



The *Great Turkes* *Defiance Revisited*

Daniel C. Waugh

University of Washington
Seattle, USA

Еще раз о «Вызове великого турка»

Даниэль К. Уо

Университет Вашингтона
Сиэтл, США

Abstract

Four decades after his monograph on the apocryphal correspondence of the Ottoman sultan was published, the author reviews the previous study of the subject, the origins of his book, its skeptical reception then, and the current acceptance of its main argument that most of the Russian versions of that correspondence are translations from Western European pamphlets and newspapers. Recent scholarship has located additional proof, and the current article presents further information which should help identify the sources for some of the Russian texts.

Keywords

turcica, apocryphal letters, kuranty, translated literature, Ottoman Empire

Резюме

По случаю сорокалетия публикации своей монографии о легендарной переписке турецкого султана автор в настоящей статье рассматривает историю изучения предмета, рассказывает о возникновении своей книги, о ее первоначальном скептическом приеме и о нынешнем согласии ученых с ее главным аргументом о том, что большинство русских текстов переписки являются переводами с западных газет и брошюр. Новые исследования обнаружили дополнительные доказательства этой концепции, и в настоящей

Citation: Waugh D. C. (2019) The Great Turkes Defiance Revisited. *Slověne*, Vol. 8, № 1, p. 162–187.

Цитирование: Уо Д. К. Еще раз о «Вызове великого турка» // *Slověne*. 2019. Vol. 8, № 1. С. 162–187.

DOI: 10.31168/2305-6754.2019.8.1.6

статье описываются новые материалы, которые должны содействовать находке источников некоторых русских текстов.

Ключевые слова

туркика, легендарная переписка, куранты, переводная литература, Османская империя

It is four decades since I published my monograph, *The Great Turkes Defiance*, and just over four centuries since the publication of the English pamphlet whose title I borrowed [Waugh 1978; *Great Turkes Defiance* 1613]¹. This seems to be an appropriate time to review the antecedents to the book, its subject matter, and the ongoing scholarship which is elaborating on and correcting some of its conclusions. There is a great deal of new material which has been uncovered in the last 40 years, and the discoveries continue.

The book is a substantial re-working and expansion of one chapter from my 1972 dissertation on Muscovite literature with Turkish themes [Waugh 1972]. The subject of the monograph is the apocryphal correspondence of the Ottoman sultan with various addressees, in many cases only the sultan's threatening letter, in other instances with a reply. These texts were amongst the most wide-spread examples of anti-Turkish propaganda in early modern Europe, their origin traceable to the late 15th century. In the 16th and 17th centuries, during almost every war against the Ottomans, versions of what was in its core the same threatening letter ostensibly written by the sultan would appear in print or manuscript. The addressee most commonly was the Habsburg Emperor; many of the letters are addressed to the King of Poland, and a few to the Cossacks. The letters continued to be "re-issued" in certain contexts even down through the 20th century. Analyzing the versions of the letters that appeared in Muscovy, Poland and Ukraine was the focus of my book.

Russian versions of some of these texts were already attracting the attention of scholars as early as the 19th century. Andrei Popov published a noteworthy group of the letters from a Khronograf manuscript dated 1696 [Попов 1869: 448–458]. Another substantial group of them, in a late-17th—early 18th-century manuscript was the basis for an important article by K. V. Kharlampovych, who published some, but not all of the texts [Харлампович 1923]². Both Kharlampovych and A. I. Sobolevskii, in his pioneering study of Muscovite translated literature, asserted that at least some of the Russian texts were translations, not original compositions [Соболевский 1903: 238–239, 243–244].

¹ For a recent, brief summary about the apocryphal letters, published in reference series on Christian-Muslim relations, see [Waugh 2016].

² For more on this manuscript and the texts, see below.

We are indebted to the late Marianna Davidovna Kagan-Tarkovskaia for the first comprehensive effort to study the Russian texts in two important articles in the 1950s [Kагап 1958a; 1958b]. Her articles included critical editions of the texts based on a great many manuscript copies. She situated the letters in the context of the creation of “documentary belles lettres” that is literary/polemical works written most probably by individuals who had some connection to the Muscovite Ambassadorial Chancery (*Posol’skii prikaz*). She published as well apocryphal correspondence of the sultan with Tsar Ivan IV, whose texts, while possibly inspired by the other apocryphal letters, belong to a different textual tradition [Kагап 1957].

It was Mme. Kagan’s work which to a considerable degree inspired me to choose my dissertation topic, although when I did so, I could not fully anticipate how my conclusions about most of texts would end up overturning hers. My study of the letters was broadly comparative, where I was able to locate a great many of the non-Russian versions, texts to which Mme. Kagan did not have access. From a close comparison of the texts in several languages, I then demonstrated (at least to my satisfaction) that, apart from the correspondence between the sultan and Ivan, most of the other letters were undoubtedly translations. It was possible to suggest lines of filiation and posit the existence of other likely versions, even though I did not have in every case what was arguably the direct source which could have been used by a translator in Moscow.

Understandably my work was greeted by Russian scholars with some skepticism. After all, I was a foreigner and an unknown beginning scholar. At least in part, opinion must have been colored by my association with my mentor, Professor Edward Keenan, to whose heretical book questioning the authorship of the correspondence between Prince Andrei Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV I had contributed [Keenan 1971]. To question the originality or attribution of widely known texts of early Russian literature was unacceptable to most Russian scholars then (and, I imagine, a good many of them today). While I have only a vague memory of the discussion, the presentation of my work on the letters at a meeting of the Sector of Old Russian Literature in Pushkinskii dom on 3 November 1971 failed to convince the distinguished audience. I had brought with me to Leningrad a copy of the proofs of Keenan’s book; it was already becoming known.

The first of my publications on the sultan’s correspondence was a long article about the exchange with the Cossacks, placed in a journal which would not have been widely accessible [Waugh 1971]. On completion of the dissertation in 1972, I sent a copy of it for deposit in the Library of the Academy of Sciences, where it probably languished un-read. And there is good reason to think that at least at first, when my monograph on the letters appeared in

1978, many who perhaps should have read it did not, since it is in English. It certainly should have been accessible though, as I had sent numerous copies to the Soviet Union. If for no other reason, my article and book would be of value because they included in the appendices a good many previously unpublished versions of the letters.

Perhaps the first scholar to accept my argument about the letters being translations was in fact Marianna Davidovna Kagan-Tarkovskaia, in private correspondence³. As the leading Russian authority on the letters, she was responsible for preparing the editions for the comprehensive *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi* [Каган 2010] and for writing the entries in the *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi* [Каган 1993]. In both of these publications, she cited my work carefully and accepted some of my conclusions, but in cases where I had not been able to identify an exact source, she still was inclined to argue at least for some originality on the part of Russian bookmen who were involved in their production. Her argument that the response by Emperor Leopold I to the sultan's letter of 1663 is an original work still seems to be correct, and questions remain especially regarding the chronology and provenance of the correspondence with the Cossacks⁴.

Subsequent work, some of it very recent, has now filled in gaps in my evidence and provided some corrections, the result being that to a considerable degree my argument about translation has ceased to be controversial. In 2006, Prof. Ingrid Maier identified and published the exact Dutch source for one of the letters, correcting my mis-identification that a different, if textually very close, Dutch publication was the source [Maier 2006]. In 2007, for another of the translations, she and Stepan Mikhailovich Shamin published the archival original which Shamin had located, along with the exact source, a Dutch broadside which Maier had found [Маьер и Шамин 2007]. I had known the text only from copies outside of the original archival environment and had failed to locate the Western source. Maier's careful linguistic analysis of the texts provides important information on the skill of the translators. Shamin recently discovered in the Muscovite Polish affairs files a previously unknown translation from Polish of the sultan's apocryphal letter to the king which had been brought Moscow on 20 December 1642 by a *kadashovets* Ivan Stepanov⁵. Shamin has also found

³ I should note she was always most generous in sharing her work with me. When she was defending her *kandidat* dissertation, devoted to the "Tale of Two Embassies" (Повесть о двух посольствах), I was asked to write a formal *otzyv*, which I was pleased to do.

⁴ With regard to that correspondence with Leopold, my detailed analysis in [Waugh 1978: 66-75] retains its value; in [Ibid.: 60-65], the discussion of the Cossack correspondence supplements what I had published in my article on it in [Waugh 1971].

