

‘DENARI IN LOCO DELLE TERRE...’ IMPERIAL ENVOY
GERARD VELTWIJCK AND HABSBURG POLICY
TOWARDS THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, 1545–1547*

BART SEVERI**
(Moerbeke-Waas)

This study concerns itself with the first Imperial Envoy Gerard Veltwijck (ca. 1500–1555), who negotiated with the Ottoman Sultan Süleymān. Using newly discovered as well as recently published sources, it will focus on the part this diplomat of Charles V played in the negotiations with the Sublime Porte and on the considerable problems the French King and his representatives in Istanbul experienced during the talks. The Most Christian King thus became a victim of his ambivalent foreign policy while his alliance with the Sultan experienced a severe crisis. Finally, this study tries to demonstrate the impact of a diplomatic sojourn in the Levant for the envoy, as such a mission was very often followed by a considerable and far from only financial reward.

Key words: Gerard Veltwijck (ca. 1500–1555), Suleyman Kanuni (1520–1566), Charles V (1519–1556), Ottoman Empire, diplomacy, travel accounts

In the beginning of June 1545 Gerard Veltwijck arrived in Venice, accompanied by the Imperial ambassador Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (1503–1575). A few days earlier, Veltwijck, who was to be the first Plenipotentiary Envoy of Emperor Charles V to negotiate with the Ottoman Sultan, had contacted him to receive further information on his assignment in the Levant. In Venice, where most European diplomats departed for Istanbul, he was to meet French Special Envoy Jean de Monluc (1508–1579), who would accompany him during his journey within Ottoman territory. Their entry into the city caught the attention of the inhabitants who, according to one of Veltwijck’s companions, enthusiastically greeted the party. Veltwijck’s duty would prove to be highly difficult and long-winded. The mutual distrust in the French–

* This paper is the summary of a more comprehensive study, my undergraduate dissertation (June 2000), of Veltwijck’s negotiations with the Sublime Porte. While writing the dissertation, I was carefully assisted by Prof. Dr. Eddy Stols of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and Dr. Joos Vermeulen, to whom I must express my heartfelt thanks. However, this study is dedicated to my parents who have helped me tremendously in the past five years.

** Bart Severi, Prijckestraat 8, B-9180 Moerbeke-Waas, Belgium, Tel.: +32 (0)9 346 7112, e-mail: bartseveri@pi.be

Habsburg delegation and the insecurity among the French diplomats could cast an unfavourable shadow on the forthcoming negotiations with the Sultan.¹

Having entered the service of Emperor Charles V some time before 1540, Gerard Veltwijck (presumably born of a Jewish mother) was appointed as Secretary of Nicolas de Granvelle (1486–1550), the Imperial Keeper of the Seal, and as Secretary in Ordinary of the *Geheime Raad* of the Netherlands.² A former student of the *Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, Veltwijck had conducted research into the history of the Syrian and Aramaic biblical translations, the so-called *targumim*, in Venetian and Roman libraries and archives. His acclaimed Hebrew publication *Shebile Tohu* or *Itinera deserti* (Venice, 1539) immediately placed him among the other well-known sixteenth-century Orientalists Johann Reuchlin, Johann-Albert Widmannstadt and Sebastian Münster. As ‘familiaris Episcopi Vaburiensis’, he accompanied Georges d’Armagnac, Bishop of Vabres, to the Imperial Court at the end of the 1530s. Probably convinced of Veltwijck’s capacities by his recent publication, Granvelle persuaded the young scholar to enter the Habsburg household.³ In the following years, he accompanied Granvelle on numerous foreign journeys.

Veltwijck rarely attended a meeting of the *Geheime Raad* but, despite his repeated absence, he was awarded a normal salary thanks to a special decree by Mary of Hungary, which allowed him to be counted as present during the drawing up of the *contreroulles*, the annual list of absentees in the Council.⁴ It is highly probable that Veltwijck, being Granvelle’s secretary, accompanied the Emperor on his unsuccessful expedition to Algeria in 1541, which one could conclude from a letter of his

¹ Less known than his 16th-century colleagues from the Netherlands Corneille de Schepper, Augerius Busbequius and Karel Rijm, who also travelled to Istanbul, only few studies have been dedicated to Veltwijck. During the interwar period, the Jew Manfred Rosenberg (1935) graduated with *Gerhard Veltwyck – Orientalist, Theolog und Staatsmann* but mainly limited his book of 70 pages to a discussion of Veltwijck’s Hebrew publication. Two small biographies appeared in Belgian biographical dictionaries: Linden (1936–1938) and, more recently, Coenen (1990). An equally important article is the one by S[ilverman] (1971). Older, outdated biographies appeared in some 19th-century dictionaries. Because of the vastness of their subject, neither Jorga (1997) nor Hammer-Purgstall (1827–1835), paid much attention to Veltwijck’s mission in the Levant. The most extensive research on Veltwijck’s stay in the East to date was conducted in an unpublished work by Ernst Dieter Petritsch (1977).

² The date upon which Veltwijck was employed into Charles’ service is unknown. As early as 1535, he proposed a motion in the *Geheime Raad*, together with Stefaan Brant and Christoffel Pyrannis, to be in receipt of a salary. Four years earlier, Pyrannis had been struck off the list of secretaries. After that, he continued to work as an unpaid secretary in the Council. Eventually, Pyrannis was reinstated in 1540 as Secretary in Ordinary. It is, therefore, possible that Veltwijck was employed as a non-paid secretary as well before his official appointment in October 1540. It often happened that unpaid activities preceded a career as secretary or councillor. See Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 1191/26 for the motion of 1535 and Baelde (1965, pp. 91, 322) for his activities in the Council.

³ Letter from Corneille de Schepper to John Dantiscus (Binche, 12th June 1546). In: de Vocht (1961, p. 388). See also de Vocht (1951–1955, Vol. 3, p. 356).

⁴ Decree of 24th February 1542 at: Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 1476/6, fol 1r & no. 1642/1, fol 408r. See e.g. the *contreroulles* of 1544 and 1550–1555 at no. 1474/6 where Veltwijck is indicated as ‘toujours servy’. See also Baelde (1965, p. 322).

friend Corneille de Schepper (ca. 1500–1554) to a Polish colleague.⁵ In 1540 he participated in a restricted dialogue between Gropper, Bucer and Capito held at Worms which preceded the fruitless Diet of Regensburg (1541) which he also attended. The Papal Legate Gasparo Contarini, who arrived at the Diet in March, admiringly called him a “fiamingo ben dotto”.⁶ As Granvelle’s secretary, Veltwijck travelled incessantly through Europe the following years.⁷ Five years after his admission to the *Geheime Raad*, Charles chose him to safeguard his interests during the coming negotiations with the Ottoman Sultan Süleymān I (reigned 1520–1566). From 1545 until 1547, Veltwijck would manoeuvre cautiously between Habsburg, French and Ottoman interests before concluding the first-ever Habsburg–Ottoman treaty.⁸

In the overrun kingdom of Hungary, the death of János Zápolya (1487–1540) caused a similar acceleration in history as the death of his predecessor Lajos II Jagiełło on the battlefield of Mohács in 1526. The military campaigns of the Ottomans against Shah Tahmāsp I in the Middle East and of Khayr ad-Dīn Barbarossa (ca. 1476–1546) in the Mediterranean Sea had relieved the pressure temporarily but the vacant royal throne inevitably drew the attention once again to the southeastern part of Europe. The Treaty of Nagyvárád (1538), signed with the then childless Zápolya, guaranteed Archduke Ferdinand of Habsburg (1503–1564), crowned King of Hungary a few months after János, the inheritance of his possessions. The Sultan, however, never endorsed the settlement.⁹ Despite the efforts of Ferdinand’s diplomats in Istanbul, Hungary was turned into a battlefield once again where the East and the West met violently. Sultan Süleymān swiftly annexed Zápolya’s part of the country to his mighty Empire and made Zápolya’s newly-born son János Zsigmond (1540–1571) the new ruler of Transylvania, in succession to his father, while he made Buda (Ofen) the new principal town of the *sancak* (province). The successful campaigns of 1543 and 1544 brought the fortresses of Székesfőhervár (Stuhlweißenburg), Esztergom (Gran) and Visegrád (Plintenburg), some of the very last strongholds of Habs-

⁵ Letter of Corneille de Schepper to John Dantiscus (Binche, 12th June 1546). In: de Vocht (1961, p. 389).

⁶ Letter of Corneille de Schepper to John Dantiscus (Binche, 12th June 1546). In: de Vocht (1961, p. 387); Jean Vandenesse: *Sommaire des voyages faictz par Charles, cinquiemes de ce nom*. In: Gachard (1874–1882, Vol. 2, p. 168); Coenen (1990, p. 376); Rosenberg (1935, pp. 26–30).

⁷ From 1541 to 1544, he visited numerous cities including Rome, Genoa, Valladolid, the Diet of Nürnberg (1543) and possibly also the Diet of Speyer (1542). See, among others, Rosenberg (1935, pp. 31–33).

⁸ The treaty of 1533 between the Porte and Habsburg, negotiated by Corneille de Schepper and the von Zara brothers, remained a verbal agreement. Also, the Imperial Envoy de Schepper was lent to Ferdinand for the duration of the mission, but was given explicit orders *not* to negotiate in Charles’ name with Süleymān. During the final audience, the Sultan cynically said according to de Schepper’s diary, “If your master wants peace, he must send someone with full powers (Letter of 2nd August 1534).” Consequently, Veltwijck was the first imperial plenipotentiary to sign a treaty with the Porte. See Zinkeisen (1840–1863, Vol. 2, p. 815); Saint-Genois–Schepper (1857, pp. 47, 64); Petritsch (1991, p. 13); Petritsch (1985, p. 51).

⁹ As a result of the treaty of 1533, every agreement between Ferdinand and Zápolya had to be approved by Süleymān before it could come into force.

burg between Buda and Vienna, into hostile hands. The Ottoman threat was more imminent than ever.

In the mid-1540s, the Sublime Porte possessed a sound territorial base to make a successful sally into the Austrian lands and occupy Vienna – still Süleymān's prime target in the West. On their way to the border during the campaign of 1543, the Ottoman troops marched through Belgrade in the middle of June and continued their expedition northward along the Danube. The border fortresses easily fell into the Sultan's hands – scarcely fortified as they were due to the wants of the Emperor who was engaged in a lingering war with the French King Francis I (reigned 1515–1547). Ferdinand hastily sent a small army of Italian soldiers to Hungary to delay the march of the Ottomans. However, after the occupation of Székesfőhervár in September, the Sultan unexpectedly turned tail and left the Court in Vienna astonished. A year later preparations started for an armistice, the first-ever written treaty between the Habsburg and Ottoman rulers.

The reasons for the military retreat in 1543 remain unknown.¹⁰ One German historian argued that the Sultan feared that further captures would have produced more support for Ferdinand from the German princes. In addition, an epidemic broke out among the Ottoman troops because of deficient provisions.¹¹ Another possibility is that the fortification of the captured castles demanded too much time and manpower during campaigns.¹² However, the most important reason was a fundamental one: the castle of Székesfőhervár fell at the beginning of September and winter was drawing near.

In April of every campaigning year, once the fast of Ramadan had ended, the Ottoman Sultan ordered his *beylerbeyler* (provincial governors) from the remotest parts of the Empire to send their troops to Istanbul. The forces rallied on Cırpıci Meadow, a grass pasture near the capital that was transformed into a great camp. Over many weeks irregular raiders (*akıncılar*), sharpshooters (*seğmenler*), musketeers (*tüfekçiler*), Tartar horsemen and *sipāhiler* joined the Sultan's array of troops. Together they formed the Army of Islam, the *gāziler* or Soldiers of True Faith, ready to wage a holy war against the infidel.¹³ Year after year, the army marched along the same route into the Domain of War (*dār ul harb*), to which the *dār ul islam*, the lands where Islam reigned supreme, must be extended. But the Ottomans did not spend winter in the field. The harsh conditions both in Anatolia and southeastern Europe made it almost impossible to survive and raised serious logistical problems. Even under the best weather conditions, the distance from Istanbul to Vienna amounted to at least fifty days travel. The often too high water-level of the Danube prevented ships from rapidly carrying troops northward. Also, the *sipāhiler*, landlords of feudal,

¹⁰ Káldy-Nagy (1973, p. 194, note 133); Petritsch (1985, p. 53).

¹¹ Rieger (1928, p. 32).

¹² The Ottoman campaign of 1532, for example, was stopped after the seizure of Kőszeg (Güns). Süleymān did not succeed in capturing Buda and initiated negotiations with Ferdinand's diplomats, which led to the armistice of 1533. Vaughan (1954, p. 118).

¹³ When the Sultan wanted to wage his campaign in the East, the army would gather above Üsküdar (Scutari), on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus. For a lively description of the yearly call to arms, see Wheatcroft (1993, pp. 42–47).

non-hereditary lands (*tīmārlar*) who constituted a substantial part of the Ottoman army, were forced to return to their fiefs. A letter from Istanbul, for example, that reached the Habsburg court on 7th September 1547 reported a crop failure in the Ottoman Empire. This inevitably hampered the military preparations of the Sultan because his *sipāhiler* remained unavailable.¹⁴

The statement that the Ottoman Empire attained its geographical limit halfway the sixteenth century is often questioned.¹⁵ It nevertheless seems meaningful to take it into serious consideration when studying both Habsburg–Ottoman and Persian–Ottoman diplomatic activity; the Sublime Porte always remained tied down by their tradition of summer campaigning. In a hostile conversation with the Habsburg envoy Andronicus Tranquillus (1490–1571) in 1542, Grand Vizier Rüstem Pasha unintentionally revealed that the Porte was well aware of the shortcomings of this system: “One shall see that even we know how to wage war in winter,” he threatened.¹⁶ But the Habsburg sovereigns did not believe him. “Great fear has arisen in Istanbul,” Tranquillus wrote to Ferdinand.¹⁷ According to the diplomat, the Porte dreaded the Austrian counter-attack in Hungary. On the other side of the border, Europe believed that the Ottoman Empire temporarily required breathing-space and began to think of a treaty with the Sultan.

Surprisingly perhaps, Süleymān agreed to negotiate with the Habsburgs. What had seemed unthinkable in the past years, was now possible. On numerous occasions, the Sultan and his viziers had stubbornly refused the proposals of Ferdinand’s envoys to conclude a treaty. In 1540, for example, the Polish diplomat Hieronymus Łaski was locked up in “a dark and humid place without any windows, so that one could see the sky” because he had aroused suspicion by writing a bellicose letter to Ferdinand.¹⁸ Convinced of his military superiority, Süleymān wanted to break what was left of Austrian resistance and conquer Vienna. But, as previously stated, after some successful campaigns in Hungary, the Porte needed an armistice of several years to recover from these efforts. “Certes les Turcs ont desier de repoz”, wrote Veltwijck.¹⁹

The above statement explains the negotiations of 1545–1547 only partially. The Sublime Porte had to face other recurring problems. As in 1533, the conclusion of a peace treaty was immediately followed by an Ottoman campaign against the

¹⁴ For the *tīmārlı*, see Káldy-Nagy (1973, pp. 171–173). For the letter from Istanbul, see Friedensburg (1899, p. 286, note 2).

¹⁵ See in general McNeill (1964). For a thorough discussion of the topic, see Fodor (1991); Coles (1968, p. 103); Perjés (1989, pp. 31, 49). In opposition to these, Petritsch (1985, p. 49) writes: “Dem Osmanenherrscher bereitete es beispielsweise kaum Schwierigkeiten, von Konstantinopel bis nach Wien zu ziehen...” Yet it is my belief that the Porte did have to contend with insurmountable logistical problems. For example, in 1529 Süleymān declared in a *fethnāme* that he had not succeeded in capturing Buda yet because the city ‘is too remote from the Islamic Empire’. Káldy-Nagy (1973, p. 191).

¹⁶ Letter from Andronicus Tranquillus to Ferdinand (end of 1542). In: Nehring (1995, p. 27).

¹⁷ Nehring (1995, p. 28).

¹⁸ Diary of Hieronymus Łaski (31st October 1540–26th July 1541). In: Zinkeisen (1840–1863, Vol. 2, p. 840, note 2).

¹⁹ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 476).

Persian Empire of Shah Tahmāsp (reigned 1524–1578). One can easily draw a parallel between Habsburg–Ottoman negotiations and unrest at the eastern border of the Sultan’s empire.²⁰ Like his father Selīm I, Süleymān preferred to freeze the state of affairs at the European border temporarily in order to be able to wage war against the *Qızılbaş*. The role played by *le Sophy*, as the Shah was commonly called in Europe, in the foreign policy of the Ottoman Empire was a crucial one. Veltwijck’s first audience in the Divan, end of August 1545, strengthened his opinion that the Porte had a ‘grand desir de paix’.²¹ The Ottoman army was rumoured to have suffered serious losses in skirmishes on the Persian frontier. Together with internal problems (‘la hayne du Sultan Moustapha’ for his half-brother Selīm and the political meddling of the Sultan’s favourite wife Roxelana), ‘les affaires du Sophy’ urged the Porte to start negotiations with the Habsburg rulers, according to Veltwijck.²²

The French initiative

After the return of French ambassador Antoine Escalin, better known as Paulin, from Istanbul, preparations for the diplomatic mission started in Brussels at the end of November 1544.²³ The initiative was taken solely by Francis I – an attempt to rebuild his seriously damaged reputation in the eyes of Christian rulers and the Sultan. His co-operation with the Ottoman fleet was not well received in other European countries. At the Diet of Speyer (1544), a request was made to the Pope to deprive the King of his honorary title of *rex christianissimus*.²⁴ He sent an envoy to the Venetian Republic to justify his exploits.²⁵ But Francis had other reasons to soothe the rulers of Europe: the recently signed Treaty of Crépy offered him the prospect of obtaining the Duchy of Milan as a dowry for his third son Charles, the Duke of Orléans, who was to marry Ferdinand’s daughter Anna.²⁶ In return Francis promised to supply the Emperor with military assistance against the Ottoman Sultan – still the King’s ally. ‘For a time it became Francis’ aim to promote peace, even between Süleymān and

²⁰ See e.g. Perjés (1998, p. 11).

²¹ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 470); memorial of the same (end of 1545) in Nehring (1995, pp. 89–90).

²² Final report of Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 470). A letter from Rome (19th July 1545) confirmed that Roxelana had an influence on political matters. Hume (1904, p. 182). On Roxelana, see Peirce (1992, pp. 105–116); Rogers–Ward (1990, pp. 16–20).

