

PUBLICATIONS IN NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST STUDIES
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Editorial Board

JOHN S. BADEAU

CHARLES P. ISSAWI

JACOB C. HUREWITZ

KARL MENGES

ALEX WAYMAN

EHSAN YAR-SHATER (Chairman)

Series A

VII

This work was approved and edited for publication in this series in 1962 by the Editorial Board consisting at that time of:

JOHN S. BADEAU

CHARLES P. ISSAWI

DOUGLAS M. DUNLOP

TIBOR HALASI-KUN (Chairman)

JACOB C. HUREWITZ

JOSEPH SCHACHT

EHSAN YAR-SHATER

This series, published under the auspices of the Department of Middle East Languages and Cultures and the Middle East Institute of Columbia University, consists of monographs, readers and other studies designed to promote systematic research on the Near and Middle East and to further public understanding of the problems of the area. The opinions expressed are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department or the Institute.

HANDBOOK OF OTTOMAN-TURKISH DIPLOMATICS

by

JAN REYCHMAN

and

ANANIASZ ZAJĄCZKOWSKI

Revised and expanded translation by

ANDREW S. EHRENKREUTZ

Indexed by

FANNY E. DAVIS

Edited by

TIBOR HALASI-KUN

MOUTON · 1968 · THE HAGUE · PARIS

© 1968 by The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York.
No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print,
photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from
the publishers.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 68-13333

PRINTED IN W. GERMANY BY J. J. AUGUSTIN, GLÜCKSTADT

CONTENTS

List of illustrations	8
List of abbreviations of periodicals and societies	10
Editor's note	12
 I. INTRODUCTION	 13
1. Definition and scope of Oriental paleography and diplomats	 13
2. History of the study of Oriental diplomats	14
3. Collections of Oriental documents in Turkey and in other Asiatic countries	 24
Turkey	24
Egypt.	31
Syria	33
Asiatic Russia	33
4. Collections of Oriental documents in Europe	33
Austria	34
Bulgaria.	35
Czechoslovakia	37
Denmark	38
Finland	38
France	38
Germany	39
Greece	42
Hungary	42
Italy	43
Poland	44
Rumania	49
Sweden	51
Switzerland	52
United Kingdom	52

USSR	52
Yugoslavia	55
5. Publications of Oriental documents	59
Austria	61
Bulgaria.	63
Czechoslovakia	67
Denmark	69
Egypt.	70
France	70
Germany	71
Greece	76
Hungary	77
Israel	81
Italy	81
Poland	82
Rumania	86
Sweden	88
Switzerland	89
Turkey	89
United Kingdom	94
USA	95
USSR	95
Yugoslavia	99
 II. PALEOGRAPHY	 104
1. Writing materials.	104
2. Writing implements	106
3. The Arabic script and its development	106
4. Types of script used in Ottoman documents	119
5. Abbreviations	128
6. Cryptographic symbols	133
 III. DIPLOMATICS	 135
1. Terminology of Ottoman documents	135
2. Description of documents	138
3. Methods of folding and preserving documents	139
4. Arrangement of components of documents	139
5. Copies and transcripts of documents	149
6. Forgeries of documents	151
7. Translations of documents	151

8. Documents of the Crimean Tatars	152
9. Basic facts of the structure of the Ottoman Chancery	159
List of <i>reis efendis</i> from the 16th through the 18th centuries	160
List of chief dragomans	166
10. Sources for Ottoman history	168
11. Poland's relations with Oriental countries	170
List of translators of the Crown Chancery	171
List of envoys to the Ottoman Empire	173
List of envoys to the Crimean Tatars	179
List of envoys to Persia	181
List of Turkish envoys in Poland	182
List of Polish-Turkish treaties	183
IV. ANCILLARY DISCIPLINES	186
1. Chronology	186
2. Chronological tables of rulers	191
Sultans of the Ottoman Empire with dates of accession	192
Crimean Khans	193
Shahs of Persia	194
Grand Viziers of the Ottoman Empire with dates of investiture	195
3. Historical geography	197
4. Numismatics	198
5. Elements of Turkish historical bibliography	200
APPENDIX	202
Conversion tables of A. H. and A. D. dates	202
INDEX	213

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Development of the Arabic alphabet	106
2. <i>Kûfi</i> script	107
3. <i>Magribî</i> script	108
4. <i>Nesih</i> script	110
5. <i>Sûlus</i> script	111
6. Persian <i>ta'liq</i> script	112
7. Persian <i>nasta'liq</i> (Ottoman <i>talik</i>) script	113
8. <i>Shekastah</i> script	114
9. <i>Divani</i> script	115
10. <i>Rika</i> script	116
11. Table of <i>divani</i> script	120
12. Example of a text written in <i>divani</i> script	123
13. Table of <i>talik</i> script	124
14. Introductory part of a letter from the Grand Vizier, Ahmet Köprülüzade, to the Grand Chancellor of the Polish Crown, Nicholas Prażmowski	128
15. Example of a seventeenth-century text written in <i>talik</i> script	129
16. Table of <i>rika</i> script	130
17. Table of <i>siyakat</i> script	132
18. Example of a simple invocation	140
19. Example of a solemn and elaborate invocation	141
20. Another version of the invocation, dated 1577	141
21. <i>Tuğra</i> of Süleyman I	142
22. <i>Tuğra</i> of Murat III	142
23. <i>Intitulatio</i> of Süleyman I	142