⁵ РГАДА. Ф. 79. Оп. 1. 1642 г. Ед. хр. 2. Л. 80-85, a copy of which was generously provided to me by Stepan Shamin. Its publication and analysis lie ahead. A preliminary

striking new evidence about the receipt of German newspapers that then were translated for the *kuranty* in 1683 and included the sultan's apocryphal correspondence with the Habsburg Emperor published in conjunction with the Ottoman attack on Vienna in that year [Шамин 2015]. I shall discuss those letters further below.

Apart from the archival originals of the letters and the identification of their sources, ongoing work is producing new evidence about copies that circulated outside of the chanceries. I was able to demonstrate in 2003 that the manuscript Kharlampovych had used when it was still in Kazan' prior to the Revolution of 1917 (it is now in Tashkent!) was compiled in Khlynov (Viatka) in the late 17th and early 18th centuries⁶. In it is a variant of the apocryphal correspondence which Kharlampovych had not chosen to publish [Уо 2003: 100–101, 298–300 (publication of that text)]. Ivan Anatol'evich Poliakov has very recently found what appears to be the earliest manuscript copy of two of the apocrypha, one a letter addressed to the King of Poland, Jan Kazimierz, and the other the correspondence with the Chyhyryn Cossacks [Поляков 2018]. This discovery raises new questions about the circulation of the letters outside of the chancery milieu in which they presumably originated. In a forthcoming article, Tat'iana Anatol'evna Bazarova publishes information on a newly discovered copy of one of the apocryphal letters which was sent to the Northern Dvina region along with reports about the siege and taking of Azov in the mid-1690s [Базарова (в печати)]⁷.

My ongoing work on the book Ingrid Maier and I are finishing about news in Muscovy has now turned up additional evidence about the apocryphal letters which merits some detailed discussion here.

comparison with the known versions of the sultan's letter to the King of Poland, published by [Каран 1958b: 240–244], reveals substantial differences—the new text is shorter than the “long version” of 1637 but longer than the “short version.” The presumed Polish original in many ways seems to be reflected in a late Muscovite manuscript transcription (in Cyrillic) published in [Waugh 1978: Appendix 3, 206–207]. However, it is premature to suggest that that text was based on a presumed Polish archival original for the 1642 translation. In general there are so many phrases and sentences common to all the versions of the sultan's letter to the king, a substantial amount of work will be needed to locate the 1642 text properly in the stemma of the other known versions.

It is important to note that some apocryphal letters attributed to the sultan include ones that fall outside the textual groupings I have focused on in my work. An example is the yet unpublished letter purportedly sent by the sultan to the Pope, a translation of which Shamin has found in the 1687 *kuranty* files (which he discusses in some detail in his forthcoming book). The archival copy, yet unpublished, and its source yet unidentified is РГАДА. Ф. 155. Оп. 1. 1687 г. Ед. хр. 6. Л. 96–101.

⁶ The manuscript is in the National Library of Uzbekistan (Ўзбекистон Миллий кутубхонаси). Пи9250; it has been described and analyzed in detail in [Уо 2003].

⁷ I am grateful to the author for sharing this yet unpublished article with me.

The letter to the Habsburg Emperor and King of Poland

To date there is only one known copy of the Russian version of this letter, in the manuscript that was assembled in Khlynov at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries. Apart from the fact the sultan is addressing both rulers, the distinctive feature of this text is an enumeration at the end of the letter of various public buildings and facilities in the Ottoman capital. As I demonstrated in my book (using Kharlampovych's publication of the text), the core of the letter otherwise places it in what I called Group B of the apocryphal letters. That analysis though was in some ways problematic, since we cannot be certain how well the one Russian manuscript copy represents the original Russian version of the text. Furthermore, the comparative example I had to use, for want of any other containing the distinctive textual features, was a pamphlet published in English by Nathaniel Butter in 1640, on the face of it an unlikely source for the Russian translation even if textually close to it. We cannot be certain of the date of the translation, which I somewhat arbitrarily indicated as "mid-17th century". While I still cannot claim to have found the exact source for the Russian translation, I now have in hand a good many other printed versions of this letter which are instructive to review. This evidence is revealing of the patterns of dissemination of these texts and may at least hint at where we can hope yet to find the source for the Russian translation.

It now seems that the earliest version of the letter addressed to both rulers and containing the appended details about Istanbul is in a German pamphlet published in 1621 in Olmütz/Olomouc in Moravia [*Warhafftige Absagung* 1621]. The title page boasts a woodcut showing two confronted rulers, one in a turban (presumably the Ottoman sultan), the other with a crown (most likely the Habsburg Emperor, who seems to be the principal addressee of the letter). The title page also points to a further source for the letter: "Diese Absagung ist von mir Johannes Werner von Ulmitz in Mehren bürtig / in offenen Druck gegeben / und von meinem guten Freunde von Breßburg auß Ungern mir zugeschrieben worden." Presumably the context for the appearance of the letter was the revolt of the Protestant Prince of Transylvania, Gábor Bethlen, against the Catholic Habsburgs (whose forces included Polish mercenaries) [Gabriel, n. d.]. This prince was supported at various points in his career by the Ottomans. Allied with the Czechs, he was elected King of Hungary, which then led to renewed open hostilities against the Habsburgs in September 1620. At the end of 1621, he again was forced to sue for peace. The name assigned by the pamphlet to the Ottoman sultan (Salamahomet) is something of a mystery, as Osman II was sultan from 1618–1622, succeeded by Mustafa I, who survived on the throne only for about a year and a half. Very likely, the composer of the original for the apocryphal letter was somehow garbling the name Suleyman, suggesting a further, 16th-century source from the time of Suleyman

I (r. 1520–1566).

Two further editions of the letter were printed in Olomouc in 1622 by Paul Schram, one retaining the same woodcut on the title page [*Warhatige Absagung* 1622], but the second, newly typeset, illustrated with a woodcut of a city under siege by, apparently, European (not Turkish) soldiers. Apart from some minor spelling variants and one passage in the descriptive enumeration for Istanbul, the texts of all three pamphlets are identical⁸. All of them add after the sultan's letter prophecies about the end of the Ottomans and the restoration of Christianity in their territories. The concluding section is a poem by Caspar Fuger, elaborating on the prophecy with appropriate biblical references.

Two decades later, another German printing of this text appeared, clearly deriving either from one of the Olomouc imprints or, more likely, from their source [*Warhafftiger Absage-Brieff* ca. 1644]⁹. The title page of the new printing lacks the woodcut, but the type on all the pages is set in a frame. The text on that new title page is somewhat condensed compared to that in the earlier imprints, but at the end, like them, it indicates “Dieser Absage-Brieff is von mir Johann Werner Buchhandler zu Preßburg in offenen Druck gegeben worden”. Below that is the further indication: “Erstlich Gedruckt zu Preßburg / Im 1644 Jahr.” In this imprint, the main part of the text is very close to that in the earlier printings, but two of the variant readings are of interest for what they reveal about the way that unfamiliar names can easily end up being distorted when a text is copied. The 1622 pamphlet includes in the sultan's titles “ein König in gantz Arabia und Mecha / ein Hertzog des Edlen Stammes in Grecia / und der Chur Armenia”, whereas in 1644, the passage reads: “ein König in gantz Arabien und America / ein Groß-Hertzog des Edlen Stammes in Graecia und Curaxiemia”. The 1644 pamphlet omits the specific reference to Vienna that is in the earlier printing. There are some substantial differences between the 1644 and 1622 editions in the information about the number of towers, churches etc. in Istanbul (see note 8).

Yet another German printing of the text appeared in 1652 [*Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief* 1652]. In it, the sultan's name has now been changed to “Molo Machometh”, perhaps because this was already the reign of Mehmet IV (1648–1687). The text condenses the sultan's titlature, replacing the presumably

⁸ The enumeration in the 1621 pamphlet reads in part: “die Stadt helt in der Ringmawren vier Deutsche Meilen / der grossen Thor sind an der Stadt vier und zwentzig / der grossen Thürme die zimlich hoch sind auff der Mawren / sind drey hundert und sechzig / der Kirchen gross und klein in dieser Stad seind vier tausent ein hundert und siebenzehn [...]” The 1622 printing (VD17 14:003219F) reads: “die Stadt helt in der Ringmawren vier Deutsche Meilen / der grossen Thürme die zimlich hoch sind auff der Mawren / sind drey hundert und sechzig / der Kirchen gross und klein in dieser Stadt / seynd vier Tausent ein hundert und siebenzehen / Tausent sechs hundert Mühlen...”

