

On the Margins of the Second Treaty of Szőny

*Data for the History of the Signing of the Treaty of Szőny in 1642**

INTRODUCTION

In this article, I will present some data on the peace treaty known as the second treaty of Szőny and the process of its signing. Although research into historical peace treaties, and especially examinations focusing on Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties within this topic, cannot be considered a novel phenomenon in the study of history, it has received increased attention in recent years.¹ The treaty that is the topic of the present examination is also organically integrated into the research project based on an overarching study of sources that is being conducted by the MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age, Eötvös Loránd Research Network (ELKH) aimed at analysing Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties and the publication of the critical edition of the treaties. The choice of subject is also justified by the fact that the data from the historical literature as well as sources publications dealing with the subject are significantly supplemented by the examined, relevant source materials of the Hungarian and foreign archives. The systematic review of the antecedents to the signing of the treaty and the events of the peace process are included in my publication, followed by the presentation of an exchange of letters that straddles the line of official and private correspondence. I consider this correspondence to be a kind of guiding thread, through which I direct attention in the latter part of the article to the individual problem areas arising in

* This article has been written within the framework of the work of the MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network). The research and the writing of this paper have been supported by the Ministry of Human Capacities (Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma) through a grant (code nr. 20391-3/2018/FEKUSTRAT; TUDFO/47138-1/2019-ITM) The research has also 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). I would hereby like to give thanks for the valuable assistance provided during the writing of this paper by the research group leader Sándor Papp, and my PhD supervisor Sándor László Tóth. Furthermore, my thanks also go to Gergely Brandl, Csaba Göncöl, Tibor Martí, Gellért Ernő Marton and János Szabados for their useful pieces of advice and help concerning the collection of sources. This paper is an enlarged, revised and, as well, updated version of the earlier published study in Hungarian: Juhász, “A második szőnyi béke margójára”.

¹ See more (non-exhaustive collection): Espenhorst, *Frieden durch Sprache?*; Espenhorst – Duchhardt, *Frieden übersetzen in der Vormoderne*; Strohmeyer, “Trendek és perspektívák”; Cziráki, “„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister””; Papp, “A pozsareváci békekötés”; Szabados, “Habsburg–Ottoman Communication”; Marton, “A Dissertation in Preparation”; Tóth, “Vasvár előtt”; Idem, “The Circumstances”; Sz. Simon, “A szülejmáni béke”; Cervioğlu, “The Peace Treaties”.

connection with the treaty and will attempt to present other details of the negotiations through the analysis of these.

A brief survey of the historiography and source materials of the 1642 Treaty of Szőny cannot be avoided in the introduction to my work. This treaty fits into the series of Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties signed during the 17th century, and naturally has not escaped the attention of earlier research. The first monographic elaboration of the topic having been written by Béla Majláth, at the end of the 19th century.² His work is at the same time a collection of sources, since in addition to providing a detailed overview of the history of the peace negotiations, the author also published a substantial cartulary comprised of 116 documents from the source materials employed. Although similar summaries about the history of the peace treaty have not been made besides this book, which represents an unavoidable point of departure for examinations related to the topic, researchers in the 19th and 20th centuries did contribute documents related to the publication of sources for the more thorough understanding of the process of the peace negotiations of 1642.³ Good examples of the increase of interest in the subject are the works that have appeared in the last couple of years that publish the most recent results from research related to the treaty either in part or in full.⁴ Although the publications just briefly cited here employed a broad basis of Hungarian and foreign sources, further documents can be found amongst the relevant source materials that provide a more nuanced understanding of the process and circumstances of the signing of the treaty than has been developed to this point.⁵

ANTECEDENTS

The so-called Long Turkish War which also known as the Thirteen (or Fifteen) Years' War (1591/93–1606) that was accompanied by great destruction is considered a crucial event of turn of the 17th century by historians from several aspects.⁶ The Peace of Zsitvatorok (1606) that ended the war fundamentally defined the development of Habsburg–Ottoman diplomatic relations in the first half of the 17th century, although it only created a relatively peaceful period on paper, as in reality military actions, raids and even the taking of villages that were violations of the

² Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*.

³ Ráth, "Gróf Esterházy Miklós"; Fekete, *Türkische schriften*; Jedlicska, *Eredeti részletek gróf Pálffy-család okmánytárához*; Hiller, *Palatin Nikolaus Esterházy*.

⁴ Tusor, „*Irom kegyelmednek...*”; J. Újváry, "Nemzeti identitás"; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós"; Idem, "...gyümölcse pedig semmi nem volt"; Idem, "A második szőnyi béke margójára".

⁵ With no attempt at being comprehensive, the following can be mentioned: MNL OL, E 174; MNL OL, P 108; MNL OL, P 123; EPL, AS, AR, Classis V; EPL, AS, AR, Classis X; SNA, EcsI; ÖStA HHStA, Pálffy-Daun Familienarchiv.

⁶ Sándor László Tóth has primarily studied the events of the Long Turkish War, and amongst his publications on the subject, I will point out the following summary work: Tóth, *A mezőkeresztesi csata*; For the most recent work on the Long Turkish War with an approach from military organisation and logistics, see: Bagó, *A császári – királyi mezei hadsereg*; For the devastation caused by the Long Turkish War, see: Pálffy, *A Magyar Királyság*, 351–359.

peace occurred unabated.⁷ However, the series of differences of opinion did not lead to a renewed wartime conflict, at least until the 1660s. The settling of relations between the two parties in a peaceful manner was attempted several times, as a result of which treaties that took the 1606 Peace of Zsitvatorok as a basis were made at Vienna in 1615–1616⁸, at Komárom in 1618,⁹ at (Hidas)gyarmat in 1625¹⁰ and at Szőny in 1627.¹¹ Four of these peace treaties, together with the Peace Treaty of Szőny in 1642, fall into the fourth category of Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties from a chronological and methodological point of view. A common feature of these peace negotiations is that they took place under the direction of local Ottoman dignitaries (including the Pasha of Buda) and the Palatine of the Kingdom of Hungary, in Hungarian venue, on the common borderland, near Komárom. The negotiations went mostly in Hungarian and in Turkish, and the transcriptions were made in Hungarian, Latin and in Ottoman–Turkish, ratified by the rulers of both empires.¹² In addition to all of these, the changes in internal and external politics that took place in the meantime had an impact on the situation of both empires.¹³

The actual political situation of the time made the maintenance of peaceful relations justified for both sides. In connection with the Habsburg Monarchy, it is enough simply to refer to the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648) that absorbed their attention, and which seemed to have a slight chance to end in 1637. This circumstance was created by the death of the Holy Roman Emperor (1578–1637) and King of Hungary (1619–1637) Ferdinand II in February and then the accession to the throne of his son, Ferdinand III (1637–1657).¹⁴ However, the fighting only ended about ten years later, which contributed to the increasingly exhausted Monarchy trying to ease pressure to the east and avoid an open, armed conflict with the Ottomans.

The Ottoman Empire did not only have to face up to its serious internal problems,¹⁵ but also came into conflict again with Safavid Persia in the middle of the 1630s. This conflict stretched back to the 16th century and was renewed regularly. It was finally ended by the treaty of Zuhab signed in the spring of 1639, as a result of which Baghdad and Mesopotamia both returned to Ottoman control.¹⁶ Almost a year later, there was a change in rulers at the head of the Ottoman Empire, and following the death of Murad IV (1612–1640), his younger brother Ibrahim I (1615–1648) followed him on the throne as Ottoman sultan (1640–1648).¹⁷

⁷ For the damage, see: Illik, “Török dúlás a Dunántúlon”; Idem, *Minden nap háború*.

