

01 Mayıs 2019

ژیتواتوروک، معاهده

۲۲۳

R. Hrair Dekmejian, *Egypt under Nasir: a study in political dynamics*, Albany 1971; Peter Mansfield, *Nasser's Egypt*, Baltimore, MD 1965.

/ محمد مالکی /

**ژیتواتوروک<sup>۱</sup>، معاهده**، معاهده صلح میان عثمانی و خاندان حکومتگر هابسبورگ اتریش در ۱۶۰۶/۱۰۱۵. ژیتواتوروک یا ژیتواتوروک (به معنای دهانه [رود] ژیتوا، در عثمانی ژیدوه) معاهده‌ای بود که میان نمایندگان احمد اول (حک: ۱۰۱۲-۱۰۲۶) و رودولف<sup>۲</sup> دوم، با وساطت نمایندگان ایشتوان بوچکای<sup>۳</sup>، حاکم اژدول (ترانسیلوانیا)<sup>۴</sup>، در کنار ملتقای دو رود ژیتوا و دانوب (در مجارستان) امضا شد (عنعیما، ج ۱، ص ۴۵۴-۴۵۵؛ نیز ع. د. اسلام، چاپ دوم، ذیل ماده). این معاهده، که به جنگهای پانزده ساله میان عثمانی و اتریش (۱۰۱۱-۱۰۱۵/۱۵۹۳-۱۶۰۶) پایان داد، نخستین مرحله افول عثمانیان و پذیرش پایان فتوحاتشان در اروپا محسوب شده است (ع. اوزون چارشیلی<sup>۵</sup>، ج ۳، بخش ۱، ص ۹۸؛ نیز ع. الیاش<sup>۶</sup> و همکاران، ص ۴۷۵). عثمانیان با این معاهده، بسیاری از متصرفاتشان را در اروپا حفظ کردند، اما پذیرش این صلح نشانه ضعف آنان و توان اروپاییان برای کسب امتیاز از عثمانیان بود (ع. فریدون بیگ پاشا، ج ۲، ص ۴۲۱-۴۲۲؛ توران<sup>۷</sup>، ص ۶۱). دو طرف بنابه دلایلی این صلح را پذیرفتند؛ از یک سو، عثمانیان درگیر جنگ با ایران و نیز سرکوب قیامهای جلالی<sup>۸</sup> در آناتولی بودند (ع. فرانسوی زاده، ج ۱، ص ۵۹۶-۵۹۷، ۶۰۳) و از سوی دیگر، با پدید آمدن مذهب پروتستان و دودستگی مردم در آلمان و اتریش، شورشهایی در آن سرزمینها به راه افتاده بود (ع. مهدوی، ص ۸۳). در حدود ۱۰۱۳/۱۶۰۴، بوچکای، که در ابتدا متحد اتریش بود، بر اثر اعمال فشار ارتش کاتولیک اتریش بر مردم پروتستان اردل، شورش کرد و با فرستادن سفیری به استانبول، از سلطان عثمانی کمک خواست (د. ا. د. ترک، ذیل "Ahmed I"). بدین سان، مذاکرات صلح در محل ژیتواتوروک با وساطت بوچکای که در ذیحجه ۱۰۱۴/ فوریه ۱۶۰۶ با رودولف دوم در وین معاهده صلح امضا کرده بود - آغاز شد (ع. د. اسلام، همانجا). علی پاشا، والی بدین<sup>۹</sup>، از طرف عثمانی، بارون دومولار<sup>۱۰</sup> از طرف اتریش و ایشتوان ایلشازی<sup>۱۱</sup> از طرف بوچکای مذاکرات را آغاز کردند و معاهده صلح در هفده ماده، در ۱۰ رجب ۱۰۱۵/ ۱۱ نوامبر

