

A LIFE ON THE MARCHES: THE CAREER OF DERVIŞ BEY

GÉZA DÁVID*
(Budapest)

The life-story of Derviş *bey* can be reconstructed with unusual accuracy. He came from an influential family, the Yahyapaşazade clan of Albanian origin. His father, Küçük Bali had a house in Jagodina. Derviş must have been born around 1500 since he is mentioned as a *tımar*-holder in the *sancak* of Zvornik as early as 1519. When his father became the *beylerbeyi* of Buda in 1542, Derviş was appointed commander of the Danube flotilla, a new post created specifically for him. When Szeged was taken early in 1543, he was elected to be the first district governor there. On 28 January 1545, he was nominated *sancakbeyi* of Székesfehérvár (Ístolni Belgrad). In late 1547 he was sent to administer the *liva* of Mohács. He held this office for almost 10 years, an exceptionally long period. His many duties can be illustrated by several hitherto unknown orders which were sent to him. At the same time, he did not forget Jagodina where he had a *cami* built and where – as Hans Dernschwam reported – he also settled some Hungarians. This is shown by a *defter* of Szendrő (Smederovo), in which several individuals with Hungarian names were registered.

On 4 February 1557, he was appointed to Avlonya, partly as a punishment for the unsuccessful siege of Szigetvár in 1556. Four days later, however, he was allowed to return to Szeged. As in Pécs, he was again charged with the preparation of the new cadastral surveys of some of the Hungarian *sancaks*.

Derviş *bey* vanishes from sight around 1560/1561. In all likelihood he died either in Hungary or on his way to Jagodina.

Key words: Ottoman Hungary, administration, prosopography, biography.

The lives of Ottoman officials are not always easy to follow: given the large number of identically named individuals cropping up at various points around the Empire, it is often difficult to determine who is who. Fortunately, the above does not apply to the subject of this essay, Derviş *bey*. Since he always served in the same part of the Empire, we may follow the main steps in his career with considerable certainty.

The origins of Derviş *bey* are relatively well known to us, which cannot be said of other Ottoman leaders. Nevertheless, the narrative sources relate two different family backgrounds. Consequently, several authors consider Derviş to be the son of

* Géza Dávid, Department of Turkish and Turkic Studies, ELTE, Budapest, H-1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 4/D, Hungary. e-mail: davidgeza@hotmail.com

Yahyapaşazade Mehmed,¹ while others refer to him as the descendent of Küçük Bali, the second Pasha of Buda and a relative of the Yahyapaşazades.² The issue is laid to rest by a note recorded in February/March 1553 in the *tumar ruznamçesi* of Buda. The note states that several villages received by Derviş *bey*, the son of Bali Pasha, from the *mirliva* of Vidin, Bali *bey*, were given to Hasan, the *sancakbeyi* of İnebahtı.³ We may conclude, on the basis of this information, that Derviş *bey* belonged to an Albanian clan⁴ that held important positions for several generations and was very influential in both the Balkans and Hungary between the late fifteenth century⁵ and 1560.

The family house mentioned by Dernschwam (cf. note 2) had two floors and a wide courtyard. It was situated in Jagodina⁶ and was cared for by a priest who had been captured in Miskolc(!).⁷

We do not know exactly when Derviş was born. Since he appears as a timariot in the *defter* of Zvornik compiled in 1519,⁸ it seems possible that he was born around 1500. His family background gave him a good start in life, and the amount of his prebends was quite substantial, by contemporary standards.⁹ He was able to acquire knowledge of military affairs and public administration by mixing with his high-ranking relatives. It seems, therefore, that he spent only a small amount of time in Istanbul. When his father became Pasha of Buda, Derviş was taken along too. A post was found, or more accurately created, for him, the position of *kapudanlık* of Buda.¹⁰

¹ E. g. Káldy-Nagy (1970a, p. 66).

² Thus for instance Hans Dernschwam (1984, p. 144): “That night, we stayed at the house of Derviş *bey*, which had been erected by his father, Küçük Bali *bey*.” For contradictory accounts of Küçük Bali, see Römer (1989, p. 24, note 4). For a short biography of Derviş *bey*, in which Bali Pasha is accepted as his father – mainly on the basis of an article by Bojanić – see Köhbach (1994, pp. 224–227, note 108).

³ Wien, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Ehemalige Konsularakademie, Krafft 284, f. 14r (hereinafter: Krafft 284).

⁴ Hedda Reindl (1983, p. 336) writes this about Yahya Pasha referring to Sanuto. Safvet Beg Bašagić (1931, p. 37) placed him among the Croats, Bosnians, and Hercegovinans serving the Ottomans, but did not state his exact origins.

⁵ Apart from two periods as the *beylerbeyi* of Anatolia (before 1480 and between 1502 and 1504), Yahya Pasha was based in the European territories. In addition to being *bey* of Bosnia and Nicopol, he was granted the governorship of Rumelia three times: Reindl (1983, pp. 335–345). His sons Bali and Mehmed later headed *sancaks* (Szendrő, Vidin): Zirojević (1974, pp. 262, 264: The data do not always seem reliable).

⁶ For other assets, see Köhbach (1994, p. 226).

⁷ Dernschwam (1984, p. 144).

⁸ Handžić (1986, pp. 52–53). – Based on another article by Handžić, Bojanić (1985, p. 63) refers to him as a spahi from 1528–1530 only. The difference stems from the fact that changes occurred in the composition of the prebend during the later periods in question, and these were carefully recorded, while the original date of the *defter*’s compilation was ten years earlier – as was convincingly demonstrated by the publisher in 1986.

⁹ According to the data cited, in circa 1530 he was due 10,000 *akçe*, which in 1531 increased to 11,144 *akçe*: Handžić (1986, p. 53). Owing to the poor quality of the facsimile, it is impossible to check how well the rather complicated notes, in which at first he owned the incomes of the listed villages with two other individuals, were translated.

¹⁰ Köhbach (1994, pp. 224–255): on the basis of chronicle material, which I have not been able to support with archival sources. In the *ruzmançe* of the Court, mention is made only of Bali’s

When Szeged fell to the Ottomans, at which time Bali was probably still alive, Derviş was given the *sancak* established there.¹¹

Owing to the dearth of Ottoman sources stemming from this period, we are unable to present the actions and local measures of the first district governor of Szeged. It seems certain, however, that within a few months of his arrival a system of defence had been established and the collection of taxes had begun.¹² The fact that his services were counted upon in the campaign of 1543 is proof of this consolidation. Derviş did not move forward with the main troops but was sent off in the direction of Vienna with the task of taking captives who might provide information. He was also expected to halt an eventual advance by enemy troops, but was then directed to Vác ‘because the town was likely to be attacked by gıavour troops’. Two days later it became clear that there was no real danger, and thus Derviş was ordered to defend Pest and construct a pontoon bridge over the River Danube.¹³

He then spent at least one more year in Szeged. On 27 January 1545, two firmans were issued. One of them was addressed to the *beylerbeyi* of Buda and the other to Derviş. The commands informed the two men of the decision of the Court to appoint Derviş as the representative of the Sultan in Székesfehérvár.¹⁴ The initial part of the first *mühimme defteri* entry reads as follows:

“14 *Zilkade* 951 (27 January 1545), Dimetoka.

