

OTTOMAN-TURKISH DIPLOMATICS

A GUIDE TO THE LITERATURE *

Ever since the illustrious Josef von Hammer-Purgstall had utilized original Ottoman-Turkish manuscripts in his monumental *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*,¹ historians writing on the old Turkish Empire have more and more been using such documents in their works.² But the scientific study of the external and internal characteristics of the documents as such without regard to their historical content, that is, their paleography and diplomacy, has until relatively recent years been neglected. The purpose of this article is to trace the development of Ottoman-Turkish diplomacy as an independent discipline and to serve as a guide to the more important literature on the subject.

Beginnings

The beginning of Ottoman-Turkish diplomacy lay in the practical necessity of European rulers and their foreign ministers to understand the correspondence from the High Porte. To help them in this task they first em-

* I am grateful to Mr. Arthur Younger, Lecturer on Politics, The New School for Social Research, New York City, for reading an earlier draft of the article and offering comments and suggestions, and to Mr. F. W. Paar and Mr. R. Lord of the Oriental Division, The New York Public Library, for their courtesy in providing the books and journals.

Transliteration of Turkish into European languages varies. Consequently, apart from direct quotations in which the original transliterations are retained, modern Turkish spelling is used here. The following sources were consulted: *Türkisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, by Fritz Heuser (3. verbesserte und stark erweiterte Auflage). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1953; *A Turkish-English Dictionary*, by H. C. Hony, with the advice of Fahir İz. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947; *Türkçe-İngilizce-Sözlük-A Turkish English Dictionary*, by A. Vahid Moran. Istanbul: Kâğıt ve Basım İşleri A. Şirketi, 1945; and "Index" III, "Nume de instituții, lucruri, popoare, ș. a. " in *Paleografia și Diplomatica Turco-Osmana: Studiu și Album*, by Mihail Guboglu. Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1958.

1. Two editions of this magnificent work were published in Pest: in 1827/33 and 1834/36. Reportedly, a new edition was brought out recently in Austria, which testifies to the enduring value of von Hammer-Purgstall's contribution to Ottoman-Turkish historiography.

2. Still mainly in translations by orientalists, because of linguistic and other difficulties. The orientalists have not only brought to light numerous Ottoman documents during the

ployed dragomans, or translators of the Turkish language, whom they recruited chiefly from the inhabitants of Pera — Greeks, Armenians, Genuese, Levantine Franks, and others. Later they drew for this service on graduates of the schools of *jeunes de langues* (Sprachknaben) which they had established. Venice, France, Austria, Poland and Russia had such schools. The Polish school was founded in Istambul in 1766, but went out of existence in 1793, at the time of the second partition of Poland.³ Austria sent since 1578 young people to Turkey for training as translators. From this developed in 1674 the Sprachknabeninstitut in Vienna. In 1754 it was superseded by the Orientalische Akademie.⁴ Von Hammer-Purgstall, "Stolz des Anstalt und der österreichischen Wissenschaft," spent nine years at this school before going to the Orient.⁵ In training dragomans the schools laid stress on knowledge of Ottoman-Turkish documents and script systems and on translation of documents into their own tongues. Thanks to the usually long and rigorous training, students of the French "oriental school" (1669) translated numerous Turkish documents and chronicles; and Russian students assigned for language training to the Russian embassy at Istambul likewise translated many documents.⁶

But scholarly contributions to Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics and paleography were first made early in the 19th century by such eminent translators as Sylvestre de Sacy and von Hammer-Purgstall, and by archivists, as the Hungarian Anton Gévy.⁷ Soon Turkish documents — from various European archives and collections — were being published in reproductions with extensive comments by orientalists, though still mainly on their philo-

three and a half centuries since Savary published in 1615 the 1604 treaty between Sultan Ahmed I and Henry IV of France, but some also have made important contributions as historians, as evidenced by the works of such scholars as Professors Franz Babinger and Paul Wittek, and others.

3. On the establishment of the Polish school, see Jan Reychman, *Zycie polskie w Stambule w XVIII wieku* (Polish life in Istambul in the XVIII century). Warszawa, 1959, pp. 71-97. A reference to it is found in my review of this book in *Balkan Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 395-399.

4. From the "Einleitung" to *Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, p. 5. For the complete citation, see discussion below.

5. *Ibid.* p. 6.

6. Ananiasz Zajaczkowski i Jan Reychman, *Zarys dyplomatyki osmanskotureckiej* (Outline of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics), p. 6. This book is discussed below, pp. 147, where the complete citation is given.

7. S. de Sacy, *Chrestomatie Arabe*. Paris, 1806, and *Paleographie universelle*. Paris, 1839; J. v. Hammer-Purgstall, *Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung des Osmanischen Reiches* (2 vols.). Wien, 1815, and *Abhandlung über die Siegel der Araber, Perser und Türken*. Wien, 1849; and A. Gévy, *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Verhältnisse zwischen Österreich, Ungarn und der Pforte im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (2 vols.). Pest, 1868-72.

logical aspects, with some data on their historical content. It is only since the 1920s, however, that attempts have been made to develop Ottoman-Turkish diplomacy as a separate field of study.

Friedrich Kraelitz-Greifenhorst

The first original contribution to this discipline was the work of the eminent Austrian orientalist, Professor Friedrich Kraelitz-Greifenhorst (d. 22 February 1932), of the University of Vienna, *Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache aus der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur osmanischen Diplomatie* (Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 197. Band, 3. Abhandlung. 111s. + 14 Tafeln), published in 1921. On the basis of twenty-five original manuscripts, most of them from the archives of the former aristocratic Republic of Ragusa, he published a systematic outline of the subject.⁸ The documents — reproduced in the book — were of a certain type, namely, imperial fermâns (orders), and included fermâns of the Ottoman sultans,⁹ to the Republic of Ragusa, to neighboring sancak-beis and different kadis in European Turkey on matters concerning Ragusans, a letter of safe conduct for a Ragusan, and a confirmation of a paid tribute. The author not only traced the evolution of these sultanic documents over a period of half a century, but also transcribed them (in the Arabic alphabet), translated them, and discussed their importance for the study of Ottoman-Turkish diplomacy.