منابع: احمد حمروش، قصه ثورة ۲۳ یولیو، ج ۱، قاهره ۱۹۸۳؛ احمد شرف، «عبدالناصر.. و دوائر سياسته الخارجية»، در جمال عبدالناصر: رؤية متعددة الزوايا، المراجعة اللغوية و التدقيق: طه عبدالرؤف سعد، حلب: دارالكتاب العربي، ۲۰۰۸؛ اسامة غزالی حرب، «ثورة يوليو/ تموز و إعادة تشكيل النخبة السياسية في مصر»، در ثورة ۲۳ يوليو/ تموز: قضايا الحاضر و تحديات المستقبل، بيروت: مركز دراسات الوحدة العربية، ۲۰۰۹؛ تاريخ معاصر كشورهای عربي، زیر نظر د. فویلیکوف و دیگران، ترجمه محمدحسین روحانی، تهران: توس، ۱۳۶۷؛ ش: ثروت عكاشه، «ثورة يوليو/ تموز و المسألة الثقافية»، در ثورة ۲۳ يوليو/ تموز، همان؛ اسحاق موسى حسینی، الاخوان المسلمون: كبرى الحركات الاسلامية الحديثة، بيروت ۱۹۵۵؛ حمادة حسنی، التنظيمات السياسية لثورة يوليو ۱۹۵۲ (۱۹۵۳-۱۹۶۱)، [قاهره] ۲۰۰۲؛ احمد صدقی دجانی، «الاطار التاريخي لثورة ۲۳ يوليو/ تموز»، در ثورة ۲۳ يوليو/ تموز، همان؛ رضوی عبدالقادر، «عبدالناصر و الديمقراطية»، در جمال عبدالناصر، همان؛ رفعت سیداحمد، ثورة الجنرال: قصة جمال عبدالناصر كاملة من الميلاد الى الموت، ۱۹۱۸-۱۹۷۰، بيروت ۱۹۹۳/۱۴۱۴؛ رفعت یونان، محمد نجيب: زعيم ثورة ام واجهة حركة؟، قاهره ۲۰۰۸؛ سعیدابوالریش، جمال عبدالناصر: آخر العرب، راجع الترجمة عن الانكليزية سمير كرم، بيروت ۲۰۰۵؛ سیدياسین، «رؤية ثورة يوليو للصراع الاجتماعي»، الكاتب، ش ۱۶۰ (يوليو ۱۹۷۴)؛ طارق بشري، الحركة السياسية في مصر، قاهره ۲۰۰۲/۱۴۲۳؛ عاصم رزان، «مقدمات حركة ۲۳ يوليو»، در جمال عبدالناصر، همان؛ عبدالسلام عبدالحليم عامر، ثورة يوليو و الطبقة العاملة، [قاهره] ۱۹۸۷؛ عبدالله امام، صلاح نصر يتذكر: الثورة، المخابرات، النكسة، [قاهره] ۱۹۹۹؛ عبدالوهاب بكر، البلاط الملكي و دوره في الحياة السياسية المصرية من اسماعيل الى فاروق: ۱۸۶۳-۱۹۵۲، قاهره ۲۰۰۸؛ عزالدین نجيب، «عبدالناصر و الفن التشكيلي»، در جمال عبدالناصر، همان؛ عزيز صدقي، «ثورة يوليو/ تموز و بناء الصناعة المستقلة في مصر»، در ثورة ۲۳ يوليو/ تموز، همان؛ عصمت سيف الدولة، «ثورة يوليو/ تموز و المسألة الديمقراطية»، در همان؛ عادل عمري، اليسار.. و الناصرية.. و الثورة المضارة.. نظرة جديدة في ملفات قديمة، قاهره ۲۰۰۹؛ لطيفة محمد سالم، فاروق و سقوط الملكية في مصر: ۱۹۳۶-۱۹۵۲، قاهره ۱۹۸۹/۱۴۰۹؛ مصطفى جبلي، «ثورة يوليو/ تموز و التنمية الزراعية»، در ثورة ۲۳ يوليو/ تموز، همان؛ نايف رشيدات، جمال عبدالناصر في الميزان، بيروت ۲۰۰۳؛ نجلاء ابوعزالدين، ناصر العرب، ترجمة فريد ابوعزالدين، قاهره ۱۹۸۸؛ نعيمة ابومصطفى، «عبدالناصر و التنمية»، در جمال عبدالناصر، همان؛ ويلتون وين، عبدالناصر.. قصة البحث عن الكرامة، قاهره ۲۰۱۰؛ محمدحسین هیکل، سقوط نظام! لماذا كانت ثورة يوليو ۱۹۵۲ لازمة؟، قاهره ۲۰۰۸؛

1. Zsitvatorok

2. Rudolph

3. Istrán Bocsokay

4. Transylvania

5. Uzunçarşılı

6. Elitaş

7. Turan

8. Budin

9. Baron du Molard

10. István Illésházy

"ZIKVATOROK" Antlaşması  
(1606)

TMM

Holt, Lambton, Lewis. "The Cambridge...", C. I. A. S.  
340-342

- Zsitvatorok Antlaşması

28 MAYIS 1993

2967 BAYERLE, G. The compromise at Zsitvatorok.  
[Ottoman-Hapsburg treaty of 1606.]  
*Archivum Ottomanicum*, 6 (1980) pp.5-53.