Order to the *beylerbeyi* of Buda: I have granted the *sancak* of İstolni Belgrad to Derviş, the present *sancakbeyi* of Segedin, may his glory be lasting, and I have appointed to the *sancak* of Segedin the son of Mihaloğlu Yahşi bey,¹⁵ --- [Hızır¹⁶] of the Rumelian *subaşı*s, that he should go there urgently.¹⁷ With this object, I have sent my lordly order with my *çavuş*. But until he [the *bey*] arrives there, the *sancak* of Segedin must be defended and guarded, therefore I have ordered that, without hesitation or delay, you should assign someone of the Aghas in Buda who is suitable and in whom you also trust and should send him to Segedin with a sufficient number of men, so that until the mentioned *sancakbeyi* arrives, he might guard and defend it, lest damage should befall this part of the country and province...¹⁸

two other sons, Ahmed and Mahmud. The relevant parts of the text illustrate that at some point in time, apart from the two *ziamet*-holder children, a third son (perhaps Derviş) also benefited from the *has*-estates of the father’s place of service, but unfortunately his name was not mentioned – in line with customary use: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Maliye defteri 34, ff. 683r, 684r.

¹¹ Cf. Szakály (1983, pp. 510–511).

¹² Szakály (1983, loc. cit.).

¹³ For details of Muradi/Sinan *çavuş*’s chronicle, see Thúry (1896, pp. 332, 336, 342–345).

¹⁴ The background to this matter was first exposed by Káldy-Nagy (1977, p. 8 and note 13), when he also referred to one of the commands translated below.

¹⁵ Gökbilgin (1987⁴, p. 290).

¹⁶ He is called thus a little later on in the *defter* in question (f. 82v). Cf. Berindei – Veinstein (1987, p. 224, note 71). Gökbilgin (1987⁴, p. 290) also notes that Yahşi *bey* had a son called Hızır.

¹⁷ Thus another member of an important Balkan clan came to Szeged.

¹⁸ Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi, D. 12321, f. 78v. The commands relating to Hungary of this *defter* and of volume K. 888 of Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi have been elaborated in co-operation with Pál Fodor under the auspices of the OTKA grant No. T 018358.

On the same day and from the same place, the following instruction was sent to Derviş *bey*:

“Order to Derviş, the *sancakbeyi* of Segedin: I now declare to you my generous high *şahi* mercies, and from this fifteenth day of *Zilkade* of the year 951 (28 January 1545) grant to you the *sancak* of İstolni Belgrad, with a salary 70,000 *akçe* higher than the sum of the *has*-estates of the *sancak* that is currently in your possession. In order to let this be known, I have sent from among the *çavuşes* of my high court Şüca¹⁹ – may his value increase – and I have ordered, that when my command which desires obedience arrives, you should not delay for a moment or a minute, but should go urgently to the fortress mentioned and join those who are there, and defend it and guard it! I have also arranged for the *çavuş* named to go with you to the mentioned fortress. When you arrive there, without hesitation or delay, you should hold a review by *bölük*, and find out how many of my servants in the fortress receiving salaries are currently present, and record accurately in a *defter* each unit with their names. Then you should seal it and send it with my *çavuş* as quickly as possible to my Threshold of Felicity!”²⁰

The above shows that there must have been considerable satisfaction with Derviş, because an increase in the prebend amounting to 70,000 *akçe* was rarely given to a *sancakbeyi* (normally they received 20,000–30,000 *akçe*) and in the case of Derviş, who was at the beginning of his career, this amount represented between one-third and one-quarter of his previous salary.

The sources do not allow us to expand upon Derviş’s years in Székesfehérvár either. We hear of him or of his men in the context of certain property deals only. This interesting list of data includes details of the sale of houses in Székesfehérvár and the taking into possession of fields in the surrounding area, as well as information on several rather valuable mills and vineyards that were parts of the neighbouring *sancak* of Simontornya. Derviş acquired possession of several fields and mills, including a probably rather valuable piece of land formerly belonging to Ferenc and Orbán Batthyány, notable landlords in the region. In Ozora he bought the mill of Bálint Török,²¹ a protagonist of the period, paying not less than 10,000 *akçe* for it.²² His *voyvoda* Mustafa became the owner of the house of a clergyman as well as a field

¹⁹ Şüca appears fifteen years later as a deliverer of letters, interestingly on Hungarian and Transylvanian territory once again – this is probably no accident: 3 [üç] *numaralı* (1993, pp. 183–184, Nos 407–408).

²⁰ D. 12321, f. 78v.

²¹ As we know from other sources, this mill had eight wheels and, as well as being the only mill in the *nahiye*, it was also the largest such facility in the whole of the *sancak*. Cf. Dávid (1982, pp. 106, 266, 274).

²² The importance of the mill is shown by the fact that in April 1560 its matter was brought before the Divan. Derviş complained that the millers gave from the profits of the mills close to Ozor[a] (the issuers of the document read it as Uzur) an annual sum of 2,000 *akçe* to a certain Turak Baltaoğlu, who had grown bold and was now demanding half of the revenue. The Court naturally forbade this abuse (but there is also a reference to “peace and friendship”, as if the issue had been broached from beyond the borders). The interesting aspect of the matter is that it is unclear on what legal basis Turak Baltaoğlu had a claim on the mill of the *bey*, and why Derviş could not resolve the matter using his own authority. Cf. 3 [üç] *numaralı* (1993, p. 425, No. 946).

(*mezraa*), while one of his men called Bayezid became the owner of a residential building.²³

From here, Derviş once again moved south, becoming the head of the *liva* of Mohács and Pécs. He is mentioned as the holder of this post in a recently discovered *ruus defteri* under a respective note dated on 26 September 1550. The statement adds that he had previously been serving in Székesfehérvár.²⁴ Still, the date of the entry cannot be the day on which he was transferred to Pécs, for on 21 March 1549 he recorded his rank in the following manner: “Nos Derwyzbek Locumtenenens Sacre Cesaree Mattis in Quinque ecclesiis.”²⁵ And although he then states that “ever since the great emperor honoured me with Pécs, I have not committed highway robbery with my people or rushed to a fortress”, unfortunately he forgot to indicate when he had been appointed. Based on the text of the document, my impression is that he summarised his experiences stretching back over a longer period in it.

We come closer to answering this question if we consider that according to the central list cited above, until 15 December 1547, the date of his appointment as the *beylerbeyi* of Buda, Kasım *bey* administered the affairs of the *liva* of Székesfehérvár.²⁶ On this basis, it appears highly probable that some time before this Kasım and Derviş exchanged places.

