

MUZEUL NAȚIONAL AL BANATULUI

ANALELE BANATULUI

Serie nouă

ARHEOLOGIE
ISTORIE

XXXI

2023

MEGA
Cluj-Napoca, 2023

Fondator**Ioachim Miloia****Colegiul de redacție**Claudiu ILAȘ, *manager al Muzeului Național al Banatului*Dr. Nicoleta DEMIAN, *redactor șef*Zsuzsanna KOPECZNY, *secretar de redacție*Dan L. CIOBOTARU, dr. Andrei GEORGESCU, dr. Zoran MARCOV, dr. Felicia OARCEA, dr. Călin TIMOC, *membri***Colegiul științific**

Dr. Costin FENEȘAN (București)

Dr. Bernhard Siegfried HEEB (Museums für Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz)

Prof. dr. Elke KAISER (Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie Freie Universität, Berlin)

Prof. dr. Raiko KRAUSS (Eberhard Karls Universität, Tübingen)

Dr. Stelian MÂNDRUȚ (Institutul de Istorie George Barițiu, Cluj-Napoca)

Prof. dr. PETROVICS István (Universitatea József Attila, Szeged)

Prof. emerit dr. Ioan PISO (Director al Centrului de Studii Romane, Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca)

Dr. Aurel RUSTOIU (Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei, Cluj-Napoca)

Dr. habil. Gábor SZABÓ (Institute of Archaeological Sciences, ELTE Faculty of Humanity, Budapest)

Prof. dr. Matthias WEMHOFF (Direktor des Museums für Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz)

Vigneta copertei: Wiliam Vastag †

Analele Banatului, serie nouă, continuă publicațiile anterioare ale Muzeului Banatului din Timișoara:*Történelmi és Régészeti Értesítő*, 1875–1918*Gemina*, 1923*Analele Banatului*, 1928–1931*Tibiscus*, 1971–1979

Orice corespondență se va adresa

Muzeului Național al Banatului, Piața Huniade nr. 1, RO–300002 Timișoara,

e-mail: analelebanatului@yahoo.com

Please send any mail to

Muzeul Național al Banatului, Piața Huniade nr. 1, RO–300002 Timișoara,

e-mail: analelebanatului@yahoo.com

Responsabilitatea asupra conținutului materialelor revine în exclusivitate autorilor.

ISSN 1221–678X

DTP: Editura Mega

Indexată în următoarele baze de date internaționale:

SCOPUS (<https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100224411>)DOAJ (<https://doaj.org/toc/1221-678X>)ICI Journals Master List (<https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/search/details?id=25470>)CEEOL (<https://www.cceol.com/search/journal-detail?id=2682>)Editura MEGA | www.edituramega.roe-mail: mega@edituramega.ro

CUPRINS ■ SOMMAIRE ■ INHALT ■ CONTENTS

ARHEOLOGIE ȘI ISTORIE VECHĂ

REMUS MIHAI FERARU

Le culte d'Apollon Didymeus dans les colonies milésiennes de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin ☞
The cult of Apollo Didymeus in the Milesian colonies of the Propontis and the Euxine Pontus 11

GABRIEL MIRCEA TALMAȚCHI

Despre un nou tezaur monetar de dioboli din Mesembria descoperit în sudul Dobrogei ☞ *About a new monetary hoard of diobols from Mesembria discovered in the south of Dobruja* 25

BOGDAN LĂPUȘAN

Keys, locking mechanisms and padlocks from the old collections of the National Museum of Banat, from Pojejena and Tibiscum 33

ANDREI-CĂTĂLIN DÎSCĂ, IULIAN LEONTI

Drumul roman imperial între Tibiscum și Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa. Câteva considerații și rezultatele unor cercetări de teren ☞ *The Roman Imperial road from Tibiscum to Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa. Several observations and the results of new field investigations* 49

ALEXANDRU FLUTUR

Considerații despre valurile romane din Banat ☞ *Considerations about the Roman earth embankments in Banat* 71

ROBERT GINDELE

Așezarea sarmatică descoperită la dezvoltarea infrastructurii rutiere de la Cerneteaz – Sit 7 (jud. Timiș) ☞ *The Sarmatian settlement discovered during the construction of the road infrastructure at Cerneteaz-Sit 7 (Timiș County)* 109

DANIELA TĂNASE

Din nou despre antichitățile romano-bizantine descoperite la Drobeta-Turnu Severin din colecția lui Imre Pongrácz ☞ *New remarks about the Roman-Byzantine antiquities discovered at Drobeta-Turnu Severin from the collection of Imre Pongrácz* 137

LUCRĂRI PREZENTATE ÎN CADRUL CONFERINȚEI „POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE. DAILY LIFE IN MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN TIMES (11TH–17TH CENTURIES)” (7–8 OCTOMBRIE 2021, TIMIȘOARA)

JELENA ĐORĐEVIĆ, VOJISLAV ĐORĐEVIĆ

“Livade-Đurđevac” near Pančevo. Results of archaeological research of medieval churches and necropolises 2009–2013 157

ALEKSANDAR KRSTIĆ

Reflection of daily life in medieval inscriptions and notes from Serbia and Bosnia (12th–16th centuries) 181

MILOŠ MAREK	
„In numerum proscriptorum malefactorum assignati“. Proscription in Banat and Transylvania in the Middle Ages (14 th –15 th century)	193
ELEK SZASZKÓ	
The last members of the Dobozi Dánfi family	203
MIKLÓS FÓTI, ISTVÁN PÁNYA	
Topographic data in Ottoman registers as a resource for the identification of vanished settlements in Bodrog County	213
NICULINA DINU	
Ottoman pottery discovered in Hârșova fortress in year 2020	227

ISTORIE MODERNĂ ȘI CONTEMPORANĂ

COSTIN FENEȘAN	
O încercare de reglementare a veniturilor fiscale din Transilvania în timpul celei de-a doua ocupații habsburgice (1603) ☞ <i>An attempt to regulate tax revenues in Transylvania during the second Habsburg occupation (1603)</i>	239
HAJNALKA TÓTH	
The 1707 raid of Kecskemét by Serbs and its diplomatic consequences in Habsburg–Ottoman relations	261
ZORAN MARCOV	
Coifurile Gărzii Cetățenești din Timișoara din colecția Muzeului Național al Banatului (prima jumătate a sec. al XIX-lea) ☞ <i>The helmets of the Citizen Guard from Timisoara from the collection of the National Museum of Banat (first half of the 19th century)</i>	273
RÓBERT KÁROLY SZABÓ	
Die historiografische Bedeutung der Schulregister der siebenbürgischen reformierten Schulen im Ersten Weltkrieg ☞ <i>The historiographical significance of register books of Transylvanian reformed schools in the First World War</i>	287
MARIAN-ALIN DUDOI	
The Romanian election of 1946 in the Norwegian press	297
RADU TABĂRĂ	
Serviciul Muncii. Analiză a impactului său economic la nivelul economiei naționale (1950–1961) ☞ <i>The Labor Service. Analysis of its economic impact on the national economy (1950–1961)</i>	301
VASILE RĂMNEANȚU	
Ultima vizită de lucru a lui Nicolae Ceaușescu în județul Timiș (14–15 septembrie 1988) ☞ <i>Nicolae Ceaușescu's last working visit in Timiș County (September 14–15, 1988)</i>	311

ISTORIA CULTURII, ARTEI, MUZEOLOGIE, RESTITUIRI

MIRELA BONCEA, CĂLIN TIMOC	
Despre activitatea de anticar și colecționar a umanistului italian Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli ☞ <i>The activity of the Italian humanist Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli as an antiquarian and collector</i>	323

RECENZII, PREZENTĂRI DE CARTE

ANDREI MIC

Sorin Mitu (editor), *Raporturi și imagini româno-maghiare*, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Argonaut-Mega, 2023,
211 p. 335

OBITUARIA

Kakucs Lajos (1944–2023)..... 339

ABREVIERI BIBLIOGRAFICE/ ABREVIATIONS BIBLIOGRAPHIQUES 343

THE 1707 RAID OF KECSKEMÉT BY SERBS AND ITS DIPLOMATIC CONSEQUENCES IN HABSBURG–OTTOMAN RELATIONS*

Hajnalka Tóth**

Keywords: Habsburg–Ottoman borderland, Habsburg–Ottoman diplomacy, Kecskemét, Kuruc, Elçi Ibarhim Pasha of Belgrade, Dietrich Heinrich Baron de Nehem, Osman Agha of Timișoara.