⁹ This unique copy is defective, with only the first three leaves, breaking off before the end of the enumeration of the sites in Istanbul.

unfamiliar “Mecha” of the original with “Mohrenland” and deleting what was probably deemed an incomprehensible “ein Hertzog des Edlen Stammes in Grecia / und der Chur Armenia /ein geborner Fürst unnd Herr des Dürren Baumes so an dem Berge Arachia stehet”. In enumerating the size of his army, where in the 1622 pamphlet the sultan boasted “etlich hundert tausent starck zu Roß und Fuß,” here we read “1300000. Mann starck zu Roß und Fuß.” The listing of Istanbul sites at the end is fairly close to that in the 1622 pamphlet; but in the final *datatio*, the text deletes the line referring to the sultan’s age. There is no appended section with prophecies.

Before describing the final set of German versions of the letter (both published in 1663), we should look at the versions that appeared in England in 1640, one of which points to a possible different branch of the genealogy of the text, and the other providing striking evidence of how such texts might then be transformed for popular consumption and oral transmission. The London publisher and bookseller, Nathaniel Butter (d. 1664), pioneered in the printing and distribution of foreign news in England in the first half of the 17th century, in the process not always managing to avoid arrest for violating the changing press laws. While there were several years in the 1630s when printing of news about the Thirty Years War was forbidden, between 1638 and 1642, it became legal again. Butter issued a great many news pamphlets, often with sensational titles. One of them, published in 1640, featured an English translation of the sultan’s letter to the Emperor and the King of Poland, following which were several datelined news items from various cities [*True and fearfull pronouncing 1640*]¹⁰. In most respects, Butter’s text is a quite faithful rendering of what had appeared in German in 1622. Note, however, his “King of whole Arabia and Media, Duke of the Noble Race in Greece and Armenia”, omitting “ein geborner Fürst unnd Herr des dürren Baumes so an dem Berge Arachia stehet”. The sultan’s forces include “1300000 men, both horse and foot”. Most, but not all, of his numbers in the enumeration of sites in Istanbul are those also in the 1622 pamphlet, but where that imprint indicates the age of the sultan is 28, Butter gives him 39 years. As Butter’s title page informs the reader, the sultan to whom the letter is attributed (“Soloma Hometh”) fortunately is now dead, but presumably his successor will pursue the same evil designs against Christendom. While there is no indication of what Butter’s exact source might have been, he reassures readers that the information in the pamphlet is “Confirmed by diverse Letters from several places, which you shall finde heer truly set downe”.

Indeed, the first of the news items, datelined “Venice the 13.23. of March” (that is, using both the old and new style calendar dates), reports the death of

¹⁰ Butter’s pamphlet and the broadside based on it discussed below may be accessed via the Early English Books Online database through libraries which subscribe to it.

the sultan (Murad IV, not named) at age 33 after reigning for 17 years, and the accession of Ibrahim, who would rule until 1648. The report goes on to indicate the Ottomans are launching a major campaign against Poland. All of the other reports which follow in the pamphlet contain news about the Turkish campaign against Poland and/or Ottoman successes at sea. While we cannot be certain about Butter's sources, since such news reports could be repeated in more than one contemporary newspaper or newsletter, it is at least suggestive that some of the reports are almost identical with ones printed in Dutch newspapers¹¹. The fact that the holdings of Dutch newspapers for this period have many gaps makes it impossible to see whether other parts of Butter's pamphlet may have been drawn from them. However, it is at least reasonable to hypothesize that his source for the sultan's letter was in Dutch, given the close connections he and the other English newsmongers had with the press in the Netherlands. Dutch translations of the apocryphal letters (many surely from German versions) seem to have been quite common. At least one other Dutch newspaper we have found opens with the text of an apocryphal letter of the sultan addressed to the King of Poland, that text though not the same one we are discussing here¹².

Apart from any bearing its text may have on our search for the source of the Russian translation, Nathaniel Butter's publication of the apocryphal letter is of great interest for quite a different reason. Most recent scholarship on news and its dissemination in early modern Europe stresses the importance of oral transmission [Pettegree 2014: 118–148; Chartier 1999; Rospocher and Salzberg 2012; Fox 2000: esp. Chs. 6, 7; Jones 2005]. Written news texts (manuscript or printed) were commonly read aloud or quoted in conversation. The pamphlet literature such as that containing the sultan's apocryphal letters often emphasized the sensational, its contents potentially having very broad appeal even amongst formally illiterate groups in society. One means by which news then might be spread was through ballads composed on the basis of prose reports but then sung by wandering performers and/or made available in print. Butter's publication of the sultan's letter was the source for

¹¹ Most of the report from Venice on the death of the sultan is a verbatim translation from the second part of a report datelined Venice, 26 March, printed in Amsterdam on 21 April in *TVQ* 1640, No. 16. Butter's final report, dated March 31/April 10, is a verbatim rendering of another (datelined Leipzig, 31 March) in the same issue of the paper, in which the news was communicated from Danzig. *TVQ*, 1640, No. 18, published on 5 May, included several items datelined Venice, 6 April, the last of which, from Constantinople, is the same as Butter's report datelined Venice March 27/April 6. We have accessed the early Dutch newspapers via the "Delpher" website [Delpher].

¹² The text is entitled "Copia eens Briefs van den Sultan, des Turckschen Keyzers Soon, gesonden aen Iohannem Casimirum Konink van Polen, inde Maent Augusty 1652." It appeared in *ODC*, 1652, No. 52, published in Amsterdam on 24 December. While the newspaper omitted the *intitulatio*, the *dispositio* of the letter corresponds closely to that in [Kurtzer Bericht 1653].

just such a ballad, published as a broadside in the same year (1640) in London [*Great Turks challenge* 1640]¹³. An anonymous author took the texts of the letter and the appended news reports and wove them into verses, indicating for purchasers two presumably popular tunes to which the verse could be sung. The broadside was illustrated with images of a standing Turk, a be-robed and crowned Western monarch, and a Western knight on a prancing horse accompanied by a lion rampant. Broadside such as this were widely sold in England (and on the Continent), reaching audiences in smaller towns or the countryside who might otherwise not have become aware of the original “news” report. Once committed to verse and sung, the sultan’s threats could readily have passed from mouth to mouth without any further need for a written text. Whether they were treated as news, of course, rather than sung simply for entertainment value, is a good question.

The last printed examples of the sultan’s letter to the emperor and king which we so far have located are two published in German in 1663, which I shall refer to as 1663A [*Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung* 1663] and 1663B [*Warhaffte und erschröckliche Absagung* 1663]. 1663A includes a prayer at the end of the letter; 1663B, includes instead of a prayer a citation from Luther’s advice to Christians, which would suggest the pamphlet was probably printed in a mainly Protestant city. On the title page of 1663B is a woodcut showing a turbaned Turk facing a presumably Christian ruler, the two of them holding on to the handle of a scimitar. This would seem to be identical with the woodcut that decorates a pamphlet with the apocryphal letter of the sultan (in a different textual variant) addressed to Emperor Matthias and published in Prague in 1613 [*Absagbrieff* 1613], which makes it likely that Prague was also the place where 1663B was published. While the name given the sultan in 1663A (Salomahomet) suggests it is the closer of the two to what was most common in the earlier printings of the letter (1663B gives a nonsensical Salomo Eonid), the few variant readings between these otherwise nearly identical renderings of the letter would suggest neither can be the direct source for my “Russian mid-17th century”.

Let us look at a tabulation of key readings to see what might be concluded about that source¹⁴.

¹³ This certainly was not the first time one of the apocryphal letters had been rendered in verse. An Italian pamphlet published in 1532 contained a verse rendition of the sultan’s letter and the response to it [*Questa e la lettera* (1532)]; see [Waugh 1978: III. 2, 101].

¹⁴ The tabulation shows the correspondence of the individual textual units, not necessarily their actual sequence in each individual pamphlet, a matter discussed following the table below.

