire futhat, mivel igen fedezi pompájával maga szemérmét." Harsányi's letter to György Rákóczi II (Constantinople, 4 June 1655) MHHd XXIII: 191.

very few real men.”<sup>90</sup> Harsányi, as I mentioned in chapter IV, explains even in his *Opinio* of 1672 that the primary goal would be to expel the Ottomans from Europe; he only gives other advice because at the moment there does not seem to be a chance for the co-operation of Christianity.<sup>91</sup>

The idea of the decline of the Ottoman Empire, as I have shown, is notably missing from the *Colloquia*: in the context of 1672, when the Sultan recently put a successful end to his long war against Venice, and was waging another one against Poland, it would have made little sense to try to convince the readers that the arch-enemy is at the brink of collapsing. This, however, only reinforced Harsányi’s pleas for a Christian co-operation, which gained a certain emphasis in the plot of the *Colloquia* as well, even before the concluding speech. The Legate himself, according to the plot, was sent to the Sublime Porte by the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, the Kings of Sweden, France, Poland and seven other mighty potentates of Christianity. The aim of this fictive legation is to tell the Sultan “that if he does not stay within his borders, and leave these disdainful inspirations”, they are going to teach him to keep peace.<sup>92</sup>

The Legate’s mission shows that, at least in the fictive plot of the *Colloquia*, the much wanted concord between the Christian rulers could be reached. However, sending a common diplomat to the Sublime Porte would have been only a first step – and it does not even convince the characters in this fictional world that it would automatically lead to a joint military action. The Interpreter remains skeptical, even after having listened to the explanations of the Legate about his task, and claims that it

<sup>90</sup> “Instat fatalis periodus etiam hujus Imperii Ottomanici, tyrannis, consiliorum inopia, defectus pecuniae, mutua dissidia in eum scopum tendunt. Sed nemo est Principum Christianorum, qui haec videat. Az régi ereje ezeknek elkölt, sok az nép, de ember nincs.” Harsányi’s letter to György Rákóczi II (21 December 1656) MHHD XXIII: 509.

<sup>91</sup> *Opinio*, version B, 291r.

<sup>92</sup> “[...] nisi se intra limites suos continuerit, inflatosque illos spiritus deposuerit”, *Colloquia*, 84–85.

has always been the discord between Christians, that made the Ottomans so successful: “The Turk does not or hardly pays attention to Christian rulers, and does not fear them too much. As they always fight each other, it is not very credible that once they could reach an agreement.”<sup>93</sup> Even in later parts of the book, he blames the Christians for fighting over a piece of unfertile land, while rich regions of Southeastern Europe are left under Ottoman rule.<sup>94</sup> The Legate seems to be not less pessimistic: “See the peoples of Jesus, without mutual love, have desire for some sandy fields of their neighbors, and fight each other for religion’s sake; therefore they would sooner gouge out the eyes of the neighboring ruler than support him in the time of necessity [...] One devil does not harm the other, one wolf does not eat the other, people on the other hand, ruin other people.”<sup>95</sup> In spite of all the skepticism, the idea of an anti-Ottoman war appears as a moral command in the *Colloquia*.

Among the contemporaries we do not find many examples for Harsányi’s solution: that he conveys a positive image of the Ottomans, but still stresses the necessity of the anti-Ottoman war. Exhortations for a campaign against the Turks were usually combined with descriptions about their horrid nature, the brutalities committed by them and the terrible fate people had to suffer under their rule. During the discussions of the Reichstag in Regensburg, in the early 1660s, leaflets, reinforcing these stereotypes from the 16<sup>th</sup> century were republished in order to further political decisions.<sup>96</sup> Putting emphasis on positive characteristics of the Ottomans –

<sup>93</sup> “Turca nihil, aut parum omnino curat Principes Christianos, nec multum sibi ab illis metuit. Semper enim invicem (mutuo) digladiantes, credibile non est eos convenire posse.” *Colloquia*, 86.

<sup>94</sup> *Colloquia*, 143.

<sup>95</sup> “Vides populum Jesu, amore mutuo destitui, qualemunque, vicini mixtam arena terram ambire, appertere, ac propter religionem, sectasve invicem contendere; ideo citius vicini Principis oculos (ex capite) erueret, quam tempore oportuno ei suppetias ferret [...] Unus Sathanas alterum non impedit, lupus lupum non devorat; homo autem hominem destruit”, *Colloquia*, 217–218.

<sup>96</sup> Meike Hollenbeck, “Die Türkenpublizistik im 17. Jahrhundert – Spiegel der Verhältnisse im Reich?”, *Mitteilungen des Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 107 (1999): 111–130. See also: Maximilian Grothaus, “Zum Türkenbild in der Kultur der Habsburgermonarchie zwischen den 16. und 18. Jahrhundert,” in *Habsburg-osmanische Beziehungen*, ed. Andreas Tietze (Vienna: Verl. des

especially their religious tolerance – was typical rather for the tradition that modern scholarship calls *Calvinoturcismus* or *Türkenhoffnung*.

The assumption that some 16<sup>th</sup> century Protestants seriously considered to accept the Ottoman rule, because they found its neutrality in inter-Christian religious questions appealing, in contrast to the oppressive actions of the Emperor, seems to be rather well-spread in modern scholarship.<sup>97</sup> The claim that the Ottoman expansion in the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century was beneficial for the spreading of Protestantism – through weakening the Emperor's capacity of resistance – is entirely acceptable.<sup>98</sup> However, little, if any data seem to support the thesis that there were groups of Protestants, who decided to prefer the Ottoman side and change loyalties: written documents about this assumption exist only in the form of treatises written against this project, without mentioning the names of its supporters. This leaves the question open, whether there were any, or one should see a rhetorical construction in this thesis, designed to pre-empt the attacks expected from the Catholic side, and to make it clear that no decent Protestant can think this way.<sup>99</sup> A vast majority of the early generations of Protestant theologians hoped rather that the truth of their theological

---

Verbundes der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs, 1985), 69–72; Zsuzsa Barbarics, “‘Türk ist mein Nahn in allen Landen...’ Kunst, Propaganda und die Wandlung des Türkenbildes im Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation,” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 54 (2001): 257–317.

<sup>97</sup> Hans Joachim Kissling, “Türkenfurcht und Türkenhoffnung im 15./16. Jahrhundert: Zur Geschichte eines ‘Komplexes’”, *Südost-Forschungen* 23 (1964): 1–18; Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973), 37.

<sup>98</sup> Stephen Alexander Fischer-Galati, *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism 1521–1555* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959); Ernst Petritsch, “Türkische Toleranz?!", *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 34–35 (1991–1992): 134–149.

<sup>99</sup> See the skeptical accounts of John W. Bohnstedt, “The Infidel Scourge of God: The Turkish Menace as Seen by German Pamphleteers of the Reformation Era,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* n. s. 58, pt. 9 (1968): 20–21; John M. Headley, “‘Eher Türkisch als Bäpstisch’: Lutheran Reflections on the Problem of Empire 1623–28,” *Central European History* 20 (1987): 3–28. The term “Calvinoturcismus” itself originates from a bulky Catholic pamphlet of William Rainald from the year 1597, where he – in a dialogue between a renegade, who newly converted from Calvinism, and his Catholic friend – argues not for the political, rather for the theological proximity of both religious groups. The title of William Sutcliffe's response from two years after, in which he turns Rainald's arguments upside down (*De Turcopapismo*) did not make a similarly great career. See Dorothy M. Vaughan, *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances 1350–1700* (Liverpool: University Press, 1954), 191–192.



interpretations will enlighten the Turks as well, who will convert in their turn. This idea enjoyed some popularity among the radical Protestant groups even in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>100</sup> These expectations however did not produce a positive image of the Turk, and they also did not plea for an anti-Ottoman war, as the authors preferred spiritual to material means to solve the “problem of the Muslims”. Thus, these were far away from Harsányi’s

A positive image of the Turks was in the 17<sup>th</sup> century much more connected to the idea of accepting the rule of the Ottomans and giving up the hope for a recovery of former Christian territories from under their rule. This is exactly what happened in the case of 17<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit missionaries in the Balkans. While in the Western literature the possibility of a new crusade jointly with the rebellion of the Balkan people frequently appeared,<sup>101</sup> these authors never suggested an anti-Ottoman campaign. One of the most remarkable among them, the Croatian Bartol Kašić, thought that the Ottomans were militarily invincible, therefore proposed that a *modus vivendi* should be found between the Sublime Porte and the Holy See. In the long run his plans met with those of his radical Protestant contemporaries, although he obviously hoped that the Turks would sooner or later convert to Catholicism if the position of the Church could be strengthened in the Ottoman Empire, and missionary activities could enjoy an upheaval.<sup>102</sup>

Harsányi would not have accepted Kašić’s solution to become resigned to the idea of the Christian territories remaining under Ottoman rule. No matter, whether he found acceptable the conditions of living in the territories of the Empire (and made it

<sup>100</sup> Rudolf Pfister, “Reformation, Türken und Islam,” *Zwingliana* 10, no 6 (1956): 345–375. For the 17<sup>th</sup> century, see M.E.H. Nicolette Mout, “Calvinoturcismus und Chiliasmus im 17. Jahrhundert,” *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 14 (1988): 72–84; Nabil I. Matar, “The Comenian Legacy in England: The Case for the Conversion of the Muslims,” *The Seventeenth Century* 8 (1993): 203–215; Littleton, “Ancient Languages.”

<sup>101</sup> Vaughan, *Europe*, 215–236.

<sup>102</sup> Antal Molnár, *Katolikus missziók a hódolt Magyarországon*, vol. 1, (1572–1647) (Catholic Missions in Hungary under Ottoman Rule) (Budapest: Balassi, 2002), 177–178.

look so through the words of the Interpreter), as a moral postulate he had to keep up the hope for a re-conquest. His answer might seem to be beyond logic: why should it be a burden for any Christian to live under the Muslims' rule, if the latter do not limit him in his corporal or religious freedom, what is more, wisely promote his physical well-being, as seen in the example of the peasant-friendly Sipahis. Nevertheless, he shrank back from drawing the probably more obvious conclusions, and relied on an implicit moral judgment – that the worst Christian rule is better than the best Muslim – when he presented his political agenda. He was not alone with following this reasoning among his fellow Transylvanian diplomats: Dávid Rozsnyai, after having spent most of his life with Ottoman issues as a Turkish scribe, and even translated a Turkish collection of tales – which should be a sign for a high opinion of their cultural production –, wrote the following lines in his will: “I do not suggest it to people far from me either, but for my relatives, I bequeath it under my curse: never take this office at any time. You should rather go to the Occident to polish shoes for two years, than to the Orient to gild crowns for thirty.”<sup>103</sup>

Taking this rigid, unchanging attitude into account, the function of the positive image of the Turks in the *Colloquia* also becomes clear. With the dialogues between the Legate and the Interpreter, Harsányi draws the attention of his audience: the archfoe is not a cruel barbarian, exactly the contrary. In order to overcome him, the Christians also have to undergo a moral development. The scattered remarks throughout the *Colloquia*, where the Ottoman practices are placed in a direct comparison with those of the Christians, point to the conclusion – which is however not made explicit in the book – that the latter have to change themselves: be better

<sup>103</sup> The original text reads as “never bite into this bread”: “Távolabb valóknak sem javaslom, magaméinak átok alatt hagyom, ebben a kenyérben, minden időben ne harapjatok. Inkább menjetek néha napnyugotra két esztendeig czipellőt tisztítani, mint sem napkeletre harmincz esztendeig koronát aranyazni.” MHHS VIII: 260.

men than the Muslims, since their Christian religion is the true one. The well known tradition of the *turcica* literature – the lamentation over the positive features of the world of “barbarians” compared to that of the Christians – meets in this conclusion the image conveyed by Puritan rhetoric: that the world one lives in is full of sins and mistakes and it is the responsibility of the person to correct them through his own moral and intellectual improvement. These two features together supply Harsányi’s individual solution for the problems of the region he was forced to leave behind: East Central Europe under the Ottoman rule.

### Instead of a conclusion

Biographies in the manner of microhistory do not lend themselves to straightforward conclusions. The assumptions of classic biographies, that their authors can uncover the true and stable core of the individual's personality, must have made this exercise easier: the recapitulation of this core, the "true nature" of the Great Man whose life was just narrated could fulfill the task well enough. But if we imagine the personality of the individual as a dynamic process of construction, and focus our attention on the changes in his self-fashioning, this approach simply deprives us of the possibility to easily summarize the meaning of a human life for eternity. An alternative solution for the classic biographies could have been to define the place of their protagonists in the Pantheon of Great Men (much less often, Women) – which however also does not make sense if the protagonist was selected exactly because of his negligible relevance for the events of Grand History. If we are to believe István Szijártó, who finds the essence of micro-historical approach in the aphorism usually attributed to Gustave Flaubert, "God is in the details", it becomes clear that a short list of all the relevant topics touched upon in the preceding pages would be in exact opposition of the methodological principles of presenting an individual in the multi-dimensional system of co-ordinates he had spent his life in.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, I decided to close this survey of Harsányi's multi-faceted life with two very small pieces of the mosaic, left unmentioned so far. They give frame to his career and in a way even try to interpret it – at the same time they illustrate very well the situational character of these interpretations. The first and last pieces of writing that we know from Jakab Harsányi Nagy's hand, are both entries in *alba amicorum* of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Szijártó, "Four Arguments", 209.

peregrinating students, and as it usually was the case, beside the note about the circumstances of the signature, there is also a motto from him in both cases. The first one Harsányi wrote when he was twenty-eight years old, on his way back from the Netherlands into the album of Ludwig Möller. The text reads: “Nullus sibi ipsi vivit; nullus sibi ipsi moritur.”<sup>2</sup> As it is also indicated in the entry, this is a quote from the Bible, from the Letter to the Romans, 14.7: “For none of us lives to himself alone and none of us dies to himself alone.” If there were any doubts about the meaning of this passage, the next one makes it clear: “If we live, we live to the Lord; and if we die, we die to the Lord. So, whether we live or die, we belong to the Lord.” Although the passages suggest that belonging to the Lord is the share of each human being, the reasons for choosing exactly this quote are quite clear: heading for Transylvania, having received the necessary education, Harsányi was preparing himself for a life in service of God. As we know by now, it happened otherwise: some ten years after writing these lines, he left the ecclesiastical career. Although he certainly did not have the opportunity to “live to himself alone”, having been in the service of several rulers, the sense of calling he had as a young theologian could not have been fulfilled.

Thirty-six years later, in Berlin, Jakab Harsányi Nagy wrote into an *album amicorum* again. To Sámuel Hodosi, he dedicated the motto “Non uni angulo nati sumus, civitatem nostram cursu solis metimur.”<sup>3</sup> This entry is much more intriguing than the other one from 1643 was. Harsányi indicated that it is a quote from Seneca – however, it is not: it is a rephrasing of a passage from the Antique philosopher’s *De otio*, with alterations that also changed its meaning. The original passage of Seneca is about the idea of the two homelands: one, which includes the entire mankind, “in which we look neither to this corner of earth, nor to that, but measure the bounds of

<sup>2</sup> Książnica Kopernikańska (Toruń), KM 5. R 8°8, fol. 53.

<sup>3</sup> OSZK Oct. Lat. 777. fol. 45v.

our citizenship by the path of the sun;” and the other, “to which we have been assigned by the accident of birth.”<sup>4</sup> That is to say, people are not only part of the country where they were born, but also of the entire mankind, and they should assume responsibility towards both of them. Harsányi’s paraphrase has an entirely different meaning: “We are not born into one corner [of the world], but measure our home with the path of the sun.” The idea of the two homelands is gone: the country where one has first seen the sunlight does not seem to play any role any more; the only one that is left, is the endless world of the entire mankind. The rephrasing might not have been deliberate: we have seen earlier that Harsányi had sometimes problems with accurately quoting classical Latin authors. However, I see something symbolic in this inaccuracy. The Hungarian emigrant, who had not seen his home country for nineteen years by then, created an explanation for his fate. Even if he was still using the means at his disposal to support his original homeland, the tripartite Hungary, giving support to the peregrinating students coming from there, he was in parallel trying to find the means to prove – probably even to himself – that his life was dedicated to a much larger homeland, the limitless one, that of mankind. And this thought – bolstered up by the authority of Seneca – must have brought consolation to him, whose Odyssey was about to end in a short time in a non-Ulysseian way, without return to where he had been born.

---

<sup>4</sup> Seneca, *De otio*, IV.1–2. „in qua non ad hunc angulum respicimus aut ad illum sed terminos ciuitatis nostrae cum sole metimur, alteram cui nos adscripsit condicio nascendi”; in the following translation: Seneca, *Moral Essays*, vol. 2, trans. by John W. Basore (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1932), 187–188.

## Appendix I

### Known Copies of the Colloquia

In case the source of information is not indicated, I have seen the volume myself.

#### ***Germany***

##### Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel; Xb 3116

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: single words with Arabic letters on 14 pages, probably from the 19<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> century
- *Possessors' signatures*: none
- *Source of information*: Pál Ács

##### Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (Göttingen); H. Turc. 239

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: on the first page „F Meindes I R[or P?] Casselus”; stamp on page 2: „Ex Bibliotheca Regia Acad. Georgiae Aug.”

##### Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz; Bibl. Dietz Oct. 1301.

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: on the first page, MGleik(?) 1721

##### Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Jena; 8 Gl.II, 175

- *Dedication*: Gustav Adolph
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: on the inner cover “Johann Matthias Gessner”
- *Source of information*: Michael Henkel

##### Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg – Hauptbibliothek; H00/OR-I 207

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: none
- *Source of information*: Hans-Jörg Sigwart

##### Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle an der Saale; Bg 832

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: at the inside of the binding “Ex libris illustrissimi viri, Dn. Dan. Ludolphi, Lib. Bar. de Danckelmann, S. Reg. Mai. Boruss. Consiliarii status intimi, cetera, Bibliothecae acad. Fridericianae testamento relictis.”

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle an der Saale; Bg 842  
(bound together with the *Institutionum linguae Turcicae libri quatuor* of Hieronymus Megiserius, Leipzig, 1613)

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: ex libris from Otto Nathaniel Nicolai

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle an der Saale; Ung II 173  
At the moment in the collection of the Universitätsbibliothek der Humboldt Universität, Zweigstelle Finno-Ugristik, Berlin

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: on the bottom of the first page, "Ottho l. B. a Schwerin"
- *Source of information*: Conny Hödt

### ***Great Britain***

Jesus College Library (Oxford); call number unknown

- *Dedication*: unknown
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: none, the copy is from the bequest of Leoline Jenkins, Principal of the College in the later 17<sup>th</sup> century
- *Source of information*: Sarah Cobbold

The British Library, London; 621.a.20

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: none

### ***Hungary***

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (Budapest); RMK III. 2586.