²³ Paulin had accompanied Khayr ad-Dīn’s fleet, sailing from Istanbul to the Western Mediterranean, in May 1543. Their objective was to raid the coasts of Sicily and Naples and they wintered in French Toulon until May 1544. Paulin was forced to sail back to Istanbul with the dissatisfied Ottoman admiral and returned to the French court several months later. See, among many others, Deny–Laroche (1969, pp. 161–211).

²⁴ Rieger (1928, p. 42).

²⁵ Oration of Jean de Monluc in Weiss (1841–1852, Vol. 3, pp. 1–12) (French translation); also in de Ruble (1876–1881, Vol. 1, pp. 142–162) (Italian original).

²⁶ The Treaty and the preceding war are discussed in Cardauns (1923); Rieger (1928, pp. 56–64) and Chabod (1958).

the Habsburgs," wrote British historian Dorothy Vaughan.²⁷ Gerard Veltwijck saw through him easily and thought of several other motives that had led Francis to take this remarkable initiative: firstly, he wanted to escape from supplying financial and military help to the Habsburgs; secondly, he assumed a diplomatic success would increase sympathy for France among 'les Allemans, Hungaroys et Ytaliens'; finally, the King would have thought a treaty would be beneficial for French economic interests in the spice trade of the Indian Ocean.²⁸

The Most Christian King did not want to give the Emperor any grounds to annul the advantageous Treaty of Crépy and kindly offered his services and diplomatic experience to Charles. Charles accepted the offer officially proposed by Paulin at the end of 1544 and agreed to send a Plenipotentiary Envoy to the Sublime Porte for the first time. As King of Spain and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, he was sufficiently involved in the battle against the Ottoman enemy to be concerned with peace. Moreover, he wished to include the corsairs of Algiers and other possessions of Khayr ad-Dīn in the coming treaty, together with the Spanish areas in North Africa. The Spanish and Italian coasts could only benefit from a short rest. The use of Spanish troops in Charles' battle against the German protestants also necessitated the conclusion of an armistice.

The diplomatic presence of Austrian Archduke and Hungarian King Ferdinand is self-evident. He was entangled in the European–Ottoman struggle since 1522, the year his brother gave him the Austrian hereditary lands. His election as King of Hungary after the disaster of Mohács followed the marriage with Hungarian Princess Anna (July 1521). The long war with the Porte had only brief intervals of peace and inevitably drained Ferdinand's military resources. The successful campaigns of 1541 to 1544 swept away most Habsburg strongholds in northern Hungary, moved the border even closer to Vienna and, therefore, heightened pressure on Ferdinand.

The subject of French intervention had been raised before and did not come as a surprise to the Court in Brussels. At the time of the Treaty of Aigues-Mortes (1538), the King offered to mediate negotiations between Charles and the Sultan to conclude an armistice. In a letter to the Keeper of the Seal, Mary of Hungary wrote "qu'il seroit plus convenient de l'accepter que de mectre en ce hasart..."²⁹ The Emperor agreed to the proposal and French envoy Cesare Cantelmo was sent to Istanbul. Presumably on the advice of ambassador Antonio Rincon and Cantelmo himself, Süleymān refused the offer. Three years later, Rincon urged the Sultan to sign a peace treaty or an armistice with the Emperor and the other Christian princes "à la réquisition dudit Roy de France, pour accroistre son auctorité en Allemaigne", as Veltwijck saw it.³⁰ Halfway the 1540s, however, the Porte had changed her mind.

²⁷ Vaughan (1954, p. 127).

²⁸ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, pp. 467–468). However, the Emperor would only accept French diplomatic intervention if Francis did not break his promise of Crépy. See the letter of Jean de Saint-Mauris to Francisco de los Cobos (7th May 1545). In Hume (1904, p. 99).

²⁹ Letter from Mary of Hungary to Nicolas de Granvelle (Brussels, 1st October 1538) at Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 123, fols 102r–103v.

³⁰ Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 91).

While Paulin and other French envoys informed the Emperor of the situation at the Ottoman Court, a messenger of the King returned from Istanbul and announced the approval of the Sultan. After “la chose a este longuement debatue”, Charles decided to accept the offer on 1st April 1545.³¹ Together with a French diplomat, an Imperial Envoy would negotiate with the Sultan. Veltwijck, who had returned from Vienna in March, was chosen as that envoy. He had just attended the Hungarian Diet of Tyrnau (Tirnova) but returned ‘mal satisfatto’. In a letter to his ambassador in France, Jean de Saint-Mauris, Charles explained his choice:

Et pour faire cestuy voiaige, m’a semble que le secretaire maistre Girard y seroit bien duysant, ayant desja ces jours passez este ou coustel de Hongrie, ou sinon que mondit frere et vous regarderez s’il y auroit quelque autre plus a propoz pour ledit voiaige...³²

The French King appointed Jean de Lasseran de Massencome (1508–1579), Lord of Monluc and brother of Blaise, as his *ambassadeur extraordinaire*. He was only the second choice because Francis ultimately decided not to send Charles de Cossé (1505–1564), Count of Brissac, to the Porte “pour faire moindre bruit en la chrestienté”.³³ In Habsburg circles, Veltwijck’s mission was shrouded in nervous secrecy as well. Ferdinand and Charles feared any possible discontent in the Empire and Hungary. As Veltwijck had learned during his stay in Tyrnau, the Hungarian subjects angrily demanded an Imperial campaign against the Turks, as Charles had promised them at the Diet of Speyer earlier that year. Because the Hungarians were disappointed that the Emperor had not attended the Diet at Tyrnau personally, Veltwijck feared a revolt. They were prepared, they asserted, to place themselves under the protection of the Sultan and pay him a yearly tribute.³⁴ If the news of the mission to Istanbul had leaked out, the precarious situation probably would have exploded.

The same can be said of the Holy Roman Empire. During the Diet at Worms in the spring of 1545, rumours of a mission to the Porte were denied. While relations between Pope Paul III and Charles considerably improved (the former had promised the Emperor military help against the Schmalkaldic League), the German Protestants became very suspicious and refused to supply Charles with troops to fight the Turks. They justly feared a military confrontation with Imperial armies.³⁵ Despite all efforts,

³¹ Letter from Charles V to Nicolas de Granvelle (Brussels, 1st April 1545). In: Weiss (1841–1852, Vol. 3, p. 109).

³² Letter from Charles V to Jean de Saint-Mauris (Brussels, 1st April 1545) *ibidem*.

³³ Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 91). On Monluc, see – with caution – Reynaud (1971); also Saint-Priest (1877, pp. 181–182); La Charité (1985, p. 711); Nehring (1995, sv ‘Monluc’).

³⁴ Rieger (1928, pp. 72–73). See also Veltwijck’s letters to Charles V (Vienna, 11th & 15th December 1544). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, pp. 419–426), as well as Charles’ instruction for the Imperial representatives at the Diet of Worms (1545) (Brussels, spring 1545). In: Lanz (1845, p. 390).

³⁵ Rieger (1928, pp. 71–72); letter from Charles V to Juan de Vega (Brussels, 2nd December 1544). In: Hume–Gayangos (1899, pp. 463–474).

the secret nature of the mission could not be preserved. The Venetian *bailo* in Worms, Bernardo Navagero, expressed his concern about the rumour of an Imperial emissary being despatched to the Porte because, he thought, this would damage Charles' reputation. The day after, 9th May 1545, he had to confirm the news. Two days after the departure of Veltwijck (24th May), Granvelle officially informed the Diet of the fact that "el secretario Gherardo era andato verso Venetia, mandato dalla Caesarea Maestà per passare in Constantinopoli".³⁶

Some days before, Ferdinand had openly requested his brother to send a joint embassy to the Sultan "pro commodo et utilitate non solum Regiae Maiestatis, sed totius Reipublicae Christianae", as Ferdinand and Francis I had asked him "repeatedly (*etiam atque etiam*)".³⁷ One day before Veltwijck received his instructions in Worms, the Italian Doctor of Law Niccolò Sicco (ca. 1510–1560) was chosen to be Ferdinand's envoy. Sicco was the successor of the unawares deceased Hieronymus Adorno who had already started negotiations with the Sultan.³⁸ The Emperor ordered Veltwijck to maintain "tres estroicte et entiere intelligence avec lui", as did Ferdinand Sicco.³⁹ Thus, the aim of Charles and Ferdinand was to co-operate, but reality proved otherwise at the outset of the mission. While Veltwijck travelled to Venice to meet Mendoza and Monluc, Sicco left Worms with Gian-Maria Malvezzi (Adorno's secretary) and travelled to Vienna and Istanbul although he had to receive information on the Ottoman state of affairs from Leonard von Vels (1497–1545), commander of the Austrian troops in Hungary and residing in Trent at the time.⁴⁰

³⁶ Report of Fabio Mignanello (Worms, 26th May 1545). In: Friedensburg (1898, pp. 711, 173, note 1).

³⁷ Memorial on co-operation ([Worms?], before 21st May 1545). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 70–71).

³⁸ Adorno had passed away on 15th March 1545 in Edirne (Adrianople) "de febre pestilentielle" before he was received by the sultan who shortly afterwards sent a charter to Ferdinand with a request for a new envoy. Letter of Gian-Maria Malvezzi to Ferdinand (after 23rd April 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 53); charter of the sultan (Edirne, end March 1545). In: Petritsch (1991, p. 48). For his successor, see Cosenza (1962, p. 3265); Benedetti (1923, pp. 203–229). Sicco is not to be confused with the Milanese captain of the same name who accompanied Veltwijck in 1545.

³⁹ Secret instructions from Charles V to Gerard Veltwijck (Worms, 22nd May 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 442); instructions from Ferdinand to Niccolò Sicco (Worms, 21st May 1545). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 68–69). See also the report of a conversation between Charles and Saint-Mauris ([March 1545]) in Weiss (1841–1852, Vol. 3, p. 103): 'qu'ilz ne traictent riens l'ung sans l'autre'.

⁴⁰ Letters from Bernardo Navagero & Domenico Morosini ([Worms], 23rd & 25th May 1545). In: Friedensburg (1898, p. 173, note 1). On Vels, see Petritsch (1977, pp. 34–50); Höfflechner (1972, p. 87); Nehring (1995, sv 'Vels').

The first journey⁴¹

From the start, co-ordination failed in the joint mission of the Habsburg brothers. Sicco's journey went well – “And thus I travelled so fast that ten horses were killed on the way”, he wrote to Ferdinand proudly.⁴² Once this news had reached Veltwijck's ears, he pressed the Emperor to send a courier to Sicco “pour non arriuer à la porte du Turc auant vostre ambassade, veu que les affaires semblent estre par dela en bon estat”.⁴³ The news that Sicco had reached Sofia on 22nd June while Veltwijck was still in Ragusa (Dubrovnik), made the latter nervous. Veltwijck decided to send a messenger of his own to Sicco to force him to wait for Veltwijck “veu que noz commissions estoient jointes”.⁴⁴ Unfortunately, he could not write his letter in code because Ferdinand's diplomat did not have the same key (‘chiffre’) as Veltwijck.

Veltwijck's journey went considerably less well. After he had exchanged his official instructions with Monluc, he gave Hugo Favolius (1523–1585), an old friend of his travelling-companion Matthias Laurijn, permission to accompany the envoy to Istanbul. Favolius left a very long and, alas, often exaggerated Latin account of the journey and stay in Istanbul, titled *Hodoeporici Byzantini* (Louvain, 1563).⁴⁵ The delegation also caught the attention of Nicander Nucius of Corfu, a Greek copyist working for Mendoza. It is highly probable that Nicander, who wrote an account as well, was instructed by Charles' ambassador in Venice to trace old manuscripts

⁴¹ Source material of this study consists mainly of diplomatic correspondence. The well-known book by Karl Lanz selectively edited the Imperial correspondence at the Algemeen Rijksarchief and the Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, both in Brussels. *Austro-Turcica*, Karl Nehring's long-awaited edition of the *Turcica* archive at the Viennese Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, a recent continuation of Anton von Gevay's classic (1840–1842), is invaluable for every scholar studying Habsburg–Ottoman relations of this period. Another major work is Charrière (1848–1860). Venetian reports are to be found in Albèri (1840–1853). Relevant letters of ambassadors in other countries than Austria and Turkey can be read in Hume (1899, 1904) and Friedensburg (1898, 1899). Ernst Dieter Petritsch (1991) published summaries of Ottoman documents in Vienna while Anton Cornelius Schaendlinger (1983, 1986) edited several letters of the Sultan. The itineraries of Jean de Chesneau (1970) and of Hugo Favolius (1563), travelling companions of the French ambassador Aramont in 1547 and Veltwijck in 1545 respectively, complement the material mentioned above. Unpublished material at the Algemeen Rijksarchief and the Royal Library will be mentioned where appropriate.

⁴² “Neque enim magnos illos aestatis calores et laborem illum sine intermissione ferre poterant,” explained the diplomat. Letter from Niccolò Sicco to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 25th August 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 73); Final report of the same (Edirne, 10th November 1545) *ibid.*, p. 76.

⁴³ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck & Diego de Mendoza to Charles V (Venice, 7th June 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 450).

⁴⁴ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Plovdiv, 6th August 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 463). See also what Sicco wrote on this in his letter to Ferdinand (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 77).

⁴⁵ For Favolius, a former medical student of the University of Padua and city doctor of Antwerp from 1565 till his death, see Paquot (1768, Vol. 2, pp. 97–98); Cox-Indestege (1979, p. 11); Gerlo–Vervliet (1972, p. 330); Heesakkers–de Schepper (1988, pp. 216–217). A discussion of the account can be found in Wiegand (1984, pp. 150–173). For Laurijn, member of a renowned humanistic family of Bruges, see Gaillard (1857); de Vocht (1959, p. 232).

during his stay in the Near East, a common occurrence at the time.⁴⁶ For a second time, Veltwijck, whom Nicander praised as a man of great knowledge, gave his permission for a stranger to accompany his travelling party.⁴⁷ The other members of the retinue remain unknown. In his account, Favolius wrote that "a number of important persons escorted Veltwijck".⁴⁸ These must have been noblemen, as they were present in almost every sixteenth-century embassy (French or Habsburg) to the Sublime Porte to add lustre to the mission, or scientists, carefully selected by the Emperor to conduct research on the flora of the Near East. The average size of a delegation could range from thirty to seventy, among which were often a doctor, an illustrator, guides, an interpreter and a priest. They were young, adventurous and well educated.⁴⁹ Because Monluc "va en grante equipage, et meine auecq luy vng grant train", Veltwijck thought it necessary to array his party in a more splendid manner. He asked Charles for more money and, while in Ragusa, bought his companions thirty horses, gave them new clothes and searched for some suitable presents for the Ottoman officials. "La cause est," he wrote to the Emperor, "que les Franchois nous ont tire sans necessite quelconque en cest ambassade longe, et comme eulx le veulent faire pompeuse".⁵⁰

Embassies did not constitute a fixed whole. Members who were travelling of their own free will could leave at any time, as did Favolius: he left Veltwijck and the others behind in Istanbul and chose to set sail for the Greek isles. The only condition was that they needed the permission of the ambassador. Entrance was free as well, there were no regulations, except the necessary permission – but it was often the case that companions knew the ambassador or another member of the group personally.⁵¹ If they were not wealthy enough, travellers often had to count on patronage. In return, the resulting travel account or scientific work would be dedicated to their patron.⁵² Relations between the envoy and his travelling companions are characterised by respect for the former. Favolius frequently glorified the acts of "magnum Veld-

⁴⁶ Imperial ambassador in Istanbul Augerius Busbequius (1522–1591), for example, promised Orientalist Andreas Masius to find him some rare Syrian manuscripts and brought home numerous Latin and Greek parchments which he gave to the royal Hofbibliothek in Vienna. Sanderus (1624, p. 28); Martels (1989, p. 408).

⁴⁷ The only recent and complete (Greek) edition of Nicander's account (which is scarcely of interest to this study) is Foucault (1962). Partial translations are to be found in Malina (1968) (with the most recent account of his life); Cramer (1841); Foucault (1951); Defradas (1966); Foucault (1971); Foucault (1972). See also Margolin (1976).

⁴⁸ Favolius (1563, fol. 9v).

⁴⁹ For some (contemporaneous) information on the composition of embassies, see Picard (1964, pp. 60–63); Teply ([1968], pp. 26, 64–65). In 1577, Imperial Envoy Joachim von Sinzendorf travelled to the Sultan with approximately sixty men. See Schweigger (1964, pp. 5–7).

⁵⁰ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Ragusa, 30th June 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 454).

⁵¹ Compare with Favolius, an acquaintance of Laurijn, and Nicander, an employee of Men-doza.

⁵² Favolius dedicated his book to Antoine de Granvelle (1517–1586), Nicolas' son and notable patron of arts. He supported Christoffel Plantin and commissioned the famous tapestry depicting the victory at Tunis (1535). Durme (1948); Delmarcel (1999, p. 123).

vicium” and made his book bulge with hyperbole. Nevertheless, the young nobleman Michael von Saurau (†1572), who accompanied two Imperial envoys in 1567 to the Porte, got “sametlich fröhlich” one particular night.⁵³ For everyone who ever dreamed of visiting the Ottoman Empire without considerable risk, being a member of a diplomatic delegation offered an almost unique opportunity.

After Monluc and Veltwijck had informed the Senate of *la Serenissima Republica* about their assignment, two galleys were prepared for the six-day voyage across the Adriatic to Ragusa. Venetian captains Christoforo Canal and Niccolò Giustiniano escorted the embassy with several ships. Charles’ envoy estimated the arrival in Istanbul “auecque layde de dieu ... sur la fin de juillet”. However, this would prove to be a mistake. Both in Venice and Ragusa, the French diplomat delayed the journey gravely. In Venice, he pretended that he had to wait for some important documents. This disturbed Veltwijck who, in a letter to the Emperor, described “la perplexite, en laquelle je me treuve, veu quil ma fallu attendre à Venise ledit ambassadeur vint et deux iours”. In the city of Ragusa, which they reached on 28th June, Monluc feigned a disease and succeeded in delaying the departure. The hot summer season and change in climate caused many travellers to have health problems – including Veltwijck – but Monluc’s “complexion delicate et colericque” was merely an attempt to postpone the negotiations with the Sultan until Charles had fulfilled the promise he made to Francis I at Crépy. Monluc had experience of simulating diseases: on his first mission to Istanbul in 1536 he feigned illness in order to force the captain of his galley to go ashore in Reggio where he could contact a nearby Ottoman ship secretly.⁵⁴ In 1545, however, he played his role too well and “fut la feinte si véritable que je tombis malade et ne pus arriver que au temps que j’avois jà escrit”.⁵⁵

On August 23, forty-six days after Sicco, Veltwijck’s party arrived in the Ottoman capital, escorted by the First Dragoman of the Porte Yünus Bey (†1550/1551) and some *çavuşlar*.⁵⁶ They had followed the route which ran from Ragusa via Niš, Sofia and Plovdiv (Felibe) to Edirne and Istanbul. This was the most frequented and best organised – merchants, pilgrims, Habsburg, French and Venetian envoys made use of it and of its *khāns*.⁵⁷ Envoys often travelled overland by coach or went down the Danube or Morava by boat. In 1555, Habsburg ambassador Augerius Busbequius covered the distance mostly by ‘currus’ but sailed between Buda and Belgrade.⁵⁸ Although Veltwijck needed more than two months to reach his destination, most en-

⁵³ Saurau (1987, pp. 44–46).

