

## **EARLY MODERN DIPLOMATIC REALITIES: MICHAEL STARZER AND CASPAR GRATIANI IN THE FIRST YEARS OF THEIR ACQUAINTANCE (1610–1614)**

**Dr. Aneliya Stoyanova**

*Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"*

**Abstract.** Austrian Habsburg resident in Constantinople Michael Starzer (1610 – 1622) and trans-imperial agent, future Ottoman diplomat and Prince of Moldavia Caspar Gratiani met in the Ottoman capital in the early 1610s. Based on the analysis of the Habsburg diplomat's correspondence, the current article focuses on the interaction and cooperation between these two men from the spring of 1611 (i.e. when Michael Starzer first mentioned Gratiani in his letters to the Habsburg court) to the appointment of Gratiani as part of the Ottoman diplomatic mission to Linz in the summer of 1614. The main research questions concern the factors that contributed to the good relationship between them and its impact on the development of the Habsburg-Ottoman diplomacy during the first decade after the end of the Long Turkish War.

**Keywords:** Early modern diplomacy; Habsburg-Ottoman relations; trans-imperial agents; Caspar Gratiani; Michael Starzer

*"Caspari Gratiani is a man who could be very helpful in these lands,  
a vassal of the honorable House of Austria"*<sup>1</sup>

### **Introduction**

In the summer of 1614 Caspar Gratiani, described by the Austrian Habsburg resident in Constantinople Michael Starzer (1610 – 1622) as a *"faithful vassal of the House of Austria"*, was appointed as part of the Ottoman embassy to the Habsburg emperor, which was supposed to negotiate about a new ratification of the Zsitvatorok treaty. Michael Starzer and Caspar Gratiani met in the early 1610s in the Ottoman capital, an important center of diplomacy and encounter between diverse ethnic and religious communities in the Mediterranean. The diplomat expressed his fondness for Gratiani multiple times, strongly suggesting that he should be attracted as a permanent servant of the emperor. What factors contributed to the good relationship between the two men and how did it impact the development of the Habsburg-Ottoman diplomacy during the first decade after the end of the Long Turkish War? The current article focuses on the interaction and cooperation

between Starzer and Gratiani from the spring of 1611 (i.e. when Michael Starzer first mentioned Gratiani in his letters to the Habsburg court) to the appointment of Gratiani as part of the Ottoman diplomatic mission to Linz in the summer of 1614.<sup>2</sup> The analysis is based mainly on the diplomat's correspondence with the Viennese court and concerns primarily this first period of their acquaintance.<sup>3</sup>

### **Who were Michael Starzer and Caspar Gratiani?**

A born Viennese, Michael Starzer traveled for the first time to Constantinople in 1608 in the entourage of the Habsburg diplomat Adam von Herberstein.<sup>4</sup> Shortly after his return to Vienna in January 1610, in March he was sent to the Ottoman capital for the second time as secretary of the Habsburg ambassadors Pietro Bonomo and Andrea Negroni, whose task was to negotiate a new ratification of the Zsitvatorok peace treaty.<sup>5</sup> There is no known data on Starzer's education before his appointments. However, his activities in Constantinople and also afterward as a counselor and advisor, highly valued by his colleague and later Habsburg resident Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, have attracted some albeit peripheral research interest.<sup>6</sup> Initially referred to as an agent, Starzer remained at the Bosphorus for over a decade as a Habsburg representative (1610 – 1622) (Spuler 1935, p. 330; Cziráki 2020, p. 44, Szabados 2023, pp. 42 – 43). Evidence of the decision that he should stay in the Ottoman capital after Pietro Bonomo's and Andrea Negroni's return is found in a memorial written by his colleague Bonomo on 1 March 1610 about four issues to be presented to the court chamber (*Hofkammer*) before starting the journey to Constantinople.<sup>7</sup> The third point was to ask for a recommendation to give to the English ambassador to gain his goodwill for the embassy and especially for Starzer who will stay on longer. The first report sent to the imperial court after the arrival of the mission in Constantinople in May 1610 reveals that the embassy was accommodated in the same two-story caravansary, the so-called German House, where the Habsburg diplomats used to live before the outbreak of the Long Turkish War.<sup>8</sup> As any other resident, Starzer had to supply the Habsburg court with any acquired information about the political and military developments in and around the Ottoman Empire. Among the topics he was primarily informing the Viennese court about were the practices and part of the campaigns of Gábor Bethlen, Prince of Transylvania (1613 – 1629).