- *Dedication*: Gustav Adolph
- *Marginalia*: none, only some terms underlined in the index
- *Possessors' signatures*: none

Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Nagykönyvtár (Sárospatak); R. 207.

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: ex libris "Ex libris Joannis de Mohcza Symb. Deus providebit mppia", later added "Coll. Ref. S. Patak", and on the first page of the dedication: "ex libris I. Coll: S. Patak"

### ***Poland***

Biblioteka Uniwersytecka we Wrocławiu; 466632

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: none
- *Possessors' signatures*: "Ex Bibl. Univ. Viad. Vrat."
- *Source of information*: Krzysztof Migoń



Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie; 28.20.3.3986 (old nr: Obce-XVII-4°-16°-1046)

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: see below
- *Possessors' signatures*: "Ex donatione Dni Autoris possid. M Andr. Müllerus Greiffenhagius"
- *Source of information*: Natalia Królikowska

on the back of the cover: "Molnar praefat. Gramm. Hung. 19. Castell. praef. Lex. Aeth. Ludolphi Postellus ap: Zwinger 1689.a."

on the pages before the dedication a table of phonology with columns "Hung.", "Germ.", "Turc.", "Exempla", "pag." Above it, the heading reads "A. Müller Gr. Lectoribus Germanis S.P.D. Cum D. Autor circa Elementorum Turcicorum pronunciationem Hungaricam orthographiam sequatur, Hungaricas quasum literas syllabusque Germanicis Turcicisque quibus qsoscant[?], e diametro exprincere fortassis juvabit"

p. 132: "ba'zi" written in the Ottoman (everything written in the Ottoman is written in the Arabic alphabet)

p. 173: Müller crossed out the word "kadileskerum" and underlined the word "kazeskerum", but on the margin in the Ottoman he wrote in the transcription "kadi'l-asker", that is, the word, which is closer to the crossed-out version.

p. 238: marginal notes in the Ottoman: "timar" and "ziamet"

p. 239: "Comenia" is corrected to "Comnenia"

p. 328: the margin note "fals." to the underlined "D. Gentius mihi ignotus"

p. 329: the margin note "Job." to the underlined "extra Ejub"

p. 380: on the margin "214" to the underlined "Beng quid fit"

p. 425: "Giuher, Zumrut" in Ottoman, and the translation "Margarita, Smargdy" is also given on the margins

p. 495: on the margin "Emn. Vox est arabian *"fatiyan"* [in Arabic characters] Puor unde est "Mufti" [in Ott.] dintur. Soc. Antitutio Fetva iustitio."

p. 499: on the margin note "fals" to "Emirii dicuntur ... descendunt"

p. 504: the margin note "α θ χ θ [?]" to "I-mansis"

p. 505: "mezin" underlined and on the margin the same word written in Ottoman.

### ***Romania***

Biblioteka Teleki-Bolyai, Târgu Mureş; Tö-1673aH

- *Dedication*: Frederick William
- *Marginalia*: some words underlined
- *Possessors' signatures*: ex libris "Ex bibliotheca Sams. R.L.Com. Teleki de Szék"

## Appendix II

### Eastern European Place Names

I did not include those place names which have an established English form (Constantinople, Adrianople, Vienna, etc). The place names which are currently in official use are highlighted with bold.

- Abaújszina (Hun): **Seňa** (Slo)
- Bártfa (Hun): **Bardejov** (Slo), Bartfeld (Ger), Bardiów (Pol)
- Beszterce (Hun): **Bistrița** (Rom), Bistritz / Nösen (Ger)
- Bihar county (Hun): Bihor (Rom)
- Borosjenő (Hun): **Ineu** (Rom)
- Brassó (Hun): **Brașov** (Rom), Kronstadt (Ger)
- Breslau (Ger): **Wrocław** (Pol), Vratislav (Cze), Boroszló (Hun)
- Bromberg (Ger): **Bydgoszcz** (Pol)
- Buczacz (Pol): **Bučač** (Ukr), Butschatsch (Ger), Bucaș (Tur)
- Csíkszereda (Hun): **Miercurea Ciuc** (Rom), Szeklerburg (Ger)
- Danzig (Ger): **Gdańsk** (Pol)
- Debrecen** (Hun): Debresin (Ger), Debrecín (Slo), Debrețin (Rom), Debreczyn (Pol)
- Dorpat (Ger, Swe, Pol): **Tartu** (Est)
- Ebesfalva (Hun): **Dumbrăveni** / Ibașfalău (Rom), Elisabethstadt / Eppeschorf (Ger)
- Elbe, river (Ger): Labe (Cze)
- Érsekújvár (Hun): **Nové Zámky** (Slo), Neuhäusel (Ger), Uyvar (Tur)
- Eszék (Hun): **Osijek** (Cro), Essegg (Ger)
- Felsőbánya (Hun): **Baia Sprie** (Rom), Mittelstadt (Ger)
- Fogaras (Hun): **Făgăraș** (Rom), Fogarasch (Ger)
- Frankfurt an der Oder** (Ger): Frankfurt nad Odrą / Ślubice (Pol)
- Greiffenhagen (Ger): **Gryfino** (Pol)
- Gyulafehérvár (Hun): **Alba Iulia** (Rom), Weissenburg / Karlsburg (Ger)
- Holešov** (Cze): Holleschau (Ger)
- Homonna (Hun): **Humenné** (Slo), Homenau (Ger)
- Iași** (Rom): Jassy (Ger), Jászvásár (Hun)
- Kamieniec Podolski (Pol): **Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi** (Ukr), Kamenets-Podolskij (Rus), Camenița Podoliei (Rom), Kamaniçe (Tur)
- Kassa (Hun): **Košice** (Slo), Kaschau (Ger)
- Kolberg (Ger): **Kołobrzeg** (Pol)
- Kolozsvár (Hun): **Cluj-Napoca** (Rom), Klausenburg (Ger)
- Kozma (Hun): **Kuzmice** (Slo)
- Lasztóc (Hun): **Lastovce** (Slo)
- Lemberg (Ger): **L'viv** (Ukr), Lwów (Pol), Lvov (Rus)
- Libau (Ger): **Liepāja** (Latv), Lipawa (Pol), Libava (Rus)
- Lőcse (Hun): **Levoča** (Slo), Leutschau (Ger)
- Marosvásárhely (Hun): **Târgu Mureș** (Rom), Neumarkt (Ger)

Munkács (Hun): **Mukačeve** (Ukr), Mukačevo (Rus, Cze, Slo), Munkatsch (Ger)  
 Murányváralja (Hun): **Muraň** (Slo), Unter-Muran (Ger)  
 Nagybánya (Hun): **Baia Mare** (Rom), Frauenbach / Neustadt (Ger)  
 Nagyenyed (Hun): **Aiud** (Rom), Straßburg am Mieresch (Ger)  
 Nagyszeben (Hun): **Sibiu** (Rom), Hermannstadt (Ger)  
 Nagyszombat (Hun): **Trnava** (Slo), Tyrnau (Ger), Tyrnawa (Pol)  
 Nagyszöllős (Hun): **Seleuş** (Rom), Gross-Alisch (Ger)  
 Nagyvárád (Hun): **Oradea** (Rom), Grosswardein (Ger)  
 Neuhausen (Ger): **Guryevsk** (Rus), Nowy Dwór Pruski (Pol), Romuva (Lith)  
 Oder, river (Ger): Odra (Pol, Cze)  
 Pernau (Ger): **Pärnu** (Est)  
**Plovdiv** (Bul): Filibe (Tur), Filippopoli (Gre)  
 Pozsony (Hun): Prešpurk / **Bratislava** (Slo), Pressburg (Ger)  
**Pskov** (Rus): Pleskau (Ger), Pleskava (Latv), Pikhva (Est), Pskovas (Lith)  
 Riga (Ger): **Rīga** (Latv)  
 Saatzig (Ger): **Szadzko** (Pol)  
**Sárospatak** (Hun): Šarišký Potok (Slo)  
 Sebes-Körös, river (Hun): Crişul Repede (Rom)  
 Silistria (Lat, Ger): **Silistra** (Bul), Dîrstor / Silistra (Rom), Dorostol (Rus), Silistre (Tur)  
 Solyomkő (Hun): **Şinteu** (Rom), Nová Huta (Slo)  
 Stettin (Ger): **Szczecin** (Pol)  
 Szászfenes (Hun): **Floreşti** / Feneş (Rom)  
 Szatmár (Hun), see Szatmárnémeti  
 Szatmárnémeti (Hun): **Satu Mare** (Rom), Sathmar (Ger)  
 Szécskeresztúr (Hun): **Zemplínska Toplica** (Slo)  
 Székelyföld (Hun): **Ţinutul Secuiesc** (Rom), Szeklerland (Ger)  
**Szentgotthárd** (Hun): St. Gotthard (Ger), Monošter (Slov)  
 Szinna (Hun): **Snina** (Slo)  
 Tackerort (Ger): **Tahkuranna** (Est)  
**Thessaloniki** (Gre): Selanik (Tur), Solun (Bul)  
 Thorn (Ger): **Toruń** (Pol)  
 Törcsvár (Hun): **Bran** (Rom), Türzdorf (Ger)  
**Ueckermünde** (Ger): Wkryjście (Pol)  
**Vasvár** (Hun): Eisenburg (Ger), Železnograd (Slov)  
 Vistula, river: Weichsel (Ger), Wisła (Pol)  
 Wehlau (Ger): **Znamensk** (Rus), Vėluva (Lith), Welawa (Pol)

## Bibliography

## I. Primary sources

## I.1. Unpublished primary sources from manuscript collections

## I.1.1. Austria

## I.1.1.1. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (Vienna) (= HHStA)

## VIII. Staatenabteilungen

## Türkei

Kt. 121–130. Turcica 1648–1658 (On microfilm: MOL X 880)

## I.1.1.2. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. Hofkammerarchiv (Vienna) (= HKA)

## Hoffinanz Ungarn

Rt. Nr. 198.

## Reichsakten

Fasc. 113.

## I.1.2. Germany

## I.1.2.1. Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (Berlin) (= GStA PK)

## Hauptabteilung I. Geheimer Rat, Repositorium 9. Allgemeine Verwaltung

F 3 Fasz. 2. Acta betr. Buchdrucker (Runge, Schultze), Avisen, Drucke, Zensur etc.  
1650–1686

F 3a Fasz. 1. Acta betr. Hofbuchdrucker Runge, G. Schultze, Liebgert 1634–1688

J 16 Fasz. 2. Acta betr. Bestallung der Hofräte 1658–87

J 16 Fasz. 3. Acta betr. Besoldung des Hofrats von Harsány 1667–84

K lit. m. II. Fasz. 1. Acta de 1666 und 1667. betr. die vorgehabte Fundation einer Universitaet  
Gentium Scientiarum et Artium

L 21 Fasc. 2. Dolmetscher 1678–82

## Hauptabteilung I. Geheimer Rat, Repositorium 11.

## 178. Moldau und Wallachei

Fasz. 3. Gheorghe Ștefan

## 255. Siebenbürgen

Nr. 19. Beziehungen des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm zu Michael Apaffy I. und  
seine Verwendungen für Siebenbürgen am Kaiserhofe in Religionssachen

## 271a. Tartarien

Fasz. 3. Acta betr. die Verrichtung und Abfertigung der Tartarischen Abgesandten  
(1670)Fasz. 4. Acta betr. die Verrichtung und Abfertigung der Tartarischen Abgesandten  
(1671)Fasz. 5. Acta betr. der Tartarinnen Khanens Ivas Giray Abgesandten ... Ankunfft...  
(1677)

Fasz. 6. Acta betr. des tartarischen Gesandten Themer Ghazi Beg (1681)

## 276. Türkei Bedanken betreffend den Türkenkrieg saec. XV. – 1673

## 278. Ungarn

Fasz. 9. Die Protestanten in Ungarn 1647–1677

## I.1.2.2. Landesarchiv Greifswald (= LA Greifswald)

## Repositorium 40. Handschriftensammlung

## I.1.2.3. Landeshauptarchiv Schwerin (= LHAS)

## 2.11–2/1 Auswärtige Beziehungen (Acta externa)

4972 Litterae familiares Herzog Gustav Adolphs an Fürst Georg Stefan von  
Moldau und Gemahlin 16644973 Acta betreffend einige von Herzoge Gustav Adolph zu Güstrow für 1200 rdr  
an den Fürsten von Moldau, dem Bericht nach, verpfändete Ämter de ann:  
1665

## 2.12–1/24 Korrespondenz mit Gelehrten

nr. 242. Fürst Gustav Adolph von Mecklenburg–Güstrow

I.1.2.4. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz (= SBB PK)*Handschriftenabteilung*

- Acta III.B.2. Acta wegen der von des Petraei Witwe erhandelten orientalischen Bücher 1677–1681)
- Acta III.C.1. Ankauf oder die Schenkung der in der Königl. Bibliothek befindlichen Handschriften, Urkunden, Gemälde, Kupferplatten

I.1.2.5. Universitätsbibliothek Johann Christoph Senckenberg, Frankfurt am Main (= UB Frankfurt)*Handschriftenabteilung*

- Ms. Ff. Ludolf Nachlaß Hiob Ludolf

***I.1.3. Great Britain***I.1.3.1. Bodleian Library (Oxford)*Rawlison Manuscripts*

- A 37 Various manuscripts

I.1.3.2. The British Library (London) (= BL)*Additional Manuscripts*

- 22905 Correspondence of Samuel Clarke 1656–1669

*Sloane Manuscripts*

- 1381 Letters and Papers of J. Pragestus

I.1.3.3. Edinburgh University Library (= EUL)

- Ms Da.2.1. Leges Bibliothecae Universitatis Edinensis

I.1.3.4. Essex Record Office (Chelmsford) (= ERO)*D/DHf Families and Estates*

- O4–O45 Various Papers relating to the Bendysh family of Steeple Bumsted, Essex

***I.1.4. Hungary***I.1.4.1. Magyar Országos Levéltár (Budapest) (= MOL)*Magyar Kamara Archivuma**E 149 Acta Transylvanica**E 190 Archivum familiae Rákóczi*

24–29. doboz Levelezés 1648–1657

43–44. doboz Levelezés 1648–1657

*E 199 Archivum familiae Wesselényi*

8. cs. Fogalmazványok

*Erdélyi Kormányhatósági levéltárak**F 1 Libri regii**F 12 Lymbus*

11. cs. 6. sz. Apafi Mihály közigazgatási rendeletei 1660–1668

*Családi levéltárak**P 507*

Fasc. 14. Lev. A.V. nr. 527. Gheorghe Ștefan vajda levelei Johann Rottalnak

I.1.4.2. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (Budapest) (= OSZK)

Oct. Lat. 777. Hodosi Sámuel album amicorum

I.1.4.3. Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Nagykönyvtár Kézirattár (= SNK)

- Kt. 21; 22/a. Szilágyi Benjámin István: *Acta Synodi Nationalis Hungaricae...*
- Kt. 403. Kocsi Csörgő István kéziratos gyűjteménye

I.1.4.4. Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Levéltár (=SRKLt.)

Kgg. I.2. Prothocollum V.T. Zemplén Tomus II.A. 1638–1651

**I.1.5. Poland****I.1.5.1. Archiwum Państwowe w Olsztynie*****381. Zbiór rodziny Schwerinów***

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| 160. | Privatkorrespondenz XVII. Jh.                               |
| 161. | Privatkorrespondenz 1655–1692                               |
| 180. | Politische Privatkorrespondenz XVII. Jh.                    |
| 242. | Korrespondenz von Otto von Schwerin mit fürstliche Personen |
| 243. | Collection Schwerinscher Briefe 1642–1731                   |

**I.1.5.2. Archiwum Państwowe w Szczecinie*****Archiwum Książat Szczecińskich***

- |        |         |
|--------|---------|
| I/1769 | Somnitz |
|--------|---------|

**I.1.6. Romania****I.1.6.1. Arhivele Naționale Direcția Județeană Cluj (=ANCJ)*****Colecția Sámuel Kemény***

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Nr. 11. | Correspondență adresată lui György Apafi, Pál Béldi, Pál Bornemisza 1629–1679 |
|---------|---|

***Fond familial Lazar din Mureșeni*****I.1.7. Sweden****I.1.7.1. Riksarkivet (Stockholm) (= RA)*****Riksregistraturet (= RR)******Rådsprotokoll***

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Vol. 40a. | 1665 åhrs Protocoll hållit af Secr: Arfwed Gustaffson Pars 1:ma |
|-----------|---|

***Diplomatica******Borussica***

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| Vol. 16. | Residenten H. Wolfradts bref till K. Mt. 1666–1669 |
|----------|--|

***Polonica***

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Vol. 53–54. | Abgesandten Matthias Palbitzkis bref till Kongl. Maj:t 1664–1665 |
|-------------|--|

***Turcica bihang Moldavo-Valachica***

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Vol. 1. | Moldaviska och valakiska furstars och sändebuds brev och memorial |
|---------|---|

***Enskilda samlingar******Delagardiska samlingen***

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| E 1500 | Skrivelser till Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (Moldau) |
| E 1540 | Skrivelser till M. G. de la Gardie Rup–Rö            |

***Skoklostersamlingen***

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| E 8164 | Riksdrotsen Grefve Per Brahe Bref ifrån utländske Herrar                                   |
| E 8184 | Riskmarsken Grefve Carl Gust. Wrangel brefwexling med utländska Furstel. personer Lit. E–O |
| E 8361 | Skrivelser till Carl Gustaf Wrangel Fr–Fö  |
| E 8380 | Skrifvelser till Carl Gustaf Wrangel, Hol–Hul  |
| E 8444 | Skrivelser till Carl Gustaf Wrangel Pa–Par   |
| E 8422 | Skrifvelser till Carl Gustaf Wrangel, Mes–Mold   |
| E 8526 | Skrifvelser till Carl Gustaf Wrangel, Würtz  |

***Sveriges forna besittningar******Livonica***

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| Vol. 81. | Generalguv. i Livland till K. Maj:t 1660–1663 |
|----------|---|

***Pommeranica***

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Vol. 6.   | Ständer i Pommern   |
| Vol. 262. | Skrifvelser till Kungl. Maj:t från generallöjtnanten och vice-guvernören P. Wirtz 1658, 1660–1664 |

**I.1.7.2. Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek (= UUB)**

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Ihre 183. | Bengt Skyttes excerpter från orientaliska reseböcker |
|-----------|--|

## I.2. Published primary sources

AF I = Iorga, Neculai, ed. *Acte și fragmente cu privire la istoria românilor* (Documents and fragments for the history of the Romanians). Vol. 1. Bucharest: Imprimeria Statului, 1895.

