

BATHS IN OTTOMAN HUNGARY

BALÁZS SUDÁR^{*}
(Budapest)

The primary aim of the present paper was to collect all the historical data on baths in Ottoman Hungary. An attempt was made at reconstructing their number and location, and identifying the persons who founded them and the time when they were available for service. The study is followed by a database of place-names arranged in alphabetical order. Each entry contains the relevant sources, the original texts themselves being listed in chronological order and succeeded by a short list of archaeological studies. Finally, an analysis and interpretation of the sources are given. Despite the difficulties in assessing the exact number of baths in Ottoman Hungary, a total of approximately 75 can be identified.

Key words: baths, Ottoman history, Hungarian history, Turkish architecture.

“... The Turks take pleasure in bathing and care about it very much...” summed up Melchior Besolt his experiences in Buda at the end of the 16th century. Indeed, the Ottoman conquerors used dozens of baths in their new province, the majority of which were built by themselves from lavish funds. Little did they think that these very baths would constitute the most enduring monuments of Ottoman Hungary, many of them still standing as opposed to the sporadic traces of caravanserais or mosques.

The fame of these superb buildings was already spread in their own time by contemporary travellers and scholars like Georgius Wernherus, Augerius Gislenius Busbequius or Nicolaus Istvánffy (Isthvani). Although in the following centuries especially their medical use was in the focus of attention, physicians would not entirely forget about the past of these buildings, either. In 1721, Laurentius Stoker wrote only four pages about the history of the baths, but a hundred years later, Franz Xaver Linzbauer devoted more than seventy pages to them (Stoker 1721, pp. 48–51; Linzbauer 1837, pp. 1–72). By 1933 so much research had been accumulated on the past and present of the baths that a separate bibliography was published on the topic (*Buda és Pest* 1933), and a similar compilation focusing on authors mentioning baths appeared in 1967 (Zoltán–Berza 1967, pp. 242–243, 455–458). Following World War II, ar-

^{*} Balázs Sudár, MTA Történettudományi Intézet, H-1014 Budapest, Úri u. 53, Hungary, e-mail: sudarbalazs@hotmail.com

cheological research and restoration work in Buda began under the conduct of Győző Gerő and others, and several towns and cities like Babócsa, Eger, Esztergom, Székesfehérvár and Pécs also followed suit.

Summaries can be found, although not as separate studies, dedicated solely to Turkish baths, as chapters in works on the architecture and arts of Ottoman Hungary. Surveys by Ernő Foerk and his disciples in 1918 (Foerk 1918), by József Molnár and Győző Gerő in 1976, and a monograph by the latter in 1980 count as important and excellent works (Gerő 1976; Molnár 1976; Gerő 1980). Contrary to their predecessors, two outstanding scholars in Ottoman art history, Oktay Aslanapa and Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, based their studies on archaeological and historical data and gave a wide-ranging treatment of the subject. However, due to their neglect of Hungarian sources and inconsistent handling of Turkish literature, these works are best to be read with due reservation (Aslanapa 1950; Ayverdi 1977).

In this paper my primary aim was to collect the historical data on baths in Ottoman Hungary. I made an attempt at reconstructing their number and location, and, if possible, at identifying the persons who founded them and the timespan when they were available for service. The study is followed by a database arranged in alphabetical order of the place-names.¹ Each entry contains the relevant sources, the original texts themselves being listed in chronological order and succeeded by a short list of archeological studies. Finally, I give an analysis and interpretation of the sources, if their quantity and quality necessitate it.

The sources

The best evidence for the existence of an Ottoman bath is the edifice itself. Quite a few of them have survived, some of them in good, others in a rather ruinous state. These monuments and archeological finds are of utmost importance, as they help us establish the structure, the concept and the quality of a given bath.

a) Written Muslim sources

Official Muslim documents contain a great deal of references to baths and bath-keepers. Accounts of state-run baths found their way into provincial registers, while in case of private foundations, it is either the deeds of foundation (*vakfnâme*) or provincial tax records that indicate baths as parts of the *vakf* 'foundation'. It is also easy to come across with bath-employees in population-registers.

Geographical works are of a completely different character. They contain descriptions of different provinces, and, since baths were highly characteristic and easily

¹ In case a settlement in the database lies outside the borders of present-day Hungary, I give the name of the country and the official name of the settlement within the new entity (SLO = Slovakia, RO = Romania, SE = Serbia).

identifiable buildings, they are frequently mentioned in them. Two works are especially worth being highlighted here.

Âşık Mehmed b. Hâfız Ömer er-Rûmî (?–after 1598) (Miroğlu 1991) visited Ottoman Hungary during the Fifteen Years' War, presumably in 1594. His *Menâziru'l-avâlim* ('Landscapes of Worlds') is particularly significant due to its description of the Balkans and Hungary.²

Evliyâ Çelebi's travel account, the chapters of which on Ottoman Hungary were written between 1660 and 1665, is far more detailed and comprehensive.³ Due to its uniquely summarising character and the debates this work has later provoked, we must deal with it at some length. Since Gyula Szekfű's sharp criticism Evliyâ's work has been prone to be handled with scepticism, notwithstanding the great number of data that confirm his statements.⁴ His descriptions follow a strict pattern: whatever town or village he describes, first he gives its history, administration, the names of administrators, the geographical characteristics and the major sights. Usually he wraps up his account by enumerating local characteristic features and sanctuaries worth while visiting. It is, amongst others, this uniform pattern that may give rise to doubts: was not he liable to write about things he had actually no knowledge of? But certain facts contradict this. Evliya always indicates when he does not know the name of a certain place or object by leaving a blank space for it. Quite untypical of Ottoman writers, sometimes he even admits ignorance. This can be best illustrated by his description of Törökkoppány: "but I do not remember how many steps long the town is".⁵ Whenever he infers that in a given town there are (—) baths, he is simply uncertain of their exact numbers; but, as the case of Simontornya testifies to it, this does not necessarily mean that in that town there was no bath. However, if he gives the exact number of baths without any further details, we may well surmise that they were of a lower quality or housed in a building that had not been a bath before and was only later converted to the new use. On the other hand, in some cases Evliyâ fails to provide further details of important, well-constructed baths, like the one in Gyula. His most reliable descriptions are those detailing the building, the beneficial effects of the thermal water, etc. His wording often follows Ottoman poetic and artistic prose traditions: domes reaching the sky, the water of life gurgling in the pools and bath-keepers resembling angels. Such flowers of rhetoric have a tendency to occur whenever service in a given bath was to the fastidious Evliyâ's liking.

He mentions some 70 baths belonging to 42 towns. (Uncertainty derives from his lack of mentioning the number of baths in three towns.) Some of them are hot springs, simple open-air pools (two in Buda, one in Eger and one or perhaps two in Siklós). In 27 cases he only makes mention of the existence of a bath, while he characterises 19 baths as small or ruinous. He speaks about the arrangement, founder

² Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi, no. 2421, 143a–b. For a facsimile of corresponding pages see Ayverdi (1977, p. 123).

³ In compiling the database I used the latest edition of Evliyâ Çelebi: Evliyâ V; Evliyâ VI; Evliyâ VII.

⁴ Szekfű (1916). For an assessment of Evliyâ Çelebi's works see Fodor (1990).

⁵ "ammâ bu varoş kaç adımdır hâtırmıda yoktur" Evliyâ VII, 16.

or quality of a bath in 18 cases, and goes into more details only with 8 baths. Hardly could he be accused of overpraising the buildings or exaggerating the significance of local bath traditions, moreover, his descriptions appear to be very realistic even in the light of the data at our disposal recording about 50 baths in 27 towns.⁶ (I came to similar conclusions in regard to his records of mosques.)

A unique source is Sokollu Mustafa Pasha's biography. The work, written in a masterly, highly ornate Ottoman style, was composed in Buda in 1591, and contains a list of the construction works carried out by the pasha. There are only a few points in which this list differs from Mustafa's *vakfınâme*, but, because of its beautiful prose style, its text also deserves presentation here.

b) Written European sources

This group of sources mainly consists of travel accounts. Fortunately, travellers were able to identify baths as opposed to schools or covenants. Sometimes they even attended them in order to relax their bodies or satisfy their curiosity. However, accounts like those of the Czech Vencel Vratislav or Ferdinand Auer from Pozsony (German *Pressburg*, Slovak *Bratislava*), though very picturesque, are of less value, as the institutions they saw or attended are not identifiable. They do contain, however, some topographic references and interesting details, but, regrettably, European travellers' accounts only focus on a small area of Ottoman Hungary, with Buda in the first place.

Post-Ottoman sources are extremely valuable. The bulky, solid buildings of baths proved very useful in a period of general decay, so they were registered (e.g. Marsigli's list), and sometimes occur in the sources in a transformed form. Thermal baths usually continued to be used as such, but *hammâms* were transformed into churches, schools or saltpetre manufactories.

Maps and pictures are also useful sources, and fortunately we are not short of them from the Ottoman period. As baths usually protruded from their environment, they were easy to depict (Rózsa 1963; Kisari Balla 1996; Kisari Balla 2000). Although many of the sceneries at our disposal owe a lot to the phantasy of their author, their value can hardly be doubted as evidence of the existence and topographic arrangement of the buildings. Of course, they must be handled with due reservation and criticism.

Why build a bath?

Ottoman baths were not merely built for pastime, but they also satisfied the need for charitable works. The widespread view that bathing is a Muslim religious rite is not

⁶ It must also be noted that the nine baths we know only from Evliyâ's narrative, were located in Temesvár Province, an area exposed to the most serious devastation during the wars of reconquest.

the best way to understand its true role. Ablution in Islam is compulsory only before ritual prayer and the believers use either water from washtubs placed outside the mosque or sand, in places like the desert, where water is not available. This would not make a bath necessary, but baths were built primarily to serve the Muslim community. Building a bath was considered a pious act (*sevâb*) and as such would be looked upon favourably on the Day of the Last Judgement. On the other hand, charity acts like founding a bath, in addition to their religious value, would also raise the reputation of the founder. But there is yet a third motive. Although entry into the bath was almost for free or at least very cheap, it still added to the income of the founder, which he could use for the maintenance of his pious foundations (*vakf*), paying, for example, the employees in his mosque. The majority of baths in Ottoman Hungary being such pious foundations, they must have been highly profitable. To build one was such a serious issue that it had to be licensed by the Sultan. When, for example Abdülbâkî, the Beg of Dugagin applied to the Sublime Porte for a license, a competent kadi was ordered to check whether the bath to be founded would not breach the Property Law or the interests of other foundations (Mühimme 1993, pp. 361–362, 368). The latter case can be best illustrated with the following example. The teacher of the Mehmed Pasha madrasa in Iznik complained in a letter to the Porte that the twin-bath built by a certain Hasan caused serious damages to the bath maintaining his foundation. An edict was thus promptly issued in defence of the unfortunate professor, which forbade further baths to be built (Mühimme 1993, pp. 525–526). There is an abundance of reasons that baths were established everywhere in the Empire, Ottoman Hungary being by no means an exception.

Bath types in Ottoman Hungary

The Ottomans knew two types, the steam bath and the thermal bath. Building a steam bath needs considerable expertise, as it is very difficult to heat a building of an inferior quality properly. Hence these must have been serious investments.

In Ottoman sources steam baths are exclusively referred to as *hammâm*.⁷ They consist of a cloakroom (*câmekân*), tepidarium (*soğukluk*) and caldarium (*harara*). The middle of the latter was not occupied by a pool but a large marble slab called ‘navel stone’ (*göbektâşı*), which was used for massage. Along the walls there was a series of small washtubs (*kurna*), utilised by guests to pour water on themselves when feeling hot. In larger baths, smaller chambers (*halvet*) opened from the caldarium. Separated from the bathing space was the cistern and the stokehole (*külhân*), whence hot air was flowing into the heating system located under the floor.

Most baths in Ottoman Hungary were hammâms, but they differed considerably from one another. In Buda, Pécs, Eger or Fehérvár sumptuous buildings awaited their guests, whereas excavations in Babócsa reveal far more modest features: the

⁷ Though Modern Turkish has the word as *hamam*, with a shortened middle geminate, but 16th–17th-century Ottoman sources preserved the original Arabic form as *hammâm*. I also adhere to the latter form in the following.

plan of the bath has an irregular shape, the materials used for the cloakroom are of an inferior quality, and the small private bath in the palace of the garrison's captain is also very simple. The bath in the outskirts of Fehérvár or the hammams that were given but a sketchy description or characterised as small or clumsy by Evliyâ Çelebi may also have been similar buildings. Vác, where an ordinary house was transformed into a hammam, may not have been a unique instance in this regard, either.

There was a specific, domestic type called 'stoven' hammâm (*soba hammâmî*), which was the converted form of a medieval stonehouse, using a stove and a tub. According to Evliyâ Çelebi there were hundreds of similar baths, posing great competition with public hammams.

Thermal baths referred to as *kaplıca*, *ılıca*, *germâb* or *sıcak su* are also an important group. (Except for *kaplıca*, all these terms allude to the temperature of water.) These are, however, umbrella terms for natural, undeveloped hot springs, open-air pools and baths built in 'classical' Turkish style. If a source contains one of these terms without giving any further explanation, it is impossible to establish to what extent a bath was developed. For example, as far as Siklós and Tata are concerned, it is not certain whether the Ottomans simply used the hot springs found there or they developed a bath complex around them. Whenever they developed a bath around a hot spring, its structure considerably resembled that of the hammâm, with the difference that it did not need a separate heating system and the centre of the bathing area was occupied by a bath.

Ottoman Hungary could boast of relatively numerous thermal baths. Buda had four developed and some undeveloped, Eger two developed and one undeveloped hot springs, and Tata and Siklós one probably undeveloped each. In Esztergom two baths were built around the same hot spring, while two others were left as they sprang out of the ground.

The two sexes, of course, were allowed to bath only separately. To this effect the Ottomans would either arrange for separate male and female opening hours or build two baths attached to each other, which were called twin-bath (*çifte hammâm*), like the ones in Pest, Fehérvár and Pécs.

The bath was under the bath-keeper's (*hammâmçı*, *hammâmî*) conduct, who was very much like a private entrepreneur. He was liable for expenses and incomes to the owner of the bath. For example, the state bath of Buda was run by the *kethüda* of the Buda *cebecis*, i.e. armorers, for three years, who was followed by a local citizen, then by a grenadier. Guests were massaged and epilated by the *dellâks*, the latter treatment being required by Islam. Their duty was to see to it that guests be served properly, so no wonder that they are the subject of praise in most descriptions. They were at pains to avail themselves of their guests' favours, like a Hungarian stripling, a Muslim convert, who managed to emerge from the pool service and get into the most élite unit of the Fehérvár garrison (Hegyî 1998, p. 247). Maintenance (heating and cleaning) was the task of servants (*hâdim*).

Names of baths

According to our data, some towns had several baths. Their great number is partly misleading, as several of the baths that appear distinct were in fact one and the same bath. Baths owned by the state (*hammâm-ı mîrî*, *hammâm-ı hassa*) like the ones in Buda, Fehérvár, Szeged, Pécs and Siklós tend to appear at the beginning of the Ottoman period of Hungary, but later they disappear from the sources, although the bureaucracy kept a watchful eye on every opportunity to increase income. Probably they were obtained by private individuals for their own foundations; but they may also have been owned successively by different persons and thus appear under different names in the sources.

For example, baths did not quite flourish in Szeged. Only one bath-keeper and one masseur appear in the 1578 census of the local Muslim population; Evliyâ Çelebi mentions only one bath in the middle of the 17th century; and following the reconquest of Hungary, bath buildings disappear from the sources. It suggests that Szeged had but one bath, and even that cannot have been very significant. On the other hand, there are early sources mentioning a state bath, and then another one owned by the foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, the Pasha of Buda, the deed of foundation of which, otherwise so accurate in such questions, does not state that the bath was built by him. Mustafa, having probably layed an eye on the state-bath while still a beg in Szeged, managed to obtain it for his foundations. Tolna may have been a similar case. In 1564 Tur Ali Beg, an illustrious nobleman of the marches was granted permission by the Sultan to build a bath. However, sources dating from just one and a half decades later mention only the bath of Sokollu Mustafa, the Pasha of Buda. The story of the Veli Beg Bath in Buda is also very suspicious. There is a copy of a memorial plaque (*kitâbe*) and also a list of the pasha's foundations indicating that it was Sokollu Mustafa who ordered the bath to be built, the beauty of which truly befits the most outstanding pasha of Buda. Then why do all the sources refer to it as Veli Beg Bath? One possible explanation is that Veli Beg, an eminent swordsman in the middle of the 16th century, was buried in the vicinity, and the whole district was named after him. It is equally imaginable that this Veli Beg commenced to build the bath, and Sokollu Mustafa somehow managed to 'inherit' it. The third explanation is that the above-mentioned examples, although all of them being related to Sokollu Mustafa Pasha, are mere coincidences. But it should always be borne in mind that building a bath is not only a charitable work but business as well.

The picture is further complicated by the widespread habit to name baths after one of their characteristics or topographic features. What is today called Rudas Bath in Budapest appears as Mustafa Pasha's Bath in Omichius and Istvánffy, but later sources mention it as 'Green Pillared Bath' (*Yeşil direkli ılıca*) due to a green pillar inside it. The Rácfürdő 'Serbian Bath' was sometimes called Tabán Bath named after its location, but, as opposed to, perhaps, the 'Green Pillared Bath', it also had the name Little Bath.

Dates of establishment

Baths are mentioned in the sources almost immediately after the Ottoman conquests, the first ones being established by the state. In Fehérvár, not later than two years after it had been taken by the Ottomans, a bath was established. In Pécs and Siklós three, in Buda eight, in Szeged maximum twelve to thirteen years after the conquest there are sources about baths. With the consolidation of Ottoman rule, private individuals also followed suit. Relying on their Syrmian and Bosnian background, Kâsim Pasha (d. approx. 1562), and, if our identification is correct, Memi Şah Gâzi (d. in the 1540s) commenced construction works in Pécs, and were followed by Mehmed, castellan of Buda before 1552 and Toygun Pasha before 1555. The governor of Szigetvár, Iskender Beg founded a bath in four years after the 1566 conquest of the town, and another one in Siklós. Mehmed Beg, the governor of Veszprém, was granted permission to build a bath just three years after the vanquishment; but unfortunately it is not known whether construction works actually took place. A little more than fifteen years after the capture of Vác, Kâsim Beg, the governor of Nógrád transformed a house into a bath. Újvár, which was conquered in 1663, also had a bath, which, however, had already been there before. In 1665, five years after its capture, seven (?) baths were enumerated by Evliyâ Çelebi in Nagyvárad. Undoubtedly, the Ottomans would not hesitate for long when it came to the establishment of proper circumstances for their comfort.