During the twelve years he spent as imperial representative at the Porte Michael Starzer fulfilled this task as expected and thus has left behind a considerable amount of reports. The current study accentuates those concerning the diplomat's relation to Caspar Gratiani in the period of 1610 – 1614. Like the majority of Habsburg residents in the Ottoman capital, Starzer experienced various difficulties linked to the constant financial misery and living on loans, the unreliability of the transportation of correspondences and the frequent lack of instructions, the need for more trustworthy dragomans, etc.<sup>9</sup> It will be further discussed how Starzer's

connections to Gratiani helped the diplomat to get through some of them. After returning from their missions, former residents in Constantinople were highly valued for their experience and were often assigned further imperial services, raised to knights, and given noble titles.<sup>10</sup> Starzer was raised to the knighthood and continued his service to the Habsburg court as a member of the Aulic War Council (*Hofkriegsrat*) (Cziráki 2020, pp. 57 – 58). Former residents also played a crucial role in the preparation of their successors.<sup>11</sup> When grand ambassador Johan Ludwig von Kuefstein (1628 – 1629) was tasked to reorganize the system for transportation of the correspondence between the court and the embassy, Starzer was one of his primary advisors (Szabados 2023, pp. 55 – 56).

Caspar Gratiani can be described as an ambitious, adventurous, and capable trans-imperial agent.<sup>12</sup> Based in the Ottoman capital since 1606 working as a dragoman for different European embassies, he was involved in the redemption of captives (both Muslims and Christians) and different merchant activities.<sup>13</sup> He had the linguistic and practical knowledge to collaborate with both branches of the Habsburg dynasty and other European power centers for several years while gaining the attention and trust of the Ottoman government and becoming a highly positioned dignitary and diplomat at the Porte. From 1614 to 1618 he was sent to the Habsburg court as part of the Ottoman embassies tasked to achieve the signing of a new ratification of the peace of Zsitvatorok (1606). For his services, he was rewarded by the Porte with the dukedom of Naxos and the possession of Paros in the Aegean Sea (Stoy 1984, p. 102; Manea-Grgin 2006, p. 76). The negotiations between Emperor Matthias (1612 – 1619) and Sultans Ahmed I (1603–1617), Mustafa I (1617–1618), and Osman II (1618–1622) were extremely prolonged and hindered by various circumstances. After the signing of the peace (28 July 1618) and his return to Constantinople (16 December 1618) the Porte appointed Gratiani Prince of Moldavia (4 February 1619). He attempted to become the main political actor in the region and expand his rule over the neighbouring principalities of Transylvania and Wallachia. He retained that position until his death in 1620.

Besides references in older chronicles, lexicons, and histories of Moldavia and Walachia<sup>14</sup>, there are a few more recent studies dedicated specifically to the work of Caspar Gratiani. They focus on different periods, following a logical division of his career path. While the comprehensive study of Austrian historian Manfred Stoy analyzes his activities before his appointment as Prince of Moldavia, Castilia Manea-Grgin's article focuses primarily on the last two years of his life (Stoy 1984, Manea-Grgin, 2006). Romanian historian Dan Floareș analyzed a narration published in an Antwerp gazette shortly after Gratiani's death and the turbulent events in Moldavia in 1620 (Floareș 2013).

Both Stoy and Manea-Grgin offer a detailed review and analysis of the previous discussions regarding Gratiani's origin. Based on cited archival sources they convincingly agree that Gratiani was of Croatian origin, born most probably in the

years between 1575 and 1580. They both cite Joan Jankovic's description of Gratiani's life in Hurmuzaki's "Documente privitoare la istoria Românilor" according to which he was born near Bihac in today's Bosna, but his family was forced to flee the area because of an eminent Ottoman attack when he was still an infant. They settled down in the South Croatian town of Gračac (Stoy 1984, pp.49 – 55; Manea-Grgin 2006, pp.54 – 57). The fact that Gratiani was later referred to as Gratiani von Gradssatz or Gratiani de Gratssats and signed some letters as Caspar Gratiani von Gratssath<sup>15</sup> seems to confirm that.

Gratiani's connections to the Spanish king, the Austrian Habsburgs, the Viceroy of Naples and Sicily, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Pope Paul V (1605 – 1621), and different cardinals, on one hand, and to the Ottoman authorities<sup>16</sup>, on the other, put him on an intriguing career path. This study won't touch upon that path in length and detail but will accentuate Starzer's accounts of him as a friend and informant of the House of Austria before he was appointed an Ottoman envoy to the Habsburg court. Gratiani's role as a mediator between the Spanish king and the sultan in an attempt to achieve a secret truce will also be touched upon. His leading involvement in the negotiations was followed, documented, and assisted by the Habsburg diplomat since mediating between Madrid and Constantinople had been a prerogative of the Austrian dynastic line since the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century (Stoyanova 2020, pp. 152 – 183).