AMN = Tóth, Ernő, ed. *I. Apafi Mihály és II. Apafi Mihály erdélyi fejedelmek naplója* (The diaries of Mihály Apafi I and Mihály Apafi II, Princes of Transylvania). Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum, 1900.

Apáczai Csere, János. "Az iskolák felettébb szükséges voltáról és a magyaroknál való barbár állapotuk okairól" (On the foremost necessity of schools and the reasons of their barbaric state among Hungarians). In *Apáczai Csere János válogatott pedagógiai művei* (The selected pedagogical works of János Apáczai Csere), Neveléstörténeti könyvtár, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, ed. Lajos Orosz, 181–205. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1976.

———. "A bölcsesség tanulásáról" (On the learning of wisdom). In *Magyar gondolkodók 17. század* (Hungarian philosophers, 17<sup>th</sup> century), Magyar remekírók, ed. Márton Tarnóc, 609–655. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1979.

AP XXI = Dienes, Dénes, ed. *Zempléni vizitációk 1629–1671: Miskolczi Csulyak István zempléni esperes és hivatali utódainak feljegyzései* (Visitations in Zemplén 1629–1671: Records by the dean of Zemplén, István Miskolczi Csulyak and his successors in the office). Acta Patakina, no. 21. Sárospatak: Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, 2008.

ARMSI II = Veress, Andrei, ed. "Pribegia lui Grigorașcu Vodă prin Ungaria și aiurea (1664–1672)" (The exile of Voievod Grigorașcu in Hungary and other places, 1664–1672). *Academia Română Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice Seria III. 2* (1924): 269–310.

ARMSI X = Iorga, Nicolae, ed. "Scriitori domnești din arhivele dela Stockholm" (Voievodes' letters from the Stockholm archives). *Academia Română Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice Seria III. 10* (1929): 509–534.

Arnauld, Antoine and Pierre Nicole. *La perpétuité de la foy du l'Eglise Catholique touchant l'Eucharistie, deffendue contre le livre du Sieur Claude, Ministre de Charenton*. Paris: Savreux, 1669.

ASAF I = Fockema Andreae, Mr.S.J. and Drs.Th.J. Meijer, ed. *Album studiosorum Academiae Franekerensis (1585–1811, 1816–1844)*. Vol. 1, *Naamlijst der Studenten*. Franeker: Wever, 1968.

ASALB = *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae MDLXXV–MDCCCLXXV, accedunt nomina curatorum et professorum per eadem secula*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1875.

Auer, Johann Ferdinand. *Auer János Ferdinánd pozsonyi nemes polgárnak héttoronyi fogságában írt naplója 1664* (The diary of the noble burgher of Pozsony, János Ferdinánd Auer, written in his captivity at the Seven Towers). Magyarország törökkori történetének forrásai. Edited by Imre Lukinich. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1923.

AVSL XVI = Teutsch, Friedrich. "Die Studierenden aus Ungarn und Siebenbürgen an der Universität Leyden 1575–1875." *Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* n.s. 16 (1880): 204–226.

AZVT V = Doby, Antal. "A moldvaországi vajdáné magyar levele 1661-ből" (A Hungarian letter of the consort of the Voievod of Moldavia from 1661). *Adalékok Zemplén-Vármegye Történetéhez* 5 (1899): 151.

BC = *Bibliotheca Castelliana, sive Catalogus variorum librorum plurimis facultatibus insignium, R. Doct. V. Edm. Castelli, D.D. Nuperrime Linguae Arabicae Professoris in Academia Cantab. Quos ingenti Sumptu, et Summa Diligentia ex ultimis Europiae partibus sibi procuravit, quorum Auctio habenda est (in Gratiam, et Commodum Eruditorum Academ. Cantab.) Aedibus Rob. Skyrings, apud insignium Aquilae et Infantis ex adverso Ecclesiae S. Benedicti, Cantab. 30 die Junii 1686*. London: Edward Millington, 1686.

BCI XIII = Ciorănescu, Alexandru. "Documente privitoare la domnia lui Mihail Radu (1658–1659)" (Documents concerning the rule of Mihail Radu 1658–1659). *Buletinul Comisiei Istorice a României* 13 (1934): 25–180.

Bethlen, János. *Erdély története 1629–1673* (The history of Transylvania 1629–1673). Translated by Judit P. Vásárhelyi, edited by József Jankovics. Budapest: Balassi, 1993.

Bethlen, Miklós. "Élete leírása magától" (A description of his life by himself). In *Kemény János és Bethlen Miklós művei* (The works of János Kemény and Miklós Bethlen), Magyar remekírók, ed. Éva V. Windisch, 401–981. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1980.

BGL = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed., *Bethlen Gábor fejedelem levelezése* (The correspondence of Gábor Bethlen). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1887.

BML I = Jankovics, József, ed. *Bethlen Miklós levelei (1657–1698)* (The letters of Miklós Bethlen, 1657–1698). Vol. 1. Régi magyar prózai emlékek, no. 6/1. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987.

Borsos, Tamás. *Vásárhelytől a Fényes Portáig: Emlékiratok, levelek* (From Vásárhely to the Sublime Porte: Memoirs and letters). Edited by László Kocziány. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1972.

BUBFS VIII = Izsépy, Edit, ed. *II. Rákóczi György levelezéséből 1646–1660* (From the correspondence of György Rákóczi II 1646–1660). Bibliotheca Universitatis Budapestiensis Fontes et Studia, no. 8. Budapest: Egyetemi Könyvtár, 1992.

Cantemir, Dimitrie. *Beschreibung der Moldau*. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1973.

CJH 1657–1740 = Márkus, Dezső, ed. *Corpus Juris Hungarici: Magyar törvénytár 1657–1740* (The collection of Hungarian laws 1657–1740). Budapest: Franklin, 1901.

Clodius, Johannes Christian. *Grammatica Tvrcica necessariis regylis praecipuas lingvae difficultates illvstrans, ac aliqvot colloqviiis et sententiis Tvrcicis avcta*. Leipzig: Deer, 1729.

———. *Compendiosum Lexicon Latino–Tvrcico–Germanicum, in quo non solum voces et phrases vistatae continentvr, sed etiam illarum lectio, adjectis vbiqve observationibus variis, ad statvm ecclesiasticvm, politicvm, et militare pertinentibvs cvm praefatione de lingua et litteratvra tvrcarvm, corrvtisqve vlgari pronvntiatione, nominibvs ministrorvm avlae Tvrcicae*. Leipzig: Deer, 1730.

*Colloquia* = Harsányi Nagy, Jakab. *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina seu Status Turcicus Loquens*. Cölln an der Spree: Schultz, 1672.

Costin, Miron. *Grausame Zeiten in der Moldau: Die Moldauische Chronik des Miron Costin 1593–1661*. Rumänische Geschichtsschreiber, no. 1. Edited and translated by Adolf Armbruster. Graz: Styria, 1980.

Dahlberg, Erik. *Erik Dahlbergs dagbok (1625–1699)* (The diary of Erik Dahlberg). Edited by Herman Lindström. Uppsala and Stockholm: n. p., 1912.

DIR V/1 = Hurmuzaki, Eudoxiu de, ed. *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor* (Documents for the history of the Romanians). Vol. 5, part 1, 1650–1699. Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1885.

DIR IX/1 = Hurmuzaki, Eudoxiu de, ed. *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor* (Documents for the history of the Romanians). Vol. 9, part 1. Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1897.

DIR Suppl. I/1 = Tocilescu, Grigore George and Alexandru I. Odobescu, ed. *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor* (Documents for the history of the Romanians). Supplement, vol. 1, part 1, 1518–1870. Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1886.

DIAMTR X = Veress, Andrei, ed. *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării-Românești* (Documents for the history of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia). Vol. 10, *Acte și scrisori (1637–1660)* (Documents and letters 1637–1660). Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1938.



DIAMTR XI = Veress, Andrei, ed. *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării-Românești* (Documents for the history of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia). Vol. 11, *Acte și scrisori (1661–1690)* (Documents and letters 1661–1690). Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1939.

Diószegi Bónis, Mátyás. *Az részegesnek gyűlölséges, utálatos és rettenetes állapotja, mely lerajzoltatott szintén úgy, amint vagyon, azoknak kedvéért; kikben még ez undok és ocsmány részegség (mely minden gonoszságnak gyökere és minden jószágnak rothasztója) fészket nem vert, hogy azok, ennek éktelen ábrázatját meglekénytelen, megrettenjenek és az halálnak útjáról visszatérjenek* (The hateful, disgusting and horrible state of drunkenness, which was described as it really is, for the sake of those in whom this abominable and filthy drunkenness (which is the root of all evil and the decomposer of all good) did not yet build a nest, so that these, seeing its foul face would be horrified and return from that way of death). Leiden: Leffen, 1649.

EÉKH = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Erdély és az északkeleti háború* (Transylvania and the Northeastern war). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1890–91.

EKK III = Gyulai, Éva, ed. *Erdélyi királyi könyvek* (The Royal Registry of Transylvania). Vol. 3, 20–29. *kötet: 1630–1656: I. és II. Rákóczi György oklevelei* (tomes 20–29, 1630–1656, the documents issued by György Rákóczi I and II). Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kara Magyar Középkori, Kora Újkori és a Történelem Segédtudományai Tanszék; Budapest: Arcanum, 2004. (CD–ROM)

EMM = Toldy, Ferenc, ed. *Galantai gróf Esterházy Miklós munkái* (The works of Count Miklós Esterházy of Galánta). Pest: Emich & Eisenfels, 1852.

EOE X = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction). Vol. 10, 1637–1649. Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1884.

EOE XII = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction). Vol. 12, 1658–1661. Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1887.

EOE XV = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction). Vol. 15, 1669–1674. Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1892.

EOE XIX = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek történeti bevezetésekkel* (Documents of the diets of Transylvania, with a historical introduction). Vol. 19, 1686–1688. Monumenta Hungariae Historica, series 3. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1896.

Erasmus of Rotterdam. *Adages I i 1 to I v 100*. Collected works of Erasmus, no. 31. Translated by Margaret Mann Philips, edited by R.A.B. Mynors. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Felvinczi, Sándor. *Disputationum theologiarum absurditates Papisticas ex Concilio Tridentino, & aliis Pontificiis Doctoribus exhibentium septima et octava, quam sub praesidio celeberrimi ac clarissimi viri, D. Johannis Valckenier, S.S.Theol. Doctoris ejusdemque Facultatis in Illustri Illustrum ac Praepotent. D. D. Hollandiae & West-Frisiae Ordinum Academia Lugduno-Batava Professoris Ordinarii, tam publice quam privatim Praeceptoris, & in omnibus Directoris sui perenni honore prosequendi publicae ac placidae disquisitioni paratus subijcit Alexander Felvinczi. Ungarus, Auth. & Defend. Nuper in SCh. Cassov. Th. & Phil. Praeceptor ad diem 4. et 7. Decembr. ante mer. horis solitis*. Leiden: Elsevir, 1669. (RMK III. 2480.).

FGR III = Hurmuzaki, Eudoxius de, ed. *Fragmente zur Geschichte der Rumänen*. Vol. 3. Bucharest: Socecă & Teclu, 1884.

FRS I = Dományházi, Edit et al, ed. *A Thurzó család és a wittenbergi egyetem* (The Thurzó family and the University of Wittenberg), *Fontes rerum scholasticarum*, no. 1. Szeged: JATE, 1989.

Hagius, Barnim (pseud. Müller, Andreas), ed. *Oratio orationum SS Orationis Dominicae versiones praeter Authenticam fere Centum eaeque longe emendatius quam antehac et e probatissimis Auctoribus potius quam prioribus Collectionibus, Jamque singulae genuinis Linguae suae characteribus*. Berlin: Runge, 1680.

Hiltebrandt, Conrad Jacob. *Conrad Jacob Hiltebrandt's dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise nach Siebenbürgen, der Ukraine und Constantinopel (1656–1658)*. Edited by Franz Babinger. Leiden: Brill, 1937.

Horváti Békés, János. *Horváti Békés János diáknaplója* (The student diary of János Horváti Békés). *Peregrinatio Hungarorum*, no. 6. Edited by Gábor Pintér and Hedvig Gácsi. Szeged: JATE BTK, 1990.

Jobst, Wolfgang. “Kurze Beschreibung der Alten Löblichen Stat Franckfurt an der Oder, auch von ihrer ersten Foundation, Erbauung und Herkommen ...” In *Memoranda Francofurtana*, ed. Johann Christoph Becmann. Frankfurt an der Oder: Eichhorn, 1676.

Kemény, János. “Önéletírása” (Autobiography). In *Kemény János és Bethlen Miklós művei* (The works of János Kemény and Miklós Bethlen), Magyar remekírók, ed. Éva V. Windisch, 7–310. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1980.

Klöcker Ehrenstrahl, David. *Certamen equestre caeteraque Solemnia Holmiae Suecorum Ao: MDCLXXII. M. Decembr: celebrata cum Carolus XI. omnium cum applausu Aviti Regni Regimen capesseret*. Stockholm: Eberdt, 1672.

Kraus, Georg. *Erdélyi krónika 1608–1665* (Transylvanian chronicle 1608–1665). Edited and translated by Sándor Vogel. Budapest: Ómagyar Kultúra Baráti Társaság, 1994.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Allgemeiner politischer und historischer Briefwechsel*. Vol. 11, *Januar–Oktober 1695*. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz sämtliche Schriften und Briefe, ser. 1, no. 11. Edited by Wolfgang Bungies, Albert Heinekamp and Franz Schupp. Berlin: Akademie, 1982.

Ludolf, Hiob. *Iobi Ludolfi Sac. Caes. Maj. necnon ser. Ducum Sax. Consil. De Bellico Turcico feliciter conficiendo, accedunt Epistolae quaedam Pii V. Pont. Max. & alia nonnulla ejusdem argumenti*. Frankfurt am Main: Zunner, 1686.

Lutsch, Johannes. “Diarium.” In *Johannes Lutsch – Jurnal de captivitate la Istanbul (1658–1661) / Johannes Lutsch – Tagebuch seiner Gefangenschaft in Istanbul (1658–1661)*, ed. Cristina Feneşan and Costin Feneşan, 137–192. Timişoara: Editura de Vest, 2006.

LWE = Du Rieu, Willem Nicolas, ed. *Levini Warneri de rebus Turcicis epistolae ineditae*. Leiden: Brill, 1883.

Mikes, Kelemen. *Törökországi levelek és misszilis levelek* (Letters from Turkey and missiles). Mikes Kelemen összes művei, no. 1. Edited by Lajos Hopp. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1966.

MHHD XXI = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Okmánytár I. Rákóczy György svéd és francia szövetségeseinek történetéhez* (Documents for the Swedish and French alliances of György Rákóczi I). *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*. Ser. I. Diplomataria, no. 21. Budapest: Eggenberger, 1873.

MHHD XXIII = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Okmánytár II. Rákóczy György diplomáciai összeköttetéseihez* (Documents on the diplomatic connections of György Rákóczi II). *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*. Ser. I. Diplomataria, no. 23. Budapest: Eggenberger, 1874.

MHHD XXIV = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *A két Rákóczy György családi levelezése* (The family correspondence of the two György Rákóczis). *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*. Ser. I. Diplomataria, no. 24. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1875.

MHHS VIII = Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. *Rozsnyay Dávid, az utolsó török deák történeti maradványai* (The historical monuments of the last Turkish Scribe, Dávid Rozsnyai). Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Ser. II. Scriptores, no. 8. Budapest: Eggenberger, 1867.

Mikolai Hegedüs, János. *Az mennyei igazságnak tüzes oszlopa, mely ez nyomorúságos élet kerengő pusztájában az Isten szerelmes ellankadt népének a sok tévelygések s eretnokségek setét éccakáján és az sok istentelenségek s megvesztő gonosz példák szövevényi között is világosan megmutatja, mely úton juthatnak bé a mennyei Canahán birodalmába* (The fiery column of the heavenly truth, which would clearly show to the down-hearted people loved by God, in the wasteland of this desolate life, in the dark night of many errors and heresies, beyond the labyrinth of many Godlessness and misleading evil examples, in which road they can get to the empire of the heavenly Canaan). Utrecht: Vasberg, 1648.

Miskolczi Csulyak, Gáspár. *Angliai independentismus avagy az ecclesiái fenyítékben és a külső isteni tiszteletre tartozó jó rendtartásokban, minden reformáta ecclesiáktól különböző fejetlen lábság* (English Independentism, or anarchy contrasting to any Reformed churches in ecclesiastical discipline as well as the ordinances about the ceremonies of God's worship). Utrecht: Vasberg, 1654.

MPEIF VI = Kaposi, Lajos. "A régiek" (The ancients). *Magyar Protestáns Egyházi és Iskolai Figyelő* 6 (1884): 264–268.

Müller, Andreas. *Disquisitio Geographica & historica, de Chataja, in qua I. Praecipue Geographorum nobilis illa Controversia: Quenam Chataja sit, & an sit idem ille terrarum tractus, quem Sinas, & vulgo Chinam vocant, aut pars ejus aliqua? latissime tractatur; 2. Eadem vero opera pleraque rerum, quae unquam de Chataja, deque Sinis memorabilia fuerunt, atque etiam nunc sunt, compendiose enarrantur*. Berlin: Runge, 1671.

Neculce, Ion. *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei și o samă de cuvinte* (Chronicle of the land of Moldavia and a collection of events). 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Scriitori români. Edited by Iorgu Iordan. Bucharest: Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, 1959.

Ovid. *Amores I*. Edited and translated by John Barsby. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Pápai Páriz, Ferenc. *Békességet magamnak, másoknak* (Peace for myself and others). Edited by Géza Nagy. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1977.

PEIL XVIII = Szilágyi, Sándor. "I. Rákóczy György fejedelem levelezése Tolnai István sárospataki pappal" (The correspondence of Prince György Rákóczi I with István Tolnai, minister in Sárospatak). *Protestáns Egyházi és Iskolai Lap* 18 (1875): 617–619, 650, 747–749, 776–779, 869–872, 905–906, 932–935, 968–972, 1064–1065, 1095–1097, 1123–1125, 1191–1192, 1220–1224, 1348–1350, 1384–1388, 1442–1447, 1485–1486, 1514–1515.

PKPS XXXII. = Friedlaender, Ernst, ed. *Aeltere Universitäts-Matrikel I. Universität Frankfurt a. O.*, vol. 1, 1506–1648. Publicationen aus den K. Preußischen Staatsarchiven, no. 32. Stuttgart: Hirzel, 1887.