Although there had already been a few baths since the very beginning of Ottoman presence in Hungary, the real wave of bath construction only came in the 1560s and 1570s. The *vakfnâme* of Güzelce Rüstem, the Pasha of Buda mentions four baths, while that of Sokollu Mustafa seventeen.

They did not, however, actually found all of these baths, but simply obtained restored or rebuilt several of them. For example, the *vakfnâme* of Sokollu Mustafa informs us that the future Serbian Bath was purchased, about six baths we learn that he was their owner; and actually he built eight ones. The heyday of Ottoman baths fell into the second half of the 16th century, when there were baths built in even smaller administrative centres like Nógrád, Szécsény or Tolna.

Several Ottoman baths, e.g. in Esztergom and Fehérvár, were seriously damaged during the Fifteen Years' War, and some were taken by Christian forces. The leaden sheathing of the domes was ripped and was later substituted by tiles, which were cheaper. Of course, new baths were built on acquired territories, amongst which the construction works in Eger are worth mentioning. Its geographical situation prevented Kanizsa from having a major bath, but it had one of the few buildings that were made of bricks. The baths of Újvár and Várad in the second half of the 17th century had probably been dwelling-houses transformed to serve bathing purposes.

Conclusion

Despite the difficulties in assessing the exact number of baths in Ottoman Hungary, the following tentative list of baths can be given: (1) *four* developed hot springs and *two* steam baths in Buda, plus *one hammâm* for the exclusive usage of the governing pasha of the time; (2) *two* baths in Fehérvár in the 16th and *three* at the end of the 17th century; (3) at least *three* in Eger; (4) *two* in Esztergom in the 16th and another *one* in the 17th century; (5) *three* in Pécs in the 16th century; (6) *two* in Babócsa, Gyula, Szeged, Szekszárd, Bács, Becskerek, Hatvan, Lippa; (7) while a number of other towns had one bath each. As far as Temesvár and Várad, two important Ottoman centres, are concerned, sources are rather deficient; but judging by the extant data steam baths could not have been too eminent, since former dwelling houses had been transformed for bathing purposes. The total number of developed baths was approximately 75,⁸ which was completed by several open-air pools, and a lot of domestic stoven baths.

Interestingly enough, while there are data about baths in almost every single village and town, no bath can be found in castles or fortifications. For the explanation of this strange fact a thorough investigation is needed, at this juncture only some conjectures can be put forward. Maybe the pious founders of baths preferred to seek the favour of women ... Or, maybe the military in Ottoman Hungary, due to their Southern Slavic, non-Muslim origins, have espoused Turkish bath culture. Or, bathing as a pastime was limited to the Ottoman élite, and was not characteristic of the whole Muslim society?

Database⁹

Arad (Arad: RO)

1660. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Bir küçük hammâmı vardır” (Evliyâ V, p. 207).

According to Evliyâ Çelebi the smaller public buildings of the town were founded by Köprülü Mehmed (?–1661). Although he does not include a bath in his list, there may well have been one. As military engineering reports from the time of the wars of reconquest make no mention of baths (Kisari Balla 2000, nos. 18, 237), probably it was not a very eminent building.

⁸ I regard all the data about steam baths (roughly 60) found in Evliyâ as constructed baths and not as natural hot springs developed later, as a *hammâm* can only be man-made. This is also confirmed by Evliyâ's critical remarks on certain baths in describing them as shabby or cramped, as such expressions can only be applied to man-made buildings. References to the founder of the bath and certain topographic designations, too, allude to their being constructed. To this number we can add the thermal baths (eight?) and the baths not mentioned by Evliyâ (six?).

⁹ I am greatly indebted to colleagues who helped me in compiling the database, especially to Klára Hegyi for her guidance through the labyrinth of Ottoman administrative records and to György Hazai for lending me a photo copy of the manuscript of *Gencîne-i ahlâk*.

Babócsa

1579. A bath owned by the *vakf* of İskender Beg, governor of Szigetvár (1566–1570) (Dávid 1993, p. 161).

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: ... “ammâ dahi taşra büyük varoşda iki halvetli bir küçük hammâm var” (Evliyâ VI, p. 309).

Excavations: (1) Steam bath in the Nárciszos, excavated by Kálmán Magyar in 1988 (Magyar 1990, pp. 118–128; Nagy 1990, pp. 384–389). (2) The bath of the castellan palace, excavated by Kálmán Magyar in 1989 (Magyar 1990, 128–138; Nagy 1990, pp. 389–390).

Bács (Bač: SE)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “ammâ dahi taşra büyük varoşda iki halvetli bir küçük hammâm var...” (Evliyâ VII, p. 39).

Excavation works were conducted by Béla Pósta in 1909 (Gubitza 1910, pp. 17–22); a survey on the building was published by Ernő Foerk in 1917 (Foerk 1918, p. 16, tables 34–36).

It is noteworthy that despite the great number and wealth of the Muslim population in Bács, apart from Evliyâ, no reference to baths can be found in the sources (unless it is implied by the term ‘barber’, see Hegyi 2002, pp. 199–214, esp. 209).

Baja

1572. Franciscus Omichius: “alda ist auch ein warmes Badt” (Omichius 1582, p. 10r).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: Varoş-ı kebîr “...ve bir hammâmı ...var” (Evliyâ VII, p. 137).

Becse (Törökbecse, Novi Bečej: SE)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “...ve bir hammâmı ...var” (Evliyâ VII, p. 144).

Becskerek (Nagybecskerek, Zrenjanin: SE)

1567. The bath of Sokollu Mehmed’s vakf (Káldy-Nagy 2000, p. 244).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ancak ...bir hammâmı kârgîr olmak ile ihrâk olmamış” (Evliyâ VII, p. 145).

Excavation: Between 1817 and 1820 extensive construction works were carried out on the castle hill, in which the mosque of Sokollu Mehmed was demolished.

By that time at the latest the bath must also have been demolished, but the heating system could still be seen in the middle of the 19th century (Bárány 1845, p. 81).

Berzence

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ancak bir kârgîr binâ ...bir hammâmı kalmış” (Evliyâ VI, p. 310).

Besenyő (Óbesenyő, Dudeştii Vechi: RO)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “... ve bir küçük hammâmı ... vardır” (Evliyâ VII, p. 144).

Buda

1549. Georg Wernher: “Utrasque Turcae, quibus tamen omnia vastare libido est, non modo non corruerunt, sed etiam cultiores, ac per speciem religionis quasi augustiores reddiderunt... Hac ratione is, qui nunc rerum potitur, Solimannus tum alibi, tum Budae in aedibus, quae quondam fuerunt Archiepiscopi Colocensis, amplissimum balneum pro sua, suorumque salute fieri curavit, in quod e Danubio, per canales subterraneos aqua in multam altitudinem, ut est Budae ad Danubium situs, ducitur. Ipsum balneum intus incrustatum et stratum est monumentis marmoreis, quae antea in templis fuere posita, imaginibus tamen, si quae in sculptae fuerunt, resectis, et toto opere perpolito.” “Sunt etiam calidae in opposita Danubii ripa supra Pesthum, sed minus celebres” (Evliyâ VII, p. 144).

1552. “Sabika Budun dizdari olan Mehmed... tarik-i ammda olan ılıcasın...mamur etmişdür.” “Ve Frengi kullenün kapusın dün bucuğında açup ılıcasına gider.”¹⁰

4 August 1555. Hans Dernschwam: “Zw Offen lest der jeczig Thoigan bascha¹¹ ein gewaldig badt pawen, alda vor das augustiner Kloster, schwarcze munich gewesen, dohin er von allen ortten die schonisten staine furent lest” (Dernschwam 1923, p. 271).

25 July 1557. “Yûsuf bin Durmuş âmil-i mukâtaa-ı hammâm-ı Budun (28 ramazân 964)” (Fekete – Káldy-Nagy 1962, pp. 435, 440).

14 July 1558. “Veli an sâkinân-ı Budun, âmil-i mukâtaa-ı hammâm-ı kale-i Budun (28 ramazân 965)” (Fekete – Káldy-Nagy 1962, pp. 435, 444, 445, 448, 458, 460, 485, 517, 552).

1559. “Sinân an sâkinân-ı Budun, âmil-i mukâtaa-ı hammâm-ı kale-i Budun” (Fekete – Káldy-Nagy 1962, p. 552).

¹⁰ Fodor (1995, pp. 94–95). – *Frengi kulle*: a big large bastion in the southern wing of Buda Castle.

¹¹ Thoigan bascha = Toygun Pasha of Buda (1553–1556, 1558–1559).

4 July 1559. “Mercân an topçuyân-ı kale-i Budun mültezîm-i mukâtaa-ı hammâm-ı kale-i Budun an 28 ramazân 966” (Fekete – Káldy-Nagy 1962, p. 599).

1564. “El ihrâcât-ı hammâm-ı mîrî-i Budun. Tahvîl şod fî 11 cemâziü’l âhir sene 971 (1564. I. 26.). Amed ’an yed-i Mercân hammâmî” (Accounts: 4 June 1561–12 May 1564).¹²

1565–1568. “Emânet-i mukâta’a-ı hammâm-ı hasse der kal’a-ı Budun der ’uhde-ı Oruç bin Hasan kethüdâ-ı cebeciyân-ı kal’a-ı Budun. ‘An vech-i iltizâm ber mûcb-ı sûret-ı sicil-ı Mevlânâ Ramazan kâdi-ı Budun. İltizâm-ı mezbûre ‘an 5 sefer 973 [1565. IX. 1.]. Oruç el-mezbûr mazûl olmış, Hasan hoca ‘an sakiyân-ı Budun hammâmî şod. ‘An vech-i iltizâm be mûcib-i sûret-i sicil-i Mevlânâ Nebî, kâdi-ı Budun. Fî sene 975 [8 June 1567–25 June 1568.]”

“Emânet-i mukâta’a-ı mezbûr der ’uhde-ı Mehemmed Mustafa ‘an kumbaraci-yân-ı Budun ‘an vech-i iltizâm ‘an 5 sefer 976 [30 July 1568] ber mûcib-i sûret-i sicil-i Mevlânâ, Pîrî (?) kâdi-ı Budun.”¹³

1568. Surius Laurentius: “Apud Budam, quae Hungariae regia est, multae sunt aquae calidae, quas thermas vocamus, quarum aliae regiae, aliae communes sunt, lavandis hominum corporibus valde opportuna: aliae vero, nisi refrigerentur, balneis non sunt idoneae. Adeo enim feruent ex his quaedam, ut in eas missum ouum, celerrime elixetur. Sed iuxta has fons est aquae frigidae, ita propinquus calidae, ut in eodem vestigio calida et frigida simul hauriri possit. Hae, quas diximus, thermae apud Budam aliae superiores, aliae inferiores dicta sunt, quod aliae supra, aliae infra urbem sint. Turcae hodie (quippe qui mirifice lavacris et balneis student, et aquas praesertim fluentes, summo honore dignantur, quibus etiam crebrius per diem non modo ob corporum, sed etiam animarum sordes ablundas utuntur) has thermas egregie ornarunt.” (Laurentius 1568, pp. 282–283).

The late 1560s–1580. The memorial plaque (*târîh*) of Sokollu Mustafa Pasha’s bath in the wall of what today is *Császárfürdő* ‘Imperial Bath’. (Though it is a chronogram and is thus intended to date the bath, we have not hitherto been able to decipher it, as the text is defective. The interpretation and hence the dating suggested by Lajos Fekete cannot be maintained due to metrical reasons.)¹⁴

3 May 1572. Franciscus Omichius: “Von dannen sein wir gengen vom Schlos [i.e. from King Mathias’ palace] gegen dem Wasser alda auff der rechten handt ist ein Badt von Marmor und andern roten Steinen schoen arbawet. Und nicht weit dawon unter S. Gottharts Berg ist eins dergleichen welchs der Bascha auff die alten Modeln Rewelben unnd mit Bley decken lassen. Das dritte Badt welchs gegen alten Offen ligt ist dessen gleich erbawet sie sein von eigenschafft alle selbst warm gleich denen in Ostereich zu baden.” (Omichius 1582, p. 9r).

19 June 1573. Stephan Gerlach: “Hernach besahen wir ein schon Bad rund und mit einem bleyern Tach von lauterm Stein gebaut da auß der Mauren schon warm Was-

¹² Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt 581, 13–14. A Hungarian edition: Velics – Kammerer (1886, pp. 287–288).

¹³ Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt 609, 2. In Hungarian: Velics – Kammerer (1886, p. 349).

¹⁴ The best copy of the plaque was published by Linzbauer (1867, Pl. III); Fekete (1944, p. 411).

ser herauß fleust in der Mitten ist eine schöne Bad – oder viel – mehr Wasserstuben darinnen das warme Wasser einem biß an den Halk gehet.” (Gerlach 1674, p. 10).

20 June 1573. Stephan Gerlach: “Darauff wir wieder heruber gen Ofen gefahren und da dergleichen schon groß und weit Bad besichtigt auf des vorigen Art gebauet von dreyen Gemachen rund und oben das Tach mit Bley (andere mit Blech) debeckt. In dem hintern Gemach ist eine Tieffe in der Mitte mit etlichen Staffeln darein schon warm Wasser mit grosser Menge fleust: auf der seiten ist es etwas erhaben da gleich auß einem schonen Rohr-Brunnen warm Wasser in einen Stein laufft und riechen alle gar starck nach Schwefel.” (Gerlach 1674, pp. 11–12).

1577. Salomon Schweigger: “Ich komme wieder an die Stadt Ova, nach dem Schlos hab ich nichts fürtrefflichs daselbst gesehen, dann die selbst warmen Bäder oder Wildbäder, die seyn zumaln auch köstlich gebawt, mit Marmorsteinerne Tafeln, sonderlich am Boden, mitten in der Badstuben ist ein runder Kast in die Tieffe gebawt, bey achtzehn Schritt weit, gehet einem Mann biß unter die Arm, rings herumb hat der Kast inwendig vier steinerne Stufen, darauff man zu sitzen pflegt, so tieff einer will, darein kommt doch kein Weib, dann sie hieltens für ein öffentliche Schand, die Quell dieser Bäder soll so heiß seyn, daß man darinn ein Schwein kan brühen jedoch schwimmen die Frösch häufig darinn ohne alle Hindernuß.” (Schweiger 1619, p. 26).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578): “Gürz Eliyas bayırı altında, nehr-i Tuna kenârında vâki’ olan kaplucamı ve mezkûr kaplucam kurbında Hindî baba zâviyesi mukâbelesinde vâki’ olan kârvânsarâyımı, ve yine Budin hâricinde debbâglar mahallesinde sâbikâ Peşte kâdisi olan Mevlâna Hasan efendiden iştirâ eyledüğim kaplucamı, ve yine Budin dâhilinde Gönüllü mahallesinde binâ eyledüğim kaplucamı... ve yine Budin hâricinde Baruthâne kurbında binâ eyledüğim kaplucamı...”¹⁵

7–9 September 1584. Melchior Besolt: “Es ist auch bey unsern Schiffen ein Türkisch Bad gewesen, darein viel der unsern nach dem Nachtessen giengen zu baden, unnd habens sehr geruhmet von gute unnd schone wegen, wie es auch über die massen mit lustigen Brunnlein geziert. Dann die Turcken viel und gern baden, darumb auch etwas lassen darauff gehen... Am Sonntag haben wir wol vermeynt, wir wurden desselben tags von Ofen auffbrechen. Weil aber ein ziemliche Ungestume vom Wind auffgestanden, seind wir den tag noch still gelegen. Derhalben unser etlich verursacht worden, als sonsten nichts mehr zu sehen, widerumb in das Bad zu gehen. Da haben wir in der warheit ein schon Fürstlich bad gesehen, so von Natur warm, unnd nicht mit Holtz gewarmt wirdt: sondern von ihm selbs so heiß daß einer es schwerlich erleiden kan. Es wirdt auch der Ort an im selber von den Turcken gar sauber und reyn gehalten. Unnd warten sie den Badleuten sehr wol auß, mit Wasschen, reiben und abtrucknen. Vor dem rechten Bad, hat es auch ein gemein Bad, so unter freyem Himmel, unnd der armen Leuten zu gutem erhalten wirdt. Ehe man in daß Bad gar hinein kompt, hat es voraussen ein schonen weiten Saal, darinnen man sich außzeucht: unnd stehet in der mitte deß Saals ein Brunnen. Darnach kamen wir in das rechte Bad, das sicht nun einer Kirchen oder Capellen ahnlicher, dann einer Badstu-

¹⁵ D 7000, 8b–9a. – Contrary to Gy. Káldy-Nagy’s assertion that the document contains references to five baths, I have found only four; cf. Káldy-Nagy (1970, p. 104; 1972, p. 449).

ben. Erstlichen hat es ein Bad, Kessel oder Waag, so nur biß an den Hals gehet, in rechter erwundschter warme. Wer da wil, kan darinnen schwimmen. Der aber etwas forchtsam, und deß schwimmen unerfahren, kkan wol darinnen umbher gehen, oder aber sitzen, so tieff er wil. Dann es hat drey Staffel hinunter (verstehe im warmen Wasser) darauff man sitzen kan. Umb dieses Bad oder Kessel kan man gerings weiß herumb gehen, unnd hat viel lustiger Brunnlein an den angewandten Orten gehauwen, darauß auch warm unnd kalt Wasser neben einander laufft. Die recht Brunnstuben oder Waag, ist von uberzientem Kupffer gedeckt, nicht anderst, dann wie man bey uns den Rundellen pflegt Hauben aufzusetzen. Dieses Gedach hat viel Locher, darvon man in dem Bad uberflussig Liecht oder Helle hat. Der Kasten, darinn das Wasser begriffen, ist von Marmorstein gemacht, wie auch bey nahe das gantze inwendig Gebeuw. Neben diesem jetzt Deschriebenen kasten, hat es auch bey seits kleine neben Rasten, oder Kessel, dem grossern sonst aller dings gleichformig: aber von Marmorstein verschlossen, als ob es sondere Bader weren. Man gehet durch Thuren hinein, darfur aber nur ein Tuch gehenckt wirdt. Als wir etwan auff ein halbe Stund gebadet, eilten wir widerumb den Schiffen zu, und kamen zum Nachtessen.” (Besolt 1595, pp. 519–520).