⁵⁴ Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 327).

⁵⁵ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545) *ibid.*, p. 608.

⁵⁶ Letter from Niccolò Sicco to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 25th August 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 73). Venetian *bailo* Stefano Tiepolo informed the Senate on 24th or 25th August that the embassy had arrived. Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 480, note 120). Other dates of arrival have been suggested: 7th September according to Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 589–590); beginning of September according to Rieger (1928, p. 83) and, finally, 20th August according to Friedensburg (1898, p. 337, note 2). On Yünus, see Matuz (1975).

⁵⁷ For a thorough discussion of this and other routes to Istanbul, see Yerasimos (1991).

⁵⁸ Busbequius (1994, pp. 15, 25).

voys travelled faster but were still subject to weather conditions, diseases, pirates and brigands. An average journey from Ragusa to Istanbul took thirty days: while in the winter it could last for six weeks, the favourable summertime often limited it to three.

Before Veltwijck's arrival, Sicco had not made much headway with the negotiations because the Pashas had refused to take any decisions without the presence of the Imperial and French envoys. Instigated by the resident French ambassador Gabriël d'Aramont (1508–1555), Grand Vizier Rüstem Pasha had locked him up "in durissimum carcerem" for one month and had tried to terrify him by showing him 'des testes couppees freschement'.⁵⁹ The messenger whom Veltwijck sent to Sicco had been intercepted and imprisoned when he wanted to enter the residence of Ferdinand's envoy. The letter he carried was brought to Rüstem Pasha and stirred up discontent: it said that their assignments were connected although both Veltwijck and Sicco seemed to act independently. Moreover, the latter denied every connection with Veltwijck's task. This state of confusion damaged trust in the European representatives, especially the French: "Les Turcs voyant la contrariete ... se sont resoluz de ne croire rien a lambassadeur de France".

The credibility of ambassador Gabriël de Luetz, Baron of Aramont and residing in Istanbul as Paulin's successor since 1543, had taken several blows in the past two years, or, in Veltwijck's words, "se trouuit apres la paix [of Crépy] en si mauuaix point, que souuentefois a este parle de lampaller".⁶⁰ The treaty had displeased Süleymān greatly, since it was an agreement between his strongest ally and his chief enemy, in which Francis had promised to support the struggle against the Ottomans. The Sublime Porte realised from the start where the King's real motives lay. Shortly after the start of the negotiations, Rüstem said to Monluc:

que le roy [Francis I] avoit esté dilligent de poursuivre le bien de l'empereur et non pas celui du Grand Seigneur, lequel, quant bon luy sembleroit, feroit la paix avec le roy des Romains [i.e. Ferdinand] à son proffit et avantage, comme le roy avoit faite la sienne avec l'empereur sans en avertir ses amys.⁶¹

Those were very harsh words and set the tone for the rest of the talks. It was clear to everyone that the Franco–Ottoman alliance, dating from 1536, began to show slight cracks that would, however, be crucial in the negotiations. A second important factor was the almost useless sojourn of the Ottoman fleet in the French harbour of Toulon from October 1543 till May 1544: "After the Peace [of Crépy]," wrote Veltwijck,

⁵⁹ "... dont le Sec [= Sicco] ne s'en estonnoit". Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 91–92). See also the letter from Sicco to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 25th August 1545) *ibid.*, p. 73. Aramont had successfully tried to postpone Sicco's audience with the Sultan. Letters from Gerard Veltwijck to Charles V (Ragusa, 12th July 1545 & Plovdiv, 6th August 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, pp. 460, 463).

⁶⁰ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 471). On Aramont, see Maurand (1901); Saint-Priest (1877, pp. 185–186); d'Amat (1939, pp. 219–222); Bacqué-Grammont (1991, pp. 5–9); Nehring (1995, sv 'Aramont').

⁶¹ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 597).

“The Turks had not stopped reproaching the French for not having known how to use such a fine army and how to defend themselves”.⁶² The friction between Special Envoy Monluc and Ambassador Aramont added fuel to the flames. The former, said Veltwijck, “tient ialousie auccque lambassadeur Harmont”. He was being thwarted, Monluc claimed, by Aramont “pour cause, que ne sembloit pas necessaire denuoyer vng nouveau ambassadeur par le roy, veu quil y auoyt vng residant a Constantinople”.⁶³ The tension did not lessen when negotiations started. Veltwijck wrote:

Or, sire, lesdits deux ambassadeurs par leur ambition priuee se sont fourez en grandes inimyties, vng chacun semployant a tirer tout lhonneur de la negociacion a soy, tellement que nenuye quilz ont eue lung de lautre leur a fait perdre honneur a tous deux.⁶⁴

Some of the other partisans or members of the French delegation in Istanbul also exhibited curious behaviour. Guillaume l’Orologier, presumably a French watchmaker brought along by Venetian *baili* to repair and maintain the Sultan’s growing clock collection, secretly visited Veltwijck once without the knowledge of Monluc and Aramont.⁶⁵ Beltramo Sachia, a merchant from Udine (commonly called Bertrand Sachis by the French) was regarded as a collaborator by Monluc and his colleague but Sachis did not refrain from paying Rüstem Pasha a private visit once in a while.⁶⁶ Two other members of their party besides Paulin, namely Jean Cavenac de la Vigne

⁶² Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 469).

⁶³ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck & Diego de Mendoza to Charles V (Venice, 7th June 1545). In: *ibid.*, p. 448. Nevertheless, their duties and tasks seem to have been accurately defined. See Ursu (1908, p. 178); Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 606).

⁶⁴ Final report of the same (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 472).

⁶⁵ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 614–615). See also Chesneau (1970, p. 19); Jorga (1997, Vol. 3, p. 92); letter from Justus de Argento to Ferdinand (after 9th November 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 189): “is [i.e. ‘horologiorum magistrum’] quem habebat Venetiis nuper obiisset et is Gallus erat”. After the conclusion of the treaty in 1547, Guillaume continued to work as a messenger for Veltwijck wrote to Ferdinand at the time: “... questo Signor [i.e. Süleymân] voleva praticare pratiche nove col re novo di Franza per via di uno horologier, chiamato messer Vilhelmo, molto familiare al Gran Signor ...” Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Büyüççekmece, 22nd June 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 161–162). He was also sent to France by the Sultan with a letter for the King. Letter from Gian-Maria Malvezzi to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 4th August 1547) *ibid.*, p. 170. He died unexpectedly on the way in Venice in August 1547. Chesneau (1970, p. 19). Jean de Morvilliers, French ambassador in Venice, wrote to Henry II that Guillaume was already ill when he arrived in the city. On his death, he wrote that ‘Messire Guillaume l’Horloger, dont il sembloit que la malladie allast en diminuant, tout soudain empira et en ung moment trépassa’. Letter from Jean de Morvilliers to Henry II (Venice, 19th & 29th August 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 29). Shortly afterwards, Rüstem Pasha asked the Habsburg ambassador in the name of Süleymân to send an ‘excellentem horologiorum magistrum’ because the previous one had died. Letter from Justus de Argento to Ferdinand (after 9th November 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 189).

⁶⁶ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 615). On Sachia, see Cardauns (1923, pp. 204–2060; Nehring (1995, sv ‘Sachia’).

and Jacobus Bondorius, both named as French dragomans by Monluc and Veltwijck, seem to have acted less suspiciously.⁶⁷

Despite the fact that they had to contend with a very experienced and astute opponent in the French, the feeling that "leur ancien credit estoit perdu" made the Habsburg party more confident.⁶⁸ Both Veltwijck and Sicco firmly believed that the outcome would be favourable to the Habsburg brothers. In one of his first letters to Ferdinand, Sicco cautiously wrote 'that it not seems that Rüstem is averse to a truce; therefore I cherish a great hope ... especially because the Imperial Envoy is very convinced that they [the Ottomans] do not really want to wage a war'.⁶⁹ They expected the Porte to come to a final decision mid-September, a mere two weeks after Veltwijck's arrival. Unfortunately, negotiations lingered on longer.

On the first Sunday after his advent, the imperial diplomat was received by the Sultan. Favolius extensively described how the party of 'Velduicius heros' was led beyond the Gate of Bliss where Dragoman Yünus Bey waited for them. Lost in admiration, he looked at the many unknown trees, the complex palace, the inner courts and galleries, seven lions and two tame leopards. In a large room, they lay down on beautiful floral carpets and were offered a meal. After the meal Veltwijck chose seven men from his company and was brought to the Sultan.⁷⁰ We can only assume that he made his oration, but the sources desert us at this point. The text itself, however, has made its way to us although it was believed to be lost. The only original indication of its location was given almost four centuries ago by Valerius Andreas (1588–1655), first librarian of the University of Louvain, who, with a slip of the pen, wrote in his *Bibliotheca Belgica* (Louvain, 1643) that it was to be read in a book of L. Tortius.⁷¹ The author's real name was Lucas Van Torre or Torrius (†1647), a Councillor in Ordinary of the *Rekenkamer* in Lille and familiar to the court of Spanish King Philip IV.⁷² At an unknown date, Van Torre transcribed Veltwijck's oration from a manuscript in the personal library of Gaspar de Guzmán, Duke of Olivares and Prime Minister of the Spanish monarch. I have discovered two copies of this last manuscript, both also containing a letter of Veltwijck to Nicolas de Gran-

⁶⁷ Jean de la Vigne (†1559) had already been sent to the Porte in 1543. After his return to France, he got mixed up in a fierce fight with Monluc whom he accused of treason. Ursu (1908, pp. 178–179); Saint-Priest (1877, pp. 188–189); Nehring (1995, sv 'Vigne'). Bondorius was last mentioned by Habsburg messenger Justus de Argento in spring 1548. Nehring (1995, sv 'Bondorius').

⁶⁸ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, pp. 468–469). The Habsburg party was quite inexperienced with Ottoman affairs. It was Sicco's first assignment as a diplomat and Veltwijck got only recently involved.

⁶⁹ Letter from the same to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 25th August 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 74).

⁷⁰ Favolius (1563, fols 53v–56v). Jérôme Maurand described how in 1544 only the notables that had been received by the Sultan, could eat the meal in the Palace. Maurand (1901, pp. 216–219). See also Schweigger (1964, pp. 58–59); Teplý ([1968], pp. 190–193).

⁷¹ Andreas (1973, p. 285).

⁷² On Van Torre, see Jean (1992, pp. 351, 394–397).

velle: one in the Royal Library in Brussels, the other in the Roman Bibliotheca Vittorio Emanuele.⁷³

The oration, of which Sicco felt it ‘hardly asked something’,⁷⁴ took a respectful and rather bashful tone. Following time-honoured custom, Veltwijck commenced with wishing the Sultan well. Next, he explained his presence in Istanbul and said that the Emperor, as Head of Christendom, desired peace for his people “because he abhors rage and destruction that usually accompanies war”. He concluded by saying:

And therefore I have been sent to Your Majesty with my companion, the Orator of the French King, so that I could negotiate an armistice and quietude between Your Majesty and the People of the Christian Belief, if it can take place under honest conditions and without neither prejudice nor damage to both Your Majesty and my merciful Lord.⁷⁵

During the first conversations in the Divan, the Viziers claimed north Hungarian Tata “because that castle lies in their jurisdiction and they assert that they have conquered it *iure belli*”. The Habsburg envoys did not attach much importance to this demand; they deemed the Sultan’s need for peace greater than the want of this fortress.⁷⁶ They were only partially right in their estimation. The castle of Tata, situated near Buda to the south of the Danube, had been claimed before by the Porte. It was possessed by land magnate Péter Perényi (1502–1548) who had been taken captive during the Ottoman campaign of 1541. When he was being visited by Ferdinand’s envoys in his camp near Buda, Süleymān claimed to be the rightful owner of Perényi’s castles Tata, Visegrád and Esztergom.⁷⁷ The latter two were captured in the next campaigns, but Tata remained out of his hands.

The claim on Tata was only a forerunner of future demands. At the beginning of October 1545, the Viziers made a concrete proposal for the first time: in return for a treaty, the Porte demanded the whole of Hungary, Croatia and a yearly tribute of thirty thousand gold ducats. Under no circumstances could the Habsburg envoys grant this bold demand. Induced by the French party, the Porte dropped her claim on Croatia but persisted in their other two demands.⁷⁸ It is easily understood why Monluc and Aramont heightened pressure on the Viziers to come to a definite con-

⁷³ Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, nos 17,365–17,366; Rome, Bibliotheca Vittorio Emanuele, no. 2,056, Fondo Sessoriano 452.

⁷⁴ “... caesareum oratorem ... qui neque in sua oratione quidquam petiit ...” Final report of Niccolò Sicco (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 79).

⁷⁵ ‘... saevitiam et vastitatem, quo bellum comitari solent, abhorreat ... Quam ob rem missus ego sum Socius oratori Regis Galliae ad Serenitatem vestram, ut de cessatione armorum et tranquillitate inter Serenitatis vestra regna et populus religionis Christianae agerem; si id de honestis conditionibus, et sine praejudiciis et damno, tam Majestatis vestrae, quam Domini mei Clementissimi fieri poterit.’ Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, nos 17,365–17,366; Rome, Bibliotheca Vittorio Emanuele, no. 2,056, Fondo Sessoriano 452.

⁷⁶ Letter from Niccolò Sicco to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 7th September 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 75).

⁷⁷ Letter from Nikolaus von Salm, Sigismund zu Herberstein & Ferenc Révai to Ferdinand (before 16th September 1541). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 4–16).

⁷⁸ Final report of Jean de Monluc (end of 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 599).

clusion: the marriage between Charles d'Orléans and Anna of Habsburg had not yet taken place and Francis I wanted to compel the Emperor not to postpone it any longer by using his diplomatic help in Istanbul as an argument.⁷⁹ Meanwhile, the Sublime Porte lessened its demands and Second Vizier Mehmed Pasha, "lequel est tenu pour ennemy des Francoys", made new overtures towards the Habsburg delegation.⁸⁰ If Ferdinand paid ten thousand ducats and recognised Ottoman claims on the possessions of Perényi and other landowners, he would be granted a treaty. In addition, he had to recognise the Ottoman conquests since the capture of Buda in 1541.

Although this proposal was more attractive than the previous one, it remained too exigent. Ferdinand would never give up the fortresses of the Hungarian magnates. Just like Perényi, Bálint Török (ca. 1504–1550) had been captured in 1541 by Ottoman soldiers "unnd durch die Türckhen treffenlich bewart".⁸¹ The claims on their castles, made by the Sultan since that year, and on the possessions of Count Nikola Zrinski, *bán* or Viceroy of Croatia, had always been refused by Ferdinand.⁸² The fact that some dissatisfied Hungarian nobles had turned their back upon the Archduke and had promised Süleymân a yearly contribution, complicated things. Mehmed's proposal was unacceptable: "Sa conclusion fut lourde et vaine", wrote Veltwijck.⁸³ At that time, the negotiations had reached deadlock and because none of the parties involved wanted to back down, it was not likely to be broken.

Meanwhile, Hugo Favolius had taken the time to visit the town but thought it was impossible to describe everything he saw: that would be equal to trying to count the number of grains of sand, he wrote. As often happened, the rest of the envoy's party did not spend much attention to the negotiations. Probably escorted by a *çavuş* and a janissary, Favolius payed a visit to the many mosques and markets of the city, saw the barracks of the janissaries at Et Meydan and gazed at the impressive dome "that touched the clouds" of the great church of Aya Sofya. He even claimed to have visited the harem where girls were locked up to satisfy "the lubricious and disgraceful lust" of the Sultan.⁸⁴ When the Ottoman court moved to Edirne to spend winter there in "un fort beau palais"⁸⁵ and to go hunting, Favolius and some others stayed in

⁷⁹ According to a report of Venetian ambassador in France Marino Cavalli, the marriage was planned for 27th March 1546. In the same report, he mentioned September or Christmas 1545 as a possible date. Tommaseo (1838, Vol. 1, p. 345); Albèri (1839–1862, Vol. 1, p. 279). Monluc said it was due in September 1545. Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 608).

⁸⁰ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 473). On Mehmed, see Petritsch (1991, p. 272).

⁸¹ Letter from Nikolaus von Salm, Sigismund zu Herberstein & Ferenc Révai to Ferdinand (16th September 1541). In: Nehring (1995, p. 15).

⁸² A recently discovered document in the Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi (no. E 11,769) contains an enumeration of the castles of Török and Perényi. See Fodor (1991, p. 317).

⁸³ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, pp. 473–474).

⁸⁴ Favolius (1563, fols 53v, 56v–58v).

⁸⁵ Chesneau (1970, p. 15).

the capital and chose to sail along the Greek isles in one of the Venetian galleys. Due to bad weather, their departure did not take place until spring 1546.⁸⁶

The Porte understood that there was no easy solution available. Nevertheless, they needed an armistice in the West: a letter of Nuncio Girolamo Dandino of October 1545 mentioned great losses among Ottoman troops in recent skirmishes at the Persian border.⁸⁷ Three months after the start of the negotiations, the Pashas proposed to postpone the almost-unsolvable quarrels about the Hungarian castles to a later date and to concentrate on the other demands in order to achieve a provisional armistice. Afraid that their King would not be able to act as a mediator, Aramont and Monluc objected strongly to this proposal. Yet, the next day an unexpected announcement made by Venetian Envoy Stefano Tiepolo caused a dramatic acceleration in the talks: Charles d'Orléans, third son of Francis I and future spouse of Anna of Habsburg, had died in the Benedictine abbey of Forêt-Montiers six weeks before.⁸⁸ The Imperial Ambassador in France, Jean de Saint-Mauris, had visited Charles in August and had found that he was feeling better.⁸⁹ After his death, it was rumoured that he had been poisoned, but Venetian *baili* Marino Cavalli wrote that he had been suffering from consumption.⁹⁰ An unpublished letter of condolence was sent by the Emperor to Francis who answered him as follows:

... je vous mercie de tresbon cuer priant dieu Vous donner grace de navoir james besoyn destre console entel endroit ny de sentir quelle douleur cest que de la perte dun filz dont jay tel regret que un pere peut avoir non seulement pour mon interest mais encores pour le service que jesperoye quil vous est fait et a toute la crestiente aynsi que le desiroit.⁹¹

The King's grief seemed sincere: it was true that "le service" his son would have rendered, could not take place and, undoubtedly, he regretted this. The girl the Prince was to marry would remain single and the Duchy of Milan would not come into French possession. His Italian dream was shattered and his diplomatic presence in Edirne seemed meaningless. He ordered his envoys to immediately withdraw from

⁸⁶ It is possible that Nicander Nucius accompanied Favolius. The Greek related his return from Istanbul via Illyria and Thracia to Venice, which is about the same route as Favolius took. The presence of Veltwijck on this journey, as mentioned by Nicander, must be erroneous. Moreover, there are reasons to doubt the assumption that he accompanied Veltwijck in 1545. However, it is equally possible that he accompanied him to the Porte a year later.