PP = David, James C., ed. *Pursuit of power: Venetian Ambassadors' Reports on Spain, Turkey, and France in the Age of Philip II, 1560–1600*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Preindl, Joseph von. *Grammaire turque d'une toute nouvelle methode d'apprendre cette langue en peu de semaines avec un vocabulaire enrichi d'anecdotes utiles et agréables*. Berlin: n. p., 1791.

R. A. *Néhány okmány szabad királyi Bártfa városa levéltárából* (Some documents from the archives of the Royal Town of Bártfa), vol. 1. Bártfa: Blayer, 1895.

Rålamb, Claes. *Diarium under resa till Konstantinopel 1657–1658* (Diary on his journey to Constantinople 1657–1658). Historiska handlingar, no. 37/3. Edited by Christian Callmer. Stockholm: Norstedt, 1963.

RGyKÖ = Sándor Szilágyi, ed. *Levelek és okiratok I. Rákóczy György keleti összeköttetései történetéhez* (Letters and documents to the history of the Eastern contacts of György Rákóczi I). Budapest: Knoll, 1883.

RGyP = Beke, Antal and Samu Barabás, ed. *I. Rákóczy György és a Porta* (György Rákóczi I and the Porte). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1888.

Rozsnyai Dávid. *Horologium Turcicum*. Régi magyar könyvtár, no. 38. Edited by Lajos Dézsi. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1926.

SD IV = Iorga, Neculai, ed. *Studii și documente cu privire la istoria românilor* (Studies and documents for the history of the Romanians). Vol. 4, *Legăturile principatelor române cu Ardealul de la 1607 la 1699* (Contacts of the Romanian Principalities with Transylvania from 1607 to 1699). București: Socec, 1902.

SEAR XXVIII = Tappe, Eric Dietmar. "Charles II and the Prince of Moldavia." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 28 (1949/50): 406–424.

SEAR XXXI = Tappe, Eric Dietmar. "Charles II and the Prince of Moldavia: Addenda." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 31 (1952/53): 528–529.

Seneca. *Moral Essays*. Vol. 2. Translated by John W. Basore. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Sennyey, László. "Római utazása (1687)" (Journey to Rome, 1687), in *Magyar utazási irodalom 15–18. század* (Hungarian travel literature, 15<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), Magyar remekírók, ed. Sándor Iván Kovács and István Monok, 520–560. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1990.

SF I = Finkei, Pál. "Magyar prot. egyháztörténeti kútforrások" (Sources for Hungarian Protestant church history). *Sárospataki Füzetek* 1 (1857): 161–180, 335–349.

SF IVa = Révész, Imre. "A szatmár-németi zsinat végzése, eddig ismeretlen eredeti szerkezetekben" (The decisions of the synod of Szatmárnémeti, in a form unknown so far). *Sárospataki Füzetek* 4 (1860): 244–247.

SF IVb = Hegedűs, László. "A zempléni helv. hitv. egyházmegye jegyzőkönyvéből" (From the registers of the Reformed diocese of Zemplén). *Sárospataki Füzetek* 4 (1860): 664–679.

SF X = Szilágyi, Sándor. "II. Rákóczy György és Csengeri István levelezése," (The correspondence between György Rákóczi II and István Csengeri). *Sárospataki Füzetek* 10 (1866): 302–310.

Szalárdi, János. *Síralmas magyar krónikája* (Hungarian chronicle of laments). Bibliotheca historica. Edited by Ferenc Szakály. Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1980.

Szenczi Molnár, Albert. *Novae grammaticae ungaricae libri duo / Új magyar grammatika két könyvben*. A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság kiadványai, no. 222. Trans. Zsuzsa C. Vladár. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 2004.

Szepsi Csombor, Márton. *Europica varietas*. Edited by Péter Kulcsár. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1979.

Tarczali, Pál, Jr. *Brevis dissertatio de vocatione gentium et conversione Judaeorum, qui Divina assistente gratia ex S. Scriptura demonstratur*. Oxford: Lichfield, 1672.

Tarczali, Pál, Sr. *Theses theologicae de sacra Domini coena, quas Divina favente gratia Sub praesidio Reverendi, & Clarissimi Viri D.D. Joannis Scharpii S.S. Theologiae in inelyta Edinburgensium Academia Professoris ordinarii dignissimi Publico examini subiicit Paulus Tartsali Hungarus Ad diem 7 Julii horis locoq[ue] solitis*. Edinburgh: Brison, [1642].

Telkibányai, P. István. *Angliai puritanismus, avagy kiváltképpen való tudományok azoknak, kik Angliában a puritánusok között (amint közönségesen nevezetnek) legkeményebbeknek tarttatnak* (Puritanism in England, that is the most outstanding knowledge of those who are held to be the toughest among the Puritans (as they are generally called) in England). Utrecht: Wasberg, 1654.

Thévenot, Jean de. *The Travels of Monsieur de Thevenot into the Levant*. London: Faithorne et al, 1687.

TL 1875 = “Kemény János leveles tárczájából” (From the briefcase of János Kemény). *Történeti Lapok* 2 (1875): 1156–1159, 1171–1174, 1185–1187, 1201–1203, 1216–1219, 1233–1234.

TMAÓ III = Szilády, Áron and Sándor Szilágyi, ed. *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age). Vol. 3. Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek, no. 5. Pest: Eggenberger 1870.

TMAÓ IV = Szilády, Áron and Sándor Szilágyi, ed. *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age). Vol. 4. Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek, no. 6. Pest: Eggenberger 1870.

TMAÓ V = Szilády, Áron and Sándor Szilágyi, ed. *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age). Vol. 5. Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek, no. 7. Pest: Eggenberger 1871.

TMAÓ VI = Szilády, Áron and Sándor Szilágyi, ed. *Török-magyarkori állam-okmánytár* (State documents from the Turkish-Hungarian age). Vol. 6. Török-magyarkori történelmi emlékek, no. 8. Pest: Eggenberger 1871.

TMIR III = Papiu Ilarianu, Alexandru, ed. *Tesauru de monumente istorice pentru Romania atātu din vechiu tiparite cătu și manuscripte cea mai mare parte straine* (Thesaurus of historical documents concerning Romania, edited from old prints as well as manuscripts, mostly of foreign origin). Vol. 3. Bucharest: Rasidescu, 1864.

TML I = Gergely, Sámuel, ed. *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki). Vol. 1, 1656–1660. A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára, no. 1. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1905.

TML V = Gergely, Sámuel, ed. *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki). Vol. 5, 1670–1671. A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára, no. 5. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1910.

TML VI = Gergely, Sámuel, ed. *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki). Vol. 6, 1672–1674. A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára, no. 6. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1912.

TML VII = Gergely, Sámuel, ed. *Teleki Mihály levelezése* (The correspondence of Mihály Teleki). Vol. 7, 1675–1677. A római szent birodalmi gróf széki Teleki család oklevéltára, no. 7. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1916.

Torquatus a Frangipani, Alexander Iulius. *Panegyricus Aeternaturae Glorae Invictissimo semper Hostuum Triumphatori Fortunatissimo SagoTogaque suorum Assertori pio forti felici Joanni Christophoro Königsmarchio Gottico Hannibali Victoriarum Herculi Virtutum Atlanti...* N. p, 1663.

TP = Birch, Thomas, ed. *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, esq: Secretary, First, to the Council of State, and afterwards to the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell*. Vol. 4–6. London: Gyles – Woodward – Davis, 1742.

TT 1879 = Szabó, Károly. “A gyula-fehérvári Bethlen-féle főtanoda szervezeti szabályzata” (The by-laws of the high school founded by Bethlen in Gyulafehérvár). In *Történelmi Tár* 1879, 797–805.

TT 1881–82 = Szilágyi, Sándor. “Bethlen Gábor és a Porta” (Bethlen Gábor and the Porte). In *Történelmi Tár* 1881, 593–640; *Történelmi Tár* 1882, 34–77.

TT 1882–83 = Gergely, Samu. “Adalék „Bethlen Gábor és a Porta” című közleményhez” (Contributions to the publication „Gábor Bethlen and the Porte”). In *Történelmi Tár* 1882, 434–469; *Történelmi Tár* 1883, 131–154, 609–644.

TT 1883 = Koncz, József. “Oklevelek Rozsnyay Dávid fogsága történetéhez” (Documents concerning the history of the imprisonment of Dávid Rozsnyai). In *Történelmi Tár* 1883, 155–169.

TT 1885 = Torma, Károly. “Okiratok Erdély történetéhez a XVII-ik század elején” (Documents for the history of Transylvania in early 17<sup>th</sup> century). In *Történelmi Tár* 1885, 75–96, 257–334, 541–565.

TT 1886 = Hellebrant, Árpád. “A franekeri egyetemen tanult magyarok” (Hungarians who studied at the University Franeker). In *Történelmi Tár* 1886, 599–608, 792–800.

TT 1889 = Szilágyi, Sándor. “Levelek és okiratok II. Rákóczy György fejedelem diplomáciai összeköttetései történetéhez” (Letters and documents for the history of the diplomatic connections of György Rákóczi II). In *Történelmi Tár* 1889, 326–353, 451–490, 637–677.

TT 1894a = Domján, István. “Adatok váradi Gyulai István portai követségéhez” (Data about the embassy of István Gyulai of Várad at the Porte). In *Történelmi Tár* 1894, 508–521.

TT 1894b = Beke, Antal. “Adalék Rákóczy György és a Porta összeköttetései történetéhez” (Contributions to the history of the contacts between György Rákóczi and the Porte). In *Történelmi Tár* 1894, 81–105, 482–507.

UA XIII = Brode, Reinhold, ed. *Urkunden und Actenstücke zur Geschichte des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg*. Vol. 13, *Politische Verhandlungen*, vol. 9. Berlin: Reimer, 1890.

UCPL LXXXVIII = Waterman, John T. ed. *Leibniz and Ludolf on Things Linguistic: Excerpts from Their Correspondence (1688–1703)*. University of California Publications on Linguistics, no. 88. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

URE = Binder, Pál, ed. *Utazások a régi Európában: Peregrinációs levelek, útleírások és útinaplók (1580–1709)* (Travels in old Europe: Peregrination letters, travelogues and diaries, 1580–1709). Téka. Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979.

Váradi Házi, János. *Machumet propheta vallasan levő egy fő irastúdo doctornac irásából törökből magyarrá fordítatot könyw, melyet Envarvl asikinnac hinac* (A Book Called “Envarul Asikin”, by a Chief Literate Doctor from the Religion of Prophet Mahomet, Translated from Turkish to Hungarian). Kassa: Sultz, 1626.

VI = Varga, Katalin S., ed. *Vitetnek ítélőszékre... Az 1674-es gályarabper jegyzőkönyve* (We are taken to court... The protocol of the “galley-slave process” in 1674). Pozsony: Kalligram, 2002.

Wallich, Johann Ulrich. *Religio turcica, Mahometis vita et orientalis cum occidentali Antichristo comparatio...* Stade: Holvianis, 1659.

## II. Secondary sources

Abbott, George Frederick. *Turkey, Greece and the Great Powers: A Study of Friendship and Hate*. London: Scott, 1916.

Acsády, Ignác. *Magyarország története I. Lipót és I. József korában (1657–1711)* (The history of Hungary in the age of Leopold I and Joseph I (1657–1711)). A magyar nemzet története, no. 7. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1898.

Ágoston, Gábor. “Muslim Cultural Enclaves in Hungary under Ottoman Rule.” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 45 (1991): 181–204.

———. “Az oszmán és az európai diplomácia a kölcsönösség felé vezető úton” (Ottoman and European diplomacy on their way to mutuality). In *Híd a századok felett: Tanulmányok Katus László 70. születésnapjára* (Bridge over centuries: Studies for the 70<sup>th</sup> birthday of László Katus), ed. Mariann Nagy, 81–96. Budapest: MTA TTI; Pécs: JPTE, 1997.

———. “Információszerzés és kémkedés az Oszmán Birodalomban a 15–17. században” (Information service and espionage in the Ottoman Empire in 15<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries). In *Információáramlás a magyar és török végvári rendszerben*, Studia Agriensia, no. 20, ed. Tivadar Petercsák and Máttyás Berecz, 129–156. Eger: Dobó István Vármúzeum, 1999.

———. “Birodalom és információ: Konstantinápoly, mint a koraújkori Európa információs központja” (Empire and information: Constantinople as an information centre of Early Modern Europe). In *Az értelem bátorsága: Tanulmányok Perjés Géza emlékére* (The valor of the mind: Studies in the memory of Géza Perjés), ed. Gábor Hausner, 31–60. Budapest: Argumentum, 2005.

Ágoston, István. *A magyarországi puritanizmus gyökerei: Magyar puritánus törekvések a XVII. század első felében* (The roots of Puritanism in Hungary: Hungarian Puritan movements in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century). Budapest: Kálvin, 1997.

Akyüz, Kenan. “Paris Milli Kütüphanesi’nde İlk Türkçe-Fransızca ve Fransızca-Türkçe Yazma Eserler” (The first Turkish–French and French–Turkish manuscripts of the national library in Paris). *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* (1959): 249–292.

Algazi, Gadi. “Food for Thought: Hieronymus Wolff Grapples with the Scholarly Habitus.” In *Egocuments and history: Autobiographical writing in its social context since the Middle Ages*, Publicaties van de Faculteit der Historische en Kunstwetenschappen Maatschappijgeschiedenis, no. 38, ed. Rudolf Dekker, 21–44. Hilversum: Verloren, 2002.

———. “Scholars in Households: Refiguring the Learned Habitus, 1480–1550”. *Science in Context* 16, no. 1–2 (2003): 9–42.

Almqvist, Jan Eric. “Clas Rålamb som rättvetenskaplig författare” (Claes Rålamb as an author of legal sciences). In *Svensk juridisk litteraturhistoria* (A history of Swedish literature on law), 150–162. Stockholm: Norstedt, 1946.

Anderson, Matthew Smith. *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450–1919*. London and New York: Longman, 1993.

Anderson, Sonia P. *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut in Smyrna, 1667–1678*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Andrea, Susana. *Din relațiile Transilvaniei cu Moldova și Țara Românească în sec. al XVII-lea* (On the relations of Transylvania with Moldavia and Wallachia in the 17<sup>th</sup> century). Cluj-Napoca: n. p., 1997.

Andreescu, Ștefan. *Restitutio Daciae*. Vol. 2, *Relațiile politice dintre Țara Românească, Moldova și Transilvania în răstimpul 1601–1659* (Political relations between Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania in the period 1601–1659). Bucharest: Albatros, 1989.

Angyal, Dávid. “Erdély politikai érintkezése Angliával” (Transylvania’s political contacts with England). *Századok* 34 (1900): 309–325, 398–420, 495–508, 702–711, 873–904.

Arı, Bülent. “Early Ottoman Diplomacy: Ad Hoc Period.” In *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?*, Studies in Diplomacy, ed. A. Nuri Yurdusev, 36–65. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Arnheim, Fritz. “Freiherr Benedikt Skytte (1614–1683), der Urheber des Planes einer brandenburgischen ‘Universal-Universität der Völker, Wissenschaften und Künste’.” In *Festschrift zu Gustav Schmollers 70. Geburtstag: Beiträge zur brandenburgischen und preußischen Geschichte*, 65–99. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1908.

Arsen'ev, Yuriy. "Moldavskiy gospodar' Stefan-Georgiy i ego snosheniya s Moskvoyu" (The Moldavian Gospodar Gheorghe Ștefan and his relations to Moscow). *Russkiy Arkhiv* 34, no. 2 (1896): 161–186.

Asker, Björn. "Clas Rålamb." In *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (Swedish biographical lexicon), vol. 31, *Rydbeck–Segerstedt*, ed. Göran Nilzén, 168–173. Stockholm: Norstedts, 2000–2002.

Asmus, Ivo. "Das Amt des Generalgouverneurs und der Herrschaftsstil Carl Gustav Wrangels." In *Der Westfälische Frieden von 1648 – Wende in der Geschichte des Ostseeraums: Für Prof. dr. Dr. h. c. Herbert Ewe zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Horst Wernicke and Hans-Joachim Hacker, 173–195. Hamburg: Kovač, 2001.

Babinger, Franz. "Die türkischen Studien in Europa bis zum Auftreten Josef von Hammer-Purgstalls." *Die Welt des Islam* 7, no. 3–4. (1919): 103–129.

Backhaus, Helmut. *Reichsterritorium und schwedische Provinz: Vorpommern unter Karl XI. Vormündern*. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, no. 25. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Bahl, Peter. *Der Hof des Großen Kurfürsten: Studien zur höheren Amtsträgerschaft Brandenburg-Preußens*. Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Beiheft, no. 8. Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 2001.

Bahlcke, Joachim. "'Veritas toti mundo declarata:' Der publizistische Diskurs um Religionsfreiheit, Verfassungsordnung und Kirchenrecht in Ungarn im letzten Drittel des 17. Jahrhunderts – eine Fallstudie." In *Konfessionelle Pluralität als Herausforderung: Koexistenz und Konflikt in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit: Winfried Eberhard zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke, Karen Lambrecht and Hans-Christian Maner, 553–574. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2006.

Balogh, Jolán. *Varadinum: Várad vára* (Varadinum: The castle of Nagyvárad). Művészettörténeti füzetek, no. 13. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1982.

Balogh, Judit. "Kérdések, hipotézisek, feladatok a XVII. századi magyar puritanizmus kutatása kapcsán" (Questions, hypotheses, tasks concerning the research of 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian Puritanism). In *Fiatal egyháztörténészek írásai* (Essays of young church historians), ed. Csaba Fazekas, 47–56. Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem BTK Kora Újkori Magyar Történeti Tanszék, 1999.

Bán, Imre. *Apáczai Csere János*. Irodalomtörténeti könyvtár, no. 2. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1958.

———. "Korai felvilágosodás és nemzeti műveltség" (Early Enlightenment and national culture). In *Európa és a Rákóczi-szabadságharc* (Europe and the Rákóczi resurrection), ed. Kálmán Benda, 225–243. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980.

Barbarics, Zsuzsa. "'Türck ist mein Nahm in allen Landen...' Kunst, Propaganda und die Wandlung des Türkenbildes im Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 54 (2001): 257–317.

Barcza, József. "A puritanizmus kutatásának újabb eredményei" (New results in the research of Puritanism). *Theologiai Szemle* n. s. 17, no. 11–12 (1976): 333–336.

Bartók, István. "A casa rustica és a mechanici: Az „alacsony stílus” ismérvei a XVII. századi magyar irodalomelméletben" (The casa rustica and the mechanici: The criteria of "low style" in the 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian theory of literature). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 96 (1992): 569–578.

Becmann, Johann Christoph. *Notitia Universitatis Francofurtanae, una cum iconibus personarum aliquot illustrium, aliorumque virorum egregiorum, qui eam praesentia sua ac meritis illustrarunt, professorum denique orindariorum qui anno seculari Universitatis secundo vixerunt*. Frankfurt an der Oder: Jeremias Schrey & Joh. Christoph Hartmann, 1707.