Since Michael Starzer's arrival in Istanbul in May 1610, it was almost four years, before Gratiani set off towards Linz as part of the Ottoman embassy in July 1614. However, it must be noted that Gratiani left the Ottoman capital and spent several months in Italy (possibly other places too) at least twice (Stoy 1984, pp. 59, 61 – 63). Starzer mentioned him for the first time in his letters from March 1611, thus it is uncertain of their relationship before that.<sup>17</sup> By the spring of 1611, they already knew each other personally and had spoken.<sup>18</sup> The first thing to learn about Gratiani was his involvement in freeing both Muslim and Christian captives and also in different merchant activities.<sup>19</sup> Starzer mentions this multiple times over the next years and concludes that achieving the redemption of Ottoman captives had allowed Gratiani to live peacefully in Constantinople and had contributed to his good reputation with the Ottoman government and especially the grand vizier.<sup>20</sup> Manfred Stoy suggests that the Croatian background of Grand Vizier Murad Pasha (1606 – 1611) may have helped him establish contact with the Ottoman authorities (Stoy 1984, p. 59). Gratiani corresponded with Archduke Ferdinand of Inner Austria<sup>21</sup>, the Grand Duke of Tuscany (Cosimo II de Medici), and the Viceroys of Naples (Pedro Fernández de Castro Andrade y Portugal) and Sicily (Pedro Téllez-Girón, 3rd Duke of Osuna), Pope Paul V, and several cardinals.<sup>22</sup> Starzer didn't comment on how the Archduke made his acquaintance but repeatedly mentioned their connection.<sup>23</sup>

The study of Starzer's correspondence with members of the Habsburg court

leaves no doubt about the diplomat's excellent disposition towards Caspar Gratiani, whom he recommended on multiple occasions. Gratiani had shown him his friendship and willingness to cooperate<sup>24</sup> and the diplomat repeatedly put effort into drawing the attention of the Habsburg court to attract him as a paid servant of the Habsburg embassy. Confronted with deep cultural, ethnolinguistic, and political differences, all Habsburg resident diplomats in Constantinople strongly depended on their intelligence network and the intermediation of dragomans for the communication with representatives of the Ottoman government. Every capable and trusted servant was valuable and attracting new ones was extremely important. This was especially true for the first years after the re-establishment of Habsburg-Ottoman diplomatic relations after the Long War, when rebuilding the intelligence network emerged as a task of primary importance. The Ottoman grandees, on their part, lacked the necessary training and personnel to deal with European diplomats and had to rely on go-betweens who had the linguistic and practical knowledge necessary for successful diplomatic negotiations (Gürkan 2015, p. 111).

#### **Starzer's efforts to attract Gratiani to Habsburg service**

The issue of bringing Gratiani into Habsburg service with regular pay to tie him more firmly to Vienna was repeatedly raised by Michael Starzer. According to the diplomat's accounts, Archduke Ferdinand's recommendation facilitated Gratiani's connection to the Habsburg embassy in Constantinople and his use as a dragoman. His statement most probably refers to the cases when, due to the lack of a trusted dragoman at his disposal, Starzer used the services of Gratiani.<sup>25</sup> His previous experience, the connections he had established, and the good command of Ottoman Turkish, Italian, Croatian, English, and Greek would certainly have allowed Gratiani to assume the position but would have necessitated the cessation of much of his other disparate activities.<sup>26</sup>

Since the spring of 1611, the Habsburg diplomat writes even about the idea of appointing Gratiani as the next permanent representative of Vienna on the Bosphorus after his return.<sup>27</sup> Later reports reveal though that he wasn't given a permanent position. Nevertheless, the idea was brought up again in July 1612. Starzer was asked by the emperor to recommend one person or more who could eventually become his successor, and Gratiani was the only one the resident could think of at this point: "[...] *Your Majesty has also entrusted me to recommend one person or more who could be used here in Your Majesty's service after my dismissal, now I can't suggest anyone but Casparum Gratiani [...]*"<sup>28</sup>. The diplomat dedicated several pages of a detailed report to Gratiani's connections, activities, valuable abilities, and reasons for attracting him to the Habsburg service.<sup>29</sup> Due to the hard conditions and various challenges of the work, like many previous residents, Starzer raised the question of his dismissal earlier than planned.<sup>30</sup> Having a good qualified candidate suitable to replace him, would serve as a valid argument in favour of the idea.