⁸⁷ Letter from the same & Girolamo Verallo to Alessandro Farnese (Ghent, 28th October 1545) in Friedensburg (1898, p. 372).

⁸⁸ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 467). See also Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 481, note 122). According to Rieger (1928, p. 87), the news was announced in Edirne on 6th October.

⁸⁹ Letter from the same to Charles V (August 1545). In: Hume (1904, p. 208).

⁹⁰ Letter from the same in Tommaseo (1838, Vol. 1, p. 345).

⁹¹ Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 419, fol. 30r: letter of condolence from Charles V to Francis I (after 8th September 1545); fol. 33r: response of Francis I (after 8th September 1545).

the negotiations “sans donner soubçon”.⁹² A treaty between his largest ally and his worst enemy was not beneficial to him any longer.⁹³

Monluc refused to withdraw from the talks. He thought it would inevitably damage the King's reputation because the discussions were already coming to an end. Instead, he chose another option and tried to persuade Süleymān to attach detrimental conditions to the treaty. Consequently, Monluc hoped that the Emperor would refuse the agreement and would be depicted “comme perturbateur du bien et repos public”. He invented several conditions prejudicial to the Habsburgs but all were refused by the Viziers, “lesquelz furent si mauvais négociateurs”, and Veltwijck.⁹⁴ Monluc persevered and succeeded in achieving one of his proposals: an armistice of three years would be granted and if Ferdinand fulfilled all the Sultan's conditions, the latter would prolong the armistice by two years. Veltwijck approved of the proposal and urged Monluc to defend the three-year term. Although the Porte termed the proposal acceptable, they did not want to approve of the duration of the first armistice and tried to reduce it to one year.

Veltwijck and Sicco agreed to conclude a preliminary armistice of one year. They understood that this was probably the best that the Habsburg party could achieve for the time being due to the difficult matter of the Hungarian fortresses.⁹⁵ Jean de Monluc, who had perplexed Aramont by refusing to withdraw from the talks, accepted the proposal as well “attendu que souvent nous avoit esté présentée”.⁹⁶ At that moment, nothing stood in the way of framing the treaty. Probably at the end of October, the armistice, the text of which has been lost, was concluded.⁹⁷ For a period of twelve or eighteen months, an armistice would be in force in Hungary. Within this term, Ferdinand was free to send a new ambassador to Istanbul to resume negotiations. Otherwise, the treaty would end irrevocably.⁹⁸ For the time

⁹² Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 604).

⁹³ Nevertheless, French envoys at the Habsburg court tried to persuade the Emperor to fulfil the conditions of Crépy. Rieger (1928, p. 93).

⁹⁴ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 600–601, 604).

⁹⁵ “Turcae tandem ad magis aequas condiciones descenderunt”, wrote Sicco. Final report of the same (Edirne, 10th November 1545) in Nehring (1995, p. 80–81).

⁹⁶ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545) in Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 604, 619).

⁹⁷ Although it is often assumed that the treaty had been signed 10th November 1545 (the day Monluc, Veltwijck and Sicco wrote their final reports), it was probably concluded earlier. In Venice, two brigantines arrived from Istanbul carrying a document, dated 24th October, that stated the existence of the treaty and its conditions. Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 483, note 162).

⁹⁸ The term is indeed rather vague and confusing: Rieger (1928, p. 87) writes that, if Ferdinand agreed to fulfil the conditions (i.e. hand over the border fortresses), the one-year treaty would come in force. If he did not ratify the text, the treaty of 1545 would be prolonged by six months. This interpretation, which is not based on the correspondence of Ferdinand, Sicco and Malvezzi, is incorrect. Sicco wrote: “Et si etiam in levi quapiam re hae condiciones non ita exacte Vestrae Maiestatis voluntati satisfaciunt, facultatem habet, *post annum* mittendi novum oratorem... (my emphasis)”. Final report of the same (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 81). Veltwijck's report confirms this: “Et fault advertir que le Turc en la lettre qu'il escript au Roy de

being, the territorial status quo in Hungary was preserved pending further negotiations.⁹⁹

It seems highly unlikely that both the Habsburg and the Ottoman side would content themselves with a one-year rest in Hungary. Both needed a longer term – Ferdinand in order to recover from the military exertions and Süleymān in order to wage his war against the Persian Shah. It was clear to them and to the French King that a new envoy had to be sent before the term had expired. The man to whom this mission would be assigned, carried a heavy burden. Several unresolved topics remained under discussion, among which, as mentioned above, the Ottoman claim on Hungarian castles. Another important question was the exact position of the Habsburg–Ottoman border. The Sultan wanted to curb the various border violations (which occurred on either side) by clearly defining his western boundaries “per commissarios”. If problems arose, the matter would be settled with Francis I as “arbiter discordiarum”.¹⁰⁰

Following Ottoman custom, the envoys of Charles, Ferdinand and Francis were given precious presents before their departure. Monluc received several quantities of balsam, *theriacum* and *terra sigillata* (well-known and valuable curative substances) from Rüstem Pasha. In return, the Grand Vizier asked the Frenchman to send him “des draps blancs de Paris et des trompettes”.¹⁰¹ Unfortunately, sources remain silent about Veltwijck’s presents.¹⁰² According to Venetian reports, Veltwijck and Sicco left the city together on 29th October bound for Vienna.¹⁰³

All in all, Veltwijck was not discontent with the efforts of the French party during the negotiations: they have, he wrote, “toutesfoys ... faict bonne diligence de venir au bout de leur intencion, et faire la tresue [i.e. trêve] en telle sorte, que lauoyent promys a vostre mageste”.¹⁰⁴ It has been argued that the French intrigues caused the signing of a preliminary armistice instead of a long-term treaty.¹⁰⁵ It is true that a temporary agreement limited the damage the French King had suffered by his ambiguous

France et au Roy des Romains ne dist pas que quant l’année sera finye, si les différentz ne sont pas vuydez que la guerre commence, mais dist que après ung an l’on peult renvoyer ung ambassadeur et dist que lors les articles se coucheront.” Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 94).

⁹⁹ Sicco wrote: “ut quidquid Vestrae Maiestatis praesidio usque ad hanc diem teneretur, in eusdem iurisdictione remaneret”. Final report of the same (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 80).

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem, p. 80.

¹⁰¹ Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 618). At the end of his first mission to the Porte in 1536, Monluc also received a pot of balsam. He lost it later during an assignment in Ireland. Busbequius (1971, Vol. 1, p. 387). Busbequius was given a small crate of *theriacum* from Alexandria, a jar of balsam, a beautiful brocaded garment and other smaller gifts. Busbequius (1994, p. 371).

¹⁰² He did receive some gifts, as Nicander wrote in his account. See Malina (1968, p. 63).

¹⁰³ Friedensburg (1898, p. 497, note 1). Veltwijck’s final report however, written while still in Edirne, is dated 10th November.

¹⁰⁴ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 474).

¹⁰⁵ Ursu (1908, pp. 164–165).

policy, but analogous armistices had been signed as preliminaries to the treaties with Habsburg in 1533 and with Venice in 1540.¹⁰⁶

The French had other wounds to lick. With considerable difficulty Monluc succeeded in inserting an article into the text of the truce that would guarantee the continued existence of friendly relations between the King and Süleymān.¹⁰⁷ Monluc's often too energetic behaviour in Istanbul and Edirne aggravated slumbering problems inside the French party. The fact that he did not return to France after the end of the negotiations but travelled to Ferdinand's Court in Vienna, increased suspicion.¹⁰⁸ Aramont and de la Vigne accused him of treason and of "indiscrétion ou témérité" towards Süleymān.¹⁰⁹ Monluc defended himself against the allegations by explaining his journey as an attempt to spy upon the fortifications of Komáron (Cormorn) and Vienna – allegedly a request of Süleymān himself.¹¹⁰ Yet the truce was

¹⁰⁶ The same can be said on the Treaty of Crépy. Habsburg envoy Hieronymus Łaski, former diplomat of Zápolya, concluded a six-month armistice with the Porte in 1539. He was sent to Istanbul again the year after but arrived after the expiration. Tranquillus Andronicus asked and received an extension of the truce by two months. The negotiations failed which explains why the armistice was not followed by a treaty. Rieger (1928, pp. 11–13); Zinkeisen (1840–1863, Vol. 2, p. 834, note 1).

¹⁰⁷ The article reads: "que par cete capitulation nouvelle ne soit fait préjudice aux capitulations vieilles et amitez que nous [i.e. the Sultan] avons eues par cy-devant avec quelques princes chrestiens, potentatz, républiques ou seigneuries que ce soit ..." His first proposal was less vague but struck Veltwijck's rejection: it defined that the truce would be annulled if Ferdinand or Charles declared war on "des amys du seigneur" (among which Francis). According to Monluc, Veltwijck said "que son maistre n'estoit si petit compagnon que personne luy deust donner loy de pouvoir faire ou non faire la guerre à ceux de qui il se tiendroit offensé". Final report of Jean de Monluc (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 601–603).

¹⁰⁸ He also visited the Imperial Court in Utrecht by order of his King. There he emphasised that the Porte had granted a one-year truce because the Sultan wanted to see if Charles fulfilled his promises to Francis. The Court did not spend much attention to this statement. Letter from Girolamo Verallo & Girolamo Dandino to Alessandro Farnese (Utrecht, 25th January 1546). In: Friedensburg (1898, pp. 546–547); letter from Jean de Saint-Mauris to prince Philip of Spain (Paris, 16th February 1546). In: Hume (1904, p. 302); oration of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 14th December 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 120); letter of Jean-Jacques de Cambray to Francis I (Pera, Istanbul), February 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 652). Veltwijck had arrived in Utrecht on 19th January 1546 "et fu ben visto". Friedensburg (1898, pp. 495, 542, 680–682). Sicco, who was Cardinal Madruzzo's secretary, went to the Council of Trent and told stories worth reading about the Sultan, his wife Roxelana and the negotiations. See Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 493). On Monluc's stay in Vienna, see his final report (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 610–612) and Ferdinand's letter to Jean de Saint-Mauris (Vienna, 21st December 1545). In: Weiss (1841–1852, Vol. 3, p. 204).

¹⁰⁹ Monluc and de la Vigne, "que Monluc accusa aussi", are said to have been locked up in the Bastille. Ursu (1908, pp. 178–179). On Monluc's arrest, see Jean de Saint-Mauris' letter to Ferdinand (January 1547). In: Hume–Tyler (1912, p. 10) and Veltwijck's memorial (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 94).

¹¹⁰ Veltwijck thought he undertook his remarkable journey "pour mutiner Lallemaigne contre vostre mageste [i.e. the Emperor], et la Hungarye contre le roy des Romains". Final report of the same (Edirne, 10th November 1545). In: Lanz (1998, Vol. 2, p. 468). On the discussion in France on Monluc's motives, see his final report (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 606–609, 617–618).

not entirely detrimental to the Most Christian King: after his return from Vienna Monluc claimed that the inhabitants of the German Empire no longer thought “que le roy conviast le Turc à la guerre d’Hongrie”...¹¹¹

The second journey

How did Europe react to the truce between the Emperor and Süleymān? Many had vainly expected and even demanded an imperial attack on the Ottoman enemy in Hungary. Charles, predicted Rüstem Pasha in the late spring of 1545, would lose the confidence of his subjects after the signing of an armistice. Moreover, he would be given little credit by the German Protestant Princes “lesquelz, au moins la plus part, ne sont alliez avec luy sinon pour l’espérance qu’il leur avoit donnée d’estre cheffz de la guerre offensive ou deffensive contre le Grand Seigneur”.¹¹² Spanish Protestant Francisco de Enzinas (1520–ca. 1570) expressed his discontent with the Christian rulers in a letter to a friend in December 1545: “And thus they want to make peace with the Enemy of Christendom so that they can fight each other and persecute the true believers of Christ”.¹¹³ On the other hand, the inhabitants of Hungary possibly welcomed the rest that would spare them at least one year of destructive warfare, although border violations never ceased completely. In May 1546, the Nuncio in Vienna wrote that “the Turks in Hungary remain calm ... and if the Hungarians renounce daily unrest, the Turks will preserve peace and allow the lands to be cultivated”.¹¹⁴

Although the Emperor, at the Diet of Regensburg (1546), had asked the German Princes for financial support “pour faire la guerre offensieve contre les Turcqs”, the Habsburgs did not consider a war against the Ottoman Empire. Peace negotiations had priority over a military solution because the situation in the Holy Roman Empire demanded too much (military) attention from Charles.¹¹⁵ There, the Protestants vehemently opposed the convocation of a General Council and smashed the last hopes the Emperor still had for religious reconciliation. Conversations between the latter and the Papal Nuncio testified to the fact that Charles considered rude and rigorous actions against the dissent more and more. The nuncio promised military assistance and returned to Rome to consult Paul III while Charles summoned garrisons to his Italian possessions. Shortly afterwards, Duke Mauritz von Sachsen and the Count of Brandenburg joined the Emperor in his battle against the Schmalkaldic

¹¹¹ Ibidem, p. 611.

¹¹² Ibidem, p. 599; Ursu (1908, pp. 163–164).

¹¹³ Letter from Francisco de Enzinas to Juan Dias (Wittenberg, 21st December 1545). Enzinas (1995, pp. 76–77).

¹¹⁴ “In Ungaria li Turchi stanno quieti nè si sente cosa extraordinaria, et si li Ungari non facessino del male quottidianamente, li turchi starebbonno in pace et lascierebbono cultivare la terra, che n’è di bisogno.” Letter from Giovanni Marsupino to Alessandro Farnese (Vienna, 24th May 1546). In: Friedensburg (1898, pp. 582–583).

¹¹⁵ Instructions from Mary of Hungary to Viglius ab Ayta (Brussels, 28th August 1547). In: Lanz (1845, p. 421).

League that, despite its internal problems, succeeded in rapidly raising an army. A confrontation seemed inevitable.¹¹⁶

In 1546, Venetian Ambassador Marino Cavalli, residing in France, was of the opinion that the position of the French King at the Sublime Porte was worse than ever.¹¹⁷ He was probably right: the Sultan, wrote Veltwijck, wished to conclude a treaty with the Habsburgs “veu l’ennimitié et hayne que les Turcz portoient alors aux François”.¹¹⁸ “One should cut off the head and tongue of people like Monluc”, said Rüstem.¹¹⁹ French Ambassador Aramont experienced once again the consequences of the deficiency of stability of the King’s foreign policy: as in 1545, he would not receive any instructions nor money from Francis, who was displeased with the Ottoman indulgence towards the Habsburg brothers.¹²⁰ Also, his help in Istanbul was apparently no longer wanted by Charles who wanted to conclude a treaty with the Sultan without the mediation of a French diplomat. Just before his departure from Edirne, Third Vizier Ahmed Pasha, a man of Albanian descent, took Veltwijck aside and said to him “que à la première fois le Turc ne pourroit abandonner ne refuser les François, mais quant nous retournerons, trouverions la grâce et le crédit tant comme les François ...”¹²¹ Consequently, the possibility of a second joint mission to the Porte was never raised in Habsburg circles. Nevertheless, Francis would certainly not give up thwarting the coming negotiations.¹²²

The second stage was initiated when Ferdinand sent his messenger Veit Ugrinović to the Ottoman court in March 1546 to announce the coming of a new plenipotentiary before the expiration of the truce.¹²³ Whereas last year two envoys had been sent, Charles and Ferdinand now chose to dispatch one diplomat together. Papal Nuncio Giovanni Marsupino reported that the latter “had asked *un gentiluom* from

¹¹⁶ Bizer (1957–1980, Vol. 2, pp. 182–183).

¹¹⁷ He also wrote: “Con il signor Turco so certo che non vi è amicitia nè confidenza alcuna: ma accorgendosi l’uno e l’altro che gli saria troppo disfavore scoprir ad altri questa sua mala soddisfazione, la dissimulano; e tuttavia col negoziare si servono quanto possono l’un dell’altro.” Report of the same (1546). In: Tommaseo (1838, Vol. 1, pp. 291–293, 346–347).

¹¹⁸ Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 87–88).

¹¹⁹ Chesneau (1970, p. xiii).

¹²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. xiii. See also Veltwijck’s letter to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th September 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 115).

¹²¹ Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545) in Nehring (1995, p. 88). On Ahmed Pasha, see Matuz (1974).

¹²² The King also feared an attack of Imperial forces, as one can read in a letter dated 17th February 1547. Although Charles’ ambassador had assured him “que l’Empereur n’avoit volonte de me faire Guerre pour le present”, Francis wrote, he took measures “et y ai deja mis si bon ordre a fortifier, munir et pourvoir mes frontieres, que mes voisins auront bien peu de moiens de m’assaillir et pourra plustot cela donner envie d’entretenir paix que de commencer Guerre”. Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, no. 15,875, fol. 281.

¹²³ Ugrinović was to remain in the city until the envoy arrived. He was only allowed to confirm Ferdinand’s claims on Croatia and the Hungarian castles. If asked about other topics, he had to refer to the coming envoy “quem cum plena informatione super omnibus venturum speret”. Instructions from Ferdinand to Veit Ugrinović (Vienna, 19th March 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 99). *Beylerbey* Mehmed Pasha of Buda had issued a decree to guarantee the messenger safe passage. Charter of the same (Buda, 10th March 1546) in Petritsch (1991, p. 49).

the former with regard to this matter".¹²⁴ That man was Veltwijck, "lent" to Ferdinand by the Emperor, as his letter of credence explained.¹²⁵ Why the brothers chose to send only one envoy this time, is unclear. Perhaps, this way, they judged it easier to avoid last year's unco-ordinated actions.