1587. Reinhold Lubenau: “Etliche meinen, der Nahm Buda kom von Baden, weil es warme Beder had, aber reimet sich nicht sehr.” “Nach diesem sei wir under den Gerhardts Bergk in das warme Badt kommen, welches von sich selber warm ist, und da es entspringet, ist es so heis, das man ein Scwein drein bruhen kan, und schwemmen ein Hauffen Forsche unverhindert lebendigk drein; wan ich es selber nicht gesehen, wurde ich es nicht gleuben. Es wirdt auch noch wol mancher sein Gespött draus haben, seindt aber unser wol dreisigk Perschonen dabei gewesen, die es gesehen. Dieses Badt ist nach türkischer Ahrt aufs herlichste von lauder gehauenen Steinen gebauet und hatt Stufen, das ein jeder so Tif er wil, hineinsteigen kan, auch dar ein schwemmen. Das Wasser ist gantz himmelblau wie der ungrische Victriol und hatt einen starcken Geruch nach Schwebel. Umb das Badt hatt es rund herumb sonderbare kleine Beder, da einer allein drin baden kan, nach Art des grosen Bades gebauet, und wirdt nur ein blauTuch vor die Thur gehengt, wan jemens drein badet.” (Sahmm 1912, p. 81).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Opposite to the mosque of Sokollu Mustafa in the Tabân “bir bî-misl ılıca binâ buyurmuşlardur ki çeşme-i âfitâb anun harâretinden muhtecib ve ‘ayn-ı mâü’l-hayât anun reşkinden gâyibdür. Misl ü mânendi kibrit-i ahmer gibi nâ-peydâ ve çeşm-i zemâne nazîrin görmeklikde nâ-bînâdur.” “Ve dahi mezbûr baruthâne kurbında bir latîf ılıca peydâ eylemişlerdür ki kubbe-i sehâb-gûnı tâk-ı gerdûndan a’lâ ve temâm-ı germiyetinden hammâm-ı nüh-kıbâb-ı âsmâna tan eylerse revâdur. Havz-ı râhat-evzâsı katı ılıcak dilberler gibi mülâyemetle herkesi sîneye çeker. Ve her bir lûlesi perî-rûlar dâyre-i teshîre çekmek içün alıcak diller döker.” “Ve dahi derûn-ı şehirde bedî’ ü musanna’ bir ılıca binâ buyurmuşlardur ki ‘âşık-ı sâdık-veş kalb-ı âyî-ne-âyîni bî-gaş u perî-rûlar harâretinden derûnı pür-âteş olup, dîde-i ‘âşık dîdâr gibi lûleleri giryân u harâret-i muhabbetden dil ü cânı sûzândur.” (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 102a–103a).

1594. Âşık Mehmed bin Hâfiz Ömer er-Rûmî (?–1600): “Germâb-ı Budim. Engürtüs vilâyetinde medîne-i Budimde bu germâb-ı müte‘addid mevâzi’dedir. Birisi Gürz Eliyâs bayılır dimekle ma’rûf mevzi’dedir ve Sobota (?) ılıcası dimekle müte‘ârifdir ki âbı şedîdü’s-suhûnetdir. İçine beyzâ vaz’ olunsa tabh ider. Ve âbı ile igitsâl emrâz-i redîyenin ekserine nâfi’dir. Ve bu germâbın menba’ında kârgîr kubbe ile bir câmekân ve kârgîr kubbe ile bir dâru’l-gusl mebnîdir. Ve dâru’l-guslın içinde bir havz-ı kebîr ve etrâf-ı havzında sekiz ‘aded hücerât ve hücerât içinde lâyenkatî’ âbı cârî kurnalar binâ olunmuşdur. Ve bu germâb menba’ından iki tâhûna idâresine kifâyet mikdârında feverân ider.

Ve bu Gürz Eliyâs bayırının cânib-i âhırında bir germâb dahi feverân ider, ki âbı ile huyûl ve bigâl-ı marîzayı gusl gâyetde nâfi’dir. Ve bu germâb üzerinde olan binâ harâbe müşerref ve âsârı zâhirdir.

Ve birisi medîne-i Budimin bir kenârındadır ki Veli Beg ılıcası dimekle müte‘ârifdir. Abı mü’tedilü’s-suhûnetdir. Ve menba’ından beş tahûna idâresine kifâyet mikdârında feverân ider. Ve civârında iki tâhûna idâresine kâfi mâ-ı bârid dahi cârîdir. Ve bu germâbın dahi menba’ında kârgîr kubbe-i kebîre ile bir câmekân ve kârgîr kubbe-i kebîre ile bir dâru’l-gusl mebnîdir. Ve dâru’l-gusl içinde bir havz-ı kebîr ve etrâf-ı havzında on altı ‘aded hücerât ve her birinde lâyennkâtî’ mâ-ı harr cârî kurnalar binâ olunmuşdur. Ve bunun dahi âbı ile igitsâl emrâz-ı redîyenin ekserine nâfi’dir.

Ve ikisi dahi medîne-i mezbûrenin içindedir ki her birinin üzerlerinde kârgîr kubbeli câmekân ve kârgîr kubbeli dâru’l-gusl ve dâru’l-gusllarının içinde birer havz ve etrâf-ı havzında lâyenkatî’ âb-ı germîleri cârî kurnalar binâ olunmuşdur. Ve bunların âbı şedîdü’l-suhûnetdir. Ve âbları ile igitsâl emrâz-ı redîyeye nâfi’dir.

Germâb-ı sahrâ-ı Budim. Bu germâb medîne-i Budim kale’sı ebvâbından Ova kapısı ile müsemma bâbın hâricından iki veyâ üç mîl mesâfededir. Abı mü’tedilü’s-suhûnetdir. Ve bu germâbın üzerinde binâ ve ‘imâret yoktur. Ve âbı ile igitsâl ba’z emrâze nâfi’dir.” (Ayverdi 1977, p. 123).

1598. Nicolaus Istvánffy: “Ungaricus vero peditatus, ut locorum et viarum peritior, Thermae, quae olim inferiores, nunc autem Mustaphanae vocantur, eadem nocte occupavit: simul cum aliis thermis, quae olim superiores, seu Sanctae Trinitatis vocari consueverant. Illas nostra memoria Mustaphas Budensis praefectus, lapidibus quadratis sumptuosissime restaurandas, ac plumbo et vitreis supra laquearia tabulis contendas curaverat ...” (Isthvanfi 1622, p. 733).

1600. Engraving by Wilhelm Dillich. D: Warme bader (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 10 (Cat. No. 40); Pl. 12 (Cat. No. 6)).

1602. Engraving by Wilhelm Dillich. No 31. Warm Badh (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 21 (Cat. No. 115)).

Early 17th century. Aquarelle of an anonymous painter. Bath at the bottom of Gellért Hill and the Cock Gate (Jajczay 1934, inserted between pp. 4–5).

1604. Johann Wild: “Darnach führte mich mein Herr in ein warmes Bad. Wie es denn zu Ofen köstliche warme Bäder hatte, Solches dienete mir sehr woll, da ich sehr erfroren war. Weil ich aber zuvor nie in einem gebadet hatte, tat es mir ernstlich an.

Da wir beide nun gebadet hatten, führte mein Herr mich in die Stadt Ofen, unnd giengen mit einander zum Schloßthor hinein, über die Burg, auf den Markt. Da bot er

misch feil. Ich wußte schon, wieviel es geschlagen hatte ... Mir waren meine Füße so sehr erfroren und kalt geworden in Ungern, diese zwei Tage von Erlau bis nach Ofen, daß ich meine Strümpfe des Nachts nicht Ronnte abziehen, sondern mußte sie anbehalten. Als ich in das warme Bad kam, da mußte ich sie von den Füßen schneiden, Wegen großer Geschwulst. Aber bei diesem Herrn wurden sie mir gottlob wieder heil. Denn er ließ mich jede Woche drei oder viermal ins warme Bad führen, ja auch oft sechs oder sieben Tage nach einander, alle Tage drei Stund. Das war meinen Füßen sehr dienlich, denn es zog mir alle Geschwulst und den Frost heraus, und wuchs mir eine neue Haut hernach. Dieses Baden trieb ich an zwey Monate. Darnach waren sie mir wie vorhin.

Das Wasser, welches in die warmen Bäder alldort fließt – sind ihrer drei – das kommt aus dem Felsen, auf dem das Blockhaus steht. Und ist ans sich selber warm; sonderlich im Winter ist es so heiß, daß es einem die Haut ganz rot macht, aber dadurch nützlich und gut für alle Schaaden, indem es den Frost, Krätze, auch den Ausatz hinwegnimmt und vertreibt.” (Wild 1964, pp. 51, 53, 63).

1606. Engraving by Wilhelm Dillich. D: Warme bade (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 11 (Cat. No. 43)).

1663. Heinrich Ottendorf: “iedoch ist neben den Bluett Thor ein schönes Badt (9) [...]. Die köstliche warme baader, welche der Mustapha Bascha erneuern lassen, sein ausserhalb der Vorstatt, das eine (11) etwa auf tausent schritt vor dem Bluettthor, nahent welchem eine schöne mit 4 Thürmen aufgebaute und einer Mauer umgebene Pulver Mühlen stehet (12); das andere (13) ist nit weit von der Schiffbrucken, da man hinüber nach Pest gehet.” (Hermann (ed.) 1943, p. 35). These three baths can be seen on Ottendorf’s map of Buda.

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Der-medh-i hammâm-ı gâsilân-ı râhat-ı cân: Bu Ortahisâr’da ancak bir küçük hammâmdan gayri yokdur. Anın dahi suyun Tuna’dan at sakkâları taşırlar, ammâ be-kavl-ı a’yân-ı vilâyet “Bu kal’amızda yetmiş aded ev hammâmlarımız ve soba germâblarımız vardır” derler, sahîhdir, zîrâ her evde soba mukarrer, ammâ bu mezkûr hammâmın âb [u] hevâsı hûbdur ve dellâkleri ve gayri hüddâmları mahbûbdur.”

Tabahâne: “...İlica mahallesi, Yeşil Direkli mahallesi,... ve cümle üç aded ılıca-ı germâbân; biri Tabahâne ılıcası ve biri Yeşil Direkli ılıcası ve biri bu varoşun kiblesinde Tuna kenârında Gerz İliyâs dağı dâmeninde üstü açık ılıca.”

“eş-Şeyh Hazret-i Baba Muhtâr: Bu vâlî-i fukarâ-yı Âl-ı Aba Yeşil Direkli ılıcası hânı önünde bir kubbe-i pür-envârda medfûn olup ziyâretgâh-ı gâziyân-ı Budin’dir, zâdellâhu nûrehu.”

“...Tabahâne varoşunda ileri Gerz İlyâs kayası dibinde hemân nehr-i Tuna kenârında, Ta’rîf-i Açık ılıca: Boşnaklar Üstü Açık ılıca derler. Cemî’i krallar bu ılıca üzere kubâblar ve tâk-ı Kistrâlar yapup tamâm olunca hemân yere geçer. Ol ecilden hâlâ küşâde bir ılıcadır...”

“Tavsîf-i germâb-ı Yeşil Direkli: Tabahâne varoşu içinde nehr-i Tuna kenârında sekiz aded tâk-ı Kistrâ’dan¹⁶ nişân verir âlî kemerler üzere bir serâmed kubbe-i

¹⁶ A reference to the famous palace of the Sasanian ruler, Kistrâ, i.e. Khosrau I (531–579) palace in Ctesiphon.

müdevveri var, serâpâ la'lgûn kırmızı kiremit örtü[lü] kubbe-i ser-nigûn-ı azîmdir kim mezheb-i Hanefî'den ziyâde aşren fe-aşren değil belki erba'a işrîn kırât ziyâde bir şekl-i müdevver buheyre-vâr bir havz-ı dâr-ı medârdır. Gird-â-girdi kâmil iki yüz aded ayak ihâta eder pâk ve pâkîze bir havz-ı müdevverdir. Kenâreleri havz içine enecek beş tabaka vâsi' nerdübânlardır kim her kişi kaddine göre tabakalarda gasl eder. Gavvâs-ı bahr-ı ma'ârif olanlar havzın tâ ortasına pertâb edüp şinâverlik edüp herkes âşık ma'sûk ve yârân-ı bâ-safâlarıyla kuç kucağ olup tâzelik çağlarında gülüşüp oynaşup zevk u safâlar ederler.

Bu havz-ı azîmin etrâfındaki sekiz aded kemerlerin altında sekiz aded Hanefî kurnaları vardır. Ve pâk ü pâkîze nîlgûn fitalara beyâz tenlerin sarmış mahbûb del-lâkleri var. Ba'zı halvetlerde gâsillerin murâd [u] merâmları üzre hidmet edüp âdemi pâk ederler... Ve taşra câmekânı çâr küşe dîvâr üzre şindire tahta örtülü bir hayli vâsi' kubâb-ı azîmdir kim içine âsâkir-i İslâmdan bin âdem sığardı. Bir yeşil direği olmakla Yeşil Direkli ılıcası derler.

Tahrîr-ı Tabahâne ılıcası: Bu mezkûr Yeşil Direkli germâbı kurbunda varoş-ı Tabahâne mahallâtı içre kurşum örtülü bir ma'mûr ılıca-ı azîmdir. Bunun dahi suyu mu'tedilü's-sühûndur. Gâyet kükürd râyihalı âb-ı kibrîtdir. Hattâ kuyumcular bu mâ-ı germâdan şîşelerle alup âteşde kaynadup altun âvânî şeyler üzre dökse eyle mücellâ ve musaykal zer-i hâlis olup bir yıl kâmil rengi mütegayyir olmaz. İki kerre kaynadup altun ile mutallâ olmuş gümüş bıçak ve hançer gılâflarına sürse iki sene reng-i zerdı gidüp fenâ bulmaz. Hattâ bu hakîrin parmağında Ferîd Çelebi hattıyla zümürîd üzre kazılmış "Seyyâh-ı âlem Evliyâ" deyü kazılmış bir gümüş hâtemim var idi. Bu Tabahâne ılıcasına ol hâtemle girüp taşra çıkdım. Hâtemim sîm-i hâlis rengin bağlamış. Tâ Uyvar fethine gidüp Belgrad'da bir sene meştâ edüp hâtemimin reng-i zerdine aslâ tagayyür gelmedi.

Bu Tabahâne germâbının tâ bu mertebe hâssası vardır, ammâ bu humma-ı nâfi'a[ya] ale's-sabâh erler girüp vakt-ı çâştda tâ nısfu'l-leyle dek avretler girir, zîrâ mahalle içinde vâki' olup havz-ı azîmli ve müte'addid halvetli ve sekiz aded kurnalı hammâm-misâl bir ılıcadır. Herkes futa ve sileceği ile girüp pâk ü pâkîze olup çıkar gider, bir habbe ve dânk vermez. Eğer bir peştemâl ve kîse ve sâbûn lâzım ise bir akçe verüp gidersin. Gayrı ılıcalar dahi hem-çünân bu gûnedir."

"aşâğı varoş-ı kebîr-i Budin: ...Ve cümle bir aded Toykun Paşa hammâmı var, o da kiyâfet eder, zîrâ bu şehrin hammâma ihtiyâcı yokdur, zîrâ ılıcaları çokdur."

"Paşa sarâyı: ... bir hammâmlı bağçe sarâyıdır."

"Temdîh-i germâb-ı bâb-ı Horos: Horos kapusunun iç yüzünde müfid ü muhtasar bir ılıca dahi var. Cümle hass [u] âmm için yenâbî'-i uyûn-ı harrâ-ı mu'tedildir, ammâ ol kadar memdûh u meşhûr değildir."

"Der-feth-i germâb-ı Veli Beğ: Gül Baba ile Baba Miftâh Sultânların cenbinde bir binâ-yı âsâr-ı azîmeler ile ârâste ve kubâb-ı gûnâ-gûnlar ile pîrâste olmuş bir ılıca-ı meşhûrdur. Sekiz aded tâk-ı Havarnak üzre ve sekiz köşe dîvâr-ı üstüvâr üzre serâpâ âsâr-ı binâları ahmer-gûn kiremit-i ibret-nümûn ile mestûr bir kubbe-i la'l-gûndur. Bu kubbe-i âlînin tâ vasatında Şâfi'î mezhebi üzre aşren fe-aşr bir havzı nazîfdır kim âb-ı nafîz ile memlû olup her cânib [ü] etrâfında beyâz mermer arslan ağızlarından germâb-ı sâfilere şeb [ü] rûz havz-ı azîme rîzân olmadadır. Ve bir halvet-

de dahi bir küçük havzı vardır, ammâ bu gâyetü'l-gâye şiddet-i hâr üzre âb-ı meshûndur. Değme âdem girmeğe tahammül edemez, tâ bu mertebe issidir.

Ve taşra havz-i kebîrin etrâfında her kemerler altında sekiz added Hanefî kurnaları ve müte'addid halvetleri ve pâk [ü] pâkîze hüddâmları var....Ve taşra câmekânı tahta şindire ile örtülü serâmed kubbedir, lâkin Yeşil Direkli ılcasının câmekânından sehel küçükdür. Bu ılıca gerçi Veli Beğ ılcası derler, ammâ câmekânının kapusu üzre celî hatt-ı hûb ile merkûm olan târîh-i mergûb budur:

Bu makâm-ı dilküşânın dediler târîhni

Mustafâ Paşa binâsıdır binâ-yı bî bedel"

"Bu mezkûr Veli Beğ ılcası kurbunda Bârûdhâne ılcası ol kadar tekellüflü ılıca değildir, ammâ hâssası vâfirdir, ekseriyyâ girenler kâfirdir. Ve Bârûdhânenin cümle çarhları bu ılıca suyundan deverân eder, gûyâ çarh-ı felekdir. Bu âsâr-ı acîbe dahi mahalliyle tahrîr olunur. İmdi bu belde-ı Budin seddinde niçe ılcalar vardır, ammâ ma'lûmumuz olan bu mezkûr germâblardır, ve's-selâm." (Evliyâ VI, pp. 140, 145, 147–149, 154).