ai territori di confine, che saccheggiavano i villaggi ottomani, facendo prigionieri e uccidendo i musulmani; inoltre i Veneziani costruivano fortezze lungo i confini e offrivano ospitalità ai corsari. Lo *şeyhülislâm* trovò anche una inoppugnabile giustificazione nella storia; infatti secondo gli antichi libri Cipro era stata terra d'Islam per circa trent'anni (26-61/647-680) sotto il terzo successore del Profeta, Mu'awiya, ma poi, ritornata in mano cristiana, le sue moschee erano state trasformate in chiese. Dunque per tutte queste ragioni il sultano non solo era libero dal suo giuramento, ma era anzi un dovere religioso improrogabile che egli combattesse contro la Serenissima per riconquistare pienamente alla *dār al-Islām* i luoghi di culto nei quali erano risonate le sure del Corano<sup>32</sup>.

In questo caso, come molto spesso nella politica internazionale, si trattò di un mero pretesto, tanto che non si fece minimamente accenno né alle incursioni ottomane ai danni delle popolazioni dalmate e istriane, né ai danni inferti dai pirati barbareschi ai navigli veneti. D'altro canto un comportamento simile era già stato tenuto, per esempio; nel 1290 dal sultano mamelucco Qalāwūn quando, per combattere contro il regno latino, aveva gettato la colpa sui cristiani di aver rotto la tregua e si ripeté, secoli dopo, allo scoppio della guerra di Candia.

3. *Szítvatorok, Karlowitz, Passarowitz e la pace perpetua.*

Si è visto come nei tempi più antichi fosse uso che gli accordi tra un sovrano musulmano e un principe europeo venissero discussi in terra d'Islam tramite un ambasciatore occidentale, quindi giurati e portati in Europa affinché anche l'altro sovrano potesse a sua volta giurare un documento simile. Questa, per esempio, fu la prassi che si mantenne nei rapporti tra Venezia e l'Impero Ottomano sino alla prima metà del Cinquecento. In tale periodo il momento della cerimonia era quasi più importante dello stesso documento scritto e gli Ottomani non esitarono a inserirvi elementi propri della tradizione altaica, come per esempio la richiesta avanzata nel 1503 dal *kahya* Lütffi bey a Leonardo Loredan di cingere la cintura che il sultano aveva già indossato in simbolo di amicizia, senza naturalmente precisare che con tale atto il doge avrebbe implicitamente riconosciuto la superiorità di Bayezid II.

A' 16 è zonto un ambassador del Turco con 20 persone: ghe è sta mandà contra 40 zentilhomeni con i piati: e 'l Dose co 'l Colegio è sta su le finestre de la sala de Gran Consegio. È sta fatto un proclama, che alcun in la Terra no ardisa de chiamarlo Ambassador del Turco, ma Ambassador del Signor, sotto pena della vita. L'ha abudo audienza a' 18 e ha presentà al Dose un fazzoal sotil, digando che 'l si Signor s'ha cinto

26 August 2015

- Pasarofaa Ant  
160026  
- Karlofaa  
110451  
- Szitvatorok Ant. 230311

MADDE YAYIMLANDIKTAN SONRA GELEN DOKUMAN

con esso, e che anca lui fazzo 'l medemo in segno de stretta e ferma amicizia: dise, che l'è vegnudo per tuor el zuramento della pace, la qual a '25 del ditto mese, zorno solenne de San Marco, è sta zurada e pubblicada in so presenza; e do zorni avanti, è sta vestio de do veste d'oro e la famegia vestia d'altri vestimenti; et è sta menà in gran Consegio<sup>33</sup>.

Per le popolazioni turco-mongole l'atto di indossare una cintura o un cappello rivestiva una forte valenza simbolica di inserimento subordinato in una comunità, fosse questa una confraternita o uno stato, come testimonia anche il fatto che all'inizio del Quattrocento i figli di Bayezid I erano stati costretti ad accettare cappello e cintura da Tamerlano come simbolo della loro posizione di sudditanza<sup>34</sup>. I Veneziani dunque accettarono, anche se nelle loro fila si trovavano personalità del calibro di Andrea Gritti, che aveva trascorso decenni a Costantinopoli e che era a conoscenza di usi e costumi di quel paese; inoltre bruciava ancora l'inganno già ricordato operato ai danni dell'ambasciatore Andrea Zancani. Per questo il doge giurò un atto che era l'esatta traduzione, anche nell'*intitulatio*, di quello emesso dal sultano e solo dopo qualche tempo Bayezid II, riconosciuto che l'atto non era valido, ne chiese un altro al doge, che si scusò attribuendo la colpa all'interprete<sup>35</sup>.