24. Part of a letter of Süleyman I to Sigismund Augustus of Poland, dated 1551	142
25. Fragment of a letter from Süleyman I to Sigismund I, with the titulatory formula, <i>sen ki</i>	142
26. Fragment of the titulatory formula in a letter from Murat III to Stefan Báthory.	145
27. <i>Pençe, sah</i> , and <i>mühür</i> of the <i>beylerbeyi</i> of Buda, from the middle of the seventeenth century	148
28. <i>Ahitname</i> of Murat III to Stefan Báthory	152
29. Initial part of Tohtamış' letter to Iagiello, King of Poland, dated 1393	155
30. <i>Tamota</i> of Maxmut, Khan of Kazan in the fifteenth century	156

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS OF PERIODICALS AND SOCIETIES

- AO* – *Archiv Orientální*, Praha.
ArPPr – *Arkhiv za poselishtni prouchvaniâ*, Sofiâ.
Belleten – *Belleten* (Türk Tarih Kurumu), Ankara.
BSOAS – *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, London.
DII – *Documenta islamica inedita*, Berlin.
EI – *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leiden.
Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja – *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo.
GSUiff – *Godishnik na sofiskiâ universitet. Istoriko-filologicheski fakultet*, Sofiâ.
IAN – *Izvestiâ Akademii Nauk SSSR*, Moskva or Leningrad.
IBID – *Izvestiâ na Bûlgarskoto istorichesko druzhestvo*, Sofiâ.
IDBS – *Izvestiâ, Dûrzhavna biblioteka "Vasil Kolarov"*, Sofiâ.
IIBI – *Izvestiâ na Instituta za bûlgarska istoriâ*, Sofiâ.
ITOIAE – *Izvestiâ Tavricheskogo Obshchestva Istorii, Arkheologii i Etnografii*, Simferopol'.
ITUAK – *Izvestiâ Tavricheskoï Uchenoi Arkhivnoi Kommissii*, Simferopol'.
JA – *Journal Asiatique*, Paris.
JAOS – *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Baltimore.
JRAS – *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*, London.
KCsA – *Kôrösi Csoma-Archivum*, Budapest.
LK – *Levéltári Közlemények*, Budapest.
MO – *Le Monde Oriental*, Uppsala.
MOG – *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, Wien.
MSOSW – *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, Berlin.
OLZ – *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Berlin-Leipzig.
OM – *Oriente Moderno*, Roma.
PO – *Przegląd Orientalistyczny*, Wrocław-Warszawa.
Prilozi – *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju i istoriju jugoslovenskih naroda pod turskom vladavinom*, Sarajevo.
RO – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, Lwów.
RSO – *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, Roma.
SAN – *Srpska Akademija Nauka*, Beograd.

- SbNU* – *Sbornik za narodni umotvoreniâ i narodopis*, Sofia.
- Sbornik Imp. Russ. Istor. Obshch.* – *Sbornik Imperatorskago Russkago Istoricheskago Obshchestva*, Sankt Peterburg.
- Sogd. Sbornik* – *Sogdiiskii Sbornik*, Leningrad.
- TOEM* – *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası*, İstanbul.
- TM* – *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, İstanbul.
- TTEM* – *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası*, İstanbul.
- TTK* – *Türk Tarih Kurumu*, Ankara.
- UJ* – *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, Berlin.
- Věstník Král. Čes. Spol. Nauk* – *Věstník (Královská Česká Společnost Nauk)*, Praha.
- VNOT* – *Vestnik Nauchnogo Obshchestva Tatarovedeniâ*, Kazan'.
- WZKM* – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Wien.
- Zap. Russ. Geogr. Obshch. Otd. Etnogr.* – *Zapiski Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva. Otdel Etnografii.*
- ZDMG* – *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig–Mainz.
- ZhMNP* – *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniâ*, Sankt Peterburg.
- ZOVID* – *Zapiski Odesskago Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostei*, Odessa.
- ZVO* – *Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniâ Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologicheskago Obshchestva*, Sanktpeterburg.

EDITOR'S NOTE

This edition of the *Handbook of Ottoman-Turkish Diplomats* is a result of a meeting held in September 17, 1956 in Lenox, Massachusetts, at which Professors Hamilton A. R. Gibb, Tibor Halasi-Kun, Bernard Lewis, Wilfred Cantwell Smith and T. Cuyler Young were present. The aim of this meeting was to discuss ways and means of improving studies in Ottoman Diplomats in the United States of America.

Among other questions, that of the desirability of a field handbook in English arose, and it was resolved to translate and enlarge the *Zarys dyplomatyki osmańsko-tureckiej* (Warszawa, 1955) by Jan Reychman and Ananiasz Zajączkowski to this end. This work was then made possible by means of the support of the Social Science Research Council, the sponsor of the meeting.

The translation and enlarging of the Polish original was effected, with the cooperation of the authors themselves, by Professor Andrew S. Ehrenkreutz. A new index was prepared by Mrs. Fanny E. Davis.

After a first scrutiny of the Ehrenkreutz-manuscript by Professor Stanford J. Shaw and Mrs. Davis the editor set himself to the task of revising the transliteration of the Arabic and Persian and of the transcription of the Turkish items throughout the work. (Transliteration of Arabic has been based on the Encyclopaedia of Islam, that of Persian on the system adopted in this series, and Turkish transcription on the 7th edition of the *İmlâ kılavuzu* of the Turkish Linguistic Society.) As a final step a careful revision of all the bibliographical materials, some 1,500 entries, was made. In this last rather complex task, which involved the checking of special collections in the New York Public Library, at the Columbia, Harvard, Leiden, and Princeton university libraries, the Library of Congress, the library of the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, in Washington, District of Columbia, the libraries of the Institute for Turkic Studies in Istanbul, of the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul and of the Turkish Historical Society in Ankara, the editor was helped by Professor Gustav Bayerle and Professor Bruce McGowan and feels especially indebted to Mr. Svat Soucek and Mr. Daniel C. Waugh for their valuable assistance. Despite all efforts, some of the entries could not be checked by the editor either because they could not be located or because, though located, they could not be reached by the editor. Also, in some instances, the information given was inadequate for checking. All these entries, about 125, are marked with an asterisk:*

We hope that the Handbook of Ottoman-Turkish Diplomats will become an important contribution to the efforts aimed to further studies in Ottoman Diplomats in the United States of America.