⁸ Salamon, *Két magyar diplomata*, pp. 265–273.

⁹ Ibid, pp. 274–278.

¹⁰ Jászay, “A’ gyarmati béke”; Gévay, *Az 1625-diki május 26-dikán költ gyarmati békekötés cikkelyei*.

¹¹ Gévay, *Az 1627-dik évi szeptember’ 13-án kelt szőnyi békekötés’ cikkelyei*; Jászay, “A’ gyarmati béke”, pp. 167–274; Salamon – Szalay, *Galántai Gróf Eszterházy Miklós*, vol. 2; Salamon, *Két magyar diplomata*.

¹² Papp, “Az Oszmán Birodalom”, pp. 91.

¹³ Marton, “A Dissertation in Preparation”, the manuscript’s pp. 4–5.

¹⁴ Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, pp. 125.

¹⁵ Kerekes, “Tradicionális birodalom”.

¹⁶ Römer, “The Safavid Period”.

¹⁷ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 11.

Miklós Esterházy (1582–1645),¹⁸ who filled the post of palatine that was the highest feudal rank in the 17th century,¹⁹ continuously informed Ferdinand III about the state of the country, indicating that the aforementioned series of disturbances on the part of the Ottomans could possibly lead to the open violation of the peace. After the ruler and his advisors realised the existing conditions, which held a danger to the entire Monarchy, Ferdinand III ordered the arming of the border fortresses on 25 April 1640. Only a couple of days had passed when on 1 June the ceremonial diplomatic mission of Sultan Ibrahim I arrived to the Habsburg monarch. On the one hand, the envoy was assigned to announce the news of the new ruler ascending to the throne, and on the other hand to provide information on the further possibilities for the maintenance of the peace.²⁰

However, the situation was complicated by the fact that Ferdinand III delayed in sending the diplomatic mission going to the Sublime Porte whose task was to greet the new sultan and discuss the possibilities for peace. Following preparations of the delegation, which took months, the internuncius András Izdenczy (?–1659)²¹ finally set off on 17 March 1641 and stayed in Constantinople between 29 April and 5 July. During this time, he had one audience with the Sultan Ibrahim I, and three audiences with Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Pasha (1592–1644), the grand vizier (1638–1644). The first meeting with the grand vizier was preceded by a wait of six weeks, because in the meantime the pasha had suffered serious burns in a fire.²² András Izdenczy's 33-day diplomatic mission can be considered successful, since the Sublime Porte made promises for the redress of the grievances, the maintenance of the peace and the dispatch of the commission.²³ In this way, the diplomatic mission of András Izdenczy to the Sublime Porte can be considered an antecedent to the 1642 Treaty of Szőny. The development of the framework for the renewed Habsburg–Ottoman peace negotiations began soon after the return of the internuncius.

¹⁸ For the life and career of Miklós Esterházy, see: Toldy, *Esterházy Miklós munkái*; Salamon – Szalay, *Galántai Gróf Eszterházy Miklós*, vol. 1–3; Csapodi, *Eszterházy Miklós*; Hajnal, *Esterházy Miklós nádor lemondása*; Idem, *Az 1642. évi meghíúsult országgyűlés*; Péter, *Esterházy Miklós*; Pálffy, Géza, “Pozsony megyéből a Magyar Királyság élére”; Hiller, *Palatin Nikolaus Esterházy*; Martí, “Esterházy Miklós nádor”; Szabó, “Eszmék a nádori politika szolgálatában”; Marton, “„Az mint Isten tudnunk adja””.

¹⁹ Ember, *Az újkori magyar közigazgatás*, pp. 25–28; Körmendy, *Levéltári kézikönyv*, p. 88; Márkus, *Magyar törvénytár 1000–1895.*, vol. 5, p. 11; Pálffy, *A Magyar Királyság*, p. 392 and pp. 405–406; Lauter, “„Modus observandus...””, p. 189.

²⁰ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, pp. 10–11.

²¹ András Izdenczy had also been asked to participate in the work of the delegation alongside Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein when the 1627 Peace Treaty of Szőny was taken to the Sublime Porte, but he declined the offer. Later he also turned up as an envoy in Poland in 1638. Nagy, *Magyarország családai*, vol. 5, p. 271; Salamon – Szalay, *Galántai Gróf Eszterházy Miklós*, vol. 3, p. 328.

²² Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 39; György Lippay to Miklós Esterházy, Regensburg, 2 July 1641, Tusor, „*Írom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 71, pp. 75–76.

²³ For the report of András Izdenczy on the diplomatic mission to the Sublime Porte, see: Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 24, pp. 171–187.

THE PEACE PROCESS

The process of the signing of the so-called second Treaty of Szőny can be divided into several phases. The first, a kind of preparatory phase, can be calculated from the summer of 1641, when András Izdenczy made a personal report to Ferdinand III after returning from the Sublime Porte, and the Habsburg monarch received the letter of the Sultan Ibrahim I regarding the renewed peace negotiations.²⁴ During this period, agreements were made concerning designating the site of the negotiations, and in the end the site of the negotiations and the accommodations of the Ottoman commissioners was in Szőny, while Komárom was arranged for the Habsburg delegates.²⁵ The appointment of the commissioners also took place in parallel to this. During the negotiations, the Habsburgs were represented by the vice-chairman of the Aulic War Council, Baron Gerhard von Questenberg (1586–1646),²⁶ the bishop of Eger (1633–1666) and royal chancellor, György Lippay (1600–1666),²⁷ the chief justice of Hungary, Tamás Mikulich (1631–1645),²⁸ the captain of Szendrő, Gáspár Szunyogh (1639–1643)²⁹ and the aristocrat Dániel Esterházy (1585–1654).³⁰ Amongst these, it should be pointed out separately that Gerhard von Questenberg and Dániel Esterházy also had participated in the negotiations at Szőny in 1627, as members of the peace delegation. Thus, their previous diplomatic experience certainly played a role in their appointments.³¹ Presumably, György Lippay filled the position of the delegated commission chairman for the Habsburgs, or at least a parallel from the first Treaty of Szőny – where the Hungarian chancellor of the time, István Sennyey, was the chair – allows one to come to this conclusion.³² For the Ottomans, the kapıcıbaşı Osman Agha received the authority to conduct the negotiations, and alongside him was the timar defterdarı of Buda, Mehmed, the alaybey of Esztergom, Mustafa, the cavalry captain of Eger, Mustafa, and the agha of Kanizsa, Mustafa.³³

The commissioners appointed by the Habsburgs had waited since 10 December 1641, for the negotiations to begin, the first Ottoman cavalymen only arrived on

²⁴ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 55.

²⁵ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 67, 72 and 77; Jedlicska, *Eredeti részletek gróf Pálffy-család okmánytárához*, p. 322; György Lippay to István Pálffy, Komárom, 23 December 1642, Tusor, „*Írom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 80, pp. 87–88.

²⁶ Kampmann, “Gerhard Questenberg”, vol. 21, pp. 43–44.