Abstract

At the beginning of 1707, about sixty Turkish and Greek merchants arrived in Szeged from Timișoara and Belgrade to then sell their goods on Hungarian territory. In Szeged they paid the usual customs duty and then received permission from the Habsburg imperial general to proceed. The merchants then went to Kecskemét, which was then in the hands of Hungarians (Kuruc insurgents), where they were arrested and forced to sell their goods at a fixed price, and were not allowed to leave the city. While the Elçi Ibarhim Pasha of Timișoara sent his interpreter, Osman Agha, to the kuruc generals, the imperial commander of Slavonski Brod stormed the town of Kecskemét with Serbian hussars and hajduks, and the merchants were also killed in the attack. The present study examines, using primarily Hungarian and German language sources, the raid on Kecskemét and its causes, as well as the Habsburg–Ottoman diplomatic wrangling that unfolded afterward, lasting for years. The case provides a detailed insight into the management of a border conflict between the two empires, the different ways in which the administrators of the two sides worked, and the less rule-bound ‘negotiating techniques’ of the Ottomans as well.

The war (1683–1699) that shattered the Ottoman domination of Central and Eastern Europe was brought to a close by the treaties concluded in January 1699 at Karlowitz (Hung. Karlóca, today Sremski Karlovci in Serbia) between the Holy League states – the Habsburg Empire, Venice, Poland and Russia – and the Ottoman Empire, and by the Russian–Ottoman armistice.¹

The fourteenth point of the treaty, which consisted of twenty articles, between the Habsburg Court and the Ottoman Porte, stipulated that merchants of the two empires could continue to trade freely and without harm in each other’s territories.² Although there was peace between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, the War of Independence led by Ferenc Rákóczi II took place between 1703 and 1711 in the Kingdom of Hungary,³ which was part of the Habsburg Empire, in the (Kuruc⁴) struggle

* The first version of the study was published in Hungarian in 2018 under the title *Török kereskedők nehézségei a kuruc korban – avagy hogyan ne kereskedjünk Magyarországon a Rákóczi-szabadságharc idején* [‘Turkish traders’ difficulties in the Kuruc era – or how not to trade in Hungary during the Rákóczi War of Independence] (Tóth 2018). The present paper is a revised version of the study, which was prepared in the framework of the work of the HUN-REN–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age. Throughout the paper, present-day official names of towns are used (unless a town has a conventionally used English name, such as *Belgrade*).

** University of Szeged, HUN-REN Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Szeged), ORCID: 0000-0003-1913-8096, email: toth.hajnalka@szte.hu.

¹ For a Latin translation of the Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaty, see Katona 1805, 106–125; for a Hungarian translation of Katona’s text, see Sinkovics 1968, 690–700; for a Hungarian translation of the original Latin clarification of the peace treaty, see Szita–Seewann 1999, 213–225; for the Ottoman Turkish edition of the peace, see *Muabedat mecmuasi* 1297/1880, 92–102., Defterdar 1995, 654–662., Silâhdar 1962, 357–364. See Szita–Seewann 1999, 239–243

for a Hungarian translation of the original Latin clarification of the Venetian–Ottoman peace treaty of the same period. For a Hungarian translation of the original Latin version of the Polish–Ottoman peace treaty, see Szita–Seewann 1999, 229–235.

For a Hungarian translation of an official Latin copy of the Russian–Ottoman armistice document of the same period, see Szita–Seewann 1999, 247–248. For the locations of the Russian and German versions of the document, see Gebei 2001, 141, note 16. The Treaty of Constantinople was signed on July 3, 1700. For a Hungarian translation of the Russian version of the peace treaty, see Gebei 2001, 150–154. In Turkish, see Defterdar 1995, 692–698.

² Szita–Seewann 1999, 220–221; *Muabedat mecmuasi* 1297/1880, 99; Defterdar 1995, 659–660; Silâhdar 1962, 362.

³ After the peace treaty of Karlowitz, the Timișoara vilâjet remained part of the Ottoman Empire.

⁴ The term *Kuruc* denotes anti-Habsburg rebels in Royal Hungary from the 1670’s until 1711.

for independence. In the resulting political situation in Hungary, it became questionable whether the above-mentioned interstate peace points could be respected, whether the merchants could continue to operate unharmed, and whether the problems on the border could be solved. The present study provides contributions to these issues by discussing the most resonant conflict of the period, the Serbian (in Hungarian sources: *rác*) raid on Kecskemét in 1707 and the subsequent diplomatic negotiations.

After the peace treaty of Karlowitz, permission and letters of protection issued by the local leaders of the two sides along the border, the pashas of Belgrade (Hung. Nándorfehérvár, today Beograd in Serbia) and Timișoara (Hung. Temesvár, Germ. Temeswar, Turk. Temeşvar; today in Romania,) on the one hand, and the imperial commanders on the other hand were required for the merchants to cross the border and travel safely. The importance of such documents increased with the outbreak of the Rákóczi War of Independence, but at the same time merchants, whether Ottoman or Habsburg, were willing to take great risks in the war in search of profits. On April 3, 1707, however, more than fifty Turkish and Greek merchants were robbed and killed in Kecskemét by Serbian hussars and hajduks (in German sources: *Rätzen*) in the service of the Habsburgs. The incident was followed by years of tense diplomatic wrangling between the two empires. Thanks to the historical hymn by János Székudvari, the rector of the reformed school in Kecskemét, entitled *Sűrű sírhalmokkal rakott jajhalom* (A heap of wails built of many graves),⁵ written in 1707, and the letter by Kuruc colonel János Csajági,⁶ Hungarian historiography has already detailed and accurate knowledge of the events in Kecskemét.⁷ The letter of Elçi

İbrahim Pasha Commander of Belgrade⁸ to Ferenc Rákóczi II dated after April 3, 1707, also reported the events.⁹ The events of the diplomatic negotiations that followed the incident were also recorded in great detail by the contemporary Ottoman narrator Osman Agha of Timișoara (in Turkish: Temeşvarlı Osman Ağa),¹⁰ and in addition, the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Turcica in Vienna has two and a half boxes of documents, still hardly researched, dealing with the case.¹¹

The reasons behind the massacre in Kecskemét have been neglected in the historical literature on the subject, although, even in wartime conditions, the looting and killing of fifty-five/fifty-three¹² merchants was unheard-of, as was the destruction of the town of Kecskemét. The town, which was under the jurisdiction of the Kuruc insurgents at the time in question, had to be evacuated several times in the years preceding the incident, sometimes because of attacks by the insurgents and sometimes by the imperial, mainly Serbian, army.¹³ As a direct antecedent to the raid, Székudvari also wrote that the Kuruc insurgents had previously attacked the Serbs, for which the latter wanted revenge.¹⁴ In March 1707, in the midst of the ongoing Kuruc–Serbian hostilities and clashes, Kuruc brigadier István Berthóti and his soldiers, with the approval of Kuruc generals Sándor Károlyi and Miklós Bercsényi, attacked Serbian settlements in Bačka (Hung. Bácska, geographical and historical area, today in Serbia). According to Berthóti's account, the two thousand-strong troop raided four villages: one hundred and fifty people were killed and forty prisoners taken.¹⁵