Kraelitz called attention to hitherto neglected aspects of Ottoman manuscripts. He showed that the imperial documents with which he was concerned had specific external and internal characteristics, which he analyzed with great care. Among their external characteristics, that is, their paleography, he considered: the paper of the documents and its place of origin as evidenced by its watermarks,¹⁰ the format of the documents, the manner of their fold-

8. Ragusa is modern Dubrovnik. On the international history of Ragusan manuscripts see Kraelitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5, 43. It should be noted that Kraelitz researched many other documents.

9. Sultan Mehmed II, the Conqueror, and his son Baiazid II.

10. The Ottoman-Turks used only paper (*Kiâğıt*) in their correspondence. It was either white or yellow; and though the latter was brittle and less durable, it was used in the correspondence with foreign princes, because it was considered more imposing and more suitable to the splendor of the imperial palace. Despite its importance, Kraelitz does not discuss the paper. He merely states that the documents "sind durchwegs auf Papier und zwar, soweit dies aus den Wasserzeichen zu entnehmen ist, italienischer Provenienz (Venedig, Palermo) geschrieben." *op. cit.*, p. 7. However, the other authors, dealt with here, devote considerable attention to the subject.

ing, and the *ṭuğrā*; the script systems used on the documents; the kind of ink used in Ottoman offices for various documents and the manner of drying it. As for their internal characteristics, that is, their diplomatics, Kraelitz pointed out that the documents were not simply composed from case to case without any consideration, but were prepared according to certain standard rules. The documents consisted structurally of three main parts: an introductory protocol, the text proper, and a concluding protocol; each part had further subdivisions, as follows:

I. Introduction or Introductory Protocol

A. Invocation (invocatio) of the name of God, called *temğid* or *tahmid*. This was either verbal or symbolic (monogrammatic).¹¹

B. The *ṭuğrā*. This consisted of the name of the sultan, the drawer of the document, and was a gracefully complicated monogram. It was called *tavki*, i.e., placing of the imperial signature, and took the place of the seal.¹²

C. The address (inscriptio), that is, the naming of the person (or persons) for whom the intent expressed in the document was meant. For the addressees there were definitely graded formulas (*elkāb*) according to the rank and status of the addressee, as established in the code of Mehmed II. There was also another formula — salutatō — for the address, which always contained a blessing (*du'a*) and likewise differed with the rank and status of the addressee.¹³

II. Actual Text of the Document

A. Description of the circumstances (expositio, or narratio) leading to the action described in the document, or an account of the condition which led to

11. It also was called *da'vet*. The invocations on the documents included in Kraelitz's study were symbolic, in that they contained an abbreviation of the Arabic word *huva* = He, i.e., God. Documents could contain verbal invocations of different length; see *ibid.* pp. 12-17.

12. The *ṭuğrā* of Mehmed II, which appears on the first nine documents in Kraelitz's collection, reads: "Mehmed, Son of Murād Hān (el-muzzafer da'imā) = Always Victorious." However, from the time of Mahmūd I (1730-1754), the contents of the sultanic *ṭuğrās* changed, in that the title "Hān" was placed immediately after the name of the reigning sultan; thus, Sultan Mahmūd's *ṭuğrā* read: "Mahmūd Hān, Son of Muṣṭafā, Always Victorious". *ibid.* p. 21. The phrase "always victorious" apparently was an imitation of "Semper Augustus", used by the Roman emperors from Constantine the Great on. The origin and significance of the *ṭuğrā* has fascinated many scholars since v. Hammer-Purgstall. The treatises on Ottoman diplomatics examined here discuss the subject; there are also a number of special studies and articles devoted to it, some of which are mentioned below.

13. For the different *elkāb* and *du'a* formulas, see *ibid.* pp. 23-26.

the drawing up of the document, which influenced it, or directly brought it about. The technical expression for this was *iblāğ*.¹⁴

B. Disposition (*dispositio*) of the sultan.¹⁵

C. Affirmation (*sanctio*) of the impositio, or of the avowed will of the sultan, called *tekid*. It consisted of a general phrase which declared that the imperial order be diligently carried out and not counteracted.¹⁶ Often, instead of *sanctio*, there was a threat of penalty (*comminatio*) for disobedience of the sultan's order.¹⁷

D. Declaration of the authenticity of the document, namely, the presence of the *tuğrā* on the document.¹⁸

III. Conclusion or Concluding Protocol

A. Dating of the document. This was in Arabic, according to the Muslim year (*Hegira*-year).

B. Indication of the place where the document was drawn up.

C. Seal (*mühür*).¹⁹

Kraelitz's work had, as he stated in the introductory remarks to it, a dual purpose: "...erstens durch Veröffentlichung möglichst alter Urkunden der Geschichtsforschung neue und unbenützte Quellen zu erschliessen und zugänglich zu machen, und zweitens, die ersten Bausteine für eine osmanische Diplomatie zu liefern und auf diese Weise zu weiteren und ausgreifenden Arbeiten auf diesem noch unbebauten Gebiete anzuregen."²⁰ His brilliant study not only laid the foundation for an independent discipline of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics, but also inspired other scholars to undertake further researches in this field.

14. It usually began with the formula: "on arrival of the high imperial signet, be it known that..." *ibid.* pp. 26-27, and the various documents.

15. This was logically connected with the *expositio* with the definite statement: "I have commanded that...;" "I have issued this august imperial order and commanded that..." *ibid.* p. 27.

16. "...and so you shall know, you shall act accordingly, and in no wise act contrarily." *ibid.* pp. 27-28.

17. An excellent illustration is the *fermān* of Sultan Mehmed II to Peter III, Prince of Moldavia, of June 9, 1456 (Document 1). *ibid.* pp. 44-46.

18. *ibid.* pp. 29-30.

19. Sultan's documents never carried the seal; they had the *tuğrā*. Only *tuğrā*-documents of a state financial content had the seal of the *defterdar*, the director of the fiscal office, *ibid.* p. 39. For discussion of the seal, see *ibid.* pp. 39-42. The seal is discussed by the other writers in some detail, below.

20. *ibid.* p. 4.