As last year, Veltwijck received his instructions at a German Diet – a clear indication that his assignments in the East were closely connected with the Holy Roman Empire. Ferdinand ordered him to gradually increase the yearly tribute from ten thousand ducats (promised by Adorno and confirmed by Sicco last year) to twenty-five thousand – a daring attempt to persuade Süleymān to drop his claims on the Hungarian fortresses in return for gold. Secondly, Veltwijck had to ask for the return of the castles Ottoman soldiers had captured even during the truce of October 1545, since the signing of the armistice preceding Adorno's mission.¹²⁶ Several of these had already been transformed into *tīmārlar*. If the Sultan refused, the envoy should definitely not press the claim.¹²⁷

The embassy left Regensburg on 22nd July and passed through Vienna, from where they followed the route to Istanbul that most Habsburg envoys took after 1553.¹²⁸ Due to unrest at the border, they could only depart on 12th August. An Ottoman escort awaited the party at Esztergom and accompanied them to the *beylerbey* of Buda whom Veltwijck was to promise two thousand ducats if the treaty was signed and another 1,500 each year if it was maintained.¹²⁹ They left the city on 23rd August after "having endowed him abundantly" and hoped to arrive in Istanbul around 1st September.¹³⁰ There is not much known about Veltwijck's companions. According to

¹²⁴ "Intendo che in breve si mandarà un ambasciatore al signor Turco, et sarà forse per confirmare o ratificare la tregue fatta l'anno passato et hoggi questa Maestà ha mandato un gentilhuom per questa cosa allo imperatore." Letter from the same to Alessandro Farnese (Vienna, 24th May 1546). In: Friedensburg (1898, pp. 582–583).

¹²⁵ "Itaque cum frater oratorem mittere decrevisset, qui cum serenitate vestra transigeret, neque is, quem alias miserat, reverti posset, a nobis petivit, *ut hunc nostrum secretarium*, qui tractatui interfuisset, *sibi concederemus* ... Qui si honestis conditionibus et aequis de iis rebus, quae superiori anno dubitationem iniecerunt, nomine fratris nostri confecerit, nos quoque nostro nomine illi facultatem dedimus perficiendi... (my emphasis)" Credentials of Gerard Veltwijck (Regensburg, 16th July 1546) at Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, no. 15,875, fol. 108; published in: Lanz (1998, p. 511) and cited in: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 621, note 1). Corneille de Schepper was lent to Ferdinand as well but, as I have said before, could not negotiate in the Emperor's name.

¹²⁶ That armistice was concluded in February 1545 by Leonard von Vels and governor Mehmed of Buda. Charter of the latter (Buda, 5th February 1545). In: Petritsch (1991, p. 48).

¹²⁷ Ferdinand wrote in his instructions that Veltwijck "acrius instare non debet". Instructions to Gerard Veltwijck (Regensburg, 13th July 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 106).

¹²⁸ For a discussion of this route, see Yerasimos (1991, p. lxxx); Nehring (1984). On Veltwijck's departure, see Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, no. 16,434: *Etat de la cour de l'Empereur Charles-quin en l'an 1546 et 1547*, fol. 65. German humanist Sleidanus wrote: "Julii die vigesimo secundo, Gerardus Velduuichus Ratisbona remittitur Constantinopolim, quum nuper inde venisset." Sleidanus (1968, Vol. 2, p. 504).

¹²⁹ Instructions to Gerard Veltwijck (Regensburg, 13th July 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 101); Petritsch (1977, p. 96).

¹³⁰ Letter from Averardo Serristori (14th September 1546). In: Friedensburg (1899, p. 243 note 5).

a Florentine envoy at Ferdinand's Court, Gian-Maria Malvezzi travelled along.¹³¹ Tridentine Justus de Argento, a member of the Viennese Chancellery, accompanied him as well.

The journey went well and at the beginning of September they reached Sofia. Like every year, wild rumours circulated about the Sultan invading Hungary with a "grandissimo exercito". As every year, people feared an attack on Vienna.¹³² Veltwijck reassured the court that he did not see any war camp nor war material. He only noticed a group of horsemen, "assai mal in ordine", of around thousand horses.¹³³ In the same city, he also perceived "15 cavalli di monsignor d'Aramont, ambasciatore di Franza residente in Constantinopoli". Veltwijck would meet Aramont himself at Pazardžik, a small town on the Maritsa River between Sofia and Plovdiv.¹³⁴ The embittered Frenchman had surreptitiously left the Ottoman capital by felucca on the pretext of taking a health cure at Iznik. He swore to crush Monluc's reputation in France and wanted to gain the latter's possessions. Nevertheless, the conversation between Veltwijck and Aramont was cheerful and the ambassador promised to have a drink with him in Istanbul after his return from France.¹³⁵ Three days' journey before Istanbul, Veltwijck fell ill and had to stay behind in a small village. Because there was no medicine available in the neighbourhood, he was forced to stay in bed.¹³⁶

The Habsburg envoy was received in Istanbul in a very honourable manner: twenty *çavuşlar* and their *çavuşbaşı* greeted the diplomat of a friendly nation. However, his stay would turn out to be less pleasant. He was refused an audience with the Sultan and Rüstem Pasha and was kept in a well-guarded "stinking *khān* that does not have any windows" – the very same place where once Łaski had been imprisoned. Meanwhile, his illness had not left him and even worsened "ch'io son stato vicino alla morte". Fortunately, he was taken care of by a Jewish doctor and his condition improved although he was still too weak to leave his bed. He left Istanbul on

¹³¹ Ibidem, p. 243, note 5.

¹³² On various rumours, see Jean de Morvilliers's letter to Francis I (Venice, 8th January 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 631); Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 482) and, on the rumour about an alliance between the Porte, German Protestants and Venice, ibidem, Vol. 3, pp. 494–495.

¹³³ Letter from the same to Ferdinand (Sofia, 3rd September 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 112).

¹³⁴ Letter from the same to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 114). According to a letter from Nuncio Bernardino Maffeo (14th October 1546), they met in Sofia. Friedensburg (1899, p. 245).

¹³⁵ "... monsignor d'Aramon ... cosi burlando ch'el beveria ancor meco in Constantinopoli et ch'el sperava de ritornar avanti ch'io fussi expedito." Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 136); see also his letter (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546) ibidem, p. 114; Chesneau (1970, p. xiv).

¹³⁶ In Belgrade, Malvezzi had caught a disease and remained behind until he was cured while Veltwijck continued his urgent journey. Letters from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Sofia, 3rd September 1546; Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 114, 116).

27th November and arrived in Edirne, where the Sultan already was, eight days later.¹³⁷

Before turning to the negotiations, two noteworthy events should be discussed. The first is the death of *kapudan* Pasha Khair ad-Dīn 4th July 1546. He was seventy-six years of age and had been seriously ill for two weeks.¹³⁸ His death could be beneficial to the Emperor who no longer had to fear the admiral's claims on La Goletta, a citadel built near Tunis which Charles had so gloriously conquered in 1535.¹³⁹ The second occurrence is the arrival of Christoph von Rogendorf (1510–ca. 1585) in Istanbul at the end of September. Because he felt wronged by the Emperor and his sister Mary, Charles' former Chamberlain offered his services to Süleymān who granted him a daily pay of merely one hundred *akçe*. Despite the fact that both the Sultan and Rüstem repeatedly urged him to, Rogendorf refused to convert himself to Islam, even when he was threatened to be locked up "in turim", in the Black Tower of Rumeli Hisari.¹⁴⁰

Christoph von Rogendorf was the son of Wilhelm, who had defended Vienna against the Ottoman army of Süleymān and Grand Vizier Ibrāhīm in 1529. Shortly after his arrival at the Ottoman Court, Christoph's properties were confiscated and he was accused of high treason for entering into the service of Charles' "enemy capital".¹⁴¹ Meanwhile, Rogendorf widely displayed his generosity by giving expensive presents to Rüstem Pasha and Yūnus Bey and arranging a copious banquet for *bailo* Alviso Renier who "answered with another banquet". Fond of gambling, he lost no less than eight thousand gold ducats. Unfortunately, his meagre loan did not cover such expenses and he ran into huge debts. Rüstem called him to order and reproachfully said "that things are not the same here in Turkey as in Christendom".¹⁴² Some revelled of course in Rogendorf's misfortune: in a letter to Mary of Hungary,

¹³⁷ Letters from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546; Edirne, 18th December 1546; Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 115–118, 124, 148). On his disease, see also Jean de Morvilliers's letter to Francis I (Venice, 7th December 1546). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 629).

¹³⁸ Jean-Jacques de Cambrai wrote that he had 'un flux de ventre l'espace de 15 ou 20 jours'. Letter from the same to Francis I (Pera, Istanbul, probably 4th July 1546) in Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 624). A rumour about him having become blind and deaf can be found in the letter from Juan de Vega to Charles V (8th April 1546). In: Hume (1904, p. 377).

¹³⁹ See Veltwijck's letter of instruction of the past year (Worms, 22nd May 1545). In: Lanz (1998, p. 443).

¹⁴⁰ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 116); letter from Gabriël d'Aramont to Anne de Montmorency (28th February 1548). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 36, note 1). See also the anonymous Habsburg report of around the end of May 1547. In: Chesneau (1970, p. 212).

¹⁴¹ The files of this case, and of the claim on his possessions by baron Christophe of Ettingen (married to a sister of Wilhelm), are to be found in Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, nos 1417/17, 1418/7, 1475/6, 1664/2 i.

¹⁴² Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 117–118).

Imperial Secretary Joost Bave wrote “quil sera briefvement empoissone sil ne lest desja”.¹⁴³

“In Edirne”, wrote Veltwijck, “they have not locked me up in a *khān* as the first time, but in a house of Greeks”. He was still very ill and could not stand up. When Rüstem Pasha offered him to be carried ‘in una cathedra’ to the Sultan, the Habsburg envoy refused and asked the Grand Vizier to grant him four more days rest.¹⁴⁴ Meanwhile, Francis I instructed Jean-Jacques de Cambray (ca. 1510–1572), secretary of the departed Aramont, to delay the negotiations between Veltwijck and the Ottoman Court until the arrival of a new plenipotentiary envoy. Rüstem promised Cambray that he would not commence talks with Veltwijck before that time. Although he did not entirely fulfil his promise, it was clear that the French influence at the Ottoman court was still not to be underestimated. While residing in Pera during the negotiations, Cambray was continuously informed of their progress by Rüstem, Yünus, the *kapı ağası* (Head of the white eunuchs) and the *yeni çeri ağası* or Commander of the Janissaries.

The situation in the Holy Roman Empire was followed argus-eyed by both the Porte and the French. The King’s ambassador in Venice, Jean de Morvilliers (1506–1577), who was to aid his colleague in the Levant, reported an attempt of Christoph von Rogendorf to persuade Süleymān to attack the Habsburg lands. The situation was favourable “pour la grande hayne que les Allemans ont conceue contre l’empeur, et la division qui est maintenant entre eulx”.¹⁴⁵ But despite the fact that rumours circulated about the sending of numerous *çavuşlar* to Buda, Veltwijck was once again convinced that the Porte did not even think of sending its army into Hungary, as Yünus Bey confided to him.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, the Sultan’s favourite Roxelana – the first wife to move into the Topkapı instead of the Eski Sarāy – urged her spouse “à demeurer à la maison”.¹⁴⁷ At the same time, the Persian Shah was said to have invaded Ottoman vassal state Basra at the beginning of October and the court expected Süleymān’s son Mustafā to rally to the Shah.¹⁴⁸ Cambray, who had also overheard

¹⁴³ Letter from Ulm, dated 27th January 1547 in Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 124, fols 274r–276r. On Rogendorf in general, see Goetz (1963, pp. 453–494).

¹⁴⁴ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 18th December 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 124).

¹⁴⁵ Letter from Jean de Morvilliers to Francis I (Venice, 7th December 1546). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 629).

¹⁴⁶ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 116–117).

¹⁴⁷ Memorial of Gerard Veltwijck (end of 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 89). See also Averardo Serristori’s letter to Cosimo de Medici (Lauringen, 13th/15th November 1546). In: Friedensburg (1899, p. 625) which states “che la soltana non vuole intendere cosa alcuna di muovere guerra et quel Signore [i.e. Süleymān] desidera di riposarsi et contentarla, trovandosi arch’egli in qualche difficultà”.

¹⁴⁸ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 9th October & 5th November 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 117).

rumours about “une tres-grande armée” of Tahmāsp I, justly feared that this could influence the negotiations in Edirne to the advantage of the Habsburgs.¹⁴⁹

Halfway through December 1546, more than a month and a half after his arrival in Istanbul, Veltwijck was given an audience by the Sultan. First, he placed the presents on the ground “as honourably as I could”. Then the presents – fifty silver goblets “à la hongresque” worth four thousand ducats according to Cambray – were brought to the Divan and given to “as much janissaries as there were goblets”. Veltwijck held some beakers up before *la dangereuse fenêtre*, the window of the Sultan’s lodge in the Divan, so that Süleymān could see them.¹⁵⁰ Afterwards he was invited to dinner “which they usually do before the ambassadors are received by the Sultan”. Only he and the four Viziers sat at table and discussed the conditions of the treaty in detail.¹⁵¹ Veltwijck was subsequently brought to the Sultan whom he presented his credentials of Ferdinand and Charles after the customary kiss on the hand and health wish. In his oration, he expressed his master’s desire to conclude “not a treaty, but an honest and lasting friendship and benevolence”, but emphasised at the same time that the Hungarian castles were still excluded from any discussion: “Peace and friendship does not keep its ground thanks to small castles, but by real trust and sincerity”, argued Veltwijck.¹⁵² Süleymān’s answer was brief but meaningful: he expressed his joy of the fact that the envoy “has the authority to discuss the condition that was closed to discussion last year”.¹⁵³ A solution of this matter, last year’s breaking point, would bring both parties very close to a conclusion of the talks.

The conversations with Rüstem and the other Viziers did not start where last year’s discussions ended. On the contrary, the Porte repeated her claim on Croatia because Rüstem asserted that he had received letters from some Croatians who no longer wanted to reside under Ferdinand’s authority. Veltwijck reacted with some surprise and said that “Croatia has nothing in common with Hungary”. Thereupon, he broke off negotiations and let the Grand Vizier know via Yūnus that he should be better sent back home tomorrow morning to prevent losing any more time.¹⁵⁴ Similar hopeless conversations repeated themselves over the following months so that

¹⁴⁹ Letter from Jean-Jacques de Cambray to Francis I (Pera, Istanbul, 4th July 1546?). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 624).

¹⁵⁰ It was Guillaume Postel who called the window “la dangereuse fenêtre”. See Dilger (1967, pp. 49–52).

¹⁵¹ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 18th December 1546). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 126–127). See also Cambray’s letter to Francis I (Pera, Istanbul, 4th July 1546?). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 623). In a letter to the same (Venice, 27th March 1547), Jean de Morvilliers writes that “Monsieur Girard a fait plusieurs présents de vaisselle et coupes d’argent doré ... mais pourtant n’a-il eu responce, et, deux jours après son audience, a esté remis en telle garde qu’il estoit auparavant”. Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 651). On the dinner in the Divan in general, see Dilger (1967, pp. 104–113).

¹⁵² Oration of Gerard Veltwijck (Edirne, 14th December 1546). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 121–123).

¹⁵³ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 18th December 1546). In: Nehring (1995, p. 128).

¹⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 125–126, 128.

a desperate Veltwijck eventually sent Ferdinand a letter on 20th February 1547 asking him "to deign himself to think for an hour or two whether he can solve this problem because I have the explicit charge not to cede any border territory *sopra la mia vita*".¹⁵⁵ The key to success lay in increasing the tribute, a move which Ferdinand had suggested in his instructions to Veltwijck. The former sent his envoy a letter in which he permitted him to raise the yearly contribution. The Emperor's military successes in his battle against the Schmalkaldic League were described extensively by Ferdinand to encourage Veltwijck.¹⁵⁶

The French King tried to heighten military pressure on Charles by increasing his contacts with the German Protestants, but received his first blow by the death of Henry VIII on 28th January 1547, always a possible ally. Some days later, Francis' Chamberlain Michel de Codignac (†1576) arrived in Edirne, announcing the coming of the newly-accredited ambassador Gabriël d'Aramont. He carried a royal letter with the request to delay the completion of the negotiations until Aramont's arrival. The Pashas agreed and said that "the mediator of this [peace] would be His Majesty on the edge of their swords".¹⁵⁷

Veltwijck considered the time was now ripe to put forward a new proposal. To preserve Ferdinand's authority over the Hungarian nobles who had turned against him and promised the Sultan tribute, the Habsburg diplomat offered a yearly present of five thousand ducats. For the possession of the castles of the landowners, he promised double the amount. To regain the ownership of the *tīmārlar*, the territory captured since the truce of February 1545, Veltwijck offered another five thousand ducats. Together with the sum Adorno and Sicco had promised earlier, this made a yearly tribute of twenty-five thousand ducats. With this unexpected and generous offer, Veltwijck tried to tempt the Porte "de accettare denari in loco delle terre ..."¹⁵⁸ He never doubted that his proposal would be successful: "Their minds have been assailed with so much suspicion this year that they have become extraordinarily irresolute", he wrote about the Viziers.¹⁵⁹ The victorious news of the position of the Habsburgs in their battle against the German Protestants, the alarming reports of Persian advances and the momentarily highly unstable alliance with France caused this irresolution. The Porte even feared that the war against the Protestants was merely a cover for military preparations for a campaign against the Ottomans. Yūnus Bey, for example, could hardly believe that Charles fought against the Protestants

¹⁵⁵ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 134).

¹⁵⁶ Letter from Ferdinand to Gerard Veltwijck (Prague, 5th January 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 129).

¹⁵⁷ Letter from Jean-Jacques de Cambrai to Francis I (Pera, Istanbul, February 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 652); Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 138). See also Ursu (1908, p. 170). On Codignac's journey and delayed arrival, see Jean de Morvilliers's letters to Francis I (Venice, 4th January 1547 & 26th February 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, pp. 631, 643).

¹⁵⁸ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 137–138).

¹⁵⁹ Ibidem, p. 139.