The Editor

I

INTRODUCTION

1. DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF ORIENTAL PALEOGRAPHY AND DIPLOMATICS

The purpose of Oriental paleography and diplomatics is the study of the scripts and documents of the Muslim East. By the Muslim East we here understand those areas which at one time or another have come under the influence of Islamic culture—in the past erroneously referred to as Arabic culture—*i.e.*, the countries of the Near East, especially those of Hither Asia, North Africa, and Central Asia. These countries have evolved various kinds of secretarial scripts and several different types of documents.

Although the main purpose of this book is the treatment of the scripts and documents of Ottoman Turkey, the scripts and documents of the Golden Horde, of the Crimean Khanate, and to a lesser extent of Persia have been included in the present discussion. The chronological range extends from the fifteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The best known studies of Ottoman-Turkish paleography are:

F. Kraelitz[-Greifenhorst], "Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache aus der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur osmanischen Diplomatie", *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 197, iii (Wien, 1921), (this publication includes fifteenth-century documents); fourteen tables:

L. Fekete, *Einführung in die osmanisch-türkische Diplomatie der türkischen Botmäßigkeit in Ungarn* (Budapest, 1926), also published in Hungarian under the title *Bevezetés a török hódoltság diplomatikájába* (Budapest, 1926). The pagination in both versions is identical. This work deals chiefly with documents pertaining to Ottoman administration in Hungary in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Other more detailed studies are referred to in appropriate chapters.

The best study of Persian diplomatics is W. Litten's *Einführung in die persische Diplomatensprache*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1919). Two articles dealing with this subject have recently been published by H. R. Roemer, "Vorschläge zur Sammlung von Urkunden zur islamischen Geschichte Persiens", *ZDMG*, 104 (1954), pp. 362–70, and W. Hinz, "Die persische Geheimkanzlei im Mittelalter", in *Westöstliche Abhandlungen, Rudolf Tschudi, zum siebzigsten Geburtstag überreicht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. by F. Meier (Wiesbaden, 1954), pp. 342–55. For samples of official Persian letters, consult A. Chodzko's *Grammaire de la langue persane* (Paris, 1883²). A collection of Persian documents, the so-called *inşa* material from the period of the Timurids, has recently been published by H. R. Roemer in his *Staatsschreiben der Timuridenzeit* (Wiesbaden, 1952). This work is provided with an introduction containing basic information about the character of documents which circulated in the area under the cultural dominance of Islam in that period. Also, H. Busse, *Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiwesen an Hand turkmenischer und safawidischer Urkunden* (Kairo, 1959); *idem*, "Persische Diplomatie im Überblick, Ergebnisse und Probleme", *Der Islam*, 37 (1961), pp. 202–245. For the study of Arabic diplomatics one must still rely on the fifteenth-century work of al-Qalqaşandī, *Ṣubḥ al-A'şā*, 14 vols. (Cairo, 1913–19). Also, C. Cahen, "Notes de diplomatique arabomusulmane", *JA*, 251 (1963), pp. 311–325; S. M. Stern, *Fātimid Decrees* (London, 1964), pp. 85–175. The new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* contains an article on "Diplomatic", vol. 2, pp. 301–316, contributed jointly by W. Björkman (Classical Arabic), G. S. Colin (Maghrib), H. Busse (Persia) and J. Reychman and A. Zajaczkowski (Ottoman Empire).

2. HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF ORIENTAL DIPLOMATICS

Interest in the study of Oriental documents was originally stimulated by purely practical considerations. A knowledge of Oriental scripts and documents was common among the official translators of Oriental languages, *i.e.*, the dragomans. Some of them should indeed be regarded as the first European experts in the problems connected with Oriental documents. Thus in 1615 F. Sauary published the text of the *ahitname*,¹ or agreement of 1604, concluded between Ahmet I

¹ For the meaning of *ahitname* and other technical terms referring to various types of documents, see Chapter III, Diplomats: 1. Terminology of Ottoman documents.

and Henry IV, King of France.² The original manuscript of Holdermann's *Grammaire turque* contained a copy, transcription, and French translation of the treaty concluded in 1673 in Edirne by Mehmet IV and Louis XIV.³ F. Meninski in his *Institutiones*⁴ gave a few samples of official Oriental scripts, documents and treaties, providing each with a translation and commentary. Similar practical considerations prompted A. I. Silvestre de Sacy to publish some documents in his chrestomathy.⁵ At the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a Transylvanian dragoman named Rozsnyay was engaged in the collection, reading, and utilization of Turkish documents.⁶

Special courses of instruction dealing with Oriental documents and scripts were included in the curricula of the practical schools for dragomans in France, Austria, Venice, and Russia.

The education of the eighteenth-century dragoman included training in the translation of official manuscripts. That the need for such instruction was felt in French government circles is evidenced by a quotation from a letter written in the first half of the eighteenth century by the French naval minister, Maurepas, to Villeneuve, the French ambassador to Turkey:

Je crois qu'il serait bon pour obliger les drogmans à s'appliquer davantage à l'étude des langues orientales de leur faire traduire les manuscrits, dont il peut être utile d'avoir la traduction en français.⁷

As a result of this teaching policy, the pupils of the Oriental school in France (*l'Ecole des jeunes de langue*) translated many manuscripts, documents and chronicles.⁸ Russian students attached to the embas-

² F. Sauary, *Articles du Traicte fait en l'annee mil six cens quatre, entre Henri le Grand Roy de France . . . et Sultan Amat Empereur des Turcs* (Paris, 1615).