Warhatige Absagung 1622	True and fearfull pronouncing 1640	Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief 1652	Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung 1663 (1663A)	Список епистолия султана (Харлампович 1923: 211)
Judea	Judea	Judea	India	Ниневитцкий Иудейский же и богатые Индеи
Mecha	Media	Mohrenland	Media	мед(и)цкий
Chur Armenia	Armenia	—	Chur Armenia	избранстве арменском урожений
mit 13. Königreichen und Völkern / etlich hundert tausent starck zu Roß und Fuß / mit Türcken und Türkischer Rüstung / ja mit aller unser Käyserlichen Macht	with 13. Kingdomes and Nations, and with 1300000 men, both horse and foot, with tyranny and Turkie power and Armours, yea with our Imperiall strength	mit 13. Königen und 1300000. Mann starck zu Roß und Fuß / zu überziehen / und mit unerhörter Tyranny und Türkischer Macht	mit dreyzehnen Königreichen und Völkern / ja mit 300000. (drey mal hundert tausent) Mann starck zu Roß und Fuß / mit Tyranny und Türkischer Macht / und Rüstung ja mit unser Käyserlichen Macht	тренадцати господарствы со всеми народы силами нашими стат тысяща тысящ и триста тысящ конных и пеших воинов, то есть сила наша великого монарха турецкого
vor Wien deiner HauptStadt	—	in deiner Hauptstadt Wien	für deiner Haupt Stad Wien	пред столичным своим градом Веднем
auch des aller elendesten Todes / so Wir mögen erdencken / umbringen und hinrichten lassen / erwürgen / und ins Elendt ewig wie die Hunde gefangen halten	and put you to the miserablest death that ever we can invent, banish you into great misery, detain you prisoners, and use you like dogs	in den elendesten Todt / so wir erdencken können / um bringen / hinrichten und erwürgen lassen	mit dem elendesten und erschrecklichsten Tode / so wir nur erdencken mögen / umbringen / hinrichten und erwürgen lassen / und Elend verjagen / gefangen halten wie die Hunde	лютейшею смертию, какову можем выдумать злейшу на кол живых тыкать, из живых кожи драть и пороть впрягать под оружие в заточенье невоздратно засылат и на катарги в вечную муку и неволю отдавать будем. И всех яко псов на сворех велмож твоих в свою землю вести станем

Warhatige Absagung 1622	True and fearfull pronouncing 1640	Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief 1652	Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung 1663 (1663A)	Список еписолия султана (Харлампович 1923: 211)
Datum in unser gewaltigen Stad Constantinopel [...] welche Stadt unsere Voreltern den deinen aus krafft haben abgewonen / darauß getrieben / gefangen genommen / ir Weib und Kinder darunter zerhauen / und ins Elend nach unserm Willen biß an ihr End zu Spott und hohn behalten.	Given in our mighty City of Constantinople [...] Which City our Ancestors have taken by force, according to our will kept and maintained to your great shame.	Geben in unser gewaltigen Stad Constantinopel [...] Diss ist von unsern Eltern und vorfahren den Christen abgenommen und sind ihre Weiber und Kinder vor ihren Augen in Stücken zerhauen worden / wir wollen sie auch dir und allen Christen zu Hohn und Spott biß an unser Ende behalten.	Datum in unseren gewaltigen Stad Constantinopel [...] Diese Stad haben Unsre Vor-Eltern den deinen aus Krafft abgenommen / ihre Weiber und Kinder zerhauen / und ins Elend geschlagen / selbe soll auch nach unserm Willen biß an ihr Ende von uns / dir zu Spott und Hohn behalten werden.	Писахом в преможнейшем нашем граде в Византии, который град предки наши сильною рукою у ваших предков взяли, мужи и жены и дети всех искоренили, так и ныне тебе цесарю в Германии и королеви полскому и всем землям вашим на вечный позор и поругание ваше учинити умыслих.
eintauesent sechs hundert acht und funfftzig Gassen	1658 streets	1659. Gaßen	1658. Gassen	✗АХНИ [1658]-м улиц
der Spittal hundert	100 Hospitals	90. Hospital	100. Spitäle	Р [100] корчемных домов
öffentliche Badstuben achthundert fünf und achtzig	800 publick Hothouses	1000. öffentliche Badestuben	1000. öffentliche Badstuben	Ū [800] мылен торговых
Wasserbrunnen / die alle Tag gut zu trincken sind / neun hundert sieben und neuntzig	997 Conduits	997. Wasserbrunnen	997. Wasser Brunnen	ЦЧЗ [997] еонтин водяных

Warhatige Absagung 1622	True and fearfull pronouncing 1640	Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief 1652	Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung 1663 (1663A)	Список епистолия султана (Харлампович 1923: 211)
gemeine Märckte da man allerley feil hat / hundert und zwölffe	112 Markets, where all sorts of wares are sold	112. Märckte	112. Märckte da man allerhand Sachen feil hat	РВІ [112] базаров торговых
verordnete Heuser und Stelle für die MaulEsel hundert und funffzehen	115 appointed places and Stables for Mules	115. verordnete Häuser vor Stallung der Maulesel	115. verordnete Häuser und Ställe vor die Maul Esel	РН [150] конюшен царских
Wirthshäuser vor die Frembdn vier hundert und achte	400 Innes for strangers	480 Wirthshäuser vor frembde Leute	400. Wirts-Häuser für die Frembdn	У [400] гостиных дворов
der grossen und kleinen Schulen seynd ein Tausend sechs hundert zwey und funfftzig	1652 great and small Schooles	1652 groß und kleine Schulen	162. der grossen und kleinen Schulen	✶АХНВ [1652] училища грамотных
[...] der Kirchen groß und klein in dieser Stadt / seynd vier Tausent ein hundert und siebenzehen	417 great and small Churches	4122. groß und kleine kirchen	47. grosse und kleine Kirchen	✶ДРДІ [4114] божниц
Tausent sechs hundert Mühlen	1600 Mills	1600. Mühlen	1600. Mühlen	Х [600] мельниц
die Stadt helt in der Ringmawren vier Deutsche Meilen / der grossen Thürme die zimlich hoch sind auff der Mawren / sind drey hundert und sechtzig.	this great City comprehends in her walls, 4 German Leagues; of the greatest Steeples standing upon the wall are 3600.	Diese große und gewaltige Stad hält in der Ringmauer um sich 4. Teutscher Meilen / hat auff der Stadmauer 360. große Thürme.	Diese grosse Stad hat in der Rinckmauer 4. Teutsche Meilen / die grossen Thürm auff den Mauren sind 360.	Великость града нашего в стенах триста шестьдесят стадей.

Warhatige Absagung 1622	True and fearfull pronouncing 1640	Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief 1652	Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung 1663 (1663A)	Список епистолия султана (Харлампович 1923: 211)
Geben nach unser Geburt im acht und zwanzigsten Jahr / jetzo aber in unser gewaltigen Regierung im neunden Jahr.	Done after our Nativity 39 yeares, after our mighty Reigne the tenth yeare.	Gegeben dasebst / unser Regierung im 10. Jahr.	Geschehen nach unserer Geburt im 39. nach unserer gewaltigen Regierung im 10. Jahre	От рождения нашего ЛЮ [39]-го. От превысочайшаго же начала скипетра нашего I [10]-го году.

There are a number of textual features of the Russian translation which are not reflected in the table here and will be discussed further below. Note, however, that the Russian text has rearranged the order of some sections in the last part of the letter and the enumeration of the institutions in Istanbul. That does not necessarily mean the original for the translation had a similar ordering. It would have been logical to move the sentences on the earlier conquest of the city up to where it is named and likewise to move the *datatio* above the enumeration, which is, after all, a rather awkward insertion in the other texts. Butter seems to have recognized that fact by marking the beginning of that insertion with a parenthesis, even though he did not choose to shift the text of it. It is more difficult to explain why several of the items in the enumeration in the Russian text are not in the same order they are in the other versions of the letter, but that likely is simply a peculiarity of the copying in Russia and not an indication we should be looking for an original with the same order of the items.

A few of the readings though would seem to be significant. Presumably the original for the Russian did have “India” (found in both 1663A and 1663B), modified in the Russian case by “bogatyē”, which would be a standard cliché applied to India. The unique “Ниневитцкий Иудейский” very possibly is an insertion from a marginal gloss for Babylonia, such as one might expect in copies of the *kuranty*, where often the translators added marginal glosses for place names that otherwise might not be commonly known. The source for the Russian text undoubtedly was a version of the letter with the reading “Media”. The absence of Vienna in Butter 1640, which in many respects is otherwise very close to the Russian textually, is probably just a matter of a careless omission on his part, as the other texts all name the Habsburg capital. The size of the Turkish army in the original for the Russian was undoubtedly 1,300,000, not the lower figure given in 1663A (1663B gives 1,300,000)¹⁵. It is not clear

¹⁵ In 1663B there are several readings which would, however, suggest it cannot be our source: it enumerates 1688 streets, 977 baths, 3660 bastions, and combines both schools and churches as “1652. grosse und kleine Kirchen.”

why the translator would have rendered “Maul Esel” as “tsesarskii” (‘imperial’ or ‘royal’), other than the fact that the term may simply have been unfamiliar: it is the technical designation for the offspring of a male horse and female donkey (i. e., a ‘hinny’).