Il significato simbolico della cintura inviata da Bayezid II al doge può introdurre il problema di cosa pensassero in realtà gli Ottomani della Repubblica di Venezia, se cioè non l'abbiano considerata, almeno in qualche periodo della loro storia, territorio in certo qual modo soggetto o almeno rientrante nella loro sfera di influenza. Effettivamente i Veneziani, a parte i periodi di guerra aperta, erano protetti da accordi di pace sempre ottenuti sborsando del denaro; pagavano annualmente un tributo per l'isola di Zante e anche per Cipro fintantoché si trovò sotto il vessillo di san Marco; l'arrivo di ogni nuovo bailo o ambasciatore veneziano era sottolineato da numerosi doni al sultano e ai grandi della Porta; in alcune occasioni, come per esempio poco prima dell'impresa di Otranto (1480), i sultani chiesero l'aiuto militare dei Veneziani, anche se poi non lo ottennero; infine Venezia tra il Quattro e il Seicento fu visitata da centinaia di rappresentanti diplomatici ottomani. Dal punto di vista del musulmano rigoroso ci si poteva recare nella *dār al ḥarb* solo per negoziare la libertà dei propri correligionari tenuti prigionieri, mentre nel caso di Venezia i motivi più vari spinsero il sultano a farsi rappresentare dai suoi inviati. Procedendo su questa strada, e portando il discorso alle sue estreme conseguenze, si potrebbe forse

<sup>33</sup> D. Malipiero, *Annali veneti*, a cura di F. Longo, «Archivio storico italiano», 7/1 (1843), pp. 3-586; 7/2 (1844), pp. 589-720; in particolare 7/1, p. 122. Da notare che tra i doni inviati da Francesco I al sultano nel 1525 vi era anche una cintura ageminata; cfr. Iannettone, *Politica*, cit., p. 43.

<sup>34</sup> J.P. Roux, *Quelques objet numineux des Turcs et des Mongols, I, Le bonnet et la ceinture*, «Turcica», 7 (1975), pp. 50-64.

<sup>35</sup> Qualche cosa di simile dovette accadere anche dopo la guerra veneto-ottomana del 1537-1540, in quanto il dragomanno Yunus venne inviato nel 1542 a Venezia per assistere a un nuovo giuramento del doge della pace accordata dal sultano il 2 ottobre 1540 e già giurata a Venezia il 30 aprile 1541. Pedani, *In nome del Gran Signore*, cit., p. 152; *I "documenti turchi"*, cit., n. 482; M.T. Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet*, cit., pp. 119-220, doc. n. 3.

<sup>32</sup> Il sunto del colloquio tra lo *şeyhülislâm* e il sultano in ASVe, *Collegio, Relazioni degli ambasciatori*, b. 4, Relazione del segretario Alvise Buonrizzo, cc. 4v-5v.

including the Banque Ottomane, but there were also Ottoman investors. Increasing involvement by Ottoman subjects, including high-level officials, prompted the late Hamidian government to attempt in vain to improve the mines. In the Ottoman parliament convened after the reinstatement of the constitution, there were protests against the high transportation fees charged by the company, which apparently aimed at the ruin of its Ottoman competitors (1909) (see D. Quataert, *Social disintegration and popular resistance in the Ottoman empire, 1881-1908. Reactions to European economic penetration*, New York 1983, 41-70). It was however only in 1937 that the government of the Republic bought back the mines, with a view toward securing a national energy supply in case of war, and in 1940 the entire mining area was nationalised.

*Mine labourers.* Throughout the 19th century, as in earlier periods, mining was not a full-time activity but was practiced by peasants recruited for labour in the mines on a part-time basis (Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia. Trade, crafts, and food production in an urban setting 1520-1650*, Cambridge 1984, 176-7). A law of 1867 specified that all mineworkers, except for the engineers and foremen, had to be Ottoman subjects. This same law also introduced the obligation of villagers to work in the mines; this forced labour continued until 1921. Even today, miners are largely local men, and rotational labour by part-time peasants continues, especially among hewers. However, foreign labourers, including Montenegrins, Croatians and Hungarians, as well as other qualified workers and technicians, were also imported.