In the following years, we come across Derviş so often that we may consider him to be an official in Pécs for the whole period. Thus, in the autumn of 1550, he suffered a defeat in the marshes of the River Rinya at the hands of the lord of Babócsa, András Báthori. This event is mentioned as late as 5 January 1552.²⁷ Antal Verancsics, the bishop of Pécs, recalled his battlefield feats in a fragment written in Latin in 1551.²⁸ In 1550–1552 it was he who compiled the cadastral surveys of the *sancak* of Simontornya.²⁹

In early 1552 the establishment of a *sancak* of Görözsgal was raised. Derviş received quite a free hand in this matter, and this is reflected in the first firman addressed to him concerning this issue:

“23 *Rebiülevvel* 959.³⁰ (19 March 1552)

Order to Derviş, the *bey* of Mihaç: the *beylerbeyi* of Budun has proposed that it would be appropriate to turn Gırıjgal into an independent *sancak*. Since there is full lordly trust in the courage and abilities of the *bey* of Östörgon, Derya, I have ap-

²³ Velics – Kammerer (1890, pp. 51, 53, 54).

²⁴ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Bâb-ı âsafî, Ruûs kalemi, 1452, Buda part, p. 5; the name of the *liva* is Mohács and Siklós. Published by Emecen – Şahin (1999, pp. 61–62).

²⁵ Szalay (1861, p. 57, No. XLIX). One can only agree with Szalay that another letter, which seems to have been dated 1540 and to have been sent by Derviş *bey* from Pécs, was in fact written in 1549 (Szalay, 1861, pp. 11–12, No. XIII). This is confirmed by the fact that Pál Istvánffy, who is welcomed in the letter as a new arrival in Szigetvár, performed his examination there between 10 March and 1 April 1549. See Timár (1989, p. 37).

²⁶ Bâb-i âsafî, Ruûs kalemi, 1452, Buda part, p. 1. Cf. Emecen – Şahin (1999, pp. 61).

²⁷ Öze (1996, I, pp. 82–83, No. 18 and note 2 pertaining to it).

²⁸ Verancsics (1857, pp. 257, 258, 262).

²⁹ Dávid (1982, p. 15 and note 33).

³⁰ The letter in question was given to a *çavuş* called Mahmud for dispatch on the same day.

pointed the named one to the *sancak* mentioned; and he should live in either Gırıjgal or Şikloş, according to whichever is more suitable. The [amount of the] *has*-estates of the *sancak* is two hundred and fifty thousand *akçe*. Ensure for him the places surveyed by you, and send the *tezkere* to my gate. If it seems better that Şikloş should also belong to the above-mentioned *sancak*, then do accordingly.”³¹

About three weeks later, however, he received the following instruction:
“14 *Rebiülahir* 959.³² (9 April 1552)

Order to Derviş, the *bey* of Mihaç: I have recently given the *sancak* of Gırıjgal to Derya *bey*, and I have sent an order to you that, depending on whichever is more suitable, you should grant (!) Şikloş or Gırıjgal to him. My decree is valid. Now your letter has come, in which you let it be known that it is not wise to detach Gırıjgal from the *sancak* of Mihaç. Well, you were entrusted with this matter. I ordered you to grant (!) him either Şikloş or the fortress mentioned, whichever you considered the more suitable, and to send a *tezkere* about this (!), so that his *berat* could be issued.”³³

The above firmans are interesting because, on the one hand, they illuminate early ideas concerning possible changes to the territory of the extensive *sancak* of Mohács and, on the other hand, they invest Derviş with powers (which I have indicated with exclamation marks) that were not normally enjoyed even by the *beyler-beyis*. This is a further indication of the effect of the prestige of his family, which was doubtless enhanced by his own capabilities.

A highly interesting firman from *Ramazán* 959, i.e. August–September 1552, reveals that Derviş *bey* took part in the important battle of Palást on 9–10 August. He took up a position in the left-hand military column with Arslan, *bey* of Hatvan, Bayram, *bey* of Szerém, Halil, *bey* of Esztergom, the unnamed *bey* of Simontornya,³⁴ and Mahmud, *bey* of Szekszárd, as well as Hızır, *mal defterdarı* of Buda, and Mehmed, *kapudan* of Buda.³⁵ From there he proceeded to Eger.³⁶

The next piece of data referring to him concerns a decision made on 27 December 1553 to reward a converted man who had earlier been recommended by him.³⁷ Turkish sources refer to him once again on 24 February 1554,³⁸ while a letter from Korokna in October relates anxiously that Derviş had set out towards the fortress with three of his fellow *beyis*.³⁹ In July 1555 Ákos Csányi was informed that Kasım Pasha (of Temesvár) and Derviş *bey* were considering a renewed action in So-

³¹ K. 888. f. 123r.

³² The firman in its final form was received by Durmuş *çavuş*, also on *Rebiülahir* 14, so that he would take it to Pécs.

³³ K. 888. f. 158v.

³⁴ At the time, it was Ahmed *bey*: Dávid (1982, p. 27).

³⁵ K. 888 f. 415r–v.

³⁶ See e. g. Tinódi (1984, p. 246).

³⁷ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Mühimme defteri 1. p. 236 (218), No. 1362.

³⁸ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Kepeci 210, p. 311: he requested a *ziamet* for the 25 years old son of the deceased *bey* of Simontornya, to whom, when Szeged was under threat, a *timar* worth 10,000 *akçe* had been granted.

³⁹ Szalay (1861, p. 138, No. CXLVIII).

mogy county:⁴⁰ in actual fact, Kaposvár and Korokna fell to the Ottomans in September 1555. Some of the sources do not mention him among the men taking part in the siege,⁴¹ while others clearly confirm his presence there.⁴² Thus, in December he was boasting – again in a letter dictated in Pécs – that the Sultan had given him the two places,⁴³ while his brother had received Babócsa.⁴⁴

Nevertheless, even while he was busying himself on the Hungarian frontier, he did not forget his family base in Jagodina. When, in 1555, Antal Verancsics and his party were returning home after their long diplomatic journey, they stopped here for a second time. Hans Dernschwam related this episode in the following manner: “When at that time, two years ago, we set out towards the interior of the country, we stayed in the house of Derviş bey, which now was full of his men, and therefore we spent the night in the house next to the *cami* that is currently being built. ... Jagoda ... today ... cannot even be compared with a village, only inasmuch as Derviş bey is having a new mosque built according to Turkish custom. ... Here in Jagoda next to the mosque, which Derviş bey is having the stones of churches and buildings raised in the name of the devil and for the salvation of his soul, we found great pieces of red marble ... it seems that they were brought here from elsewhere, that is, from wherever Derviş bey may have spotted them; he is the chief of Pécs and thinks nothing of stealing and robbing, if this will glorify his name.”⁴⁵ Thus, it is not possible to determine exactly when construction of the *cami* began, but it must have been after 5 August 1553, because the attentive Dernschwam made no mention of the construction work on the outward journey to Istanbul.

⁴⁰ Őze (1996, I, p. 141, No. 57).