⁵ János Székudvari's work was first published in 1866 by János Hornyik in his work on the city of Kecskemét, Hornyik 1866, 397–414. Kálmán Thaly also published the work in 1872, comparing Hornyik's edition with the fragmentary but contemporary copy in the manuscript archives of the Academy, and noting the differences in it: Thaly 1872, 151–182. László Szalay referred to a work by a Franciscan monk (Szalay 1859, 396), the work is a sermon or farewell by Vince Blahó (1725–1785), a Franciscan monk, delivered in Kecskemét in 1772 and published in 1775, the new edition of which appeared in Bánkúti 1991. Presumably the source of the short summary of the events in Kecskemét, which can be read here, was also Székudvari's historical hymn, which Katona also quoted in his 1806 work, 523. On Vince Blahó, see most recently Molnár 2002.

⁶ János Csajági's letter to Sándor Károlyi. Gyöngyös, April 17, 1707: Bánkúti 1994, 97–98.

⁷ Hornyik 1866; Thaly 1872; Szalay 1859.

⁸ Elçi İbrahim Pasha arrived in Vienna in January 1700 as the official ambassador of the Porte: *Anonim* 2000, 138. On his return from Vienna he was appointed head of the Timișoara vilajet: Defterdar 1995, 681; F. Molnár 2006, 1486; Kreutel–Spies 1962, 205. Then İbrahim became Pasha of Rumelia: Kreutel–Spies 1962, 205. And after the appointment of Damad Hasan Pasha as Grand Vizier (November 18, 1703 through September 28, 1704), he became Pasha of Bosnia: Defterdar 1995, 838. Shortly afterwards, he was appointed head of the Belgrade vilajet: Kreutel–Spies 1962, 207; Fekete 1993, 441., 441. note 20.

⁹ Letter of Elçi İbrahim to Ferenc Rákóczi II. Belgrade, [after 3 April 1707]: Fekete 1993, 441.

¹⁰ Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, *passim*.

¹¹ ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177., 178., 179. The Kecskemét case was also recently written about by Ömer Gezer: Gezer 2021.

¹² The sources mention different numbers, see below.

¹³ Hornyik 1866, 178–181. On the losses suffered by the inhabitants of Kecskemét from the Kuruc, Serbian and German armies, see Bánkúti 1994, 68–74.

¹⁴ Hornyik 1866, 403; Thaly 1872, 159.

¹⁵ István Berthóti's letter to Miklós Bercsényi. Kecskemét,

In return, on 3 April, 1707, the fourth Sunday of Great Lent, the imperial commander of Slavonski Brod (Hung. Bród, today in Croatia), Constantin von Cobila (Colonel *Kovay*) and Ober Capitan Vulin attacked the town¹⁶ with about a thousand Serbian hussars – or, according to Székudvari's work, with two thousand horsemen and a thousand infantry.¹⁷ The night before, the Serbs had approached Kecskemét, spied out the town and attacked in the morning. As the Serbian army had threatened the town of Nagykőrös a short time before, the armed men of Kecskemét rushed to their aid, leaving their own town defenceless.¹⁸ All they could muster were two hundred armed men, who were helpless against the Serbs. In addition to the brutality of the robbery and the bloodshed, the inhabitants were shocked because many of the attackers had previously served Kecskemét citizens. Székudvari also made an account of the victims and the damage as an appendix to his historical song, according to which the Serbs may have killed about four hundred people and abducted one hundred and fifty-five to one hundred and sixty-five people.¹⁹

The fifty-five/fifty-three Turkish and Greek merchants in the focus of the present study lost their lives in the raid.²⁰ They had arrived in Szeged from Timișoara and Belgrade sometime in early

March 19, 1707: Bánkúti 1994, 95. On the Kuruc brigadier István Bertóthi, see Heckenast 2005, 61.

¹⁶ Cf. Johann Friedrich von Globitz's letter to the Aulic War Council. Vienna, March 8, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 1. fol. 97r. János Csajági put the number of the attacking Serbs at barely a thousand and a half: Bánkúti 1994, 98. The full name of the commander of Slavonski Brod is given in General Globitz's report. In the work of Osman Agha he is listed as *Kovay*: Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 59.

¹⁷ Using Székudvari's data, Hornyik 1866, 403; Thaly 1872, 160–161.

¹⁸ Cf. János Csajági's letter to Sándor Károlyi. Gyöngyös, April 17, 1707: Bánkúti 1994, 99.

¹⁹ Hornyik 1866, 403; Thaly 1872, 159. Cf. the report of de Renaud, Obristleutenant of the Nehem regiment, that many people were killed, including Ottomans, and four hundred houses were burnt: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 445. (1707. 04–07.) fol. 560r. The figures in the various editions of Székudvari's work are not identical, and Hornyik gives the number of widows on page 187 of his own work as 102, while the Székudvari text he published gives 202: Hornyik 1866, 398, 413–414. Cf. Thaly 1872, 180, 183. The monk Vince Blahó also provided figures on the losses, which also differ from the previous ones: Bánkúti 1991, 25.

²⁰ Cf. Hornyik 1866, 412; Thaly 1872, 177. In a letter addressed to Ferenc Rákóczi, the Pasha Elçi Ibrahim of Belgrade wrote about 53 Turkish merchants and one Greek *zimmi*: Fekete 1993, 441. Gezer found a list of thirty-six names of the dead as an appendix to General Dietrich

1707, presumably in February, to sell their goods in Habsburg territory. After payment of the customs duty, they received a letter of protection from the General of Szeged, Johann Friedrich Freiherr von Globitz,²¹ that they would not be harmed by the military in the service of the Emperor.²² The merchants, however, went to Kecskemét, which was in the hands of the Kuruc insurgents. After they had paid the customs there, they were detained for the next six weeks and demanded to sell their goods in the city at a fixed price.²³ Only three of the traders escaped during the Serbs' raid, but all were looted. The water carrier of one of the victims survived only because he was dressed in Serbian clothes and could speak Serbian.²⁴ The people of Kecskemét buried the slaughtered merchants, together with the Serbs who died in the raid, in a separate area in the eastern part of the town, a place known as the *Ráctemető* (Serbian cemetery) even in the 19th century.²⁵

Immediately after the bloodshed, the demand for the return of the enslaved Kecskemét locals was launched, and from the Ottoman side Elçi İbrahim Pasha of Belgrade and Karayılanoğlu Ali Pasha of Timișoara²⁶ demanded compensation for the murdered merchants. The return of the Kecskemét locals was completed relatively quickly, although not without losses, in the summer of 1707. Both General Globitz of Szeged and

Nehem's report of September 18, 1708 (Gezer 2021, 62), which presumably does not mention all the victims.

²¹ On Johann Friedrich von Globitz, see Heckenast 2005, 160.

²² Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 25–26; Hornyik 1866, 187. Globitz immediately informed the Aulic War Council about the events in Kecskemét: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 445. Exp. (1707. 04–07.) fol. 554v.