Considerable labour unrest first occurred in 1908, when wage demands, fear of mechanisation and a reaction against "outside" miners brought in from Sivas, triggered a wave of strikes; Ottoman local authorities tended to support the strikers against the foreign company. In 1940 obligatory service in the mines was reintroduced, and only abolished in 1948. From 1937 and into the 1940s, prison labour was employed on a considerable scale (Kahveci, *The miners*, 183-200). Private records and memoirs document the unsanitary conditions of life in the mines, and the high incidence of diseases such as tuberculosis, typhus and intestinal ailments. Only from the 1960s onwards did the mines become a focus of organised trade union activity, with a major strike in 1965. Large-scale demonstrations sparked by a long-term decline in real wages, occurred in the early 1990s as well (see on these topics, Mübeccel Kiray, *Ereğli, ağır sanayiden önce bir sahil kasabası*, Ankara 1964; D.A. Roy, *The Zonguldak strike. A case study of industrial conflict in a developing society*, in *MES*, xii [1974], 147-85; Sina Çiladır, *Zonguldak havzasında işçi hareketlerini tarihi, 1848-1940*, Ankara 1977; T. Nichols and Erol Kahveci, *The condition of mine labour in Turkey. Injuries to miners in Zonguldak, 1942-1990*, in *MES*, xxxi [1995], 198-227; Quataert and Nadir Özbek, *The Ereğli-Zonguldak coal mines. A catalog of archival documents*, in *The Turkish Studies Assoc. Bull.*, xxiii [1999], 55-67; Quataert, *Zonguldak maden işçilerinin hayatı, 1870-1920 başlangıç niteliğinde bazı gözlemler*, in *Toplum ve Bilim*, lxxxiii [1999-2000], 80-90). After employing up to 10,000 people in 1914, and 50,000 at the peak of mining activity, the coal mines are today in crisis and scheduled for privatisation.

*Fixed capital and output.* Zonguldak until late into the republican period had few links to the Anatolian interior, and handled all its trade by sea. The port was constructed after 1896 by the French mining company. Railways linking the different mines to the port also were constructed, but by the beginning of the

First World War, the tunnels necessary for connecting the more remote mines to the port had not as yet been dug. Coal production in the early 20th century reached 500,000 tons per year, the foreign company's share amounting to over 75%. By the terms of their contracts, all mining entrepreneurs had to offer 60% of the coal extracted to the government at prices determined by the latter. Apart from the needs of the Navy, Izmir enterprises and households also came to depend on Zonguldak coal, and there were some exports to Greece and Rumania. Yet until 1913 the foreign company was not very profitable, in part because coal seams had been poorly chosen, and management problems were rife. But impediments placed in the company's way by a government hostile to foreign control of a crucial energy source equally limited profitability.

A study published in 1995 emphasised that low investment in the mines has remained typical of the republican period as well, resulting in the widespread use of out-of-date equipment. Much of the capital invested has been derived from international sources, down to 1965, particularly funds made available under Marshall Plan auspices, more recently from the World Bank. Today, Zonguldak coal has increasingly to compete in the Turkish market against the imported item.

*Other industrial towns.* It is one of the peculiarities of Zonguldak province that, apart from the central city, we find two major rival towns. Karabük is of even more recent origin than Zonguldak itself, having been founded in 1939. Partly for military reasons, the steelworks established in this locality, whose construction formed a major item in the Five-Year-Plan of 1932, were built at a considerable distance from the coast, with coal brought in from Zonguldak and raw iron from distant Divriği. The other important town in the province of Zonguldak is Ereğli (Bendereğli, Karadeniz Ereğlisi), which by contrast was a small but active port as early as the 10th/16th century (Faroqhi, *op. cit.*, 110-13). Up to the 1950s, Ereğli's harbour was only suitable for small craft, and the transportation of Zonguldak coal to steamships constituted an important activity, but since 1960, Ereğli has also become the site of a large steelworks, and a modern harbour has been built.

*Bibliography:* Given in the article.

(SURAIYA FAROQHI)

**ZSITVATOROK**, the name of a peace-treaty signed by the Ottomans and the Habsburgs in 1606, and so-called ever since the negotiations leading to it started on boats at the confluence of the rivers Zsitva and Danube (the literal meaning of the word being "Zsitva mouth").

The peace treaty put an end to the so-called "Long" or "Fifteen Years' War", which was begun in 1593 and renewed each year, bringing smaller or bigger successes to both sides without a final victory. The revolt led by István Bocskai against the Habsburgs helped the Ottomans to a certain extent to strengthen their sometimes rather weak positions.