Early June 1665. John Burbury's description of the Veli Beg Bath: "The hot Bath here (for which Buda is celebrated) hath the Pavement of marble, and the Fountain that feeds it is so luxuriant in Water, that what runs in waste drives two Powder-mills, and a Corn-mill. The Pond, where the Spring rises, is said to have Fish, wich if true, may be said to be parboyl'd, but Frogs I saw in it. The chief Bath is so hot, that is presently causeth Sweat, and is very much frequented. Before your Eye can find it, you enter a square Room, with Windows on both sides, and light from the top, with places erected from the ground, and cover'd with Mats and carpets, to repose on after bathing, with a place in the middle for the Clothes of the ordinary People, and round about the Room hang Clothes in the nature of Aprons, wich the Bathers put before them, and persons there attending do furnish them with, who while they are bathing, do wash their Boots or Shooes, the way the Turks use for making them clean. Having bathed enough, and drest them selves again, on a Stall, that is cover'd with Carpets the Receiver of the Money sits demanding his due, wich is inconsiderably little." (Burbury 1671, pp. 90–92).

1669. Edward Brown: "Da sind, wie bereits angeführt wurde, acht Bäder, über welche ich während meines Aufenthaltes in Ofen gute Gelegenheit hatte, Nachrichten einzuziehen, nämlich: von diesen erwähnten acht Bädern, liegen drei nach Osten und Südosten von der Stadt, auf dem Wege nach Constantinopel, die fünf andern aber am West-Ende der Stadt, an dem Wege nach Alt-Ofen und Gran.

Das erste ist ein geräumiges offenes Bad, an dem Fuße des hohen felsigen Berges, Wageweier genannt, wovon das fremde abergläubische Volk sich Vieles einbildet.

Das zweite ist gedeckt mit einer Kuppel, und befindet sich dicht und nahe dem genannten Berge, aber mehr gegen den Platz, an dessen Ende Leder bereitet wird.

Das dritte wird das Bad mit den grünen Säulen genannt, welche gegenwärtig von rother Farbe sind. Diesem Bade gegenüber befindet sich eine Herberge für Reisende. Dieses Wasser ist heiß, jedoch ohne Zuthun von kaltem Wasser erträglich, und enthält solche Bestandtheile, woraus Stein wird; das, welches sich von Zeiten her

aus diesem Bade wasser während seines Träufelns und an anderen Orten ausgebildet hat, zeigt einen grauen Stein. Die Ausdünstung von diesem Bade prallt von der Kuppel zurück, wodurch an dem Eisen, welches sich von einer Säule zur andern erstreckt, längs den Kapitälern derselben Tropfsteine, gleich herabhängenden Kegeln gebildet werden. Dieses Wasser wird zur Nachtzeit abgelassen, wenn die Frauen aus dem Bade, in welchem sie sich oft spät aufhalten, gegangen sind. Das bad ist rund, mit dicken Pfeilern in der ganzen Rundung versehen, die eine Kuppel tragen, welche Oeffnungen hat, damit die Ausdünstung entweichen könne, und dennoch bleibt der ganze Raum eine beständig warme Stube.

Die Bäder am West-Ende der Stadt sind zu förderst:

Tactelli, oder des Tafel-Bad, dieses ist ein offnes kleines Bad, das Wasser sieht weiß aus, und ist von einem schwefelartigen Geruch, sie trinken aus dieser Quelle eben so, als wären sie im Bade. Alles, was sie trinken, fließet durch eine Röhre zu, in welcher das Wasser hingeleitet wird. Ich gab einem Türken ein Fünf-Stüber-Stück (eine silberne Münze im Werthe von 5 Groschen) damit er es im Bade, vor meiner, zwischen seinen Fingern, während das warme Wasser aus der Röhre auf dasselbe fiel, reibend vergolde, welches in einer halben Minute vollführt wurde.

Das zweite ist Barat Degirmene, oder das Bad der Pulver-Mühle, dieses Wasser entquillt einem, an dem Hochwege gelegenen offenen Fischteiche, und vermengt sich mit dem frischen Quellwasser, wodurch das Wasser in dem Fischteiche von einer Seite weißfärbig, von der andern hingegen klar erscheint, welches als eine Wirkung der aufsteigenden kalten und warmen Quellen zu betrachten ist. Dem Fischteiche gegenüber am Hochwege ist eine Pulver-Mühle, worin Schießpulver bereitet wird.

Das dritte ist Cuzzoculege, (das kleine Bad) oder das Bad des Heiligen, von welchem die Türken wunderliche Dinge erzählen. Dieses von türkischen Mönchen bewachte Bad, entsteht aus Springquellen und ist so heiß, das man dasselbe nur schwer erleiden kann; hingegen, wenn man davon etwas Weniges in ein anderes Bad abläßt, so wird es zum Gebrauche erträglich. Dieses Wasser hat weder Farbe, noch Geruch, noch Geschmack, ist von gemeinem Wasser verschieden, und läßt auf dem Grunde keine Ablagerungen, da hingegen der Rand des Bades, woran sich ein schwammiger Stoff anlegt, grün ist.

Das vierte ist ein sehr edles Bad, Caplia genannt, zwar wurde ein Theil dieses Gebäudes, durch das zu Ofen im J. 1669 entstandene heftige Feuer verzehrt, doch ist es seit der Zeit von den Türken wiederum hergestellt worden. Das Wasser ist außerordentlich warm, und nicht ohne Ablagerung, welche sich an den Stein ansetzt. Das Gebäude ist beinahe achteckig mit einem vortrefflichem Bade in der Mitte, worin zur größeren Zierde rings herum ein Rand st, wohin das Wasser kommt, um dort die Füße zu waschen. Zur Seite hat dieses Bad eine Nische, in welcher eine Quelle ist. In der Mitte der Vorkammer, wo die Kleider abgelegt werden, befindet sich ein sehr schöner steinerner Becken, und ein Brunnen.

Das fünfte Bad ist das von Velibey, welches einen starken schwefelartigen Geruch hat, am Rande desselben ist der Ansatz der Bestandtheile des Wassers, welcher zu Stein wird, ersichtlich, und es ist so heiß, daß, um es erträglich zu machen, kaltes

Wasser beigemennt werden muß. Dieses Bad ist von allen das vortrefflichste. Die Vorkammer ist außerordentlich geräumig, das Bad von Innen ist sehr weit und hochgewölbt mit fünf Kuppeln verziert. Eine dieser Kuppeln, welche sich über dem großen runden Bade in der Mitte befindet, ist sehr schön, minder schön sind die andern an den vier Ecken, wo die Badestuben zu besonderem Gebrauche sind. Allhier lassen die Türken das Haar von ihren Körper durch ein Psilotrum, (das Ausfallen der Haare bewirkendes Mittel) vermengt mit Seife abätzen, weil es nicht ihre Gewohnheit ist, einiges Haar auf dem Körper zu haben, ausgenommen den Bart allein. Zwölf Säulen unterstützen und tragen die große Kuppel, zwischen achten derselben sind warme Quellen, zwischen den andern sind Plätze zum Gehen und zum Sitzen, wo die Barbierer den Badegästen aufpassen, und jeder von diesen Plätzen hat zwei Cisternen aus hartem Steine, darein man warmes und kaltes Wasser einlaufen läßt, damit dasselbe zum Gebrauche nach Belieben vermengt werden könne.

Die Männer baden sich Morgens, und die Frauen Nachmittags. Wenn Jemand zu baden gesonnen ist, tritt derselbe in das erste Zimmer, findet dort verschiedene Diener, die ihm aufwarten, und ihn mit Kleidern und Schürze versehen. Wenn der Badende seine Kleider abgelegt, und die Schürze umgenommen hat, tritt er in das zweite Zimmer, wo das große Bad sich befindet, und setzt sich zur Seite des Bades zwischen den Säulen, wo bei einer Quelle ihn der Barbier mit der flachen Hand stark abreibt, wobei die Arme ausgestreckt nach Aufwärts gerichtet werden, nach diesem Verfahren begiebt er sich ins Bad. Jenen, welche Unterthanen großer Herren sind, wird nach der, von seinem Vaterlande hergebrachten Sitte und Gewohnheit, das Haupt geschoren, eben so einem Jünglinge der Bart, ausgenommen an der Oberlippe. Nach diesem reibt der Barbierer dessen Brust, Rücken, Arme und Beine mit einem haren Zeug. Zuweilen sieht man Leute, die mit dem Angesichte sich zu Boden legen, dann wäscht der Barbierer deren Haupt mit Seife, und gießt über den ganzen Körper kaltes Wasser. Von diesem Reiben und Kaltwaschen wandeln sie in dem vom Bade erzeugten Dampfe und Dunste." (Linzbauer 1837, pp. 52–56).

1684. Engraving by L. N. Hallart – M. Wening. W: Der Türcken Bäder (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 28 (Cat. No. 70); Pl. 31 (Cat. No. 118); Pl. 30 (Cat. No. 77)).

1686. Engraving by Karl Joseph Juvigny (Domokos 1993, pp. 22–23).

1686. Engraving by L. N. Hallart. R: Warme bader (Kisari Balla 1996, no. 101).

1686. Engraving by Leonardo Anguissola. I: Bagni d'aqua Calda (Kisari Balla 2000, nos. 247, 248).

1686. *Calendarium Tyrnaviense ad annum Christi M. DC. LXXXVI.* G: *Thermae sub Monte.* H: *Thermae Reginae.* O: *Thermae Regis* (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 39 (Cat. No. 20; 78)).

December 1686–January 1687. Inspector commissioned by the Treasury János István Werlein: "The baths are cleanest of all, one of them formerly belonging to the Hungarian king, another to the queen." "The baths should be made use of, but it is impossible, as they lie outside the town. They are occupied by musketeers and commoners. They could be let out. Otherwise the baths themselves are in no need of significant repairing, it only being the surrounding premises and the rooms for the service of the clients that should be taken greater care of." (Bánrévy 1936, p. 263).

1686. Engraving by Nicolao Marcel de la Vigne. F: *Thermae* [?], &: *Duo balneae in dicta Civ. Te Inferiori. 2. Thymarum Scaturgio, sive Balneum Regale* (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 34 (Cat. No. 21; 88; 98)).

1686. Description of Luigi Fernando Marsigli (Szakály (ed.) 1986, pp. 592–593).

“1. Veli Bei Iligesi. Il Bagno dell’acqua calda minerale di Veli Bei. Questo è il più principale, e più magnifico; vi sono fontane dentro, non solo d’ acqua calda naturale, che scaturisce int re parti, e forma gli bagni, ma anco d’ acqua fresca, che si può aprire e chiuder a piacere. Nel mezzo è tanto largo, che v isi può natare dentro. È fatto con gradini di scala. Resta intieramente illeso: è coperto con mattoni, e fabricato di pietra.

2. Tahtali Ilige Bekir Efendinum. Il Bagno d’ acqua calda minerale del Bekir Efendi, fabricato di legno; intieramente illeso.

3. Kapili Ilige Horos Capusine Jakin. Il Bagno d’ acqua calda minerale, presso la Porta del Gallo, coperto di mattoni; resta intieramente.

4. Chiuzzuk Ilige. Il Piccolo bagno d’ acqua calda minerale, qual’è il più profittevole, è molto stimato, per esser di gran rimedio a gl’infermi; è tutto coperto di piombo, che dà buona rendita ogn’anno; è rimasto illeso.

5. Jessil Birekli Ilige. Il Bagno d’ acqua calda minerale con colonne verdi; è coperto con mattoni; intieramente resta.

6. Tahladan Acik Ilige. Il Bagno aperto d’ acqua calda minerale; questo anco è molto salutare.

7. Cadi Sokaginde Hamam Uzziurnali. Nella strada del cadi v’ è un bagno ordinario della città, dove si suole lavarsi scaldano le acque; è con tre conche di marmo, nelle quali si lascia correre acqua calda e fredda a piacere; questo resta intatto.

8. Pasciá Serainde Uzziurnali Hamam. Il Bagno nel palazzo del Vesiro di Buda; questo anche, come sopra, con tre conche, è arso, ma si può restaurare.

9. Tassirada ichi Hamam Bir Jerde Biri Avret Izzum biri Erler Izzum. Due altri bagni simili uniti insieme situati four della città, arsi, restandovi attorno le mura.”

1686. Drawings of the baths of Buda by Luigi Fernando Marsigli: *Figurae balneorum Budensium* (Marsigli 1726, Tab. 46):

“1. Balneum destructum, Vetus, ad Radicem Montis S. Gerhardi.

2. Balneum, ad pontem

3. Balneum, Rascianorum.

4. Balneum, civitatis inferior.

5. Balneum, Regium, in Cujus medio recessus.”

1686. A map of Ottoman Buda by Luigi Fernando Marsigli (Fekete 1944, Pl. 58):

“1. Açık ılıcası

2. Küçük ılıcası

3. Yeşil direkli ılıcası

4. Kaplı ılıcası

5. Tahtalu ılıcası

6. Veli beg ılıcası”

1686. A map by Andreas Magliar: No. 44. Bagno di Velibeg. No. 46. Bagno di Tah-talo (Rózsa 1959, Kat. 103/b).

1686. Simpliciano Bizzeri: “Fuori delle mura, verso Strigonia si truouano gli Bagni caldi molto stimati da’ Turchi, uno de’ quali chiamasi in loro lingua Velibeg, et un’ altro Tahtalo.” (Bizzeri 1690, p. 181).

1712. A drawing of the Császár Bath (Kayssers Bad) by Fischer von Erlach (Rózsa 1959, Pl. 70 (Cat. No. 123)).

Excavations: (1) Horoz kapi ılcası (= Király fürdő) (Gerő 1980, pp. 93–96; Gerő 1958; Gerő 1963; Gerő 1959). (2) Küçük ılıca/Debbâghâne ılıcası (= Rác fürdő) (Gerő 1980, pp. 96–98; Gerő 1959). (3) Yeşil direkli ılıca (= Rudas fürdő) (Gerő 1980, pp. 98–102; Kunszt 1947, p. 4). (4) Veli Beg ılıcası (= Császár fürdő) (Gerő 1980, pp. 103–106). (5) The hammâm of Toygun Pasha (Végh 1998, p. 16; Gerő 1974). (6) The hammâm of the pasha’s serail (Gerő 1999, pp. 353–360).

It is best to start analysing these data in a reverse chronological order, i.e. from the time of the reconquest of Hungary, as some very good descriptions intended to be complete and a great many excellent maps have come down to the present. Yet it is still anything but easy to identify names and loci. Although the number of baths in the different sources does not vary too much, Evliyâ mentioning eight but giving the details of nine (!), Brown knowing of eight and Marsigli listing nine, the exact details are still very difficult to collate. The baths in the castle are mentioned by Marsigli and Evliyâ Çelebi, who describe them in an almost completely identical fashion: they are both informed about the baths owned by the state and those found in the pasha’s serail. The bath of Toygun Pasha is only mentioned in Evliyâ, but it can be found on the map of De la Vigne as well. All the five sources make mention of the Horos Gate Bath, the Green-pillared *ılıca* and Veli bey’s hot spring. The Rác (‘Serbian’) Bath also appears in all five of them, although under different names: it is *Tabahâne ılıcası* in Evliyâ, *Küçük ılıca* and *Balneum rascaniorum* in Marsigli,¹⁷ and a domed bath facing the tanners’ square in Brown (although the latter also knows of a *Küçük ılıca* located at the north of Buda).

But the picture has blurred parts as well. We find two further baths in Evliyâ and four in Brown; while Marsigli writes about two, but gives the map and a drawing of only one. Evliyâ and Brown know about the bath next to the powder-mill (*Baruthâne/Barut degirmeni ılıcası*), which is not indicated in Marsigli’s drawings, only on his map, where, similarly to Andreas Magliar, it appears under the name *Tahtalu ılıcası*. This must be identical with the bath referred to in Marsigli’s list as Bekir Efendi Bath. All the sources seem to agree that there were three baths around Gellért Hill: the Rác, the Rudas and another one, which was ruinous and is usually mentioned as an open-air pool. The problem is, however, that while it is located by Evli-

¹⁷ In Marsigli we find drawings of four unscathed baths. The one with a columnar interior next to the bridge can undoubtedly be identified as the Yeşil direkli ılıca (no. II). Drawings V and VII depict the Veli Beg ılıcası of a more intricate structure with a side-chamber. The other two baths seem to be easily identifiable by virtue of their names, Balneum Rascaniorum today being called Rác, and the lower city (inferior) bath now being Király Bath. However, on the basis of the pictures they should be identified just the other way round. Unlike at Rác Bath, there is no trace in Király Bath of a ledge emphasising the root of the arch. A similar identifying feature could be the taperwise point of the wooden closets. It is possible that either Marsigli’s drawings are inaccurate or he may equally have mixed up the names of the baths.

yâ and Brown in the neighbourhood of Gellért Hill, Marsigli refers to it as being west of the Rác Bath. That there were several baths under the same name is not at all improbable, either.