⁴¹ Celalzade Mustafa's highly decorative and – as regards the names – accurate list, which includes the men who fought alongside Toygun Pasha, fails to mention the name of the leader of Mohács–Pécs along with his two southern colleagues: Thury (1896, pp. 273–274).

⁴² According to Kepeci 214, p. 6, the prebends of the following *beys* were raised for their heroism there: Székesfehérvár – Arslan, Mohács – Derviş, Nógrád – Süleyman, Görözsgál – Ahmed, Hatvan – Mehmed, Szekszárd – Sinan, Simontornya – Mahmud, Koppány – Nasuh, Szendrő – Rüstem, Zvornik – Bayram, the former *bey* of Esztergom – Ahmed. According to a contemporary Hungarian source, all of the *beys* in Transdanubia took part in the action: Szalay (1861, pp. 160–161, No. CLXXVI); cited in Thury (1896, p. 274, note 4).

⁴³ Szalay (1861, p. 174, No. CXCI). These two settlements are not mentioned in the list of his *has*-estates examined below, although there is mention of his heroism shown when they were captured, for which he received an increase of 40,000 *akçe*: Krafft 284, f. 428v. See also Kepeci 214, p. 6, where it is stated that, apart from him, all of the *beys* that took part in the action received a uniform “premium” of 20,000 *akçe*. His amount was greater because some of his *has*-lands had become the property of the Sultan; thus compensation for these lands comprised the villages designated for him in the territories conquered around Szent-Jakab, Kaposvár, Babócsa, and Korokna. The date of this note was 12 November 1555. A few pages further on (*ibid.* p. 9), several additional details of the matter are given: he allowed 150,000 *akçe* worth of his prebends (total value 400,000 *akçe*) to be transferred to the treasury from the *nahiyes* of Mohács, Szekcső, Baranyvár, and Harsány, including the town of Siklós.

⁴⁴ The man in question was called Ahmed and, as we have seen, he had been the *bey* of Görözsgál earlier on; his service in Babócsa began on 12 November 1555. See Kepeci 214, p. 5.

⁴⁵ Dernschwam (1984, pp. 481–482).

Another interesting point from a cultural historical perspective is the letter of Ákos Csányi of 1 April 1556. In the letter Csányi requests Tamás Nádasdy to send to the scribe of Derviş *bey* “some good Christian books” with the ulterior motive of winning over the scribe and, via him, perhaps his superior as well.⁴⁶

Our hero’s fine taste and love of grandeur is illustrated by a piece of data according to which in return for freeing a *voynoda* called Ferruh,⁴⁷ a demand was made for a tent worth 800 golden coins “with its courtyard and seat; such like the main tent of Derviş *bey* when he is in battle with the person of the emperor”.⁴⁸ We might say that the battle tent of the leader of Mohács and Pécs served as an etalon on the frontier. Nevertheless, there is no trace of his construction work either in the city or in other parts of the *sancak*. It seems that he concentrated his building efforts on Jagodina.

It is worth briefly mentioning that, according to Dernschwam, Derviş settled Hungarians in Jagodina. Dernschwam refers to this fact both on the outward journey to Istanbul and on the return journey. On the first occasion, he mentions the priest from Miskolc, who “performs the mass in both kinds, christening the Hungarians, and preaching to them, and is a married man”. Almost two years later, he stressed that “Many Hungarians – with wives and children – have arrived in Jagoda at the invitation of the *bey* in question. The *bey* has detained them; as I have already mentioned, they have a Hungarian priest”.⁴⁹

Part of the above report indicating that the district governor of Pécs had sent men to the region, is confirmed by the letter of Johann Maria Malvezzi written in Edirne on 29 March 1551. In his letter Malvezzi states that Rüstem Pasha showed him 45 chained Heyducks that had just been caught near Szigetvár and had been directed here by Derviş *bey*.⁵⁰ It is quite possible that Derviş subsequently had the captives returned to Jagodina, settling them on his own territory. One particular *defter* from Szendrő,⁵¹ which is undated but – as will become apparent – must have been compiled after 1560,⁵² when mentioning the *kasaba* of Jago-

⁴⁶ Öze (1996, I, pp. 218–219, No. 118).

⁴⁷ Ferruh seems to be identical to someone who was mentioned as one of Derviş *bey*’s men and who, in 1546 and 1552, had two *çifliks* in the *nahiye* of Anyavár: Dávid (1982, pp. 264, Nos 12a, 16a, 266–267, and in 1552: p. 272, Nos 13a, 18a). The same person might have delivered the command sent to Derviş, the *bey* of Szeged, in 1559, who was again referred to as the “man” of the district governor: 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 58, No. 118).

⁴⁸ Öze (1996, II, p. 302, No. 431). Date: 21 August, 1561.

⁴⁹ Dernschwam (1984, pp. 144, 481).

⁵⁰ *Austro-Turcica* (1995, p. 565, No. 215).

⁵¹ Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien, Türk. Hss. Mxt. 632 (Flügel) 1376.

⁵² In her earlier works, Olga Zirojević also dated it to the “fifties or sixties” (1966–67, p. 129) or as having been drawn up in the “sixties” (1970, p. 139). Most recently, she referred to it as a survey dating from “after 1536” (1987, pp. 85–86). – For establishing when the *defters* of Szendrő were compiled, see also Heywood (1991, pp. 225–228). According to Heywood, two Viennese fragments – the Mxt. 632 and 629 = Flügel No. 1375 – are closely related and were copied out at some point in time between 1540 and 1545 (p. 227 and note 16, p. 228). We have to reject this date, at least as regards the volume in which we are interested. We know from other sources that a *tahrir defteri* was completed here between 7 and 16 April 1560: Bojanić (1974, p. 51). It is possible that a slightly later copy of this is preserved in the Nationalbibliothek. I should also mention that

dina,⁵³ refers to his forty married and ten unmarried non-manumitted slaves.⁵⁴ After the death of their owner, these men were assigned a place of residence in Dobranje, an uninhabited area (*mezraa*) near Jagodina. The list of names shows – after some analysis – that many of these slaves were Hungarians.⁵⁵ Of course, it is possible that they are not the same group as that mentioned in 1551, but even if their origins were different, this does not alter the essential point.⁵⁶

The *defter* in question contains another surprising piece of information: in the *nahiye* of Lefçe,⁵⁷ after the villages of Doşna (?) and Banik (?), there are Hungarians⁵⁸ among the servants (*bendegan*) of the respective *çiftliks* of the *mirliva* of Temesvár, Mustafa *bey*.⁵⁹ Here, however, the numbers are smaller than in the case of the “Hungarians” mentioned above. I have not examined systematically all of the *tahrir defteri* for Hungarians, but since this evidence cropped up, I decided to cite it here, given that similar specific references to individuals from Hungary who were settled in the Balkans as captives are quite rare.

the supplementary nature of the two Viennese *defter* is not entirely certain; the same hand did not write them, and several *nahiye* are repeated in them.

⁵³ Pages 116–117 (the page numbers are given on the basis of Zirojević, the photocopy at ELTE University is not numbered).