“who had always been friends of the Emperor and have always granted him enormous favours”. Consequently, Veltwijck did not expect any problems to occur after the arrival of Aramont.¹⁶⁰

March 1547 was a quiet month. Süleymān had left Edirne to amuse himself with hunting for two weeks.¹⁶¹ Veltwijck tried to convince the Viziers to accept his proposal but they awaited the arrival of the French ambassador. His advent, 6th April, heralded the start of what would turn out to be a turbulent month. Three months after their departure from France, the splendid embassy of Aramont, with eminent scholars as Pierre Gilles d’Alby and Pierre Belon, reached Edirne.¹⁶² Some days later a shocking fact, dealing another blow to the French party, became known at Edirne: the French King had passed away on the last day of March.¹⁶³ Ambassador Aramont, “fort fasché” according to his secretary, immediately requested an audience with the Sultan. He was received by Süleymān on 12th April and offered him precious presents:

... un grand orloge fait à Lyon où y avoit une fontaine qui tiroit par l’espace de douze heures de l’eau qu’on y mettoit, qui estoit un chef d’oeuvre et de hault pris, avec tant de draps d’or et d’argent, toilles d’Hollande, veloux, satin et damas de toutes couleurs et draps d’escarlate de Paris, que c’estoit une fort belle chose; et le present estoit de grand valeur et estimé beaucoup. Aprèz, il n’y eut bassa ne officier de qualité dudict Grand Seigneur à qui ledict ambassadeur ne fit present.¹⁶⁴

It was indeed a remarkable clock, gilt and set with gems, which Aramont himself valued at fifteen thousand gold coins, according to Veltwijck.¹⁶⁵ After the customary meal, the ambassador asked the Sultan to attack the Emperor both at sea and in Hungary. This proposal, which had the support of Rogendorf who promised Süleymān to capture Vienna in less than a month, was very reluctantly received by the Porte who were worried by the joyful reports coming from the German Empire.¹⁶⁶ In a letter to

¹⁶⁰ “... et perché sono conosciute le busie [i.e. ‘bugie’] de’Francesi in questo corte, poi penso che la principal causa – che è della paura delle pratiche del’Imperatore – non potria aiutare al ditto ambasciatore [i.e. Aramont] ...” *Ibidem*, pp. 139–140.

¹⁶¹ Letter from Jean de Morvilliers to Francis I (Venice, 3rd & 9th March 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 645).

¹⁶² Jean de Chesneau, Aramont’s secretary, has written a very readable account of his travels in the Levant from 1547 until 1550, including the Persian campaigns of the Sultan and a stay in Egypt. A discussion is given by Bernard (1988, pp. 70–74); Yerasimos (1991, pp. 328–337, 368–); Rouillard (1941, pp. 195–217); Ebersolt (1918, pp. 72–91). See also Jean de Morvilliers’s letter to Francis I (Venice, 23rd March 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 648).

¹⁶³ Chesneau (1970, p. 17).

¹⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 17.

¹⁶⁵ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 3rd & 13th April 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 151). See also Ursu (1908, p. 170).

¹⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 151; letter from the same to Ferdinand (Edirne, 1st, 2nd & 4th May 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 154).

the French King, the Sultan politely explained his refusal "because the season was too far advanced".¹⁶⁷

Negotiations between the Porte and Veltwijck were at a complete standstill for a considerable time. The Viziers had not continued talks for a long time and Rüstem Pasha had forbidden the dragomans to visit the Habsburg envoy. The latter realised he could do nothing more and decided to await a decision.¹⁶⁸ Around the middle of May, the Court moved back to Istanbul where Veltwijck was again kept in a well-guarded house. "Quanto al resto," he wrote, "non mi trattano male".¹⁶⁹ The situation did not improve for the French party after the return of the Court to the capital. Aramont went through last year's nightmare again when he did not receive any instructions from Paris after the death of Francis.¹⁷⁰

On April 24th, Charles gained a sensational victory over the rebellious Protestant forces on the battlefield near Saxon Mühlberg.¹⁷¹ The truce of 1545, which was prolonged during the second phase in Veltwijck's negotiations, had given the Emperor significant and sufficient freedom of movement in the German Empire to counter-act the opposition.¹⁷² Less than a month later, Veltwijck announced from Büyükkçekmece (or the Great Bridge, near the City) that the Sublime Porte had agreed with his last proposal and was prepared to sign a treaty. The news of Charles' victory, the death of the French King and the arrival of Elkās Mirzā at Istanbul at the end of May or the beginning of June, had caused the conclusion of the negotiations, wrote Veltwijck.¹⁷³ Elkās was the brother of Shah Tahmāsp I and had decided to join Ottoman forces on the eve of a campaign against Persia.¹⁷⁴ The news of the treaty

¹⁶⁷ Letter from Süleymān to Henry II (Edirne, beginning of May 1547). In: Testa (1864–1911, Vol. 1, pp. 40–41); Ursu (1908, pp. 171–172).

¹⁶⁸ Letters from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Edirne, 3rd & 13th April 1547; Edirne, 1st, 2nd & 4th May 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 150, 155–156). For a long time, the Venetian *bailo* had nothing to report to the Senate. Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 482, note 134).

¹⁶⁹ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 7th June 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 159). Aramont wrote that Veltwijck "ayant esté reserré et renvoyé à Constantinople avec estreite garde, de sorte qu'il peut mal aisément négocier ses affaires, et quand ainsi seroit, j'ay tenu tel moyen, que j'en pense toujours avoir advis". Letter from Gabriël d'Aramont to Henry II (Edirne, 4th May 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 12).

¹⁷⁰ Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 5).

¹⁷¹ Káldy-Nagy (1973, pp. 197–198); Rieger (1928, p. 71, note 37); Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, pp. 482, 484, note 140). For an eye-witness account, see Antoine de Granvelle's report (24th April 1547). In: Weiss (1841–1852, Vol. 3, pp. 262–265) and Ferdinand's letter to Paul III (25th April 1547). In: Friedensburg (1899, pp. 677–678). On the importance of the victory, see Braudel (1966, Vol. 2, pp. 231–238) and Fischer-Galati (1959).

¹⁷² Rabe (1971, pp. 32–36). On the extension of the truce, see Veltwijck's letter to Ferdinand (Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 141). One month before the signing of that truce, *bailo* Bernardo Navagero wrote that the Emperor would only wage war against the Schmalkaldic army when he had concluded "whether a truce or a peace treaty with the Sultan". Rieger (1928, p. 75, note 64).

¹⁷³ Letter from the same to Ferdinand (Büyükkçekmece, 22nd June 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 161).

¹⁷⁴ Mirzā arrived at the beginning of June "mit großem Prunk" according to Káldy-Nagy (1973, p. 197, note 141).

gradually spread throughout Christendom. *Bailo* Renier sent a message on 25th June to the Venetian Senate, a co-signatory of the agreement, to make known its conditions. At the end of July, Cardinal Francesco Sfondrato, Papal Legate at the Imperial Court, reported to Rome that an agreement had been reached “con honesta riputazione”, as Antoine de Granvelle told him.¹⁷⁵

For five years an armistice would be in force between the Sultan and the Habsburg monarchs. On the Christian side, Venice, the Pope and the French King were included although Rüstem Pasha reacted with some surprise to the request of Veltwijck to include Paul III: the Pope, said the Grand Vizier, must restrict himself to matters of faith.¹⁷⁶ France remained very concerned about the way she was included: the Court feared an attack of the Emperor, who was inscribed on the same side, especially after his victory over the Protestants.¹⁷⁷ The most important stipulation was the territorial status quo. Süleymān dropped his claims on the fortresses of the Hungarian landowners and contented himself with the payment of an increased tribute. Yet the Sultan still regarded Hungary as his rightful possession, “conquered by our triumphant sword”.¹⁷⁸ All forces, except the ones intended for defending the border, had to be withdrawn and violators of the treaty had to be punished “on both sides”.¹⁷⁹ The *tīmārlar*, the territory captured since the truce of February 1545, were to be abolished.¹⁸⁰ Merchants from all co-signatories were allowed to travel freely in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁸¹ The Algerian corsairs were included also: they were not permitted to attack Christian ships or cities, nor could they be attacked by co-signatories’ forces.

These conditions were not disadvantageous to Ferdinand at all. However, all this required a substantial concession in return: Ferdinand had to pay thirty thousand gold ducats every year, at the end of March, to the Sublime Porte for the duration of the treaty.¹⁸² The former preferred to think of it as a *honorarium munus*, a favour, and always instructed his envoys to speak of it in this manner during negotiations.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁵ Letter from the same to Alessandro Farnese (Augsburg, 25th July 1547). In: Friedensburg (1907, p. 52).

¹⁷⁶ Letter from Justus de Argento to Ferdinand (after 9th November 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 185).

¹⁷⁷ Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, p. 485). On Monluc’s attempts to include his King in a beneficial manner in last year’s truce, read his final report (after November 1545). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 601–602).

¹⁷⁸ Charters of Süleymān to Charles V and Ferdinand (Istanbul, 19th–28th June 1547). In: Schaendlinger (1983, Vol. 2, pp. 11–18).

¹⁷⁹ Ratification of Ferdinand in: Petritsch (1985, p. 70).

¹⁸⁰ Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Mary of Hungary (Augsburg, 2nd September 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 180).

¹⁸¹ Ratification of Süleymān (8th October). In: Petritsch (1985, p. 75). See also Joost Bave’s letter to Mary of Hungary (Augsburg, 6th September 1547) at Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 124, fols 309r–310v; charters from Süleymān to Charles V and Ferdinand (Istanbul, 19th–28th June 1547). In: Schaendlinger (1983, Vol. 2, p. 13).

¹⁸² Ferdinand’s ratification mentioned: “triginta millia Ducatorum in auro obtulit, quottannis solvendam in mense Martio”. Petritsch (1985, p. 69).

¹⁸³ See for example Niccolò Sicco’s letter of instructions (Worms, 21st May 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 64) and Sicco’s letter to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 25th August 1545). In: Nehring (1995, p. 74).

That does not alter the fact that it was a considerable sum of money to be paid, more than the tribute of vassal state Walachia at the time.¹⁸⁴ Veltwijck was very displeased with the fact that the Porte had single-handedly increased the tribute with five thousand ducats to overcome the obstacle of the Hungarian nobles who had promised Süleymān a yearly payment but who now seemed to be unwilling to pay.¹⁸⁵ The composition of the tribute was interpreted differently by all parties involved.¹⁸⁶

The final agreement was made on 13th June and a provisional *'ahdnāme* was drafted six days later. Two charters, addressed to Ferdinand and Charles and differing in length and minor details, were brought by Veltwijck and Justus de Argento to the Habsburg brothers. The Emperor ratified the treaty on 1st August 1547 at Augsburg whereas Ferdinand signed his copy on 26th August in Prague.¹⁸⁷ According to Malvezzi, who remained in Istanbul to become the first Habsburg ambassador in the Ottoman Empire, Veltwijck left the city on 20th June, a few days after the agreement had been reached. Because he was not yet entirely recovered from his illness, he sent Argento, carrying a digest of the treaty, ahead and remained in Sofia to recover.¹⁸⁸ Upon his arrival at Augsburg on 12th August, he was struck again by "une maladie colicque, si extrême que n'ay sçeu n'escrive ne faire office quelconque attendant la mort d'une heure à l'aulture".¹⁸⁹ At the Diet, he described the course of the negotiations to Charles and Ferdinand. Mary of Hungary, who was in the Low Countries at the time, asked secretary Joost Bave to find out more about Veltwijck's mission though the latter decided to inform the governor personally.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁴ Sugar (1977, p. 121–122).

¹⁸⁵ Veltwijck did not accuse the Sultan or the Grand Vizier, but *re 'īs effendi* Reğeb Çelebi of being bribed by Aramont to make sure the Emperor would not ratify the treaty. Letter from Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (Büyükçekmece, 22nd June 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 162). Compare with Süleymān's ratification in Petritsch (1985, p. 73).

¹⁸⁶ Ferdinand understood it as follows: 10,000 ducats promised by Adorno and Sicco, 10,000 for the castles of Perényi, Török and other magnates, 5,000 for the acquisition of the *īmārlar* and another 5,000 as a compensation for the authority over the Hungarian magnates who had promised the Porte tribute. Instructions from Ferdinand to Gian-Maria Malvezzi & Justus de Argento (Prague, 25th August 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 176).

¹⁸⁷ Jorga (1997, Vol. 2, p. 864). Ferdinand's Latin ratification was published in Petritsch (1985, pp. 68–70). A letter from the Venetian ambassador at Charles' court (6th August 1547) mentioned the ratification. See Jean de Morvilliers' letter to Henry II (Venice, 19th & 29th August 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, pp. 28–29).

¹⁸⁸ Letters from Gian-Maria Malvezzi to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 6th & 16th July 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 167, 169). See also Jean de Morvilliers's letter to Henry II (Venice, 30th July 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 25).

¹⁸⁹ Final report of Gerard Veltwijck to Ferdinand (before 7th December 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 193). A document containing a description of the Imperial Court in 1547, mentions his arrival at that day: Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, no. 16,434, fol. 65r. Sleidanus writes that "Gerardus Veltuichus, quem ad Turcam iuisse libro xvii diximus, Augusti mensis die XII redit ad Caesarem, pactis induciis in annos quinque". Sleidanus (1968, Vol. 3, p. 42). See also Francesco Sfondrato's letter to Alessandro Farnese (Augsburg, 20th August 1547). In: Friedensburg (1907, p. 85).

¹⁹⁰ See Joost Bave's letter to Mary of Hungary (Augsburg, 6th September 1547) at Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 124, fols 309r–310v; letter from Gerard Veltwijck the same (Istanbul, 2nd September 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 179–180).

Because his condition prevented it, Veltwijck was not sent back to Istanbul to deliver the two signed Charters.¹⁹¹ Ferdinand charged Justus de Argento with this task and warned him to remain alert to any French attempts to prevent the ratification by Süleymān.¹⁹² This concern was unnecessary because Rüstem Pasha was also vexed by Aramont's intrigues.¹⁹³ Argento arrived at the Ottoman Court on 28th September. The Sultan ordered a new document to be framed and signed on 8th October at Istanbul.¹⁹⁴ In a conversation with Argento, Rüstem asked "why master Gerard did not return". The messenger answered him that the diplomat's weak condition could not bear such a heavy assignment.¹⁹⁵ He left the city on 13th October and returned in March 1548 with the first tribute.¹⁹⁶ Besides the tribute for the Sultan, Argento brought five hundred ducats for the *beylerbey* of Buda, forty for his secretary, three thousand for the Grand Vizier, six hundred for each of the other Viziers, five hundred gold coins for Yūnus Bey and, on Veltwijck's advice, only one hundred for Dragoman Mahmud Bey (†1575).¹⁹⁷ The three Viziers, the First Dragoman and the *kapı ağası* also received one clock whereas Rüstem was given two.¹⁹⁸

The same month, Malvezzi had bought 'una bella et honorevole casa in Constantinopoli' although he preferred to live in Pera. The Sultan, however, did not allow Habsburg ambassadors to reside outside the old centre of Istanbul. He refurbished the house and put up the emblems of Ferdinand and Charles.¹⁹⁹ A new phase in the relations between Habsburg and the Sublime Porte had been initiated: from this time onwards, the former had a diplomatic representative at the Ottoman court for the first time. The Treaty of 1547, the first written agreement between the two

¹⁹¹ Letter from Jean de Morvilliers to Henry II (Venice, 12th & 20th October 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 35).

¹⁹² Instructions from Ferdinand to Gian-Maria Malvezzi and Justus de Argento (Prague, 25th August 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 172–177). Even after the ratification, Aramont caused problems about the inclusion of France and Venice. Setton (1976–1984, Vol. 3, pp. 485–486).

¹⁹³ Letter from Gian-Maria Malvezzi to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 26th August 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 178–179).

¹⁹⁴ Published in: Petritsch (1985, pp. 71–80). See also Bittner (1903, p. 16); Petritsch (1991, pp. 50–52); Jorga (1997, Vol. 3, p. 92); Noradounghian (1978, Vol. 1, p. 30).

¹⁹⁵ Final report of Justus de Argento to Ferdinand (after 9th November 1547). In: Nehring (1995, p. 185). During the audience with the Sultan, Malvezzi said: "... per l'infirmità dil dottor Girardo suo ambasciatore non ha possuto rimandarlo in qua ..." Ibidem, p. 186.

¹⁹⁶ Letter from Justus de Argento to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 23rd March 1548). In: Nehring (1995, p. 227); Letter from Gian-Maria Malvezzi to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 6th November 1547) ibidem, p. 181; letter from Ferdinand to Gian-Maria Malvezzi (Augsburg, 23rd January 1548) ibidem, p. 203; letter from Francesco Sfondrato to Alessandro Farnese (Augsburg, 22nd November 1547). In: Friedensburg (1907, p. 201). See also Petritsch (1977, p. 59). For Spuler (1935, p. 322), the carrier of the tribute remained unknown.

¹⁹⁷ Mahmud Bey or Sebald von Pibrach belonged to a Viennese merchant family. See Petritsch (1985, pp. 61–66).

¹⁹⁸ Instructions from Ferdinand to Gian-Maria Malvezzi and Justus de Argento (Augsburg, 24th January 1548). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 205–207, 209–210). Bondorius received 200 ducats but refused to support the Habsburg cause. See Argento's final report to Ferdinand (April or May 1548). In: Nehring (1995, p. 249).

¹⁹⁹ Letter from Gian-Maria Malvezzi to Ferdinand (Istanbul, 29th March 1548). In: Nehring (1995, p. 234).

dynasties, was a landmark as well. Not only was it the first confirmation of the present territorial situation in Hungary since the capture of Buda in 1541 by the Ottomans, but it also formally confirmed the inequality between Ferdinand and Süleymān. Because an Islamic ruler could not conclude long-lasting treaties with unbelieving princes, the 1547 armistice was only temporary. Moreover, the Sultan still saw Ferdinand as his vassal, obliged to pay tribute to his suzerain.

One historian has interpreted this treaty as the first step of the Porte to treat the enemies of Faith as her equals. By admitting a resident ambassador representing Habsburg interests, she adopted "den im Abendlande üblich gewordenen Formen des zwischenstaatlichen Verkehrs". "Die Politik des Sultans wurde, wenn man so sagen will, zivilisiert."²⁰⁰ This view omits the fact that France had a permanent representative in Istanbul since 1536. Since Bāyāzīd II's times, the Porte interfered in European politics using European methods. Nor did the Treaty of 1547 contain official recognition of her enemies as her equals. Süleymān, Sultan of Rūm, still considered himself to be the only rightful ruler of the world.²⁰¹ The Porte was greatly dissatisfied with the coronation of Charles in Bologna in 1530: she considered the title of *çasar* to be unjustly given to him.²⁰² A real recognition would come only with the signing of the Treaty of Zsitvatorok in 1606 where Sultan Ahmed I (1603–1617) acknowledged the Habsburg Emperor to be his equal. With the signing of this treaty, the custom of paying a yearly tribute ended as well for the Habsburgs.²⁰³

Only a few months after the signing of the 1547 treaty, the Emperor mentioned the armistice and the victory at Mühlberg as important successes of the past years in a letter to his son Philip.²⁰⁴ The next year, Charles sent two letters to the Porte, one addressed to Süleymān and the other to his Grand Vizier.²⁰⁵ He expressed his hope that the Truce would be maintained "omnia ... mari terraque" but asked Rüstem Pasha to curb the pirate attacks against Spanish ships.