Lajos Fekete

Kraelitz's pioneer treatise was followed in 1926 by the study of the Hungarian Turkolog and archivist Lajos Fekete, titled *Einführung in die osmanisch-türkische Diplomatie der türkischen Botmässigkeit in Ungarn* (Veröffentlichungen des Königlichen Ungarischen Staatsarchivs. Budapest. Königliche Ungarische Universitätsdruckerei. LXVIII S. Urkunden 35 S + XVI Faksimiles). Fekete became an orientalist in an unusual way. Taken prisoner by the Russians in World War I, he was sent to far North Asia where he learned from his Turkish companions their language. After his return from captivity, he entered the service of the state archives and devoted himself to mastering Turkish and to the study of Ottoman history. To perfect himself in his scientific work he studied for a time under Kraelitz in Vienna and also visited Turkey.²¹

Fekete investigated numerous original documents in Hungarian and Viennese archives that concerned Ottoman administration of Hungary during the 16th and 17th centuries. He included in his book twenty-one documents (from 1536-1575) pertaining to Hungary but also to relations of Turkey with the Emperor. These he transcribed (in the Arabic alphabet), translated and extensively annotated. In contrast to Kraelitz's investigation which covered imperial *fermāns* concerning a foreign state, Fekete's analysis was based on a great variety of documents — *fermāns*, *mehtups* = letters, *veşikas* = documents, *varakas* = acts, *hurufs* = writings, *berāts* = diplomas of privilege, etc., — dealing with the internal administration of a conquered country. His discussion of their paleography and diplomatics was consequently more comprehensive than that presented by Kraelitz. In the introduction to his work he set out its purpose: "...die vorliegende Arbeit hat es sich zur Aufgabe gemacht einen Ausschnitt aus dem unendlich weiten und vorläufig undurchdringlichen Gebiet der türkischen Diplomatie, nämlich die paläographischen und urkundlichen Eigentümlichkeiten der Urkunden der Botmässigkeit Ungarns (1541-1699) zu behandeln. Auf zwei Wegen sucht sie ihr Ziel zu erreichen. Das einleitende Kapitel soll die wichtigsten Schrift- und Urkundentypen, welche bei den Osmanlitürken in dieser Zeit in Gebrauch waren, darstellen. Der Urkundenteil (Text, Übersetzung und Faksimile der Urkunden) soll durch möglichst reichliche Veranschaulichung der Übung des Urkundenlesens dienen."²² Fekete went a step further than Kraelitz in that he offered his work as a text-book — albeit a highly advanced one — on Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics.

21. Dr. Desiderius Csánki in "Vorwort" to Fekete's treatise, *op. cit.* p. VI.

22. Fekete's "Einleitung," *ibid.* p. IX.

Fekete's *Einführung* comprised two main parts, the paleographic and diplomatic, and a concluding section which discussed the western and eastern influences on the "style and structure of the documents."²³

The paleographic part considered: the paper²⁴ of the documents (sorts of paper, utilization of different sorts of paper, preparation of the paper for writing, the purification of the paper, the watermarks, and the cutting of the paper); the external arrangements of the document (the general format of the document, space for addressee, the margin, ruling, interlinear space, end of lines); the script (official language used, Arabic alphabet, the various script systems); the writing instruments (the pen, ink, writing sand); embellishment of script (ornamental letters, colors, utilization of mixed script systems); the abbreviations; the seal (the use of the seal, the state seal, the legend of the seals, the position of the seal on the document, seal wax), and the packing of the written documents.²⁵

Unlike Kraelitz's documents which in general had an unvaried structure, those which Fekete analyzed showed considerable variations. For, as the author pointed out: "Die ständigen Teile des Textes einer Urkunde nannten die Türken deren Säule oder Pfeiler (rükn, pl. erkjān). Ihre Zahl und Form ist nach der Art der Urkunden verschieden. Die unwichtigeren Schriftstücke ruhten auf weniger und minder prächtigen Säulen als die feierlichen und textlich komplizierten."²⁶ A brief outline of the documents will indicate the rich material underlying Fekete's discussion of the diplomatic formulas used in the different kinds of writing.

Fekete divided the documents into two groups, in accordance with the authorities drawing up the documents: ecclesiastical and secular. "Den Unterschied zwischen diesen zwei Gruppen bildet nicht etwa nur die Person des Ausstellers; auch die rechtliche Grundlage und die Auffassung, die den Geist der Urkunde formt, konnte verschieden sein. Diese Grundlage ist in den kirchlichen Urkunden die *şeri 'at*... oder kurz *şer'* ... genannte summa iuris ecclesia-

23. Kraelitz called attention to Western influences on the structure of the imperial *fermāns*, but he did not develop the subject: "Schon eine oberflächliche Betrachtung wird die auffallende Ähnlichkeit, wenn nicht geradezu Gleichheit mit der abendländischen Kaiser- und Papsturkunden feststellen können. Diese Ähnlichkeit, bzw. Gleichheit ist keine zufällige, sondern zweifellos auf abendländische Einflüsse zurückzuführen, auf die nicht näher eingegangen werden kann." Kraelitz, *op. cit.* p. 42. However, Lajos Fekete, as well as Mihail Guboglu, see below, devote considerable space to it.

24. Fekete provides the first detailed information on the paper used in Ottoman correspondence, *op. cit.* pp. X-XII.

25. Fekete gives a description of the different fabrics, colors and sizes of the *Kise* = sacks for packing documents in, depending on the status of the addressee, *ibid.* pp. XXVII-XXVIII.

26. *ibid.* p. XXX.

stici der Mohammedaner, die auf den Schriften der Kirche ohne jede Vermischung mit dem weltlichen Rechte rein zur Geltung kommt. Die Urkunden der weltlichen Behörden fussen auf weltlichen Gesetzen, auf Erlässen der Herrscher, deren Gesamtheit *kānūn*... hiess. Da der *kānūn* keine Widersprüche zur *Šerīʿat* enthalten durfte, stimmt er im wesentlichen mit dieser überein und war eigentlich deren Auslegung und Anpassung an die wechselnden Verhältnisse."²⁷
The two classes of documents included:

1. *Secular Documents*:

A. Sultan documents.²⁸ These were the most developed as regards style and structure of text, and the most carefully worked out as regards script. They comprised three groups:

1. Documents which began with *intitulatio*, the titles of the sultans (*ʿunvān*):²⁹ imperial letters to foreign rulers, proclamations, peace documents, treaties, decrees, and other special ceremonial documents.