⁵⁴ In the heading, they are referred to as *bendegan*, i.e. servants, and in the explanation we find the expression *azadsuz kullar*, which corresponds to the above translation.

⁵⁵ Petri the son of Mátyás, Máté the son of Mihál, Vitán (?) the son of Alberd (= Vitán Alberd), Huszti the son of Kelemen (= Huszti Kelemen), Bányi* the son of Jákob (= Bányi Jákob), Márton the son of Gergör, Horvát the son of János (= Horvát János), ... the son of Imre (= ... Imre), Szente the son of Lórinç (= Szente Lórinç), Borsós the son of János (= Borsós János), Kaptár* the son of András (= Kaptár András), Kozma the son of Mihál (= Kozma Mihál), Kozma the son of Gáspár (= Kozma Gáspár), Bakos the son of Pál (= Bakos Pál), Sárkezi the son of János (= Sárkezi János), Arsók (?) the son of Imre (= Arsók Imre), Pál the son of Imre, István the son of Ágoston, Ács the son of Balázs (?) (= Ács Balázs), Szentei the son of Balás (?) (= Szentei Balás). The other names are less certain, thus Keszer Lukács, Keszer Isztovi (?), and Keszer Mihál, Nagy Bendi (?), Göker (?) Pál, and others. There are some people who seem to be of Slav background, as well as a converted man called Korkud the son of Bendöl (?).

⁵⁶ After the registering of the inhabitants and taxes of the small town into the cited *defter*, we may read the following comment, which is worth mentioning because it applies to Hungary: “The mentioned *kasaba* of Jagodina is a public passing place, there is no shortage of comers and goers and [its inhabitants] take care of the money coming from the Threshold of Felicity to Buda and of the *akçe* of the fortress soldiers serving in the *sancaks* of Pojega, Segedin, and Mihaç, who receive their pay from *mukataas* in the form of transfer, and when these sums arrive, they help to forward them as far as the *derbend* village called Lokofça (?), and who anyway serve the treasury continuously. Since they have in their hands a command that in return the inhabitants of the mentioned *kasaba* should be exempt from paying the extraordinary war tax (*avarız-i divaniye*) for as long as there is no lack of their service, it has been recorded in the new *defter* that according to the noble command they shall be exempt from the extraordinary war tax.”

⁵⁷ “Levač, a district of Central Serbia between the mountain ranges of Gledička Planina and Juhor west of the Morava river.” Cf. Römer (1994, p. 299, note 20).

⁵⁸ For example, Girgor, that is Gergely – Hungarian; Petri – Hungarian; Imre – Hungarian; again wrongly: Radosav – Hungarian.

⁵⁹ For the background to this matter, whereby the centre of the *vilayet* of Temesvár became Lippa for a temporary period, while Temesvár itself became the seat of the *sancak* where in 1558 Mustafa is referred to as *bey*, see Dávid (2000, p. 292, note 176).

Returning to the career in Hungary of Derviş *bey*, we find that on 4 April 1556 the decision was taken in Istanbul that he should receive back 50,000 *akçe* from his revenues of 150,000 *akçe* that had been transformed into sultanical *has*.⁶⁰

A new list of his prebends was compiled at some point in time after November 1555. In that year he must have received revenues amounting to 441,190 *akçe* from the *nahiyes* of Pécs, Szentlőrinc, Szentmárton, Szekcső, Harsány, Siklós, Görözsgal, Szász, Sellye, Baranyavár, and Korokna. In addition, he had a landed property consisting of four parts and worth 12,000 *akçe* in the *nahiye* of Lefçe in the *sancak* of Szendrő, above which it was written: “wherever he owns a *sancak*, it should be included in the *has*es.” (One of the four villages was Jagodina itself with 8,668 *akçe*, while the third was Dobranje – “near Jagodina” – with 332 *akçe*,⁶¹ i.e. exactly the two villages in the area that have been mentioned in connection with the Hungarians.) Of the major settlements, Derviş received all non-treasury revenue from the towns of Pécs, Pellérd, Szentlőrinc, Szentmárton, Siklós, Kálmánca, Lábad, Szigetvár (!), and Marcal. I should mention that 146,134 *akçe* of the complete sum came from places whose tax-paying capacities could be determined only on the basis of estimates or agreement (i.e. with the agreement of Derviş *bey*).⁶² In such areas, which had not been fully conquered, the amount of tax collected was dependent upon the skill of the prebend-holder. Clearly, Szigetvár belonged in this category, as it was far from being under the control of the Ottomans.

One of the last proposals made by Derviş in his capacity as the *bey* of Mohács and Pécs, was deliberated in Istanbul on 24 November 1556.⁶³ In the proposal Derviş requested that the villages assigned to the brave soldiers of the 1555 siege of Kaposvár should be exchanged for settlements closer to where they were serving.

Shortly afterwards, probably as a result of the machinations of the Pasha of Buda, who considered Derviş to be partly responsible for the defeat at Szigetvár in 1556,⁶⁴ a decree was issued by the Porte on 4 February 1557 providing for Derviş's transfer to Avlonya (now Valona, Albania), a town at some considerable distance.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Mühimme defteri 2, p. 50, No. 453.

⁶¹ In Mxt. 632 the revenues of the *kasaba* (perhaps including Dobranje, which was not counted separately this time) already amounted to 11,843 *akçe*. The taxes of the village of Rahnik or Račnik rose in a similar manner from 1,500 to 3,921. Sredna Bunifçe/Budinçe (?), which also paid 1,500 *akçe* in 1555, cannot be found in the later *defter*. It is important to note that the very same places also constituted the old parts of the *has*es of Derviş's father, Bali Pasha as the *beyler-beyi* of Buda in the form of *çiftlik*. Dobranje figures here with 337 *akçe* and the total is 12,005 *akçe*. Cf. Maliye defteri 34, f. 635v.

⁶² Krafft 284, ff. 427r–428v.

⁶³ Mühimme defteri 2, p. 18, No. 1700. See also *ibid.* pp. 51, No. 469; 55, No. 507. Both are dated 2 April 1556.

⁶⁴ The siege was still underway when he complained about Derviş: Szalay (1861, p. 193, No. CCX).