Evliyâ	Brown	Marsigli's list	Marsigli's drawing	Marsigli's map	Today
Veli beg	Veli beg	Veli beg	Regium	Veli beg	Császár
Yeşil Direkli	Green Pillared	Yeşil direkli	ad pontem	Yeşil direkli	Rudas
Horos kapu	Caplia	Horos kapu	civitas inferior	Kaplu	Király
Tabahâne	Curriers' Square	Küçük	Rascianorum	Küçük	Rác
Baruthâne	Barut degirmeni	Bekir efendi?	—	Tahtalı	—
Açık	Open	Tahtadan açık	destructum	—	Gellért?
	Küçük				
	Tahtalı	Twin bath outside the city			

Let us now examine the history of these baths. It is the state-run (*mîrî, hassa*) steam-bath in the castle that first appears in the sources, which must already have been working by 1549. We know who its intendants between 1557 and 1568 were; in 1663 Evliyâ Çelebi praises the services provided there; and in 1686 Marsigli mentions its three marble pools. Its exact place is unknown, but in order to locate it, we have several points to go by. According to Georgius Wernherus, it had originally been the palace of the Archbishop of Kalocsa, which is known to have been in the Olasz 'Italian' (today Városház) Street.¹⁸ The same street, or according to Marsigli, at least its northern end, was called Bath Street by the Turks (*Hammâm yolu*). In Marsigli's list of buildings there is a certain Hammam mosque, which could be found in the neighbourhood of the jannissaries' barracks in the castle. It can be identified with the mosque dubiously called *Kirba* (?), which was located at the north-eastern end of Űri Street (Fekete 1944, pp. 87–88) called *Kadi sokagı* 'Qadi Street' (Fekete 1944, p. 82), and Marsigli relates that the steam-bath of the castle could be found in this very street. Thus we know, on the one hand, that the steam-bath was in Városház Street, and on the other, it is clear the bath and the Bath Mosque were both in Űri Street. This contradiction can only be dissolved by presuming that the bath and the mosque stood on the premises between Űri and Városház Streets, with entrances from both streets. Győző Gerő suggests that the premises were at No. 49, Űri Street (Gerő 1980, p. 83).

The second steam-bath of Buda was commissioned by Toygun Pasha some time between 1553 and 1555. It stood in the district named after Toygun, the remains of which were excavated by Győző Gerő in the yard of the Capuchin cloister. The remains of the vestibule suggest that it was a very impressive bath (Végh 1998, pp. 15–17). It seems to have been available for service throughout the whole period of Ottoman rule in Hungary – at least it was mentioned by Evliyâ Çelebi in 1663. Although it does not appear in the 1684 and 1686 siege-plans and descriptions, but,

¹⁸ There are several references to the palace of the archbishop of Csanád from the 16th century, all of which locate it in Olasz Street, but it cannot be located more exactly. Cf. Végh (2003).

together with its plan, it is properly indicated by de la Vigne's excellent map as one of the two baths of Víziváros.

The bath known as Yeşil direkli is the core of what is called today Rudas Bath, which was first recorded probably by Franciscus Omichius. On his way down from the castle towards the Danube he beheld a beautiful marble bath on his right and near to it the Mustafa Pasha Bath at the foot of the Gellért Hill. This can only be accepted if he left the castle via one of the western gates and neared the Danube through the Tabán, along the valley of Ördögárok. If this is true, the former building must have been the Serbian and the latter the Rudas Bath; and then this is the first reference to Mustafa, the founder of the bath, who is later mentioned by Istvánffy, Ottendorff, Schweiger, Lubenau and a number of travellers and soldiers at the end of the 17th century. The history of the bath is fairly well documented after the Ottomans were expelled from Hungary (Kunszt 1947).

The *ılıca* of the Tabán, too, is first mentioned by Omichius, if our argumentation above is right. Somewhat later it reappears in the vakfnâme of Sokollu Mustafa, the pasha of Buda, according to which the pasha had bought the bath from the former kadi of Pest, Hasan Efendi. The bath thus probably has a long history. Johann Wild (1964), although without mentioning its name, certainly refers to it in the description of three baths at the foot of Gellért Hill. The first detailed reference is in Evliyâ Çelebi, and from that time on the history of the bath is well documented. The sources mention it under the name Tabahâne and Küçük ılıca, Marsigli was the first to refer to it as Rác 'Serbian' Bath.

What is today called Császár 'Kaiser' Bath was also founded by Sokollu Mustafa Pasha at the northern hot springs. Although an epitaph relating the foundation together with a chronogram (*târîh*), has been preserved in the wall of the bath down to the present day, many have doubted that Mustafa had truly been its founder.¹⁹ It is partly because the bath is referred to as Veli Beg Bath in all the sources, and partly because previous editions of Evliyâ Çelebi linked Mustafa to the Horos Gate Bath. The fact, however, that the chronogram given in Evliyâ is identical with the last line of the memorial plaque in the wall of Császárfürdő, seems to have often been forgot. The most recent edition of Evliyâ has finally dissolved every doubt in this regard. A longer passage was omitted in previous editions: the description of the Horos Gate Bath is followed by that of the Veli Beg Bath. The complete text, however, has made it clear that Evliyâ actually saw the chronogram (*târîh*) in the Császárfürdő, where it can still be read. The sentence shedding light on the relation between Veli bey and Mustafa Pasha is also missing from previous editions. Evliyâ remarks that although the bath was founded by Mustafa Pasha, people usually refer to it as Veli Beg Bath. In my opinion, this has geographical reasons, i.e. the district was named after Veli Beg, whose tomb could be found nearby. Of course, it is not improbable, either, that the bath had started to be built by Veli, but Mustafa Pasha, his powerful master, dispossessed him of it, completing its development himself. In any case, it was the most eminent bath all-over Ottoman Hungary. Following the Ottoman period the bath appears under the name Kaiser or Royal Bath (Erlach: Kayssers Bad, Calendarium Tyr-

¹⁹ Similarly Gerő (1980, pp. 104, 155, n. 862).

naviense: Thermae Regalis, which is confirmed by Werlein and Marsigli: Balneum regium). There is an excellent drawing of it made by Fischer von Erlach in 1712.

The first unquestionable appearance of the Horos Gate Bath is in an early 17th century painting. It can, at the same time, be identified with the bath referred to in Sokullu Mustafa Pasha's *vakfnâme* as being found in the district of Buda, called *Gö-nüllük*, because we know of four developed thermal baths in Buda, all of which can be found in the *vakfnâme*. The other three are easily identifiable. The emphasis on the location of the bath within the town is also revealing, as there was only one bath in Buda, today called Király, that could be found within the walls; and according to the document, it was built by the pasha. The history of the bath is well documented after the second half of the 17th century.

Evliyâ Çelebi and Edward Brown say that the wheels of the powder mill was turned by the water of the bath of the Baruthâne. Evliyâ mentions no building, only inferring that the hot spring is attended by common people. Brown confirms it, giving an even clearer depiction: the bath is in fact a small pond of natural hot water. The small, square-shaped, plank-fenced area can be seen in an engraving by Fontana, the legend of which states that it is the fountain of the water of the baths (no. 76). This plank-fence is probably the reason why the bath was called "planked" (*tahtalu*) hot spring (Andreas Magliar), which is in all likelihood identical with Bekir efendi's planked bath (Marsigli). Provided that Melchior Besolt's reference from 1584 is related to this, the bath must have been working in the 16th century.

There were several other open-air baths at the foot of Gellért Hill. Evliyâ mentions one, south of the Tabán, on the bank of the Danube, further informing us that in Christian times it had been a developed bath, which having collapsed, the Ottomans were unable to rebuild it. It is therefore called open-roofed or simply open bath (*üstü açık ilica/açık ilica*) Âşık Mehmed assigns another, quite ruinous bath to the area, which was attended by common people. Marsigli gives the drawing of a bath exactly befitting this description and claims it to be old (*vetus*). This hot spring is identified by modern research with the springs supplying water to the Gellért Bath.

However, in Marsigli's map the *Açık ilica* is located somewhere else, west of what is today the Serbian Bath, near Naphegy. Âşık Mehmed's 1594 description may further confirm this reference, as he mentions an undeveloped hot spring on the Buda meadow (*sahra-i Budun*), two miles (*mîl*) from the Fehérvár (*Ova*) Gate. Siege plans do indicate a pond located in the area in question, i.e. in the vicinity of today's Déli Railway-station. Perhaps this is the bath indicated by Marsigli, as his depictions of areas outside the castle are rather sketchy.

In sum, we may say that first the state-owned steam bath of the castle started work prior to 1549. The thermal bath of Mehmed, *dizdâr* of Buda, was built roughly at the same time, before 1552, and might have been a predecessor to a later bath, perhaps the *Horos kapi ilicası*. Toygun Pasha's hammâm had been built by 1555; as had by 1572 the Yeşil direkli, the Veli Beg and the Tabahâne, and the Horos Gate Bath by 1578 at the latest. Open-air baths at the south-eastern part of the Gellért Hill foot and perhaps next to the powder-mill must have been opened by the end of the 16th century. The private bath of the pasha's serai was in all probability built at the begin-

ning of the 17th century, when the pasha's residence was relocated to the castle. No more stone baths were built, only wooden buildings like Bekir efendi's planked *ılıca*. A total of seven stone baths and two or three open-air pools awaited guests in Buda. Four of these enduring buildings can still be seen, two have been partially excavated, and only one has totally disappeared.

Csanád (Nagycsanád, Cenad, RO)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve cümle bir hammâm-ı muhtasardır." (Evliyâ VII, p. 144).

Eger

1570. Karye-i Korhaz [Kórház]

"Zemînhâ-l enhâr-ı ılıca der kurb-ı kal'a-ı Egri ma' binâ-ı kârgîr ve gayre der enhâr-ı mezbûre. Zikr olan ılıcaların mâ-ı cârîları tevâba'da olan toprakları ve binâları ile harbîların olup mâ-ı cârîleri araz ve tevâbî'leriyle verilmek ve binâları furuht olunmak ulu ve enfa' olmanın Budin'de tîmârdefterdârı Ahmed Beg – dama uluvvuhu – ile Behrâm nâm za'îm tâlib olup merkûm tapuya ve binâlara kıymet-i bahâ için mîrîyeye 880 akçe edâ ve teslîm etdiklerinde ziyâde ile taleb ider kimesne bulunmadığı ecilden defter-i cedîd-i hâkânîde üzerlerine kayd olundu." (Tapu 550, 140a; in Hungarian: Bayerle 1998, p. 153).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Der beyân-ı yenâbî-i germâbhâ-yı zemîn ve menâfî'-i uyûn-ı hârâ-ı arazîn. Cümle üç aded ılıcadır, ammâ biri erlere ve biri avretlere ve birinin suyu hayvânâtlara nâfî'dir... Lâkin Budin'deki gibi mükellef binâlı germâblar dedîldir. Bu ılıcalar olduğıçün bu kapuya ılıca kapusu derler." "Der-medh-i hammâmı râhat-ı cân: Bardesi iki hammâm-ı rûşenâdır. Biri iç kal'a kapusundan aşadî köprü başında Valide Sultân hammâmı gâyet müferrah ve dîlküşâ âb u hevâsı latîf altı aded halvetli ve cümle kibâbları kırmızı kiremit örtülü germâb-ı şîrîndir. Ve bir hammâm dahi Felemet [Felnémet] kapusu kurbunda müfîd u muhtasar soba hammâmı derler küçük hammâmıdır..." (Evliyâ VII, pp. 66–67).

28 April 1690. Inventory of bailiff Georg Edelsbacher: Turkish bath in front of the castle gate (Soós 1962).

Excavations: (1) 1 Dózsa György Square, the *hammâm* of Valide Sultan, in 1958, 1962, 1984–1985, 1987 by Győző Gerő (Gerő 1961; Gerő 1980, pp. 106–109; *RF* 1985, pp. 95–96; *RF* 1986, p. 85; *RF* 1988, p. 80; Voit 1972, pp. 276–280). (2) The former archbishopric bath has not been professionally excavated, and it was rebuilt relying on István Sugár's surveys between 1974 and 1979 (Sugár 1983; Voit 1972, pp. 300–302).

The hot springs of Eger had already been known to the Ottomans before they managed to occupy it in 1596. Baths are depicted in Houfnagel's engraving as well. There are, however, many problems regarding the thermal bath, which was on the bank of the brook Eger. The bath is generally referred to as Arnaut Pasha Bath and

its construction is thought to have taken place sometime between 1610 and 1617. This, however, is based on one single document of doubtful credibility. In 1794, István Katona published two epitaphs that he claims to have seen on plaques on the walls of Eger Castle (Katona 1794, p. 614). First it is odd that the work written in Latin presents the quotations in Hungarian. If they are not in Latin, why does not the author give the Turkish original? The texts themselves are very strange and do not in the least resemble the usual style of Ottoman inscriptions (*kitâbe*). They contain, moreover, statements an Ottoman dignity would never have made public, like the one on the success of Christians in getting their church regranted to them. These quasi-epitaphs are not lofty praises but short anecdotes. It is also dubious that dating formulas are missing. And even if all these difficulties were ignored, the person of Arnaut Pasha poses an insurmountable problem: we do not know of any Arnaut Pasha in Eger.²⁰ (In the original text his name appears as Vernauth.) Of course, it is possible that a pasha's Albanian ethnic affiliation is used as his sobriquet, but it is highly unlikely that he would refer to himself with that, especially on a plaque. All these circumstances make me think that István Katona can by no means be regarded as a reliable primary source. It seems to be based on a local tradition and not actual epitaphs. Of course it cannot be excluded that it contains some real elements as well. But even if one accepts that an otherwise unidentifiable pasha called Arnaut built a bath in Eger, there is no clue regarding its location. Evliyâ lists four baths, all of which, even the Valide Sultân Bath (!), can have been commissioned by the pasha. It is thus utterly groundless to ascribe the future Archbishopric Bath to Arnaut Pasha.

Its dating is also problematic. The *terminus ante quem* is Houfnagel's engraving from 1617, depicting a domed bath. But in this case the date when the engraving was (1617) made cannot be the same as that of its sketching, which must have taken place before the 1596 capture of the castle by the Ottomans. Some characteristics of the engraving – for example the half-built Bladigara bastion, the total lack of traces of Muslim presence within the castle and the depiction of Hungarian soldiers riding out in chase of the Ottomans and not the other way round – also confirms this (Csif-fáry 1986, pp. 65–89). Hence the engraving cannot be used for defining the date of the bath.

The weakness of its name and date is only matched by the bath itself. It was first presented to modern scholarship by József Molnár with two writings of practically the same contents (Molnár 1961, pp. 31–34; Molnár 1960, pp. 16–17), which were not received favourably. Whereas István Sugár, local historian of Eger accepted and further elaborated his ideas (Sugár 1983, pp. 109–230), they were totally rejected by Győző Gerő, eminent archeologist, who had been studying the remains of Ottoman Hungary for decades.²¹ The reason for the rejection was probably the lack of careful archeological investigations before the restoration of the bath in 1974

²⁰ The successive order of the pashas of Eger was established on the basis of Hungarian sources by Előd Vass (Vass 1986, pp. 30–38). According to Győző Gerő, Arnaut Pasha was the second castellan of Eger (without references: Gerő 1961, p. 3).

²¹ Gerő first attributes the building of the Valide Sultân Bath to Arnaut Pasha (Gerő 1976, p. 34), but in his later monographs he does not refer to the Ottoman origins of the archbishopric bath.

(Gerő 1996). István Sugár, however, basing on Evliyâ's description, provides an abundance of data making it unquestionable that there were two Ottoman *ılıcas* in Eger. The bath itself does exhibit Ottoman features and has other parallels. It is also beyond question that in the plans of the archbishopric to build a bath always *this* 'core-bath' is taken into account. Hence this part of the building is, in my opinion, undoubtedly authentic.

Another thermal bath is recorded by Evliyâ in the Ottoman period, but its history is well documented until its 1855 demolition (Sugár 1983, pp. 117–126, esp. 123). The bath used for animals was in all probability a simple hot spring, which can be identified with the third hot spring group of the area. The Valide Sultân ("Sultan's Mother") Bath appears first in Evliyâ and its history in the Ottoman period is unknown. But its history after reconquest is well documented (Soós 1962, pp. 23–27; Gerő 1961; Gerő 1980, pp. 106–109; Voit 1972, pp. 276–280). No traces of the small steam bath mentioned by Evliyâ have come down to us, but its existence is confirmed by local traditions.

Esztergom

Before 1563. The foundation of Güzelce Rüstem, Pasha of Buda (1559–1563) (Karácsón 1914, p. 43).

Ca. 1570. "Hânehâ-ı kal'e-i tahtânî-i Estergon... Hammâm-ı merhûm Rüstem paşa" "Mahalle-i mescid-i ...sultân: ...Hammâm-ı Mustafa paşa." (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Krafft 290, 75b, 86a, 97a, 99b).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve kal'a-ı Estergon'un varoş-ı kebîri dâhilinde binâ eyledüğim hammâmumı..." (Topkapı D, 7000, 11b).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk. "Ve dahi kal'a-ı Estergon'da bir germâbe binâ eylemişlerdür ki her câmi çeşm-i bîdâr-ı devlet ve her gûşesi halvet-i [...] olmuştur." (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 103b–104a).

1594–1595. Engravings by Johann Siebmacher and Meyerpeck. A double domed bath with domes breached by shooting (Torma (ed.) 1979, pp. 123, 124, and Pls 79–80).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ammâ bu yukarı kal'ada ... hammâm...yokdur." "...bu Tuna kenârı dîvârıyla yürüyüp cânib-i kiblede tâ handak ılıcası kullesine varınca..." "Ve bu dolma dîvârın iç yüzündeki handakda bir küçük kubbe ılıca var, Budin ılıcaları gibi issi değildir, amm, mu'tedilü's-sühûndur. Cemîli garîb ve gurebâlar ve huddâmân makûleleri bu ılıcaya girirler." "Ve cümle ancak bir küçük hammâmı vardır." (Evliyâ VII, pp. 167, 168, 170).

1669. Edward Brown: "...there are in this place Natural Bathes of a moderate heat." (Brown 1975, p. 31).

Excavations: (1) No. 6–8, Katona (formerly Óvoda) Street. Some parts of a significant Ottoman bath were excavated in 1969–1971, then in 1991 under the conduct of István Horváth (I. Horváth's reports: *RF* 1970, pp. 82–83; *RF* 1971, pp. 83–

84; *RF* 1972, p. 90; *RF* 1993, p. 80; Torma (ed.) 1979, pp. 123–124 (8/2u), drawings: 115). (2) The so-called Mattyasovszky Bath: No. 36, Bajcsy-Zsilinszky Street. Excavation of the harara (?) of an Ottoman bath covered with earth in 1969, under the conduct of István Horváth (*RF* 1970, p. 82; Torma (ed.) 1979, pp. 24–25 (8/2v), drawings: 115). (3) Ottoman finds and a medieval pool from the neighbourhood of the thermal bath Hévíz (Torma (ed.) 1979, pp. 158–161 (8/6)).