²⁷ For the most recent work on his life and activities, see: Tusor, „*Írom kegyelmednek...*”.

²⁸ György Lippay to Ádám Batthyány. Bécs, December 16, 1638. Tusor, „*Írom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 41, pp. 42–43. According to Iván Nagy, Tamás Mikulich, who came from a Croatian family, filled the office of chief justice from 1625. Cf. Nagy, *Magyarország családai*, vol. 7, p. 498.

²⁹ Borovszky, *Szendrő vára*, p. 34.

³⁰ Esterházy, *Az Esterházy család*, pp. 175–178; Nagy, *Magyarország családai*, vol. 4, p. 93.

³¹ For their roles during the peace negotiations in 1627, see: Brandl, et al., “Válogatott források”, passim; Brandl et al., “Kommunikáció és híráramlás”, passim; Brandl, et al., “Kommunikation und Nachrichtenaustausch”, passim.

³² Cf.: the previous footnote.

³³ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 71 and 77. Cf.: ÖStA HStA, Türkische Urkunden, Karton 8., No. 16.

4 January the next year to survey the site. Based on the sources prior to the commencement of the negotiations as well as those appearing immediately after, great emphasis was placed on the mobilisation of their armies. Alongside the arming of the border fortresses,³⁴ the Ottomans arrived at the negotiations with about 600 cavalymen.³⁵ Dániel Esterházy provides information on the presence of a total of 600–700 cavalymen and about half as many infantrymen in Komárom and the nearby village of Mócsa,³⁶ and from him we know that there were 250 infantrymen with them at the negotiations.³⁷

The second major period of the peace process only commenced five days after the arrival of Osman Agha in Szőny, namely on 13 January 1642, with the beginning of the actual negotiations.³⁸ The letter of Jeromos Rausz provisor informs us that the first room of town hall in Szőny has been designated as the venue for the negotiations, where the Ottomans had taken various chairs and carpets before the opening of the negotiation. The crossed table in the hall separated the half of the Ottoman and the Habsburg (Hungarian) negotiators.³⁹

Within this, another two periods can be differentiated. The first lasted until 2 February 1642, when negotiations for peace took place in three sessions. However, the process was interrupted for a time due to the lack of authorisation for the Ottoman commissioners and the disputes surrounding the return of occupied villages. The second stage can be interpreted as a phase of more intensive negotiations that brought progress. During this time, the representatives of the two sides met a total of eight times. According to Dániel Esterházy's report, following the agreements on 20 March 1642, they wanted to write the peace document in three languages – Latin, Ottoman-Turkish and Hungarian – then certify these the next day with the signatures and seals of the commissioners of both sides.⁴⁰ At the same time, the settlement of several of the disputed issues (e.g. the situation of the castles built on the Croatian frontier) was assigned to the tasks of separate commissions or to ambassadorial missions. The final, closing phase of the peace process began in March of 1643, when the diplomatic mission of György Szelepcsényi

³⁴ Jedlicska, *Eredeti részletek gróf Pálffy-család okmánytárához*, p. 309.

³⁵ György Lippay to István Pálffy, Komárom, 10 January 1642, Tusor, „*Irom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 84, p. 91; György Lippay to István Pálffy, Komárom, 10 January 1642, *Ibid*, doc. no. 85, p. 92.

³⁶ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 14 January 1641/1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 171–174; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 179–182.

³⁷ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, January 18–19, 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 175–178; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 183–186.

³⁸ György Lippay to István Pálffy, Komárom, 10 January 1642, Tusor, „*Irom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 84, p. 91; György Lippay to István Pálffy, Komárom, 10 January 1642, *Ibid*, doc. no. 85, p. 92; Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 79.

³⁹ Jeromos Rausz to Commissioners, Szőny, 10 January 1642, MNL OL, X 725. EPL, AS, AR, Classis X., microfilm nr. 2648, (until November 1642) pag. 91–92.

⁴⁰ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 20 March 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 183; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, p. 197; for the Latin and Hungarian versions of the peace treaty with the seals and signatures, see: ÖStA HHStA, Türkische Urkunden, Kt. 8., No. 16.

(1595–1685) set off to the Sublime Porte.⁴¹ As a special envoy, he set off for the Sublime Porte again in the autumn of 1643 and on 9 December in Constantinople he handed over the copy of the peace treaty ratified by the Habsburg ruler.⁴²

THE EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN MIKLÓS AND DÁNIEL ESTERHÁZY

Already during comprehensive research into the sources for the 1627 Treaty of Szőny⁴³ a focal point for the network of relationships emerges, with Miklós Esterházy and Dániel Esterházy taking the leading roles. This same direction of communication appears during the process of signing the 1642 Treaty of Szőny as well, and this is a segment of both treaties that has not yet been explored. Taking the topic of the present article into account, in the following, I will examine the correspondence in connection with the so-called second Treaty of Szőny, highlighting the most relevant details from this. At the same time, I consider it important to refer to the fact that the analysis of this communication pathway does not only offer an opportunity in connection with the treaties individually, but also opens the possibility for a comparative analysis.⁴⁴ The examination of the letters that represent the main lines for the contemporary disclosure and flow of information is rather exciting in the light of the exchange of letters, if only from the perspective that through the personal information it is not only possible to get closer to the given individuals, but also to the current events.

One of the corresponding partners was Miklós Esterházy, who was born in 1583. His election by the estates at the Diet of Sopron in 1625 as the palatine of the Kingdom of Hungary, to the general satisfaction of the monarch Ferdinand II and the country, was a milestone in the development of his life and career. He contributed to the signing of two Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties in under 20 years during his time as palatine.⁴⁵ The second main participant in the correspondence, Dániel Esterházy, was born on 26 July 1585, as the child of Ferenc Esterházy and Zsófia Illésházy. He was initiated as a Knight of the Golden Spur in 1618,

⁴¹ The delegation performed two tasks. On the one hand, negotiations took place on the 1642 Treaty of Szőny, and on the other hand Alexander Greiffenklau (?–1648) accompanied György Szelepcsényi to take over the post of imperial resident ambassador in Constantinople from Johann Rudolf Schmidt zum Schwarzenhorn (1590–1667). The uncovering and publication of the diplomatic reports of Alexander Greiffenklau is currently ongoing under the direction of Arno Stohmeyer, and the corpus that is being prepared will provide supplementary information about the history of the so-called second Treaty of Szőny.

⁴² For a description of the diplomatic mission of György Szelepcsényi, see: Takáts, *A régi Magyarország*, pp. 196–206.

⁴³ Within the framework of the project of the MTA – SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (ELKH), Gergely Brandl, Csaba Göncöl, Krisztina Juhász, Gellért Ernő Marton and János Szabados are developing a database that up to this point contains nearly 2,000 documents concerning the 1627 Treaty of Szőny that is continuously expanding. For more on this work, see: Brandl et al., “Kommunikáció és híráramlás”.

⁴⁴ The Esterházy brothers remained in constant contact with one another, and the corpus of their extensive correspondence can now be found dispersed amongst source publications and Hungarian as well as foreign archives.

⁴⁵ For summaries related to his life and career, see: footnote 12.

achieved the rank of baron one year later, and then became an advisor of the royal chamber at the 1625 Diet at Sopron.⁴⁶ As has been mentioned previously, he also accepted a role as a negotiating commissioner for the 1642 Treaty of Szőny, which was due not only to his experience, but also to his family connections, since Dániel Esterházy was the younger brother of the palatine by two years.