The selection of the envoys during the period under consideration was not an easy task and depended on various factors like the limited number of suitable candidates. On the one hand, practically few possessed the required minimum of knowledge about the Ottoman Empire and its affairs. On the other hand, the task itself and the long stay in the Ottoman capital were inevitably associated with a serious burden of a different nature, including financial. Throughout the Early modern period, residents, as well as their employees, not only regularly complained about their difficult financial situation, but they often had to personally finance part of their stay.<sup>31</sup> At this stage, there is no evidence that the idea was seriously discussed in the Habsburg court.

A year later, by July 1613, the correspondence between Starzer and the President of the *Hofkriegsrat*, Hans von Molart, revealed that Molart received letters of useful information from Caspar Gratiani.<sup>32</sup> With the promise of recommending to the emperor to reward Gratiani's efforts, Starzer was instructed to encourage him to continue the correspondence.<sup>33</sup> Although the idea of recalling Starzer and replacing him with Gratiani was not commented on by the court and the diplomat remained in office, Gratiani still managed to attract some attention. He kept on writing to the Imperial court since in a report from May 1614 Starzer mentioned that Gratiani sent his letters together with his correspondence.<sup>34</sup> Nevertheless, he seems to have been doing it without any remuneration. If Starzer's accounts are correct, until May 1614 all Gratiani had received from the Habsburg court was a precious chain worth 100 ducats. In 1613 the emperor had decided to grant him another 100 ducats, but it hadn't happened so far.<sup>35</sup> His versatile activities allowed him to invest time, effort, and capital into growing relationships that would be profitable in the future.

A further urgent appeal for Gratiani's enlistment in paid service is found in Starzer's letter to Emperor Matthias II from 24 May 1614, which again provides information about his activities, his qualities, and his service to the House of Austria. The diplomat appealed that the emperor should acknowledge Gratiani's merits and grant him a reasonable reward and even an annual payment so that he would continue serving the Habsburgs. Starzer himself would greatly appreciate having another trusted person to help him. Like many of his colleagues, the resident repeatedly complained about the need for trustworthy dragomans. Since the establishment of the permanent Austrian Habsburg embassy in Constantinople (1547), the lack of highly valued servants has been an ever-emerging topic for discussion.<sup>36</sup> The diplomats also suggested better and more regular payments for the interpreters at their disposal.<sup>37</sup> Starzer claimed that the other ambassadors had many more trusted dragomans and other servants and didn't hesitate to spend money to attract new ones. He praises the Venetian embassy's extensive network of qualified servants and informants.<sup>38</sup> Sending young boys from their lands to Constantinople to learn Ottoman Turkish and later become dragomans was also a Venetian practice (since 1551), which the Habsburg residents sought to implement since the mid-1560s.<sup>39</sup> In the 1610s,



Michael Starzer's concerns and suggestions to the Habsburg court regarding that matter sound very much like those of his predecessors Albert de Wijs (1562 – 1569) and Karl Rijm (1570 – 1573).<sup>40</sup> In the multicultural context of Habsburg-Ottoman diplomacy, where not only there was no common language for communication, but also the sociocultural traditions and practices of both sides differed greatly, the role of the dragomans for the functioning of the incoming missions was of undeniable importance and exceeded the linguistic aspect of their service.<sup>41</sup>

In this respect, it should be noted that Starzer's letter from 19 March 1611 contains the first reference about Johan Paul Damiani, who would later become a valuable dragoman and currier to the imperial embassy and remain in its service for over a decade.<sup>42</sup> It can be presumed that Starzer's passionate recommendation contributed to Damiani's long-term commitment to the Habsburg embassy.<sup>43</sup> Since Damiani was occasionally sent to the Imperial court and wasn't available the whole time, Starzer appealed that the emperor should attract the more experienced and well-connected Gratiani to take the place of the deceased Habsburg dragoman Matthias del Faro. This analogy is important since Matthias del Faro was one of the key Habsburg dragomans in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>44</sup> Fearing that Gratiani could be hired by another ruler, Starzer accentuated he had allegedly already received a proposal from the Spanish king.<sup>45</sup> The diplomat's reports on Gratiani's relation to Madrid and his involvement in the Spanish-Ottoman peace negotiations will be further discussed.