⁶⁵ Mühimme defteri 2, p. 208, No. 1882. – According to Vass (1977, p. 94, note 4), he had already been dismissed in 1555, and replaced by a cavalryman from Pécs called Mehmed. It seems that this is some kind of misunderstanding, for Derviş was definitely still in office in Pécs in 1555. Such a document is to be found neither in the catalogue issued by Petritsch (1991, *passim*) nor in the texts published by Schaendlinger and Römer (1986, *passim*). What does arise and may be read

Four days later, however, the decision was modified and Derviş was allowed to make a return to Szeged.⁶⁶

Thus, in total, Derviş *bey* spent nearly ten years in Pécs, which is a considerable length of time by both local and imperial standards.⁶⁷

Even after his transfer to Szeged, Derviş continued to keep an eye on his former place of employment. Thus, on one occasion he informed the Court that the road via Mohács had been closed due to a shortage of garrison troops, which meant that travellers to the *vilayet* of Buda were compelled to cross the Danube at Tolna.⁶⁸

Various sources allow us to follow the activities of Derviş *bey* in Szeged until August⁶⁹/September,⁷⁰ and even until October 1560.⁷¹ During this period, other obligations often took him away from the area. For instance, he had to stand in for the *beylerbeyi* of Buda temporarily. After he reported the death of Toygun Pasha to the Court,⁷² he received the following answer in a letter that was dispatched (and probably written) on 19 June 1559:

“Order to Derviş, *sancakbeyi* of Segedin: you have made it known by sending a letter that Toygun, *beylerbeyi* of Budun, has died. Now the *beylerbeyilik* mentioned has been entrusted to Rüstem, *beylerbeyi* of Temesvár, may his fortune last. I have ordered that until the named one arrives, you should not lose a moment or a minute in defending and guarding the *vilayet* of Budun, be careful lest damage and injury should befall the country and the province or the *reaya* and the subjects from the side of the enemy; be attentive as necessary, and bring forth various beautiful efforts.”⁷³

in a thorough transcription and translation in the latter work is an appointment on 25 August 1555, following a proposal by Derviş, the *bey* of Mohács (pp. 51–52, No. 33).

⁶⁶ Mühimme defteri 2, p. 209, No. 1896. Sinan *bey*, who was in charge of the much closer *sancak* of Yanya (Yanina), was appointed to Avlonya: *ibid.* p. 209, No. 1894.

⁶⁷ Dávid (1992, pp. 176–177), Kunt (1983, pp. 70–72).

⁶⁸ Mühimme defteri 4, p. 170, No. 1764.

⁶⁹ 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 614, No. 1415).

⁷⁰ Fekete – Káldy-Nagy (1962, p. 699).

⁷¹ The relevant *umar defteri* of the *sancak* of Szeged was compiled without reference to the month in the 986th year according to Hegira: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Tapu defteri 333, p. 1. The year in question lasted from 22 September 1560 until 10 September 1561. Given that in several of the administrative units of the *vilayet* the conscription works were undertaken in 1559, it would seem that the Szeged list was copied out in 1560 rather than in 1561.

⁷² Gévay (1841, 7, No. 6) indicated the time of death as the first third of June, based on the fact that news of the death reached the Ottoman capital on 20 June. We may add to this that some people knew of the matter already on 12 June. We do not know where the man in question was at the time. His letter informs of measures taken by the Sultan, which seems to suggest that he had not gathered his information in Hungary (Szalay 1861, pp. 329–330, No. CCCXXXVI). Interestingly, the deterioration in his condition is also referred to in the *ruzmançe* of Buda on 5 June 1559: Krafft 284, photocopy No. 622. Since the last known document issued by Toygun is dated 6 June (Petritsch, 1991, p. 133, No. 367), this is the earliest possible date of his death. The “posts” relating to the sorrowful news must have been rather quick since, even if we accept Gévay’s version of events, there was less than two weeks for the message to make its way to the capital. (Scholars have usually put the time taken by an express messenger from Buda to Istanbul at fifteen days – which, in the light of the above, appears to underestimate slightly human capabilities: de Groot, 1978, p. 3.)

⁷³ 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 6, No. 9).

Based on the above, we may conclude that Güzelce Rüstem was assigned to Buda at least two days earlier, as the envoy cited by Antal Gévay was informed.⁷⁴

It is probable that one of Derviş's tasks in the interim period was to release Velican, the former *bey* of Fülek. Velican had been dismissed from his post in November 1558 after an unsuccessful action against Szikszó and a serious defeat at the hands of Imre Telekessi and György Bebek at Sajókaza in Northern Hungary.⁷⁵ According to the contemporary Hungarian historian Miklós Istvánffy, Velican made his way to Istanbul to ask for mercy, but then poisoned himself when clemency was refused.⁷⁶ Still, two other *mühimme defteri* documents, both dispatched on 19 June 1559, contradict this: in the first of these, Velican himself was informed that he had been granted mercy and that Derviş *bey* was to release him from prison;⁷⁷ meanwhile, in the second, Derviş was instructed briefly to release Velican.⁷⁸ Since, however, we have no further records of the *bey* in question, we cannot be certain that the amnesty arrived in time.

Subsequently, Derviş was given the task of preparing the cadastral surveys of five *livas* of Ottoman Hungary. His successful and similar work in Simontornya must have been a good reference for this task. He was required to survey the *sancaks* of Buda, Hatvan, Fülek, Nógrád, and Szécsény.⁷⁹ He had to pay special attention to the drawing up of boundaries. This was pointed out to him on 23 December 1559:

“Order to Derviş, *sancakbeyi* of Segedin: since the boundaries of the *sancaks* of Filek, Novigrad, and Seçen – which you have been ordered to survey – were not clear or exact, there have been constant arguments and differences between their *sancakbeyis*. I have now ordered that when my [decree] arrives, [you should deal with the matter]. If the boundaries of the *sancaks* mentioned should not be clear and exact, but are blurred, go to the disputed places and, with the agreement of experts, indicate the boundaries at the appropriate places, and put signs there. But be completely just in this matter, and prevent anyone from being bothered.”⁸⁰

⁷⁴ Gévay (1841, p. 9, No. 11). – The cited anonymous source considered Hamza, Derwys (Derviş), Arzlam (Arslan), Banja (Bayram ?) *bey*, and Kazwn (Kasim) Pasha as possible candidates for succession, but in the end none of these men were appointed: Szalay (1861, p. 329, No. CCCXXXVI).

⁷⁵ Köhbach (1994, p. 293, note 440).

⁷⁶ Köhbach (1994, loc. cit.).

⁷⁷ “Order to Velican *bey*: you have sent a letter, and have asked for mercy for the forgiveness of your offences. Well, the forgiveness of offences and transgressions is the fine custom of my Threshold of Felicity, and thus I have put the sign of forgiveness on the scroll of your offence, and I have commanded that you should be freed from prison. In this matter, I have sent a noble decree to Derviş, *bey* of Segedin – may his glory be lasting – and have commanded him that when you are released in accordance with my decree, you should not cease to pray for the survival of my empire.” 3 [üç] *numaralı* (1993, p. 5, No. 7).

⁷⁸ 3 [üç] *numaralı* (1993, p. 6, No. 10).

⁷⁹ Káldy-Nagy (1977, p. 12); Köhbach (1994, p. 226).

⁸⁰ 3 [üç] *numaralı* (1993, pp. 291–292, No. 639). – Presumably because the binding of the *defter* was wrong, the *defter* contains another command dated 3 December in a different place. The firman was sent to Derviş after a petition from Mahmud, *bey* of Szécsény; and it mentions the disturbed nature of the borders in all five *sancaks* in question: *ibid.* 301, No. 663.