The Ottomans found excellent conditions for baths in Esztergom. The bath-houses that had been built by János Vitéz and praised by Galeotto and Bonfini might have still been standing (Torma (ed.) 1979, pp. 99, 110 (8/11 and 1r)); there was a hydraulic engine in the castle; and hot-springs abounded in the vicinity. When construction works exactly started is not known, but it is sure that there were two eminent governors of Buda, Güzelce Rüstem (1559–1563) and Sokollu Mustafa (1566–1578), who established baths in Esztergom. Although we cannot rely on anything to locate these baths, one of them may have been identical with the Bath in Óvoda Street, which is known to have been the most eminent bath of Ottoman Esztergom. The building depicted as double domed was seriously injured during either the 1594 or the 1595 siege. While Esztergom had been in Christian hands, it was used most probably as a dwelling-house; but disappears from engravings made in 1684, which suggests that it might have been destroyed by that time. Its role was taken over by the so-called Mattyasovszky Bath, a smaller building described by Evliyâ as rather shabby, which used the water of the same spring. This survived the reconquest and continued to serve as bath, even after the ground had been raised. As is evidenced by Evliyâ and archaeological finds, lake Hévíz was also used for bathing. There are many proofs that baths flourished at the end of the 17th century. Evliyâ Çelebi mentions a steam bath inside the town and a hot spring is reputed to have been located near the hydraulic engine. It is testified by Mátyás Bél in 1730 (Torma (ed.) 1979, p. 125 (8/2z)).

It must have already been working when Evliyâ visited Esztergom, who expressed his regrets at so much squander (Evliyâ VII, p. 169). Meyerpeck depicts another bath in the district called Rácváros as well, which, however has not hitherto been confirmed by archaeological research (Torma (ed.) 1979, p. 151 (8/3v)).

Fehérvár (Székesfehérvár)

1545–1546. “Be cihet-i ihrâcât-ı mühimât-ı kal’a ve bûshâne ve hammâm ve âsyâbhâ ve bâbhâ-ı varoş ve gayre 2447 [akçe].” (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt 630 (the manuscript is not numbered); in Hungarian: Velics–Kammerer 1886, p. 47).

1546–1547. (?) Kilise-i Senkiral [Szentkirály] der ’uhde-i Sefer bin Mustafa hammâmî (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt 593, 68; in Hungarian: Velics–Kammerer 1886, p. 52).

Before 1563. The foundation of Güzelce Rüstem, Pasha of Buda (1559–1563) (Karácsón 1914, p. 43).

1591. Gencîne-i Ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa “bir hammâm-ı latîf binâ eyleyüp...” (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

1594. Âşık Mehmed bin Hâfiz Ömer er-Rûmî (?–1600): “it has two baths” (Bálint 1870, p. 24).

1601. An Italian sketch of the plan of the bath in the outskirt called Palota (Kisari Balla 2000, no. 389).

1601. German pen-and-ink drawing of the bath of the outskirt called Palota: “7. Das Türkische Badtsambt dem Master Radt.” (Kisari Balla 2000, no. 365).

22 August 1602. Report on the Ottoman siege: “The enemy were battering the bath with guns.” (Benda–Nehring 1978, p. 275).

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Der-medh-i hammâm-ı râhat-ı cân: Cümle bir aded hammâm-ıdır, ammâ çift hammâm-ıdır.” (Siklósi 1990b, p. 40).

1688. Saltpetre-making was started in the former Ottoman bath (Siklósi 1990b, p. 40).

1689. The plan of the town centre by La Vergne indicates several Ottoman baths, e.g. on today’s Szabadság Square, but it does not indicate the bath now attributed to Güzelce Rüstem (Siklósi 1990b, p. 40).

1750. The artillery takes possession of the bath attributed to Güzelce Rüstem. The former saltpetre factory was demolished in the second half of the 18th century, and a baroque house was built on its remains (Siklósi 1990b, p. 40).

Excavations: 1960: Gerő. 1987/88 and 1991: Siklósi (Siklósi 1989, pp. 154–159; Siklósi 1990a, pp. 141–149). For Gyula Siklósi’s report see: *RF* 1991, p. 90; *RF* 1993, p. 96; Gerő 1980, pp. 109–110; Gerő 1977, pp. 112–117; Siklósi 1990b, pp. 39–41, 88. 1985: Siklósi’s rescue excavation of the Palotai mosque.

The Ottomans were quick to make themselves feel at home in Fehérvár, which included bath buildings as well. In 1545 they already possess one which needs to be repaired. Then Güzelce Rüstem Pasha and Sokollu Mustafa Pasha, governors of Buda make foundations. Although hitherto the bath of the outskirt called Palota has been identified with the 1545 data, and that excavated at No. 2, Jókai Street with Güzelce Rüstem’s,²² in the light of the extant data I am not convinced that these identifications can be upheld. The fact that foundations were created and included the baths does not necessarily imply that the baths were also newly founded. We must remember that Esztergom had a working bath from 1545 on and there were two steam baths before the siege of 1601: one in the outskirt called Palota and another at No. 2, Jókai Street. The former disappears from the sources later and might have been destroyed during the Ottoman siege. But the history of the twin-bath in the town centre is well documented down to its demolition in the 18th century. It is clear that this bath is described by Evliyâ Çelebi, who mentions a twin-bath – a statement confirmed by archaeological data as well. The other bath referred to by Âşık Mehmed was perhaps the same as that of the district called Palota. Apart from these two, if we are to trust

²² This hypothesis was originally put forward by Fitz–Császár–Papp (1966, p. 31). It came to be generally acknowledged on the grounds that it had an eminent place, thus it might have been the most elegant bath. In 1977 Gerő unquestioningly talked about the Güzelce Rüstem Pasha Bath, adding that he completely agrees with this identification (Gerő 1977, p. 113), whereas in 1980 he did not refer to the uncertainties concerning this identification at all (Gerő 1980, pp. 109–110).

the map of La Vergne, there must have been further baths in the town. Their probable insignificance may be the reason for Evliyâ's silence over them.

Gyula

1579. ? Hacı hammâmî (Káldy-Nagy 1982, p. 48).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve cümle bir dâne Alî beğ hammâmı vardır" (Gerelyes 1996, p. 104).

1715. The bath was granted to the Calvinist community as a church.

1722. A drawing by Rosenfeld. Elevation and plan (Gerelyes 1996, Tab. XXI; Gerő 1980, pp. 110–111).

1784. Calvinist church and school at the same time (Gerelyes 1996, p. 104).

1818. Transformed into an elementary school by Mihály Nusbeck, which is still there. Its further foundations were then excavated (Gerő 1980, p. 157, n. 941).

Excavations: at the time of another alteration in 1962, rescue excavations and preliminary research were carried out by Győző Gerő (No. 3, Erkel Square), which he continued in 1982 (Gerő 1980, p. 157, n. 935). For Győző Gerő's report see: *RF* 1983, p. 82.

As is evidenced by archeological finds, the Ottomans used or rebuilt the baths of Gyula, which had been working since the Middle Ages (Gerelyes 1996, p. 104).

By 1579 there must have been a bath in the town, as we know the name of the bath-keeper. The institution continued to be in use down to the end of the Ottoman period, and was later used as a church and school. The only bath Evliyâ Çelebi mentions must be this building. He infers that this bath was founded by Ali Beg, whose mosque and tomb, the only significant buildings of the town, can be found near the bath. The person of Ali in question is probably identical with Pîrsiz Ali Beg, who governed the province in 1567–1571, 1581–1582 and 1583–1584 (Dávid 1993, pp. 161–163).

Provided that bath-keeper Hacı was working in a new, Ottoman-style bath, it had surely been built by Ali during his first tenure. The materials for the bath were taken from the demolished churches of the nearby villages, which was remembered by the locals as late as in 1733 (Gerelyes 1996, p. 104).

Hatvan

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve kal'a-ı Hatvan dâilinde vâki' olan hammâmumı..." (Topkapı, D 7000, 14b–15a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa "kal'a-ı be-nâmda bir latîf hammâm binâ buyurmuşlardır" (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

1596. Drawing by Wilhelm Dilich: Hadwan. C: Badtstube (Dercsényi–Voit 1972, pp. 251–259 (I/1; I/3)).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "...ve cümle bir aded kesîf küçük hammâmı var..." (Evliyâ VII, p. 61).

1684. Drawing: 3. Li Bagni presso la Moschea (Dercsényi – Voit 1972, p. 256).

1686. A drawing by Efraim von Strackwitz after the evacuation of the town. No. 9. Bath. Not destroyed by fire (Kisari Balla 2000, no. 38).

Jenő (Borosjenő, Ienu: RO)

1660. Evliyâ Çelebi: "...Paşa sarayı... hammâmlı..." (Evliyâ V, p. 212).

Kanizsa (Nagykanizsa)

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve bu câmi'e muttasıl Sührâb Mehmed Paşa'nın bir latîf hammâmı var, ammâ küçükdür, zîrâ bataklık yerde olmağile büyük hammâm inşâ olunsa temel dutmaz." (Evliyâ VI, p. 316).

There was a terrible conflagration in Kanizsa in July 1660 (Miklós Zrínyi's report of 25 June 1660: Széchy 1900, p. 86). The town was rebuilt by Sahrâb Mehmed, a future governor of Buda.²³ Evliyâ infers that the bath was founded by him, which, however, does not necessarily exclude that there had been a bath prior to the conflagration.

Kaposvár

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve cümle (—) aded hammâm-ı râhat-ı cândır" (Evliyâ VII, p. 18).

Kobila (Alsókaol, Donji Kobilj: SE)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "... ve bir hammâm ... var" (Evliyâ VII, p. 140).

Koppány (Törökkoppány)

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve kal'a-ı Koppanda binâ eyledüğim hammâmumı ve mezkûr hammâma tâbi' sekiz bâb dükkânımı..." (Topkapı, D 7000, 12a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa "kal'ada bir hammâm-ı behcet-encâm binâ eylemişlerdür" (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 103b–104a).

²³ Gévay (1841, p. 47). Sahrâb Mehmed was truly the beglerbeg of Kanizsa in the early 1660s, see Fekete (1993, p. 225).

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve cümle iki aded hammâmı var, biri iç kal’ada Süleymân hammâmı, biri taşra varoşda Beğ hammâmı var” (Evliyâ VII, p. 16).

Lippa (Lipova: RO)

Before 1563. Foundation of Güzelce Rüstem, Pasha of Buda (1559–1563) (Karácson 1914, p. 43).

1567. “Mahalle-i Ferhâd Kethüdâ: Mezid hammâmî.” “Mahalle-i mescid-i Kâsim paşa el-merhûm: Dellâk Bali, Dellâk Hasan” (Fodor 1997, p. 323).

1579. “Mahalle-i câmi’-i şerîf: Mehmed hammâmî.” “Mahalle-i Kâsim paşa: Dellâk Hasan” “Mahalle-i Hüsrev aga: Dellâk Kaya” (Fodor 1997, pp. 328, 329).

Mohács

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). “Ve Mohaç palankası varoşunda .. mezkûr kârbân-sarâyım kurbında binâ eyledüğim hammâmı...” (Topkapı, D 7000, 13a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa “varoşda dahi bir kârbân-sarây-ı latîf ve kurbında bir hammâm-ı latîf binâ buyurmuşlardır” (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

Early 17th century. An aquarelle by an anonymous master: a building that looks like a bath in the periphery of the town (Jajczay 1934, inserted between pp. 14 and 15).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve bir hammâm-ı latîfi var, ol dahi kiremitlidir...” (Evliyâ VI, p. 111).

Nádasd (Mecseknádasd)

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: “...ve bir küçük hammâmcuğazı... var” (Evliyâ VII, p. 19).

Nógrád

Ca. 1570. “Parkan-ı cedîd-i kal’e-i Novigrad: ...Hammâm-ı Mustafa paşa mîrmîrân-ı vilâyet-i Budun...hâne-i Yûsuf hammâmî...” (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Krafft 290, 37a, 38b, 41b).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). “Ve kal’a-ı Novigrad dâhilinde binâ eyledüğim hammâmımı...” (Topkapı, D 7000, 14a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa “bir hammâm-ı latîf binâ eylemişlerdür” (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Bu kal’a dest-i İslâm’da iken bir küçük hammâmı var imiş, mu’attal dururdu. Hammâmı... asker-i İslâm amâra başlayup...” (Evliyâ VI, p. 235).

Nógrád was in Ottoman hands from 1544 to 1594, and later from 1663 to 1685. Evliyâ Çelebi visited it shortly after the first capture, and his description makes it sure that there had been a bath already in the former period, i.e. before 1594. The building of the bath survived the latter, Christian period unscathed. Gerhard Graas' very detailed survey of the castle has come down to us from 1565 (Kisari Balla 2000, no. 55: 314; no. 200: 459, nos. 201–202: 460–461). One of the buildings indicated in the survey must be the bath, but we cannot define which one.

Orsova (Orşova: RO)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve kal'anın handak kenârında bir hammâmı ... var” (Evliyâ VII, p. 172).

Pécs

Ca. 1546. Register: “An mahsûl-ı kist-i hammâm fî sene 4300 [akçe]” (İstanbul, Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Tapu 441, varak 9).

1546–1547. “... ve kist-i hammâmân der kal'a-ı Peçuy ve Şikloş” (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt, 630 (the manuscript is not numbered); in Hungarian: Velics – Kammerer 1886, p. 55).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Der-medh-i hammâm-ı gâsılân-ı râhat-ı cân: Hamusu üç aded hammâmı var, ammâ cümleden Kâsim Paşa hammâmı: Câmi'inin mihrâbı önünde yol aşırı sol cânibde bir hammâm-ı latîf ü nazîfdır kim dillerde dâstândır. Ab u hevi ve binâsı dahi latîfdır. Bu hammâmın câmekânı bir kubbe-i bâlâ-yı azîmdir. Anın tâ vasatında yekpâre beyâz mermerden bir havz-ı azîm var kim diller ile ta'bır olunmaz... Ve bu havzın tâ ortasında sapsarı altuna benzer sarı piriçden bir şazrevân kadehi var. İçine on beş adem murabba' otursa sıdar. Tâ bu mertebe vâsi' dökme piriç kadehdir. Ve bu kadehin cânib [ü] etrâfında on iki aded ejder adızları tasvîrlerinden âb-ı hayât sular pertâb edüp cereyân edüp aşağı mermer havz-ı kebîre dökülür. Ve bu kadeh-i musanna'ı üstâd-ı kâmil üç aded tuçdan öküz kellesi ve üç aded tuçdan kaplıbağa gövdesi sûretleri üzre bu şazrevân kadehin bir san'at ile oturmuş kim gören âdemin akli gidüp âlem-i hayretde kalır... Andan Seget [= Sziget] kapusundan içeri Memi Şâh câmi'i kurbunda, Memi Şâh Gâzî'nin hammâmı: Müferrih ve hoş binâ ve hoş meâlî germâ-yı latîfdır kim cemî'i hüddâmları pençe-i âfitâb gilmân-ı mehtâblardır... cümle mahbûbân-ı şehri Peçoy... derûn-ı hammâmıda reftâr ederler. Andan, Ferhâd Paşa hammâmı: Bir latîf hammâm-ı hûb-havâ ve bir pâk ve nazîf humma-ı rûşenâdır, ammâ ol kadar işlemez hammâm-ı fukarâdır.” (Evliyâ VI, p. 117).

February 1664. Pál Esterházy: “Sunt et termæ duæ intra ipsorum moeniorum ambitum, marmoreo pavimento, nec non aerea fontana ac christallinis super fornicem constructis fenestris ornatae.” (Esterházy 1989, p. 238).

1687. Map of Joseph de Haüy: 3 baths (*Bains*) (Kisari Balla 2000, no. 85).

1687. House assessment (*Inventatio domuum*): “Magna platea: [...] Quam sequitur balneum rudibus exstans...”; “Ad fontem quator canalium vulgo Nagy Csatornya: ... Ibidem e regione eiusdem Balneum ad instar Moschei nunc per Vigiliis possessum triplici apice tectum...” (Petrovich 1969, p. 208).

1695. Land assessment: Kâsim Pasha Bath (Molnár 1961, p. 41).

1774. Drawings of the Ferhâd Pasha Bath by Petz Mátyás (Szőnyi 1928, p. 37).

Excavations: (1) 1977. Győző Gerő, at the North-West corner of Sallai és Várady Antal Streets (Gerő 1987). (2) Excavations in 1984 in the Ferhâd Pasha Bath, Nos. 23–25, Kossuth Street (Szőnyi 1928, pp. 32–42; *RF* 1985, p. 112).

We have a rather clear picture of the baths in Pécs, as the data from the second half of the 17th century complete one another. There are only two baths mentioned in Esterházy and the 1687 house-register. Evliyâ describes three in 1663, which also appear in Haüy's drawing and among archaeological finds. We know their names from Evliyâ: Kâsim Beg, Memi Şah/Memi Şah Gâzi and Ferhâd Pasha Baths. Unfortunately there are no earlier data, only a part of the record of incomes from the bath in 1546 (!), where, however, we encounter a state-owned bath, which either declined, or went into private hands, being the ancestor of one of the three known baths.

It seems that Ferhâd Pasha very actively pursued construction works in Pécs. Beside the eminent twin-bath, he commissioned the building of a cloister for the Halveti order and a mosque. His activities in Banjaluka, the conquest of which earned him the title *Gâzi*, are also important. He had a *mahalle* in the town, where his palace was situated. The most beautiful mosque of the town, which was surrounded by welfare institutions and served as a burial-place for the élite was also his work. Further, he built in Pécs a bath, an elementary and a high school as well. The trustee of his *imaret* in Pécs, Mehmed Beg, was still alive in 1662, when Evliyâ paid him a visit (Evliyâ V, pp. 267–269, 287). There was a district and a mosque bearing his name in Belgrade (Evliyâ V, pp. 195–196), a fountain and a mosque in Sarajevo, the latter having been built in 1579 according to its chronogram (Evliyâ V, pp. 224–225). Although there is no direct evidence that all these buildings were the work of one and the same Ferhâd Pasha, their closeness to one another and the relative rarity of the name Ferhâd makes it probable. The only eminent individual in the region with this name was Gâzi Ferhâd belonging to the Sokollu family. He was Bosnian beg and later beglerbeg from 1569 to 1574, from 1580 to June 1584, and from October 1584 to November 1588, and was the governor of Buda from 1588 until his demise in 1590 (Takáts 1956, pp. 192–193; Gévy 1841, p. 14). If the bath was truly founded by him, it must be dated prior to 1590 (Gerő 1980, p. 121).