³ Cf., E. Blochet, *Bibliothèque Nationale, Catalogue des manuscrits turcs* (Paris, 1932-33), part i, pp. 86-87.

⁴ F. à Mesgnien Meninski, *Institutiones linguae turcicae*, 2 vols. (Vindobonae, 1756).

⁵ A. I. Silvestre de Sacy, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1806).

⁶ Cf., Rozsnyay Dávid, *az utolsó török deák történeti maradványai*, ed. by S. Szilágyi in *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Második Osztály: Írók*, vol. 8 (Pest, 1867); Supplement (Pest, 1871).

⁷ H. Dehérain, *Silvestre de Sacy in Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique* (Haut-Commissariat de la République Française en Syrie et au Liban, Service des Antiquités), 27 (1938), part ii, p. 13.

⁸ *Supra*; also O. Górká, "Niezmany żywot Bajezida II", *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 52 (1938), pp. 381-86. Most of these translations are in the Turkish manuscript collection of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris). See E. Blochet, *Catalogue des manuscrits turcs*, part ii, No. 715-951 and *passim*.

sy in Turkey worked at copying documents. Some Turks also displayed interest in old documents. As a result, for instance, the sixteenth-century *Münşeat-üs-selâtin* of Feridun Bey for a long time constituted one of the largest collections of official Turkish documents.

Gradually, however the subject of Oriental paleography and diplomatics came into its own, changing from a purely utilitarian, practical skill into an independent academic discipline, ancillary to Oriental history and particularly important for the study of the relations between the West and the East.

In this development, one cannot overlook, among the archivists, the achievements of such translators as Silvestre de Sacy, von Hammer-Purgstall, and Gévay. Their works were frequently provided with lithographic facsimile reproductions of documents. Although all the details of the scripts and the seals could not be reproduced exactly, their procedure constituted definite progress. Sometimes these early studies of documents went beyond a mere explanation of their texts, yet the fruits of such attempts were not always proportionate to the amount of effort expended on them. Thus von Hammer[-Purgstall] (1774–1856), realizing the importance of Oriental documents, collected and utilized many of them in his monumental *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*.⁹ He explained the structure of the Ottoman Chancery and offered solutions for converting the dates of the Muslim calendar. He was also interested in seals. Moreover, he translated and supervised the lithographic reproduction of a letter of Mehmet IV written to Bohdan Chmielnicki and published by Russian scholars.¹⁰ Yet his explanation of the origin of the *tuğra* has proved to be erroneous.

Many examples of Oriental documents were contained in early chrestomathies and language manuals such as the Turkish works of A. Kasem-Beg, professor at Kazan University,¹¹ of Mukhlinskii,¹² Smirnov,¹³ and Quatremère.¹⁴ The Arabic chrestomathy

⁹ 10 vols. Pest, 1827–35, hereafter referred to as *GOR*

¹⁰ See, *Pamiatniki izdannye vremennoiu kommissieiû dlâ razbora drevnikh aktov* (Kiev, 1852), one plate.

¹¹ A. Kasem-Beg, *Allgemeine Grammatik der türkisch-tatarischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1848).

¹² *A. Mukhlinskii, *Osmanskaia khrestomatiia dlâ universitetskago prepodavanâ* (Sankt Peterburg, 1858–59).

¹³ V. D. Smirnov, *Sbornik nekotorykh vazhnykh izvestii i ofitsial'nykh dokumentov kasatel'no Turtsii, Rossii i Kryma* (S.- Peterburg, 1875).

¹⁴ M. Quatremère, *Chrestomathie en turk oriental* . . . (Paris, 1841).

of Silvestre de Sacy¹⁵ and the Persian one of Chodzko¹⁶ also included samples of Oriental documents.

In the course of the nineteenth century, Russian scholars such as Berezin, Grigor'ev, Īartsev, Obolenski, and Smirnov, by studying coins and medals, especially those of the Crimean Tatars, laid the foundations for the development of Oriental epigraphy.

Knowledge of Oriental documents was enriched in the second half of the nineteenth century by the Austrian scholar Karabacek, who devoted a number of publications to the story of paper in the East. He also attempted, not always successfully, to explain certain expressions appearing in Ottoman documents, e.g., the formula *هو*.¹⁷ At the turn of the twentieth century, considerable attention was given to the study of Turkish documents by a German scholar, J. H. Mordtmann.¹⁸

In the second decade of the present century Georg Jacob (d. 1937), a professor at the University of Kiel, established the study of Oriental documents as a special university subject by introducing the reading of them into the curriculum of his university department. For the study of Turkish diplomatics Jacob used photographic reproductions. He examined many collections of Oriental documents, undertook the first registration of the contents of these collections, and brought many such documents to Kiel. He also copied the documents industriously collected by W. Bernhauer, which have been preserved in Budapest. And finally it was Jacob who initiated the first series of editions of Oriental documents as source material for seminar studies of Ottoman-Turkish paleography.

The main merit of Jacob's achievement was the stimulation of interest in documents dealing with internal Ottoman affairs. Hitherto the main emphasis had been laid on documents pertaining to the external relations of Turkey, such as letters from or to foreign rulers, treaties, and *fermans*. Jacob pointed out the previously neglected area of internal Turkish administrative documents, such as investiture certificates, receipts of tribute, etc. The documents used by Jacob dealt chiefly with the Turkish domination of Hungary in

¹⁵ A. I. Silvestre de Sacy, *op.cit.*

¹⁶ A. Chodzko, *Grammaire de la langue persane* (Paris, 1883²).

¹⁷ For the works of Karabacek on the subject in question, consult *H. Bockwitz, *Zu Karabaceks Forschungen über das Papier im islamischen Kulturkreise* (Leipzig, 1940).

¹⁸ Mordtmann's lectures dealing with disciplines ancillary to Turkish history were delivered in Istanbul, where they were published in 1331-32 under the title *İlm-i usul-i tarih*.

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. His orientation was imposed by the character of the bulk of the material at his disposal, since the material was acquired through military conquests in the seventeenth century. Consequently, it was on this period that Jacob and his collaborators (Neumann, Jensen) focused their research.

The early researchers like Jacob interpreted documents from a philological point of view. They attempted to present information contained in the documents in the light of their historical background. Hardly anyone, however, treated the actual formal aspects of the Turkish documents. The focusing of attention on the document itself, on the necessity of examining it from a formal point of view—these were the crucial milestones in the progress of the young discipline of Oriental paleography and diplomatics. This development was prompted in the Twenties of the present century by the achievements of scholars such as F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst of Austria, F. Babinger of Germany, and L. Fekete, the Orientalist and archivist from Hungary. Their works, especially the manual of Fekete,¹⁹ represented the beginning of a new phase of research studies. The journal *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, which appeared between 1921 and 1926 under the editorship of F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst and P. Wittek, implemented the studies of old Turkish diplomatics. And since that time fundamental contributions by other scholars from Germany (e.g., Giese), from Czechoslovakia (Rypka, Kabrda), from Italy (Bombaci, Bonelli), from England (B. Lewis), and from France (Deny), have greatly added to our knowledge of Oriental documents. Some old Ottoman manuscripts were published for didactic purposes by the State Archives in Rumania. Before World War I, scholars in Bosnia and Herzegovina were engaged in the study of Turkish documents. During the period between the two World Wars valuable studies were contributed by the Yugoslav scholar F. Bajraktarević. In recent years these traditions have been carried on by a number of scholars both in Yugoslavia (Elezović, Đurđev, Šabanović)²⁰ and Bulgaria (Tsvetkova, Gülâbov, Nedkov, Popov).²¹

Both the *Einführung* of Fekete and the contributions of Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Babinger, and others dealt with documents of a specific

¹⁹ L. Fekete, *Einführung in die osmanisch-türkische Diplomatie der türkischen Botmäßigkeit in Ungarn* (Budapest, 1926), hereafter referred to as Fekete, *Einführung*.

²⁰ See J. Kabrda, "Les études orientales en Yougoslavie, (L'activité de l'Institut Oriental à Sarajevo)", *AO*, 25, i (1957), pp. 146–55.

²¹ See, *idem*, "Orientalistika Bułgarska", *PO*, 19 (1956), pp. 369–78.

character: documents originating only from Dubrovnik or the Turco-Hungarian provinces. And so our knowledge of Oriental documents would have remained limited if additional studies had not been made of documents available in the Turkish archives. Even before Turkish archivists became seriously interested in the materials at their disposal—materials consisting mainly of registers of old official institutions of the sultanate—a few European scholars such as I. Karácson of Hungary and G. Jarring of Sweden had made efforts to examine these archival holdings. But the turning point in the history of the study of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics came when the contents of the Turkish archives were roughly arranged and their substance revealed to the public.

Considerable progress in the study of Oriental documents had also been achieved in Russia, especially in the field of Uyghur-Turkic diplomatics. The beginning of these studies goes back to the first half of the nineteenth century, when several Orientalists, above all Grigor'ev, Berezin, and Īartsev, treated many Tatar *yarlıks*, seals, inscriptions, and Oriental coins. Research in this field was later carried on by Smirnov, Radlov, Priselkov, and Samoilovich.²² Valuable practical instructions were furnished by N. I. Veselovskii in his "Pogreshnosti i oshibki pri izdanii dokumentov po snosheniū Russkikh gosudareī s aziātskimi vladeltsami", *Zhivaiā Starina*, 18, ii–iii (1909), pp. 237–68.

It was a Pole, J. J. S. Sękowski, who was commissioned by the Russian government to examine Turkish archives and documents. Sękowski thus contributed to arousing interest in the study of Turkish diplomatics. Yet another Pole, A. Muchliński, published a diplomatic chrestomathy²³ and carried on with the studies of diplomatics at Russian universities. Both these scholars published a number of works in Russian as well as in Polish; their Polish publications are treated below.²⁴ In the second half of the nineteenth century many monographs dealing with Oriental documents were contributed by V. D. Smirnov (d. 1922). In more recent times V. V. Bartol'd (d. 1935) showed interest in the problems of Oriental archives by setting down the principles of the study of them in his "Khranenie dokumentov v gosudarstvakh musul'manskogo Vostoka", *Arkhivnye Kursy*, 1 (1920), pp. 371–84. Other scholars, such as

²² See below, pp. 95 ff.

²³ *A. Mukhlinskiĭ, *Osmanskaia khrestomatiia* . . . (Sankt Peterburg, 1858–59).

²⁴ See below, pp. 82, 86.

N. F. Katanov (d. 1920), I. Orbeli (d. 1940), and L. V. Cherepnin (d. 1944), devoted works to the problems of Oriental chronology connected with Oriental documents. I. ĪŪ. Krachkovskii and V. Beliaev published valuable works treating ancient Central Asiatic documents preserved on skin and papyri. V. Dubrovskii composed a manual of Turkish paleography, but it has not been published. In recent years scholars from Russia and from other Soviet Socialist Republics, such scholars as ĪAkubovskii, Khubua, Papazian, and Dzhikiia, have published many Persian and Turkish documents as well as some in other languages. Another Russian scholar, V. Minorsky, who lives in England, has dealt with privilege grants (*suyurgals*) dating from the fifteenth century. The archives of the khans of Khiva, now in the Saltykov-Shchedrin Library of Leningrad, have been systematically examined by P. P. Ivanov.²⁵

In pre-partition Poland, knowledge of Oriental scripts and documents was primarily associated with the office of dragomans, *i.e.*, translators of Oriental languages at the Royal Chancery.²⁶ The Chancery had several good translators and experts in the field of Oriental documents, such men as K. and R. Dzierzek, Otwinowski, Strutyński, Romaszkievicz, and Zajerski. Towards the end of the eighteenth century Oriental documents in the Royal Archives were translated by Crutta, an Albanian in the Polish service.

The necessity of improving knowledge of Oriental documents and of educating specialists not only for immediate utilitarian, but also for academic purposes, was realized during the reign of Stanislas Augustus (1764–97). Contemporary projects concerning the program of instruction for young dragomans, who were to be educated either in Poland or in the Polish institution of the “jeunes de langue” in Constantinople (1766–93), provided for special studies of Oriental documents. The young men were supposed to copy old *fermans* and to record from original sources, such as old acts and Turkish chronicles, any details referring to Poland. The collapse of the Polish Republic prevented a full realization of these plans.

After the fall of the Republic, Oriental studies continued to progress on an academic level. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Polish scholars raised the problem of examining Oriental

²⁵ P. P. Ivanov, *Arkhiv khivinskikh khanov XIX. v.* (Leningrad, 1940).

²⁶ For a detailed study on this subject, see J. Reyman, *Znajomość i nauczanie języków orientalnych w Polsce xviii w.* (= *Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław*, ser. A, No. 35) (Wrocław, 1950).

documents available in Polish archives. They also considered possible utilization of Turkish archival material for the treatment of Polish history. In 1819 it was decided to send Sękowski to the East. One of the aims of his journey was: "To search for and record acts and materials pertaining to Polish history".²⁷ Indeed, in 1820 he was able to report to Lelewel that he had been promised by the *reis efendi* "a transcript from the Chancery of the Porte listing all treaties, agreements, and pacts concluded by the Porte and Poland".²⁸

The same Sękowski translated and published numerous extracts from Turkish chronicles in his *Collectanea*.²⁹ He included in this work letters from Sultan Murat III and the Grand Vizier to King Stefan Báthory, providing them with editorial comments and a lithographic reproduction. This was the first reproduction of an Oriental document in a Polish edition. Sękowski was eager to collect such documents and wrote in one of his letters: "... if anyone happens to be in possession of any Turkish diplomatic papers, let me have them immediately".³⁰

Turkish diplomacies also attracted the attention of scholars in Vilna, an active center of Oriental studies. I. Pietraszewski published a few corrective remarks concerning Sękowski's translation of the letter of Murat III to Báthory.³¹ A. Muchliński examined Turkish documents referring to Polish history. He published several documents (*e.g.*, *fermans* of 1743 and 1780) in various works, but he did not reproduce the original texts. He also presented in his chrestomathy a number of documents with translations, for the purpose of studies of Turkish paleography and diplomatics.³²

A team of Hungarian scholars examining Turkish archives in 1889 included a Pole, Józef Korzeniowski. The latter, however, was not an Orientalist. He was interested merely in locating missing parts of royal birth certificates, but he failed. Studies in the temporarily

²⁷ A. Jabłonowski, "Orientalista Sękowski w korespondencji z Lelewel", *Pisma*, vol. 7 (1913), pp. 17-18.

²⁸ See Sękowski's letter to J. Lelewel of September 15, 1820; see, *idem*, *Pisma*, vol. 7 (1913), pp. 45-49.

²⁹ J. J. S. Sękowski, *Collectanea z dziejopisów tureckich rzeczy do historii polskiej służących*, vol. 2 (Warszawa, 1825); see H. Neumann, "Türkische Urkunden zur Geschichte Ungarns und Polens", *Der Islam*, 8 (1918), pp. 125-33.

³⁰ Sękowski to Lelewel, February 1, 1825, in A. Jabłonowski, *op.cit.*, vol. 7, pp. 105-07.

³¹ *I. Pietraszewski, *Nowy przykład dziejopisów tureckich dotyczących historii polskiej, a szczególnie Tarychy Wasyf Efendiego*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1846), pp. 1-7, 22.

³² *A. Mukhlinski, *op.cit.*

neglected discipline of Turkish paleography and diplomatics were resumed at the beginning of the twentieth century by Jan Grzegorzewski. In 1916 he published a plan of studies to be pursued by Polish Orientalists.³³ In this he emphasized the necessity of copying all Oriental diplomatic documents which were available in Polish archives and collections. Grzegorzewski himself published a number of Turkish documents from the archives in Sofia, documents dating from the end of the seventeenth century.³⁴ His method was to present a copy, transcribed in printed Arabic characters, together with a translation and comments which, incidentally, were not always accurate. Unfortunately, Grzegorzewski did not provide either reproductions of the original texts or Latin transliterations. He also published two *fermans* from the archives of Sofia and the Czartoryskis' archives in Cracow.³⁵ Although in this case he supplied a facsimile of the texts, he failed to substantiate his translation by producing a transcription or an explanation of his reading. Grzegorzewski also published a number of other texts, *e.g.*, a *ferman* of Abdülhamit I, dated 1775,³⁶ with translations and transcriptions, but without reproductions of the original texts.