First, Bocskai and the Habsburgs came to an agreement in Vienna on 9 February 1606. Three-party talks started on 29 October, when the Emperor Rudolph II was represented by Ernst Molart, the Sultan Ahmed I by 'Alī, the *beglerbegi* of Buda, and Bocskai by Baron István Illésházy. The treaty, to be valid for 20 years, was signed on 11 November, amended in March 1608 at (Érsek-) Újvár (Nové Zámky), and ratified by the sultan—after long consideration—on 11 October 1608.

The peace treaty stipulated, among other things,

A 82

230311 - Zsitvatorok

WZKM, band 82, Wien 1992,

s. 223-234.

23 OKT 2007

*Çasar oder imperator?* –

## Zur Titulatur der römischen Kaiser durch die Osmanen nach dem Vertrag von Zsitvatorok (1606)

Von MARKUS KÖHBACH (Wien)

Die von den osmanischen Herrschern in Münzlegenden, Bauinschriften und insbesondere Urkunden gebrauchte Titulatur liefert uns wertvolle Aufschlüsse über ihre Machtstellung und ihren Machtanspruch, ihr imperiales Selbstverständnis und dessen religiös-ideologische Hintergründe etc. Ebenso aussagekräftig ist die von den Osmanen im zwischenstaatlichen diplomatischen Verkehr christlichen Souveränen zugestandene Titulatur, weil sie die Einschätzung und Bewertung des jeweiligen Partners widerspiegelt.

Im Gefolge der Schlacht von Mohács 1526 war es infolge der Ansprüche des Habsburgers Erzherzog Ferdinand auf die ungarische Krone<sup>1</sup> zu machtpolitischen und militärischen Konflikten mit den Osmanen, aber auch zu ständigen diplomatischen Kontakten und einem regen Schriftverkehr<sup>2</sup> gekommen. Die Osmanen pflegten Ferdinand, seit 1531 auch römischer König, als *Beç qvralı*, *Nemçe qvralı* etc. oder einfach als *Ferenduş qvralı*<sup>3</sup>, seinen Brüder, den römischen Kaiser Karl V., bloß

<sup>1</sup> Die rechtliche Basis der Ansprüche Ferdinands auf die ungarische und böhmische Krone nach dem Tod seines Schwagers, König Ludwigs II., in der Schlacht von Mohács bildeten die Wiener Erbverträge von 1515, s. HERMANN Zsuzsanna, *Az 1515. évi Habsburg-Jagelló szerződés. Adalék a Habsburg magyarországi uralmának előtörténetéhez*. Budapest, 1961 (Értekezések a történeti köréből, Új sorozat, 21).

<sup>2</sup> Zu den in Original und/oder Übersetzung erhaltenen osmanischen Urkunden des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs bis 1574 s. Ernst Dieter PETRITSCH, *Regesten der osmanischen Dokumente im Österreichischen Staatsarchiv*. Band I (1480–1574). Wien, 1991 (Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs, Ergänzungsband 10/1). Zu den habsburgisch-osmanischen Beziehungen im Zeitraum 1527–1541 und der darauf bezüglichen Korrespondenz s. Anton von GÉVAY, *Urkunden und Actenstücke zur Geschichte der Verhältnisse zwischen Österreich, Ungarn und der Pforte im XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderte*. 3 Bde., Wien, 1840–1842.

<sup>3</sup> Zur Titulatur Ferdinands I. und seines Nachfolgers, Maximilians II., durch Süleymān I. s. Anton C. SCHAENDLINGER–Claudia RÖMER, *Osmanisch-*