In the enumeration of Istanbul institutions, the Russian text follows closely most of the numbers given in one or another of the printed pamphlets, but no one of them has all the numbers which it is reasonable to posit were the correct ones. This then suggests there must have been yet another version of the letter which had all those “correct” numbers: that is, 1658 streets, 100 hospitals, 800 baths, 997 wells, 112 bazaars, 400 caravanserais, 1652 schools. The unique readings of 150 stables and 600 mills in the Russian text might be explained simply by a slip on the part of the translator or copyist, where one would expect the numbers in the original would be 115 and 1600 respectively. It is hard to know what the exact number of churches (mosques?) was in the original for the Russian text, but at very least it must be in the 4000 range even if not 4114. Presumably the original text indicated the length of the walls (4 German miles) and the number of the bastions (360), but the Russian text has collapsed the two parts of the sentence into a single (erroneous) indication of 360 and given the unit of measurement (for distance) as “stadia”, which at the time this copy was made could have been the equivalent of *versty*, that is, approximately a kilometer. Lastly, one should expect that the original for the Russian translation gave the age of the sultan as 39 and the number of years of his reign as 10.

Where does this leave us then in searching for the source? Unless there is some specific linguistic evidence pointing to a Dutch original, I would posit yet another pamphlet in German published in 1663 at a time when there was a flood of such publication in conjunction with the ongoing Habsburg war against the Turks.

The Russian text does contain a number of phrases not found in any of the other apocryphal letters in this cluster, although at least some are in other clusters of the letters belonging to a different textual lineage. Note, for example, in the *intitulatio*, “але андръский, цесарь великого и малаго Египта”, both found in the same manuscript in a short apocryphal letter of the sultan addressed to the King of Poland. The “папа райский” inserted in our letter is undoubtedly the equivalent for “проповедник раю земнаго” in that same letter to the King of Poland, and “насилник христьянский” in our text corresponds to “гонитель христьянский” in the letter to the king. Given how many different versions of these letters were around, with several variants in the one manuscript apparently copies made from yet another “compendium” of these apocrypha in the 1680s or 1690s, it would not surprise us if a copyist simply added a few additional titles to the text he had in front of him.

In similar fashion, our Russian text elaborates on some of the punishments to be inflicted on the Christians: “[Н]а кол живых тыкать, из живых кожи драть и пороть впрягать под оружие в заточенье невозвратное засылать и на катарги в вечную муку и неволю отдавать будем.” The source for this could have been at least in part another of the letters (there is a mention of impaling in one), but perhaps combined with widespread knowledge of how Russian captives often were sent to the galleys (and, when some escaped, related in depositions on their return). Further examination of this text may suggest other possibilities of sources or might, of course, reinforce the idea that the translator or copyist exercised a certain degree of originality. It would be wrong though to make too much of that, since clearly in the first instance, the letter indeed is a translation from one of a well-documented cluster of western pamphlets.

The correspondence of the sultan with Emperor Leopold

There are two different Russian versions of the apocryphal correspondence with Emperor Leopold I. One of them, which dates the letters to 1663, became widely known in Muscovy in copies that circulated outside of the chanceries. While the sultan’s letter in that set clearly is based on the texts which circulated in the West, the reply of the Emperor at least so far seems to be a Muscovite composition, created as an explicit response to the threats of the sultan and employing particularly colorful and insulting rhetoric. To date, no Western publication has been found which might be deemed a direct source for Leopold’s response.

The sultan’s letter in a correspondence with Leopold that began to circulate in conjunction with the siege of Vienna in 1683 is textually related to the sultan’s letter of 1663. I published the 1683 texts (both the sultan’s letter and the emperor’s reply) from a copy that circulated outside of the chanceries, a manuscript which also contained a copy of the 1683 treaty of alliance between Leopold and the King of Poland Jan Sobieski and a short text purporting to be the oath of the sultan and his pashas to exterminate Christians¹⁶. My hypothesis was that the source for all of these texts may have been a single German pamphlet, and my analysis suggested the translations are quite faithful to the presumed originals. However, I was able to locate only contemporary publications of just the sultan’s letter. As Stepan Shamin has now shown, there is explicit evidence that the sultan’s letter alone appeared in German newspapers, which were received in May and early June 1683 [Шамин 2015]¹⁷. The sultan’s

¹⁶ See my discussion in [Waugh 1978: 75–78], the text of the correspondence [Ibid.: 213–214], and that of the oath [Ibid.: 215]. The manuscript is СпБии РАН, колл. 11, рукописей Археографической комиссии, No. 44.

¹⁷ In Chapter 6 of his forthcoming book, which he has kindly shared with me in typescript, Stepan Shamin elaborates with comparative examples on his brief published

letter thus was translated twice, and when another version of it, in a separate pamphlet, was sent somewhat later via a Muscovite agent in Poland-Lithuania, the translators noted there was no need to translate it yet again, for they had already done so on the basis of newspaper copies received through Riga and from Kiev. Shamin goes on to tantalize us with the indication that the archival translations for the *kuranty* and the version I published differ substantially, to the degree that one might even posit they are separate translations. Or at very least the compiler of the separate manuscript indulged in considerable re-working of the translations in the *kuranty*. Shamin logically posits that the gathering into a “Turkish-themed collection” containing the sultan’s letter, the response to it, and the separate text of an oath by the sultan and his pashas to exterminate Christians was done in Moscow by someone who had access to the chancery archives.

However, we now can be confident that at least the two letters in the correspondence, if not the oath, did also circulate outside of Russia together. I have now found two German pamphlets containing both the sultan’s letter and the emperor’s reply, published in 1663, not in 1683 [*Declaration* 1663A; *Declaration* 1663B]. Presumably the texts of the earlier publications were re-issued almost unchanged in 1683 in various forms: as separate pamphlets, incorporated into newspapers, or in the case of the sultan’s letter, inserted into a very substantial history of the Habsburg-Ottoman wars¹⁸.

Obviously it will be of some interest to be able to compare the translations with the originals once the *kuranty* texts have been published. Since I do not have in hand all the material needed to do a more thorough analysis for the sultan’s letter, I will focus here on the translation of Leopold’s reply (as reflected in the one manuscript miscellany), now that we have a German text of its proximate source. In my original comments about that letter, lacking a German text, my comparisons were with a Polish version published in the late 18th century (and based on a 17th-century Italian text!). There are a number

communication about these texts. A search in the online database of the Deutsche Presseforschung, Bremen, has not yet found the possible sources. The database includes copies of long runs of the Europäische Ordinari Postzeitung (Königsberg) which have been preserved in RGADA and on which one can see the annotations of the translators of the Ambassadorial Chancery (<http://brema.suub.uni-bremen.de/zeitungen17/periodical/titleinfo/935895>). However, even though there are many numbers from 1683, the set is incomplete; so there is no way of knowing whether that newspaper was the one which contained the copy of the sultan’s letter. Unfortunately, preservation is much poorer for the other German newspapers which might most logically have been the source.

¹⁸ My original analysis of the sultan’s letter was based on a separate pamphlet containing it, published in 1683, and on the text contained in [Happelius 1684: 384–385]. Even though the texts of the sultan’s letter in all of these publications are almost identical, at least one key variant (“Nielonien/Melonien” in the *intitulatio* of 1663, as opposed to “Babylonien” in 1683) is evidence the Russian translator could not have been using the earlier publications.

of places where the translator has departed from his original, although only occasionally corrupting its meaning.

<i>Declaration 1663A</i>	СпБИИ РАН, колл. 11, рукописей Археографической комиссии, No. 44, Л. 483–484об. (Waugh 1978: 214)
<p>Ich / als ein weiterberühmter Kayser deß Römischen Reichs</p> <p>Du sollst wissen /Kayser der Türcken Sohn dess Mahomets / was hat dein Gott Mahomet anders thun können /als durch eine Taube /einen Ochsen /oder andere Teuffels-Künste / und durch seinen Magnetstein / an welchem erhangen blieben /wodurch derselbe dich / und alle dein Volck bezaubert hat.</p> <p>...als wie mit Nebucadnezar / der mit dem Vieh das Graß muste essen / und nachmahls bekennen /daß kein anderer Gott war / als der GOTT Israel. Dann hat dein Gott Mahomet wol einen Stern am Himmel können machen /wie unser GOTT / der Himmel und Erden erschaffen hat.</p> <p>du must aber wissen / hochmüthiger Kayser...</p> <p>...ohne Gottes Willen / oder den gecreutzigten Christum / welchen die Juden verfolget und getödtet...</p> <p>Deinen Glauben und dein Joch / so der Mahomet hat aufgeworffen /wollen wir nicht annehmen...</p> <p>...und alle meine Krieges-Macht soll gegen deine Trohungen / dich und deine Macht mitt Hülff und Beystand unsers Allmächtigen Gottes / parat seyn /dann mein Volck ist bereit und willig wider dich und deinen Anhang zu streiten / und sich Lieber tode zu fechten / als unter deinem Joch den Halß zu biegen.</p>	<p>Мы Леопард цесарь, славные державы римской кесарь ...</p> <p>Ты же да увеси, кесарю турков, сын Магметов, яко бог твой Махмет есть прелесник, иже ты и народ твой, ослепленный голубем, волом и прочими диаволскими хитростми, таже и Махметом к нему же привесился очарован есть...</p> <p>...яко же гордость Новоходоносора кесаря вавилонского, иже судом Бога нашего поражен и принужден со скоты траву ясти и потом признати и сродно исповедати яко инаго Бога Израилева. Бог твой мнимый, возмог ли едину звезду на небе сотворити, яко же Бог наш иже сотворил небо, и землю, и моря, и вся лепоты ея?</p> <p>Но сие да веси, высокоумный кесарю...</p> <p>...кроме воли распятого нашего Христа и Бога, его же людей завистию и з любовию на смерть осудиша...</p> <p>Веру же твою и ярмо, юж на тя возложи Махмет твой, приняти не хочет...</p> <p>...и сила моя, иже точию уповает во Христа нашего и Бога, суть готови встрети ты, и люди моя готови битися с тобою и подвизатися до смерти, а под иго твое выя (!) свою наклонити не хотят.</p>

Adding the emperor's name (and rendering it as "Leopard") may be significant only if it suggests some kind of intent of parody on the part of the translator or copyist. The translator has rearranged somewhat the original in the next passage, simplifying the syntax. The translator might or might not have known the widespread Christian tales about how Mohammed (labeled a "пелесник", conveying the German "bezaubert") pretended to effect a miracle by having a dove pluck grain out of the ear of an ox and how the Prophet's tomb was suspended as though miraculously in the air thanks to a lodestone (translations were available in Muscovy). However, clearly he misunderstood the reference to the lodestone ("Magnetstein") and thus garbled the sense of the original. In referring to the biblical tale about Nebuchadnezzar, the translator successfully somewhat simplified the references to the Divinity, and then he added a bit of literary elaboration ("и моря, и вся лепоты ея"). In several places, the German refers to the sultan with the epithets "hochmüthiger" and "trotziger" ('arrogant', 'insolent'). Either the translator or the copyist got the first one wrong, writing "высокоумный", instead of what one assumes should have been "высокомерный". Later though, he renders the same word with "гордый", and "trotziger" as "прегордый". It appears that the translator misread "Juden" as "Leuten" (hence "людей") and thus made further changes that garbled the meaning of the clause. The translator's "возложи" for "aufgeworffen" was not a good choice, since Mohammed did not yoke the sultan but rather provided him with a set of beliefs and a yoke that he might lay on others. In the last of the passages copied above, the translator has somewhat condensed the original without distorting it, although in the process eliminating the mention of threats ("Trohungen"~Drohungen), where in the preceding passage the emperor had explicitly stated he was not frightened by them. The "а под иго твое [шею] свою наклонити не хотят" (here with the presumed intended word where the manuscript is unclear) is a very precise rendering of "als unter deinem Joch den Halß zu biegen".

Conclusion

In summary then, a great deal of new evidence has accumulated over the past four decades. When I did the work for the dissertation and book, my main source for locating the published Western *turcica* was the excellent collection at Harvard, most of the old imprints located in open stacks where I could systematically look at each and every one of them. For copies in other collections, I had to rely on published bibliographies, that for the 16th-century *turcica* by Carl Göllner an invaluable resource [Göllner 1961–1978], but with no equivalent for the 17th century. Published catalogs for various important library collections were incomplete. I had only a beginning knowledge of how to try to locate 17th-century newspapers. I had but limited time to work in a number

of repositories, especially in RGADA (then TsGADA) and in collections elsewhere in Europe. My queries in RGADA regarding whether the archive had many of the originals for the *kuranty* failed to elicit information about how many German and Dutch newspapers are indeed there [now catalogued by Simonov 1979 and Maier 2004, with copies accessible on-line]. And given the specification that my work was on a “literary” topic, even had I wanted to do some searching for additional texts in the foreign relations files (where many translations are in fact located), it is almost certain requests to do so would have been rejected, since my subject was not Muscovite foreign relations.

The resources available now are vastly different. The collection of early German newspapers at the Deutsche Presseforschung in Bremen contains copies of more than 60,000 items, and the whole collection is now freely available in an on-line database that can be searched by title, year or place of publication [Zeitungen]. We have an equivalent database for early Dutch newspapers [Delpher]. Both of these collections now include copies of the 17th-century newspapers that are preserved in RGADA, although it seems a great many extant copies of Dutch newspapers from various collections remain to be added to Delpher. It is important to keep in mind that the preservation of early newspapers is very uneven; there are many large gaps, even for some of the most popular ones. There is on-line access to a huge number of early German imprints [VD16, VD17]. Though that database cannot be considered complete, it has made possible locating numerous copies of the apocryphal letters that I had not previously known, many of which can be downloaded in full text. The same is the case for early English publications catalogued in the standard *Short Title Catalog* and available via Early English Books Online (in subscribing libraries). And, of course, apart from the proliferation of such resources, the systematic work over the years by scholars such as Stepan Shamin and Ingrid Maier continues to locate new material. One can be optimistic that there is still much history to be written about the sultan’s apocryphal correspondence and the related *turcica* that proliferated in Muscovy.

Libraries and archives

РГАДА – Российский государственный архив древних актов.
СПБНИИ РАН – Санкт-Петербургский институт истории РАН.

Bibliography

Databases and reference works

Delpher

Delpher [Open-access database of Dutch newspapers] (<https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten>; last access on: 31.05.2019).

Göllner 1961–1978

Göllner C., *Turcica: 3 vols* [Bibliography of 16th-century European *turcica*, the third volume a monographic study], București, Baden-Baden, 1961–1978.

Short Title Catalog, 2nd ed.

Pollard A. W., Redgrave G. R., *A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*, 2nd rev. ed., 3 vols. London, 1976–1991. Wing, D. G., comp., *Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641–1700*, 2nd rev. ed., 3 vols., New York, 1972–.

VD16

Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts [Open-access database of 16th-century German imprints] (<https://www.bsb-muenchen.de/sammlungen/historische-drucke/recherche/vd-16>; last access on: 31.05.2019).

VD17

Das Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachraum erschienenen Drucke des 17. Jahrhunderts [Open-access database of 17th-century German imprints] (<http://www.vd17.de>; last access on: 31.05.2019).

Zeitungen

Zeitungen des 17. Jahrhunderts: Digitalisierung der vollständigen Zeitungen des 17. Jahrhunderts [Open-access database of the German newspaper collections of the Institut Deutsche Presseforschung, Bremen] (<http://brema.suub.uni-bremen.de/zeitungen17>; last access on: 31.05.2019).

Manuscript sources

РГАДА. Ф. 79. Оп. 1. 1642 г. Ед. хр. 2. Л. 80–85

Сношения России с Польшей, 1642 г. Перевод списка турецкого листа с польского писма.

РГАДА. Ф. 155. Оп. 1. 1687 г. Ед. хр. 6. Л. 96–101

Иностранные ведомости (куранты) и газеты.

СпбИИ РАН. Колл. 11, рукописей Археографической комиссии. No. 44. Л. 481–488об.

Сборник кон. XVII — нач. XVIII в.

Ўзбекистон Миллий кутубхонаси. «Нодир» ноёб манбалар зали, MS No. Пи9250. Л. 75–80об.

Сборник кон. XVII — нач. XVIII в.