2. Those which, without *intitulatio*, began with *inscriptio* (*elkāb*), that is, with the address to the person: orders to subordinates and ordinary letters to foreign rulers.

3. Those which, without *intitulatio* and *inscriptio*, began with a short introduction: documents designated as *berāt*.

The imperial documents were of the *nāme* and *hükm* type, and the *berāt*. In the former, a *compositum* [with these words served as their designation; such *composita* were for example: *ʿahd-nāme* = written agreement (treaty), *şulh-nāme* = peace treaty. However, documents designated with the word *hükm* "gave no indication of the sort and the content of the document." The *berāt* was an economic regulation, an appointment to a position of honor which was connected with a usufruct from landed property, or with a payment of cash, a receipt for paid taxes, etc.

B. The documents of the higher officials of the central government (in Istanbul and Erdine=Adrianople)³⁰ consisted of two groups:

1. The *telhis*, which originally included reports or proposals from the grand vizir to the sultan, but since the 17th century they also included memorials, and even petitions of the provincial administrations.

2. The *mehtups* or letters from high officials to foreign rulers; they were

27. *ibid.* p. XXIX.

28. *ibid.* pp. XXX-XLVII.

29. Kraelitz did not give any illustrations of *intitulatio*. Fekete, however, gives two: the *unvāns* of Süleiman II (1687-1691) and Muştafâ II (1695-1703). *ibid.* p. XXXII.

30. *ibid.* pp. XLVII-LI.

usually accompanying letters to sultan's name in important matters, such as, conclusion of a treaty or announcement of accession to the throne.

C. The documents of officials vested with full legal power and authority, such as those of vizir-paşa of Buda, and of serdars, the leaders of the armed forces in the war zones.

D. The documents of the beilerbeis: official circular letters, orders (internal orders=the buiuruldus).

E. The documents of the lower provincial administrations: judicial pronouncements of kadis, receipts, passports, authorizations, etc.

F. The copies.³¹

G. The defters (registers, lists) of notices or collections of documents for official or private use.

H. The petitions, memorials, notices.

I. The letters of private persons.

J. The documents of Tartar hāns: regulations and writings.

II. Ecclesiastical Documents. These included:

A. The documents of kadis (judges): decisions rendered in the name of medjlis-i şer = church law; legal decisions.

B. The vakif-nāme documents, in which a charitable endowment was set up in the presence of church authorities.

C. The fetva: interpretations of the Mohammedan church law by the ecclesiastical authorities.

Lajos Fekete's *Einführung* served as a model for later works on the subject.

Interwar Period

a) *Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*. The writings of Kraelitz and Fekete constituted a point of departure for further studies on Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics. And the interwar period saw outstanding works in the field by a number of younger orientalists, as well as by the older scholars. An important vehicle for publication of some of these was the journal *Mitteilungen zur*

31. Copies (*şuret*) of imperial and other documents were collected and preserved; they were similar to the copy-books in the West. Copies always carried a legalization formula (*ibāre-i taşdik*), a short and fervent prayer, and the seal of the kadī who copied the original document. Copies never had the *tuğra*, although the place was indicated with the words: "place of *tuğra*" = *tuğra ierī*, or *mahāll-i tuğrai şerif* = locus signi imperialis. *ibid.* pp. LVII - LVIII. For a detailed discussion of the legalization formula, see Kraelitz's article mentioned in the section "Interwar Period", below.

Osmanischen Geschichte which was founded in 1912 and edited by Professor Kraelitz-Greifenhorst and Dr. Paul Wittek.³² Its purpose was to investigate all aspects of Ottoman history on the basis of original materials in Austrian and other archives and collections. Regrettably it was short lived, having ceased publication (after seven issues) in 1926, apparently owing to lack of means of financing — a casualty of the hard times in post-World War I Austria.

Kraelitz published therein a number of valuable articles on special aspects of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics, including, "Die Tugra der osmanischen Prinzen,"³³ "Studien zur osmanischen Urkundenlehre. I. Die Handfeste (Pençe) der osmanischen Wesire"³⁴ and "Legalisierungsformeln in Abschriften osmanischer kaiserlicher Erlässe und Handschreiben."³⁵ Other important contributions included J. H. Mordtman's analysis of "Zwei osmanische Passbriefe aus dem XVI Jahrhundert,"³⁶ and Joachim Mayr's "Probleme der islamischen Zeitrechnung," an auxiliary study on deciphering dates of the Muslim calendar, indispensable for work in Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics.³⁷ And the present day outstanding German orientalist, Professor Franz Babinger, then a Dozent at Berlin, had an article titled "Ein türkischer Stiftungsbrief des Nerkesi vom Jahre 1029/1620."³⁸ These articles, based on original documents, were either elaborations on or new contributions to special topics that had been touched on by Kraelitz and Fekete in their basic works.

b) *Franz Babinger*. Babinger's contribution to the new discipline during this period is noteworthy. In addition to the aforementioned article, some of his other significant studies included, in chronological order: the article "Zwei türkische Schutzbriefe für Georg II Rákóczi, Fürsten von Siebenbürgen aus dem Jahre 1649;"³⁹ the treatise *Die Grossherrliche Tughra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des osmanischen Urkundenwesens* (Jahrbuch der asiatischen Kunst,

32. Band I, 1921-22. Österr. Verlagsgesellschaft Ed. Hölzel & Co., Wien; Band II, 1923-26. Orient Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, Hannover. It was edited by F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, in cooperation with F. Giese and Paul Wittek.

33. Band I, Heft 2/3, pp. 167-170.

34. (Mit drei Tafeln). Band II, Heft 3/4, pp. 257-268. Kraelitz pointed out that "...die Grosswesire, Wesire und andere hohe Würdenträger in ämtlichen Schreiben ihren Namen in einer der grossherrlichen Tugrā ähnlichen Gestalt unterfertigt haben bezw. unterfertigen liessen und dass dieser oft verschlungene Namenszug im Gegensatze zur Tugrā Pençe...auch (pençe), Handfeste hiess." Here, p. 257.

35. Band II, Heft 1/2, pp. 137-146.

36. (Mit einer Tafel). Band I, Heft 4, pp. 177-201.