As Polish Oriental studies gradually progressed, knowledge of Oriental documents and editorial techniques also improved. O. Górka proposed a special publication, *Monumenta islamitica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia*.³⁷ T. Kowalski, assisted by J. Dutkiewicz, published an eighteenth-century *yarlık*.³⁸ A. Zajaczkowski treated an interesting letter from Süleyman I to Sigismund Augustus. It is interesting to note that the letter in question was written both in the *divani* script and in a sixteenth-century Latin transcription.³⁹ Górka on several occasions

³³ See his letter, "List otwarty do jego ekselencji j.w. Pana Marszałka Krajowego w sprawie orientalizmu i orientalistyki", published in the bulletin of the Polish Oriental Station, *Hyacinthaeum*, 1916.

³⁴ J. Grzegorzewski, *Z siedzib rumelijskich epoki wyprawy wiedeńskiej. Akta tureckie (tekst turecki i polski)* (Lwów-Konstantynopol, 1912).

³⁵ *Idem*, "Dwa fermany sułtańskie z w. XVIII-go", *RO*, 1 (1914-18), pp. 333, one plate.

³⁶ **Idem*, "Ferman sułtana Abdul Hamida z r. 1775 w. sprawie wykupu jeńców chrześcijańskich", *Pamiętnikowa Księga ku uczczeniu Józefa Tretiaka* (Kraków, 1913).

³⁷ See, *Collectanea Orientalia*, 6 (1934), pp. 28-29.

³⁸ T. Kowalski—J. Dutkiewicz, "Jarłyk tatarski z r. 1177 H. (= 1763 D.)", *RO*, 2 (1919-24), pp. 213-19.

³⁹ A. Zajaczkowski, "List turecki Sulejmana I do Zygmunta Augusta w ówczesnej transkrypcji i tłumaczeniu polskim z r. 1551", *RO*, 12 (1936), pp. 91-118, one plate.

stressed the necessity of treating Oriental documents and sources, notably at the 1933 Meeting of Polish Orientalists in Cracow. At the same meeting and also at the Warsaw convention of 1935, S. Szachno-Romanowicz presented a short paper concerning the documents which he was personally examining in the Central Archives of Poland. A report on documents from the Czartoryskis' archives was given by Zawaliński, and S. Szapszał discussed Persian documents from the Central Archives. A few documents were exhibited and subsequently published⁴⁰ on the occasion of the 1929 State Fair in Poznań; others were exhibited on the occasion of the 1935 Convention of Polish Orientalists. In order to train new teams of young Orientalists in Oriental diplomatics and paleography, A. Zajączkowski conducted special seminars in the years 1935–39 and also after 1945. To accomplish his objectives he relied mainly on the tables of script enclosed in the *Einführung* of Fekete. A recent program of Oriental studies has introduced regular seminars in Oriental paleography and diplomatics for those advanced students who elect history as their field of specialization in Polish university programs of Oriental studies. These seminars are conducted in Warsaw by J. Reychman and in Cracow by W. Zimnicki. The latter published a hectographic edition of samples of the *divani* script, provided with comments.⁴¹ Turkish diplomatics and paleography were included in the program of a "Symposium on Oriental sources of the history of Central and Eastern Europe", held in Warsaw in October, 1957. Ottoman diplomatics was discussed in the papers of J. Reychman, "Historical manuscript sources of the Ottoman Turks and of the Crimean Tatars available in Poland, and the problem of their publication"; of L. Fekete, "The immediate tasks and forms of publication of Ottoman-Turkish sources in Hungary"; of B. Đurđev, "Editorial and publishing activities of the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo in the field of Oriental sources"; and of others. See "Rencontres internationales des orientalistes", *PO*, 25 (1958), pp. 122–24; also J. Reychman, "La première conférence sur les sources orientales pour l'étude de l'histoire de l'Europe Orientale", *ibid.*, 26 (1958), pp. 155–59.

⁴⁰ See, *Dyplomacja dawnej Polski* (Warszawa, 1929) (published by J. Siemiński).

⁴¹ *W. Zimnicki, *Tureckie pismo divānī — Ze studiów nad paleografią i dyplomatyką turecką* (Kraków, 1951).

3. COLLECTIONS OF ORIENTAL DOCUMENTS IN TURKEY AND IN OTHER ASIATIC COUNTRIES

Turkey

Government offices in Ottoman Turkey preserved copies and registers of outgoing acts and collected incoming documents, and most of these records were stored in the archives in Istanbul. These archives are extremely rich in such material. Until recently, however, they suffered from a lack of proper care. Moreover, in the early years of the Turkish Republic, during the period of condemnation of all symbols of the Ottoman era, many tons of archival material were thrown out as waste paper. Almost 200 bales of records were even sold to a Bulgarian paper-mill, though the deal was fortunately discovered in time to save some but not all of the material.⁴² The ensuing scandal had the good effect of making the Turkish government and the public archive-conscious. A new start was made in 1932, and since then excellent work has been done in housing, cleaning, and cataloguing the records.⁴³

The largest number of state documents is preserved in the Archives of the Office of the Prime Minister (*Başbakanlık Arşivi* or *Başvekâlet Arşivi*) in Istanbul. This collection originally consisted of the records of the Imperial Council (*Divan-i Hümayun*) and of the Office of the Grand Vizier (*Bab-i Asaî*). It comprised international agreements (*ahitnames*), *fermans* and other documents issued in the name of the sultan (*berats, menşurs*); imperial writings (*hatt-i hümayuns*); personal letters or annotations of the sultans pertaining to their correspondence with army and navy commanders and provincial governors (*valis*); registers of decrees and of directives (*ahkâm defterleri*);⁴⁴ registers of salaries (*mevacip defterleri*) and of fiefs (*timar defterleri*); and finally files pertaining to miscellaneous current affairs.⁴⁵

⁴² Cf., B. Lewis, "The Ottoman Archives as a Source for the History of the Arab Lands", *JRAS*, October, 1951, p. 141.