The death of Francis I had caused great uncertainty at the French Court. Some asked themselves whether the King should try to reinforce or tone down the alliance

²⁰⁰ Rieger (1928, pp. 91–92). The author also described "das natürliche Beharrungsvermögen der abendländischen Kulturwelt, die auch durch den noch so wütenden Anprall unzivilisierter, wenn auch militärisierter Scharen nicht aus dem Gleichgewicht zu bringen war".

²⁰¹ See the used form of address in the Sultan's charters to the "King of Vienna" and the "King of Spain", for example Süleymān's ratification of 8th October in: Petritsch (1985, pp. 71–72). See also the charters of Süleymān to Charles V and Ferdinand (Istanbul, 19th–28th June 1547). In: Schaendlinger (1983, Vol. 2, pp. 11–18).

²⁰² Necipoğlu (1989).

²⁰³ However, the Emperor was forced to pay a single tribute of 200,000 ducats. See Bayerle (1980); Niederkorn (1993). On the Ottoman use of titles of the Habsburg Emperors, see Köhbach (1992).

²⁰⁴ Letter from Charles V to Prince Philip (Augsburg, 18th January 1548). Weiss (1841–1852, Vol. 3, pp. 267–318).

²⁰⁵ Letters from Charles V to Süleymān (Augsburg, 4th February 1548) and to Rüstem Pasha ([Augsburg?], 1548). Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, no. 15,875: *Caroli Quinti Imperatoris Epistolae ad Summos Pontifices, Reges et Principes Electores Ordinesque Imperii Germanici...*, pp. 157–158. The letter to the Sultan has been published in Lanz (1998, p. 611).

with the Porte.²⁰⁶ Several attempts were made by the new King, Henry II (reigned 1547–1559), “pour rafraîchir les alliances du prédécesseur”, but his envoys did not meet with success due to the events of the past five years that had shifted the situation to their disadvantage.²⁰⁷ Aramont’s party joined the Sultan’s army at Erzurum, beneath the Black Sea, at the end of June 1548 and accompanied him eastward.²⁰⁸ After his arrival in France, Aramont received a negligible award: he was allowed to keep his two galleys and received the title of marquis. Partially ruined financially, he died in 1555.

The reward

Marino Cavalli, Venetian ambassador at the French court, complained about the small remuneration he and his colleagues received after having fulfilled an assignment. The ambassadors of the Emperor, France, Portugal and England, he continued, obtained eight to ten ducats and were entitled to a commission per assignment. “And afterwards their Kings endow them with abbeys, dioceses, lifelong offices, of which the interest amounts to four thousand to ten thousand ducats.” Consequently, Cavalli did not understand how an assignment abroad could be more lucrative than remaining in Venice. That was the reason why “several citizens rather stayed in Venice and lived in all simplicity, than fulfilled a mission abroad”.²⁰⁹

His Habsburg colleagues seem to have fared better: the career of many, if not all diplomats who carried out an assignment in the Ottoman Empire, took a great leap forwards after their return.²¹⁰ In the year of his mission in the Near East, the Emperor promoted Corneille de Schepper from Secretary to Councillor in the *Geheime Raad* of the Low Countries.²¹¹ The same happened to Karel Rijm van Estbeek, a year after

²⁰⁶ See, for example, Jean de Morvilliers’ letter to Anne de Montmorency (Venice, 14th & 23rd April 1547), written just after the death of Francis I. In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 8).

²⁰⁷ He sent *ambassadeur extraordinaire* François de Fumel (†1562) who arrived at Istanbul at the end of June 1548. Letter from Henry II to Jean de Morvilliers (Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 12th May 1547). In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 18). His predecessor, the messenger Jean Lavau, lord of Huyson, was equally unsuccessful. Instructions from Henry II to Jean de Huyson. In: Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 2, p. 30, note 1); Chesneau (1970, pp. 219–225). See *ibidem*, pp. 218–219 for his credentials of the King and *ibidem*, pp. 20–21 for Chesneau’s description of his arrival.

²⁰⁸ The journey is described in Chesneau (1970, pp. 38–144); Yerasimos (1991, pp. 329–337); Rouillard (1941, pp. 123–124). On the campaign itself, see Káldy-Nagy (1973, pp. 198–199).

²⁰⁹ Report of Marino Cavalli (1546). In: Tommaseo (1838, Vol. 1, pp. 362–363).

²¹⁰ The same can be said of several French diplomats. Monluc, for example, was admitted to the *Conseil Privé*. In 1554, he received the episcopate of Valence and Dié. Charrière (1848–1860, Vol. 1, p. 625, note 1). This roused Rüstem Pasha’s indignation who said that he deserved to be impaled, wrote Veltwijck. Letter from the latter to Ferdinand (Edirne, 20th February 1547). In: Nehring (1995, pp. 136–137). See also Reynaud (1971, pp. 13–84).

²¹¹ Baelde (1965, p. 222).

his return from Istanbul in 1573.²¹² In the summer of 1547, on his way to the Emperor, Veltwijck probably paid a visit to the University of Padua in the Venetian Republic where he was enrolled *honoris causa* – most probably a mark of honour for his achievements in the Levant.²¹³ He left the city and crossed the Alps – presumably accompanied by Titian – towards Augsburg where he was to be received by the Emperor.

While Veltwijck still resided at the Ottoman Court, Charles had promoted his Secretary to Councillor of the *Geheime Raad* thanks to his:

bons et loyaulx seruices quil nous a faiz tant en plusieurs noz ... emprinses par mer et par terre, qui en diuerses honorables charges et ambassades ... deuers le Roy des Romains, de hongrie, de boheme monseigneur nostre bon frere et les estatz desdicts Royaulmez que aussi deuers le turc ou Il est encoires presentement et sestant par tout acquite a nostre contente.²¹⁴

Shortly afterwards, at least from 1549, he was admitted to the more prestigious *Raad van State*.²¹⁵ Finally, he was chosen as the eleventh Treasurer of the Order of the Golden Fleece by its members.²¹⁶ Being a Christian order, the Golden Fleece had always been closely connected to the fight against Islam. When Burgundian Duke Philip the Good founded the Order, the air buzzed with rumours about a crusade. In the following centuries, the struggle against the Turks was often an opportunity for these knights to receive personal esteem. The election of Hungarian King Lajos II as Grand Master, just before he met his untimely demise on the battlefield, was an attempt to invigorate the alliance between Habsburg and Hungary but also a clear sign of the policy of honouring those who fought the Ottomans.²¹⁷

The Treasurer of the Order, “ung des honorables Estats que Gentilhomme puisse deservir” according to the Knights themselves, was responsible for the treasures, relics, ornaments, tapestries, the library and the clothes.²¹⁸ In 1552, Sir Thomas Chamberlain, the English Ambassador in the Low Countries, received a request from a friend to find out more about the ceremonies and the members of the Order. The Chancellor of the Golden Fleece, a Frenchman, distrusted the English and was wary of giving information. A more willing servant at the Court of Mary of Hungary told

²¹² [Christyn] (1674, p. 39); Baelde (1965, p. 223). A discussion of the rewards (as seen by Sigismund zu Herberstein, sent to the Sultan in 1541) can be found in Picard (1964, pp. 39–42).

²¹³ He was enrolled as “Gerardus Vechwick Belga. 1547”. Tex (1959, p. 51).

²¹⁴ Letter of appointment from Charles V (Augsburg, 20th January 1547) at Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 1,293.

²¹⁵ The policy of appointment concerning these two councils is discussed in Baelde (1965, pp. 81–87, 89–93, 100–102).

²¹⁶ *Extrait du Registre des Chapitres et Actes de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, De l'an 1431 à l'an 1569*, fol. 152v at Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Handschriftenkabinet, no. G 583. See also Andreas (1650, p. 244); Koller (1971, pp. 79–82); Kervyn de Lettenhove (1907, p. 111).

²¹⁷ Csernus (1998, pp. 85–89).

²¹⁸ Koller (1971, p. 55).

him that, at the time of the foundation, the members had to be “gentlemen”, but now, however, dubious men had found their way into the order. He told Chamberlain that the Treasurer was certainly such a man who was placed in the Order by Antoine de Granvelle as an eavesdropper.²¹⁹

Some historians have supposed that Veltwijck was a Knight of the Golden Fleece instead of Treasurer.²²⁰ The sources of the Chapters of the Order contradict this and the mistake is probably due to the fact that, at least since 1551, his name in the *contreroulles* of the *Geheime Raad* is accompanied by the annotation “chevalier”.²²¹ This is probably an indication of his ennoblement, an honour which received several other Habsburg diplomats.²²²

In the following years, he carried out various assignments for Charles, Ferdinand, Mary of Hungary and Antoine de Granvelle throughout Europe. According to the travel account of Nicander Nucius, Veltwijck also carried out an assignment in London, where he conducted negotiations with King Henry VIII. The date of this mission is, however, uncertain.²²³ Looking at his correspondence, he was selected for far less missions after 1552. He wrote his last two known letters in Brussels to the lady governor. It is, therefore, possible that he resided mainly in the capital during the last two years of his life and attended the meetings of the two Councils.²²⁴

In contrast, Veltwijck’s private life has remained virtually unknown to historians. A very remarkable fact is that he seemed to have been in touch with two famous botanists, Rembert Dodoens and Amatus Lusitanus. The former, born in Mechelen around 1517, finished his famous *Cruydeboeck* in 1552 but decided to publish a smaller botanical work first. This harbinger was titled *De Frugum Historia* (Antwerp, 1552) and was dedicated to Veltwijck who had “scoured several parts of the world, almost the whole of Italy and the steepest places of the Alps and other mountains for this book, in danger of his own life”.²²⁵

Amatus Lusitanus, a New Christian from Portugese Castel Branco and former medical student at Salamanca, resided in Antwerp from 1533 until 1540 and in Ferrara and Ancona afterwards. In 1558 he travelled to Ottoman territory where he cast off his Christian belief and started to profess the Jewish creed openly. He seems

²¹⁹ Letter from Thomas Chamberlain to William Cecil (Brussels, 23rd October 1552). Turnbull (1861, pp. 225–226).

²²⁰ Baelde (1965, p. 86) for instance.

²²¹ Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no. 1476/6. A list of all Knights of the Order does not contain his name. See *Toison d’Or* (1962, pp. 35–81).

²²² According to Coenen (1990, p. 378), he was ennobled in 1549. Proof of nobility was not found.

²²³ For the account, see Cramer (1841).

²²⁴ The mentioned letters (Brussels, 26th September & 13th October 1553) are to be found at Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, Raad van State en Audiëntie, no 1666/2.

²²⁵ “Tu solus occurisses qui secretiorem illam plane divinam Physices ac Iatricis partem ... cum omnis generis disciplinis jungeres ... plurimas orbis partes, Italiae fere omnes, Alpium aliorumque montium praeruptissima loca, corporis tui etiam periculo, hujus studii causa peragraveris.” Cited from the dedication of the book (fols 2–3). The complete title is: *Remberti Dodonaei Mechliniensis Medici, De Frugum Historia, Liber unus. Eiusdem Epistolae Duae, Una de Farre, Chondro, Trago, Ptisana, Crimno, & Alica. Altera de Zytho, & Cereusia.*

to have been on friendly terms with Joseph Naci, a Jew who had experienced very similar events as Amatus had.²²⁶ In two editions of his commentary on the work of Dioscorides, Amatus mentioned that he had received curative herbs from the Ottoman lands:

... I was supplied with a large quantity and this Gerardus, a very learned *orator* of Emperor Charles the Fifth at the court of Solyman, the Emperor of the Turks, extracted them by their roots with his own hands in the region of the Pontus [the Black Sea]. This man is very learned and highly versed in different languages, and an extraordinary investigator of singular medicines, who shed light on these roots for the first time ...²²⁷

Unfortunately, we do not know which herbs or flowers Veltwijck brought from his journeys in the Levant or elsewhere. Amatus wrote that he came from Ancona when he met Veltwijck. In May 1547 he had left Ferrara and travelled to the former city. In the same year he went to Venice to meet an Imperial Ambassador there.²²⁸ It is possible that he met Veltwijck, who returned from Istanbul, in this city as well.

It now seems clear that a journey of a European envoy to the Sublime Porte very often embraced much more than political interests. Not only his travelling-companions but also the diplomat himself considered his stay in the Ottoman Empire as a select opportunity to discover those distant regions. Manuscripts and tulips found their way into European libraries and gardens thanks to these travels. Up until now, it remained unknown that Veltwijck held similar activities during his stay in the Ottoman Empire. Thanks to Dodoens and Amatus, he can be placed among more famous colleagues as Augerius Busbequius who is remembered as the first to introduce the tulip in Europe.²²⁹ Whether he played an active role in the spreading of the tulip can only be pointed out by more thorough examination of the sources.

Veltwijck's diplomatic activities in the Levant have been more thoroughly examined. Yet a complete account of his three-year stay at the Ottoman Court was lacking. This study was meant to fill this gap and give a clearer insight into the European and Ottoman policy of that time and into Veltwijck as a person and a diplomat. While he seemed to have relied mostly on Monluc during his first stay at the Sultan's Court, Veltwijck took advantage of this experience during the second round of negotiations which lasted for one year. Both in 1545 and 1547, the death of

²²⁶ On Amatus, see Friedenwald (1937, pp. 603–653); Leibowitz (1971, pp. 795–798); Tucker (1998, pp. 83–113). On Naci, see Grünebaum-Ballin (1968).

²²⁷ L[eibowitz] (1971, pp. 795–798). Amatus wrote: "Anconam veni ... ut in rhapontico iudicare quis poterit, quod ad me advectum fuit in maxima quidem copia et id Gerardus Caroli Quinti Imperatoris apud Solymanum Turcarum Imperatorem doctissimus orator, in propriis manibus, in regione Ponti eradicaverat. Est enim vir ille doctissimus et variarum linguarum peritissimus, ac medicamentorum simplicium diligentissimus investigator, qui hoc tempore primo radicem istam in lucem traxit ..." (*Index Dioscorides* (Lyon, 1556) p. 430); cited by Secret (1964, p. 254, note 42).

²²⁸ Friedenwald (1937, p. 610).

²²⁹ Dash (1999, pp. 34–36); Busbequius (1994, pp. 440–452).

Frenchmen of royal blood caused an immediate conclusion of the talks in Edirne and Istanbul: first the death of Prince Charles d'Orléans, then of the King. The treaty which was signed can be seen as a turning point in the relations between the Lily and the Crescent. The rivalry between the Most Christian King's representatives and the latter's ambivalent policy caused considerable discontent at the Ottoman Court. By consequence, the negotiations between the Habsburgs and Süleymān went well for the latter but the Sultan still remained ruler of Hungary and Ferdinand his vassal. As for France, the initiative taken by Francis ended in a crisis at the French Court: the benefits of the alliance with the Sublime Porte were being seriously questioned. To the career of Gerard Veltwijck, the two-year mission in the Levant was beneficial. He was promoted from Secretary in Ordinary to Councillor and was admitted to the highly esteemed *Raad van State*. To contemporaries and later historians, he was always remembered for his negotiations with the Porte. "It is nevertheless an assignment full of danger and fatigue", he wrote after his return home.²³⁰

References

- Albèri, Eugenio (ed.) (1839–1862): *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al senato. 1: Relazioni degli stati Europei, tranne l'Italia*. 6 Vols, Florence.
- Albèri, Eugenio (ed.) (1840–1853): *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al senato. 3: le Relazioni degli Stati Ottomani*. 3 Vols, Florence.
- Amat, Roman d' (1939): Aramon (Gabriel de Luels, seigneur d'). *Dictionnaire de Biographie française*. Vol. 3, pp. 219–222.
- Andreas, Valerius (1650): *Fasti Academici Studii generalis Lovaniensis, id est Origo & Institutio: Rectores, Cancellarii, Conservatores, Doctores & Professores, Fundatores & Benefactores, Resque aliquot memorabiles ejusdem Universitatis*. Louvain.
- Andreas, Valerius (1973): *Bibliotheca Belgica. Facsimile of the Edition Louvain. 1643*. Louvain.
- Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis (1991): *Représentants permanents de la France en Turquie (1536–1991) et de la Turquie en France (1797–1991)*. Paris.
- Baelde, Michel (1965): *De collaterale raden onder Karel V en Filips II (1531–1578)* (Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van de centrale instellingen in de zestiende eeuw). Brussels.
- Bayerle, Gustav (1980): The Compromise at Zsitvatorok. *Archivum Ottomanicum*. Vol. 6, pp. 5–53.
- Benedetti, Maria (1923): Un segretario di Cristoforo Madruzzo (Nicolò Secco). *Archivio Veneto-Tridentino*. Vol. 3, pp. 203–229.
- Bernard, Yvelise (1988): *L'Orient du XVI^e siècle à travers les récits des voyageurs français: regards portés sur la société musulmane*. Paris.
- Bittner, Ludwig (1903): *Chronologisches Verzeichnis der österreichischen Staatsverträge I*. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für neuere Geschichte Österreichs I). Vienna.
- Bizer, Ernst (1957–1980): The German Reformation to 1555. In: G. R. Elton (ed.): *The New Cambridge Modern History*. 14 vols, Vol. 2, pp. 182–183. Cambridge.
- Braudel, Fernand (1966): *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéenne à l'époque de Philippe II*. 2 Vols, Paris.

²³⁰ "Est enim legatio plena periculi et laboris ..." Final report of Gerard Veltwijck (before December, 1547). *Austro-Turcica*, p. 196.