²³ The merchants wrote a Greek-language request to Ali Pasha of Timișoara, who had sent the divan interpreter Osman Agha from Timișoara to the Kuruc leaders regarding several other matters. During the course of his approximately one and a half month-long assignment, the Agha also negotiated with Sándor Károlyi, Miklós Bercsényi and Ferenc Rákóczi II. When he returned to Timișoara, the merchants had not yet been released from Kecskemét. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 25–59. Cf. Hornyik 1866, 189.

²⁴ Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Slankamen, December 24, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 241v–242r. Cf. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 80, 88. In describing the incident, Hornyik mentions that the merchants were fleeing towards Nagykőrös when the Serbs attacked them. Hornyik 1866, 186–187.

²⁵ Hornyik 1866, 187–188.

²⁶ Karayılanoğlu Ali Pasha held the office of Pasha of Timișoara from July 15, 1706 to October 1708: Fekete 1993, 452, note 44. Cf. Kreutel–Spies 1962, 207.

Dietrich Heinrich Baron de Nehem Commander General of Petrovaradin²⁷ were helpful in this, but in return they demanded the return of the Bačka Serbs previously taken by the Kuruc insurgents.²⁸ The exchange of prisoners continued unabated, and Globitz had already informed the judges in Kecskemét in a letter dated June 9 that he would detain the prisoners he still had until the Serbian prisoners still held by the insurgents were sent to him, within 15 days.²⁹

On 6 April, the companions of the murdered and looted merchants in Szeged wrote to the leaders of Kecskemét to inquire about the events and their three surviving merchants.³⁰ The heirs of the victims appealed to the pashas of Timișoara and Belgrade for redress and compensation. Ali Pasha demanded retribution from General Globitz and punishment for the perpetrators, describing the actions of the Serbs in the service of the Habsburgs as a breach of the peace.³¹ The General, having no jurisdiction over Slavonski Brod, denied responsibility but informed the Aulic War Council of what had happened.³² After Elçi İbrahim Pasha of

Belgrade had received a similar reply from General Nehem of Petrovaradin, he demanded compensation from Rákóczi, as the incident had occurred in territory under Kuruc jurisdiction.³³ Then he informed the Porte as well: Halil Agha had arrived in Constantinople on May 5 with news of the massacre, and had also visited the then Habsburg resident, Michael Talman.³⁴ By appealing directly to the Sublime Porte for help, Grand Vizier Damad Çorlulu Ali Pasha (1706–1710)³⁵ summoned Talman, and the matter reached the highest diplomatic level.³⁶

The official position of the Viennese court was that the Serbs had been sent to Kecskemét to disarm the Kuruc insurgents, and that the Turkish and Greek merchants should not have been there. Following the reply, the Turks in Constantinople summoned Talman for an audience, who suggested that special envoys be appointed from both sides, as laid down in the eleventh article of the Peace of Karlowitz,³⁷ in order to settle the disputes on the spot.³⁸ Although the Porte unequivocally considered the events to be a breach of the peace, they were in favour of a peaceful settlement,³⁹ thanks to the cautious policy of the Ottoman government, which was struggling with internal problems.⁴⁰ This was well received in Vienna, concerned about French diplomatic moves to encourage the Ottomans to intervene on the side of Rákóczi's

²⁷ On Dietrich Heinrich Freiherr von Nehem, see Heckenast 2005, 303.

²⁸ Bánkúti 1994, 96–97. By May 9 Nehem had a list of 113 deportees drawn up, on which other information was also recorded, such as the fact that three had escaped from captivity, three women had married, four had died and several others had been released: Bánkúti 1994, 102–103. Another list from the end of May or beginning of June contains the names of the people of Kecskemét who had been freed from the hands of the kuruc rebels by the commander of Petrovaradin and taken under his control and support: Bánkúti 1994, 104–106. Cf. Hornyik 1866, 188. Cf. the report of Johann Heinrich Seyfrid, commissar to the Aulic War Council, May 1707. ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 445. Exp. (1707. 04–07.) fol. 711v.

²⁹ Bánkúti 1994, 109. The letter was accompanied by a list of the wanted Serbian prisoners: *ibidem*, 109–110.

³⁰ Letter by Çamaşır İbrahim *beşe*, Osman Agha of Belgrade and Hasan *beşe* of Belgrade to the judges and jurors of the city of Kecskemét. Szeged, April 6, 1707: Hornyik 1866, 415. The Hungarian source publication erroneously uses the term „passa” instead of „bese”, as it is not the title of the Turkish word *paşa*, but the word *beşe*, which means „comrade”.

³¹ In his work, Osman Agha published the Ali Pasha's letter, which is indeed related to the events, but its date is wrong: 17th day of the month Receb in the year 1118 [October 25, 1706]. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 60–61. The erroneous date is explained for the time being by the possibility of an error in the copies and notes used for the work, which was compiled afterwards. Cf. Johann Friedrich von Globitz's letters to the Aulic War Council, May 1707: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 445 Exp. (04–07 1707) fol. 657r, 683v.

³² The General's letter was also published by Osman Agha, which is also wrongly dated: 22nd day of the month Receb in the year 1118 [October 30, 1706]. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 61–62.

³³ Elçi İbrahim Pasha's letter to Ferenc Rákóczi II. Belgrade, [after April 3, 1707]: Fekete 1993, 441. Letter of Ferenc Rákóczi II. to Elçi İbrahim Pasha, Serdar of Belgrade. Szerecs, May 23, 1707: Benda–Maksay 1961, 274–276.

³⁴ Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, May 16, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 123r–124r. Cf. *de Renaud's* report to the Aulic War Council, May 1707: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 445. Exp. (04–07 1707) fol. 656r. On Michael Talman see Szabados 2013, 385–386; Szabados 2015, 76; Tóth 2021, *passim*; Gezer 2022.

³⁵ On Damad Çorlulu Ali Pasha see Aktepe 1993.

³⁶ See Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 64.

³⁷ Szita–Seewann 1999, 219; *Muabedat mecmuasi* 1297/1880, 97–98; Defterdar 1995, 658; Silâhdar 1962, 360. Cf. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 64.

³⁸ Cf. *de Renaud's* report to the Aulic War Council, July 1707: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 445. Exp. (1707. 04–07.) fol. 967v.

³⁹ Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, October 13, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 162v.

⁴⁰ The extremely critical state of the Porte's government is reflected in the fact that between September 1697 and May 1706, eight grand vizierates succeeded each other, and in July 1703, the reign of Sultan Mustafa II (1695–1703) was overthrown by a disaffected military. The frequent changes of grand vizier also had an impact in the provinces, including the Habsburg–Kuruc–Ottoman borderlands.

army and, more specifically, about the actions of Elçi İbrahim Pasha of Belgrade.⁴¹

The governor of Belgrade, who was considered very dangerous in Vienna, was finally entrusted with the management of the border negotiations on the part of the Porte, while on the Habsburg side the matter was assigned to General Nehem of Petrovaradin. Their appointment took place in September or October 1707, after which both parties set up committee of inquiry, which were assigned to Stari Slankamen (Hung. Szalánkemén, today in Serbia).⁴² There are two lists of members of the Turkish commission: in addition to Osman Agha of Timișoara, who was reinstated, İbrahim Effendi, Osman Beg, Mehmed Agha and Ahmed Beg participated in the committee, and a vice-kadi also accompanied them.⁴³ In General Nehem's report of December 10, Osman Agha is not mentioned, but Jusuf Zaim is, and the Ottoman vice-kadi is also named, as Abdul Effendi.⁴⁴ On the Habsburg side, the committee was headed by Johann Adam Lachowitz, chief court interpreter and secretary,⁴⁵ accompanied by Lieutenant-Colonel Dörck and Assistant Officer Haas.⁴⁶ The two committees met for the first time in December 1707, eight months after the events.⁴⁷