- No. 1: Denis Sinor, Notes on the equine terminology of the Altaic peoples. Reprinted from: *Central Asiatic Journal*, Vol. X, Nos. 3-4.
- No. 2: Larry W. Moses, Soviet-Japanese confrontation in Outer Mongolia: the battle of Nomonhan-Khalkin gol. Reprinted from: *Journal of Asian History*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (1967).
- No. 3: Denis Sinor, Radloff's *Proben*. Preface to V. V. Radloff, *South-Siberian oral literature*, I, Indiana University Publications, *Uralic and Altaic Series*, Vol. 79/1, (1967) being a reprint of *Proben der Volkslitteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens*, I (Sankt Petersburg, 1866).
- No. 4: S. Y. Teng, Comments to *China in Crisis*. Reprinted from: *China in Crisis*, Vol. 1, Ping-Ti Ho and Tang Tsou, Editors. Chicago University Press, 1968.
- No. 5: George Macklin Wilson, A New Look at the Problem of "Japanese Fascism." Reprinted from: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. X, No. 4, July 1968.
- No. 6: Denis Sinor, Some Remarks on the Economic Aspect of Hunting in Central Eurasia. Reprinted from: Die Jagd bei den Altaischen Völkern, Vorträge der VIII. PIAC, 1965. Vol. 26 of *Asiatische Forschungen*. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1968.
- No. 7: Svetlana Rimsky-Korsakoff, Soviet Dungan: The Chinese Language of Central Asia. Reprinted from: *Monumenta Serica*, Vol. XXVI, 1967.
- No. 8: S. Y. Teng, Wang Fu-chih's Views on History and Historical Writing. Reprinted from: *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, November 1968.
- No. 9: Denis Sinor, La langue mandjoue. Reprinted from: *Handbuch der Orientalistik V, Dritter Abschnitt: Tungusologie*, F. J. Brill, Leiden/Köln 1968.
- No. 10: Charles R. Boxer, Portuguese and Spanish Projects for the Conquest of Southeast Asia 1589-1600. Reprinted from: *Journal of Asian History*, Vol. III, No. 2, 1969.
- No. 11: Denis Sinor, Two Altaic Etymologies. Reprinted from: *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics Presented to Shiro Hattori*, Tokyo, 1970.
- No. 12: Denis Sinor, Mongol and Turkic Words in the Latin Versions of John of Plano Carpini's *Journey to the Mongols* (1245-1247). Reprinted from: *Mongolian Studies*, ed. by Louis Ligeti, Budapest, 1970.
- No. 13: Gustav Bayerle, Toward a Classification of Ottoman *tapu* Registers. Reprinted from: *Acta Orientalia*. Vol. XXXII (1970).
- No. 14: Denis Sinor, Linguistic Remarks Pertinent to John Bell's Journey from St. Petersburg to Peking (1719-1722). Reprinted from: *Acta Orientalia*, Vol. XXXII (1970).
- No. 15: İlhan Başgöz, Turkish *Hikaye* Telling Tradition in Azerbaijan, Iran. Reprinted from: *Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 83, No. 330, 1970.
- No. 16: İlhan Başgöz and Naili Boratav, Les Devinettes. Reprinted from: *Philologiae Fundamenta*, Vol. II, 1965.
- No. 17: İlhan Başgöz, Dream Motif and Shamanistic Initiation. Reprinted from: *Asian Folklore Studies*, No. 1, 1966.
- No. 18: Denis Sinor, Horse and Pasture in Inner Asian History. Reprinted from: *Oriens Extremus*, Vol. 19, no. 1/2, 1972.
- No. 19: Larry Clark, The Turkic and Mongol Words in William of Rubruck's *Journey*. Reprinted from: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 93.2, 1973.
- No. 20: Denis Sinor, "Urine"-Star-"Nail". Reprinted from: *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 72, 1973.
- No. 21: Edward D. Rockstein, Maritime Trade and Japanese Pirates: Chinese and Korean Responses in Ming Times. Reprinted from: *Asian Pacific Quarterly of Cultural and Social Affairs*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Autumn 1973.

2. Zsitvatorok and  
07 MARS 2005

## THE COMPROMISE AT ZSITVATOROK<sup>1</sup>

G. BAYERLE

### I. *The Problem of the Treaty Texts*

Zsitvatorok is one of those places whose claim to historical fame is tied to a single event that happened only incidentally at that particular location. In the case of Zsitvatorok the name is connected with a peace treaty that was negotiated and concluded there in the latter part of a rainy and cold autumn in 1606. One finds this tiny hamlet on the map only with some difficulty, though its Hungarian name<sup>2</sup> indicates that it was built where the Zsitva creek joins the river Danube, sixteen kilometers east of Komárom, roughly half-way between Győr and Buda. Somewhere in this vicinity the ill-defined antebellum boundary between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans crossed the Danube, though by the time of the negotiations this general region had, in effect, passed under Habsburg control.