Kâsim Pasha was another important founder of baths. He was in the position of beg of Mohács and Pécs, and governed the province for five years in 1542–1547, and twice returned for a short period in 1557 and 1561. His career rose high and he became pasha of Temesvár and later Buda. However, he did not forget about where his career had started and built the most important mosque of Pécs and a cloister as well, although it was rather Eszék that he did very much for.²⁴ Due to the lack of data

²⁴ For a detailed biography of Kasim Beg see Dávid (1995–1996; 1999).

about bath construction, we can only state that it must have taken place before Kâsim's death in 1562.

The third constructor of baths is mentioned by Evliyâ as Memi Pasha and Memi Şah Gâzi,²⁵ about whom he relates a popular legend. When Memi Pasha conquered the town at the head of his army, they occupied the local cloister to find 50 Muslim children in the cellar. In their outrage they put the friars to sword and made the cloister a mosque, naming it Fethiyye 'Victory' (Evliyâ VI, p. 115). The story is an obvious indication that Memi Pasha was active around 1543. An individual with a similar name, Gâzi Memi Beg, later pasha, does appear in the region with the sobriquet Arnavut, i.e. Albanian, who was the grandfather of an old acquaintance of Evliyâ's, Sarhoş Ibrahim Pasha. He had been a very active participant in the Bosnian wars side by side with Gâzi Murad Beg and Gâzi Hüsrev Beg, occupying Koknovi in 1532/33, Zemonik in 1539, and Brod, Jakova, Dobrakuga, and Vokin. In 1536 Sultan Süleyman sent him with Murad and Hüsrev against Zadar owned by the Venetians. He was granted the castle of Karin with the title *sancak begi*, and conquered lands as far as Kirka (Evliyâ VI, pp. 244–245, 270, 276–279), becoming the beg of Kirka in 1537/38. Evliyâ mentions a *mahalle* called Memi Beg and a Memi Pasha Mosque in (Sremska) Mitrovica, the founder of which was buried next to the latter (Evliyâ VI, pp. 102–103). Evliyâ's story mentioned above does befit the rest of Memi's career, as here again Memi was accompanied by his old comrade Murâd Beg. The evidence extant suggests that he started to lay foundations here.

Pest

1555. VIII. 4. Dernschwam: "Zw Pesst hot der Khaiser ein gemain bad lassen bauen" (Dernschwam 1923, p. 271).

Before 1563. Foundation of Güzelce Rüstem, Pasha of Buda (1559–1563) (Karácson 1914, p. 43).

1573. VI. 20. "Den 20. sind die Herren mit einander auff einem Schiff gen Pest gefahren, und da ein schon Bad von rothem Marmelstein gesehen, welches man einheißt, und das Wasser schon warm auß einer Mauer herauß fleust." (Dernschwam 1923, p. 11).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve kal'a-ı Peşte dâhilinde binâ eyledüğim câmi'-i şerîfim kurbında vâki' olan çifte hammâmumı ..." (Topkapı, D 7000, 11a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: "Ve câmi'-i şerîf kurbında bir çifte-hammâm-ı nezâfet-encâm binâ eylemişlerdür ki derûnı mânend-i dil-i lârifân çirkâb-ı hadesândan sâde ve her gûşesi halvet-i erbâb-ı 'uzlet gibi hâşâk-ı agyârdan âzâdedür. Ve hammâm mukâbelesinde bir kârbânserây binâ eylemişlerdür..." (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 103b).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve cümle iki aded hammâmıdır." (Evliyâ VI, p. 157).

²⁵ The two names must indicate one and the same person, as the Memi Shah Bath was situated directly next to the Memi Pasha Mosque.

Segesd

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: "... ve bir hammâm ... var" (Evliyâ VII, p. 15).

Siklós

1546–1547. "... ve kist-i hammâmân der kal'a-i Peçuy ve Şikloş..." (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt. 630 (the manuscript is not numbered); in Hungarian: Velics – Kammerer 1886, p. 55).

1579. The foundation of İskender Beg: "A shop ... (?) with a tannery, near the thermal bath." "2 fish-ponds, near the thermal bath." (Dávid 1993, p. 179).

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve ümmeten bir küçük hammâm-ı hoş-havâsı var" (Evliyâ VI, p. 300).

February 1664. Pál Esterházy: "...aquae etiam calidae ad termarum usum non desunt" (Esterházy 1989, p. 240).

Thermal water in Siklós comes to the surface under the Perényi bastion. The site of today's sulphurous spa used to be occupied by an earlier building until the first half of the 20th century. In the 1970s rescue excavations were carried out in the area under Győző Gerő's conduct, who thought the walls to be of Ottoman origins but due to the lack of a more thorough archaeological investigation he found no proof that the finds went back to Ottoman times (Fejes 1937, p. 202; Gerő 2000, p. 106). Pál Esterházy's account gives us no hint as to the location of the bath, either. There used to be a steam bath at an unknown locality of Siklós.

Simontornya

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve Şimontorna palankası hâricinde harâbe kenise kurbında olan hammâmımı..." (Topkapı, D 7000, 12a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa "kal'ada bir bî-mânend hammâm binâ eylemişlerdür" (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve cümle (—) aded hammâm-ı gâsılândır" (Evliyâ VII, p. 20).

1696. The Turkish bath is in the possession of the widow of the late castellan, Péter Drevadelics Horváth (Kiss 1938, p. 98).

Szécsény

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve Sıçan palankası dâhilinde binâ eyledüğim hammâmımı..." (Topkapı, D 7000, 14a).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa "bir hammâm-ı latîf binâ eylemişlerdür" (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

1607. The Lutherans transformed the former Turkish bath into a church (Jakus 1987, p. 1).

Local legends preserve the memory of two Ottoman baths. One of them, only accessible to the beg, is said to have been housed in the sacristy of the Franciscan monastery;²⁶ and archaeological finds do indicate that the building was in Ottoman use. The other site of a former Ottoman bath is the so-called north-western bastion, which has been rebuilt many times. It is an interesting coincidence that the building was also used as a Lutheran church.²⁷

Szeged

19 August 1556–1557. VIII. 7. “An mahsûl-ı kist-i hammâm ve şem’hâne 2500 [akçe]” (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt. 590, 50. In Hungarian: Velics – Kammerer 1886, p. 89).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). “Ve kal’e-i Segedin dâilinde vâki’ hammâmumı...” (Topkapı, D 7000, 15b).

1578. “Mahalle-i mescid-i hassa: ...Hüseyn hammâmî....” “Mahalle-i mescid-i Hüseyrev mîralay-ı sâbik: ... Yûsuf dellâk...” (Tapu, 570, 12).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa “bir hammâm-ı güzîn binâ eylemişlerdür” (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve cümle bir hammâmı ...var” (Evliyâ VII, p. 142).

Szekeşzárd

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve kal’a kapusu önünde handak aşırı bir küçük kesîf hammâmı var...” (Evliyâ VI, p. 121).

Marsigli: “Lapis inventus inter ruinos Turcici cujusdam balnei, Opidi Sexar prope flu(viu)m Sarvis [Sárvíz]” (Marsigli 1726b, tab. 43/1).

Szigetvár

1579. The foundation of İskender Beg: “wasteland near the bath” (Dávid 1993, p. 178).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). “Ve kal’a-ı Sigetde vâki’ olan hammâmumı...” (Topkapı, D 7000, 13b).

1591. Gencîne-i ahlâk: Sokollu Mustafa “bir hammâm-ı letâfet-peyâm ... itmâm buyurmuşlardır” (*Gencîne-i ahlâk*, 104a).

²⁶ The popular legend was recorded by a Franciscan friar, András P. Nagy (1730–1777) in the *Historia Domus* of the Convent of Szécsény. Published by König (1931, p. 169).

²⁷ My thanks go to Tamás Majcher, director of the Ferenc Kubinyi Museum in Szécsény for this information.

1579. One ruinous steam bath with ten cabins (Vass 1993, p. 201).

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve cümle bir küçük hammâmdır...” (Evliyâ VI, p. 307).

1689. Laurentius Schaffen: “it has three valuable baths, one of which was used by men, the other by women...” (Szita 1993, p. 153).

Szolnok

1594. Âşık Mehmed bin Hâfiz Ömer er-Rûmî (?–1600): Bath of Bektaş Pasha (Bálint 1870, p. 306).

Before 1617. Engraving by Georg Houfnagel. C: Balneum turcicum (Rózsa 1959, p. 11).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve cümle (—) aded hammâm-ı dil-sitân” (Evliyâ VII, p. 136).

Tata

1594. Âşık Mehmed bin Hâfiz Ömer er-Rûmî. (?–1600) “Germâb-ı Tata. Bu germâb Macaristândan ehl-i islâm sene-i isneteyn ve elifde feth etdikleri kale-i Tata’nın cânib-i garbîsinde iki mîl mesâfededir. Abı mütedildir ve üzerinde kârgîr ile bir kubbe-i sagîre mebnîdir. Cevânib-i erba’sı kıl ve lay ve sa’bu’l-meşy ve’l-murûr mevzi’dir. Sene-i mezbûrede kale-i mezbûre fethinde fakîr hazîr olmakla ba germâbı temâşa etmek vâki’ olmuştur.” (Fekete 1944, p. 138; Bálint 1870, p. 241; Ayverdi 1977, p. 123).

Temesvár (Timișoara: RO)

1643/44. An inscription traditionally regarded as having belonged to a bath (published in Foerk 1918, p. 1).

1660. Evliyâ Çelebi: “Ve cümle dörd aded hammâm-ı dilsitândır. Evvelâ biri Yalıkapusu hammâmı ve biri Sukapusu hammâmı kapunun iç yüzünde gâyet küçük hammâmıdır.” (Evliyâ V, p. 205).

1717. A petition submitted by the magistrate of Temesvár: “No. 3. Das Türkische Baad zu einem Stadt oder Rats-Haus nebst bey dem gemeinem stattschanch zug eben erlaubet seyc.” (Petri 1966, p. 72).

1727. Map of the town: “No. 5: Ruins of Turkish bath. Later the German town hall was built here.” (Petri 1996, Tafel 1).

It is quite noteworthy that such an important town as Temesvár had so few baths, and even those were characterised by Evliyâ as small and shabby. It is perhaps due to the marshy vicinity that prevented the construction of more eminent buildings. We have data about the bath that had occupied the site where later the town hall was built. It is impossible now to find out with which of the baths mentioned by Evliyâ it was identical, as the bath was in the main square of the town and not in the vicinity

of one of the gates. On the other hand, Evliyâ informs us that the town had four *mahalles*, i.e. districts, which were named after the four gates, thus his remark may refer to the district where the bath was located. It was closer to the Horos Gate than the Yalı Gate, and was quite far off from the Vízi Gate (*Sukapusu*).

Titel (Titel, SE)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: Kal'a: "...ve cümle bir hammâm-ı rûşinâ" (Evliyâ VII, p. 140).

Tolna

1564. The order of Sultan Süleymân for a bath to be built, at the request of Tur Ali Beg (Karácson 1914, p. 60).

1572. Franciscus Omichius: "der Mechmet Bascha hat alda ein Badt unnd Cornetseria erbawet" (Omichius 1582, 9v).

Before 1578. The foundation of Sokollu Mustafa, Pasha of Buda (1566–1578). "Ve varoş-ı Tolna dâhilinde binâ eyledüğim hammâmumı..." (Topkapı, D 7000, 12b).

1594. Âşık Mehmed bin Hâfız Ömer er-Rûmî (?–1600): "It has a crowded market-place and a bath" (Bálint 1870, p. 239).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Bir vîrân hammâmı var" (Evliyâ VI, p. 122).

1686. Engraving: a detached building that resembles a bath (Grósz–Kápolnár (eds) 1998, pp. 160–161).

Újvár (Érsekújvár, Nové Zámky, SLO)

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Cümleden Fargaçi [Forgács] sarayı gâyet ma'mûr u müzey-yendir ... bir hammâmı ... var" (Evliyâ VI, p. 227).

Vác

Ca. 1570. "Hâne-i Laslo pop, hâliyâ hammâmdır. Mezkûr zimmî isyân üzere dâru'l-harba firâr idüp bir bâb kemer oda ve diger dörd bâb harâbe oda ve bir battâl ... ile ki bir cânibi parkan ve bir cânibi Balaş pop ve bir cânibi Varga Yanoş mülkleri ve bir cânibi tarîk-i 'amm ile mahdûddur. Sâbikâ Vaç emîni Derviş emînden iştirâ edüp sonra hammâm yapıp mescidine vakf edüp emînin bilâ emr bei'... ve akçesi hizâne-i 'âmire-i Buduna teslîm olunmak bulunmayup tekrâr müherrir-i vilâyet Derviş Beg bei' edüp mütevellisi Abdurrahman emîne temessük bulmağın deftere kayd olundu." (Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Krafft 290, 15b; in Hungarian: Fekete 1993, p. 99, no. 196).

1663. Evliyâ Çelebi: Taşra kal'a: "Bir hammâm-ı muhtasarı ... var" (Evliyâ VI, p. 237).

1680. In a map of the town, a bath is indicated in the German quarter (approximately at No. 9, March 15 Square) (Dinnyés et al. 1993, pp. 408, 430–432).

The locations found in the data contradict one another. It is certain that the bath registered in 1570 was in the Mahalle of the Kâsim Beg mosque, belonging to the foundation of the mosque. It is also clear that the house was built by Kâsim Beg, who is mentioned in the register as the beg of Nógrád. Consequently the mosque was built sometime between 1544 and 1570.²⁸ The exact place, however, of the Kâsim Beg mahalle is debated. Whereas Lajos Fekete locates it near the Kosdi Gate in the eastern part of the town, the future German district (Fekete 1993, p. 126), Előd Vass thinks it was in the south-eastern part, the future Hungarian district (Vass 1983, p. 106 and picture 6). In either case, the premises of the bath were separated by planks, unlike the bath in the town centre, which, according to a map from 1680, faced Main Street (Dinnyés et al. (eds) 1993, pp. 408, 430–432). For chronological reasons this latter bath is probably the one referred to by Evliyâ, although he gives no topographic description. Thus in the 16th century Vác had a bath that had been transformed from an old dwelling-house. Already in quite a bad state in the 1570s, it did not probably survive the vicissitudes of the Fifteen Years' War. The Ottomans thus built a new bath in the town centre, which, according to its plan, may have been domed. Perhaps its building was commissioned by Karakash Mehmed Pasha, governor of Buda (1618–1621) who is depicted by Evliyâ Çelebi as the restorer of Vác (Evliyâ VI, p. 237; for Karakash Mehmed see Gévay 1841, p. 26).

Várad (Nagyvárad, Oradea: RO)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Bu kal'a içre ... iki hammâm ... var" Taşra varoş: "Ve cümle beş aded hammâm-ı rûşinâdır." (Evliyâ VII, pp. 152–153).

1670. Matthias Miles: "Die vierte ist die Königische (Király Bastya) weil sie Johannes 2 erbawt hat, dieser entgegen kompt die kleine Bach aus den Warmen Badern Pecze genant, ist der Mühlen..." (Balogh 1982, pp. 221–222).

Evliyâ Çelebi surprisingly informs us that only five years after its Ottoman capture there were already seven baths working in Várad, two of which inside the castle. The latter were in all likelihood in the Renaissance-style palace, as there are no traces of new buildings in the sources. Miles' description may provide some topographic guidance saying that the bath was near the foot of the Király bastion, on the bank of a brook called Pece, which flowed into a branch of the river Körös. This

²⁸ Kasım obtained the house from Dervish Beg who was referred to in the register as the census-maker of the province. Since the register was ordered to be compiled in 1559 (Káldy-Nagy 1970, pp. 45–46; Dávid 1999, pp. 15–16.), Dervish Beg accomplished it perhaps in 1560. This makes it probable that the bath was founded around the same time. This Kasım is thus not identical with a beg with the same name from Nógrád county, already said to be dead in 1552 (Karácson 1914, p. 122).

stream is indicated as *Badwasser* in a German map (Kisari Balla 2000, pp. 84, 339, no. 80).

Versec (Vršac: SE)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "...ve cümle bir hammâm ... var" (Evliyâ VII, p. 166).

Veszprém

28 January 1555. Mehmed Beg appeals to the Sublime Porte with an entreatment for a bath (*hammâm*) to be built, and is granted petition (Dávid 1998, p. 21).

Visegrád

1664. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Ve cümle bir aded hammâm-ı gâsılândır" (Evliyâ VII, p. 50).

Zombor (Sombor: SE)

1594. Âşık Mehmed bin Hâfız Ömer er-Rûmî (?–1600): it has a bath (Bálint 1870, p. 306).

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: "Bu kullenin kapusu önünde handak aşırı ... hammâmı var ..." Taşra varoş: "Ve cümle bir aded hammâm-ı cânistândır" (Evliyâ VII, p. 138).

According to local traditions the Ottoman bath used to be on the site of the old Fridrik-house, under the gymnasium of the future secondary school (Borovszky (ed.) s. a., p. 209).

Yeni Palanka (Palánk, Banatska Palanka: SE)

1665. Evliyâ Çelebi: Büyük varoş: "Ve bunda bir binâ-yı latîf hammâmı var" (Evliyâ VII, p. 167).

References

- Aslanapa, O. (1950): Macaristan'da türk abideleri. *Tarih Dergisi*, pp. 325–345.
- Ayverdi, E. H. (1977): *Avrupa'da Osmanlı Mimârî Eserleri. I/1–2. Romanya, Macaristan*. İstanbul.
- Bálint, G. (1870): A magyarországi török hódoltságáról – XVII-ik századi török forrás szerint. I–II. *Századok* 4, pp. 233–244, 297–308.
- Balogh, J. (1982): *Varadinum – Várad vára*. Vol. II. Budapest.