Two factors are worth pointing out when explaining the motivation for examining the correspondence between the two Esterházy. One is the fact that in addition to maintaining contact with the commissioners sent to Szőny, the palatine Miklós Esterházy corresponded separately with Dániel Esterházy during the negotiations. However, it must also be noted that Miklós Esterházy's network of connections presents a different picture during the 1642 negotiations than it did in 1627. After all, during the time of the so-called first Treaty of Szőny no contact can be registered between the palatine and the Habsburg commissioners (with the exception of Dániel Esterházy).⁴⁷ At the same time, it should also be noted that in 1642 the palatine had a direct communication link with the chancellor György Lippay, who was the chairman of the Habsburg commission according to my hypothesis. All of this is interesting, because according to the most recent research findings, during the peace negotiations at Szőny in 1627, only indirect contact can be shown between him and István Sennyey, the chancellor and the chairman of the negotiating commission at that time. In addition, it is also worth pointing out that the flow of information between Miklós Esterházy and Dániel Esterházy also contains interesting data because the nature of their relationship has some significance beyond the official, palatine–commissioner relation, due to their family ties.

According to my current knowledge, the letters from the correspondence in question can be found in the family archives of the Esterházy, the National Archives of Hungary and the Slovak National Archive.⁴⁸ In terms of the extent of the correspondence comprising the period of three months that has been analysed, it can be stated that in the present phase of research the two letters that have been published⁴⁹ can be supplemented by a further seven,⁵⁰ which include six occasions

⁴⁶ A comprehensive elaboration of the life of Dániel Esterházy has not yet been made, for information on his life, see: footnote 23.

⁴⁷ Brandl et al., “Kommunikáció és híráramlás”, p. 123.

⁴⁸ MNL OL, P 123, I/a; MNLOL, E 174, box 3, item 7; SNA, EcsI box 48.

⁴⁹ Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy, Nagyszombat, 22 January 1642, Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 72, pp. 320–321; Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy, Sempte, 28 February 1642, Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 98, pp. 370–371.

⁵⁰ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 14 January 1641/1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 171–174; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 179–182; Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 18–19 January 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 175–178; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 183–186; Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 187–190; Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 19 February 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 179–180; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 190–192; Miklós Esterházy to Daniel Esterházy, Komárom 20 February 1642, SNA, EcsI box 48, fol. 1–2; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 193–195; Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 5 March 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a, fol. 181–182; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 195–196; Dániel Esterházy to Miklós

when Dániel Esterházy was the sender and three when it was Miklós Esterházy. Insomuch as the intensity of the exchange of correspondence cannot only be concluded by the number of surviving letters, it is also necessary to count documents whose existence is only indicated by references made to them in the surviving writings, and these are present in most of them. In these cases, the sender–addressee relationship can be clearly determined, we can conclude the approximate date of writing and perhaps there is some indication of certain elements of the content as well. By taking these items into account, the frequency of correspondence is altered somewhat. Since in the nine surviving letters, there are eight occasions of a reference to another piece of correspondence, it can be stated with certainty that there were at least 17 letters that were written and arrived at their destination. Of these, the palatine Miklós Esterházy was the author on 8 occasions and Dániel Esterházy on 9 occasions,⁵¹ so it appears that the responses are linked to one another sequentially and the communication was continuous and mutual between the sender and addressee.

If we want to place the letters on a timeline of the negotiations, 8 can be identified in the first period (14 January – 2 February 1642), and 9 in the second period lasting until 23 March 1642. There is an incorrect date on one of the documents (14 January 1641). The content of the letter aids in determining its proper date, from which it is clear that it was written in the year 1642.⁵² The incorrect year was probably due to habit, since the letter was written at the beginning of the year. There is a long, nearly three-week, interval that appears between 29 January and 19 February 1642, when there are no letters or references to letters being sent that can be found. There may be several reasons behind this, and two of these definitely played a role. One was that there were no talks between the Habsburg and Ottoman commissioners between 2 and 18 February 1642, and as a result of this, there were no significant events that were worth reporting.⁵³ It should also be mentioned as a second reason that it is probable that during this period Miklós Esterházy and Dániel Esterházy met in person as well. The occasion for this may have been provided by an unfortunate family event, namely the funeral of István, Miklós Esterházy's eldest son from his first marriage,⁵⁴ which took place on 4 February 1642,

Esterházy, Komárom, 20 March 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 183; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, p. 197.

⁵¹ In addition to the letters that are mentioned, there is the possibility that there are also undiscovered documents that may be included in this correspondence.

⁵² Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 14 January 1641/1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 171–174; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 179–182.

⁵³ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 103.

⁵⁴ István Esterházy died in Vienna on 4 July 1641, as the result of an illness. His death and funeral were noted by Dániel Esterházy in the family journal he maintained, which contains reminiscences going back to 1567 and contemporary entries from 1634. This also provides the information that this was not the only death in the first half of 1641 that overshadowed the life of Miklós Esterházy. His wife, Krisztina Nyáry lost her life on 1 February 1641, not long after bringing their son Ferenc into the world (17 January 1641). Révay, “Az Esterházy-család”, pp. 357–362. For an analysis of the journal, see: S. Sárdi, “Az önmegörökítő Esterházy Pál”

at Nagyszombat (present day Trnava, in Slovakia), a city that was connected to the family in several ways.⁵⁵

Date	Sender – Addressee	Letter/Reference
before 14 January 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Reference
Komárom, 14 January 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Letter
before 18 January 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Reference
Komárom, 18 January 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Letter
before 22 January 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Reference
Nagyszombat (Trnava), 22 January 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Letter
26 January 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Reference
Komárom, 29 January 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Letter
Komárom, 19 January 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Letter
before 20 February 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Reference
Sempte (Šintava), 20 February 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Letter
before 28 February 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Reference
Sempte, 28 February 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Letter
before 5 March 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Reference
Komárom, 5 March 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Letter
before 20 March 1642	Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy	Reference
Komárom, 20 March 1642	Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy	Letter

The correspondence of Miklós Esterházy and Dániel Esterházy (14 January – 20 March 1642)

The primary purpose of the letters examined was the provision of information. Their tone was highly personal and confidential, and it can be stated from their nature that they were balanced on the border between official and private correspondence, which was clearly due to the multifaceted relationship of the two correspondents. This duality flows over into the topics as well. The subject of every one of the surviving documents is politics, represented exclusively by the peace negotiations, but at the same time, while reading the letters, researchers find themselves suddenly in the middle of a family matter that needs to be resolved.

“EITHER WE SHOW OR DO NOT TO THEM THE DIPLOMAS”⁵⁶

A quite interesting and at the same time complex area of questioning unfolded during the study of the literature related to the 1642 Treaty of Szőny and the source base at my disposal – including the correspondence between Miklós and Dániel Esterházy that is being examined here. This developed around the previous treaties and other documents that comprised the starting point for this negotiation, and

⁵⁵ Miklós Esterházy to György Lippay, Kismarton, 24 December 1641. MNL OL, X 725. PL AS AR Classis X. 2648. tekercs, (1641) pag. 331–332.