In June 1614, Starzer again passionately complained about the extreme financial misery and lack of trusted servants and repeatedly stated that he couldn't remain in the Ottoman capital without bringing shame to the emperor's name and reputation, instead of protecting his interests.<sup>46</sup> He was expecting his dragoman Paul Damiani to return from Vienna and hoped for a written answer to his repetitive appeals concerning Caspar Gartiani's permanent employment.<sup>47</sup> In the absence of a trustworthy interpret, Gratiani helped him out once again by going with him on his meetings with Ottoman officials: "[...] *This week and the past week I have been to Mehmed Aga's several times, and because I don't have a trusted person to use instead of a dragoman, I was able to get Casparum Gratiani to go there with me [...]*"<sup>48</sup> Starzer concluded that he could serve the Habsburg interests much better, if he had better financial resources and at least one trusted helper.<sup>49</sup> Several statements of the diplomat reveal that he truly confided in Gratiani. It was for example Gratiani's house in Galata, where the resident spent several weeks during the summer months of 1615, when Istanbul suffered a plague epidemic, "more poisonous" than others (*vil güfftiger alls andere*).<sup>50</sup>

At the beginning of 1614, the Ottoman Grand Vizier Nasuh Pasha sent first Hussein chiaush and then Mehmed chiaush to the imperial court to confirm Emperor Matthias's wish for negotiating a new ratification of the peace. The emperor's hesitation and the detention of the Ottoman envoys until the resolutions of the Landtag

in Linz had been made, led to the dispatch of a third Ottoman embassy in July 1614. According to Stoy's research, Michael Starzer's suggestion and repeating recommendations were the leading factor for the selection of Caspar Gratiani as part of the diplomatic mission. Consenting to appoint a Christian was a precedent and an eloquent sign that at that point preserving the peace was preferable for the Ottoman government (Stoy 1984, pp. 74 – 75).

### **Surviving the financial struggles with Gratiani's support**

The fondness of Starzer for Caspar Gratiani was also connected to the fact that, in times of need, the Habsburg resident received from him several loans. Michael Starzer's correspondences offer an abundant amount of desperate references about the constantly difficult financial situation.<sup>51</sup> Less than a year after he arrived in Constantinople he stated that he wouldn't have gotten involved in the mission, had he known the living conditions and high costs – double the expected.<sup>52</sup> The following note written by Michael Starzer to Hans von Molart on 5 February 1611 is illustrative of the financial misery he faced: "[...] *So I am also completely broke and have taken loans now and then, so that I don't know how I can provide for my daily needs, because without money there's very little that can be done [...]*"<sup>53</sup>. The diplomat concluded that he couldn't have survived the financial misery so far without Gratiani's help.<sup>54</sup> Gratiani's correspondence to Molart confirms that he had given loans to Starzer in 1614. He asked to receive it back from the Imperial court with the promise to help him out again.<sup>55</sup>

A document issued by the *Hofkriegsrat* shortly after the arrival of the first Ottoman embassy with Gratiani's participation (1 September 1614) reveals the amount Starzer owed Gratiani and thus had to be given back (2275 thaler). He also received a golden chain worth 200 ducats for bringing the emperor highly appreciated presents. The content of the document testifies that Gratiani enjoyed the trust of the Habsburg court so far that he was entrusted to deliver the money that had to be sent to the resident in Constantinople and his dragoman Johan Paul Damiani. As a mediator between the Ottoman embassy and the Habsburgs, Gratiani shared his opinion and consulted on the proper gifts for the Ottoman governors.<sup>56</sup> Starzer saw his participation in the embassy as an advantage for Emperor Matthias and explicitly asked that he be granted an audience. The resident relied on him for orally informing the court of his extreme financial struggles.<sup>57</sup> The diplomat made the same request when Gratiani set off toward Vienna for the second time in December 1614. Starzer's choice of words in the letter informing Molart about his departure once again expresses his affection for him: "[...] *I hope to God that Mr. Casparo Gratiani who departed from here on the 16<sup>th</sup> last month will have arrived at the Imperial court long before this letter does [...]*"<sup>58</sup>. Once again Gratiani was supposed to inform the emperor orally and in writing about the financial misery of the Habsburg diplomat. Manfred Stoy makes mention of a curious case from 1616, when even



while being in Vienna as an Ottoman envoy, Gratiani contributed financially to the maintenance sent to Michael Starzer by the Habsburg court (Stoy 1984, p. 65).