- Busbequius, Augerius (1971): *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, Seigneur of Bousbecque, Knight, Imperial Ambassador*. In: Ch. Th. Forster–F. H. B. Daniell (eds): 2 Vols, Geneva.
- Busbequius, Augerius (1994): *Legationis epistolae Turcicae quatuor. Vier brieven over het gezantschap naar Turkije*. Michel Goldsteen–Zweder von Martels (eds). Hilversum.
- Cardauns, Ludwig (1923): *Von Nizza bis Crépy. Europäische Politik in den Jahren 1534–1544*. Rome.
- Chabod, F. (1958): Milán o los Países Bajos? Los discusiones en España sobre la “alternativa” de 1544. In: *Carlos V (1500–1558). Homenaje de la Universidad de Granada*, pp. 331–372. Granada.
- Charrière, Ernest (1848–1860): *Négociations de la France dans le Levant*. 4 Vols (Collection de documents inédits sur l’histoire de France XLVI). Paris.
- Chesneau, Jean de (1970): *Le voyage de Monsieur d’Aramon ambassadeur pour le roy en Levant escript par noble homme Jean Chesneau l’un des secretaires dudict seigneur ambassadeur*. Charles Schefer (ed.) (Recueil de voyages et de documents pour servir à l’histoire de la géographie VIII). Geneva.
- [Christyn, Johannes Baptista] (1674): *Les tombeaux des hommes illustres, Qui ont paru au Conseil Privé du Roy Catholique au Pays-Bas, Depuis son institution de l’an 1517, jusques aujourd’hui*. Amsterdam.
- Coenen, Daniel (1990): Veltwijck. *Nouvelle Biographie Nationale* Vol. 2, pp. 375–379.
- Coles, Paul (1968): *The Ottoman Impact on Europe*. London.
- Cosenza, Mario Emilio (1962): Siccus, Nicolaus. *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300–1800*. Vol. 4, p. 3265.
- Cox-Indestege, Elly (1979): Favoli, Hugo. In: *Bibliotheca Belgica. Bibliographie générale des Pays-Bas*. Vol. 3, p. 11. Brussels.
- Cramer, John Anthony (ed.) (1841): *The Second Book of the Travels of Nicander of Corcyra*. (Publications of the Camden Society XVII). London.
- Csernus, Sándor (1998): L’Europe centrale du XV^e au XVIII^e siècle. In: Jean-Luc Liez (ed.): *La Toison d’or, un mythe européen*, pp. 85–92. Paris.
- Dash, Mike (1999): *Tulipomania. The Story of the World’s Most Coveted Flower & the Extraordinary Passions it Aroused*. London.
- Defradas, Jean (ed.) (1966): Les mines de charbon. In: Louis Trenard (ed.): *Charbon et sciences humaines. Actes du colloque organisé par la Faculté des Lettres de l’Université de Lille en mai 1963*, pp. 99–100 (Industrie et artisanat II). Paris.
- Delmarcel, Guy (1999): *Het Vlaamse wandtapijt van de 15de tot de 18de eeuw*. Tielt.
- Deny, Jean–Laroche, Jane (1969): L’expédition en Provence de l’armée de mer du Sultan Suleyman sous le commandement de l’Amiral Hayreddin Pacha, dit Barberousse (1543–1544). *Turcica. Revue des Etudes turques*. Vol. 1, pp. 161–211.
- Dilger, Konrad (1967): *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Osmanischen Hofzeremoniells im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Beiträge zur Kenntnis Südosteuropas und des Nahen Orients IV). München.
- Durme, Maurice Van (1948): *Antoon Perrenot van Granvelle, beschermheer van Christoffel Plantijn*. Antwerp.
- Ebersolt, Jean (1918): *Constantinople Byzantine et les Voyageurs du Levant*. Paris.
- Enzinas, Francisco de (1995): *Epistolário*. Ignacio J. García Pinilla (ed.) (Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance CCXC). Geneva.

- Favolius, Hugo (1563): *Hodoeporici Byzantini Lib. III. Ad illustrissimum D.D. Antonium Perrenotum Cardinalem Granuellanum*. Louvain.
- Fischer-Galati, Stephen (1959): *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Fodor, Pál (1991): Ottoman Policy towards Hungary, 1520–1541. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. Vol. 45, Nos 2–3, pp. 271–345.
- Foucault, J.-A. de (ed.) (1951): Nicandre de Corcyre en Morinie. *Bulletin trimestriel de la Société Académique des Antiquaires de la Morinie*. Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 423–431.
- Foucault, J.-A. de (ed.) (1962): *Voyages de Nicius Nicandre* (Nouvelle collection de textes et documents). Paris.
- Foucault, J.-A. de (ed.) (1971): Le siège de Corfou vu par Nicandre de Corcyre. *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé (revue de culture générale)*. Vol. 1, pp. 83–91.
- Foucault, J.-A. de (ed.) (1972): Après l'année Érasme. Souvenirs d'un contemporain. *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé (revue de culture générale)*. Vol. 1, pp. 97–106.
- Friedensburg, Walter (ed.) (1898): *Nuntiatur des Verallo 1545–1546* (Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. Erste Abteilung 1533–1559 VIII). Gotha.
- Friedensburg, Walter (ed.) (1899): *Nuntiatur des Verallo 1546–1547* (Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. Erste Abteilung 1533–1559 IX). Gotha.
- Friedensburg, Walter (ed.) (1907): *Legation des Kardinals Sfondrato 1547–1548* (Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. Erste Abteilung 1533–1559 X). Berlin.
- Friedenwald, H. (1937): Amatus Lusitanus. *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*. Vol. 5, pp. 603–653.
- Gachard, M. (1874–1882): *Collection des voyages des souverains des Pays-Bas*. 4 Vols (Collection de chroniques belges inédites). Brussels.
- Gaillard, J. (1857): *Bruges et le Franc ou leur magistrature et leur noblesse, avec des données historiques et généalogiques sur chaque famille*. 6 Vols. Bruges.
- Gerlo, Alois–Vervliet, Hendrik D. L. (1972): Bibliographie de l'humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas. Avec un répertoire bibliographique des humanistes et poètes néo-latins (Instrumenta Humanistica III). Brussels.
- Gevay, Anton von (1840–1842): *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Verhältnisse zwischen Österreich und der Pforte im XVI. und XVII. Jahrhundert aus Archiven und Bibliotheken*. 3 Vols. Vienna.
- Goetz, Helmut (1963): Die geheimen Ratgeber Ferdinands I. (1503–1564). Ihre Persönlichkeit im Urteil der Nuntien und Gesandten. *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*. Vol. 42, pp. 453–494.
- Grünebaum-Ballin, Paul (1968): *Joseph Naci, duc de Naxos*. Paris–Den Hague.
- Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von (1827–1835): *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*. 10 Vols. Pest.
- Heesakkers, Chris L.–Schepper, M. de (1988): *Bibliographie de l'humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas. Avec un répertoire bibliographique des humanistes et poètes néo-latins. Supplément 1970–1985*. Brussels.
- Höfflechner, Walter (1972): *Die Gesandten der europäischen Mächte, vornehmlich des Kaisers und des Reiches 1490–1500* (Archiv für österreichische Geschichte CXXIX). Vienna.
- Hume, Martin A. S. (ed.) (1904): *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas, Vienna, Brussels, and Elsewhere. Henry VIII. 1545–1546* (Calendar of State Papers. Spanish VIII). London.

- Hume, Martin A. S.–Gayangos, Pascual de (eds) (1899): *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas, Vienna, Brussels, and Elsewhere. Henry VIII. 1544* (Calendar of State Papers. Spanish VII). London.
- Hume, Martin A. S.–Tyler, Royall (eds) (1912): *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas, Vienna, Brussels, and Elsewhere. Edward VI. 1547–1549* (Calendar of State Papers. Spanish IX). London.
- Jean, M. (1992): *La Chambre des Comptes de Lille. L'institution et les hommes (1477–1667)* (Mémoires et documents de l'École des Chartes XXXVI). Paris.
- Jorga, Nicola (1997): *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*. 5 Vols. Darmstadt.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1973): Suleimans Angriff auf Europa. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 163–212.
- Kervyn de Lettenhove, H. (1907): *La Toison d'Or. Notes sur l'institution et l'histoire de l'ordre*. Brussels.
- Köhbach, Markus (1992): *Çasar oder imperator? – Zur Titulatur der römischen Kaiser durch die Osmanen nach dem Vertrag von Zsitvatorok (1606)*. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*. Vol. 82, pp. 223–234.
- Koller, Fortuné (1971): *Au service de la Toison d'Or (Les officiers)*. Dison.
- La Charité, Raymond C. (ed.) (1985): *A Critical Bibliography of French Literature. Volume II, Revised. The Sixteenth Century*. Syracuse.
- Lanz, Karl (ed.) (1845): *Staatspapiere zur Geschichte des Kaisers Karl V. aus dem Königlichen Archiv und der Bibliothèque de Bourgogne zu Brüssel*. Stuttgart.
- Lanz, Karl (ed.) (1998): *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V. aus dem Königlichen Archiv und der Bibliothèque de Bourgogne zu Brüssel*. Vol. 2, Brussels.
- L[eibowitz], J. O. (1971): Amatus Lusitanus. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Vol. 2, pp. 795–798.
- Linden, Herman Vander (1936–1938): Veltwyck (Gérard van). *Biographie nationale*. Vol. 26, pp. 570–575.
- Malina, Anneliese (ed.) (1968): Nikandros Nukios, Buch I. Bericht über seine Reise durch Deutschland in den Jahren 1545–1546. In: Johannes Irmscher–Marika Mineemi (eds): *O ellenismos is to exoterikon: Über Beziehungen des Griechentums zum Ausland in der neueren Zeit*. pp. 45–181, Berlin.
- Margolin, Jean-Claude (1976): Erasme et Luther dans le journal de voyage de Nicandre de Corfou. *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português*. Vol. 10, pp. 3–43.
- Martels, Zweder von (1989): *Augerius Gislenius Busbequius. Leven en werk van de keizerlijke gezant aan het hof van Süleyman de Grote*. Groningen.
- Matuz, Josef (1974): Ahmed Pascha, Kara. In: Mathias Bernath (ed.): *Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas*. pp. 22–23. Vol. 1 (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten LXXV). München.
- Matuz, Josef (1975): Die Pfortendolmetscher zur Herrschaftszeit Süleymans des Prächtigen. *Südost-Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Geschichte, Kultur und Landeskunde Südosteuropas*. Vol. 34, pp. 26–60.
- Maurand, Jérôme (1901): *Itinéraire de Jérôme Maurand d'Antibes à Constantinople (1544)*. Léon Dorez (ed.) (Recueil de voyages et de documents pour servir à l'histoire de la géographie XVII). Paris.
- McNeill, William H. (1964): *Europe's Steppe Frontier 1500–1800*. Chicago–London.
- Necipoğlu, Gülru (1989): Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power in the Context of Ottoman–Hapsburg–Papal Rivalry. *The Art Bulletin* Vol. 71, No. 3, pp. 401–427.

- Nehring, Karl (1984): *Iter Constantinopolitanum. Ein Ortsnamenverzeichnis zu den kaiserlichen Gesandtschaftsreisen an die Ottomanische Pforte 1530–1618* (Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München. Serie C. Band XVII). München.
- Nehring, Karl (ed.) (1995): *Austro-Turcica 1541–1552. Diplomatische Akten des habsburgischen Gesandtschaftsverkehrs mit der Hohen Pforte im Zeitalter Süleymans des Prächtigen* (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten XCV). München.
- Nieder Korn, Jan Paul (1993): *Die europäischen Mächte und der "Lange Türkenkrieg" Kaiser Rudolfs II. (1593–1606)* (Archiv für österreichische Geschichte CXXXV). Vienna.
- Noradounghian, Gabriel Effendi (1978): *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'empire Ottoman: traités, conventions, arrangements, déclarations, protocoles, procès-verbaux, firmans, bérats, lettres patentes et autres documents relatifs au droit public extérieur de la Turquie*. 3 Vols. Nendeln.
- Paquot, Jean-Noël (1768): Favoli. In: Jean-Noël Paquot (ed.): *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la Principauté de Liège, et de quelques contrées voisines*. 3 Vols, pp. 97–98. Louvain.
- Peirce, Leslie (1992): The Family as Faction: Dynastic Politics in the Reign of Süleymân. In: Gilles Veinstein (ed.): *Soliman le Magnifique et son temps. Actes du Colloque de Paris. Galeries Nationales du Grand Palais, 7–10 mars 1990*, pp. 105–116. Paris.
- Perjés, Géza (1989): *The Fall of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary: Mohacs 1526–Buda 1541* (Atlantic Studies on Society in Change LVI/East European Monographs CCLV). Columbia.
- Petritsch, Ernst Dieter (1977): *Beiträge zur Diplomatie Ferdinands I. an der Hohen Pforte. Das Gesandtenwesen 1545–1547* (Prüfungsarbeit am Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung). Vienna.
- Petritsch, Ernst Dieter (1985): *Der Habsburgisch–Osmanische Friedensvertrag des Jahres 1547*. (Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchiv.) Vol. 38, pp. 49–80.
- Petritsch, Ernst Dieter (ed.) (1991): *Regesten der Osmanischen Dokumente im Österreichischen Staatsarchiv I. Band (1480–1574)*. (Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchiv – Ergänzungsband X, I). Vienna.
- Picard, Bertold (1964): *Das Gesandtschaftswesen Ostmitteleuropas in der frühen Neuzeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Diplomatie in der ersten Hälfte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts nach den Aufzeichnungen des Freiherrn Sigmund von Herberstein* (Wiener Archiv für Geschichte des Slawentums und Osteuropas VI). Graz–Vienna–Cologne.
- Rabe, Horst (1971): *Reichsbund und Interim. Die Verfassungs- und Religionspolitik Karls V. und der Reichstag von Augsburg 1547/1548*. Cologne–Vienna.
- Reynaud, Hector (1971): *Essai d'histoire littéraire. Jean de Monluc évêque de Valence et de Die*. Geneva.
- Rieger, Gerhard (1928): *Die Einbeziehung der Osmanen in das abendländische Staatensystem. König Franz I. von Frankreich, Sultan Soliman der Prächtige und die Habsburger*. Göttingen.
- Rogers, J. M.–Ward, R. M. (1990): *Süleyman the Magnificent*. London.
- Rosenberg, Manfred (1935): *Gerhard Veltwyck – Orientalist, Theolog und Staatsmann*. Göttingen.
- Rouillard, Clarence Dana (1941): *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature (1520–1660)*. Paris.
- Ruble, Alphonse de (ed.) (1876–1881): *Commentaires et lettres de Blaise de Monluc, maréchal de France*. 4 Vols (Publications de la Société de l'histoire de France). Paris.
- Saint-Genois, Jules de–Schepper, G. A. De (eds) (1857): *Missions diplomatiques de Corneille Duplicius de Schepper* (Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique XXX). Brussels.

- Saint-Priest, François Emmanuel Guignard comte de (1877): *Mémoires sur l'ambassade de France en Turquie*. Charles Schefer (ed.) (Publications de l'école des langues orientales vivantes VI). Paris.
- Sanderus, Anthonius (1624): *De scriptoribus flandriae libri tres*. Antwerp.
- Saurau, Michael von (1987): *Orttenliche Beschreybung der Rayß gehen Constantinopel, mit der Pottschaft von Kaysser maxmillian dem anderen in die dürgkey abgeferdigt, anno im 15:67*. Konrad Wickert (ed.) (Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A. Geisteswissenschaften. Band XL). Erlangen.
- Schaendlinger, Anton C. (ed.) (1983): *Die Schreiben Süleymāns des Prächtigen an Karl V., Ferdinand I. und Maximilian II. aus dem Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv zu Wien*. 2 Vols (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften CLXIII). Vienna.
- Schaendlinger, Anton C. (ed.) (1986): *Die Schreiben Süleymāns des Prächtigen an Vasallen, Militärbeamte, Beamte und Richter*. 2 Vols (Osmanisch-Türkische Dokumente aus dem Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv zu Wien II). Vienna.
- Schweigger, Salomon (1964): *Ein neue Reyssbeschreibung auss Teutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem*. Rudolf Neck (ed.) (Frühe Reisen und Seefahrten in Originalberichten III). Graz.
- Secret, François (1964): *Les kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance* (Collection Sigma V). Paris.
- Setton, Kenneth, M. (1976–1984): *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*. 4 Vols (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society Held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge CXIV, CXXVII, CLXI–CLXII). Philadelphia.
- S[ilverman], G. E. (1971): Veltwyck, Gerard. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Vol. 16, p. 89.
- Sleidanus, Johannes (1968): *De statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo Quinto caesaere commentarii*. 3 Vols. Osnabrück.
- Spuler, Bertold (1935): Die europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel bis zum Frieden von Belgrad (1739). *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven N.F.* Vol. 11, pp. 316–366.
- Sugar, Peter F. (1977): *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354–1804* (A History of East Central Europe V) Seattle–London.
- Teplý, Karl ([1968]): *Kaiserliche Gesandtschaften ans Goldene Horn*. (Bibliothek klassischer Reiseberichte). Stuttgart–Hamburg.
- Testa, Ignace de (1864–1911): *Recueil des traités de la Porte ottomane avec les puissances étrangères depuis le premier traité conclu, en 1536, entre Suleyman I et François I jusqu'à nos jours*. 11 Vols (Bibliothèque Diplomatique). Paris.
- Tex, Jan den (1959): Nederlandse studenten in de rechten te Padua, 1545–1700. *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Historisch Instituut te Rome*. Vol. 10, pp. 45–165.
- Toison d'Or. *Cinq siècles d'Art et d'Histoire*. (1962). Bruges.
- Tommaseo, M. N. (ed.) (1838): *Relations des ambassadeurs vénitiens sur les affaires de France au XVI^e siècle*. 2 Vols (Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France XLVIII). Paris.
- Tucker, George Hugo (1998): To Louvain and Antwerp, and beyond: The Contrasting Itineraries of Diogo Pires (Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus, 1511–99) and João Rodrigues de Castelo Branco (Amatus Lusitanus, 1511–1568). In: L. Dequeker–Werner Verbeke (eds): *The Expulsion of the Jews and their Emigration to the Southern Low Countries (15th–16th C.)*, pp. 83–113 (Mediaevalia Lovaniensia. Series I: Studia XXVI). Leuven.
- Turnbull, William B. (ed.) (1861): *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Edward VI (1547–1553)*. London.
- Ursu, Jon (1908): *La politique orientale de François I^{er} (1515–1547)*. Paris.
- Vaughan, Dorothy M. (1954): *Europe and the Turk. A Pattern of Alliances. 1350–1700*. Liverpool.

- Vocht, Henri de (1951–1955): *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517–1550*. 4 Vols. Louvain.
- Vocht, Henri de (ed.) (1959): *Stephani Vinandi Pighii Epistolarium* (Humanistica Lovaniensa XV). Louvain.
- Vocht, Henri de (1961): *John Dantiscus and his Netherlandish Friends as Revealed by their Correspondence. 1522–1546* (Humanistica Lovaniensa XVI). Leuven.
- Weiss, Charles (ed.) (1841–1852): *Papiers d'état du cardinal de Granvelle*. 9 Vols (Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France 48). Paris.
- Wheatcroft, Andrew (1993): *The Ottomans*. London.
- Wiegand, Hermann (1984): *Hodoeporica: Studien zur neulateinischen Reisedichtung des deutschen Kulturraums im 16. Jahrhundert*. Baden-Baden.
- Yerasimos, Stéphane (1991): *Les voyageurs dans l'empire ottoman (XIV^e–XVI^e siècles). Bibliographie, itinéraires et inventaire des lieux habités*. Ankara.
- Zinkeisen, Johann Wilhelm (1840–1863): *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa*. Gotha.