Benczédi, László. *Rendiség, abszolútizmus és centralizáció a XVII. század végi Magyarországon (1664–1685)* (States, absolutism and centralization in late 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungary). *Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből*, n. s., no. 91. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980.

Benda, Kálmán. “Diplomáciai szervezet és diplomaták Erdélyben Bethlen Gábor korában” (Diplomatic organisation and diplomats in Transylvania in the period of Gábor Bethlen). *Századok* 125 (1981): 725–730.

Bérenger, Jean and Károly Kecskeméti. *Országgyűlés és parlamenti élet Magyarországon 1608–1918* (Parliament and parliamentary life in Hungary 1608–1918). Budapest: Napvilág, 2008.

Berg, Pál. *Angol hatások tizenhetedik századi irodalmunkban* (English influences in 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian literature). *Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár kiadványai*, no. 21. Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 1946.

Berridge, G. R. “Diplomatic Integration with Europe before Selim III.” In *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?*, Studies in Diplomacy, ed. A. Nuri Yurdusev, 114–130. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Bevan, Jonquil. “Seventeenth-Century Students and Their Books.” In *Four Centuries: Edinburgh University Life 1583–1983*, ed. Gordon Donaldson, 16–27. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 1983.

Bíró, Vencel. *Erdély követei a Portán* (The envoys of Transylvania at the Porte). Kolozsvár: Minerva, 1921.

Bittenbinder, Miklós. “Adatok Rozsnyai Dávid életéhez” (Data for the biography of Dávid Rozsnyai). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 20 (1910): 338–348.

Bod, Péter. *Magyar Athenas, avagy az Erdélyben és Magyar-Országban élt tudos embereknek, nevezetesebben a’ kik valami, világ eleibe bocsátott irások által esméretesekké lettek, ’s jó emlékezeteket fen-hagyták historiájok* (Hungarian Athenae, that is, the history of those erudite people, who lived in Transylvania and Hungary, and became known through a published work of theirs and left their good memory). [Pozsony]: n. p., 1766.

Bodrogligeti, András J.E. Review of *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert*, by György Hazai. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 8, no. 2 (1977): 251–265.

Boeckler, Johann Heinrich. *Commentarius Historico-Politicus de rebus Turcicis*. Edited by N.C.J. Bautzen: Richter, 1717.

Bohnstedt, John W. “The Infidel Scourge of God: The Turkish Menace as Seen by German Pamphleteers of the Reformation Era.” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* n. s. 58, pt. 9 (1968).

Bots, J. A. H. and W. Th. M. Frijhoff. “De studentenpopulatie van de Franeker academie: Een kwantitatief onderzoek (1585–1811)” (The student population of the Academy of Franeker: A quantitative analysis 1585–1811). In *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), *Fryske Akademy*, no. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra, 56–72. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985.

Bozzay, Réka. “Debreceni diákok a leideni egyetemen a XVII. században” (Students from Debrecen at the 17<sup>th</sup> century University of Leiden). *Debreceni Szemle* 10 (2002): 307–316.

———. “Der finanzielle Hintergrund der “peregrinatio academica” der ungarländischen Studenten an den niederländischen Universitäten.” In *Studiosorum et librorum peregrinatio: Hungarian–Dutch Cultural Relations in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century*, ed. August den Hollander, István Monok and Ferenc Postma, 23–30. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam; Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 2006.

———. “Leiden, a gondoskodó egyetem: Magyarországi diákoknak nyújtott juttatások és kiváltságok a leideni egyetemen a 17–18. században” (Leiden, the university that takes care: Benefits and privileges given to students from Hungary at the University of Leiden in the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries). *Századok* 160 (2006): 985–1006.

Bölskei, Gusztáv. “A kezdetektől a váradi iskola beolvadásáig (1660)” (From the beginnings to the incorporation of the school of Nagyvárád, 1660). In *A debreceni református kollégium története* (History of the Reformed College of Debrecen), ed. József Barcza, 9–42. Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1988.

Bömer, Aloys. *Die lateinischen Schülergespräche der Humanisten: Auszüge mit Einleitungen, Anmerkungen und Namen- und Sachregister*. Texte und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts in den Ländern deutscher Zunge, no. 1. Berlin: Harrwitz, 1897.

Brendemoen, Bernt. “Some Remarks on Claes Brodersson Rålamb and his Contemporaries.” In *Turcica et Orientalia: Studies in Honour of Gunnar Jarring on His Eightieth Birthday 12 October 1987*, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul Transactions, no. 1, ed. Ulla Ehrensward, 9–18. Stockholm: Svenska Forskningsinstitutet Istanbul, 1987.

Brugman, Jan. “Arabic Scholarship.” In *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century – An Exchange of Learning*, ed. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurler and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, 203–215. Leiden: Universitaire Pers and Brill, 1975.

Bruzzzone, Barbara. “Fremdsprachen in der Adelserziehung des 17. Jahrhunderts: Die Sprachbücher von Juan Angel de Sumarán.” In *Die Volkssprachen als Lerngegenstand im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Akten des Bamberger Symposions am 18. und 19. Mai 2001*, Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, no. 3, ed. Helmut Glück, 37–45. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002.

Bura, László. *Szatmári diákok 1610–1852* (Students in Szatmár 1610–1852). *Fontes rerum scholasticarum*, no. 5. Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem Régi Magyar Irodalom Tanszék, 1994.

Camariano, Nestor. *Alexandre Mavrocordato le Grand Dragoman: Son activité diplomatique*. Etairieia Makedonikon Spondon Idrima Meleton Hersonison tou aimou, no. 119. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balcan Studies, 1970.

Cândeă, Virgil. “Nicolae Milescu și începuturile traducerilor umaniste în limba română” (Nicolae Milescu and the beginnings of Humanist translations in Romanian). In *Rațiunea dominantă: Contribuții la istoria umanismului românesc* (Dominant reason: Contributions to the history of Romanian Humanism), 79–223. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1979.

Ciorănescu, Alexandru. “Domnia lui Mihnea III (Mihail Radu) 1658–1659” (The rule of Mihnea III (Mihail Radu) 1658–1659). *Buletinul Comisiei istorice a României* 14 (1935): 49–229.

Çırakman, Aslı. *From the 'Terror of the World' to the 'Sick Man of Europe': European Images of the Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Nineteenth*. Studies in Modern European History, no. 43. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Collinson, Patrick. “A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 483–488.

———. *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture: A Paper Presented at a Clark Library Seminar 25 April 1987*. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989.

———. “Antipuritanism.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, 19–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Consentius, Ernst. *Die Berliner Zeitungen bis zur Regierung Friedrichs des Großen*. Berlin: Hande & Spener, 1904.

Corfus, Ilie. "Pe urmele lui Moise Movilă și ale lui Gheorghe Ștefan" (On the track of Moise Movilă and Gheorghe Ștefan). *Anuarul de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D. Xenopol"* 15 (1978): 297–305.

Craufurd, Thomas. *History of the University of Edinburgh, from 1580 to 1646*. Edinburgh: Neill, 1808.

Csernák, Béla. *A református egyház Nagyváradon 1557–1660* (The Reformed Church in Nagyvárad 1557–1660). Nagyvárad: Nagyvárad Református Egyház, 1934.

Csomor, János. *Körösnagyharsány krónikája* (The chronicle of Körösnagyharsány). Bibliotheca Bekesiensis, no. 19. Edited by Lajos Köteles. Békéscsaba: Rózsa Ferenc Gimnázium, 1980.

Csorba, Dávid. "A' sovány lelket meg-szépíteni": *Debreceni prédikátorok (1657–1711)* ("To embellish the poor soul": Preachers in Debrecen 1657–1711). *Nemzet, egyház, művelődés*, no. 5. Debrecen: Hernád, 2008.

Czegle, Imre. "Amesius korai magyar tanítványai" (The early Hungarian students of Amesius). *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae: Acta Historiae Litterarum Hungaricarum* 10–11 (1971): 107–123.

Danışmend, İsmail Hâmi. *Osmanlı Devlet Erkâni* (The pillars of the Ottoman State). İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, no. 5. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971.

Darnell, W. R. *The Correspondence of Isaac Basire, D.D. Archdeacon of Northumberland and Prebendary of Durham in the Reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. with a Memoir of His Life*. London: Murray, 1831.

Davies, Godfrey. *The Early Stuarts 1603–1660*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. The Oxford History of England, no. 9. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

Deák, Farkas. "Adalékok a török-tatár rabok történetéhez" (Contributions to the history of the Tatar and Turkish captives). *Századok* 19 (1882): 579–589, 655–661.

[Debreceni Ember, Pál] and Friedrich Adolph Lampe. *Historia ecclesiae reformatae in Hungaria et Transylvania, inter perpetua certamina & afflictiones a primordiis praecipue repurgatorum sacrorum ad recentiora tempora per dei gratiam conservatae*. Utrecht: Jacobus van Poolsum, 1728.

De Groot, Alexander H. *Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic: A History of the Earliest Diplomatic Relations 1610–1630*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, no. 43. Leiden and İstanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1978.

———. *De Betekenis van de Nederlandse Ambassade bij de Verheven Porte voor de Studie van het Turks in de 17de en 18de Eeuw* (The relevance of the Dutch embassy at the Sublime Porte for the study of the Turks in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries). Oosters Genootschap in Nederland, no. 9. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

———. "The Dutch Nation in Istanbul, 1600–1985: A Contribution to the Social History of Beyoğlu." *Anatolica* 14 (1987): 131–150.

Demény, A. Lídia, Lajos Demény and Nicolae Stoicescu. *Răscoala seimenilor sau răscoală populară? 1655, Țară Românească* (The revolt of the *seimens* or a popular revolt? 1655, Wallachia). Pagini din istoria patriei. Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1968.

Dienes, Dénes. *Minthogy immár schola mestert tartanak... Református iskolák Felső-Magyarországon 1596–1672* (As they already keep a schoolmaster... Schools of the Reformed Church in Upper Hungary, 1596–1672). Acta Patakina, no. 4. Sárospatak: Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, 2000.

———. *Keresztúri Biró Pál (1594?–1655)*. Sárospatak: Author's edition, 2001.

Djuvara, Trandafir G. *Cent projects de partage de la Turquie (1281–1913)*. Bibliotheque d'histoire contemporaine. Paris: Alcan, 1914.

Drăganu, Nicolae. “Codicele pribeagului Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievodul Moldovei” (Codices of the exiled Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievod of Moldavia). *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională Cluj* 3 (1924–25): 183–254.

Drewes, G.J.W. “The Legatum Warnerianum of the Leiden University Library.” In *Levinus Werner and His Legacy: Three Centuries Legatum Warnerianum in the Leiden University Library*, 1–31. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Dukkon, Ágnes. “Egy mondat az oroszokról: Irodalom és politika kapcsolatai Kelet-Európában a 17. század derekán” (A sentence about Russians: Connections of literature and politics in Eastern Europe in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 106 (2002): 334–349.

Eickhoff, Ekkehard. *Venedig, Wien und die Osmanen: Umbruch in Südosteuropa 1645–1700*. Munich: Callwey, 1970.

Ekkart, R. E. O. *Athenae Batavae: De Leidse Universitaet / The University of Leyden 1575–1975*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1975.

Elekes, Mihály. *Rozsnyai Dávid élete és művei* (The life and works of Dávid Rozsnyai). Szeged: Traub, 1905.

Engels, M. H. H. “De Franeker academiebibliotheek 1626–1694” (On the Academy Library of Franeker 1626–1694). In *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), *Fryske Akademy*, no. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra, 161–176. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985.

Englund, Peter. *Det hotade huset: Adliga föreställningar om samhället under stormaktstiden* (The house in peril: Noble ideas of the society in the 17<sup>th</sup> century). Stockholm: Atlantis, 1989.

Erdélyi, Alajos. “Barcsay Ákos fejedelemsége” (The rule of Ákos Barcsai). *Századok* 40 (1906): 412–450, 489–547.

Endrődi, Frigyes. “Basire Izsák Erdélyben” (Isaac Basire in Transylvania). *Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok / Studies in English Philology* 2 (1937): 71–81.

Escher, Felix. “Die brandenburgisch-preußische Residenz und Hauptstadt Berlin im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert.” In *Geschichte Berlins*, vol. 1, *Von der Frühgeschichte bis zur Industrialisierung*, ed. Wolfgang Ribbe, 343–403. Munich: Beck, 1987.

Esze, Tamás. “Bársony György ‘Veritas’-a” (The “Veritas” of György Bársony). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 75 (1971): 667–693.

Etényi, Nóra, G. *Hadszintér és nyilvánosság: A magyarországi török háború hírei a 17. századi német újságokban* (The theatre of war and the public opinion: The news of the Turkish wars in Hungary in the 17<sup>th</sup> century German press). Budapest: Balassi, 2003.

Ethem, Halil. *Yedikule Hisarı* (The fortress of the Seven Towers). İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1932.

Externbrink, Sven. “Das Selbstporträt eines Diplomaten im 17. Jahrhundert: Giustiniano Priandis Memorandum für Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin aus dem Jahre 1644.” In *Formen internationalen Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Frankreich und das Alte Reich im europäischen Staatensystem: Festschrift für Klaus Malettke zum 65. Geburtstag*, *Historische Forschungen*, no. 71, ed. Sven Externbrink and Jörg Ulbert, 227–243. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2001.

Faden, Eberhard. "Festung und Hauptstadt unter dem Großen Kurfürsten und dem ersten König." In Max Arendt, Eberhard Faden and Otto Friedrich Gandert, *Geschichte der Stadt Berlin: Festschrift zur 700-Jahr-Feier der Reichshauptstadt*, 171–229. Berlin: Mittler, 1937.

Fazakas, Gergely Tamás. "„Mesterségükben disputálók” vitája II. Váci P. András *Replika* című műve és a Tolnai–Váci polémia újraértelmezése" (The debate of "those disputing in their craft": The *Replika* of András P. Váci and the re-interpretation of the polemics between Tolnai and Váci). *Studia Litteraria (Debrecen)* 41 (2003): 111–131.

———. "„Mesterségükben disputálók” vitája: Hitvitázó irodalomként értelmezhető-e Tolnai Dali János Váci P. Andrással polemizáló könyve?" (The debate of "those disputing in their craft": Can the book of János Tolnai Dali in polemics with András Váci be understood as literature of religious debates?). In *Religió, retorika, nemzettudat régi irodalmunkban* (Religion, rhetoric, national identity in the old Hungarian literature), Csokonai Könyvtár (Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium), no. 31, ed. István Bitskey and Szabolcs Oláh, 401–423. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2004.

———. "Az imádság testi kifejeződései az angol és magyar puritanizmusban: Az 1643-as *Praxis Pietatis* filológiai és ikonográfiai kérdései" (The corporal forms of prayer in the English and Hungarian Puritanism: Questions of philology and iconography concerning the 1643 edition of *Praxis Pietatis*). In *Medgyesi Pál redivivus: Tanulmányok a 17. századi puritanizmusról* (Studies on 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism), ed. Gergely Tamás Fazakas and János L. Győri, 95–147. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem and Egyetemi és Nemzeti Könyvtár, 2008.

Finlay, Robert. "The Refashioning of Martin Guerre." *American Historical Review* 93 (1988 June): 553–571.

Fischer-Galati, Stephen Alexander. *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism 1521–1555*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Fisher, C.G. and Alan W. Fisher. "Topkapi Sarayı in the Mid-Seventeenth Century: Bobovi's Description." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 10 (1985): 5–81.

Fodor, Pál. "'Hivatásos törökök – született törökök': Hatalmi elit és társadalom a 15–17. századi Oszmán Birodalomban" ("Professional Turks – trueborn Turks": Political elite and society in the Ottoman Empire in the 15–17<sup>th</sup> centuries). *Századok*, 138 (2004): 773–791.

Forbes, Eric G. "Philosophy and Science Teaching in the Seventeenth Century." In *Four Centuries: Edinburgh University Life 1583–1983*, ed. Gordon Donaldson, 28–37. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 1983.

Fuhrmann, Manfred. *Latein und Europa. Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts in Deutschland von Karl dem Großen bis Wilhelm II.* Cologne: DuMont, 2001.

Gácsi, Hedvig. "A XVII. századi erdélyi főúri peregrinációs irodalom művészettörténeti vonatkozásairól" (On the art historical aspects of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian aristocratic travelogues). *Aetas* 5, no. 1 (1987): 5–30.

Gebei, Sándor. "II. Rákóczi György lengyelországi hadjárata, 1657" (The Polish campaign of György Rákóczi II, 1657). *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 105, no. 2 (1992): 30–64.

———. *II. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem külpolitikája (1648–1657)* (The foreign policy of György Rákóczi II, Prince of Transylvania 1648–1657). Acta Academicae Pedagogicae Agriensis: Nova series, sectio historiae, no. 23. Eger: EKF–Liceum, 1996.

Gelbart, Nina Rattner. "The Monarchy's Midwife Who Left No Memoirs." *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996): 997–1023.

George, C. H. "Puritanism as history and historiography." *Past and Present* 41 (1968): 77–104.

Gestrich, Andreas. "Einleitung: Sozialhistorische Biographieforschung." In *Biographie – sozialgeschichtlich*, Kleine Vandenhoeck-Reihe, no. 1538, ed. Andreas Gestrich, Peter Knoch and Helga Merkel, 5–28. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. London: Routledge, 1980.

———. "Proofs and Possibilities: In the Margins of Natalie Zemon Davis' *The Return of Martin Guerre*." *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 37 (1988): 114–127.

Glück, Helmut and Libuše Spáčilová. "Einleitung." In *Deutsche Sprachbücher in Böhmen und Mähren vom 15. Jahrhundert bis 1918: Eine teilkommentierte Bibliographie*, Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, no. 2, ed. Helmut Glück et al, vii–xv. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002.

Goffman, Daniel. *Britons in the Ottoman Empire 1642–1660*. Publications on the Near East. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Goldgar, Anne. *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters 1680–1750*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Gorovei, Ștefan. "Studiu introductiv" (Introductory study). In Petre P. Panaiteșcu, *Nicolae Milescu Spătarul (1636–1708)*, 3–50. Iași: Junimea, 1987.

Gotthard, Axel. "Benjamin Bouwinghausen: Wie bekommen wir die „Männer im zweiten Glied“ in den Griff?" In *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Erlangen Studien zur Geschichte, no. 3, ed. Helmut Altrichter, 69–103. Erlangen and Jena: Palm & Enke, 1997.

Göllner, Carl. *Turcica*, vol. 3, *Die Türkenfrage in der öffentlichen Meinung Europas im 16. Jahrhundert*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialista România; Baden-Baden: Koerner, 1978.

Gömöri, György. "Magyar peregrinusok a XVII. századi Cambridge-ben" (Hungarian students in 17<sup>th</sup> century Cambridge). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 79 (1985): 194–202.

———. "Bánfihunyadi János – alkimista és vegyész" (John Bánfihunyadi – alchemist and chemist). In *Angol–magyar kapcsolatok* (English–Hungarian contacts), 66–73. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1989.

———. "Egy magyar peregrinus levele William Sancroft-hoz" (A letter of a Hungarian student to William Sancroft). *Erdélyi Múzeum* 62 (2000): 14–18.

———. "Bánfihunyadi János eszmevilága és alkémista kapcsolatai" (The intellectual world and alchemist contacts of John Bánfihunyadi). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 106 (2002): 93–100.

———. "Nagy utazók és emigránsok: Magyarok a Restauráció-korabeli Londonban" (Great travelers and emigrants: Hungarians in London of the Age of the Restoration). *Forrás* 34, no. 2 (2002): 64–72.

———. "Magyar tanárok a 17. századi Londonban" (Hungarian teachers in 17<sup>th</sup> century London). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 108 (2004): 456–465.

———. *Magyarországi diákok angol és skót egyetemeken 1526–1789* (Hungarian students at English and Scottish universities 1526–1789). Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, no. 14. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Levéltára, 2005.

———. "Bánfihunyadi János egy skót–lengyel polihisztor műveiben és leveleiben" (John Bánfihunyadi in the works and letters of a Scottish–Polish polihistor). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 110 (2006): 61–66.

———. “Thomas Barlow magyar kapcsolatai és egy ismeretlen Tarczali Pál-levél” (The Hungarian contacts of Thomas Barlow and an unpublished letter from Pál Tarczali). *Magyar Könyvszemle* 124 (2008): 181–185.

Grape, Anders. “Riksråd – språkforskare: Med anledning av ett par nyfunna brottstycken av Bengt Skyttes etymologiska verk” (State Counselor – Researcher of languages: On the occasion of discovering some fragments of the etymological work of Bengt Skytte). In *Uppsala Universitets Biblioteks minnesskrift 1620–1921*, Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis, no. 1, 329–372. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1921.

Gräf, Holger Thomas and Ralf Prüve. *Wege ins Ungewisse: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Reisens 1500–1800*. Fischer Taschenbücher, no. 15081. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2001.

Greenblatt, Stephen J. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980.

Grothaus, Maximilian. “Zum Türkenbild in der Kultur der Habsburgermonarchie zwischen den 16. und 18. Jahrhundert.” In *Habsburg–osmanische Beziehungen*, ed. Andreas Tietze, 69–72. Vienna: Verl. des Verbundes der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs, 1985.

Gusarova, Tatyana. “A vallási kérdések vitáinak légköre a magyar országgyűléseken a 17. század első felében” (The atmosphere of the debates on confessional questions at the Hungarian diets in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century). In *R. Várkonyi Ágnes emlékkönyv születésének 70. évfordulója ünnepére* (Festschrift for Ágnes R. Várkonyi on the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of her birth), ed. Péter Tusor, 308–319. Budapest: ELTE Bölcsészettudományi Kar, 1998.

———. “A 17. századi magyar országgyűlések résztvevői” (Participants of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian diets). *Levéltári Közlemények* 74, no. 2 (2005): 93–148.

Györi, L. János. “Mártirium, puritanizmus, retorika” (Martyrdom, Puritanism, rhetorics). *Irodalomtörténet* 31 (2000): 51–72.

Haag, Georg. “Das stettiner Exil eines moldavischen Woïwoden.” *Baltische Studien* 31 (1881): 157–162.

Hagenau, Gerda. *Jan Sobieski: Der Retter Wiens*. Vienna and Munich: Amalthea, 1983.

Hajnal, István. *Esterházy Miklós nádor lemondása (Székfoglaló értekezés)* (The abdication Palatine Miklós Esterházy: Inaugural dissertation). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1929.

Hajós, József. “Frölich Dávid.” *Magyar Könyvszemle* 113 (1997): 16–32.

Hall, Bo G. “Kan biografisk metod vara vetenskap?” (Can a biographic method be academic?). *Historisk Tidskrift* 126 (2007): 433–456.

Hamilton, Alastair. “An Egyptian Traveller in the Republic of Letters: Josephus Barbatus or Abudacnus the Copt.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 57 (1994): 123–150.

———. “The English Interest in the Arabic-Speaking Christians.” In *The ‘Arabick’ Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century England*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, no. 47, ed. G. A. Russell, 30–53. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Hamilton, Alastair and Francis Richard. *André Du Ryer and Oriental Studies in Seventeenth-Century France*. London: The Arcadian Library; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hazai, György. *Das osmanisch-türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány*. Bibliotheca orientalis hungarica, 18. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1973.

Headley, J. M. "‘Eher Türkisch als Bäpstisch’: Lutheran Reflections on the Problem of Empire 1623–28." *Central European History* 20 (1987): 3–28.

Heltai, János. *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* (Péter Alvinczi and the peregrinates to Heidelberg). Humanizmus és reformáció, no. 21. Budapest: Balassi, 1994.

Herepei, János. "Tolnai Dali János hazatérésének ideje" (The time of János Tolnai Dali's return). In *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 1, *Polgári irodalmi és kulturális törekvések a század első felében: Herepei János cikkei* (Bourgeois movements in literature and culture in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű, 411–414. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1965.

———. "Adatok a Rákócziak váradi kollégiumának történetéhez" (Data concerning the history of the college of the Rákóczi in Nagyvárad). In *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű, 19–131. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966.

———. "Gidófalvi Csulak István." In *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű, 324–332. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966.

———. "Nagyari Benedek." In *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű, 137–148. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966.

———. "A fehérvári kollégiumi alapítvány sorsa Bethlen halála után" (The history of the donation for the Gyulafehérvár college after Bethlen's death). In *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 2, *Apáczai és kortársai: Herepei János cikkei* (Apáczai and his contemporaries: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű, 7–18. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1966.

———. "Az öreg Comenius néhány magyar híve (Magyar diákok Amszterdamban)" (Some Hungarian followers of the old Comenius: Hungarian students in Amsterdam). In *Adattár XVII. századi szellemi mozgalmaink történetéhez* (Database for the study of Hungarian intellectual movements in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), vol. 3, *Mívelődési törekvések a század második felében: Herepei János cikkei* (Cultural movements in the second half of the century: Studies of János Herepei), ed. Bálint Keserű, 349–418. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtörténeti Intézete; Szeged: Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem I. Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszéke, 1971.

Hill, Christopher. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. London: Martin Secker and Wartburg, 1964.

———. *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Hill-Paulus, Beate. *Nikolaj Gavrilovič Spatharij (1636–1708) und seine Gesandtschaft nach China*. Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens: Mitteilungen, no. 71. Hamburg: Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens, 1978.



Hiller, István. "A tolmácsper" (The Interpreters' lawsuit). In *Perlekedő évszázadok: Tanulmányok Für Lajos történész 60. születésnapjára* (Centuries in quarrel: Studies for the 60<sup>th</sup> birthday of the historian Lajos Für), ed. Ildikó Horn, 147–186. Budapest: ELTE BTK Középkori és Kora-újkori Magyar Történelmi Tanszék, 1993.

Hirsch, Ferdinand. "Otto v. Schwerin." *Historische Zeitschrift* 71 (1893): 193–259.

Hirsch, Ferdinand and Hans Saring. "Lorenz Christoph von Somnitz, ein Staatsmann des Großen Kurfürsten." *Baltische Studien* n. s. 35 (1933): 134–173.

Hochedlinger, Michael. "Die französisch-osmanische „Freundschaft“ 1525–1792: Element antihabsburgischer Politik, Gleichgewichtsinstrument, Prestigeunternehmung – Aufriß eines Problems." *Mitteilungen des Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 102 (1994): 108–164.

Hollenbeck, Meike. "Die Türkenpublizistik im 17. Jahrhundert – Spiegel der Verhältnisse im Reich?" *Mitteilungen des Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 107 (1999): 111–130.

Horányi, Elek. *Memoria Hungarorum et provincialium scriptis editis notorum*. Pars 2. Vienna: Loew, 1776.

Horn, Ildikó. "Esterházy Pál: Itinerarium ad Germaniam, 1653." *Sic Itur ad Astra* 4–5 (1989): 21–48.

———. "Sebesi Ferenc – egy erdélyi diplomata" (Ferenc Sebesi – A Transylvanian diplomat). In *Scripta manent: Ünnepi tanulmányok a 60. életévét betöltött Gerics József professzor tiszteletére* (Studies for the honor of professor József Gerics, after filling his 60<sup>th</sup> year), ed. István Draskóczy, 199–205. Budapest: ELTE Középkori és Kora Újkori Magyar Történelmi Tanszék, 1994.

Horváth, Jenő. *Várad fresco: Nagyvárad története* (Fresco of Várad: The history of Nagyvárad). Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1940.

Hossain, Mary. "Seventeenth Century Travellers to the Holy Land." *Arab Historical Review for Ottoman Studies*, 13–14 (1996): 65–73.

Hoyle, David. *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1690–1644*. The History of the University of Cambridge. Texts and Studies, no. 6. Woodbridge: Boydell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 2007.

Höfert, Almut. *Den Feind beschreiben: „Türkengefahr“ und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450–1600*. Campus historische Studien, no. 35. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 2003.

Hörsik, Richárd. *A sárospataki református kollégium diákjai 1617–1777* (Students of the Reformed Church of Sárospatak 1617–1777). Sárospatak: Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei, 1998.

Hüttl, Ludwig. *Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg der Große Kurfürst 1620–1688: Eine politische Biographie*. Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1981.

Ijsewijn, Jozef. "The Neo-Latin Satirical Novel in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century." *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch / Journal of Neo-Latin Language and Literature* 1 (1999): 129–140.

Imhof, Arthur E. *Die verlorenen Welten: Alltagsbewältigung durch unsere Vorfahren – und weshalb wir uns heute so schwer damit tun*. Munich: Beck, 1985.

İnalçik, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973.

Irrgang, Stephanie. "Gründungsvisionen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Das gescheiterte Bemühen um eine Universitätsgründung in Tangermünde." *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte* 9 (2006): 113–132.

Jakó, Klára. "A Szaláncziak (Egy fejezet az erdélyi fejedelemség keleti diplomáciájának történetéből)" (The Szalánczis: A chapter from the history of the Eastern diplomacy of the Principality of Transylvania). In *Emlékkönyv Imreh István születésének nyolcvanadik évfordulójára* (Festschrift for the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of István Imreh), ed. András Kiss, Gyöngy Kovács Kiss and Ferenc Pozsony, 199–210. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 1999.

———. "Budai Péter: Egy újszerű értelmiségi pálya előfutára a hanyatló erdélyi fejedelemségben" (Péter Budai: The forerunner of a new career type for intellectuals in the period of decline at the Principality of Transylvania). In *Studii de istorie modernă a Transilvaniei / Tanulmányok Erdély újkori történelméről: Omagiu profesorului Magyari András / emlékkönyv* (Studies on the modern history of Transylvania: Festschrift for professor András Magyari), ed. Judit Pál and Enikő Rüs-Fogarasi, 132–137. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2002.

Jakó, Zsigmond and István Juhász. *Nagyenyed diákok 1662–1848* (Students in Nagyenyed 1662–1848). Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979.

Jankovics, József. "Régi magyar irodalmunk 'viseletképe'" (The "image of clothing" in old Hungarian literature). In *Régi erdélyi viselet: Viseletkódex a XVII. századból* (Old Transylvanian attire: Codex of clothing from the 17<sup>th</sup> century), 5–21. Budapest: Európa, 1990.

———. "A magyar peregrinusok Európa-képe" (The Hungarian students' image of Europe). In *Régi és új peregrináció: Magyarok külföldön, külföldiek Magyarországon* (Old and new peregrination: Hungarians abroad, foreigners in Hungary), ed. Imre Békési et al, vol. 2, 556–564. Budapest: Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság; Szeged: Scriptum, 1993.

Janos, Damien. "Panaiotis Nicousios and Alexander Mavrocordatos: The rise of the Phanariots and the office of Grand Dragoman in the Ottoman administration in the second half of the seventeenth century." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005/6): 177–196.

Jöcher, Christian Gottlieb. *Allgemeines Gelehrter-Lexicon: darinne die Gelehrten aller Stände sowohl männ- als weiblichen Geschlechts, welche vom Anfange der Welt bis auf ietzige Zeit gelebt, und sich der gelehrten Welt bekannt gemacht, nach ihrer Geburt, Leben, merckwürdigen Geschichten, Absterben und Schrifften aus den glaubwürdigsten Scribenten in alphabetischer Ordnung beschrieben werden*, vol. 4, S–Z. Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1751.

Kafadar, Cemal. "The City That Râlab Visited: The Political and Cultural Climate of Istanbul in the 1650s." In *The Sultan's Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Râlab Paintings*, ed. Karin Ådahl, 59–73. Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2006.

Kaposi, Márton and Sándor Iván Kovács. "Rozsnyai Dávid kiadatlan kéziratol imádsága" (An unpublished autograph prayer of Dávid Rozsnyai). *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 64 (1960): 486–488.

Karácson, Imre. "Az erdélyi ház Konstantinápolyban" (The Transylvanian House in Constantinople). *Budapesti Hírlap* 27 (1907), no. 125, 31.

Kármán, Gábor. "Svéd diplomácia a Portán 1657–1658: Claes Râlab és Gotthard Welling konstantinápolyi követsége" (Swedish diplomacy at the Porte, 1657–1658: The embassy of Claes Râlab and Gotthard Welling). *Sic Itur ad Astra* 13, no. 1–2 (2001): 53–85.

———. "Identitás és határok: 17. századi magyar utazók nyugaton és keleten" (Identity and borders: 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian travelers in West and East). *Korall* 26 (2006): 72–98.

———. "Az erdélyi török deákok: Kora újkori értelmiségiek állami szolgálatban" (The Turkish Scribes of Transylvania: Early Modern Intellectuals in State Service). *Sic Itur ad Astra* 18, no. 1–2 (2006): 155–182.

———. “‘Átkozott Konstantinápoly’: Törökkép Erdély XVII. századi portai követségén” (“Damned Constantinople”: The image of the Turks in the 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian embassy at the Porte). In *Portré és imázs: Politikai propaganda és reprezentáció a kora újkorban* (Portrait and image: Early Modern political propaganda and representation), ed. Nóra G. Etényi and Ildikó Horn, 29–48. Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2008.

———. “Kísérlet a misztikus alapú külpolitikára: Bengt Skytte útja a Rákócziakhoz 1651–1652” (An attempt for foreign policy on mystical grounds: The journey to Bengt Skytte to the Rákóczi). *Aetas* 23, no. 4 (2008): 65–82.

———. “Translation at the 17<sup>th</sup> Century Transylvanian Embassy in Constantinople.” In *The Ottoman Orient and East Central Europe*, ed. Robert Born and Stephan Conermann. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010. (forthcoming).

Kentschynskyj, Bohdan. “Ukrainska revolutionen och Rysslands angrepp mot Sverige 1656” (The Ukrainian revolution and Russia’s assault on Sweden 1656). *Karolinska Förbundets Årsbok 1966*, 7–86.

Kerekes, Dóra. “A császári tolmácsok a magyarországi visszafoglaló háborúk idején” (The Imperial interpreters during the expulsion of the Ottomans from Hungary). *Századok* 148 (2004): 1189–1228.

Kissling, Hans Joachim. “Türkenfurcht und Türkenhoffnung im 15./16. Jahrhundert: Zur Geschichte eines ‘Komplexes’.” *Südost-Forschungen* 23 (1964): 1–18.

Klaniczay, Tibor. “Értelmiség egyetem nélküli országban” (Intellectuals in a country without university). In *Pallas magyar ivadéakai* (The Hungarian progenies of Pallas), 77–85. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1985.

Klatte, Holger. “Fremdsprachen in der Schule: Die Lehrbuchtradition des Sebald Heyden.” In *Die Volkssprachen als Lerngegenstand im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Akten des Bamberger Symposions am 18. und 19. Mai 2001*, Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, no. 3, ed. Helmut Glück, 77–86. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002.

Kołodziejczyk, Dariusz. *Ottoman–Polish Diplomatic Relations (15<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> Century): An Annotated Edition of ‘Ahdnames and Other Documents*. The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, no. 18. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Koncz, József. *A marosvásárhelyi evang. reform. kollégium története* (The history of the Ev. Reformed college of Marosvásárhely). Marosvásárhely: Sztupjár, 1896.

Kósa, János. *II. Rákóczi György*. Budapest: Franklin, 1942.

Kovács, András. “Az építkező Bethlen Gábor és székvárosa” (Gábor Bethlen, the commissioner of buildings and his residence town). In *Emlékkönyv Jakó Zsigmond születésének nyolcvanadik évfordulójára* (Festschrift for the 80<sup>th</sup> birthday of Zsigmond Jakó), ed. András Kovács, Gábor Sipos and Sándor Tonk, 230–246. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 1996.

———. *Késő reneszánsz építészet Erdélyben 1541–1720* (Late Renaissance architecture in Transylvania 1541–1720). Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány; Kolozsvár: Polis, 2006.

———. “A gyulafehérvári Szent Mihály székesegyház” (The Saint Michael cathedral in Gyulafehérvár). In *Épületek emlékezete: Nevezetes épületek Erdélyben* (Memory of buildings: Famous edifices in Transylvania), 11–39. Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2007.

Kovács, Sándor Iván. “Magyarok Rómában Janus Pannoniustól Zrínyi Miklósig” (Hungarians in Rome from Janus Pannonius to Miklós Zrínyi). *Vigilia* 47 (1982): 191–198.

———. “A régi magyar utazási irodalom az európai utazáselméleti művek tükrében” (Old Hungarian travel literature in the mirror of European works on the theory of travel). In *Szakácsmesterségnek és utazásnak könyvecskéi: Két tanulmány* (Booklets of cookery and travel: Two studies), 95–200. Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1988.

Köpeczi, Béla. *Staatsräson und christliche Solidarität: Die ungarischen Aufstände und Europa in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna, Cologne and Graz: Böhlau, 1983.

Kristaller, Paul Oskar. “Active and Contemplative Life in Renaissance Humanism.” In *Arbeit, Musse, Meditation: Betrachtungen zur Vita activa und Vita contemplativa*, ed. Brian Vickers, 133–152. Zurich: Verlag der Fachvereine, 1985.

Krusenstjern, Benigna von. “Was sind Selbstzeugnisse? Begriffskritische und quellenkundliche Überlegungen anhand von Beispielen aus dem 17. Jahrhundert.” *Historische Anthropologie* 2 (1994): 462–471.

Kvačala, Ján. “Bisterfeld János Henrik élete” (The life of Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld). *Századok* 25 (1891): 447–478, 545–577.

Ladányi, Sándor. “Magyar diákok a franekeri egyetemen” (Hungarian students at the Franeker University). *Confessio* 10, no. 4 (1986): 70–73.

———. “Ungarische Studenten an der Universität Frankfurt an der Oder.” In *Iter Germanicum: Deutschland und die Reformierte Kirche in Ungarn im 16.–17. Jahrhundert*, ed. András Szabó, 214–220. Budapest: Kálvin, 1999.

Lake, Peter. “William Bradshaw, Antichrist and the Community of the Godly.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985): 570–589.

———. “Defining Puritanism – Again?” In *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer, 3–29. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.

———. “‘A Charitable Christian Hatred’: The Godly and Their Enemies in the 1630s.” In *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700, Themes in Focus*, ed. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, 145–183. Houndmills: MacMillan, 1996.

Le Goff, Jacques. “Wie schreibt man eine Biographie?” In *Der Historiker als Menschenfresser: Über den Beruf des Geschichtsschreibens*, Wagenbach Taschenbuch, no. 187, 103–112. Berlin: Wagenbach, 1990. [Originally: “Comment écrire une biographie historique aujourd’hui?”, *le-débat* 54 (March–April 1989)].

[Lehmann]. Brandenburgisch-polnische Türkenzüge von 1671–1688, in *Kriegsgeschichtliche Einzelschriften*, no. 5, 1–29. Berlin: Mittler, 1884.

Lehmann, Hartmut and Guenther Roth, ed., *Weber’s Protestant Ethic: Origins, Evidence, Contexts*. Washington: German Historical Institute (London), 1993.

Lepetit, Bernard. “Architecture, géographie, histoire: usages de l’échelle.” *Genèses* 13 (1993 Automne): 118–138.

Leverenz, Patrick. *The Language of Puritan Feeling: An Exploration in Literature, Psychology, and Social History*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1980.

Levi, Giovanni. “Les usages de la biographie.” *Annales ESC* 44 (1989): 1325–1337.

Littleton, Charles G. D. “Ancient Languages and New Science: The Levant in the Intellectual Life of Robert Boyle.” In *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Intersections, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, 151–171. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Luffy, Katalin. "Medgyesi Pál és a magyar puritanizmus: Historiográfiai áttekintés a kezdetektől 1980-ig" (Pál Medgyesi and Hungarian Puritanism: Historiographical overview from the beginnings to 1980). In *Medgyesi Pál redivivus: Tanulmányok a 17. századi puritanizmusról* (Studies on 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism), ed. Gergely Tamás Fazakas and János L. Győri, 15–30. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem and Egyetemi és Nemzeti Könyvtár, 2008.

Lynch, Michael. "The Creation of a College." In Robert D. Anderson, Michael Lynch and Nicholas Philipson, *The University of Edinburgh: An Illustrated History*, 1–49. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.

Macinnes, Allan I. *The British Revolution 1629–1660*, British Studies Series. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Mączak, Antoni. *Travel in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Polity, 1995.

Majda, Tadeusz. "L'École polonaise des langues orientales d'Istanbul au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle." In *Istanbul et les langues orientales: Actes du colloque organisé par l'IFEA et l'INALCO à l'occasion du bicentenaire de l'Ecole des Langues Orientales: Istanbul 29–31 Mai 1995*, Varia turcica, no. 31, ed. Frédéric Hitzel, 123–128. Paris and Montréal: L'Harmattan, 1997.

———. "The Rålamb Album of Turkish Costumes." In *The Sultan's Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Rålamb Paintings*, ed. Karin Ådahl, 196–265. Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2006.

Makkai, László. *A magyar puritánusok harca a feudálizmus ellen* (The struggle of Hungarian Puritans against Feudalism). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1952.

———. "Bevezetés" (Introduction). In *Galeria omnium sanctorum: A magyarországi gályarab prédikátorok emlékezete* (Memory of the Hungarian galley-slave ministers), ed. László Makkai, 7–28. Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1976.

———. "Debrecen iskolájából az ország iskolája (1660–1703)" (From the school of Debrecen to the school of the country (1660–1703)). In *A debreceni református kollégium története* (History of the Reformed College of Debrecen), ed. József Barcza, 43–65. Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1988.

Makoldy, Sándor. *Bojthi Veres Gáspár élete és történetírói munkássága* (The life and historiographic activities of Gáspár Bojthi Veres). Nagykároly: Róth, 1904.

Mansel, Philip. *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453–1924*. London: Murray, 1995.

Mantran, Robert. *La vie quotidienne à Constantinople au temps de Soliman le Magnifique et de ses successeurs (XVI<sup>e</sup> et XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Paris: Hachette, 1965.

Márki, Sándor. "Cromwell és Erdély" (Cromwell and Transylvania). *Erdélyi Múzeum* 18 (1901): 16–37.

Martels, Zweder von. "In His Majesty's Service: Augerius Busbequius, Courtier and Diplomat of Maximilian II." In *Kaiser Maximilian II: Kultur und Politik im 16. Jahrhundert*, Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit, no. 19, ed. Friedrich Edelmayer and Alfred Kohler, 169–181. Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1992.

Matar, Nabil I. "The Comenian Legacy in England: The Case for the Conversion of the Muslims." *The Seventeenth Century* 8 (1993): 203–215.

———. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Matei, Ion. "Contributions aux débuts des études de turcologie en Roumaine, XVI<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles." *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 26 (1988): 99–111.

Mattingly, Garrett. *Renaissance Diplomacy*. Baltimore: Penguin, 1955.

Matuz, Jozef. *Das Osmanische Reich: Grundlinien seiner Geschichte*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985.

McDonald, Maryon. "The Construction of Difference: An Anthropological Approach to Stereotypes." In *Inside European Identities: Ethnography in Western Europe*, ed. Sharon MacDonald, 219–236. Oxford: Berg, 1993.

McKay, Derek. *The Great Elector*. Profiles in Power. Harlow: Longman, 2001.

Meinenberger, Peter. *Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn als kaiserlicher Resident in Konstantinopel in dem Jahren 1629–1643: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und der Türkei in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Geist und Werk der Zeiten, no. 37. Bern and Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1973.

Ménage, Victor L. Review of *Das osmanisch-türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert* by György Hazai. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies University of London* 38 (1975): 162–164.

Mészáros, István. *Középszintű iskoláink kronológiája és topográfiája 996–1948 (Általánosan képző középiskolák)* (A chronology and topology of secondary schools in Hungary 996–1948: Secondary schools with general curriculum). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1988.

Mihail, Zamfira. "Nicolae Milescu, le Spathaire – un « encyclopédiste » roumain du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle." *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 18 (1980): 265–285.

———. "Les intellectuels « sans frontières » du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Nicolae le Spathaire Milescu." *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 44 (2006): 185–194.

Mika, Sándor. "Az erdélyi ház Konstantinápolyban" (The Transylvanian House in Constantinople). *Budapesti Szemle* 103 (1907): 1–21.

Miklós, Ödön. "Magyarok pere a leideni rektor előtt" (Processes against Hungarians at the court of the Rector in Leiden). *Theologiai Szemle* 3 (1927): 163–165.

———. "Magyar diákok a leydeni Staten Collegeben" (Hungarian students in the Staten College of Leiden). *Theologiai Szemle* 4 (1928): 290–319.

Miović, Vesna. "Dragomans of the Dubrovnik Republic: Their Training and Career." *Dubrovnik Annals* 5 (2001): 81–94.

Mollova, Mefküre. "Sur les 'Qulloquia [sic!] Familiaria Turcico-Latina.'" *Linguistique Balkanique (Académie Bulgare des Sciences)* 12, no. 4 (1979): 53–83.

Molnár, Antal. *Katolikus missziók a hódolt Magyarországon*. Vol. 1, (1572–1647) (Catholic Missions in Hungary under Ottoman Rule). Humanizmus és reformáció, no. 26. Budapest: Balassi, 2002.

Molnár, Attila. *A „protestáns etika” Magyarországon: A puritán erkölcs és hatása* (The "Protestant ethic" in Hungary: The Puritan morals and their impact). Debrecen: Ethnica, 1994.

Molnár, István. *Rozsnyai Dávid török deák* (The Turkish Scribe Dávid Rozsnyai). Művelődéstörténeti értekezések, no. 33. Budapest: Stephaneum, 1909.

Moore, Hugh. *A Dictionary of Quotations from Various Authors in Ancient and Modern Languages with English Translations, and Illustrated by Remarks and Explanations*. London: Wittaker, Treacher & Co, 1831.

Moote, A. Lloyd. "New Bottles and New Wine: The Current State of Early Modern Biographical Writing." *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996): 911–927.

Mordovin, Maxim. "Petki István, II. Rákóczi György főudvarmestere" (István Petki, major-domo of György Rákóczi II). In *Szerencsének elegyes forgása: II. Rákóczi György és kora* (The alternating turns of fortune: György Rákóczi II and his age), ed. Gábor Kármán and András Péter Szabó, 373–423. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009.

Mout, M.E.H. Nicolette. "Calvinoturcismus und Chiliasmus im 17. Jahrhundert." *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 14 (1988): 72–84.

Mulsow, Martin. "Kulturkonsum, Selbstkonstruktion und intellektuelle Zivilität." *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 35 (1998): 529–547.

Murdock, Graeme. *Calvinism on the Frontier: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

———. "Did Calvinists Have a Guilt Complex? Reformed Religion, Conscience and Regulation in Early Modern Europe." In *Retribution, Repentance, and Reconciliation: Papers Read at the 2002 Summer Meeting and the 2003 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, Studies in Church History, no. 40, ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory, 138–158. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004.

———. "'They Are Laughing at Us'? Hungarian Travellers and Early Modern European Identity." In *Under Eastern Eyes: A Comparative Introduction to East European Travel Writing on Europe*, ed. Wendy Bracewell and Alex Drace-Francis, 121–145. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2008.

———. "Responses to Habsburg Persecution of Protestants in Seventeenth-Century Hungary." *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 37–52.

Mühlpfordt, Günter. "Die Oder-Universität 1506–1811." In *Die Oder-Universität Frankfurt: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*, ed. Günther Haase and Joachim Winkler, 19–72. Weimar: Böhlau, 1983.

Müller-Wiener, Wolfgang. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls: Byzantion, Konstantinopolis, Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jh.* Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1977.

Nagy, Iván. *Magyarország családai czimerekkel és nemzedékrendi táblákkal* (The families of Hungary with coats of arms and genealogical tables). Vol. 5. Pest: Ráth Mór, 1859.

Nagy, László. "Élet a 'magyar romlásnak századában'" (Life in the "century of the decay of Hungary"). In *Kard és szerelem: Török kori históriák* (Sword and love: Stories from the Turkish age), 30–54. Budapest: Gondolat, 1985.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. *Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. New York: The Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1991.

Neudecker, Hannah. "Wojciech Bobowski and his Turkish grammar (1666)." *Dutch Studies – Near Eastern Languages and Literatures* 2 (1996): 169–192.

———. "From Istanbul to London? Albertus Bobovius' appeal to Isaac Basire." In *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Intersections, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, 173–196. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Noack, Lothar. "Der Berliner Probst, Orientalist und Sinologe Andreas Müller (1630–1694)." *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 157, no. 1 (1995): 1–39.

Noack, Lothar and Jürgen Splett. *Bio-Bibliographien: Brandenburgische Gelehrte der Frühen Neuzeit: Berlin–Cölln 1640–1688*, Veröffentlichungen zur brandenburgischen Kulturgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit. Berlin: Academia, 1997.

Norris, H.T. "Professor Edmund Castell (1606–85), Orientalist and Divine, and England's Oldest Arabic Inscription." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 29 (1984): 155–167.

———. "Edmund Castell (1606–86) and His *Lexicon Heptaglotton* (1669)." In *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophy in Seventeenth-Century England*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, no. 47, ed. G. A. Russell, 70–87. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Oakes, Penelope J., S. Alexander Haslam and John C. Turner. *Stereotyping and Social Reality*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Oelrichs, Johann Carl Conrad. *Commentationes historico-literae quarum prior consilium Friderici Wilhelmi M. Elect. Brand. condendi novam universitatem omnium gentium, scientiarum et artium exponit, posterior historiographos Brandenburgicos recenset*. Berlin: Haude et Spener, 1751.

Opgenoorth, Ernst. *Friedrich Wilhelm: Der Grosse Kurfürst von Brandenburg*. Vol. 1–2. Göttingen: Mustersmidt, 1971–1978.

Oprava, Zdeněk. "Bestseller in der frühen Neuzeit: Die verschiedenen Ausgaben des Gesprächsbüchleins von Ondřej Klatovský (1540)." In *Die Volkssprachen als Lerngegenstand im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Akten des Bamberger Symposions am 18. und 19. Mai 2001*, Die Geschichte des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, no. 3, ed. Helmut Glück, 57–66. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002.

Palumbo Fossati Casa, Isabella. "L'École vénitienne des 'giovanni di lingua'." In *Istanbul et les langues orientales: Actes du colloque organisé par l'IFEA et l'INALCO à l'occasion du bicentenaire de l'Ecole des Langues Orientales: Istanbul 29–31 Mai 1995*, *Varia turcica*, no. 31, ed. by Frédéric Hitzel, 109–122. Paris and Montréal: L'Harmattan, 1997.

Panaite, Viorel. "Reprezentanța diplomatică a Țării Românești la Poarta Otomană în epoca lui Constantin Brâncoveanu" (The Diplomatic Representation of Wallachia at the Ottoman Porte in the Period of Constantin Brâncoveanu). *Revista de Istorie* 41 (1988): 877–894.

Panaiteescu, Petre P. "Nicolas Spathar Milescu (1636–1708)." *Mélanges de l'École Roumaine en France* 1 (1925): 33–180.

Papp, Sándor. "II. Rákóczi György és a Porta" (György Rákóczi II and the Porte). In *Szerencsének elegyes forgása: II. Rákóczi György és kora* (The alternating turns of fortune: György Rákóczi II and his age), ed. Gábor Kármán and András Péter Szabó, 99–170. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009.

Păun, Radu G. "Pouvoir, Croisade et Jugement Dernier au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle." In *Ius et ritus: Rechtshistorische Abhandlungen über Ritus, Macht und Recht*, ed. Ivan Biliarsky, 213–281. Sofia: Iztok, 2006.

Pavercsik, Ilona. "David Frölich sajátkezű feljegyzései műveiről" (The autograph register of David Frölich about his works). *Magyar Könyvszemle* 112 (1996): 292–319, 429–450.

Perényi, József. *Rozsnyai Dávid*. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Híradó, 1895.

Perjés, Géza. *Zrínyi Miklós és kora* (Miklós Zrínyi and his age). Budapest: Gondolat, 1965.

Péter, I. Zoltán. *Nagyvárad 900 éves múltja és épített öröksége* (The 900 years past and architectural heritage of Nagyvárad). Budapest: Noran, 2005.

Péter, Katalin. "Az értelmiség és a XVII. század közepének politikai mozgalmái" (The intellectuals and the political movements of the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century). In *A magyarországi értelmiség a XVII–XVIII. században* (Intellectuals in Hungary in the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), ed. István Zombori, 21–30. Szeged: n. p., 1984.

———. "Az erdélyi magyar iskolázás a 16. és a 17. században (Hungarian schools in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvania). *A Ráday Gyűjtemény évkönyve* 7 (1994): 3–13.



Petritsch, Ernst. "Türkische Toleranz?!". *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 34–35 (1991–1992): 134–149.

Petróczi, Éva. "XVII. századi puritán szerzőink magyarságképe" (The image of Hungary among 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian Puritan authors). In *Religió, retorika, nemzettudat régi irodalmunkban* (Religion, rhetoric, national identity in the old Hungarian literature), Csokonai Könyvtár (Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium), no. 31, ed. István Bitskey and Szabolcs Oláh, 473–483. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2004.

———. "Pengeváltás nélkül: Miskolczi Csulyak István és Telkibányai István vitája a puritánizmusról," (Without crossing swords: The debate of István Miskolczi Csulyak and István Telkibányai about Puritanism). In *"Tenger az igaz hitről való egyenlenségek vitatásának előadott özöne..." Tanulmányok XVI–XIX. századi hitvitáinkról* ("There is a sea of debates around the problems of the true faith...") Studies on religious debates in 16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> century Hungary), ed. János Heltai and Réka Tasi, 103–114. Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem BTK Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszék, 2005.

———. "Puritán szerzőink mint művészek: A puritanizmus és a művészetek viszonya a magyar szakirodalomban" (Hungarian Puritan authors as artists: The correlation of Puritanism and arts in the Hungarian historiography). In *Puritánia: Tanulmányok a magyar és angol puritanizmus irodalmáról* (Puritania: Studies on the literature of English and Hungarian Puritanism), 7–36. Budapest: Universitas, 2006.

Pfister, Rudolf. "Reformation, Türken und Islam." *Zwingliana* 10, no 6 (1956): 345–375.

Pippidi, Andrei. "Drogmans et enfants de langue: La France de Constantinople au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle." In *Istanbul et les langues orientales: Actes du colloque organisé par l'IFEA et l'INALCO à l'occasion du bicentenaire de l'Ecole des Langues Orientales: Istanbul 29–31 Mai 1995*, Varia turcica, no. 31, ed. by Frédéric Hitzel, 131–140. Paris and Montréal: L'Harmattan, 1997.

———. "La décadence de l'Empire Ottoman comme concept historique de la Renaissance aux Lumières." *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 35, no 1–2 (1997): 5–19.

Pongrácz, József. *Magyar diákok Angliában* (Hungarian students in England). Pápa: n. p., 1914.

Popescu, Marin Matei and Adrian N. Beldeanu. *Mihnea al III-lea (1658–1659)*. Domnitori și voievozi. Bucharest: Editura militară, 1982.

Postma, Ferenc and Jakob van Sluis. *Auditorium Academiae Franekerensis: Bibliographie der Reden, Disputationen und Gelegenheitsdruckwerke der Universität und des Athenäums in Franeker 1585–1843*. Fryske Akademy, no. 760. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1995.

Preissler, Holger. "Orientalische Studien in Leipzig vor Reiske." In *Johann Jacob Reiske – Leben und Wirkung*, Beiträge zur Leipziger Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Reihe B, no. 6, ed. Hans-Georg Ebert and Thoralf Hanstein, 19–43. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005.