37. Band II, Heft 3/4, pp. 269-304.

38. Band I, Heft 2/3, pp. 151-166. This is a detailed study of an "älteren osmanischen Wakfnāme", that of Mehmed Nerkesi Effendi (1592-1635), the kadı and imperial historian.

39. (Mit zwei Lichtdrucktafeln). *Le Monde Oriental* (Uppsala). 1921 X, pp. 115-151.

Berlin, 1925) and the book *Das Archiv des Bosniaken Osman Pascha nach den Beständen der Badischen Landesbibliothek zu Karlsruhe* (Gedruckt in der Reichsdruckerei. Berlin, 1931. 181 S.). These and other writings of Babinger were distinguished by the high accuracy of his paleographic work and the numerous valuable instructions for editing Ottoman documents.

Babinger's *Archiv* deserves comment. It concerned the archives of the imperial treasurer 'Osman Paşâ, which became the booty of Markgraf Herman von Baden at the Turkish defeat during the second siege of Vienna in 1683. The archives contained eighty documents, which Babinger reproduced in the book; he also included four other pertinent documents relating to this dignitary that could not be properly dated. The documents covered various periods in 'Osman Paşâ's political career, and in the words of the author constituted in their "... Umfang eine Geschlossenheit besonderer Art. Man kann sogar sagen, dass eine ähnliche Urkundenreihe über die Laufbahn eines der höchsten Beamten des osmanischen Reiches, noch dazu in geschichtlich besonders bewegter Zeit, nirgendwo nachzuweisen, also einzigartig ist."⁴⁰

Under the general heading "description of documents," Babinger classified the documents in seven groups: imperial letters; documents from the official period of the bostânġi başı Osman Ağâ; documents from the official period of the kaimakam visir 'Osman Paşâ; documents from the official period of the governor of Syria 'Osman Paşâ; documents from the official period of the governor of Anatolia 'Osman Paşâ; documents from the official period of the governor of Egypt 'Osman Paşâ, and documents of indeterminable periods. These documents, which covered the major part of the book, he summarized, in many cases translated, annotated, and provided other useful information.

The text proper consisted of three sections. Section A discussed "the archives and their fortune;" section B described the "life and work of the Bosnian Osman Pasha," and section C analyzed the "contents and form of the documents." An appendix was devoted to what probably was the first discussion "on the history of paper production in the Ottoman Empire."⁴¹

Section C, "contents and form of the documents," constituted "a contribution to Ottoman diplomatics." It described briefly the internal and external elements of the various types of documents included in the aforementioned groupings:

The imperial letters written by Mehmed IV.

The private letters of the Sultan, namely those which were not sent to

40. *Das Archiv*, p. 6.

41. On the origin of the paper used for the documents of the 'Osman Paşâ archives, as evidenced by the watermarks, see *ibid.* p. 32.

the recipient through the office of the grand vizir, but were delivered by special messenger. They accompanied gifts of honor from the Sultan and were a sign of special imperial favor.

The *fermāns* of Mehmed IV, which contained the *tuğrā* and comprised the largest number of documents in the collection, as well as copies without the *tuğrā*.

The letters of the two grand vizirs Köprülü-zāde Fazıl Ahmed Paşā and Kara Muştafā Paşā.

The letters of officials who either were subordinates of 'Osman Paşā or as High Porte-officials were in confidential relation with him.

The legal documents (from his Syrian period).

The lists (*defātir*) concerned with incomes and expenditures, with supplies, armaments, taxes, etc.

Babinger stressed the unusual character and variety of the documents, especially the letters from the hand of Mehmed IV: "Eine besondere Seltenheit stellen die vier eigenhändige Schreiben des Sultans Mehmed IV. (1648-1687) dar. Sie dürften die einzigen derartigen Schriftstücke sein, die ausserhalb der Stambuler Archive sich bis zur Gegenwart erhalten haben. Sultanische Urkunden aus der Zeit gerade Mehmed IV. sind nicht allzu selten in abendländischen Sammlungen. Das rührt, abgesehen von der langen Herrschaft dieses Grossherrn, wohl hauptsächlich daher, dass in seine Regierung jene Türkenkriege in Ungarn, Österreich und anderwärts fielen, die manchen Teilnehmern an den Feldzügen eine zahlreiche Beute an türkischen Schriftstücken vermittelten. Dennoch befinden sich unter den katalogisierten Urkunden aus der Zeit Mehmeds IV., soweit ich sehe, nirgendwo Stücke der vorliegenden Art, nämlich Ernennungsschreiben, Anweisungen an Statthalter sowie Briefe der beiden berühmten Grosswesire Köprülü-zāde Fâdil Ahmed Paşa (Okt. 1661-Okt. 1676) und seines Nachfolgers Kara Muştafā Paşa. (Okt. 1676-Dez. 1683)."⁴²

In the foreword to the study, the author expressed the hope that the book "dazu beiträge, die osmanische Urkundenlehre in diesem und jenem Betracht zu fordern und zu weiteren ähnlichgearteten Untersuchungen anzuregen."⁴³ His hopes were being fulfilled in the period since the war of 1939-1945.

Postwar Period

The development of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics has shown renewed vigor in the post-World War II years, owing to the expansion of oriental

42. *ibid.* pp. 6-7.

43. *ibid.* "Vorwort."

studies in the West and elsewhere as a consequence of the great political changes that have taken place in the world. The rich collections of old Ottoman materials in European archives, libraries and museums are reportedly being carefully inventoried with view to eventual publication (e. g., in Poland, Bulgaria).⁴⁴ Individual and collections of documents have been edited more and more with the purpose of contributing to the discipline. Furthermore, recent years have seen the issue of an important basic work, of a group of documents in a special area, as well as a first university textbook for training of new cadres of orientalists, historians and other specialists.

Numerous studies have been made in the postwar period, but only a few significant ones can be mentioned. In 1948 Paul Wittek reexamined the origin of the *tuğra* in his "Notes sur la tughra ottomane."⁴⁵ In 1952, he published "A letter of Murad III to the Doge of Venise of 1580," with a translation and careful annotations,⁴⁶ and between 1957 and 1959 there appeared his three-part contribution to diplomatics: "Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden."⁴⁷ B. Lewis in his *Notes and Documents from the Turkish Archives. A Contribution to the History of the Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, published in (Jerusalem) 1952, included, among others, five edicts of the Turkish central administration of the second half of the 16th century regarding Jews in Turkey. He not only supplied the texts and translations, but also reproductions of the documents. And the foremost Swedish orientalist, Professor K. V. Zetterstéen published in 1945 his *Türkische, tatarische und persische Urkunden im schwedischen Reichsarchiv* (Uppsala, 1945). The *Turcica* section of this work embraced the correspondence of the sultans, grand vizirs and other leading personalities from 1587 to 1749. The author catalogued and described the invaluable documents, and provided excerpts or summaries of them. In addition, he made useful methodological observations and gave valuable instructions on research in Ottoman diplomatic documents.⁴⁸ The basic book on Ottoman-

44. For Poland, Ananiasz Zajaczkowski i Jan Reychman, *Zarys dyplomatyki osmanskotureckiej*: "Dzis, gdy Zakład Orientalistyki PAN podejmuje prace nad inwentaryzacją dokumentów orientalnych w zbiorach polskich..." p. 4; for Bulgaria, Mihail Guboglu, *Paletografia și Diplomatica Turco-Osmana; Studiu și Album*: "Din inițiativa Institutului de istorie al Academiei R.P. Bulgaria, se lucrează în ultimii ani la inventarierea sau regestrarea întregului material oriental, aflător per teritoriul Bulgariei." p. 13. Guboglu's book is discussed below.

45. *Byzantion* (Bruxelles), 1948, XVII, pp. 311-334.

46. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (London). 1952, XIV, 2.

47. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*. I (LIII, pp. 300-313); II (LIV, pp. 240-256); and III (LV, pp. 124-141).

48. See my review of Zetterstéen's book in *Journal of Modern History* (Chicago) 1951, XIII, 4, pp. 377-78.

Turkish diplomatics, the collection of the special documents, and the text-book deserve more detailed consideration.

a) *Mihail Guboglu*. The first is the splendid *Paleografia și Diplomatica Turco-Osmana: Studice și Album* (Ottoman-Turkish Paleography and Diplomatics: Study and Album) (Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine. Pp. 351 incl. 203 facsimiles + 4 colored plates), by the leading Rumanian Turkolog Mihail Guboglu, published in 1958. Although patterned on the works of Kraelitz, Fekete (especially the latter), and other individual studies, this huge volume in fact offers the first comprehensive discussion on Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics to date, and moreover, contains much new information on the subject.

Guboglu researched numerous Turkish manuscripts and has included reproductions of 203, covering the period from 1453 to the beginning of the first World War. He has summarized, and in many cases has transcribed into modern Turkish, translated and annotated these documents. They relate to Rumania's history during the Turkish era and help give a picture of the administration of the country at that time.

The text consists of: an introductory chapter which describes the various contributions to the discipline in Rumania, in other European countries and in Turkey; paleographic and diplomatic sections; and a number of highly useful appendices.⁴⁹ The paleographic part discusses the external elements of the documents: the paper, watermarks, format, types of script, writing materials and instruments, seals, abbreviations, methods of preservation of documents, etc. An appendix to this section contains many illustrations of watermarks on the various documents, and includes types of script, money and decorations from different periods of Ottoman history.

Following a brief outline of the organization and functions of the imperial chancellery (*divân-ı humâiün kalemi*), the section on diplomatics analyzes exhaustively the internal elements of the different types of documents, that is, their structure and their introductory and concluding protocol formulas. In line with Fekete's *Einführung*, Guboglu groups the documents into se-

49. These include chronological lists of: sultans of the Ottoman Empire, 1299-1922; Ottoman grand vizirs, under various sultans; ministers of finance (*baş defterdarlar*) under selected sultans; nişangis (secretaries of the chancellery) under selected sultans; reis efendi, 1524-1830; chief translators at the Porte (*baş terdjman*), from the 16th to the 19th centuries; kadıs of Istanbul, 1458-1878; Tartar hâns of the North Black Sea; a table for converting Hegira-dates into those of the modern era; and a general bibliography, comprising: oriental manuscripts; Ottoman-Turkish manuscripts; articles and studies; bibliographies, dictionaries, encyclopedias and grammars; and chronologies and numismatics.

cular and ecclesiastical, but includes many types not previously known.⁵⁰ This chapter also has a section describing the oriental and western influences on the "style of Ottoman-Turkish documents."

b) *Nicoară Beldiceanu*. The other contribution is the book of Mme. Nicoară Beldiceanu, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris. I. Actes de Mehmed II et de Bayezid II du ms. fonds turc ancien 39* (École Pratique des Hautes Études VI^e Section) (Mouton et Cie., Paris, 1960, PP/195), published in 1960. It is based on the unusual manuscript *ancien fonds turc 39*, preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, which throws light on the monetary and economic policy of the empire under Mehmed II, the Conqueror, and his son Bāiazid II. In 1956, Franz Babinger published the text from a microfilm supplied him by Mme. Beldiceanu, a former student of his, under the title, *Sultanische Urkunden zur Geschichte der osmanischen Wirtschaft und Staatsverwaltung am Ausgang der Herrschaft Mehmeds II., des Eroberers* (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 49. Südost-Institut, München. Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1956 PP. XIV, 306). In the introduction to it, he pointed out its significance and great value: "Es dürfte kein Zweifel daran erlaubt sein, dass die vorliegende Veröffentlichung die weitaus wichtigste bisherige schriftliche orientalische Quelle erschliesst, die sich im Zusammenhang mit der Erforschung der frühosmanischen Wirtschafts- und Finanzgeschichte wünschen lässt. Sie wird ganz wesentlich dazu beitragen, uns einen Einblick in das Gebaren des Eroberer⁵¹ - Reiches im Gebiete des Geldwesens und der Staatswirtschaft zu gewähren." Babinger listed the documents contained in the manuscript⁵² and stated that a second volume which "eine wenigstens auszugsweise Übertragung der 56 Urkunden enthalten wird, liegt in den Händen meines Kollegen H. J. Kissling (München) und soll in Kürze gleichfalls ans Liht treten."⁵³ But so far as is known, it has not yet been published. Probably because of this delay (?) Beldiceanu published her book⁵⁴.

However, apart from their extraordinary historical value, these documents are an important source on Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics. Beldicea-

50. For example: *hoğēt* = act of victory; *sefaret nāme* = diplomatic document; *takrir* = report; *'ilām* = juridical sentence; *mu'afnāmeberāi* = diploma of immunity; *'arzuhal* = individual petition; etc.

51. Babinger, *op. cit.* p. IX.

52. *ibid.* pp. VIII-IX.

53. *ibid.* p. VII.

54. In 1957, R. Anhegger and H. Inalcik published a Turkish transcription of this document under the title, *Kānūnnāme-i sultāni ber mūceb - i 'ōrf-i 'osmāni* ("Reglements impériaux conformes aux coutumes ottomanes") on the basis of "a manuscript in Topkapi Serayi in Constantinople." Beldiceanu discusses this book on pp. 36ff.

nu does not provide a reproduction of the original text; it will have to be consulted in Babinger's book. But she does give: a brief description of the paleography of the manuscript, and a comprehensive discussion of the sixty documents contained therein.⁵⁵ The major part of the book is devoted to detailed analyses — not translation — of the documents, with extensive scholarly comments.

In her discussion of the diplomatics, the author points out that the documents are imperial, and consist of three main categories: "règlements, bérats et firmans." The règlements are in the greatest part designated *yasaghükmi*, and in some cases *yasagh*, *yasagname*, or *qanunname*,⁵⁶ which is an entirely new type of document, not found in any of the previous studies. Beldiceanu defines it as follows: "L'acte nommé *yasagname*, *qanunname*, *yasaghükmi* ou simplement *yasagh*, est une pièce délivrée en général à une personne pourvue d'une charge. Il formule les règles que le sultan désire voir observées dans tel ou tel domaine, et d'après lesquelles la personne mentionnée doit exercer la charge, dans les limites de laquelle le pouvoir exécutif lui est conféré. Le document peut être également délivré à un group des personnes. Il règle les rapports entre administrateurs et administrés, et, dans la plus grande partie des cas, exhorte les autorités locales à porter aide et assistance aux personnes auxquelles le document est délivré. A cela s'ajoute une clause pénale à l'adresse de ceux qui oseraient transgresser les ordres impériaux."⁵⁷

Her brief schematic outlines of the structure of the three types of documents are reproduced in full, for they bring out concisely the differences in the elements of the documents on which her study is based.⁵⁸

"1. Règlements et Bérats

Dans un règlement ou un bérat émis par la chancellerie ottomane, nous pouvons reconnaître deux parties principales: protocole et texte. Le protocole se divise à son tour en deux parties, protocole initial et protocole final.

Protocol initial.

Invocation, formule pieuse: *huva* (Lui), *huva'l-mugni* (Lui, qui suffit), etc.

Tughra. Elle énonce la personne au nom de laquelle l'acte est rédigé: nom du sultan et celui de son père, suivis de la formule 'toujours victorieux'.

Texte.

55. The difference in the number of documents listed by Babinger and those analyzed by Beldiceanu arises from Babinger's combining of some documents. See discussion in Beldiceanu, *op. cit.* pp. 35-62; also compare documents in Beldiceanu with Babinger's list.

56. Beldiceanu, *op. cit.* p. 41.

57. *ibid.* p. 42.

58. *ibid.* p. 43-44.

Notification et salut. La notification annonce le document; la salut y est intégré.

Adresse-exposé. Dans les règlements et les bérats de notre recueil, les deux parties sont difficilement séparables, et parfois l'adresse est placée après l'exposé. Dans les bérats, cette partie indique que telle personne a été investie dans telle charge, et spécifie qu'un bérat a été accordé. Dans les bérats d'affermage, elle fournit en plus des précisions sur la nature de la ferme, sa durée, la date à partir de laquelle le fermage entre en vigueur, le montant versé pour la ferme et à titre de taxe de bérat.

Dispositif; énonce les décisions du législateur.

Clauses finales; interdisent toute violation de ces décisions et menacent les contrevenants.

Formules de validation; garantissent l'authenticité de l'acte.

Protocole final: Date et lieu d'émission."

"2 Firmans

Le formulaire d'un firman se divise également en protocole initial, texte et protocole final.

Protocole initial: invocation, tughra, adresse et salut, ce dernier étant intégré dans l'adresse.

Texte; Exposé, dispositif, clauses finales, formules de validation.

Protocole final; Date et lieu d'émission.

Le protocole initial des firmans diffère d'habitude dans sa composition de celui des règlements et des bérats. La formule de notification manque, la séparation est nette entre l'adresse et l'exposé, ce dernier faisant partie du texte du firman".

c) *Zajączkowski and Reyhman.* The foregoing works address themselves primarily to specialists, even though Fekete and Guboglu offered their treatises as textbooks. With the spread of oriental studies in institutions of higher learning what was needed was an introductory text. Such book was published in 1954 by Professors Ananiasz Zajączkowski and Jan Reyhman, the leading orientologists at the University of Warsaw, under the title *Zarys Dyplomatyki Osmansko-Tureckiej* [Outline of Ottoman-Turkish Diplomats] (Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955. Pp. 168). It is an outstanding handbook on the new discipline, but its scope is somewhat beyond what its title indicates. For it deals with the paleography and diplomats of oriental documents, that is, those of the countries of the Muslim east with whom the old Polish Kingdom had diplomatic and other relations over a period of five centuries — from the 15th to the 19th, inclusive — mainly Ottoman Turkey, but also the Golden Horde and the Crimean Tartars, and to a lesser extent

Persia. According to the authors, the Polish collections of oriental documents are "one of the greatest" in Europe, and they comprise "for the most part the correspondence of the rulers of Ottoman Turkey, the Golden Horde, Crimea and Persia, with the Polish Kingdom, sometimes *fermāns* regarding trade matters, as well as state papers from Eastern offices which found their way into our collections."⁵⁹ Most of them escaped destruction during the last war. But as the authors point out, in Poland likewise the collections of oriental documents have so far not even "been touched and not worked on," and for the same reasons as elsewhere: lack of knowledge of the languages, of "the distinctness of the character of the scripts and of oriental diplomatic formulas."⁶⁰

As the Polish Government has apparently decided to make its archives accessible to scholars and researchers, the oriental documents will become important for the study of the old Kingdom's relations with Ottoman Turkey, the Tartars, and with Persia. It is with the view of enabling the new cadres of Polish orientalists, historians and archivists now being trained at Polish universities to scientifically explore and utilize these rich collections that Zajaczkowski and Reychman prepared their book.

The text is divided into four parts: introduction, paleography, diplomatics, and auxiliary sciences. The introductory part deals with: the concept and scope of oriental paleography and diplomatics; the history of researches in oriental diplomatics; the collections of oriental documents in Turkey and in other Muslim countries, and a similar survey of collections in Poland and in other European countries; and lists of publications of oriental documents in Poland, Turkey, and in European countries.

The paleographic and diplomatic parts provide the basic information on these subjects (which are covered more elaborately in Fekete and Guboglu), and, in addition, the chapter on diplomatics describes the structure of the Ottoman Government, of the organization of the chancellery, and Poland's relations with the countries of the Orient. The part on auxiliary sciences includes such subjects as chronology, genealogy, numismatics, etc. The discussions of the various topics in the four parts are appropriately annotated and illustrated with reproductions of original documents from Polish archives.

Although the book was designed primarily for Polish university students,

59. *op. cit.* p. 3.

60. *ibid.* p. 3. More than three decades earlier, Kraelitz had called attention to this; it is still true today: "Der Grund weshalb man im Abendlande die türkischen Urkunden verhältnismässig wenig benützte, mag ausser in ihrer geringen Anzahl in abendländischen Archiven und Bibliotheken vor allem in der Schwierigkeit der Entzifferung liegen, die nicht nur eine genaue Kenntnis der Sprache und der Einrichtung des Osmanischen Reiches, sondern auch eine mehrjährige paläographische Schulung erfordert." *Osmanische Urkunden*, p. 3.

it recommends itself as well to students of the discipline in other countries. Indeed, a few years ago, an English translation of it was published in the Netherlands, and another edition was reportedly brought out in the United States in 1965.⁶¹

Turkish Archives and Ottoman-Turkish Diplomatics

The works discussed in this article are based on types of documents found in European archives, libraries, and museums. However, the study of Ottoman-Turkish diplomatics remains incomplete without knowledge of the types of manuscripts available in Turkey. So far only a minute portion of the rich Ottoman collections in that country have been published.

Prior to the Atatürk revolution, access to the Turkish archives had been almost impossible because of their totally disorganized state and the hostility of the Ottoman authorities to their use by foreign, as well as their own scholars. The Young Turk Revolution, which was the first blow to Ottoman absolutism, made possible for a few foreign scholars access to the archives in connection with their scientific investigations. Before the first World War, the Hungarian orientalist and historian Imre Karácsón was the most famous Westerner who, despite considerable obstacles, systematically explored (1907-1911) the manuscript collections in the Top Kapı Serayı. He also was responsible for awakening in Turkish scholars and important public personalities an interest in the problems and administration of the archives.⁶² And during the war, the Dutch orientalist, Professor Johannes Hendrik Kramers (d. 17 Dec., 1951), then a dragoman in the Netherlands Legation in Istanbul (1915-1921), apparently also researched the archives.⁶³

But it is only since the abolishment of the sultanate in the years 1922 - 1924 that the Turkish archives were opened to scholars, which has led to the expansion of our knowledge of the available materials there. Central and

61. By Mouton & Co., The Hague, The Netherlands, under the title, *Handbook of Ottoman-Turkish Diplomatics*. Columbia University in the City of New York has also issued a translation of it, entitled *Turkish Diplomatics*, in its series "Publications in Near East and Middle East Studies, Columbia University." (See *Bulletin*, School of International Affairs and The Regional Institutes 1965-1966, p. 148). However, as I have not seen either of these translations, I cannot comment on them here.

62. On Imre Karácsón's work in the Istanbul archives, see Fekete's "Einleitung," *op. cit.* p. VII, and Guboglu, *op. cit.* p. 11.

63. Johannes Hendrick Kramers, *Analecta Orientalia* (2 vols.). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954. Kramers was Professor of Arabic and Islamic Studies at the University of Leiden from 1922-1951, and served as co-editor of the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden).

Western European scholars and Turkish historians and archivists have been engaged in the exploration and arrangement of the various collections. In the interwar period, the Swede Gustav Jarring was the first to provide information on the Turkish archives which he researched for a study of King Charles XII stay in Turkey. He gave his observations on some of the documents and on the methods used in inventoring and classifying them.⁶⁴ In 1939 Paul Wittek published a guide to the archives, especially those in Istanbul, and gave information about the arrangement of the materials there.⁶⁵ Two years earlier, Lajos Fekete participated as an invited expert in organizing the Turkish archives.⁶⁶ But despite the considerable progress since that time, the collecting, editing and publication of the Ottoman manuscripts in Turkey apparently still create great difficulties because of lack of a sufficient number of Turkish specialists. To remedy this, the Turks have had to appeal to foreigners, particularly Hungarians, for assistance.⁶⁷

It should be noted, however, that Turkish historians have published many Ottoman documents, notwithstanding the aforementioned and other difficulties. After 1910, such documents began to appear in the historical review TOEM-Tarihi 'Osmanî Enğumeni Meğmu'ası, now Türk Tarih Kurumu. Most of this work has been due to Ahmed Refik (d. 1937), and such Turkish scholars as Ismail Hakki Uzunçarşılı, T. Gökbilgin, Ö. L. Barkan, H. Inalcik, and others. And as order is being introduced in the various archives in Turkey, it is to be hoped that both Turkish and other scholars will be able to contribute to a better and more complete knowledge of Ottoman-Turkish diplomacies.

Brooklyn, New York
U.S.A.

ARTHUR LEON HORNIKER

64. *Arkiv forskningar i Turkiet, en preliminar rapport*. Karolinska Förbundet Arsbok, Stockholm, 1939.

65. "Les archives de Turquie," *Byzantion* (Bruxelles). 1939, XII, pp. 691-699.

66. Lajos Fekete, "Über Archivalien und Archivwesen in der Türkei," *Aeta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae*. III, 3, pp. 179-205; also, Guboglu, *op. cit.* p. 16.

67. Guboglu, *op. cit.* pp. 15-16; and Zajaczkowski and Reychman, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-43.