⁵⁶ The quoted text in Hungarian: “[...] vagy mutattuk, vagy nem nekik az diplomákat [...]”. Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 19 February 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 179–180; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 190–192.

the trouble was apparent not only during the negotiations, but also already during the preparations for them.

During the formation of the framework for the Habsburg–Ottoman peace negotiations, so already during the autumn of 1641, the Hungarian Chancellery received a mandate to seek out and prepare the letters and documents necessary for the negotiations. The palatine Miklós Esterházy himself made efforts to recover the documents that were not found at the chancellery, so he hurried to his own archives at Kismarton (present day Eisenstadt, in Austria) to look for them. The palatine also sent out a call to the counties to compile a list of the damages and grievances caused by the Ottomans since the treaty of 1627.⁵⁷ In connection with the latter, Dániel Esterházy in his letter of 14 January 1642, took issue with the fact that neither the counties of Zala, Veszprém and Győr, nor Vasvár had not sent the documents requested, and that none of the delegates of the counties that had arrived the necessary documents.⁵⁸

The disorganised and even chaotic circumstances that surrounded the previous Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties represented an even weightier problem. It is worthwhile to start the list with the most recent, the 1627 Treaty of Szőny. In connection with this, it is worth referring to the opinions of Miklós Esterházy that he drafted in the autumn of 1641⁵⁹ and February of 1642.⁶⁰ In these, the palatine made the observations that are here only outlined in broad strokes, according to which in truth there was no peace treaty that was in force. After all, the last valid treaty had expired in 1636, and although in 1627, the Treaty of Szőny had been established, it had not been ratified and he considered the later negotiations related to the period of validity of the treaty to have been abandoned.⁶¹ Miklós Esterházy had a key role in the establishment of the first Treaty of Szőny as well, and his opinion that he stated several times is interesting because although there had been further talks about the duration of the peace, the ratification of the first Treaty of Szőny had in fact occurred. This was linked to the name of Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein (1582–1656), whose mission had taken place in the period between December of 1627 and December of 1629.⁶² Even amongst the previous Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties, whose forwarding had been urged beforehand, the

⁵⁷ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, pp. 60–61.

⁵⁸ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 14 January 1641/1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 171–174; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 179–182.

⁵⁹ Miklós Esterházy proclaimed his opinion in the matter of the peace negotiations on 11 November 1641. The text of the Latin opinion was published in print. Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 64, pp. 231–260. In all likelihood, the Hungarian language opinion that the palatine could find at the Batthyány family archives formed the basis of this, which Zsuzsanna J. Újváry analysed in her article. J. Újváry, “Nemzeti identitás”.

⁶⁰ For Miklós Esterházy’s opinion of 28 February 1642, see: EPL AS AR Classis V. Nr. 431, pag. 1–6. For the publication of the opinion, see: Juhász, “...gyümölcse pedig semmi nem volt”.

⁶¹ Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 64, pp. 231–260; J. Újváry, “Nemzeti identitás”; Juhász, “...gyümölcse pedig semmi nem volt”.

⁶² For the mission of Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein in more detail, see: Brandl – Szabados, “A megbízás terhe”.

copy of the 1627 Treaty of Szőny was the first that arrived to the Habsburg commissioners assigned to the negotiations. It was certainly already there on 12 February 1642, while Michel d'Asquier (1598–1664), chief interpreter for eastern languages in Vienna (1625–1664) was entrusted with bringing the rest.⁶³ The representatives of the Habsburg party planned to show the requested “diplomas” to the Ottomans on 20 or 21 February 1642. According to Dániel Esterházy, there would be no harm if the documents in question were not to arrive in time, because the kapitány clearly informed them that they were not willing to give back the villages.⁶⁴

The 1606 Peace Treaty of Zsitvatorok also caused confusion from several aspects. On the one hand, it is known from current research that treaties with differing texts on significant points were made at Zsitvatorok, and both sides considered their own version to be the basis for negotiation.⁶⁵ The second, perhaps less well-known fact is contained in the letter dated 24 February 1642, from the archbishop György Lippay to the palatine Miklós Esterházy. In the letter, the archbishop first referred to the differing versions of the treaty of Zsitvatorok and that they still had not found the document. He then continued with a surprising statement, according to which, “*az Situatoroki diplomat magunk mi fasificaltuk etc., az többit pennara nem bizhatom* [we ourselves falsified the diploma of Situatorok [Zsitvatorok] etc., and the rest I cannot entrust to the pen]”.⁶⁶ György Lippay’s statement allows the conclusion that perhaps a forged Hungarian language version was also made in addition to the forged Turkish language copy of the treaty. The forging of the treaty of Zsitvatorok raises numerous further questions. Of these, it is enough simply to ask, who made the forgery, when and why was this done, and what differences does it contain in comparison with the original version. In the present case, insomuch as I have not found a source that provides substantive information in connection with this, it is only further research in this direction that could provide a satisfactory answer to these questions.

The Treaty of Vienna in 1615–1616 also caused concern, since it still had not yet been found and provided to the negotiating commissioners by 24 February, or one month before the conclusion of the talks.⁶⁷ Lines that also grab one’s attention are contained in the postscript of the response of palatine Miklós Esterházy’s letter to the urging of Dániel Esterházy, dated 28 February 1642, “*P.S. Emlékezik kegyelmed az bécsi pacificatiórul is levelében, hogy originalibus én nálam volna,*

⁶³ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 187–190; For the life and career of Michel d’Asquier, see: Alastair, “Michel d’Asquier”.

⁶⁴ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 187–190.

⁶⁵ For the history of the Peace Treaty of Zsitvatorok in 1606, see: Nehring, “Magyarország és a zsitvatoroki szerződés”; Bayerle, “The Compromise at Zsitvatorok”; Papp, Sándor, “A zsitvatoroki békéhez vezető út”; Idem, *Török szövetség – Habsburg kiegyezés*; For examples and copies of the Treaty of Zsitvatorok signed on 11 November 1606, see: MNL OL, P 108, Rep. 71. Fasc. 26a.

⁶⁶ György Lippay to Miklós Esterházy, 24 February 1642, Tusor, „*Írom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 92, pp. 97–99.

⁶⁷ György Lippay to Miklós Esterházy, 24 February 1642, Tusor, „*Írom kegyelmednek...*”, doc. no. 92, pp. 97–99.

a ki úgy vagyon, hogy in paribus vagyon nálam, de az originált nem láttam, s nem is mutatták nekem, de ha szintén meg volna is, ahoz, bár ne bizzanak, mert szintén úgy falsificálva vagyon az mint az többi [P.S. Your Grace recalls in your letter that the original of the peace of Vienna would be in my possession, whereas it is a copy that I have, but I have not seen the original, and it has not been shown to me, but even if I had it, I would not trust it because it would be falsified like the others.]”⁶⁸

It is quite apparent from the above examples that the situation of the Habsburg commissioners was fundamentally impacted and frustrated by the serious problem that even at the end of February 1642 they did not have access to authentic versions of the previous Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties that would have represented a proper basis of reference. Although according to the evidence of Dániel Esterházy’s letter, the 1627 document from Szőny was in the possession of the commissioners by 19 February 1642,⁶⁹ the lines written by Miklós Esterházy in connection with the falsification of the copies of the peace treaty raise the issue of its authenticity as well.⁷⁰ In my opinion, assistance would be provided in reconstructing this by the thorough examination of the documentary materials from the peace of 1606, and the following treaties and peace negotiations, as well as the integration of other groups of sources into the research, and the work on this has already begun.

OTHER DETAILS OF THE CORRESPONDENCE

Details reveal themselves through the letters of Miklós Esterházy and Dániel Esterházy that are only partially related to the diplomatic events, since they also provide data on the theatre of everyday, ordinary life. For example, the correspondence provides information on the state of health of the commissioners and one can learn how all this had an impact on the process of negotiations. Already before the actual commencement of negotiations (14 January 1642), Dániel Esterházy was unwell. In the postscript dated 19 January of his letter written to his brother on 18 January 1642, he provides information about aches in his head, shoulders, neck and back that had lasted almost two weeks but did not want to go away, and which he tried to alleviate with both medications and bloodletting.⁷¹ The experienced Gerhard von Questenberg, who was then in his 56th year, was struggling with more serious health problems. He complained of his painful legs and based on the symptoms that appeared,⁷² there were probably abscess on them. Various doctors and

⁶⁸ Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy, Sempte, 28 February 1642, Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 98, pp. 370–371.

⁶⁹ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 187–190.

⁷⁰ Miklós Esterházy to Dániel Esterházy, Sempte, 28 February 1642, Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, doc. no. 98, pp. 370–371.

⁷¹ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 18–19 January 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 175–178; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 183–186.

⁷² „Questenberg uram nem igyekezik talám még el innen, az lába miatt doctort akar...” [“Mr. Questenberg perhaps will not hasten from here, he wants a doctor due to his leg...”] (Dániel

healers came to him to treat this while the negotiations were proceeding. István Pálffy, who at that time held the position of captain-general of Érsekújvár⁷³ (present day Nové Zámky, in Slovakia) and the mining region, sent his doctor to Gerhard von Questenberg,⁷⁴ but in addition to this, a doctor named Pál Gaiger and two barbers treated him,⁷⁵ and they even wanted to have a doctor brought from Pozsony (present day Bratislava, in Slovakia).⁷⁶ It seems that the condition of the Habsburg commissioner was not satisfactory later either, since near the end of February 1642, Dániel Esterházy also tried to intervene, as a result of which the palatine Miklós Esterházy sent István Barbély with two or three new Christians, or anabaptists to Komárom, so he could recover as soon as possible.⁷⁷ Gerhard von Questenberg's health also had an impact on the process of the negotiations, since the next "face-to-face" time with the Ottoman commissioners also depended on this, as was noted in one of the letters of the younger Esterházy.⁷⁸

The latter example also seems to support the fact that the leadership role amongst the Habsburg commissioners during the peace talks was played by Gerhard von Questenberg, who had the greatest amount of experience. However, all of this also created some tension, and the letters of Dániel Esterházy regularly evidence the offence he felt due to the precedence of Gerhard von Questenberg. The younger brother of the palatine objected on more than one occasion that the Ottoman side often only sent the documents to Questenberg, and only addressed the commissioners of the Habsburgs at the end.⁷⁹ Giving voice to this on one occasion, they emphasised in their messages from the chief interpreter Michel d'Asquier that "*nálunk az comes elsőbb s böcsüsebb status* [for us count is the title

Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 18–19 January 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 175–178; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 183–186.); "...Questenberg uramhoz, mivel beteges lábaira..." ["...to Mr. Questenberg, since for his unwell legs..."] (Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 187–190.); "...tegnap az lábára sok pustulákat mondá rajta, hogy fakadtak az más éjjel..." ["...he told yesterday that many pustules burst on his leg that at another night ..."] (Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January, 1642. MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 187–190.)

⁷³ Pálffy, "Kerületi és végvidéki főkapitányok", p. 271.

⁷⁴ Jedlicska, *Eredeti részletek gróf Pálffy-család okmánytárához*, p. 330.

⁷⁵ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 187–190.

⁷⁶ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 18–19 January 1642, MNL OL, P 123, I/a fol. 175–178; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 183–186.

⁷⁷ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 187–190; Miklós Esterházy to Daniel Esterházy, Komárom, 20 February 1642, SNA, EcsI box 48, fol. 1–2; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 193–195.

⁷⁸ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNL OL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 187–190.

⁷⁹ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 14 January 1641/1642, MNLOL, P 123, I/a fol. 171–174; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 179–182; Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNLOL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, "Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós", pp. 187–190.

with priority and greater esteem]”,⁸⁰ also indicating the tension between Miklós Esterházy and Questenberg.

Although Miklós Esterházy was not personally at the site of the talks during the negotiations, his brother constantly urged him to come at least to the nearby Érsekújvár.⁸¹ The palatine’s expeditious remark to all of this was quite revealing, „Az mi az én Uivárban való menetelímet illeti, nem tudhatom mint érkezhessen reá, mert igen debilis vagyok, s más az, hogy gyümölcset sem látom, miért kellettnek oda mennem [As regards my move to Uivár [Érsekújvár], I do not know if I am able, because I am quite weakling, and in addition, I see no reason why I should go there.]”.⁸² Miklós Esterházy’s opinion on the development of the talks is quite apparent from the lines quoted, and he clearly saw that the peace could only come about at the cost of serious concessions from the imperial side.

Details also arise during the processing of the correspondence of the two Esterházy families that do not touch upon the peace negotiations at all, but were merely included in the letters connected to the talks. Thus, here the matter of the marriage of two young members of prominent families must be mentioned, namely that of Baron János Amadé (1610–1654)⁸³ and Judit Esterházy.⁸⁴ The marriage, inasmuch as it involved two related families and their members that were fourth cousins, ran into difficulties and a dispensation was needed to settle the obstacles to it. The archbishop of Esztergom, György Lippay and the palatine Miklós Esterházy both made efforts to intercede. According to evidence from the Royal Books (*Libri Regii*), the monarch Ferdinand III issued the marriage permit on 10 July 1641,⁸⁵ and then two days later György Lippay let Miklós Esterházy know that he would soon send Baron Amadé’s consensus (consent) and would strive to have the Roman (Papal) dispensation granted as well.⁸⁶ On 30 August, the palatine sent the “genealogy” and asked György Lippay to have the nuncio continue to help.⁸⁷ In the sources I have used, the matter only comes up again in January of 1642, when Dániel Esterházy informs Miklós Esterházy that Farkas Esterházy, the brother of the girl planning on being wed, had set the date for the nuptials on 16 February. However, the dispensation that had been requested had not yet arrived

⁸⁰ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 14 January 1641/1642, MNLOL, P 123, I/a fol. 171–174; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 179–182.

⁸¹ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNLOL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 187–190.

⁸² Miklós Esterházy to Daniel Esterházy, Komárom, 20 February 1642, SNA, EcsI box 48, fol. 1–2; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 193–195.

⁸³ The Amadé family came from the Gutkeled clan. János Amadé had extensive family estates in the Csallóköz region. His father, Lénárd Amadé, was loyal to the Habsburg emperor, receiving the title of baron, and his mother was Orsolya Geczél of Korpona (present day is Krupina, in Slovakia), who also brought great property to the marriage. Nagy, *Magyarország családai*, vol. 1, p. 27; Gálos, *Báró Amadé László*, pp. 8–9.

⁸⁴ Judit Esterházy’s father was the brother of Miklós and Dániel Esterházy, Gábor Esterházy, who died in 1626, and her mother was Mária Derssffy. B. Révay, “Az Esterházy-család”, p. 358.

⁸⁵ MNLOL, A 57 (*Libri regii*), vol. 9, pp. 377–378.

⁸⁶ Hajnal, *Az 1642. évi meghíúsult országgyűlés*, pp. 59–61.

⁸⁷ Hajnal, *Az 1642. évi meghíúsult országgyűlés*, pp. 103–107.

and it was doubtful whether it would be received by the appointed date, so the matter had to be expedited not only by the archbishop, but also by the nuncius.⁸⁸ I found a single reference in the literature that the wedding was finally concluded in 1646,⁸⁹ so the information above was merely data related to the antecedents to the marriage.

In my article, following the presentation of the antecedents and circumstances of the 1642 Treaty of Szőny, I have considered the main focus of my examination to be a single direction of communication (the correspondence of Miklós Esterházy and Dániel Esterházy) from the not at all simple network of contacts related to the so-called second Treaty of Szőny. I have presented data and supplementary information not only related to the treaty, but also to the Esterházy brothers and the broader history of the Esterházy family based on the analysis of the letters included in the research, supplemented by other relevant sources. The most complex area of issues is represented without doubt by the difficulties that developed surrounding the peace treaties, which at the same time are partial results of ongoing research, thus clearly indicating the directions that call for further, more thorough examination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Materials

Austria

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA)
Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA)
Pálffy-Daun Familienarchiv
Türkische Urkunden

Hungary

Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltár (MNL OL)
Magyar Kancelláriai Levéltár
A Magyar Kancellária regisztratúrája
Libri regii (A 57)
Magyar kincstári levéltárak
Magyar Kamara Archívuma (MKA)
Archivum familiae Esterházy (E 174)
Magánlevéltárak
Esterházy család hercegi ágának levéltára
Repositorium (P 108)
Esterházy Miklós (P 123)
Másolatok gyűjteménye
Esztergomi Primási Levéltár (EPL)
Archivum Saeculare
Acta Radicalia (X 725)

⁸⁸ Dániel Esterházy to Miklós Esterházy, Komárom, 29 January 1642, MNLOL, E 174, box 3, item 7, fol. 427–430; Juhász, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós”, pp. 187–190.

⁸⁹ Esterházy, *Az Eszterházy család*, p. 88.

Slovakia

Slovenský Národný Archív

Esterházy csesznecká líniá. Nové usporiadanie

Published Primary Sources

- B. Révay, Ferenc, “Az Esterházy-család nemzékrendét illető eredeti feljegyzések”, *Új Magyar Muzeum* 9/5–6 (1859), pp. 357–362.
- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Válogatott források az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés történetéhez”, *Lymbus. Magyarágtudományi Forrásközlemények* 15 (2017), pp. 151–203.
- Fekete, Ludwig, *Türkische schriften aus dem Archive des Palatins Nikolaus Esterházy, (Schriften des Palatins Nikolaus Esterházy) 2*, Budapest: Paul Esterházy, 1932.
- Gévay, Antal, *Az 1625-diki május’ 26-dikán költ gyarmati békekötés’ cikkelyei, deákúl, magyarul és törökül*, Bécs: Strauss Antal’ Özvegye, 1837.
- Gévay, Antal, *Az 1627-dik évi september’ 13-án kelt szőnyi békekötés’ cikkelyei, deákúl, magyarul és törökül*, Bécs: Strauss Antal’ Özvegye, 1837.
- Jedlicska, Pál, ed., *Eredeti részletek gróf Pálffy-család okmánytárához 1401–1653 s gróf Pálffyak életrajzi vázlatai*, Budapest: Stephaneum Nyomda R. T., 1910.
- Juhász, Krisztina, “...gyümölcse pedig semmi nem volt”. Esterházy Miklós véleménye 1642. február 28-án a szőnyi béke(tervezet) pontjairól”, *Levéltári Közlemények* 89 (2020), pp. 353–366.
- Juhász, Krisztina, “Esterházy Dániel és Esterházy Miklós levelei az 1642. évi szőnyi békekötés idején”, *Lymbus. Magyarágtudományi Forrásközlemények* 17 (2019), pp. 175–204.
- Majláth, Béla, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés története*, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1885.
- Martí, Tibor, “Esterházy Miklós nádor aranygyapjas rendi tagságával összefüggő levéltári források”, *Lymbus. Magyarágtudományi Forrásközlemények* 16 (2018), pp. 211–243.
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, “„Az mint Isten tudunk adja, oltalmazzuk vérünkkel is szegény hazánknak bátyját...”: Magyar nyelvű levelek a Koháry-Coburg család levéltátaból”, *Aetas* 35/3 (2020), pp. 126–150.
- Ráth, Károly, “Gróf Esterházy Miklós nádor levelei”, *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 1st series, 8 (1861), pp. 3–208.
- Salamon, Ferenc, *Két magyar diplomata a tizenhetedik századból*, Pest: Ráth Mór, 1867.
- Salamon, Ferencz – Szalay, László, *Galántai Gróf Eszterházy Miklós. Magyarország nádora*, 3 vols, Pest: Lauffer és Stolp, 1863–1870, 1582–1622, vol. 1, Pest, 1863, 1627–1629, vol. 2, Pest, 1866, 1626–1629, vol. 3, Pest, 1870.
- Tusor, Péter, discov., ed. and pub., “Írom kegyelmednek, mint igaz magyar igaz magyar-nak...” Lippay György veszprémi és egi püspök, esztergomi érsek levelei magyar arisztokratákhoz, nemesekhez, 1635–1655, (Bibliotheca Historiae Ecclesiae Universitatis Catholicae de Petro Pázmány nuncupatae, 2nd Series, class. 1, Collectanea Studiorum et Textum) 1, Budapest: Gondolat – MTA–PPKE “Lendület” Egyháztörténeti Kutatócsoport, 2015.

Literature

- Alastair, Hamilton, “Michel d’Asquier, Imperial Interpreter and Bibliophile”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009), pp. 237–241.
- Bagi, Zoltán Péter, *A császári – királyi mezei hadsereg a tizenöt éves háborúban*, Budapest: Históriaantik Könyvesház, 2011.