The settlement of the Habsburg–Ottoman conflict was hindered by several factors: on the one

hand, the delay in setting up the committees, for which we do not have a concrete explanation at present, but the political situation in Hungary and the possible exploitation of this situation to advance Ottoman interests may have played a role. The possibility of open armed assistance from the Ottomans could not be ruled out,⁴⁸ partly because of previous experience, and partly because the Pasha who was the very person appointed in charge of the negotiations was considered to be pro-war as well as known for his extremely difficult character.⁴⁹ It was unpredictable how much room for manoeuvre İbrahim Pasha had and whether there would be consequences if he went against official government policy. The problem was caused by the very distant positions of the opposing sides: the Ottomans believed that the imperial side was clearly responsible for the murder and plunder of the merchants, since the victims had received letters of protection from General Globitz of Szeged; and on this basis they demanded monetary compensation and punishment of the perpetrators, even blood revenge.⁵⁰ The Habsburg side had insisted throughout that, on the one hand, the Serbs were not ordered to attack Kecskemét but to search out the Kuruc rebels, and, on the other hand, that the letter of protection from Globitz did not mean that they would protect the merchants in territory held by the kuruc.⁵¹

⁴¹ Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, October 13, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 154v–155r. On Turkish diplomacy in the Rákóczi War of Independence, see Benda 1962; Papp 2004; Vatai 2011; Tóth 2019a.

⁴² At the end of October 1707, İbrahim Pasha blamed the General of Petrovaradin for the delay in setting up the committees of inquiry. Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, November 7, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 176r. Talman was again called to account for the Pasha's letter on November 2, and had to write to Petrovaradin on the Grand Vizier's orders to expedite matters. Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, November 7, 1707.: *ibidem*, fol. 176r–177v.

⁴³ Kreutel–Spies 1962, 206–207; Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 65–66.

⁴⁴ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, December 12, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 216r.

⁴⁵ On the activities of Johann Adam Lachowitz, see Tóth 2021.

⁴⁶ In Osman Agha's recollections, the imperial commissioners were „Lackowitz”, the chief lieutenant of the Aulic War Council, „Türkch”, lieutenant colonel of the engineer of Petrovaradin, and „Kastner”, captain of the general's corps regiment. Kreutel–Spies 1962, 206–207; Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 65–66.

⁴⁷ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, December 12, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 216r.

⁴⁸ Although there were examples of Turkish and Tatar mercenary troops being hired in the early days of the Rákóczi War of Independence, the Porte did not provide much armed assistance, and at the same time did not break the Treaty of Karlowitz with the Habsburg Empire. See Benda 1962, 202–203; Papp 2004, 801; Vatai 2011, 97; Tóth 2019a, *passim*. On the Turkish and Tatar soldiers fighting in the Kuruc army, see Dávid 1980; Seres 1996.

⁴⁹ „Weilen es nuhn das ansehen hat, als wann obbemelter bascha die entstandene differentien mehrers zu embröwilliren als zu applaniren suchet, als bitte gehorsamst, so bald es möglich, mich meines ferneren verhaltens zu instruiren, damit dieses bösen menschen weit aussehendes vorhaben (wo man bey der Porten nicht schon andere mesures genohmen), annoch in tempore hintertrieben werden könne.” Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, December 17, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 218r. Cf. the characterisation of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, who called the pope mad: F. Molnár 2008, 104–105., 184.

⁵⁰ Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 67–74. Cf. Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Slankamen, December 18, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 237r–v; Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Slankamen, December 24, 1707: *ibidem*, fol. 254r.

⁵¹ “Vierdtens findet man unser seits nicht, das der ketschke-meter einfall gegen die capitulationes geschehen, unsere husaren und heyduckhen haben hiezu keinen befehl gehabt,

In addition, we cannot ignore the differences in the operating and decision-making mechanisms of the two sides, nor the competence and even the habitus of the two committees and their leaders, although the latter is difficult to assess objectively. On the Habsburg side, Lachowitz kept General Nehem informed of developments by means of regular reports, who forwarded copies of both the secretary's and Talman's letters from the Porte and his replies, to Vienna, where they were submitted to the Aulic War Council for its opinion and, together with proposals for solutions, to the Emperor. New instructions were only given to the General and the Habsburg resident of the Porte after the Emperor's approval. By contrast, Elçi İbrahim Pasha acted as plenipotentiary in the negotiation of border matters and, although he corresponded with members of the Sultan's divan, he did not inform the Porte, or did so inaccurately. But it also says a lot about the distrust of the Porte's officials that they were informed of the Pasha's activities by Talman.⁵²

In December 1707, the committees, headed by Secretary Lachowitz and İbrahim Effendi, began (or rather, were to begin) their work with

sondern nuhr den feind gesucht. Die [220v] türckhische kaufleuthe seyndt unter denen rebellen gefunden worden, haben sich auch mit ihnen zuer gegenwehr gesetzt. Wie wäre es dann möglich gewesen, bey einem nächtlischen einfall einen unterschied zu machen? Ketskemets ist seith der rebellion nicht in unseren, sondern feinds händen, die rebellen haben die kaufleuthe etliche wochen aufgehalten und sich mithin verbündlich gemacht, selbige zu schützen. Die segediner päße seyndt denen kaufleuthe auf ihr importunes anhalten und ihre eigene gefahr, damit es nicht das ansehen habe, als wann mann ihr commercium hemmen wolte, gegeben worden. Können sich auch bis in einem feindlichen und von ihren truppen besetzten orth, wo wür dermahln nicht mesiter seyndt, keines wegs extendiren. Erhellet also gnugsamb hieraus, das nicht wür wegen dieses unser seits, gnugsamb beklagen unglückhs, sondern die rebellen satisfaction zu geben schuldig seyndt. Das beste wäre gewesen, wann lauth der friedensarticuln sich diese kaufleuthe nicht unter denen rebellen hätten finden lassen." Cf. Dietrich Nehem's letter to Michael Talman. Petrovaradin, December 16, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 220r–v. Cf. Dietrich Nehem's letter to Johann Adam Lachowitz. Petrovaradin, January 1, 1708: *ibidem*, Kt. 178. Konv. 1. fol. 2v. Cf. „Auß den friedensarticuln sehe ich nicht, wie die Türcken die sicherheit ihrer kaufleuth im feindlichen territorio und kriege von unß verlangen können, da solche ja, nicht anders, alß in ksl. gebieth qua tali und nicht vom feinde besetzen zu extendiren." Johann Friedrich von Globitz's letter to the Aulic War Council. Vienna, March 8, 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 96v.

⁵² Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, March 4, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 1. fol. 88v–89r. (Cf. Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin] March, 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 451. Exp. (1708. 01–06.) fol. 372r.)

a convivial coffee. The Habsburg delegation was confronted with the fact that Elçi İbrahim Pasha had identified points of negotiation that were in fact long-standing unresolved issues.⁵³ The first was to settle a conflict that had been dragging on since 1704: the return of a French ship stolen at Durrës (it. Durazzo, today in Albania), then held by the Ottomans, and the resolution of the *çardak* problem (*çardaks* being the guardhouses built on the border in the border region of Serbia), which had also been dragging on for years.⁵⁴ The Habsburg delegation, however, had no mandate to discuss these matters, and substantive negotiations were again delayed. The issue of the merchants and the representation of the interests of the survivors and business partners was already on the back burner when the negotiations started.