Without elaborating on this issue, I note that in 1546 the town of Gyöngyös was listed both in the *liva* of Hatvan and in the *liva* of Nógrád.⁸¹ Thus, Derviş's task of re-establishing the boundaries was no easy one.⁸²

It is difficult to determine whether or not the fair copies of the *tahrir defteris*, which are available to us in rough drafts only,⁸³ were prepared – like that of Füle.⁸⁴ Whatever may be the case, the surplus in the estimated revenues, arising mainly from an increase in the price of grain, was carefully calculated and proudly reported to the Sublime Porte. The Court then arranged for the whole sum of the increase, which amounted to 2,693,947 *akçe*, to be collected from appropriate places and made into treasury income.⁸⁵ At the same time, a distribution of *tumars* was undertaken in three or four of the *sancaks*.⁸⁶ This did not always result in the satisfaction of those involved, some of whom wished to follow the Hungarian practice and benefit from the incomes of the same villages on a continuous basis,⁸⁷ which of course contradicted the interests of the centre and Ottoman principles. Another example shows that he did not always make the right decision concerning boundaries.⁸⁸

In addition to this responsible task, Derviş also undertook the *cizye* collection of several Turkish “counties”.⁸⁹ A sign of his unbroken prestige throughout Ottoman Hungary is the fact that he was requested to investigate the affair of Ahmed, *bey* of Szécsény, and Mahmud, *mir-i alem* of Buda, who were jointly accused of having fled from the enemy and cowardice.⁹⁰

Just one single note of the *mühimme defteris* contains a specific reference to Szeged. After Derviş's proposal, which was sent to Istanbul through the mediation of the *beylerbeyi* of Buda, a decree of the Divan, which was debated on 19 May 1560 and dispatched three days later, gave consent for the roof of the warehouse in the fortress to be covered with tiles, lest the military materials stored in it be damaged. Although the estimated cost of 30,000 *akçe* was probably a realistic amount, as so often, the centre cautioned against unnecessary expenditure.⁹¹

It is possible to describe the *has*-estates of Derviş *bey* in the *sancak* of Szeged. In sum, these amounted to 310,373 *akçe*, including 116,292 *akçe* from the *nahiye* of Szeged, 23,681 from the *nahiye* of Titel, 43,119 from the *nahiye* of Bács, 50,930 from the *nahiye* of Solt, 26,145 from the *nahiye* of Zombor, and 50,206 from the *nahiye* of Kalocsa. The latter included the *sancakbeyi*'s *niyabet* revenue from the whole

⁸¹ Fekete (1968, pp. 37–42. The *defter* in question was probably compiled in 1546), and Tapu defteri 981, pp. 70–80.

⁸² Still, the centre was very confident about his capabilities, because they even promised John Sigismund and Queen Isabella that he would draw up the boundaries in the district of Szolnok together with Durmuş, *defterdar* of Temesvár: 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 71, No. 146).

⁸³ Tapu defteri 314, 318.

⁸⁴ Tapu defteri 343.

⁸⁵ Káldy-Nagy (1970b, pp. 45–46).

⁸⁶ Tapu defteri 329, 335.

⁸⁷ 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 314, No. 696).

⁸⁸ Karácson (1914, p. 71, No. 71), quoted by Köhbach (1994, p. 226).

⁸⁹ Fekete – Káldy-Nagy (1962, pp. 764–765) and passim.

⁹⁰ 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 317, No. 704).

⁹¹ 3 [üç] numaralı (1993, p. 510, No. 1157).

of the *liva*. Among the larger towns, the non-treasury tax income from Szeged and all other *nahiye* centres except Titel was due to Derviş, although one should add that the individual amounts were not particularly great.⁹² It seems that Derviş received supplementary sums from one or more *livas*, since it is unlikely that his prebends would have been reduced.

Derviş *bey* thus disappears from view in the autumn of 1560. What could have happened to him? Did he die as a sixty-year-old veteran here on the Hungarian frontier? This is suggested by the fact that only the drafts of several *tahrir defteris* were compiled. Or did something happen to him on the way to his beloved Jagodina? It is unlikely that he died in the village itself, because Evliya Çelebi makes no mention of his *türbe*, whereas he does list the soup-kitchen, baths, shops, and caravanserais next to the *cami*.⁹³

A solution to the puzzle may lie in the fact that in the above-mentioned *defter* of Szendrő, the only Muslim quarter of Jagodina is called “the *mahalle* of the noble *cami* of the deceased Derviş *bey*”. He is referred to as deceased when his servants are listed, when their taxes are detailed, and when their transfer is mentioned.⁹⁴ If we knew exactly when the *defter* was compiled, then the puzzle would be solved. But, despite my great efforts to discover the date, I have had no luck in this regard. One aspect is certain: since the 1560/1561 *tumar defteri* of Szeged refers to Derviş as an active *bey*, the Szendrő survey must have been compiled or copied afterwards. The reference to the tent from August 1561, which has been cited above, appears to extend the possible length of Derviş’s life, but we cannot exclude the possibility that the letter in question was written after his death.

I should also point out that, rather inexplicably, Ottoman chancellery data – so profuse in other periods – is rather scarce in the early 1560s. Thus, searching for a decision concerning the possible disgrace or dismissal of Derviş *bey*, it becomes obvious that there is almost nowhere to look. What is indisputable, however, is that the subsequent *mühimme defteri* stemming from 1564–1565 contains no mention of a high-ranking official called Derviş.⁹⁵ While this does not represent absolute proof of Derviş *bey*’s departure from the land of the living at some time between 1560/61 and August 1564, this would seem to be the most reasonable conclusion, above all in the light of the contents of the Szendrő *defter*.⁹⁶

⁹² Tapu defteri 333, pp. 6–7.

⁹³ Köhbach (1994, p. 226).

⁹⁴ Mxt. 632, loc. cit.

⁹⁵ 6 [altı] numaralı (1995, passim).

⁹⁶ The mill of Ozora was still listed under Derviş *bey*’s name in 1565, even though by that time it had become the property of Rüstem Pasha, the *beylerbeyi* of Buda between 1559 and 1563. In 1570 it appears as part of Rüstem’s pious foundation: Dávid (1982, pp. 289, 306).