Rácz, István. "A magyarországi protestáns peregrináció szükségserűsége és lehetőségei" (The necessity and opportunities of Hungarian Protestant peregrination). In *Politikai gondolkodás – műveltségi áramlatok: Tanulmányok Irinyi Károly professzor születésének 60. évfordulója tiszteletére* (Political thought – intellectual movements. Studies for the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of Professor Károly Irinyi), 133–142. Debrecen: Kossuth Lajos Tudományegyetem Történelmi és Klasszika-Filológiai Intézet, 1992.

Rady, Martyn. "A Transylvanian Alchemist in Seventeenth-Century London." *Slavonic and East European Review* 72 (1994): 140–151.

Reinhard, Ursula. "Die Musik am türkischen Hof im 17. Jahrhundert." In *Höfische Kultur in Südosteuropa: Bericht der Kolloquien der Südosteuropa-Kommission 1988 bis 1990*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen: Philologisch-Historische Klasse, III. Folge, no. 203, ed. Reinhard Lauer and Hans Georg Majer, 174–204. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

ReiBer, Werner. "Botanik." In *Geschichte der Universität Leipzig 1409–2009*, vol. 4, *Fakultäten, Institute, Einrichtungen*, ed. Ulrich von Hehl, Uwe John and Manfred Rudersdorf, 1125–1137. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2009.

Révész, Imre. *A szatmárnémeti zsinat és az első magyar református ébredés* (The synod of Szatmárnémeti and the first Hungarian Calvinist awakening). *Theologia*, no. 5. Budapest: Református Traktátus Vállalat, 1947.

Ridder-Symoens, Hilde de. "Buitenlandse studenten aan de Franeker universiteit 1585–1811" (Foreign students at the Franeker University 1585–1811). In *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), *Fryske Akademy*, vol. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra, 73–89. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985.

RMNy II = Borsa, Gedeon and Ferenc Hervay, ed. *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok*, vol. 2, 1601–1635 (Old Hungarian prints). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1983.

Rodenberg, Carl and Volquart Pauls. *Die Anfänge der Christian-Albrechts Universität Kiel*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins, no. 31. Neumünster: Wachholtz, 1955.

Rouillard, Clarence Dana. *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature (1520–1660)*. Études de littérature étrangère et comparée, no. 13. Paris: n. p., 1940.

Runeby, Nils. "Bengt Skytte, Comenius och abdikationskrisen 1651" (Bengt Skytte, Comenius and the crisis of abdication). *Scandia* 29 (1963): 360–382.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Schachinger, Erika. *Die Berliner Vorstadt Friedrichswerder 1658–1708*. Veröffentlichungen aus den Archiven preußischer Kulturbesitz, Beihefte, no. 4. Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau, 1993.

Scheidegger, Gabriele. *Perverse Abendland – barbarisches Russland: Begegnungen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im Schatten kultureller Missverständnisse*. Zurich: Chronos, 1993.

Schmidt, Jan. "Between Author and Library Shelf: The Intriguing History of Some Middle Eastern Manuscripts Acquired by Public Collections in the Netherlands Prior to 1800." In *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, *Intersections*, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, 27–51. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Schnurrer, Christian Friedrich. *Bibliotheca Arabica*. Halle an der Saale: Hendelius, 1811.

Schwarz, Klaus. "Vom Krieg zum Frieden: Berlin, das Kurfürstentum Brandenburg, das Reich und die Türken." In *Europa und der Orient 800–1900*, ed. Gereon Sievernich and Hendrik Budde, 245–278. Berlin: Berliner Festspiele and Bertelsmann, 1989.

Scuchard, Marcia Keith. "Leibniz, BenzeliuS, and Swedenborg: The Kabbalistic Roots of Swedish Illuminism." In *Leibniz, Mysticism and Religion*, *Archives internationales d'histoire des idées*, ed. Allison P. Coudert, Richard H. Popkin and Gordon M. Weiner, 84–106. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998.

Şerban, Constantin. *Vasile Lupu, Domn al Moldovei (1634–1653)* (Vasile Lupu, the Voievod of Moldavia, 1634–1653). Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1991.

Setton, Kenneth M. *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1991.

Shepherd, Christine. "University Life in the Seventeenth Century." In *Four Centuries: Edinburgh University Life 1583–1983*, ed. Gordon Donaldson, 1–15. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 1983.

Simonfi, János. “Rosnyay Dávid naptári följegyzései” (The diaries of Dávid Rozsnyai). *Erdélyi Múzeum* 9 (1914): 108–126.

Smet, Ingrid R.A. *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters, 1581–1655*. Travaux du Grand Siècle, no. 2. Geneva: Droz, 1996.

Smith, Jay M. *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600–1789*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Soltész, János. *A nagybányai reformált egyházmegye története* (History of the Reformed diocese of Nagybánya). Nagybánya: Molnár, 1902.

Southern, Richard William. *Western Views on Islam in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Spears, Russell, Penelope J. Oakes, Naomi Ellemers, and S. Alexander Haslam. “Introduction: The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life.” In *The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life*, ed. Russell Spears, Penelope J. Oakes, Naomi Ellemers, and S. Alexander Haslam, 1–19. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1997.

Sprunger, Keith L. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, no. 31. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

———. “William Ames and the Franeker Link to English and American Puritanism.” In *Universiteit te Franeker 1585–1811: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Friese Hogeschool* (The University of Franeker 1585–1811: Contributions to the history of the Frisian high school), Fryske Akademy, no. 648, ed. Goffe Th. Jensma, F. R. H. Smit and Frans Westra, 264–274. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 1985.

Spurr, John. *English Puritanism 1603–1689*. Social History in Perspective. Houndmills: MacMillan, 1998.

Stagl, Justin. “Der wohl unterwiesene Passagier: Reisekunst und Gesellschaftbeschreibung vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert.” In *Reisen und Reisebeschreibungen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert als Quellen der Kulturbeziehungsforchung*, Studien zur Geschichte der Kulturbeziehungen im Mittel- und Osteuropa, no. 6, ed. Boris I. Krasnobaev, Gert Robel and Herbert Zeman, 353–384. Berlin: Camen, 1980.

Stoicescu, Nicolae. *Dicționar al marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova* (Dictionary of the major dignitaries of Wallachia and Moldova). Bucharest: Editura enciclopedică română, 1971.

Stoy, Manfred. “Rumänische Fürsten im frühneuzeitlichen Wien.” *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* 46 (1990): 153–180.

Stuth, Steffen. *Höfe und Residenzen: Untersuchungen zu den Höfen der Herzöge von Mecklenburg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. Quellen und Studien aus den Landesarchiven Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, no. 4. Bremen – Rostock: Temmen, 2001.

Szabó, András Péter. “Haller Gábor peregrinációja” (The peregrination of Gábor Haller), *Kút* 3, no. 3–4 (2004): 1–43.

———. “Haller Gábor naplójának forrásai” (The sources of the diary of Gábor Haller). In *Emlékezet és devóció a régi magyar irodalomban: A kolozsvári Babeş-Bolyai Tudományegyetem Magyar Irodalomtudományi Tanszéke által szervezett nemzetközi konferencia előadásai 2006. május 24–27, Kolozsvár* (Memory and devotion in the old Hungarian literature: Papers presented at the international conference organised by the Department of Hungarian Literature at the Babeş-Bolyai University of Sciences, Kolozsvár, 24–27 May 2006), ed. Mihály Balázs and Csilla Gábor, 409–430. Kolozsvár: Egyetemi Műhely – Bolyai Társaság, 2007.

———. “Haller Gábor – egy 17. századi erdélyi arisztokrata életpályája” (Gábor Haller. Career of a 17<sup>th</sup> century Transylvanian aristocrat). Ph.D. diss., ELTE BTK, 2008.

———. “A magyar Hallerek nemzetségekönnyve: Egy különleges forrás keletkezésének társadalomtörténeti háttere” (The ancestry book of the Hungarian Hallers: The social historical background of the origins of a peculiar source). *Századok* 142 (2008): 897–942.

Szabó, János, B. “II. Rákóczi György 1658. évi török háborúja” (The Turkish war of György Rákóczi II in 1658). *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 114 (2001): 231–278.

———. “Erdély katasztrófája 1658-ban: A védelem összeomlásának politikai és pszichológiai okai” (The catastrophe of Transylvania in 1658: Political and psychological reasons of the defense’s collapse). *Aetas* 21, no. 2–3 (2006): 204–218.

Szabó, Miklós and Sándor Tonk. *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a korai újkorban 1521–1700* (Early Modern Transylvanians visiting universities, 1521–1700). *Fontes rerum scholasticarum*, no. 4. Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem, 1992.

———. “Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a középkor és a koraiújkor folyamán” (Transylvanians visiting universities in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period). In *Régi és új peregrináció: Magyarok külföldön, külföldiek Magyarországon* (Old and new peregrination: Hungarians abroad, foreigners in Hungary), ed. Imre Békési et al. (Budapest: Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság; Szeged: Scriptum, 1993), vol. 2, 491–507.

Szendrey, István. “Debrecen, a mezőváros” (Debrecen, the market town). In *Debrecen története 1693-ig* (The history of Debrecen until 1693), Debrecen története öt kötetben, no. 1, ed. István Szendrey p. 131–311. Debrecen: n. p., 1984.

Szijártó, István. “Four Arguments for Microhistory.” *Rethinking History* 6, no. 2 (2002): 209–215.

Taeschner, Franz. *Alt-Stambuler Hof- und Volksleben: Ein türkisches Miniaturenalbum aus dem 17. Jahrhundert*. Hannover: Lafaire, 1925.

Takáts, Sándor. “A török és magyar raboskodás” (Turkish and Hungarian captivity). In *Rajzok a török világból* (Sketches from the Turkish world), vol. 1, 160–303. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1915.

Taylor, Alan John Percivale. “The Historian as a Biographer.” In *Biographie und Geschichtswissenschaft: Aufsätze zur Theorie und Praxis biographischer Arbeit*, Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit, no. 6, ed. Grete Klingenstein, Heinrich Lutz and Gerald Stourzh, 254–261. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1979.

Thallóczy, Lajos. “Az ál-Brankovicsok” (The Pseudo-Brankovics). *Századok* 32 (1888): 689–713.

———. “II. Rákóczy György és az oláh személyek” (György Rákóczi II and the Wallachian seimens). *Századok* 26 (1892): 449–456.

Thury, Etele. *Iskolatörténeti adattár* (Database for school history). Vol. 2. Pápa: Országos Református Tanáregyesület, 1908.

Tietze, Hans. *Die Juden Wiens: Wirtschaft, Kultur*. Vienna and Leipzig: Tal, 1933.

Todd, Margo. “Puritan Self-Fashioning: The Diary of Samuel Ward.” *The Journal of British Studies* 21 (1992): 236–264.

Tongas, Gérard. *Les relations de la France avec l'Empire Ottoman durant la première moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, et l'Ambassade à Constantinople de Philippe Harlay, Comte de Césy, 1619–1640*. Toulouse: Boisseau, 1942.

Toomer, Gerald J. *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

———. “John Selden, the Levant and the Netherlands in the History of Scholarship.” In *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, Intersections, no. 5, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, 53–76. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Tóth, István György. *Literacy and Written Culture in Early Modern Central Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2000.

Tóth, Zsombor. “EGOizmus: Az énreprezentáció mint én-performancia (self-fashioning) Bethlen Miklós emlékiratában” (EGOism: Self-representation as self-fashioning in the memoirs of Miklós Bethlen). *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 4 (2003): 57–85.

———. *A koronatanú: Bethlen Miklós: Az Élete leírása magától és a XVII. századi puritanizmus* (The star witness: Miklós Bethlen: The *Autobiography* and 17<sup>th</sup> century Puritanism). Csokonai Könyvtár / Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium, no. 40. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2007.

Tóth-Szabó, Pál. *Nagyvárad az erdélyi fejedelmek s a török uralom korában* (Nagyvárad in the age of the Transylvanian Princes and the Turkish rule). Nagyvárad: Sebő, 1904.

Trócsányi, Berta. *Magyar református teológusok Angliában a XVI. és XVII. században* (Theologians of the Hungarian Reformed Church in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century England). Debreceni angol dolgozatok, no. 11. Debrecen: Tisza István Tudományegyetem Angol Intézete, 1944.

Trócsányi, Zsolt. *Teleki Mihály (Erdély és a kurucmozgalom 1690-ig)* (Mihály Teleki: Transylvania and the Kuruc movement until 1690). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1972.

———. *Erdély központi kormányzata 1540–1690* (The central administration of Transylvania 1540–1690). Magyar Országos Levéltár kiadványai. III. Hatóság- és hivataltörténet, no. 6. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980.

Tryjaski, Edward. “Marcin Bielski (16. Century) on the Turks.” *Journal of Turkish Studies* 17 (1993): 173–185.

Twigg, John. *The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution*. The History of the University of Cambridge: Texts and Studies, no. 1. Woodbridge: Boydell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1990.

Ulbicht, Otto. “Supplikationen als Ego-Dokumente: Bittschriften von Leibeigenen aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts als Beispiel.” In *Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte*, Selbstzeugnisse der Neuzeit, no. 2, ed. Winfried Schultze, 149–174. Berlin: Akademie, 1996.

Ursprung, Daniel. *Herrschaftslegitimation zwischen Tradition und Innovation: Repräsentation und Inszenierung von Herrschaft in der rumänischen Geschichte*. Veröffentlichungen von Studium Transylvanicum. Kronstadt: Aldus; Heidelberg: Arbeitskreis für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, 2007.

Várkonyi, Ágnes, R. *Török világ és magyar külpolitika* (Turkish world and Hungarian foreign politics). Gyorsuló idő. Budapest: Magvető, 1975.

———. *Erdélyi változások: Az erdélyi fejedelemség a török kiűzésének korában 1660–1711* (Changes in Transylvania: The Principality of Transylvania in the age of the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary 1660–1711). Nemzet és emlékezet. Budapest: Magvető, 1984.

———. “Értelmiség és államhatalom Magyarországon a 17–18. század fordulóján” (Intellectuals and state power in Hungary at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century). In *A magyarországi értelmiség a XVII–XVIII. században* (Intellectuals in Hungary in the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), ed. István Zombori, 54–80. Szeged: n. p., 1984.

———. “Országegyesítő kísérletek (1648–1664)” (Attempts to unite the country, 1648–1664). In *Magyarország története 1526–1686* (The history of Hungary 1526–1686), Magyarország története tíz kötetben, no. 3, ed. Zsigmond Pál Pach and Ágnes R. Várkonyi, 1043–1154. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1985.

———. “A ‘kereszténység Achillese’” (The “Achilles of the Christianity”). In *Europica varietas – hungarica varietas*, 76–90. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1994.

———. “Európai játéktér – magyar politika 1657–1664” (European field of action – Hungarian politics 1657–1664). In *Az értelem bátorsága: Tanulmányok Perjés Géza emlékére* (The valor of the mind: Studies in the memory of Géza Perjés), ed. Gábor Hausner, 577–614. Budapest: Argumentum, 2005.

Váró, Ferenc. *Bethlen Gábor kollégiuma* (The college of Gábor Bethlen). Nagyenyed: Nagyenyedi Könyvnyomda, 1903.

Vaughan, Dorothy M. *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances 1350–1700*. Liverpool: University Press, 1954.

Vickers, Brian. “Public and Private Life in Seventeenth-Century England.” In *Arbeit, Musse, Meditation: Betrachtungen zur Vita activa und Vita contemplativa*, ed. Brian Vickers, 257–278. Zurich: Verlag der Fachvereine, 1985.

Vincze, Hanna Orsolya. “The Stakes of Translation and Vernacularisation in Early Modern Hungary,” *European Review of History* 16, no. 1 (2009): 63–78.

Wachowiak, Bogdan. “Stettin in der Neuzeit (1478–1805).” In Jan M. Piskorski, Bogdan Wachowiak and Edward Włodarczyk, *Stettin: Kurze Stadtgeschichte*, trans. Eligiusz Janus and Andreas Warnecke, 55–96. Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1994.

Wehrmann, Martin. *Geschichte der Stadt Stettin*. Stettin: Saunier, 1911.

Westerberg, Sten. “Claes Rålamb: Statesman, Scholar and Ambassador,” in *The Sultan’s Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Rålamb Paintings*, ed. Karin Ådahl, 26–57. Istanbul: Svenska Forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul, 2006.

Woltjer, Jan Juliaan. “Introduction.” In *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*, ed. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurler and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, 1–19. Leiden: Universitaire Pers – Brill, 1975.

Worchel, Stephen and Hank Rothgerber. “Changing the Stereotype of the Stereotype.” In *The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life*, ed. Russell Spears et al, 72–93. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1997.

Yatsimirskiy, A.I. “Domna Stefanida, nevesta Alekseya Mikhaylovicha” (Domna Ștefanida, the bride of Alexei Mikhailovich). *Istoricheskiy Vestnik* 15 (1904): 825–843.

Yerasimos, Stéphane. *Constantinople: De Byzance à Istanbul*. Paris: Éditions Place des Victoires, 2000.

Zahariuc, Petronel. *Țara Moldovei în vremea lui Gheorghe Ștefan voievod (1653–1658)* (Moldavia in the period of Voievod Gheorghe Ștefan, 1653–1658). *Historica*, no. 30. Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2003.

———. “Gheorghe Ștefan moldvai vajda és II. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem kapcsolata” (The contacts between Gheorghe Ștefan, Voievod of Moldavia and György Rákóczi II, Prince of Transylvania). In *Szerencsének elegyes forgása: II. Rákóczi György és kora* (The alternating turns of fortune: György Rákóczi II and his age), ed. Gábor Kármán and András Péter Szabó, 61–96. Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2009.

Zeiller, Martin and Matthäus Merian. *Topographia Electorat. Brandenburgici et Ducatus Pomeraniae, das ist Beschreibung der Vornembsten und bekantisten Stätte in Plätz in dem ... Churfürstenthum vnd March Brandenburg; vnd dem Hertzogtum Pomeran...* [Frankfurt am Main]: Merian, 1652.

Zemon Davis, Natalie. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

———. “On the Lame.” *American Historical Review* 93 (1988 June): 572–603.

Zoványi, Jenő. *Puritánus mozgalmak a magyar református egyházban* (Puritan movements in the Hungarian Reformed Church). A Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság kiadványai, no. 28. Budapest: Hornyánszky, 1911.

———. *Magyarországi protestáns egyháztörténeti lexikon* (Lexicon for Hungarian Protestant church history). 3. ed. Edited by Sándor Ladányi. Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1977.

Zsilinszky, Mihály. *A magyar országgyűlések vallásügyi tárgyalásai a reformatiótól kezdve* (The negotiations on Hungarian diets concerning the confessional issue from the Reformation). Vol. 3, 1647–1687. A Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság kiadványai. Budapest: Hornyánszky, 1893.