Osman Agha discreetly kept quiet about the other ways in which Elçi İbrahim Pasha of Belgrade had obstructed the negotiations: he regularly detained and even sent back to Petrovaradin the imperial couriers on their way to Constantinople bearing letters.⁵⁵ In May and June 1708, he held

⁵³ Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Blankamen, December 15, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 226r–227v; Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, December 17, 1707: *ibidem*, fol. 218r–v. (Cf. Receipt of Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 446. Exp. (1707. 08–12.) fol. 1485r.) Osman Agha interpreted this as a sign that the imperial commissioners wanted to do something else: Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 73–77. Cf. Michael Talman's letter to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, November 7, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 177r. Elçi İbrahim Pasha had already sent a letter to Prince Eugen von Savoyen, President of the Aulic War Council, in July, but it was not filed with the Aulic War Council until September: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 446. Exp. (1707. 08–12.) fol. 1198v.

⁵⁴ The Viennese court wanted to set up a special commission to resolve the Durrës (Durazzo) conflict and to discuss the *çardak* problem. After the Christmas holidays, General Nehem sent his quartermaster and interpreter to Elçi İbrahim Pasha to persuade him to continue the negotiations. Dietrich Nehem's letter to Johann Adam Lachowitz. Karlowitz, December 21, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 241r. Cf. Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, January 3, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 1. fol. 1v. (See also Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin] January, 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 451. Exp. (1708. 01–06.) fol. 101r; Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin] March, 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 375r.) On the Durrës (Durazzo) case, see also Szabados 2015, 96–97.

⁵⁵ Michael Talman's letter to Dietrich Nehem. Constantinople, November 22, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 222r; Dietrich Nehem's

Lachowitz, who had come to him for personal negotiations, captive for several weeks,⁵⁶ and marched with the Pasha's troops as far as Šabac (Hung. Szabács, today in Serbia) to put pressure on the Habsburg court, or at least to force the unification of Nehem's troops.⁵⁷

The negotiations, which turned out to be very complicated, were basically about money. By agreeing to the negotiations, the Viennese court accepted the Ottomans' claim for compensation, mainly from the heirs of the merchants. The main problem in the negotiations, which lasted a year and a half, was determining the amount. Since the merchants paid customs duty in Szeged, the value of the goods brought into Hungarian territory could be easily established on the basis of the customs logbooks. According to the records, the traders had paid a total of 500 thalers in customs duty, which meant that the value of the goods they had – as declared – could not have been more than 16,000 thalers.⁵⁸ On the other hand, the Ottoman side demanded compensation of 120 bags (Turk. *kese*, Germ. *Beutel*) for the total stock of goods held by the merchants (the Agha also agreed that they had concealed most of their goods)⁵⁹ and for human losses, and refused to budge. According to General Nehem's report of May 1, 1708, the

report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, December 17, 1707: *ibidem*, fol. 220v.

⁵⁶ Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Slankamen, December 18, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 238v. Cf. Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin], July 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 452. Exp. (1708. 07–12.) fol. 791r; The Aulic War Council to Michael Talman. Vienna, June 18, 1708: *ibidem*, Bd. 453. Reg. (1708. 01–06.) fol. 653r; The Aulic War Council to Dietrich Nehem. Vienna, June 18, 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 653r, 653v.

⁵⁷ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, May 1, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 2. fol. 41r; Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, 21 May, 3 June and 8 June 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 50r, 87v, 98r–v.

⁵⁸ Michael Talman's report to the Aulic War Council. Constantinople, October 6, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 78r. In Osman Agha's work, this sum is given as 32 bags: Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 83. In addition to the official figures, the surviving victims also gave testimony: the interrogation of Seydi Ahmed and his water carrier is described in Osman Agha's memoir, where he put the value of his own goods at 3,000 gurus, and his testimony had to be confirmed by two men under oath. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 86–90. Cf. Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Slankamen, December 24, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 177. Konv. 3. fol. 241v–242r.

⁵⁹ Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 83.

amount was finalized as 62,648 ½ (lion) thalers (about 125 bags), which he considered to be unreasonably high.⁶⁰ From the reports of Secretary Lachowitz and General Nehem, it can be concluded that a substantial part of the sum would have ended up in the Pasha's treasury rather than in the hands of the heirs of the victims, and it had since been discovered that İbrahim Pasha had also claimed some gifts,⁶¹ which were included in the above amount.⁶² In July, the Pasha received strict orders to bring the Kecskemét affair to an end as soon as possible,⁶³ but this had to wait because in August the plague epidemic, which was in the process of abating, reached Belgrade, and at the end of the month Nehem informed the Viennese court that İbrahim Pasha was also suffering from a high fever.⁶⁴ In September 1708, Lachowitz, who had been released from Pasha's captivity, presented his superior with the Ottomans' calculations at the time: they were demanding a total of 72,750 thalers 9 paras and 3 aspers (about 145 bags).⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, May 1, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 2. fol. 41r–v. On the value of the lion's thaler, see Buza 1981–1982. In June, the possibility of compensation of 100 bags (50,000 thalers) was already being considered at the Porte and on the border, but in the meantime Elçi İbrahim Pasha had reinforced his forces and was still holding Lachowitz prisoner. Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, June 8, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 2. fol. 98r.

⁶¹ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, June 26, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilung, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 2. fol. 155r.

⁶² Nehem wrote in his report of September 8 about a gift of 2,000 ducats demanded by the Pasha, and on October 2 he mentioned a gift of 30 bags. Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, 8 September 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilung, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 47r; Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, October 2, 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 56v.

⁶³ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, July 27, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilung, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 11r.

⁶⁴ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, August 30, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilung, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 45r. At the same time, the General also reported that several of his staff, including Secretary Lachowitz, had fallen ill, so that he was unable to write or have letters translated.

⁶⁵ Johann Adam Lachowitz's report to Dietrich Nehem. Stari Slankamen, September 10, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 43r. Cf. „Communicatur die von denen Türckhen wegen der Keskemeter-säch auf 72 849 löwenthaller stellende praetension...” The Aulic War Council to the Aulic Chamber. Vienna, September 27, 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 454. Reg. (1708. 07–12.) fol. 951v.

On 2 October, news arrived in Petrovaradin of the death of İbrahim Pasha,⁶⁶ which, absurdly, could have brought a solution closer. Both the Habsburg negotiators and Commissioner İbrahim Effendi had assumed that the Pasha of Timișoara, Karayılanoğlu Ali, who had aspired to the Pasha's seat and then won it, would be easy to come to an agreement with.⁶⁷ General Nehem had to admit afterwards that the negotiations with Ali Pasha had been more problematic.⁶⁸ The Pasha started negotiations almost from the beginning and, like Elçi İbrahim, tried to force ever greater compensation: he demanded compensation through Osman Agha, who had arrived in Petrovaradin in mid-November 1708, of 80 shekels, and by the turn of 1708–1709 he was demanding 100 bags, which he could obviously have used to enrich his own treasury.⁶⁹ But as two years had passed since the Kecskemét incident, he wanted to force a quick agreement from the other side. The latter factor

proved stronger, and finally, in separate negotiations conducted by Osman Agha, a compensation of 70 bags (35,000 thalers) was agreed upon.⁷⁰ This was much less than İbrahim Pasha's claim, but much more than the value of the goods as shown in the customs invoices.