It was certainly an unusual place for a diplomatic gathering, particularly if one considers Ottoman practice. According to Ottoman protocol, treaties of peace and friendship were traditionally issued from the sultan's court in Istanbul or perhaps from his summer residence in Edirne. In such edicts, the padishah — the shelter of the universe in the ornate claims of Ottoman intitolations — benevolently granted truces to various Christian or other communities, as if the sultan extended his compassion even to groups of imploring infidels. This rigid form of diplomatic conduct adhered to the Ottoman doctrine of

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to the American Council of Learned Societies for a travel grant to Hungary in July, 1973, and to the Director General of the Hungarian National Archives for his kind permission to carry on my research there. An abbreviated version of this paper was presented at the First International Conference of Turkish Studies at Naples in September, 1974.

<sup>2</sup> Zsitvatorok, or Zsitvatő (an alternate form used on *Generalkarte von Mitteleuropa*, 36° 48') means the mouth of Zsitva [creek]. The Ottoman name for the village is Jidvaboğazi, an exact translation of the Hungarian designation for the place.

در سال ۱۰۰۰ فاضل بنونک انامس و در سال ۱۰۱۰ جادوکار بنونک  
 علی ایچام کتبه به لغات سرکار ذنار بن اذفان ایچام بنونک  
 لکه کج کادوس کما سولک لکن سرکار کتبه  
 مکتوب انعامه بیک معطه جادوکار ایچام بنونک  
 قور بهر مکتوب کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 اذفان جبهه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 رسد سرکار کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 مکتوبه وارقی اذفان کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 سرکار کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه

در سال ۱۰۰۰ فاضل بنونک انامس و در سال ۱۰۱۰ جادوکار بنونک  
 علی ایچام کتبه به لغات سرکار ذنار بن اذفان ایچام بنونک  
 لکه کج کادوس کما سولک لکن سرکار کتبه  
 مکتوب انعامه بیک معطه جادوکار ایچام بنونک  
 قور بهر مکتوب کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 اذفان جبهه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 رسد سرکار کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 مکتوبه وارقی اذفان کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 سرکار کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه

در سال ۱۰۰۰ فاضل بنونک انامس و در سال ۱۰۱۰ جادوکار بنونک  
 علی ایچام کتبه به لغات سرکار ذنار بن اذفان ایچام بنونک  
 لکه کج کادوس کما سولک لکن سرکار کتبه  
 مکتوب انعامه بیک معطه جادوکار ایچام بنونک  
 قور بهر مکتوب کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 اذفان جبهه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 رسد سرکار کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 مکتوبه وارقی اذفان کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه  
 سرکار کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه کتبه

EK V: Kamil Kepeci, Ruus 208, s. 45. Tercüman Mehmed'e dair belge

ÇAĞDAŞ OSMANLI KAYNAKLARINDA  
UZUN SAVAŞLAR VE ZİTVATOROK ANTLAŞMASI  
İLE İLGİLİ ALGILAMA VE YORUM PROBLEMLERİ

Feridun M. EMECEN\*



Zitvatorok Antlaşmasının  
400. Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle

XVI. yüzyılın son çeyreği devasa Osmanlı İmparatorluğu için daha önce böyle bir boyutta hiç yaşanmayan dış ve iç gelişmelere sahne oldu. 1578'de Safevilerle başlayan yıpratıcı savaş yılları sonunda imzalanan 1590 antlaşmasının daha mürekkebi bile kurumadan batıda yeni bir mücadele alanı daha açıldı. 1591'de Bosna hududundaki karşılıklı çatışmalarla parlayan kıvılcımlar, iki sene sonra alevlenerek Habsburglarla resmi bir genel savaşa dönüştü ve bu sürerken de bir taraftan içeride geniş çaplı isyanlar patlak verdi, diğer taraftan doğuda 1603'te Safevilerle yeniden harbe girildi. Habsburglarla baş gösteren zorlu mücadelenin son safhalarında Osmanlı imparatorluğu Celalîlerle yapılan mücadelede hesaba katılırsa, üç cepheli bir savaş veriyordu ve durum imparatorluğun sadece askeri tarihinde değil iç dinamiklerinde de daha önce hiç rastlanmayan yeni gelişmeleri beraberinde getirdi. İmparatorluğun iç bünyesinde ve kurumlarında önemli değişimlerin yaşanmasına vesile olduğu gibi entelektüel kesimde Osmanlı idaresinin sorgulandığı yeni bir süreci de başlattı.

Bütün bu üç yönlü savaş ortamı içerisinde bilhassa batı cephesindeki gelişmeler, iki buçuk asırdan bu yana hedefini Balkanlar ve Orta Avrupa'ya yöneltmiş olan İmparatorluğun bundan sonraki geleceğinin mahiyetini de belir-

\* İstanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü