

ZSUZSANNA CZIRÁKI

## Ambassador or Rogue?

*The Labyrinth of Habsburg Diplomacy in the Light of a Murder in Constantinople\**

### INTRODUCTION

Previously, I have extensively researched in the Viennese archives about the circumstances surrounding the appointment of the Habsburg resident ambassador in Constantinople, Simon Reniger (1649–1665). Right from the very beginning, the difficulties in the appointment of Reniger piqued my interest, including the fact that the diplomatic mission began with a huge financial deficit prior to the new envoy beginning his service. When Reniger was dispatched to Constantinople in 1649, it came after three decades of costly war and was in the middle of a general lack of funds that predominated at the Habsburg treasury. At this time, an embarrassingly large amount, 10,000 florins,<sup>1</sup> was sent to the Sublime Porte simply because it was necessary to repay the mountain of debt that his predecessor Alexander von Greiffenklaus zu Vollraths (1643–1648) had left behind after dying in Constantinople in 1648. How was it possible for the resident ambassador to compile such a debt in just a few years of service? Considering the history of the diplomatic mission, it would not have been considered unusual for the diplomats in Constantinople to take out loans of varying amounts to bridge hard times. They managed to deal with issues of liquidity this way arising from the temporary drying up of the financial resources that trickled irregularly from Vienna. However, this was not the case here. In the autumn of 1646, the resident ambassador Greiffenklaus had committed a murder in Constantinople, and despite his efforts to keep it quiet, it quickly leaked out. The incident did not only lead to the ambassador being imprisoned, but also stirred up a minor diplomatic storm in Habsburg–Ot-

---

\* This article has been written within the framework of the project “Everyday Life and Imperial Politics during the Time of the Köprülü Restoration” (OTKA (NKFI) project nr. 109070; principal investigator: Sándor Papp), as well as of the MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network). The research has been supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (NRDI) (Nemzeti Kutatási, Fejlesztési és Innovációs Hivatal) through a grant (Thematic Excellence Programme (Tématerületi Kiválósági Program) 2020, NKFIH-1279-2/2020) of the Interdisciplinary Centre of Excellence (University of Szeged), the Department of Medieval and Early Modern Hungarian History (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Szeged), MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network). András Oross (Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Hofkammerarchiv) and Balázs Lázár (Kriegsarchiv) aided me in my archival work in Vienna related to the subject, and I would like to give thanks to Luis Tercero Casado for the Spanish archival data. The archival research necessary to complete the article was made possible in part by a fellowship in Vienna from the Collegium Hungaricum.

<sup>1</sup> This amount represented the full operational budget for the diplomatic mission for about 3 years.

toman relations. Following Greiffenklau's botched crime, he was only able to secure his freedom by paying out huge amounts of bribes. Since in theory the Holy Roman Emperor had vouched for the ambassador, it seemed to be a good idea to finance his release. However, in the end the creditors did not see a single kreuzer of the money until after Greiffenklau's death, or even until 1649 when the special envoy Johann Rudolf Schmid<sup>2</sup> arrived, having been entrusted with setting up Simon Reniger as resident ambassador and settling the Greiffenklau debt alongside many other duties.<sup>3</sup>

Before familiarising ourselves with the incident itself, I would like to address the question why I think this murder is more than just a colourful story from the east. On the one hand, the analysis of the events provides valuable details about the service of a lesser-known Habsburg ambassador. In general, the rather scanty literature up to this point in connection with the activities at the Sublime Porte of the Habsburg resident ambassador in Constantinople, Alexander Greiffenklau, emphasises two aspects. The first is the diplomatic ineptitude of the envoy and the second is the disgrace of the murder committed against the victim being discussed, who I shall now name, Don Juan de Menesses.<sup>4</sup> In terms of Greiffenklau's professional qualifications, it must be stated that no comprehensive work has been written analysing and evaluating his period as ambassador with proper thoroughness based on the factual materials in the archival sources, so it would be rash to flog the resident ambassador for the time being.<sup>5</sup> The harsh value judgment of posterity, according to which Greiffenklau must have been a lousy diplomat because he was hard-headed, violent and a drunkard, is shaky because the above description was true of many envoys in Constantinople. The fact that the work of two outstanding resident ambassadors – Johann Rudolf Schmid (1629–1643) and Simon Reniger (1649–1665) – bookend his activities at the Sublime Porte may factor into the unfavourable judgment of him. Since the careers of these two envoys were longer and there are more abundant surviving sources on them – so they are better researched – it is easy to fall into the trap of evaluating Greiffenklau as having

---

<sup>2</sup> Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn (1590–1667), was the resident ambassador to the Sublime Porte from 1629–1643, was internuncius in 1649 and grand ambassador in 1650. For an overview of Schmid's career and the contemporary diplomatic terminology, see: Meienberger, *Johann Rudolf Schmid*; Strohmeyer, "Kategorisierungsleistungen und Denkschemata in diplomatischer Kommunikation", pp. 21–30.

<sup>3</sup> For more detail, see: Cziráki, "Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén"; Aulic War Council excerpts from the reports from Constantinople by Johann Rudolf Schmid between 30 April and 2 June 1649, ÖStA HHStA, StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 121, Konv. 1, fol. 60–81; Johann Rudolf Schmid to Ferdinand III, Edirne, 13 August 1649, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 121, Konv. 1, fol. 224–232; Johann Rudolf Schmid's opinion on Greiffenklau debts, s.l., 29 May 1648, ÖStA FHKA, Hoffinanz Ungarn, Kt. 417 (1648.04–1648.06.), fol. 163–169.

<sup>4</sup> Cf.: Hammer, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, vol. 3, p. 249.

<sup>5</sup> The publishing of Alexander Greiffenklau's diplomatic reports, which is proceeding under the direction of Arno Strohmeyer at the University of Salzburg, will certainly provide greater momentum for this research. Recently on the activity of Greiffenklau: Strohmeyer: "Religion – Loyalität – Ehre", pp. 165–181; Würflinger, "Die Verschlüsselung der Korrespondenz des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel".

been overshadowed by Schmid and Reniger. All of this is intensified by the fact that his predecessor in the office – Johann Rudolf Schmid – had a dislike of Greiffenklaus from the moment they met, and he did not even try to conceal his poor opinion of him.<sup>6</sup> The significance of Schmid's antipathy was not minor, since the disfavour of this key expert official on eastern affairs of the Aulic War Council could not be swept under the rug by any circumstances. The question of how his personality fit in with the patron-client network of the Aulic War Council and even the entire Hofburg is also of interest in examining the background to Greiffenklaus's isolation, and without this understanding, the activity of a mid-level diplomat on par with him cannot be understood.

It is not the goal of this essay to examine the networks within the court, but I would like to provide an idea of the role of these relationships in diplomatic life through a few symptomatic examples. After all, one does not have to dig particularly deeply into the documents before finding Greiffenklaus's enemies. His relationship with the grand ambassador Hermann Czernin was markedly tense, and they had several conflicts in 1644–1645 at the Sublime Porte.<sup>7</sup> The aforementioned Schmid – and his ally, the chief interpreter for eastern languages in Vienna, Michel d'Asquier – also worked against him completely overtly. This influential diplomatic advisor clearly took satisfaction when Simon Reniger, who without any doubt was Schmid's client, landed up in the post of ambassador following the death of Greiffenklaus.<sup>8</sup>

In addition, the issue of the Menesses murder similarly beckons for caution. On the basis of earlier works, it is possible to form an image that Greiffenklaus stooped to this awful deed due to his temper without seriously thinking it through, again simply strengthening the image of the “bad diplomat” for posterity (however, this was not an unprecedented incident, since a few years earlier the oft-mentioned Schmid had attempted to use poison to get rid of a rival of his friend and ally d'Asquier. The victim Vincenzo Bratutti was reported to have been too greatly renowned as an interpreter).<sup>9</sup> However, if we unravel the fabric of the archival sources, we are confronted with connections that go far beyond a single individual. Based on the incident, it is possible to gain a glimpse into the mechanisms of Habsburg world diplomacy and the details of the complicated interplay between the two branches – Spanish and Austria – of the ruling family. Thus, in the following I will attempt to examine the conclusions that can be made in con-

---

<sup>6</sup> Johann Rudolf Schmid to Heinrich Schlick, Vienna, 20 July 1648, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 2, fol. 158–161.

<sup>7</sup> Cf.: Czernin, *Zweite Gesandtschaftsreise*, p. 65 and 70; The Turcica collection of the HHStA abounds with dossiers bearing evidence to the discord between the two. Without trying to be comprehensive, see: Alexander Greiffenklaus to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 22 December 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 438–442; Alexander Greiffenklaus to Franz Ulrich Kollowrat, the chairman of the Aulic Chamber, Constantinople, 30 July 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 446–451.

<sup>8</sup> Cf.: Cziráki, “Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén”, pp. 848–854.

<sup>9</sup> Hiller, “A tolmácsper”; Meienberger, Peter, *Johann Rudolf Schmid*, p. 112.

nection with the relations between Vienna and Madrid during an extremely interesting period, the final years of the Thirty Years' War, in the light of this scandal in Constantinople. However, before making wider-ranging conclusions, we should familiarise ourselves with the details of this murder that befit a detective novel.

#### THE MENESSES INCIDENT

Don Juan de Menesses first appears in Greiffenkalu's reports in November 1645. The resident learned of his arrival on the basis of the news that leaked out from the entourage of the grand vizier.<sup>10</sup> According to this, Menesses had been captured at the beginning of autumn on an English ship arriving from Livorno where he was seen as a spy, and so they handed him over to the kadı of İzmir. According to the kadı, the prisoner was a noble knight from Madrid and had stated he was an envoy of the Spanish king. The prisoner demanded that they provide him with an escort and send him off to Constantinople immediately, because he had an important assignment with the sultan.<sup>11</sup> Already at that time, the suspicion arose that he only produced this story because he wanted to escape punishment – or at least this was suggested by the fact that he had not spoken of any kind of mission previously to the other passengers on the ship. In the end, the perplexed kadı provided him with an escort of two Turks and an interpreter, who accompanied him over an extended journey by land and sea to Constantinople. The news of the “envoy” arrived at the Sublime Porte well before the man himself, and doubt also arose in the grand vizier in connection with Menesses's supposed mission during this long wait.<sup>12</sup>

In the meantime, Greiffenklau learned through his informants that the newcomer had sailed to Gallipoli, and then from there had continued over land. He did not bring up the topic at the Sublime Porte, since interest in him had clearly subsided there. However, Menesses finally rolled up to the capital on 30 October 1645 after all, and his arrival fundamentally disrupted relations at the Sublime Porte. He stayed at an ordinary house in Galata and quickly hired a Jewish interpreter. He then made a connection with the grand vizier's “favourite Jewish courtier” and through him got a message to the grand vizier that he had an offer for the sultan that would bring even the Christians to a fever. During all of this, Menesses's arrangements in Constantinople were accompanied by quite a bit of publicity. The people of Galata marvelled at the mysterious Spanish envoy, women, children, passers-by and all sorts of curious people listened with mouths agape to the stories of the loquacious newcomer. However, adversaries also soon appeared, since there were scuffles and other violent events around him on a daily basis according to the imperial diplomatic reports. One way or another, Menesses definitely succeeded in drawing attention to himself, and he purposefully got closer

---

<sup>10</sup> Grand Vizier Salih Pasha (1645–1647).

<sup>11</sup> Sultan Ibrahim (r. 1640–1648).

<sup>12</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 2 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 382–385, and its duplicate, fol. 386–391.

to the decision makers of the Sublime Porte by building upon the colourful cavalcade of genuine and false reports. With unprecedented self-assurance he depicted how the curious inhabitants of the area “harassed” him, so prior to the anticipated negotiations he requested more worthy accommodations – and received them at the house of the grand vizier’s aforementioned Jewish confidant.<sup>13</sup>

Greiffenklau kept a close eye on the developments throughout, and found out that Menesses had not arrived with a letter of commission, as was the custom, which he had supposedly lost in İzmir. Furthermore, it was suspicious that he had marched into the city alone, without an interpreter or servants. The Habsburg ambassador, now proceeding with considerable thoroughness, provided an outstandingly precise description of the man in question. He was an unusually shaven man of small stature and Christian customs who was about 60 years of age, but it was apparent that he was not nearly as aristocratic as he wanted to seem. Considering all of this, an atmosphere of uncertainty surrounded the newcomer. Greiffenklau himself was only certain about one thing in connection with him, he was not who he said he was.<sup>14</sup>

It also soon came to light that Menesses did not have much money. To the troublesome question of why, as an envoy of the Spanish king, he did not make contact with the Habsburg resident ambassador, he only replied that what he had to say was of a confidential nature and it was not for anyone but the sultan. Greiffenklau had found out in the meantime on the basis of reports from his informants in Vienna that Menesses was actually working against Spanish interests, and thus he then intervened with the grand vizier so that they would not take this self-styled envoy seriously. The resident ambassador’s misgivings were further increased by the fact that information obtained from Portuguese, Sicilian and Spanish Jews confirmed the reports that stated Menesses was using malicious trickery against the Spanish crown.<sup>15</sup>

Following the initial interest, the Menesses affair was pushed into the background of Greiffenklau’s surviving reports to Ferdinand III at the end of 1645 and beginning of 1646. However, we do know that he corresponded on this topic separately with the Aulic War Council, as well as with the envoy of the Spanish king in Vienna, the Duke of Terranova, in which particular emphasis was given to the protection of the American interests of the Spanish Monarchy.<sup>16</sup> However, the correspondence from the Habsburg resident ambassador starting in the autumn of 1646 became far less often than it had previously. It was not the contemporary

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 2 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 382–385, and its duplicate, fol. 386–391; Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 28 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 395–401, 402–406 and 407–412; Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 13 February 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 2, fol. 10–21.

<sup>16</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 13 February 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 2, fol. 10–21.

postal service or loss over the years that lay in the background of the lack of reports, but instead, Greiffenklau had been arrested on 31 October 1646.<sup>17</sup> He landed up in prison for two months for something that qualified as a serious crime for both Christians and Muslims, premeditated murder.<sup>18</sup>

In the end, the sources that had dried up resume, starting in the spring of 1647, now discussing the murder that had taken place. On the basis of the subsequent reports related to the matter that encompassed a time of about one year (autumn of 1645 – autumn of 1646), it is possible to know that the resident ambassador's efforts at undermining Menesses were successful and he really did get him sent to prison, but he was not completely successful in eliminating him. After all, the grand vizier did negotiate with the "envoy", who resented the fact that he could not come before the sultan. However, he did relate that he had brought news from America about an island called Madon.<sup>19</sup> He had supposedly received strict orders to reveal the precise goal of his mission only to the sultan, and additionally he suggested that he could bestow new countries and fabulous treasures, including rich gold mines, on the potentate.<sup>20</sup> Originally, he said he would have had a letter of commission as well, if his Arab interpreter that had fled had not ridden off with it along with many other things. The interpreter that assisted in the meeting with the grand vizier – who the translator for the imperial diplomats, Nicusio Panaiotti,<sup>21</sup> had gotten to well beforehand – stated that Menesses was crazy and not a word of his should be taken seriously. Perhaps due to this as well, Menesses was sent back to jail,<sup>22</sup> while in the meantime new reports leaked out little by little about his vague proposal. According to these, there were Christians, Jews and pagans<sup>23</sup> all amongst the inhabitants of the island, but even the imperial interpreter Panaiotti, who had gotten close to the prisoner in disguise, was not able to find

---

<sup>17</sup> Dujčev, *Avvisi di Ragusa*, p. 91.

<sup>18</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 27 March 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 20–25. On the 7<sup>th</sup> of May 1647, he describes that he was freed on 27 December 1646 after he paid the "ransom" from the loan taken out from the grand vizier, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 38.

<sup>19</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 27 March 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 20–25.

<sup>20</sup> The report of the imperial interpreter Nicusio Panaiotti about the death of Don Juan de Menesses, Constantinople, 6 May 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 49/3–4.

<sup>21</sup> Alternatively, Panagiotis Nikousios, a Greek Phanariot interpreter. He was a prominent figure amongst the professional interpreters in Constantinople in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. His career began in 1645 as an imperial interpreter, and later he became the chief interpreter of the Sublime Porte. Cf.: Damien, "Panagiotis Nikousios and Alexander Mavrocordatos"; Hering, "Panagiotis Nikousios als Dragoman der kaiserlichen Gesandtschaft in Konstantinopel"; Cziráki, "Language Students and Interpreters".

<sup>22</sup> He was definitely still in captivity on 22 December 1645. Cf.: Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 2 December 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 425–430, 431–437.

<sup>23</sup> In a later report, Greiffenklau cites Menesses as having said that the inhabitants of the island were all Jewish. Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 28 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 395–401, 402–406 and 407–412.

out the precise location of the island.<sup>24</sup> In the end, the resident decided that it was time to get rid of the bothersome stranger, and so resorting to what seemed to be the easiest solution, he tried to poison him three times. However, none of these attempts met with success, because the victim was able to get the antidote in time on every occasion.<sup>25</sup>

The only consequence of Greiffenklau's attempts was that the danger became perfectly clear to Menesses, so he continued to fight for his life with every trick he had up his sleeve. First, he had to arrange to be freed from captivity. He managed this through the method commonly employed in the empire of the sultans; he "became a Turk", or rather converted to Islam. In addition, he established relationships with a few renegade expatriates in the entourage of the grand vizier, who certainly saw the opportunities in his promises of dizzying wealth. His new friends took him in so that he could write his memoranda to the grand vizier and the sultan from "safe surroundings". These contained extensive descriptions of the Spanish Indies, the sea route there, the gold and silver mines that could be found there and in particular about the Madonians, who had no other desire on earth than to be the subjects of the Ottoman emperor.<sup>26</sup>

As the interpreter Panaiotti later noted in summary, after all of this the "master resident" came to the decision that he would finally wipe out the troublemaker at what he believed to be the secure premises of the imperial embassy. Unnamed Catholic priests in Galata – most probably Franciscan friars who were traditionally well-connected to the imperial embassy – also gave their blessing to this risky plan, thus, resolving the problem of "conscience" related to it. A renegade expatriate chiaus named Mustafa was convinced to abet in the perpetration, and he helped lure Menesses to the house of the resident ambassador in Galata. The ruse was that Mustafa promised an evening of wine drinking to the freshly converted Menesses, who was bristling at the injunction against alcohol, at the house of an English merchant – in reality Greiffenklau's residence. The slightly transparent plan surprisingly worked. After the chosen victim arrived, the resident ambassador sent the staff to the interpreter Panaiotti's house, who knew of the plan, so that none of them would accidentally learn of the assassination or let things slip by accident. Only he remained in the house, as well as the aforementioned Panaiotti and the earlier apprentice interpreter Natale di Paulo, who was at that time a courier in the employ of the Aulic War Council. Following a bit of a scuffle, it was the latter that delivered the final blow to the victim. After the deed had been done, the perpetrators temporarily hid the body in a room, and then buried it on the grounds of the house at two in the morning. They were able to keep the matter secret for a total of two days, when the staff that had returned in the meantime

---

<sup>24</sup> It is not clear which island this might have been, or whether it was an actual place at all or if it was just disinformation. I have not yet been able to find a trace of it in 17<sup>th</sup> century atlases. Cf.: Blaeu – van der Krogt, *Atlas maior*.

<sup>25</sup> Nicusio Panaiotti's report on the death of Don Juan de Menesses, Constantinople, 6 May 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 49/3–4.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

discovered traces of blood at the site of the crime. However, the biggest problem was that one of the perpetrators, Natale di Paulo, panicked and in his fear was constantly hanging around the site where Menesses was buried until it became suspicious and the curious household staff finally dug up the corpse. After this, news spread like wildfire that a dead body had been found in the vicinity of the Habsburg resident ambassador's house. After a while, the kadı of Galata looked into the matter and – considering the significance of the participants – the entire machinery of the Ottoman judiciary went into gear, and the main motor of this was the grand vizier. They interrogated Greiffenklaus and his associates and threw them in prison. From there they were only able to get out by paying a ransom that was covered by large loans that hung over the finances of the Habsburg diplomatic mission for years to come. During this time, the Ottoman leadership made sure that the affair would create an enormous international scandal. The incident contributed to postponing the extension of the Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaty that had been on the threshold of completion, and also altered the communication between the emperor and the sultan. Before long, it led to the dismissal of Greiffenklaus and the appointment of a new resident ambassador – Simon Reniger – following long negotiations.<sup>27</sup>

#### THE DIPLOMATIC PLAYING FIELD OF THE SPANISH MONARCHY IN CONSTANTINOPLE

The topic of the Menesses murder raises interesting questions from several aspects, which cannot be covered completely within the context of this essay. For the time being, we must be satisfied with posing the question that I touched upon in the introduction: how did the diplomatic machinery of the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs work together in this special situation. The key motif of the murder is after all the fact that Menesses contradicted Spanish interests with what he was saying. In hindsight, it is not possible to know for sure what the extent of the truth was in his proposal and where the fantasy began. However, it is clear that the Spanish king and the entire Habsburg dynasty judged his presence in Constantinople to be a threat and decided to eliminate him. The collaboration of the two powers in this instance is particularly interesting because the Spanish crown – in a manner unlike what was common in this period – depended entirely on the set of tools available to their Austrian relatives.

Spain at this time did not maintain any kind of regular relations with the Ottoman Empire, so it did not have a diplomatic mission in Constantinople. Following the agreement to split power between the brothers – Ferdinand and Charles – to establish a worldwide empire, the eastern front on land belonged by the right of the Hungarian crown to the sphere of interest of the Austrian party, which also

---

<sup>27</sup> For more detail on the consequences of the Menesses murder, see: Cziráki, “Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén”; Veltzé, “Die Hauptrelation des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel”, pp. 57–170, especially: pp. 60–61; Hammer, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, vol. 3, pp. 279–280.

possessed the title of Holy Roman Emperor. Despite this, the events in Constantinople were of note on the Iberian Peninsula in the time of Charles V and Philip II, since the North African front and the advances in the area of the Mediterranean Sea that put Italy in fear kept the Spanish interest in the east alive.<sup>28</sup> However, following the great clashes on sea and on land of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the network of informants in the eastern Mediterranean fell apart during the reign of Philip III (1598–1621), or rather was reorganized. In place of their own spy service, intermediaries provided the reports. This process was clearly characterised by the circumstance that they no longer even had the need for an interpreter of eastern languages (dragoman) in Madrid.<sup>29</sup> In this situation, the main font of information arriving from Constantinople as well as from the entire Ottoman Empire could not be any other than the Austrian relatives. Through the Ottoman wars of central Europe, the Austrians were linked by innumerable threads to the Ottoman Empire, and despite breaks of varying length had maintained a diplomatic mission at the seat of the sultan since the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>30</sup>

In the 1640s, the Ottoman-Habsburg relationship had become stable, at least in the sense that both empires had an interest in maintaining the treaty signed in 1606.<sup>31</sup> Although the mutual frontier continued to cause both sides to rattle their sabers due to the regular raids, the occasional skirmishes still did not change the fact that diplomats had the leading role in shaping the relationship between the emperor and the sultan for nearly sixty years. This was a radically new situation compared to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and this was primarily due to the two powers' other concerns – the Thirty Years' War and the French headway in Europe, and the Asian rebellions and war in Crete in the east. Special diplomatic missions to continue the peace became regular occurrences between the two imperial seats, which since 1627 meant the extension of the Treaty of Szőny multiple times.<sup>32</sup> The Habsburg side – based on the 16<sup>th</sup> century precedents – in addition had a permanent envoy (resident ambassador) at the Sublime Porte to maintain constant contact with the monarch and to reconcile possible disputes quickly. Constantinople also held a prominent position as a centre of information amongst the world's great cities at that time, so the duties of the resident ambassador encompassed collecting

---

<sup>28</sup> Davies, *The Golden Century of Spain*, pp. 93–102; Gürkan, Emrah Safa, “Espionage in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century Mediterranean”, pp. 200–220.

<sup>29</sup> Conde Pazos, “La embajada turca en Madrid”, p. 11; Veronelli – Labrador Arroyo, *Diario de Hans Khevenhüller*, pp. 17–19; Davies, *The Golden Century of Spain*, pp. 171–175 and 241–256; Millán – Visceglia, *La monarquía de Felipe III*, vol. 4, pp. 1453–1454.

<sup>30</sup> For more on this, see amongst others: Teply, *Kaiserliche Gesandtschaften*; Nehring, *Adam Freiherrn zu Herbersteins Gesandtschaftsreise*; Nehring, *Adam Wenner*; Hiller, “A Habsburgok török diplomáciája”; Papp, *Török szövetség – Habsburg kiegyezés*, p. 221.

<sup>31</sup> Marton, “A Dissertation in Preparation”, the manuscript's pp. 3–5; Papp, “Az Oszmán Birodalom”; Strohmeyer, “The theatrical Performance of Peace”.

<sup>32</sup> Brandl et al., “Kommunikáció és híráramlás”; Idem, “Kommunikation und Nachrichtenaus-tausch”; Idem, “Válogatott források”; Brandl – Szabados, “A megbízás terhe”; Cervioğlu, “The Peace Treaties of Gyarmat (1625) and Szőny (1627)”; Juhász, “A második szőnyi béke margójára”; Marton, “„Szőnyből tudatjuk...””; Idem, “On the Question of the Negotiations”, pp. 80–81; Idem, “Péter Koháry's Life”.

information through a very carefully established intelligence network as well. This information would be forwarded without delay to the imperial court, or more precisely the Aulic War Council, where the threads of eastern diplomacy came together and where the data was evaluated, and necessary decisions were prepared.<sup>33</sup>

The Turkish war and everything that it entailed – thus eastern diplomacy – was eminently a matter for the Austrian Habsburgs in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, who when necessary then handed over information to their Spanish relatives. This was the state of affairs during the reign of Philip IV (1621–1665) as well, although it seems that the news from Constantinople was hardly noticed by the decision makers of the Spanish crown. The attention of King Philip was naturally engaged with the European war being conducted in alliance with his uncle Ferdinand II (1619–1637) and then with his cousin and brother-in-law Ferdinand III (1637–1657). This was precisely so that Spanish interests would be asserted as much as possible in the aggregation of conflicts ravaging the Holy Roman Empire. The Spanish government was focused mainly on the Netherlands, northern Italy and the French advances in connection with this. Thus, starting from the renewal of the Dutch war in 1621, its primary interest was that its will should be asserted in the heart of the continent, at the Viennese court of its relatives near the fighting. At the same time, the Spanish financial resources that were believed to be inexhaustible and their additional troops had become essential to the Austrian Habsburgs, who were in a hard-pressed situation. The wartime symbiosis of the two branches of the dynasty was clear, and this proved to be effective enough for a long time, despite low points that occurred on occasion. It was no accident that the constant demand of their antagonists at peace negotiations that interrupted the fighting from time to time was to end the Spanish–Austrian collaboration, which took place *pro forma* in the Peace of Westphalia.<sup>34</sup>

Researching the backdrop to the Menesses murder, an obvious starting point is to examine the techniques of the Spaniards to assert their interests in Vienna, which in any case is an inexhaustible topic of the literature dealing with the era. In connection with the system of relations that has been widely discussed by historians, I would only like to point out here that the Spanish influence, which had been of varying intensity, again strengthened at the Hofburg starting in 1631 when another marriage between the Spanish and Austrian branches reinforced the unity of the dynasty.<sup>35</sup> The sister of the Spanish king, Maria Anna (María Ana) arrived in Vienna with a large entourage – including her Capuchin confessor Diego de

---

<sup>33</sup> Meienberger, Peter, *Johann Rudolf Schmid*, pp. 15–34; Hiller, “A Habsburgok török diplomáciája”; Höbelt, *Ferdinand III*, pp. 359–371; Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, pp. 260–277; Strohmeyer, “Die habsburgisch-osmanische Freundschaft”, pp. 223–238; Regele, *Der österreichische Hofkriegsrat*, p. 16.

<sup>34</sup> Stradling, *Philip IV and the Government of Spain*, pp. 129–150; Höbelt, *Ferdinand III*, pp. 173–182; Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, pp. 70–72, 101–110; Ernst, *Madrid und Wien*; Rohrschneider, *Der gescheiterte Frieden von Münster*, pp. 32–91; Alcalá-Zamora y Queipo de Llano, “La política exterior del reinado”, pp. 177–198.

<sup>35</sup> Höbelt, *Ferdinand III*, pp. 53–55; Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, pp. 86–90; Monostori, “Diego Saavedra Fajardo”, pp. 32–48.

Quiroga, one of the most outstanding Spanish diplomats – and her household remained dominated by Spaniards even after her wedding.<sup>36</sup> Thus, the “Spanish party”<sup>37</sup>, which had been present in fact in the life of the Austrian Habsburgs since the time of Ferdinand I, gained strength through the installation of the infanta in Austria and this served as the bridgehead of the Spanish crown in central Europe. In this sense, it contributed as an indispensable means when necessary at any given time for the Spanish king to force his Austrian relatives into the shackles of Charles V’s “universal monarchy” that traditionally prioritised Spanish interests.<sup>38</sup>

If we take stock of Diego Velázquez’s painting of “infanta María” made in 1630 before the wedding, not an iota of doubt remains that Ferdinand III’s wife entered both the marriage and politics as a full partner. In this work of one of the most talented painters at depicting character in the history of art, it is a disciplined young lady looking at us. Her gaze exudes resolve, calm and assurance provided by poised intellectual abilities.<sup>39</sup> Contemporaries also commented on her favourable qualities and further emphasised that she had an extraordinarily great influence on Ferdinand III, who in any case had sensitive nerves and was prone to depression. Characteristic symptoms of this were often brought about by crises, causing him to seek refuge in the sickbed.<sup>40</sup>

Maria Anna seemingly envisaged her role in politics to be a well-prepared ruling partner with her husband, alongside with activities of patronage and representation that were typical of the empresses of the period.<sup>41</sup> All of this is supported by numerous examples, in particular the correspondence of Maria Anna and Ferdinand that abounded with political topics.<sup>42</sup> The most important of these from the perspective of our subject was that the empress was regularly invited to the meetings of the highest decision making forum, the Privy Council, and she was in direct contact with influential Spanish diplomats as well as with her brother Philip

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf.: The payrolls of the court of Maria Anna (1635, 1640), ÖStA HHStA, Obersthofmeisteramt, Sonderreihe, Kt. 76, Konv. 5, sin. fol.; The payrolls of the court of the empress Maria Anna, 1638, ÖStA HHStA, Spanien, Varia, Kt. 11/b (1635–1641), fol. 189–191.

<sup>37</sup> For the sake of simplicity, I am using the older terminology even though more recent literature has pointed out that due to a lack of synchronised action and unified structure amongst the “party members”, the term “Spanish party” (“facción española”, “spanische Partei”) does not really encompass the truth and sounds decidedly anachronistic. Cf.: Marek, *La embajada española*, pp. 40–52.

<sup>38</sup> Ernst, *Madrid und Wien*, pp. 8–33; Tercero Casado, “A Fluctuating Ascendancy”, pp. 1–3; Marek, *La embajada española*, pp. 9–11.

<sup>39</sup> Velázquez, Diego, *Maria de Austria, Reina de Hungría* (oil on canvas, 1630), Madrid, Museo del Prado, (<https://www.museodelprado.es/coleccion/obra-de-arte/doa-maria-de-austria-reina-de-hungria/1e61408f-ef2d-498b-a719-289a1fbd91ff>), accessed: 20 June 2020.

<sup>40</sup> Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, p. 125; Tercero Casado, “A Fluctuating Ascendancy”, p. 2; Marek, *La embajada española*, pp. 134–135.

<sup>41</sup> For female roles in early modern diplomatic context, see: Keller, Katrin, “Frauen – Hof – Diplomatie”, pp. 33–50.

<sup>42</sup> The letters of Empress Maria Anna are edited by Christian Standhartinger under the supervision of Katrin Keller and Andrea Sommer-Mathis at the Austrian Academy of Sciences and will be published in the near future.

IV.<sup>43</sup> The relationship between the two of them could also presumably have been impacted by the fact that Ferdinand and his style of governing was often considered “soft” in Madrid court circles. The followers of the Catholic king made efforts to suppress influence conflicting with Spanish interests – primarily considerations for the Bavarians and the German empire – as much as possible in the environment of the easily manipulated emperor.<sup>44</sup>

In addition to the empress, the Spanish diplomatic mission in Vienna constituted another important hub of power and information in asserting their interests. The diplomatic office of the Spanish crown in Austria during the period in question could already look back on a significant history, since it had operated as the central European citadel of Spanish interests since 1558.<sup>45</sup> In addition to everyday politics, the envoys – during the time of the events in question, the man filling the post was the Duke of Terranova<sup>46</sup> – also played an important role in the expansion and maintenance of the network that linked the Spanish ruler as a patron with courtiers in the entourage of the emperor as clients. These clients agreed to participate in asserting Spanish interests in central Europe for estates and annuities or other advantages in prestige.<sup>47</sup> The efforts of the two branches of the Habsburg family to link the nobility of the courts in Madrid and Vienna through the establishment of family ties played into the hands of the envoy in building up the network of clients. Through the networks of family ties and clients, influential aristocratic families such as the Harrachs, the Dietrichsteins, the Khevenhüllers and the Lobkowitzes belonged to the “Spanish party” during the reign of Ferdinand III, and in certain cases, the emperor’s head chamberlain and chairman of the Privy Council Maximilian Trauttmansdorf also performed significant services for Philip IV.<sup>48</sup>

The empress, Spanish diplomats and well-positioned pro-Hispanic followers that received appanage from the Catholic king moved every stone so that information affecting the Spanish crown would get to Madrid as soon as possible, and

<sup>43</sup> Sommer-Mathis, “María Ana de Austria”, p. 153.

<sup>44</sup> The evaluation of the situation by the Venetian delegation in Madrid is outstandingly telling in terms of this. It discusses in particular how little esteem Ferdinand III had at the Spanish Court. Cf.: The Final Report of the Envoy of the Venetian Republic in Madrid, Venice, 8 February 1649, in, Firpo, *Relazioni*, pp. 182–183.

<sup>45</sup> Marek, *La embajada española*, p. 10.

<sup>46</sup> Diego de Aragón, Duke of Terranova (1596–1663). He was a Spanish duke from a Sicilian family and was Philip’s envoy at the imperial court between 1646 and 1648. Cf.: Ferdinand III’s letter of confirmation for the assignment of the Duke of Terranova to Vienna (draft), Linz, 24 December 1644, ÖStA HHStA, Spanien, Diplomatische Korrespondenz, Kt. 31, Mapped 538, fol. 1–2; For more detail, see: Keller – Catalano, *Die Diarien und Tagzettel*, pp. 220–221.

<sup>47</sup> The current literature interprets the permanent Spanish envoy as a “broker”, who linked the patron and innumerable distant clients. See: Marek, *La embajada española*, p. 39; For more on the diplomatic network of Philip IV, see: Ochoa Brun, “Los embajadores”, pp. 199–233.

<sup>48</sup> As a result of the complexity of the central European Habsburg Monarchy, this network did not only include German, but also Czech nobility and Hungarian aristocrats to a lesser extent. Cf.: Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy*, p. 48; Martí, “Az aranygyapjas lovag”; Marek, *La embajada española*; Winkelbauer, *Österreichische Geschichte 1522–1699*, vol. 1, pp. 85–86; Oross – Martí, “La administración pública”.

they were even able to secure the measures demanded by the given situation at the Hofburg. Considering the above context, it was entirely clear that Greiffenklau and his colleagues did not undertake the murder of Menesses on their own, but were following orders, behind which we can suspect close-knit diplomatic machinery operating between Madrid and Vienna comprised of official and unofficial components. Although no directive ordering a murder has yet been found, an image emerges from the scattered data of why and how it was considered worthwhile to eliminate this agent of dubious origins that had popped up in the sultan's court.

Why Habsburg diplomacy did not just consider Menesses a harmless adventurer and why they dealt with him at all is apparent from the state of the Spanish crown of the 1640s. Spain during the reign of Philip IV had already passed its zenith of power, which amongst other factors manifested in the increasing dissolution of the Iberian Peninsula that was influenced by French manipulation. The Castilianisation and centralisation of this diverse country stalled, serious structural problems weakened public administration and both the economy and society were overburdened by irresponsible financial management and corruption, which was only made worse due to the burden of the war being fought in central Europe. Even the efforts at reform by the Count-Duke of Olivares<sup>49</sup> were not able to reverse the adverse processes, and rebellions reared their heads on the peninsula accompanying the spreading crisis.<sup>50</sup> The defining conflict of the 1640s was the uprising against the Spanish king in Catalonia, which even after 1648 fanned the flames of Spanish–French animosity for years. The situation in Portugal was extremely serious as well, where during Habsburg rule local interests had been similarly sacrificed to Spanish imperial conceptions. The country had fell under Habsburg rule in 1580, but this government representing the preferences of Castile was outstandingly unpopular. Later, in 1640, the Portuguese dispossessed Philip IV of his control and elected their own ruler.<sup>51</sup> Naturally, the Spaniards did everything they could in the interest of reacquiring the country, but their efforts were without permanent result. During this fierce animosity, the Portuguese, who were allied with the French, were not picky about the means they used to weaken their opponent's position.<sup>52</sup>

Thus, for the full investigation of the context of the events it is necessary to include the background information found in the correspondence of Philip IV stating that this Menesses talking about the American colonies was actually a Portuguese agent and was only passing himself off as Spanish because this gave him the best chance to make it across the Mediterranean and to the sultan's court.<sup>53</sup> All

---

<sup>49</sup> Don Gaspar de Guzmán y Pimentel, conde-duque de Olivares (1587–1645). Favourite of Philip IV and prime minister to the king between 1622 and 1643.

<sup>50</sup> Davies, *Spain in Decline*, pp. 6–7 and 23–54.

<sup>51</sup> John IV (Bragança), king of Portugal, r. 1640–1656.

<sup>52</sup> Davies, *Spain in Decline*, pp. 43–47; Disney, *A History of Portugal*, vol. 1, pp. 212–228; Monostori, “Diego Saavedra Fajardo”, pp. 65–70.

<sup>53</sup> Letter of the Spanish king Philip IV to Count Oñate [Íñigo Vélez de Guevara], Madrid, 6 November 1650, AHNM, Consejo de Estado, sf. Leg. 2871.

of this is only underscored by the fact that the “envoy” travelled incognito and without escort. This by itself made the authenticity of his mission questionable, particularly in light that the actual Spanish–Ottoman contacts known from the period were performed through the maintenance of the necessary ceremonial framework.<sup>54</sup> Also speaking against Menesses working for Spain was that he had not sought out contact with the Habsburg resident ambassador in Constantinople, although this would have been an obvious step, with the 1650 mission to Constantinople of the actual Spanish commissioner Alegreto Alegretti serving as a sufficient example.<sup>55</sup>

Although not in an entirely consistent manner, the question of the American gold and silver mines come up time after time in the reports of Menesses’s “secret mission”. It was not by chance that this subject struck a nerve with the Habsburg monarchs. Spain had been pressed into an increasingly defensive stance in its colonies in the face of its English and Dutch rivals, even though the empire’s large-scale enterprises – particularly military – depended directly on the amount of precious metals brought in from America. Clearly, the Portuguese were also quite aware of this, so it is not surprising that they were trying to undermine the power of the rival Spanish king on this point. The committed Portuguese diplomats at this time had appeared in every significant centre of power in Europe and were agitating against the Catholic king, even though the Spanish representatives were able to parry one diplomatic blow after another.<sup>56</sup> What is more, at this time Spain was already sitting at the negotiating table in Westphalia and was successfully fighting to isolate the delegates arriving from the new Portuguese king.<sup>57</sup> In this

<sup>54</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 2 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 382–385 and its duplicate, fol. 386–391; Conde Pazos, “La embajada turca en Madrid”.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid*; the instructions of Ferdinand III to the Habsburg ambassador in Constantinople Simon Reniger, Vienna, 28 January 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 45–50; Aulic War Council extract from Simon Reniger’s report dated 3 April 1650 to Ferdinand III, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 87–89; Simon Reniger’s report to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 3 April 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 113–116, 117–120 and 124–135; Simon Reniger’s report to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 30 April 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 196–198; Instructions of Ferdinand III to Simon Reniger, Constantinople, 5 May 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 199–204; Simon Reniger’s report to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 6 May 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 205–208; Simon Reniger’s report to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 7 June 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 235–236; In a not particularly surprising manner, Alegretti, who was from Dubrovnik, began his service as the court chaplain of Maria Anna, where he obviously came into contact with high-ranking diplomats as well. After the death of the empress, he applied to join the imperial service. His experience in Vienna certainly contributed to his later hiring in Madrid. Cf.: The court payrolls of the empress Maria Anna, 1638, ÖStA HHStA, Spanien, Varia, Kt. 11/b. (1635–1641) Fol. 189–191; See also the note with the title “Memoria de lo que pretenden las criadas y criados de su Mayestad la Emperatriz nuestra Señora que haya gloria” on the orders affecting the court of Maria Anna following the death of the empress in May of 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Obersthofmeisteramt, Sonderreihe, Kt. 76, Konv. 6., sin, fol.

<sup>56</sup> See footnote 51, and in addition: Céspedes del Castillo, “Brasil y los Reinos de Indias”.

<sup>57</sup> Monostori, “Diego Saavedra Fajardo”, p. 70.

light, it is easy to imagine that Menesses did represent Portuguese interests at the Sublime Porte, the objective of which would have been to awaken an interest in America in the Ottoman Empire. However outlandish this idea seems, it could not have been completely imagined out of thin air, since on this issue even Greiffenklaus himself observed that on the basis of his experiences, the Ottomans would have been willing to embark on an “American adventure”, and even the obvious inadequacy of their fleet would not hold them back.<sup>58</sup>

However, how was it possible from Madrid to stave off these kinds of fantasies in Constantinople? The answer is obvious: through Vienna. The Habsburg defeats in the European war and the pressure of the hostile powers brought about the feeling in contemporaries that the days were numbered for the close cooperation of the dynasty. Despite this, it seems that the Spanish diplomatic machinery in Vienna was still operational at the time of the appearance of Don Juan de Menesses, at the end of 1645 and beginning of 1646. An important factor from the perspective of our topic is that the network of Spanish clients was also present in the Aulic War Council, which was responsible for eastern diplomacy and could be considered the “overseeing body” of the Habsburg resident ambassador in Constantinople.<sup>59</sup> We also know that the Habsburg ambassador in Constantinople received orders to defend Spanish interests and various useful news from several sources, from the Spanish envoy in Vienna directly and indirectly through the Aulic War Council. It is worthy of note that in the final years of the war, the Spanish envoy himself took charge of informing his colleague in Constantinople about the military events occurring on the continent and the progress of the negotiations. At the same time, he requested that the activities of the enemies of the Casa de Austria at the Sublime Porte be kept under close observation.<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless, the latter request was not considered unusual, since the resident ambassadors had long kept note of the manoeuvres of the French, English and Dutch at the Sublime Porte,

---

<sup>58</sup> Alexander Greiffenklaus to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 28 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 395–401, 402–406 and 407–412; Alexander Greiffenklaus to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 13 February 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 2, fol. 10–21.

<sup>59</sup> The Spanish also counted on the prestigious vice-chairman of the Aulic War Council Gerhard Questenberg, who had an enormous amount of experience with Ottoman matters. Marquis Francesco di Carreto di Grana’s (the emperor’s envoy in Madrid) report to Ferdinand III, on the discussion with Don Francisco de Melo, Madrid, 13 June 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Spanien, Diplomatische Korrespondenz, Kt. 33. Mappa 567, fol. 56–57; Wenzel Eusebius Lobkowitz, Duke of Sagan was also in the closest pro-Spanish circle and was a member of the Aulic War Council. The duke had prestigious Spanish relatives through his grandmother (María Manrique de Lara y Mendoza) and had a rich pro-Spanish network of connections. Winkelbauer: *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht* 1, pp. 84–85.

<sup>60</sup> The matters generally were limited to learning of, reporting on and reacting to anti-Habsburg initiatives. The latter meant that the ambassador would strive to thwart the initiative using diplomatic means of negotiation at the Sublime Porte. On rarer occasions, there were examples of the ambassador having to intervene actively in the events. Cf.: Alexander Greiffenklaus to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 2 November 1645, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 1, fol. 382–385 and its duplicate, fol. 386–391.

and reports were made of possible sources of danger to the Casa de Austria that came to their attention.<sup>61</sup>

However, it was genuinely extraordinary that from the moment of Menesses's appearance Greiffenklau referred to the secret correspondence with the Duke of Terranova conspicuously often. After his release from prison, Greiffenklau stated directly in a letter to the duke that the emperor should be informed of everything in person that was in the report given to Terranova on the events.<sup>62</sup> He also wrote down in black and white that the "incident that had occurred" took place in the interest of the dynasty. Since he could not refer to this reason before the Ottoman authorities, he had no other choice than to arrange for his own release by paying serious bribes. Greiffenklau expected the court to repay the loans he took out for his release and in addition requested his recall, since following these events he was completely compromised at the Sublime Porte.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, the situation was also aggravated by other circumstances. After all, in the middle of the money shortage squeezing the Ottoman government, the grand vizier, who was considered extremely greedy, used the knowledge that had leaked out about the murder and the related debt to blackmail the resident ambassador. He also tried to exert pressure through him on the court in Vienna so that he could get them to agree to his demands for amendments that had come up during the extension of the aforementioned Treaty of Szőny.<sup>64</sup>

Alongside all of this, the financial difficulties that followed the murder cast a rather bad light on the Spaniards. After all, it can be seen from the comments of the resident ambassador that the Spanish envoy in Vienna who had collaborated in the organisation of the murder had promised to recompense Greiffenklau for

---

<sup>61</sup> See footnote 29. The communication directed through intermediaries in Vienna was also made necessary by the great distance between Madrid and Constantinople. In the reports of the later resident ambassador, Simon Reniger, this reason is stated explicitly: Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 3 April 1653, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 101–112.

<sup>62</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 1 February 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 8–9; Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 21 February 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 10–12.

<sup>63</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 21 February 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 10–12; Presumably informing in person was a typical form of conduct in this confidential matter, perhaps also owing to the fact that the Menesses affair hardly appears in the surviving archival materials in Vienna – the HHStA, HKA and KA. Every indication points to the hub of information in Vienna being the Duke of Terranova. With this understanding, further data related to this topic may be found in Spanish archives. In addition to all of this, it is necessary to note that certain evidence suggests that there were documents related to the Menesses murder in Vienna as well. According to a note in a protocol book from 1647, the Aulic War Council removed the materials touching upon the Greiffenklau–Menesses incident in 1666. The succinct reference did not extend to why the matter came up again and where the materials related to it were taken. There is not a trace of the missing sections in the surviving documents of the War Council. Cf.: ÖStA KA, ZSt, HKR, HR Protokollbücher, 1647 Prot. Exp, fol. 455v.

<sup>64</sup> It was primarily the one-time gift of 200,000 thalers that came up. The report of the courier Johann Dietz on his journey to Constantinople. s. l. 6 May 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 49/5–51.

the expenses of the action. However, Madrid later refused to cover the ever-increasing debts.<sup>65</sup> On the one hand, this is understandable, since Spanish diplomacy obviously wanted to avoid even the impression that it had anything to do with the unpleasant incident. However, on the other hand, there was the imperial court, which had been put in an extraordinarily awkward position by the operation that had gone awry. It should also be taken into consideration that while the mutual intent for peace is clearly seen in retrospect, this was not nearly as obvious to contemporaries. It may have seemed the situation was at a breaking point and could have led at any point to the renewal of war in Hungary, so they did not want to burden the Habsburg–Ottoman relationship, which could never have been called friendly, with unnecessary disputes.<sup>66</sup> In this situation, the imperial court had no other choice than to try to calm the diplomatic storm as quickly as possible and shoulder the considerable expenses that arose from Greiffenklau's actions.<sup>67</sup>

#### CONSEQUENCES

Therefore, it is possible to state without any doubt that the Menesses murder had a political motive. This assertion holds true even if based on the scanty and often contradictory information it is not possible to reconstruct word for word precisely what Don Juan de Menesses was offering at the Sublime Porte. Nevertheless, the reports from the Austrian information network to Vienna and forwarded on to Madrid through the Spanish envoy there proved clearly sufficient to arouse the suspicion of the Spanish government. In the difficult external and internal political circumstances outlined above, the decision of Madrid could not be anything other than to eliminate the dubious Menesses, who according to Greiffenklau's reports knew too much about America and the route there and was willing to share this with the Ottomans. The Habsburg resident ambassador in Constantinople was given a key role in this operation because he was the closest to the fire. Thus, he not only became indispensable in the gathering of information, but

---

<sup>65</sup> The Aulic Chamber, which was entrusted with finding the necessary resources for payment, was also informed about the previous promises of the Spanish envoy but received a negative response. Cf.: The report of the Aulic War Council to the Aulic Chamber. s. l. 9 May 1648, ÖStA FHKA, Reichsakten, Fasz. 186, Konv. 1, fol. 436; There is an itemised listing of Greiffenklau's debts – not just those related to the Menesses murder – and their payment in Johann Rudolf Schmid's: "Nota von der Greiffenclau (seeliger) in Constantinopel hinderlassenen und von mir dagefundenen schulden..." ÖStA FHKA, Reichsakten, Fasz. 186, Konv. 1, fol. 602–606; Ferdinand III also entrusted his envoy in Madrid in vain to collect the debt that arose in Constantinople due to Menesses at the Spanish court, as this never took place according to the information available. Cf.: Ferdinand III to Francesco de Carretto, Marquis of Grana, Vienna, 30 September 1648, ÖStA FHKA, Reichsgedenkbücher 487 (1644–1650), Fol. 520r – 521v.

<sup>66</sup> As occurred in the 1660s. Cf.: Czigány, "A furcsa háborútól a nagy háborúig".

<sup>67</sup> Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 27 March 1647, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 120, Konv. 1, fol. 20–25; Nicusio Panaiotti's letter to Johann Dietz, Constantinople, 7 December 1647, ÖStA FHKA, Reichsakten, Fasz. 186, Konv. 1, fol. 365–366; Nicusio Panaiotti's letter to Johann Dietz, Constantinople, 5 December 1647, ÖStA FHKA, Reichsakten Fasz. 186, Konv. 1, fol. 367; Cf. in addition: Cziráki, "Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén", pp. 862–863.

also in carrying out the murder that was most possibly planned in Madrid. It was naturally necessary to have the cooperation of the War Council in Vienna for this as well. Therefore, for Spain, which at this time had very little means of action in eastern affairs, the infrastructure available to its Austrian relations in Constantinople came in handy and it did not tarry in taking advantage of this.

In examining the consequences of the incident, it should not be forgotten that the significance of the Menesses murder is dwarfed by the larger conflicts of the period – in particular the final phase of the Thirty Years' War as well as the emerging Ottoman-Venetian war for control of Crete. Despite this, it is my view that the affair can provide interesting details about the history of relations not only between the two Habsburg branches, but also between the Habsburgs and the Ottoman Empire. This is on the one hand due to its documentation of the collaboration of the Habsburg dynasty in an unusual environment – Constantinople – during a period that the literature traditionally considers a time when Spanish–Austrian cooperation was waning. In truth, 1646–1648 was clearly a period when Spain and Austria were drifting apart, with Spanish influence continuously diminishing in Vienna due to the pressure from the successes of French diplomacy, as well as Swedish/Protestant military advances. All of this was made worse by the “Spanish party” in the Hofburg being weakened by the death of the empress Maria Anna on 13 May 1646, the gradual elimination of her household and the reorganisation of Spanish diplomacy in Vienna in conjunction with this. Accordingly, it is particularly edifying that while the negotiating parties at Westphalia were working to separate the Austrians and Spaniards as quickly as possible, they were still able to synchronise their interests and actions through the old channels of the family's diplomacy.<sup>68</sup>

Alongside this, it is not possible to cover up the fact that the joint operation did not succeed perfectly by any means. By taking a closer look at the events, it is clear that the two parties – the Spanish and Austrian branches of the dynasty – were thoroughly disappointed by the collaboration. Vienna obviously resented the fact that not only had the emperor's reputation in Constantinople been endangered during the events, but also in the end they had to settle the steep bill arising from the murder themselves. Even though Madrid achieved its objective in the end with the elimination of Menesses, it was dissatisfied with the quality and frequency of the information from Constantinople through the mediation of Vienna. The Hofburg was able to take advantage of its better position to gain information in its own interest, which in general was only counterbalanced with difficulty by the supplementary reports obtained by the members of the “Spanish party” in Vienna.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Tercero Casado, “A Fluctuating Ascendancy”, p. 3; Marek, *La embajada española*, pp. 138–139; Höbelt, *Ferdinand III*, pp. 265–292; Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, pp. 260–265; Rohrschneider, *Der gescheiterte Frieden von Münster*, pp. 299–406.

<sup>69</sup> Marquis Francesco di Carreto di Grana's (the emperor's envoy in Madrid) report to Ferdinand III on the discussion with Don Francisco de Melo, Madrid, 13 June 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Spanien, Diplomatische Korrespondenz, Kt. 33, Mappa 567, fol. 56–57; Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 3 April 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 101–112; Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 3 April 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122,

It is also certainly due to this odd situation that at precisely around this time the Spanish crown attempted to establish new, direct diplomatic relations with Constantinople. In examining the motivation for this, it is necessary to account for other factors in addition to the lack of information that came up on the agenda from time to time. Nor is it without consequence, for example, that the king of Spain, who came out of the negotiations at Westphalia with his authority in shreds – reviving the image of their role at Lepanto – wanted to prove to Europe that he was not indifferent to what was going on in the eastern section of the Mediterranean. The attack on the Venetian territory of Crete in 1645 stirred old fears in the people of the Mediterranean Sea, primarily on the Italian coasts where the Spanish crown also had interests.<sup>70</sup> In addition to the genuine traumas of the long-lasting Ottoman–Venetian conflict, French diplomacy also played a major role in influencing the mood in Italy. They proclaimed to everyone that the Habsburgs would abandon the parts of the peninsula under the dynasty’s rule before a “pagan” invasion that was on the threshold.<sup>71</sup>

Under these circumstances, the development of another, direct relationship in Constantinople would have been useful by all means, naturally alongside the maintenance of the Vienna–Madrid path of information. This was even more so because the sultan had shown interest in establishing contact with the Catholic king. In the shadow of the Cretan War, the reawakening Spanish–Ottoman interests that the Austrian Habsburgs wanted to avoid reached its zenith in essence in 1649–1650. Constantinople was the initiator, when in the autumn of 1649 a renegade expatriate named Ahmed Agha – who had a Spanish Jewish background – arrived in a delegation to Philip IV with the objective of regularizing the “friendly” relations of the two powers in an official agreement.<sup>72</sup> The return delegation of the Spaniards took place one year later. Its leader was Alegretto Alegretti, who had been born in Dubrovnik and has been mentioned previously as one

---

Konv. 1, fol. 101–112; Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 3 April 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 196–198.

<sup>70</sup> Eickhoff, *Venedig, Wien und die Osmanen*, pp. 216–228.

<sup>71</sup> Conde Pazos, “La embajada turca en Madrid”, p. 11; Considering the 1647 revolt of Naples, the Spanish worries over the French diplomatic manoeuvres in Italy were well-founded. Cf.: Davies, *Spain in Decline*, pp. 49–54; Spain by all means would have been interested in establishing peace on the seas as soon as possible, particularly in that it would have been able to direct the peace negotiations between Venice and the Ottoman Empire as “peacemakers”. It took steps in this direction, including through the Habsburg ambassador in Constantinople. The collaboration of the Spanish–Austrian diplomatic machinery included the efforts of the Duke of Terranova, the Spanish envoy in Vienna, working together with Count Rabatta – the emperor’s envoy in Venice – as well as through the active participation of the resident ambassador Greiffenklau at the Sublime Porte, to make sure the future negotiations would be mediated by Spain, not by France, which also wanted to play this role. Cf.: Alexander Greiffenklau to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 8 May 1646, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 119, Konv. 2, fol. 67–73.

<sup>72</sup> Conde Pazos, “La embajada turca en Madrid”, pp. 11–12; Excerpt from Simon Reniger’s report, Constantinople, 4 September 1649, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 121, Konv. 1, fol. 238–239; Instructions of Ferdinand III to Simon Reniger, Vienna, 28 January 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 41–43.

of the players in the court of the empress Maria Anna. The subject of the agreement in question was constituted of propositions from the Ottoman side,<sup>73</sup> none of which came to anything,<sup>74</sup> but Alegretti did not go home empty handed. As an important part of his mission, he made steps to remedy old grievances of the Spanish crown and made an agreement with a dependable informer in Constantinople – none other than the interpreter of the Austrian Habsburg diplomatic delegation, Nicusio Panaiotti – to send reports to Madrid in the future about the Sublime Porte.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, the Spanish royal court was not only making an effort to improve information gathering, but also took care to make their own translations of documents written in Ottoman Turkish, again depending on just its Austrian relatives. The aforementioned Vincenzo Bratutti arrived from Vienna after all, who due to his constant rivalry with the opinion leaders of the Aulic War Council chose employment in Madrid that promised to be more tranquil and made a fine career as an interpreter of eastern languages and as a diplomat in Spain.<sup>76</sup>

If we look at the brief but rather spectacular role and scandalous death of Don Juan de Menesses in its wider context, considering the internal relationships of the Habsburg family, it is possible to see in the tiniest detail how the diplomatic gears between the two branches of the dynasty engaged, and sometimes jammed. This incident also shows that being oriented in eastern affairs was significant to both branches of the Habsburgs, naturally to differing degrees due to their positions. The French efforts to undo the unity of the dynasty that came to the forefront time and again at the negotiations for the Peace of Westphalia did not come to pass at all in the case of eastern diplomacy, because the family connections still worked, even if a slight weakening can be observed in the internal dynamics. After 1648, the situation changed again in terms of the representation of Spanish interests in Vienna. Although the ink had barely dried on the treaties signed at Westphalia, the unity of the Habsburg dynasty was reinforced by another marriage – between

---

<sup>73</sup> The imperial court also had precise information about the draft treaty presented by the Ottomans in Madrid. In return for an official peace treaty, the sultan offered to provide free and unperturbed access to pilgrims of all Christian nations to the Holy Land, to rein in the pirates of the Mediterranean Sea and – depending on measures in the same spirit by the Spanish king – to stave off further actions aimed at taking captives. Furthermore, he would accept the Spanish king's role as a mediator in disputes between the Sublime Porte and the European Christian powers, primarily in connection to the war with Venice. Instructions of Ferdinand III to Simon Reniger, Vienna, 28 January 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 41–43.

<sup>74</sup> Alegretti calmed the obviously apprehensive imperial resident ambassador many times that he had no reason for worry, in truth the Spanish king had absolutely no intention of signing a treaty with the sultan. Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 6 May 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 205–208.

<sup>75</sup> Panaiotti harped upon the considerable expenses that were accrued during the Menesses affair to Alegretti. See: The letter of the Spanish king Philip IV to the Count of Oñate [Íñigo Vélez de Guevara], Madrid, 6 November 1650, AHNM, Consejo de Estado, sf. Leg. 2871; Conde Pazos, “La embajada turca en Madrid”, pp. 12–15; Incidentally, Alegretti made this kind of offer to Reniger, the Habsburg envoy himself, who rejected it and then reported in detail about the events to the emperor. Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, Constantinople, 3 April 1650, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, Kt. 122, Konv. 1, fol. 196–198.

<sup>76</sup> Hiller, “A tolmácsper”, pp. 213–214.

Philip IV and archduchess Maria Anna (Mariana) – and at the same time the influence of the Spanish party in the court at Vienna also strengthened again.<sup>77</sup> In terms of the eastern projection of Habsburg diplomacy in the years following the European war, in the end Spain's inroads towards Constantinople in 1649–1650 do not contradict this tendency. As is adequately shown in the diplomatic reports of the new Habsburg envoy Simon Reniger that are cited in this essay, the main representative of the interests of the Spanish king at the Sublime Porte continued to be the resident ambassador of the empire.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

##### **Archival Materials**

###### *Austria*

- Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA)
  - Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv (FHKA)
    - Alte Hofkammer
    - Hoffinanz Ungarn (HFU)
  - Sammlungen und Selekte
    - Reichsakten
  - Gedenkbücher
    - Reichsgedenkbücher
- Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA)
  - Obersthofmeisteramt
    - Sonderreihe
  - Diplomatie und Außenpolitik vor 1848
    - Staatenabteilungen (StAbt)
      - Türkei I (Turcica)
      - Spanien
        - Diplomatische Korrespondenz
        - Varia
- Kriegsarchiv (KA)
  - Zentralstellen (ZSt)
    - Hofkriegsrat (HKR)
      - Hauptreihe (HR)
        - Protokollbücher Expedit (Prot. Exp.)
    - Sonderreihen (SR)
    - Kanzleiarchiv (KzIA)

###### *Spain*

- Archivo Histórico Nacional Madrid (AHNM)
  - Consejo de Estado, sf. Leg. 2871

##### **Published Primary Sources**

- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Válogatott források az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés történetéhez”, *Lymbus. Magyarástudományi Forrásközlemények* 15 (2017), pp. 151–203.

---

<sup>77</sup> Tercero Casado, “A Fluctuating Ascendancy”, p. 14.

- Czernin, Hermann, Graf, von und zu Chudenitz, Zweite Gesandtschaftsreise des Grafen Hermann Czernin von Chudenic nach Constantinopel im Jahre 1644, Neuhaus: A. Landfrass, 1879.
- Dujčev, Ivan, Avvisi di Ragusa. Documenti sull'Imperio Turco nel sec. XVII. e sulla guerra di Candia (*Orientalia Christiana analecta*) 101, Roma: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1935.
- Nehring, Karl, Adam Freiherrn zu Herbersteins Gesandtschaftsreise nach Konstantinopel. Ein Beitrag zum Frieden von Zsitvatorok (1606), (*Südosteuropäische Arbeiten*) 78, München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1983
- Nehring, Karl, Adam Wenner: Tagebuch der kaiserlichen Gesandtschaft nach Konstantinopel 1616–1618, (*Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München, Serie C, „Miscellanea“*) 16, München: Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminar an der Universität München, 1984.
- Veltzé, Alois, “Die Hauptrelation des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel Simon Reniger von Reningen 1649–1666”, *Mittheilungen des k.u.k. Kriegs-Archivs, Neue Folge* 12 (1900), pp. 57–170.

### Literature

- Alcalá-Zamora y Queipo de Llano, José, “La política exterior del reinado”, in Idem, ed., Felipe IV., El hombre y el reinado. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica – Real Academia de la Historia, 2005.
- Blaeu, Joan – van der Krogt, Peter, Atlas maior of 1665, Köln – Los Angeles: Taschen Verlag, 2005.
- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Kommunikation und Nachrichtenaustausch – Verhandlungsstrategie der habsburgischen Seite bei der Friedensverhandlung von Szöny 1627”, *Chronica* 19 (2020), pp. 113–140.
- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Kommunikáció és híráramlás: A Habsburg-oldal tárgyalási stratégiája az 1627. évi szönyi békekötés során”, *Aetas* 33/4 (2018), pp. 108–124.
- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Kommunikation und Nachrichtenaustausch – Verhandlungsstrategie der habsburgischen Seite bei der Friedensverhandlung von Szöny 1627”, *Chronica* 19 (2020), pp. 113–140.
- Brandl, Gergely – Szabados, János, “A megbízás terhe. Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein báró konstantinápolyi nagykövetségének előkészítése 1628-tól”, in J. Újváry, Zsuzsanna, ed., Oszmán–magyar viszony a 16–18. században. Tanulmányok a Magyar Királyság és az Oszmán Birodalom népeinek – magyarok, törökök, rácok, tatárok, zsidók, görögök és egyéb népek – hétköznapijairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 2020, pp. 149–170.
- Cervioğlu, Mahmut Halef, “The Peace Treaties of Gyarmat (1625) and Szöny (1627)”, *Ege ve Balkan Araştırmaları Dergisi* 3/2 (2016), pp. 67–86.
- Céspedes del Castillo, Guillermo, “Brasil y los Reinos de Indias en tiempos de Felipe IV”, in Alcalá-Zamora y Queipo de Llano, José, ed., Felipe IV., El hombre y el reinado. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica – Real Academia de la Historia, 2005, pp. 235–250.
- Czigány, István, “A furcsa háborútól a nagy háborúig 1661–1664. A furcsa háború 1661”, *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 127/4 (2014), pp. 892–908

- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén. Simon Reniger konstantinápolyi Habsburg rezidens kinevezésének tanúságai (1647–1649)”, *Századok* 149/4 (2015), pp. 835–871.
- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “Language Students and Interpreters at the Mid-seventeenth-century Habsburg Embassy in Constantinople”, *Theatrum Historiae. Historical Journal of the University of Pardubice* 19 (2016), pp. 27–44.
- Damien, Janos, “Panaiotis Nicousios and Alexander Mavrocordatos: The Rise of the Phanariots and the Office of Grand Dragoman in the Ottoman Administration in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005–2006), pp. 177–196.
- Davies, R. Trevor, *Spain in Decline, 1621–1700*. London: Macmillan, 1965
- Davies, R. Trevor, *The Golden Century of Spain 1501–1621*, London: Macmillan, 1964.
- Disney, Anthony R., *A History of Portugal and the Portuguese Empire*, 2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, vol. 1, *Portugal From Beginnings to 1807*.
- Eickhoff, Ekkehard, *Venedig, Wien und die Osmanen. Umbruch in Südosteuropa 1645–1700*. München: Callwey Verlag, 1970.
- Ernst, Hildegard, *Madrid und Wien 1632–1637. Politik und Finanzen in den Beziehungen zwischen Philipp IV. und Ferdinand II.*, (Schriftenreihe der Vereinigung zur Erforschung der Neueren Geschichte) 18, Münster: Aschendorff, 1991.
- Evans, R. J. W., *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550–1700*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Firpo, Luigi, *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al Senato*, 10 vols, Torino: Bottega d’Erasmus, 1968–1979, vol. 10, *Spagna (1635–1738)*, 1979.
- Gürkan, Emrah Safa, “Espionage in the 16th Century Mediterranean: Secret Diplomacy, Mediterranean Go-betweens and the Ottoman Habsburg Rivalry”, PhD Dissertation: Washington DC: Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Georgetown University, [doctoral defence: 2012]
- Hammer, Joseph von, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, 10 vols, Pesth: C. A. Hartleben’s Verlag, 1827–1837, vol. 3, (1623–1699), 1835.
- Hengerer, Mark, *Kaiser Ferdinand III. (1608–1657): Eine Biographie*, (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs) 107, Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2012.
- Hering, Gunnar, “Panagiotis Nikousios als Dragoman der kaiserlichen Gesandtschaft in Konstantinopel”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 44 (1994), pp. 143–178.
- Hiller, István, “A tolmácsper. A bécsi Haditanács és a Habsburgok tolmácsai a 17. század első felében”, *Történelmi Szemle* 33/3–4 (1991), pp. 203–214.
- Hiller, István: “A Habsburgok török diplomáciája a 17. század első felében”, in Fodor, Pál – Pálffy, Géza – Tóth, István György, eds., *Tanulmányok Szakály Ferenc emlékére*, (Gazdaság- és társadalomtörténeti kötetek ) 2, Budapest: MTA TKI Gazdaság- és Társadalomtudományi Kutatócsoportja, 2002, pp. 215–227
- Höbelt, Lothar, *Ferdinand III. (1608–1657) Friedenskaiser wider Willen*, Graz: Ares Verlag, 2008.
- Juhász, Krisztina, “A második szőnyi béke margójára. Adalékok az 1642. évi szőnyi békekötés történetéhez”, in J. Újváry, Zsuzsanna, ed., *Oszmán–magyar viszony a 16–18. században. Tanulmányok a Magyar Királyság és az Oszmán Birodalom népeinek – magyarok, törökök, rácok, tatárok, zsidók, görögök és egyéb népek – hétköznapijairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya*, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, *Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója*, 2020, pp. 171–188.

- Keller, Katrin – Catalano, Alessandro, eds., *Die Diarien und Tagzettel des Kardinals Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598–1667)*. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs) 104, 7 vols., Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2010.
- Keller, Katrin, “Frauen – Hof – Diplomatie: Die höfische Gesellschaft als Handlungsraum von Frauen in Außenbeziehungen”, in Bastian, Corina – Dade, Eva Kathrin – Thiessen, Hillard von – Windler, Christian, eds., *Das Geschlecht der Diplomatie. Geschlechterrollen in den Außenbeziehungen vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2014.
- Marek, Pavel, *La embajada española en la corte imperial (1558–1641). Figuras de los embajadores y estrategias clientelares*, (Ibero-Americana Pragensia: Supplementum) 33, Praga: Universidad Carolina de Praga Editorial Karolinum, 2013.
- Martí, Tibor, “Algunos datos sobre las relaciones entre la nobleza hispana y los estados húngaros en la época de la Guerra de los Treinta años”, in Rodríguez, Manuel Rivero, ed., *Nobleza hispana, nobleza cristiana: la Orden de San Juan*, Actas del congreso internacional Alcázar de San Juan, 1–4 de octubre de 2008, Madrid: Editorial Polifemo, 2009, pp. 453–526.
- Martí, Tibor, “Az aranygyapjas lovag Esterházy Pál”, in Pál, Ács, ed., *Esterházy Pál, a műkedvelő mecénás: egy 17. századi arisztokrata-életpálya a politika és a művészet határvidékén*, Budapest: Reciti, 2015, pp. 49–65.
- Marton, Gellért Ernő “A Dissertation in Preparation – Structure, Methodology, Approach and Content. The Peace Treaty of Szőny (1627) and Its Subsequent Territorial Negotiations (1628–1629) in Light of Péter Koháry’s Correspondence”, *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Historia* (2021) [article in press].
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, “„Szőnyből tudatjuk...”. Három magyar diplomata – Rimay János, Tassy Gáspár és Tholdalagi Mihály – követnaplójának összehasonlító elemzése az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés kapcsán”, in J. Újváry, Zsuzsanna, ed., *Oszmán–magyar viszony a 16–18. században. Tanulmányok a Magyar Királyság és az Oszmán Birodalom népeinek – magyarok, törökök, rácok, tatárok, zsidók, görögök és egyéb népek – hétköznapijairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya*, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 2020, pp. 135–148
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, “On the Question of the Negotiations Between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans at Szécsény and Buda (1628) through Palatine Miklós Esterházy’s letter to the head of the Hungarian negotiators”, *Rocznik Przemyski 55, Historia 22/1* (2019), pp. 79–91.
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, “Péter Koháry’s Life and Correspondence – Outline for a Greater Synthesis”, *Rocznik Przemyski 56, Historia 25/1* (2020), pp. 25–36.
- Meienberger, Peter, *Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn als kaiserlicher Resident in Konstan-tinopel 1629–1643*, Geist und Werk der Zeiten, vol. 37, Bern – Frankfurt: H. Lang, 1973.
- Millán, José Martínez –Visceglia, Maria Antonietta, eds., *La monarquía de Felipe III: Los reinos*, 4 vols, Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, 2008, vol. 4, pp. 1453–1454.
- Monostori, Tibor, “Diego Saavedra Fajardo és a Habsburg-egység (1633 –1646)”, PhD dissertation, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, Doctoral School of History, [doctoral defence: 2011]
- Ochoa Brun, Miguel-Ángel, “Los embajadores de Felipe IV.”, in Alcalá-Zamora y Queipo de Llano, José, ed., *Felipe IV., El hombre y el reinado*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica – Real Academia de la Historia, 2005, pp. 199–233.

- Oross, András – Martí, Tibor, “La administración pública en la Monarquía de los Austrias y en el Reino de Hungría en los siglos XVI–XVII”, *Cuadernos de Historia del Derecho* 22 (2015), pp. 187–213.
- Papp, Sándor, “Az Oszmán Birodalom, a Magyar Királyság és a Habsburg Monarchia kapcsolat-története a békekötések tükrében (vázlat és adatbázis)”, *Aetas* 33/4 (2018), pp. 86–99.
- Papp, Sándor, *Török szövetség – Habsburg kiegyezés. A Bocskai-felkelés történetéhez*, (Károli könyvek, monográfia), Budapest: KRE – L’Harmattan, 2014.
- Regele, Oskar, *Der österreichische Hofkriegsrat 1556–1848*, (Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs. Ergänzungs-Band 1), Wien: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1949.
- Rohrschneider, Michael, *Der gescheiterte Frieden von Münster. Spaniens Ringen mit Frankreich auf dem Westfälische Friedenskongress (1643–1649)*, (Schriftenreihe der Vereinigung zur Erforschung der Neueren Geschichte) 30, Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Sommer-Mathis, Andrea, “María Ana de Austria: spanische Infantin – Königin von Ungarn und Böhmen – römisch-deutsche Kaiserin (1606–1646)”, in Braun, Bettina – Keller, Katrin – Schnettger, Matthias, eds., *Nur die Frau des Kaisers? Kaiserinnen in der Frühen Neuzeit*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung) 64, Wien, 2016, pp. 141–154.
- Stradling, R. A., *Philip IV and the Government of Spain, 1621–1665*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Strohmeyer, Arno, “Die habsburgisch-osmanische Freundschaft (16–18. Jahrhundert)”, in Strohmeyer, Arno – Spannenberger, Norbert, *Frieden und Konfliktmanagement in interkulturellen Räumen. Das Osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit*, (Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Mitteleuropa) 45, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013.
- Strohmeyer, Arno, “Kategorisierungsleistungen und Denkschemata in diplomatischer Kommunikation: Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn als kaiserlicher Resident an der Hohen Pforte (1629–1643)”, in Barth-Scalmani, Gunda, ed., *Politische Kommunikation zwischen Imperien. Der diplomatische Aktionsraum Südost- und Osteuropa*, *Innsbrucker Historische Studien*, vol. 29, Innsbruck – Wien – Bozen: Studien Verlag, 2013.
- Strohmeyer, Arno, “Religion – Loyalität – Ehre: „Ich-Konstruktionen“ in der diplomatischen Korrespondenz des Alexander von Greiffenklau zu Vollrads, kaiserlicher Resident in Konstantinopel (1643–1648)”, in Keller, Katrin – Mat’ a, Petr – Scheutz, Martin, eds., *Adel und Religion in der frühneuzeitlichen Habsburgermonarchie: Annäherung an ein gesamtösterreichisches Thema* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung) 68, Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2017.
- Strohmeyer, Arno, “The theatrical Performance of Peace: Entries of Habsburg Grand Embassies in Constantinople (17th–19th Centuries)”, in Sariyannis, Marinos, ed. in ch., *New Trends in Ottoman Studies. Papers presented at the 20th CIÉPO Symposium Rethymno*, 27 June – 1 July 2012, Rethymno: University of Crete, Department of History and Archaeology – Foundation for Research and Technology-Hellas, Institute for Mediterranean Studies, 2014, pp. 486–494.
- Teply, Karl, *Kaiserliche Gesandtschaften ans Goldene Horn*, (Bibliothek Klassischer Reise-berichte), Stuttgart: Steingrüben Verlag, 1968.
- Tercero Casado, Luis, “A Fluctuating Ascendancy: The “Spanish Party” at the Imperial Court of Vienna (1631–1659)”, *Libros de la Corte.es, Monográfico* 2, 7 (2015).

- Velázquez, Diego, *María de Austria, Reina de Hungría* (oil on canvas, 1630), Madrid, Museo del Prado, (<https://www.museodelprado.es/coleccion/obra-de-arte/doa-maria-de-austria-reina-de-hungria/1e61408f-ef2d-498b-a719-289a1fbd91ff>), accessed: 20 June 2020.
- Veronelli, Sara – Labrador Arroyo, Félix, *Diario de Hans Khevenhüller, embajador imperial en la corte de Felipe II*, (Colección Fuentes), Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 2001.
- Winkelbauer, Thomas, *Österreichische Geschichte 1522–1699. Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht: Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, 2 vols, Wien: Ueberreuter, 2003, vol. 1.
- Würlinger, Christoph, “Die Verschlüsselung der Korrespondenz des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel, Alexander von Greiffenklau zu Vollrads (1643–48)”, *Chronica* 19 (2020), pp. 6–23.