As early as the autumn of 1708, General Nehem had a proposal for the collection and payment of the compensation: he wanted to collect it from the Serbs who had taken part in the raid on Kecskemét, on the one hand, and from the taxes on the Serbs' territories, on the other. He was of the opinion that the first instalment of this could be paid by taking out a loan. The Jewish merchant *Joseph* from Belgrade and his associates had already offered their help on several occasions.⁷¹ Then, in February 1709, Nehem agreed with Osman Agha, who had come to him from Belgrade, that 30 of the 70 bags would be paid, whereas the rest would be paid by borrowing from Jewish merchants who would later collect it in the affected areas, in the Serem and Bačka.⁷² In his report of April 1, the General described the planned arrangements for the transfer of the money: the Ottomans would receive 15,000 thalers in cash from the amount negotiated, and the remaining money would be given in the form of a bill of exchange from the aforementioned Jewish merchants in Belgrade.⁷³ What exactly happened to the money is anyone's guess.⁷⁴ General Nehem sent Secretary Lachowitz

⁶⁶ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, October 2, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staateabteilung, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 53r. The news of the Pasha's death reached Constantinople on October 9. Michael Talman's report to the Imperial War Council. Constantinople, October 13, 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 113r.

⁶⁷ On the appointment of Karayılanoğlu Ali Pasha, see Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, October 5, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. konv. 3. fol. 59r; The Aulic War Council to Dietrich Nehem. Vienna, October 13, 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 454. Reg. (1708. 07–12.) fol. 994v. Kreutel–Spies 1962, 207; Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 99–100, 150. note 99; Fekete 1993, 452. note 44. (Cf. Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin], October 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 452. Exp. (1708. 07–12.) fol. 1071v; Dietrich Nehem's letter to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin], October 1708: *ibidem*, fol. 1075r.) Ali Pasha could not take office until the new Pasha of Timișoara, Hasan Pasha, arrived to replace him. Kreutel–Spies 1962, 207–209; Kreute–Kornauth 1966, 100. On Hasan Pasha of Timișoara, see Fekete 1993, 437. note 12.

⁶⁸ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, March 4, 1709: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 4. fol. 34v, 41r.

⁶⁹ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, November 15, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 141v. Cf. The Aulic War Council to Dietrich Nehem. Vienna, October 20, 1708: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 454. Reg. (1708. 07–12.) fol. 1015r; Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, January 11, 1709: *ibidem*, Konv. 4. fol. 23v. General Nehem sent the Petrovaradin interpreter, Marcantonio Mammucca della Torre's son, the castle curator and Secretary Lachowitz to receive the Agha. After Hasan Pasha's arrival in Timișoara, Ali Pasha requested that he take the Agha with him to Belgrade, initially for only 15–20 days. For the person of Marcantonio Mammucca della Torre, see Marcantonio Mammucca della Torre 1818.

⁷⁰ For the final amount, see Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, February 21, 1709: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 4. fol. 43v. On the separate negotiations of Osman Agha, see Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 103–115.

⁷¹ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, October 25, 1708: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 3. fol. 178. Cf. Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, January 11, 1709: *ibidem*, Konv. 4. fol. 31v.

⁷² Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, February 21, 1709: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 4. fol. 42r–43v. The involvement of a Jewish merchant named *Joseph* and his partner in the affair was already mentioned in January 1709: Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, January 19, 1709: *ibidem*, fol. 31v. Based on Katona, Hornyik also wrote that all Hungarian borderland families and Bačka Serb families had to pay 1 forint each, and those who participated in the robbery had to pay 2 forints each. Katona 1805, 522; Hornyik 1866, 190.

⁷³ Dietrich Nehem's report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, April 1, 1709: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 4. fol. 87v.

⁷⁴ Osman Agha wrote that the money he had received had been re-counted by a Belgrade Jew named *Jacob Israel*, and then he had it confiscated, and that he had received a bill of

and Captain *Kastner* to Belgrade to settle the matter, and instructed them to make an agreement with the Ottomans that in future they would protect their merchants on Hungarian soil only as long as they did not go territory held by the rebels.⁷⁵

The events at Kecskemét in April 1707 caused a great stir in the already unpeaceful Habsburg–Ottoman and Habsburg–Kuruc–Ottoman relations.⁷⁶ The words of General Nehem, written after the end of the affair – „So wäre es ja billig, das unsere pässe sie vor ihre freunde überall schützen solten [So it would be fair that our passports should protect you from your friends everywhere]”⁷⁷ – show how he did not consider the Ottomans’ demands to be legitimate and fair, but rather absurd, that they seemed to be protecting the Ottomans from the Kuruc insurgents, while they were trying to maintain friendly relations with each other. However, the stalemate that had developed required the acceptance of the solution. The Kecskemét case and the subsequent diplomatic negotiations described in Hungarian sources and in the memoirs of Osman Agha of Timișoara are controlled and supplemented by a considerable amount of German-language documents, which provide a thorough insight into the course of the border conflict between the two empires, the

exchange for the remaining 40 bags, which the Jew paid him in Belgrade. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 121–126.

⁷⁵ Instructions from Dietrich Nehem to Johann Adam Lachowitz. Petrovaradin, April 1, 1709: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 4. fol. 86v–87r. Cf. „Schließlich seye der secretari Lachawiz mit dem Osman aga bey ihm ankhomen mit bericht, das daß jurament beiderseiths von denen unter commissarien auf ratification der principal commissarien wegen der differenten mit denen Türkchen zu ständten gebracht worden. Die translation auß dem türkchischen werde er nechst einschickhen.” Dietrich Nehem to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin] March or April 1709: ÖStA KA HKR Protokollbücher Bd. 457. Exp. (1709. 01–05.) fol. 387r. Cf. also Dietrich Nehem to the Aulic War Council. [Petrovaradin] March or April 1709: *ibidem*, 470v. The deed closing the Kecskemét case was issued on March 25, 1709. Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, 156. Contrary to Hornyik’s claim that the case was settled in October 1708: Hornyik 1866, 190. Cf. Katona 1805, 522.

⁷⁶ The French diplomatic corps was also involved in the case. In a letter of April 4, 1707, from Roland Puchot Des Alleurs, the Marquis’s envoy to Rákóczi, to Louis XIV, he reported on the raids of the kuruc insurgents on the territory of the Ottoman Empire and the damage and insults caused to Ottoman merchants captured on Hungarian territory. He learned of these from the envoy of the Pasha of Timișoara. AD série CP, Hongrie et Transylvanie, vol. 11, fol. 201–202. For its publication see Tóth 2012, 301–302.

⁷⁷ Dietrich Nehem’s report to the Aulic War Council. Petrovaradin, April 1, 1707: ÖStA HHStA Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I, Kt. 178. Konv. 4. fol. 88r.

different mechanisms of the two sides’ administrations, and the less rule-abiding „negotiating techniques” of the Ottomans.

The case of the Kecskemét raid discussed here was not unique in the period, with several atrocities against „Turkish” merchants before and after.⁷⁸ In February 1707, the Ottoman Empire’s subjects went to Kuruc territory obviously in the hope of high profits, just as the border Pashas were strongly motivated by money in later negotiations. In addition, the Jewish merchants from Belgrade were also involved in the payment process hoping to make profit. However, the question of how the victims and heirs benefited from the compensation is still not answered.

REFERENCES

Archival Materials

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA), Staatenabteilungen, Türkei I. Kt. 177–179.

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), Kriegsarchiv (KA), Hofkriegsrat (HKR), Protokollbücher

Published Primary Sources

Anonim 2000

Anonim osmanlı tarihi (1099–1116/1688–1704), haz. A. Özcan, Ankara (2000).

Balla 1856

G. Balla, *Nagy-körösi krónika*, eds. K. Szabó, S. Szilágyi, Kecskemét (1856).

Bánkúti 1991

I. Bánkúti (ed.), *Bláho Vince búcsúbeszéde Kecskeméten 1772-ben*, Kecskemét (1991).

Bánkúti 1994

I. Bánkúti (ed.), *Iratok a Rákóczi szabadságharcból: Kecskemét város és körzete*, vol. II, Kecskemét (1994).

Benda–Maksay 1961

K. Benda, F. Maksay (eds.), *Ráday Pál iratai II. (1707–1708)*. Budapest (1961).

Defterdar 2005

Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Pasa, *Zübde-i vekayiat*, haz. A. Özcan, Ankara (1995).