Early imprints

Absagbrieff 1613

Absagbrieff/ Welcher von dem Türckischen Keyser/ an unsern Grossmächtigsten/ etc. Römischen Keyser Matthiam gelanget/ darinnen er ihme den auffgerichten Friedes Stand abgekündigtet und gantzlich abgeschrieben. Nebenst einem Gebett wider den Türcken, erstlich gedruckt zu Prag/ im Jahr 1613 (copy in the Harvard College Library, Ott. 372.2; other printings are listed in VD17: 23:266136C, 23:332144U and 23:336218C [two copies of the same imprint], and 14:001307F).

Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung 1663

Copia oder Warhafftige Zeitung der erschrecklichen Absagung An Ihre Römische Käyserliche Majestät/ so wohl auch an ihre Königliche Majestät in Pohlen/ welche geschehen von dem Türckischen Käyser Salomahomet..., n.p., 1663 (VD17 39:122705A).

Declaration 1663A

Declaration Oder Kriegs-Ankündigung, Welche der Türckische Käyser/ so sich anitzo mit seinem ganzen Hoff zu Adrianopel befindet/ an den Röm. Käyser gethan hat Benebenst der Röm. Käys. Maj. Antwort darauff, n.p., [?1663] (VD17 12:199387Z).

Declaration 1663B

Declaration Oder Kriegs-Ankündigung/ Welche der Türckische Käyser/ so sich anjetzo mit seinem gantzten Hof zu Adrianopel befindet/ an den Römischen Käyser gethan hat Benebenst Der Röm: Käyserl. Majestät/ Antwort darauf, n.p., [?1663] (VD17 1:728462Q).

Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief 1652

Erschrecklicher Absag-Vrief/ Von den iletzigen Türckischen Käyser/ an die Röm. Käys. Majest. und an den König in Pohlen, n.p., 1652 (VD17 1:728588D).

Great Turks challenge 1640

*The great Turks terrible challenge, this yeare 1640. Pronounced against the Emperour of Germany and the King of Poland by Soloma Hometh who lately deceased, but continued by his brother Ibraim, the first of that name. To the tune of My bleeding heart, or Lets to the wars againe, [London]: Printed for Richard Harper at the Bible [and Harp in Smithfield, 1640] (*Short Title Catalog*, 2nd ed., No. 23424.7).*

Great Turkes Defiance 1613

*The Great Turkes Defiance: Or his Letter Denuntiatorie to Sigismond the Third, now King of Polonia, as it hath been truly aduertised out of German, this present yeere, 1613. With the King of Poland his replie, Englished according to the French Copie, by M.S., London: Printed by Melchisedech Bradwood, for William Aspley, 1613 (*Short Title Catalog*, 2nd ed., 206).*

Happellius 1684

Happellius, E. G., *Der Ungarische Kriegs-Roman*, 1, Ulm, 1684; also Middelburg, 1685.

Kurtzer Bericht 1653

Kurtzer Bericht/ und Absag-Brieff/ Was der Türckische Sultan/ ihrer Königlichen Majestät in Polen/ Anno 1652. den 10. Decembris/ in der Königlichen Residentz-Stadt Warschaw/ durch einen eylenden Curier überbracht/ zugeschrieben..., n.p., 1653 (VD17 23:324570L).

ODC

Ordinaris Dingsdaeghsche Courante, 1652, No. 52.

Questa e la lettera [1532]

Questa e la lettera & disfida laqual a mandato el gran Turco a Ferdinando Re Hungaria: & la risposta che gli fa el preditto Re & come se inuita tute le potentie del mondo a far la Santa Crucia [Bologna, 1532] (copy in the British Library, 1071.g.22.[1]).

True and fearfull pronouncing 1640

*A true and fearfull pronouncing of warre against the Roman Imperial Majesty, and withall against the king of Poland, by the late emperour of Turkey, Soloma Hometh..., London, Printed for Nathaniel Butter, 1640 (*Short Title Catalog*, 2nd ed., No. 23424.5).*

TVQ

Tijdingen uyt verscheyden Quartieren 1640, Nos. 16, 18.

Warhafftiger Absage-Brieff ca. 1644

Ein Warhafftiger und erschrecklicher Absage-Brieff/ An Römische Käys. May. auch an den König von Polen/ von dem Türckischen Käyser/ Salo Mahomet..., n.p., n.d. (VD 17 3: 004126P).

Warhaffte und erschrückliche Absagung 1663

Warhaffte und erschrückliche Absagung/ Der Römischen Käyserlichen Majestät/ So auch I. Königl. Majestät zu Pohlen/ Von dem Türckischen Käyser Salomo Eonid..., n.p., 1663 (VD17 23:678981M).

Warhafftige Absagung 1621

Eine Warhafftige und Erschreckliche Absagung Der Römischen Käyserlichen Mayestet/ so wol auch des Königes in Polen/ von dem Türckischen Keiser Salamahomet..., n.p., 1621 (VD17 3:316432Z).

Warhatige Absagung 1622

Eine warhatige und erschreckliche Absagung. Der Römischen Käys. Mayestet/ so wol auch des Königs in Polen/ Von dem Türckischen Keyser Salamahomet... (VD17 14:003219F and 1:728559S, [two printings the first of these with the portrait woodcut; the second with a battle scene and “warhafftige” in the title]).

Literature

Chartier 1999

Chartier R., Reading Matter and “Popular” Reading: From the Renaissance to the Seventeenth Century, *A History of Reading in the West*, L. G. Cochrane, tr., G. Cavallo and R. Chartier, eds., Amherst, MA, 1999, 269–283.

Fox 2000

Fox, A., *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500–1700*, Oxford, 2000.

Gabriel n.d.

Gabriel Bethlen (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gabriel_Bethlen; last access on: 31/05/2019).

Jones 2005

Jones A. M., *The Gazet in Metre; or the Rhiming Newsmonger: The English Broadside Ballad as Intelligencer. A New Narrative, News and Politics in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)*, J. W. Koopmans, ed., Leuven etc., 2005, 131–150 + [Pls. 1, 2].

Keenan 1971

Keenan E. L., *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the “Correspondence” Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV*, with an appendix by D. C. Waugh, Cambridge, MA, 1971.

Maier 2004

Maier I., Niederländische Zeitungen (“Couranten”) des 17. Jahrhunderts im Russischen Staatsarchiv für alte Akten (RGADA), Moskau, *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 79, 2004, 191–218.

——— 2006

Maier I. Ontsegh-brief van den Turckschen Keyser ... Ein fiktiver Brief des türkischen Sultans an den König von Polen in russischer Übersetzung (1621), *Jako blagopesnivaja ptica. Hyllningskrift till Lars Steensland*, P. Ambrosiani, I. Lysén et al., eds., Stockholm, 2006, 135–146.

Pettegree 2014

Pettegree A., *The Invention of News: How the World Came to Know about Itself*, New Haven, London, 2014.

Rospocher and Salzberg 2012

Rospocher M., Salzberg R., An Evanescent Public Sphere: Voices, Spaces, and Publics in Venice during the Italian Wars, *Beyond the Public Sphere: Opinions, Publics, Spaces in Early Modern Europe*, M. Rospocher, ed., Bologna, Berlin, 2012, 93–114.

Simonov 1979

Simonov V. I., Deutsche Zeitungen des 17. Jahrhunderts im Zentralen Staatsarchiv für alte Akten (CGADA), Moskau, *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 54, 1979, 210–220.

Waugh 1971

Waugh, D. C., On the Origin of the “Correspondence” between the Sultan and the Cossacks, *Recenzija: A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Scholarly Publications*, 1, 2, 1971, 3–46.

——— 1972

Waugh, D. C., Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets with Turkish Themes: Toward a Study of Muscovite Literary Culture in its European Setting, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 1972.