- Bánrévy, Gy. (1936): Az első hivatalos intézkedések a visszafoglalt Budán 1686-ban. In: *Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából* 5, p. 263.
- Bárány, Á. (1845): *Torontál megye hajdana*. Buda.
- Bayerle, G. (1998): *A hatvani szandzsák adóösszeírása 1570-ből*. Hatvan.
- Benda, K. – Nehring, K. (1978): Székesfehérvár 1602-es török ostromának naplója. *Fejér megyei Történeti Évkönyv* 12, p. 275.
- Besolt, M. (1595): Des Wolgebornen Herrn Heinrichs Herrn von Lichteinstein von Nicolspurg... Reys auff Constantinopel in 1584. In: Lewenclaw, H.: *Neue Chronica Türkischer nation von Türcken selbs beschrieben*. Francfurt am Mayn, pp. 519–520.
- Bizozzeri, S. (1690): *La Sagra Lega contra la Potenza Ottomana*. Milano.
- Borovszky, S. (ed.) (s. a.): *Bács Bodrog vármegye*. Vol. I. Budapest.
- Brown, E. (1975): *A Brief Account of Some Travels in Hungaria, Servia... London 1673*. Ed. by K. Nehring. München (Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München. Serie C, Band 2).
- Buda és Pest* (1933): *Buda és Pest fürdőinek és gyógyforrásainak irodalma*. Budapest [1933] (A Fővárosi Nyilvános Könyvtár Budapesti Gyűjteményének bibliográfiai munkálatai 2).
- Burbury, J. (1671): *A Relation of a Journey of the Right Honourable My Lord Henry Howard from London to Vienna, and thence Constantinople; in the Company of his Excellency Count Lesley...* London.
- Csiffáry, G. (1986): Georg Hoefnagel XVI. század végi egri vedutája. *Agria* 22, pp. 65–89.
- D 7000: İstanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi, D 7000 (I used a microfilm copy of it preserved in the Hungarian National Archives).
- Dávid, G. (1993): Szigetvár 16. századi bégjei. In: Szita, L. (ed.): *Tanulmányok a török hódoltság és a felszabadító háborúk történetéből. A szigetvári történész konferencia előadásai a város és a vár felszabadításának 300. évfordulóján (1989)*. Pécs.
- Dávid, G. (1995–1996): Kászim vojvoda, bég és pasa. I–II. *Keletkutatás* 1995 ősz, pp. 53–66; 1996 tavasz, pp. 41–56.
- Dávid, G. (1998): Török uralom Veszprém (1552–1566). In: Tóth, G. P. (ed.): *Veszprém a török korban. Felolvasóülés Veszprém török kori emlékeiről*. Veszprém.
- Dávid, G. (1999): Mohács – Pécs 16. századi bégjei. In: Szakály, F. (ed.): *Pécs a törökkorban*. Pécs, pp. 52–65.
- Dercsényi, D. – Voit, P. (eds) (1972): *Heves Megye Műemlékei*. Vol. III. Budapest (Magyarország műemléki topográfiája VIII).
- Dernschwam, H. (1923): *Hans Dernschwam's Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55)*. Ed. by Fr. Babinger. München–Leipzig.
- Dinnyés, I. – Kövári, K. – Kvassay, J. – Miklós, Zs. – Tettamanti, S. – Torma, I. (eds) (1993): *Pest Megye régészeti topográfiája. A szobi és a váci járás*. Budapest (Magyarország régészeti topográfiája XIII/2.).
- Domokos, Gy. (1993): Buda visszavívásának ostromtechnikai problémái. *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 106:1, pp. 22–23.
- Esterházy, P. (1989): *Mars Hungaricus*. Ed. by Iványi, E. – Hausner, G. Budapest.
- Evliyâ V: Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi. Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 307 Yazmasının Transkripsiyonu – Dizini. 5. Kitap. Ed. by Dağlı, Y. – Kahraman, S. A. – Sezgin, İ. İstanbul 2001.
- Evliyâ VI: Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi. Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan 1457 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini. 6. Kitap. Ed. by Dağlı, Y. – Kahraman, S. A. İstanbul 2002.

- Evliyâ VII: Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi. Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 308 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini. 7. Kitap. Ed. by Dağlı, Y. – Kahraman, S. A. – Dankoff, R. İstanbul 2003.
- Fejes, J. (1937): *Siklós múltja*. Siklós.
- Fekete, L. (1944): *Budapest a törökkorban*. Budapest.
- Fekete, L. (1993): *A hódoltság török levéltári forrásai nyomában*. Szerkesztette: Dávid Géza. Budapest.
- Fekete, L. – Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (eds) (1962): *Rechnungsbücher türkischer Finanzstellen in Buda (Ofen) 1550–1580. Türkischer text*. Budapest.
- Fitz J. – Császár, L. – Papp, I. (1966): *Székesfehérvár*. Budapest.
- Fodor, P. (1990): Evlia Cselebi útleírása. *Keletkutatás* 1990 ősz, pp. 37–55.
- Fodor, P. (1995): Így kezdődött a török hódoltság. *Keletkutatás* 1995 tavasz, pp. 94–95.
- Fodor, P. (1997): Lippa és Radna városok a 16. századi török adóösszeírásokban. *Történelmi Szemle* 39, pp. 3–4.
- Foerk, E. (1918): *Török emlékek Magyarországon*. Budapest (A Budapesti Magyar Állami Felső Építő Ipariskola 1917. évi szüniei felvételei VI.)
- Gencîne-i ahlâk*, in: MTAK Keleti Gyűjtemény [Oriental Collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Török o. [Turkish Section], no. 215.
- Gerelyes, I. (1996): Török építkezések Gyulán (1566–1695). In: Jankovich, B. D. (ed.): *Tanulmányok a gyulai vár és uradalma történetéhez*. Gyula.
- Gerlach, St. (1674): *Stephan Gerlachs des Altern Tage Buch...* Frankfurt am Mayn.
- Gerő, Gy. (1958): A törökkori király fürdő I. *Budapest régiségei* 18, pp. 587–599.
- Gerő, Gy. (1959): A Budapesti Történeti Múzeum leletmentései és ásatásai az 1958. évben. *Törökkor. Budapest Régiségei* 19, pp. 266–267.
- Gerő, Gy. (1961): Az egri török fürdő 1958. évi feltárása. *Az Egeri Vár Híradója* 3, pp. 1–12.
- Gerő, Gy. (1963): A törökkori király fürdő II. *Budapest régiségei* 20, pp. 137–154.
- Gerő, Gy. (1974): Gerő Győző jelentése. *Régészeti Füzetek* 27, p. 82.
- Gerő, Gy. (1976): *Török építészeti emlékek Magyarországon*. Budapest.
- Gerő, Gy. (1977): Istolni Belgrád építészeti emlékei. In: Kralovánszky, A. (ed.): *Székesfehérvár Évszázadai*. Vol. III. Székesfehérvár, pp. 112–171.
- Gerő, Gy. (1980): *Az oszmán-török építészet Magyarországon. (Dzsámik, türbék, fürdők.)* Budapest (Művészettörténeti füzetek 12).
- Gerő, Gy. (1983): Gerő Győző jelentése. *Régészeti Füzetek* 16, p. 82.
- Gerő, Gy. (1987): Das neuerdings freigelegte Memi Pasa-Bad in Pécs. In: Kreiser, K. – Majer, H. G. – Restle, M. – Zick-Nissen, J.: *Ars Turcica. Acten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Türkische Kunst vom 3. bis 7. September 1979, München. Vol. I. Architektur*. München, pp. 219–225.
- Gerő, Gy. (1996): A török Eger építészeti és régészeti emlékei. *Az Egeri Vár Híradója* 28, pp. 26–27.
- Gerő, Gy. (1999): Residence of the Pashas in Hungary and the discovered Pashasaray from Buda. In: Déroche, F. (ed.): *Art Turc/Turkish Art. 10th ICTA, Geneva 1995*. Geneva, pp. 353–360.
- Gerő, Gy. (2000): Az oszmán-török építészet emlékei Siklóson. In: Kanyar, J. (ed.): *Város a Tenkes alján. Siklós évszázadai*. Siklós.
- Gévay, A. (1841): *A budai pasák*. Wien.
- Grósz, J. – Kápolnár, M. J. (eds) (1998): *Tolna mezőváros monográfiája*. Tolna.
- Gubitz, K. (1910): *A muzeumőr jelentése. A Bács-Bodrog vármegyei történelmi társulat évkönyve 1910*, pp. 17–22.

- Hegyí, K. (1998): Etnikum, vallás, iszlamizáció. A budai vilájet várkatonaságának eredete és utánpótlása. *Történelmi Szemle* 40:3–4, p. 247.
- Hegyí, K. (2002): A török Bács. In: Fodor, P.–Pálffy, G.–Tóth, I. Gy. (eds): *Tanulmányok Szakály Ferenc emlékére*. Budapest, pp. 199–214.
- Hermann, E. (ed.) (1943): *Budáról Belgrádba 1663-ban. Ottendorff Henrik képes útleírása*. Pécs.
- Horváth, I. (1970): *Régészeti Füzetek* 23, pp. 82–83.
- Horváth, I. (1971): *Régészeti Füzetek* 24, pp. 83–84.
- Horváth, I. (1972): *Régészeti Füzetek* 25, p. 90.
- Horváth, I. (1993): *Régészeti Füzetek* 45, p. 80.
- Istvánfi, N. (1622): *Historiarum de rebus Ungaricis libri XXXIV*. Coloniae [Köln].
- Jajczay, J. (1934): *Császári követ fogadása Budán a török idők alatt a Fővárosi Könyvtár egy vízfestményén*. Budapest.
- Jakus, L. (1987): Török fürdőből és mecsetből evangélikus templom Szécsényben. *Evangélikus élet* 15 February 1987, p. 1.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1970): *Harács-szedők és ráják. Török világ a XVI. századi Magyarországon*. Budapest.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1972): Macht und Immobilienvermögen eines türkischen Beglerbegs im 16. Jahrhundert. *AOH* XXV:1–3.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (1982): *A gyulai szandzsák 1567. és 1579. évi összeírása*. Békéscsaba.
- Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (2000): *A csanádi szandzsák 1567. és 1579. évi összeírása*. Szeged.
- Karácson, I. (1914): *Török-magyar oklevéltár (1533–1789)*. Ed. by Thallóczy, L. – Krásmárk, J. – Szekfü, Gy. Budapest.
- Katona, St. (1794): *Historia Critica... Tomulus VII (correctly VIII), ordine XXVI (correctly XXVII)*. Buda.
- Kisari Balla, Gy. (1996): *Törökkori várrajzok Stockholmban*. Budapest.
- Kisari Balla, Gy. (2000): *Kriegskarten und Plane aus der Türkenzeit in den Karlsruher Sammlungen*. Budapest.
- Kiss, I. (1938): *Simontornya krónikája*. Simontornya.
- König, P. K. (1931): *Hatszázéves ferences élet Szécsényben, 1332–1932. A szécsényi ferencesek története a megye-, az ország- és az egyháztörténet tükrében*. Vác.
- Kunszt, J. (1947): *A Rudas monográfiája*. Budapest.
- Laurentius, S. (1568): *Commentarum brevis rerum in Orbe gestarum ab anno salutis M. D. usque in annum MDLXVIII*. Coloniae [Cologne] 1568.
- Linzbauer, F. X. (1837): *Die warmen Heilquellen der Hauptstadt Ofen*. Pest.
- Linzbauer, F. X. (1867): *Führer Seiner Majestät Sultan Abdul Aziz Khan bei Besichtigung der türkischen Baudenkmaler in Ofen*. Pest.
- Magyar, K. (1990): Babócsa története a honfoglalástól a mohácsi vészig. In: Magyar, K. (ed.): *Babócsa története. Tanulmányok a község történetéből*. Babócsa, pp. 118–128.
- Marsigli, L. F. (1726a): *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus*. Vol. I. Amsterdam.
- Marsigli, L. F. (1726b): *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus*. Vol. II. Amsterdam.
- Miroğlu, I. (1991): Âşık Mehmed. In: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* III, p. 553.
- Molnár, J. (1960): Arnaut pasa egri fürdője. *Műemlékvédelem* 4:1, pp. 16–17.
- Molnár, J. (1961): *Eger török műemlékei*. Budapest.
- Molnár, J. (1976): *A török világ emlékei Magyarországon*. Budapest.
- Mühimme (1993): *3 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (966–968/1558–1560)*. Özet ve Transkripsiyon. Ankara.
- Nagy, G. (1990): A Basakert építészeti öröksége, romhelyreállítás a Nárciszosban. In: Magyar, K. (ed.): *Babócsa története. Tanulmányok a község történetéből*. Babócsa, pp. 384–389.

- Omichius, Fr. (1582): *Beschreibung einer Legation und Reise von Wien aus Österreich auff Constantinopel...* Mecklenburg.
- Petri, A. P. (1996): *Die Festung Temeschwar im 18. Jahrhundert*. München.
- Petrovich, E. (1969): Pécs utcái és házai 1687-ben. *Baranyai Helytörténetírás* 1969.
- RF 1970: *Régészeti Füzetek* 23.
- RF 1971: *Régészeti Füzetek* 24.
- RF 1972: *Régészeti Füzetek* 25.
- RF 1985: *Régészeti Füzetek* 38.
- RF 1986: *Régészeti Füzetek* 39.
- RF 1988: *Régészeti Füzetek* 41.
- RF 1993: *Régészeti Füzetek* 45.
- Rózsa, Gy. (1959): *Régi várképek, a MNM történeti emlékei*. Budapest.
- Rózsa, Gy. (1963): *Budapest régi látképei 1493–1800*. Budapest.
- Sahmm, W. (1912): *Beschreibung der Reisen des Reinhold Lubenau*. Vol. I. Königsberg.
- Schweiger, S. (1619): *Gezweyte neue nützliche und anmuthige Reiss-Baschreibung*. Nürnberg.
- Siklósi, Gy. (1989): A székesfehérvári Güzeldse Rüsstem pasa fürdő. *Műemlékvédelem* 33:3, pp. 154–159.
- Siklósi, Gy. (1990a): A székesfehérvári Szt. Bertalan templom. *Alba Regia* 24, pp. 141–149.
- Siklósi, Gy. (1990b): *Adattár Székesfehérvár középkori és törökkori építészetéről*. Székesfehérvár.
- Siklósi Gy. (1991): Report. *Régészeti Füzetek* 42, p. 90.
- Siklósi Gy. (1993): Report. *Régészeti Füzetek* 45, p. 96.
- Soós, I. (1962): Újabb adatok az egri török fürdőről és iskoláról. *Az Egri Vár Híradója* 4, p. 23.
- Stoker, L. (1721): *Thermographia Budensis, seu scrutinium phisico-medicum aquarum mineralium Budae scaturientium, de earum origine, situ, antiquitate, numero, mineralibus, virtutibus et uso medico...* Augustae Vindelicorum [Vienna].
- Sugár, I. (1983): Az egri fürdőkultúra története. In: Sugár, I. (ed.): *Az egri gyógyvizek és fürdők*. Eger, pp. 114–157.
- Szakály, F. (ed.) (1986): *Buda visszafoglalásának emlékezete, 1686*. Budapest.
- Széchy, K. (1900): *Gróf Zrínyi Miklós 1620–1664*. Vol. IV. Budapest.
- Szekfü, Gy. (1916): Kútfőkritikai tanulmány a hódoltság korabeli török történetírókról. In: *Török Történetírók*. Budapest, Vol. III, pp. 1–63.
- Szita, L. (1993): Szigetvár kapitulációjának visszhangja az egykorú nyugat-európai sajtóban. Tanulmányok a török hódoltság és a felszabadító háborúk történetéből. In: Szita, L. (ed.): *A szigetvári történetész konferencia előadásai a város és a vár felszabadításának 300. évfordulóján (1989)*. Pécs.
- Szőnyi, O. (1928): Ferhád pasa fürdője Pécsen. *Historia* 1:1, pp. 32–42.
- Takáts, S. (1956): Ferhád pasa halála. In: Takáts, S.: *Bajvívó magyarok*. Budapest, pp. 192–193.
- Tapu: İstanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, Tapu defterleri.
- Torma, I. (ed.) (1979): *Komárom Megye régészeti topográfiája. Esztergomi és a dorogi járás*. Budapest (Magyarország régészeti topográfiája V).
- Vass, E. (1983): Vác a török korban. In: Sági, V. (ed.): *Vác története*. Vol. I. Szentendre.
- Vass, E. (1986): Adalékok az egri pasák hivatali sorrendjéhez. *Az Egri Vár Híradója* 19–20, pp. 30–38.
- Vass, E. (1993): Szigetvár város és a szigetvári szandzsák jelentősége az Oszmán-Török Birodalomban (1565–1689). In: Szita, L. (ed.): *Tanulmányok a török hódoltság és a felszabadító háborúk történetéből. A szigetvári történetész konferencia előadásai a város és a vár felszabadításának 300. évfordulóján (1989)*. Pécs.

- Végh, A. (1998): A középkori ágostonos kolostor felfedése a Vízivárosban. *Magyar Múzeumok* 4:3, p. 16.
- Végh, A. (2003): *Buda város középkori helyrajza*. Budapest (dissertation in typescript).
- Velics, A. – Kammerer, E. (1886): *Magyarországi török kincstári defterek*. Vol. II. Budapest.
- Voit, P. (1972): Eger város műemlékei. In: Dercsényi, D. – Voit, P. (eds): *Heves Megye Műemlékei*. Vol. II. Budapest (Magyarország műemléki topográfiája VIII).
- Wernherus, Georgius (1551): *De Admirandis Hungariae Aquis Hypomnematum*. Vienna. (1st edition: Basel, 1549.)
- Wild, J. (1964): *Reysbeschreibung eines Gefangenen Christen Anno 1604*. Ed. by K. Teply. Stuttgart.
- Zoltán, J. – Berza, L. (eds) (1967): *Budapest történetének bibliográfiája. I. Általános rész – A legrégibb időktől 1686-ig*. Budapest.