Katona 1805

S. Katona, *Historia critica regum Hungariae stirpis Austriacae: 1526–1710*, vol. XXXVI., Budae (1805).

⁷⁸ Kreutel–Kornauth 1966, *passim*; Fekete 1993, *passim*. Cf. Tóth 2019b.

- Katona 1806
S. Katona, *Historia critica regum Hungariae stripsis Austriacae*, Tom XVIII, Ordine XXXVII, Budae (1806).
- Kreutel–Kornauth 1966
R. F. Kreutel, Friedrich Kornauth (Hrsg.), *Zwischen Paschas und Generalen: Bericht der Osman Ağa aus Temeschwar über die Höhepunkte seine Wirkens als Diwandolmetscher und Diplomat*, (Osmanische Geschichtsschreiber, 5) Graz (1966).
- Kreutel–Spies 1962
R. F. Kreutel, O. Spies (Hrsg.), *Der Gefangene der Giauren: Die Abenteuerlichen Schicksale des Dolmetschers ‘Osman Ağa aus Temeschwar, von ihm selbst erzählt*, Graz–Wien–Leiden (1962).
- Muahadat mecmuasi* 1297/1880,
Muahadat mecmuasi, 3. cilt, İstanbul, 1297/1880.
- Silâhdar 1962
Silâhdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme*, 1. cilt, İstanbul (1962).
- Sinkovics 1968
I. Sinkovics (ed.), *Magyar Történeti Szöveggyűjtemény*, vol. II/2. (1526–1790), Budapest (1968).
- Szita–Seewann 1999
L. Szita, G. Seewann (eds.), *A karlócai béke és Európa: Dokumentumok a karlócai béke történetéhez 1698–1699*, Pécs (1999).
- Tóth 2012
F. Tóth (éd.), *Correspondance diplomatique relative à la guerre d’indépendance du prince François II Rákóczi (1703–1711)*, Paris–Genève (2012).
- Literature*
Aktepe 1993
M. Aktepe, Çorlulu Ali Paşa, in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 8. cilt, İstanbul (1993), 370–371.
- Benda 1962
K. Benda, II. Rákóczi Ferenc török politikájának első éve 1702–1705. *Történelmi Szemle*, 5/2 (1962), 189–209.
- Buza 1981–1982
J. Buza, Az oroszlanos tallér árfolyama és szerepe Magyarország pénzforgalmában. *Numizmatikai Közlöny*, 80–81/1 (1981–1982), 89–100.
- Dávid 1980
G. Dávid, Török és tatár katonák Rákóczi seregében, in B. Köpeczi, L. Hopp, Á. R. Várkonyi (eds.), *Rákóczi-tanulmányok*, Budapest (1980), 159–167.
- F. Molnár 2006
M. F. Molnár, Tárgyalási technikák és hatalmi játszmák, A Habsburg és az Oszmán Birodalom közötti határ meghúzása a karlócai békét követően, *Századok*, 140/6 (2006), 1475–1502.
- F. Molnár 2008
M. F. Molnár, *Az Oszmán és a Habsburg Birodalom közötti határ kijelölése a karlócai békét követően (1699–1701)*. PhD disszertáció. Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar. Budapest (2008).
(<http://doktori.btk.elte.hu/hist/fmolnar/phdmolnar.pdf>)
- Fekete 1993
L. Fekete, A Rákóczi-Aspremont-levéltár török iratai, in *idem*, *A hódoltság török levéltári forrásai nyomában*, Budapest (1993), 429–463.
- Gebei 2001
S. Gebei, Az orosz–török béketárgyalások Karlócán és Konstantinápolyban (1699–1700). *Aetas*, 21/2 (2001), 134–154.
- Gezer 2021
Ö. Gezer, Massacre in Kecskemét (1707) and Ottoman–Habsburg Negotiations, in Ö. Oral (ed.), *Torkey&Kosovo: The Role of Diplomacy in the History of the Balkans* (IBAC Book Series, 7), İstanbul (2021), 57–65.
- Gezer 2022
Bıçak Sırtında: Michael Talman’ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndaki İlk Seneleri. *Cihannüma Tarih ve Coğrafya Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7/2 (2022), 1–43.
- Heckenast 2005
G. Heckenast, *Ki kicsoda a Rákóczi-szabadságharcban? Életrajzi adattár* (Historia könyvtár, Kronológiák, Adattárak, 8) Budapest (2005).
- Hornyik 1866
J. Hornyik, *Kecskemét város története*, vol. IV, Kecskemét (1866).
- Marcantonio Mammucca della Torre 1818,
Marcantonio Mammucca della Torre. *Archiv für Geographie, Historie, Staats- und Kriegskunft*, 9/65 (1818) 253–256.
- Molnár 2002
A. Molnár, A török kori Kecskemét ferences krónikása: Blahó Vince (1725–1785), *Cumania*, 18 (2002), 171–205.
- Papp 2004
S. Papp, A Rákóczi-szabadságharc török diplomáciája, *Századok*, 138/4 (2004), 793–821.
- Seres 1996
I. Seres, II. Rákóczi Ferenc török katonái 1708-ban, *Keletkutató*, 1996. tavasz, 91–98.
- Szabados 2013
J. Szabados, Michael Talman konstantinápolyi

Habsburg rezidens két jelentése az Udvari Haditanács részére (1705. július 25. és augusztus 13.), *Fons*, 20/3 (2013), 385–419.

Szabados 2015

J. Szabados, Hírek Konstantinápolyból 1705 derekán: A nagypolitika történései egy Habsburg diplomata szemüvegén keresztül, *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 128/1 (2015) 74–104.

Szalay 1859

L. Szalay, *Magyarország története*, vol. VI, Pest (1859).

Thaly 1872

K. Thaly, *Adalékok a Thököly- és a Rákóczi-kor irodalomtörténetéhez*, vol. II, Pest (1872).

Tóth 2018

H. Tóth, Török kereskedők nehézségei a kuruc korban – avagy hogyan ne kereskedjünk Magyarországon a Rákóczi-szabadságharc idején, *Acta Historica Universitas Szegediensis*, 143 (2018), 87–106.

Tóth 2019a

H. Tóth, „Roma çasarıyla şevketlü padişahımızın sulh

[u] salahı olub” – The „Ali pasha” of Temesvár on the Habsburg, Hungarian and Ottoman frontier at the time of the Rákóczi War of Independence, in P. Fodor, N. E. Kovács, B. Péri (eds.), *Şerefe. Studies in Honour of Prof. Géza Dávid on His Seventieth Birthday*, Budapest (2019), 459–479.

Tóth 2019b

H. Tóth, Szalih zajm, Musztafa zajm és társaik tragikus kereskedőútja 1711-ben: Adalékok az Oszmán Birodalom kereskedőinek magyarországi tevékenységéhez, in Z. Bagi (ed.), „...*ugy irhassak, mint volt...*” *Ünnepi tanulmányok a 65 esztendőös Tóth Sándor László tiszteletére*, Szeged (2019), 197–209.

Tóth 2021

H. Tóth, Thirty Years in the Service of the Habsburgs: Insight into the devoted Work of the Turkish Interpreter Johann Adam Lachowitz (1678–1709), *Prace Historyczne*, 148/4 (2021), 745–767.

Vatai 2011

Vatai Gábor, Út az irrealitásba: Rákóczi török diplomáciája a szabadságharc idején, *Keletkutatás*, 2011. ősz, 91–108.