- 1978
Waugh D. C., *The Great Turkes Defiance: On the History of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan in its Muscovite and Russian Variants*, with a Foreword by Academician Dmitrii Sergeevich Likhachev, Columbus, O., 1978.
- 2016
Waugh D. C., Pseudo-epigraphic correspondence with the Ottoman sultan: The Russian versions of the apocryphal correspondence with the Ottoman sultan, *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History. Vol. 8. Northern and Eastern Europe (1600–1700)*, D. Thomas and J. Chesworth, eds., Leiden, Boston, 2016, 981–988.
- Базарова (в печати)
Базарова Т. А., «Пришла почта ис-под Азова...»: Письма участников Азовских походов (1695 и 1696) в Научно-историческом архиве СПбИИ РАН, *История военного дела: исследования и источники*, 2018 (в печати).
- Каган 1957
Каган М. Д., Легендарная переписка Ивана IV с турецким султаном как литературный памятник первой четверти XVII в., *ТОДРЛ*, 13, 1957, 247–272.
- 1958a
Каган М. Д., Русская версия 70-х годов XVII в. переписки запорожских казаков с турецким султаном, *ТОДРЛ*, 14, 1958, 309–315.
- 1958b
Каган М. Д., Легендарный цикл грамот турецкого султана к европейским государям — публицистическое произведение второй половины XVII в., *ТОДРЛ*, 15, 1958, 225–250.
- 1993
Каган М. Д., Легендарная переписка Ивана Грозного с турецким султаном; Легендарная переписка турецкого султана с цесарем Леопольдом; Легендарная переписка турецкого султана с чигиринскими казаками; Легендарное послание турецкого султана немецким владетелям; Легендарное послание турецкого султана польскому королю, *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*, 3 (XVII век), 2, С.-Петербург, 1993, 218–231.
- 2010
Каган М. Д., Легендарная переписка Ивана IV с турецким султаном; Переписка турецкого султана с цесарем Леопольдом; Переписка турецкого султана с чигиринскими казаками, *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси*, 16 (XVII век), С.-Петербург, 2010, 34–43, 549–556.
- Майер и Шамин 2007
Майер И., Шамин С. М., «Легендарное послание турецкого султана немецким владетелям и всем христианам» (1663–1664 г.). К вопросу о распространении переводов европейских памфлетов из Посольского приказа в рукописных сборниках, *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 2007, 4 (30), 80–89.
- Морозов 2012
Морозов Б. Н., Царь Василий Шуйский перед польским королем (новый памятник «турецкой темы» с легендарной перепиской польского короля, турецкого султана и царя Михаила Федоровича, *Славяноведение*, 2012, 2, 102–106.
- Поляков 2018
Поляков И. А., «Азбука фряская» князя С. В. Ромодановского и новые списки грамот из цикла «легендарной переписки турецкого султана», *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 2018, 1 (71), 89–99.
- Попов 1869
Попов А., сост., *Изборник славянских и русских сочинений и статей, внесенных в Хронографы русской редакции (Приложение к Обзору Хронографов русской редакции)*, Москва, 1869.

Соболевский 1903

Соболевский А. И., *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV-XVII веков. Библиографические материалы* (= Сборник ОРЯС, LXXIV), С.-Петербург, 1903.

Уо 2003

Уо Д. К., *История одной книги. Вятка и «не-современность» в русской культуре Петровского времени*, С.-Петербург, 2003.

Харлампович 1923

Харлампович К. В., Листування запорозьких козаків із султаном, *Записки історично-філологічного відділу*, 4, 1923, 200–212.

Шамин 2015

Шамин С. М., «Легендарная переписка турецкого султана с цесарем Леопольдом»: к вопросу об источниках памфлета в редакции Russian 1683, *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 2015, 3 (61), 143.

References

Chartier R., Reading Matter and “Popular” Reading: From the Renaissance to the Seventeenth Century, *A History of Reading in the West*, L. G. Cochrane, tr., G. Cavallo and R. Chartier, eds., Amherst, MA, 1999, 269–283.

Fox, A., *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500–1700*, Oxford, 2000.

Harlampovych K. V., Lystuvannia zaporoz'kyh kozakiv iz sultanom, *Zapysky istorychno-filologichnogo viddilu*, 4, 1923, 200–212.

Jones A. M., *The Gazet in Metre; or the Rhiming Newsmonger: The English Broadside Ballad as Intelligence. A New Narrative, News and Politics in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800)*, J. W. Koopmans, ed., Leuven etc., 2005, 131–150 + [Pls. 1, 2].

Kagan M. D., Legendarnaia perepiska Ivana IV s turetskim sultanom kak literaturnyi pamiatnik pervoi chetverti XVII v., *TODRL*, 13, 1957, 247–272.

Kagan M. D., Russkaia versiiia 70-kh godov XVII v. perepiski zaporozhskikh kazakov s turetskim sultanom, *TODRL*, 14, 1958, 309–315.

Kagan M. D., Legendarnyi tsikl gramot turetskogo sultana k evropeiskim gosudariam — publisticheskoe proizvedenie vtoroi poloviny XVII v., *TODRL*, 15, 1958, 225–250.

Kagan M. D., Legendarnaia perepiska Ivana Groznogo s turetskim sultanom; Legendarnaia perepiska turetskogo sultana s tsesarem Leopoldom; Legendarnaia perepiska turetskoto sultana s chigirinskimi kazakami; Legendarnoe poslanie turetskogo sultana nemetskimi vladeteliam; Legendarnoe poslanie turetskogo sultana pol'skomu koroliu, *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi*, 3 (XVII vek), 2, St. Petersburg, 1993, 218–231.

Kagan M. D., Legendarnaia perepiska Ivana IV s turetskim sultanom; Perepiska turetskogo sultana s tsesarem Leopoldom; Perepiska turetskogo sultana s chigirinskimi kazakami, *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi*, 16 (XVII vek), St. Petersburg, 2010, 34–43, 549–556.

Keenan E. L., *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the “Correspondence” Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV*, with an appendix by D. C. Waugh, Cambridge, MA, 1971.

Maier I., Niederländische Zeitungen (“Couranten”) des 17. Jahrhunderts im Russischen Staatsarchiv für alte Akten (RGADA), Moskau, *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 79, 2004, 191–218.

Maier I. Ontsegh-brief van den Turckschen Keyser ... Ein fiktiver Brief des türkischen Sultans an den König von Polen in russischer Übersetzung (1621), *Jako blagopesnivaja ptica. Hyllningskrift till Lars Steensland*, P. Ambrosiani, I. Lysén et al., eds., Stockholm, 2006, 135–146.

Maier I., Shamin S. M., “Legendarnoe poslanie turetskogo sultana nemetskimi vladeteliam i vsem khristianam” (1663–1664 g.). K voprosu o rasprostraneniі perevodov evropeiskikh pamfletov iz Posol'skogo prikaza v rukopisnykh sbornikakh, *Old Russia. The Questions of Middle Ages*, 2007, 4 (30), 80–89.

Morozov B. N., Tsar Vasili Shuyskiy before the Polish king (a new source on the «Turkish» issue with the fictional correspondence of the Polish king, the Ottoman sultan and Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich, *Slavyanovedenie*, 2012, 2, 102–106.

Pettegree A., *The Invention of News: How the World Came to Know about Itself*, New Haven, London, 2014.

Poliakov I. A., “Azбука Fryaskaya” of Prince S. V. Romodanovskoy and New Manuscripts of the Parts of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan, *Old Russia. The Questions of Middle Ages*, 2018, 1 (72), 89–99.

Rospoche M., Salzberg R., An Evanescent Public Sphere: Voices, Spaces, and Publics in Venice during the Italian Wars, *Beyond the Public Sphere: Opinions, Publics, Spaces in Early Modern Europe*, M. Rospoche, ed., Bologna, Berlin, 2012, 93–114.

Simonov V. I., Deutsche Zeitungen des 17. Jahrhunderts im Zentralen Staatsarchiv für alte Akten (CGADA), Moskau, *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 54, 1979, 210–220.

Shamin S. M., “Legendarnaia perepiska turetskogo sultana s tsesarem Leopold’dom”: k voprosu ob istochnikakh pamfleta v redaktsii Russian 1683, *Old Russia. The Questions of Middle Ages*, 2015, 3 (61), 143.

Waugh, D. C., On the Origin of the “Correspondence” between the Sultan and the Cossacks, *Recenzija: A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Scholarly Publications*, 1, 2, 1971, 3–46.

Waugh, D. C., Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets with Turkish Themes: Toward a Study of Muscovite Literary Culture in its European Setting, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 1972.

Waugh D. C., *The Great Turkes Defiance: On the History of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan in its Muscovite and Russian Variants*, with a Foreword by Academician Dmitrii Sergeevich Likhachev, Columbus, O., 1978.

Waugh D. C., Istoriiia odnoi knigi. Viatka i “ne-sovremennost’” v russkoj kul’ture Petrovskogo vremeni, St. Petersburg, 2003

Waugh D. C., Pseudo-epigraphic correspondence with the Ottoman sultan: The Russian versions of the apocryphal correspondence with the Ottoman sultan, *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History. Vol. 8. Northern and Eastern Europe (1600–1700)*, D. Thomas and J. Chesworth, eds., Leiden, Boston, 2016, 981–988.

Daniel Clarke Waugh, Ph.D.

Department of History Box 353560

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington 98195 USA

dwaugh@u.washington.edu

Received October 20, 2018