- Bayerle, Gustav, "The Compromise at Zsitvatorok", *Archivum Ottomanicum* 6 (1980), pp. 5–53.
- Borovszky, Samu, Szendrő vára, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1908.
- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, "Kommunikáció és híráramlás: A Habsburg-oldal tárgyalási stratégiája az 1627. évi szőnyi 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 – hétköznapjairól; 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.
- Csapodi, Csaba, Eszterházy Miklós nádor 1585–1645, Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1942.
- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, "„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister” – Wissenstransfer unter kaiserlichen Gesandten an der Hohen Pforte in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts", *Chronica* 19 (2019), pp. 42–83.
- Ember, Győző, Az újkori magyar közigazgatás története Moháctól a török kiűzéséig, (Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai, III., Hatóság- és hivataltörténet) 1, Budapest: Irodalmi, Művészeti és Tudományos Intézet, 1946.
- Espenhorst, Martin, ed., *Frieden durch Sprache? Studien zum kommunikativen Umgang mit Konflikten und Konfliktlösungen*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz) 91, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Esterházy, János, *Az Esterházy család és oldalágainak leírása*, Budapest: Athenaeum, 1901.
- Gálos, Rezső, Bárány Amade László, Pécs: Dunántúl Pécsi Egyetemi Könyvkiadó és Nyomda, 1937.
- Hajnal, István, *Az 1642. évi meghíúsult országgyűlés időszaka: 1640. december – 1643. március*, (Esterházy Miklós nádor iratai) Budapest: Paul Esterházy, 1930.
- Hajnal, István, *Esterházy Miklós nádor lemondása: székfoglaló értekezés*, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1929.
- Hengerer, Mark, *Kaiser Ferdinand III. (1608–1657): Eine Biographie*, (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs) 107, Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2012.
- Hiller, István, *Palatin Nikolaus Esterházy: Die ungarische Rolle in der Habsburgerdiplomatie 1625–1645*, Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau, 1992.
- Illik, Péter, "Török dúlás a Dunántúlon. Török kártételek a nyugat-dunántúli hódoltsági peremvidéken a 17. század első felében", PhD Dissertation, Budapest: Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Doctoral School of History, [doctoral defence: 2009]
- Illik, Péter, *Minden nap háború: a magyar királyságbeli török kártételek anatómiája (1627–1642)*, Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2013.
- J. Újváry, Zsuzsanna, "Nemzeti identitás és a törökkel megtartandó béke kérdése a 17. század első felében. Esterházy Miklós 1641. évi Opiniója", in Ács, Pál – Székely, Júlia, eds., *Identitás és kultúra a török hódoltság korában*, Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2012, pp. 383–397.

- 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 – hétköznapjairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya*, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 2020, pp. 171–188.
- Kampmann, Christoph “Gerhard Questenberg”, in Stolberg-Wernigerode, Otto, ed., *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 27 vols, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1971–2020, vol. 21, Berlin, 2003, pp. 43–44.
- Kerekes, Dóra, “Tradicionális birodalom – modern birodalom. Az Oszmán Birodalom a 17. század első felében”, *Aetas* 23/4 (2008), pp. 140–157.
- Körmeny, Lajos, ed., *Levéltári kézikönyv*, (Osiris kézikönyvek), Budapest: Osiris Kiadó – Magyar Országos Levéltár, 2009.
- Lauter, Éva, “„Modus observandus...” A 17. századi magyar nádorválasztások rendje”, in Horn, Ildikó – G. Etényi, Nóra, eds., *Portré és imázs. Politikai propaganda és reprezentáció a kora újkorban*, Budapest: L’Harmattan – Transylvania Emlékeiért Tudományos Egyesület, 2008.
- Márkus, Dezső, ed., *Magyar törvénytár 1000–1895. 1608-1657. évi törvénycikkek – Corpus Juris Hungarici, Millenniumi emlékkiadás 5*, Budapest, 1900.
- Martin Espenhorst – Heinz Duchhardt, eds., *Frieden übersetzen in der Vormoderne. Translationsleistungen in Diplomatie, Medien und Wissenschaft*, (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz) 92, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- 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].
- Nagy, Iván, *Magyarország családai czimerekkel és nemzékrendi táblákkal*, 13 vols, Pest: Beimel és Kozma – Ráth, 1857–1868, vol. 1, 1857; vol. 4, 1853; vol. 5, 1859; vol. 7, 1860.
- Nehring, Karl, “Magyarország és a zsitvatoroki szerződés (1605 – 1609)”, *Századok* 120/1 (1986), pp. 3–50.
- Pál Jászay: “A’ gyarmati béke”, *Tudománytár, Értekezések*, 2 (1837), pp. 39–75.
- Pálffy, Géza, “Kerületi és végvidéki főkapitányok és főkapitány-helyettesek Magyarországon a 16–17. században”, *Történelmi Szemle* 39/2 (1997), pp. 257–288.
- Pálffy, Géza, “Pozsony megyéből a Magyar Királyság élére. Karrierlehetőségek a magyar arisztokráciában a 16–17. század fordulóján. Az Esterházy, a Pálffy és az Illésházy család felemelkedése”, *Századok* 141/4 (2009), pp. 853–882.
- Pálffy, Géza, *A Magyar Királyság és a Habsburg Monarchia a 16. században*, (História Könyvtár Monográfiák) 27, Budapest: História, MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2011.
- Papp, Sándor, “A pozsareváci békekötés és a magyarok”, *Aetas* 33/4 (2018), pp. 5–19.
- Papp, Sándor, “A zsitvatoroki békéhez vezető út. Egy állítólagos Habsburg ígéret hátteréhez”, in Papp, Klára – Jeney-Tóth, Annamária, eds., „Frigy és békesség legyen...” A bécsi és a zsitvatoroki béke, (A Bocskai-szabadságharc 400. évfordulójára) 8, Debrecen: DE TI – Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Önkormányzat, 2006, pp. 267–298.
- Papp, Sándor, “Az Oszmán Birodalom, a Magyar Királyság és a Habsburg Monarchia kapcsolattörténete 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.

- Péter, Katalin, Esterházy Miklós, Budapest: Gondolat, 1985.
- Römer, Hans Robert, “The Safavid Period”, in Jackson, Peter –Lockhart, Laurence, eds., *The Cambridge History of Iran*, 7 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006 (reprint), *The Timurid and Safavid Period*, vol. 6, pp. 189–350.
- S. Sárdi, Margit, “Az önmegörökítő Esterházy Pál”, in Ács, Pál, ed., Esterházy Pál, a műkedvelő mecénás. Egy 17. századi arisztokrata-életpálya a politika és a művészet határvidékén, Budapest: Reciti, 2015, pp. 317–328.
- Strohmeier, Arno, “Trendek és perspektívák a kora újkori diplomáciatörténetben: A konstantinápolyi Habsburg diplomaták esete” (Transl. Kármán, Gábor), *Történelmi Szemle* 59/2 (2017), pp. 177–198.
- Sz. Simon, Éva, “A szülejmáni béke. A magyarországi oszmán adóösszeírások és a magyar–oszmán békekötések összefüggései”, *Aetas* 33/4 (2018), pp. 53–71.
- Szabados, János, “Habsburg–Ottoman Communication in the Mid-17th Century – The Death of Imperial Courier Johann Dietz. A Case Study”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 54 (2019), pp. 119–140.
- Szabó, András Péter, “Eszmék a nádori politika szolgálatában: Esterházy Miklós nádor levelei a vármegyéknek (1626–1645)”, in Kármán, Gábor – Zászkaliczky, Márton, eds., *Politikai nyelvek a 17. század első felének Magyarországon*, Budapest: Reciti, 2019, pp. 223–284.
- Takáts, Sándor, *A régi Magyarország jókedve*, Budapest: Athenaeum, 1921.
- Toldy, Ferenc, ed., Esterházy Miklós munkái. Eredeti kéziratok és kiadások után a szerző életrajzával, Pest: Emich és Eisenfels, 1852.
- Tóth, Hajnalka, “The circumstances and Documents of the Peace of Vasvár”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 34 (2017), pp. 243–256.
- Tóth, Hajnalka, “Vasvár előtt. Habsburg–oszmán megegyezési kísérlet Temesváron 1663-ban”, *Aetas* 35/3 (2020), pp. 46–61.
- Tóth, Sándor László, *A mezőkeresztesi csata és a tizenöt éves háború*, Szeged: Belvedere Meridionale, 2000.