⁴³ *Idem*, "The Ottoman Archives. A Source for European History", *Report on Current Research*, The Middle East Institute, Washington, D.C., Spring, 1956, p. 19.

⁴⁴ The number of such documents pertaining to the years 1554-1908 amounted to 1,592. They were discussed by Musa Kâzım, "Vesaik-i tarihiyemiz", *TOEM*, 1, ii, (1329), pp. 65-69.

⁴⁵ For a detailed list of the categories in this collection, see B. Lewis, "Başvekâlet Arşivi", *EI* (new ed.), vol. 1, pp. 1089-91.

This archival material was originally housed on the grounds of the Sublime Porte, but after a fire in 1754 it was transferred to a storehouse near the prison of the *Mehterhane* (former barracks of the Grand Vizier's military band). In 1846 the reforming vizier Reşit Paşa provided for the archives a special building called the *Hazine-i Evrak*. Here the archival materials were partially sorted according to departmental categories. This collection contained some 63,312 documents dating from 1730 to 1839. During the vizierate of Ali Paşa the collection was expanded by the transfer of the financial records, which had previously been kept in the *Mehterhane*. Copies of outgoing documents recorded in registers were arranged according to subject matter. Separate documents (*fermans* and incoming letters) were kept in boxes. By 1910 the total number of documents in the archives in question amounted to 350,000 items.

Connected with this institution are the archival deposits of the palace (*Topkapı Sarayı*), most of which were housed in the *Kubbe altı*. The materials in these archives were entirely neglected until after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 when Abdurrahman Şeref, the last imperial historiographer, transferred a greater part of these archives to *Babıali*. The rest, packed in 392 large boxes, was deposited in the galleries of *Aya Sofya*. These materials contained about 500,000 acts, including documents pertaining to more recent times.

There exist also a number of separate archival collections:

1. The archives of the former Ministry of Finance (*Maliye*), which are partially arranged and are located in the *Mehterhane*; 2. the archives of the *Defterhane*, popularly known as the "*tapu defterleri*", which contain documents pertaining to landed property and also approximately 600 cadastral surveys of the provinces of the Empire⁴⁶ (these provide bases for population estimates); 3. the archives of pious endowments (*Evkaf*); 4. the archives of the *şeyhülislâm* (*Meşihat*), containing documents of the *kazaskers* of Rumelia and Anatolia, *fetvas* (legal decisions), and nominations of *kadis* (some of these documents were destroyed in fires in 1926 and 1933; many of them have been published);⁴⁷ 5. the archives of the Fleet and of its Province of the Islands (*Cezayir*), comprising the islands and some coastal areas in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean; and finally

⁴⁶ See B. Lewis, "The Ottoman Archives as a Source for the History of the Arab Lands", *JRAS*, October, 1951, p. 144. They include, among others, the cadastral survey made during the reign of Süleyman I.

⁴⁷ See, *İlmiye Salnamesi* (Istanbul, 1334).

6. the disorderly, partly dispersed and partly destroyed archives of the *şer'î* courts.⁴⁸

Turkish archival collections have suffered not only from recurrent fires (1755, 1809, 1826, 1839, 1878, 1911, 1926, 1933), but also from humidity and general lack of care. They first attracted the attention of scholars at the beginning of the twentieth century when they were examined by a Hungarian historian, Karácson,⁴⁹ and later by a Swede, Jarring, but on the whole they were difficult to handle because of the lack of order. Countries historically associated with Turkey also became interested in Turkish archives, hoping to find there important sources pertaining to their own history. Towards the end of the nineteenth century Rumania took steps to copy documents relating to the history of the Rumanian territories. In 1929 Bulgaria sent P. Dorev to Istanbul, where he copied seventy volumes of documents, of which 1,300 documents, dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, bore on the history of Bulgaria under the domination of the Ottomans. These documents were subsequently translated with the collaboration of V. Šanov, and they were published in 1940, two years after the death of Dorev himself. In 1936 Yugoslavia sent a team of archivists, Turkologists, and other scholars to analyze the contents of the archives in Istanbul from the standpoint of the history of the Yugoslav provinces. The members of the team were S. Stanojević (who published a report on the activities of the expedition), G. Elezović, F. Bajraktarević, and B. Đurđev. After the war these activities were resumed, and many microfilms were made which are now in Belgrade, in the Oriental Institute of Sarajevo, in Skoplje, and in private hands.

Following the foundation of the Ottoman Historical Society (*Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni*),⁵⁰ Turkish historians began to turn their attention to the archives. In 1928, Ahmet Refik [Altınay] proposed that systematic steps be taken toward the publication of the materials in the *Babıali* archives.⁵¹ He proposed separate publication of the sources pertaining to the relations of the Empire with foreign

⁴⁸ "These are now being collected in a number of regional centers, to serve as provincial archives. Cataloguing has begun and some documents have been published or studied", B. Lewis, "The Ottoman Archives as a Source for the History of the Arab Lands", *JRAS*, October, 1951, p. 141. See also H. Ongan, *Ankara'nın 1 numaralı şer'iye sicili* (Ankara, 1958).

⁴⁹ Karácson died in 1911 of blood-poisoning contracted during this work.

⁵⁰ Later renamed *Türk Tarihi Encümeni*, the present *Türk Tarih Kurumu*.

⁵¹ *TTEM*, 19 (96) (1928), p. 164.