References

- 6 [altı] numaralı (1995): *6 numaralı mühimme defteri (972/1564–1565) <Özet-Transkripsiyon ve Indeks>. I–II.* Ankara (T. C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü. Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı 28. Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn Sicilleri Dizisi III).
- Austro-Turcica* (1995): *Austro-Turcica 1541–1552. Diplomatische Akten des habsburgischen Gesandtschaftsverkehrs mit der Hohen Pforte im Zeitalter Süleymans des Prächtigen.* Bearbeitet von Srećko M. Džaja unter Mitarbeit von Günter Weiß. In Verbindung mit Mathias Bernath herausgegeben von Karl Nehring. München (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 95).
- Bašagić, S. B. (1931): *Znameniti Hrvati, Bošnjaci i Hercegovci u turski carevimi.* Zagreb.
- Berindei M.–Veinstein G. (1987): *L'Empire Ottoman et les pays roumains, 1544–1545. Etudes et documents.* Paris–Cambridge/USA.
- Bojanić, D. (1974): *Turski zakoni i zakonski propisi iz XV i XVI veka za smederevsku, kruševačku i vidinsku oblast.* Beograd (Zbornik za istočnjačku istorijsku i književnu građu 2).
- Bojanić, D. (1985): Požarevac u XVI veku i Bali-beg Jahjapašić. *Istorijski Časopis XXXII*, pp. 49–77.
- Dávid, G. (1982): *A Simontornyai szandzsák a 16. században.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Dávid, G. (1992): Die Bege von Szigetvár im 16. Jahrhundert. *WZKM in memoriam Anton C. Schaendlinger* 82 [1993], pp. 67–96.
- Dávid, G. (2000): An Ottoman Military Career on the Hungarian Borders: Kasım voyvoda, bey, and Pasha. In: *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe. The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest.* Ed. by G. Dávid and P. Fodor. Leiden–Boston–Köln, Brill (The Ottoman Empire and its Heritage No. 20), pp. 265–297.
- Dernschwam, H. (1984): *Erdély, Besztercebánya, Törökországi útinapló.* Közreadja Tardy Lajos. Budapest, Európa Könyvkiadó.
- Emecen, F. M.–Şahin, İ. (1999): Osmanlı taşra teşkilâtının kaynaklarından 957–958 (1550–1551) tarihli sancak tevcih defteri. *Belgeler* 23, pp. 53–121.
- Fekete, L. (1968): *A Hatvani szandzsák 1550. évi adóösszeírása.* Jászberény (Jászsági füzetek 4).
- Fekete, L.–Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1962): *Rechnungsbücher türkischer Finanzstellen in Buda (Ofen) 1550–1580. Türkischer Text.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Gévay, A. (1841): *A' budai pasák.* Bécs.
- Gökbilgin M. T. (1987⁴): Mihál-oğulları. *İA VIII*, İstanbul, pp. 285–292.
- de Groot, A. (1978): *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic. A History of the Earliest Diplomatic Relations, 1610–1630.* Leiden–İstanbul.
- Handžić, A. (1986): *Dva prva popisa zborničkog sandžaka (iz 1519. i 1533. godine).* Dešifrovan, preveo i obradio: Adem Handžić. Sarajevo.
- Heywood, C. (1991): The Evolution of the Ottoman Provincial Law-Code (Sancak Kānūn-nāme): The Kānūn-nāme-i Livā-i Semendire (I). *The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin XV/2*, [1992], pp. 223–251.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1970a): *Harács-szedők és ráják. Török világ a XVI. századi Magyarországon.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (Kőrösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 9).
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1970b): *Magyarországi török adóösszeírások.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből. Új sorozat, 52. Szerk. János Varga).
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1977): *A Budai szandzsák 1559. évi összeírása.* Budapest (Pest megye múltjából 3).
- Karácson, I. (1914): *Török–magyar oklevéltár, 1533–1789.* Szerk. Lajos Thallóczy, János Kracsma-rik, Gyula Szekfű. Budapest.

- Köhbach, M. (1994): *Die Eroberung von Fülele durch die Osmanen 1554. Eine historisch-quellenkritische Studie zur osmanischen Expansion im östlichen Mitteleuropa*. Wien–Köln–Weimar, Böhlau Verlag (Zur Kunde Südosteuropas II/18).
- Kunt, M. I. (1983): *The Sultan's Servants. The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government, 1550–1650*. New York (The Modern Middle East Series 14).
- Öze, S. (1996): *500 magyar levél a XVI. századból. Csányi Ákos levelei Nádasdy Tamáshoz, 1549–1562*. I–II. Kiadja Sándor Öze. Budapest.
- Petritsch, E. D. (1991): *Regesten der osmanischen Dokumente im Österreichischen Staatsarchiv. Band 1. (1480–1574)*. [Wien] (Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs, Ergänzungsband, 10/1).
- Reindl, H. (1983): *Männer um Bāyezid. Eine prosopographische Studie über die Epoche Sultan Bāyezids II. (1481–1512)*. Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 75).
- Römer, C. (1989): Einige Urkunden zur Militärverwaltung Ungarns zur Zeit Süleymāns des Prächtigen. *AOH* XLIII, pp. 23–80.
- Römer, C. (1994): On Some Häss-Estates Illegally Claimed by Arslan Pasha, Beglerbegi of Buda 1565–1566. In: *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*. Ed. by C. Heywood and C. Imber. Istanbul, pp. 297–318.
- Schaendlinger, A. C.–Römer, C. (1986): *Die Schreiben Süleymāns des Prächtigen an Vasallen, Militärbeamte, Beamte und Richter aus dem Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv zu Wien. Transkriptionen und Übersetzungen*. Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 183).
- Szakály, F. (1983): Török megszállás alatt (1543–1686). In: *Szeged története 1. A kezdetektől 1686-ig*. Szeged, pp. 499–738.
- Szalay Á. (1861): *Négy száz magyar levél a XVI. századból*. Pest.
- Thúry J. (1896): *Török történetirók. II. (1521–1566)*. Budapest.
- Timár Gy. (1989): *Királyi Sziget. Szigetvár várgazdaságának iratai, 1546–1565*. Pécs.
- Tinódi S. (1984): *Krónika*. Budapest.
- 3 [üç] numaralı (1993): *3 numaralı mühimme defteri (966–968/1558–1560) <Özet ve transkripsiyon>*. Ankara (T. C. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü. Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı 12. Dîvân-ı Hümayûn Sicilleri Dizisi I).
- Vass, E. (1977): A Szekcsői–Mohácsi szandzsák 1591. évi adóösszeírása. In: *Baranyai helytörténetírás 1977*. Pécs, pp. 15–93.
- Velics A.–Kammerer E. (1890): *Magyarországi török kincstári defterek. II*. Budapest.
- Verancsics A. (1857): Fragmentum rerum Hungaricarum anni M. DLI. In: *Verancsics Antal M. Kir. helytartó, esztergomi érsek összes munkái. I. Történelmi dolgozatok deák nyelven*. Közli László Szalay. Pest.
- Zirojević, O. (1966–67): Putopisi u ogledalu deftera. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* XVI–XVII [1970], pp. 125–134.
- Zirojević, O. (1970): Carigradski drum od Beograda do Sofije (1459–1683). Interesovanje za carigradski drum od XV veka do danas. In: *Zbornik Istorijskog Muzeja Srbije* 7, Beograd, pp. 3–196.
- Zirojević, O. (1974): *Tursko vojno uredjenje u Srbiji (1459–1683) – L'organisation militaire turque en Serbie (1459–1683)*. Beograd.
- Zirojević, O. (1987): Zur historischen Topographie der Heerstrasse nach Konstantinopel zur Zeit der osmanischen Herrschaft. Das Interesse an der Heerstrasse nach Konstantinopel vom 15. Jahrhundert bis heute. [I.] *Études Balkaniques* 1987/1, pp. 81–106.