The problems related to the financing of ambassadorial missions, as evidenced by the constant complaints from the diplomats about the lack of resources provided to them weren't just an issue of the Habsburg administration, but a pan-European phenomenon and can serve as a good indicator of the organizational level of development of the diplomatic service during the Early Modern period (Strohmeyer, Edelmayer 1997, pp. 44 – 45).

### **Gratiani's involvement in the Spanish-Ottoman peace negotiations, 1613 – 1614**

The very first mentions of Gratiani in Starzer's reports contain references to the correspondence he maintained with the representatives of Felipe III in Naples and Sicily. Gratiani himself also often referred to his contact with the Spanish crown. Before leaving for Italy in mid-July 1612<sup>59</sup>, he had asked Starzer to continue his correspondence with the viceroys of Naples and Sicily, the King of Spain, and several cardinals and to send them *avisi* in his absence.<sup>60</sup> Given the dynastic bond between the two Habsburg courts, the diplomat seemed willing to do so, relating to former Austrian Habsburg residents and other agents who had previously worked in the interest of the Spanish king.<sup>61</sup> Paulo Dapino, an agent of the viceroy of Naples, who arrived in the Ottoman capital in the spring of 1612 to investigate the condition and equipment of the Ottoman armada, made a similar request to Starzer, arguing that with Gratiani's departure, the Spanish king was left with no other trusted agents in the Ottoman capital.<sup>62</sup> Starzer replied to both that he had to wait for the emperor's approval. At the end of September, the emperor gave his affirmative answer.<sup>63</sup> In January 1615, when Gratiani had already left for Vienna, Starzer reported sending letters to the Spanish king through his agent in Ragusa Antale Alegreti.<sup>64</sup>

The information that Starzer gives about the course of the secret Spanish-Ottoman peace negotiations is not detailed but leaves no doubt that Caspar Gratiani played the role of the main mediator. The resident's most informative report in this respect dates from 24 May 1614. Both the letter and the attached postscript offer insides into Gratiani's involvement. In the fall of 1613, the Spaniard Don Pietro Bruno arrived in Constantinople with him, charged with the task of starting the negotiations. Gratiani personally engaged in the process, maintaining contact with Grand Vizier Nasuh Pasha<sup>65</sup>, who supported the idea of a truce with both the Grand Duke of Tuscany Cosimo II and Felipe III and let Gratiani be the intermediary. He also assisted in the delivery of correspondence between the negotiating parties. According to Starzer the Grand vizier wished that the Pope should also be included in the peace, and Malta should be destroyed, which was an extremely hard point to negotiate about.<sup>66</sup>

The other ambassadors in Istanbul were trying to sabotage the Spanish peace negotiations and had succeeded in setting the Mufti and other Ottoman officials

against the idea, but according to Starzer Gratiani counteracted using the proven method of bribery to silence the opposition.<sup>67</sup> The Habsburg resident learned from the French ambassador, that he knew about the secret peace negotiations for several months and had asked his sovereign whether to be supportive or impede that truce, but he didn't get further instructions. As he was asked by a high official what he would advise the sultan and whether the friendship with the Spanish king would be beneficial for the Porte, he didn't want to give any advice without further instructions from his lord. When asked a second time, he answered that he didn't think much of this friendship.<sup>68</sup>

Nasuh Pasha preferred to negotiate with a native Spaniard and was willing to meet with Pietro Bruno, who afterward set off to Italy on Gratiani's ship carrying the Grand Vizier's letters to the Spanish king and the Grand Duke. Starzer expressed his belief that the negotiations had very good chances of coming to a successful end, which as Gratiani had told him, was also Nasuh Pasha's wish.<sup>69</sup> The diplomat was certain that as soon as the peace between Madrid and Istanbul was concluded, the Spanish king would attract Gratiani to his service.<sup>70</sup> For years he was searching for a more permanent appointment, but wasn't offered a regularly paid position by any monarch. Nevertheless, he remained faithful to the House of Austria and could be of great use to have him as a servant. A series of factors, such as the death of the Grand Vizier, Gratiani's appointment as part of the Ottoman embassy to the Habsburg court, and the preference of the viceroy of Sicily to exploit the weakened position of the Porte rather than make a truce, led to the failure of the Spanish-Ottoman negotiations. Nevertheless, Gratiani made it clear that he was willing to work again to achieve this truce (Stoy 1984, p. 70).

### **Conclusion**

It can be concluded that the factors contributing to the good relationship between the two men were connected to both Gratiani's career aspirations and the difficulties experienced by the Habsburg diplomat in Constantinople, especially the lack of trustful dragomans and the constant financial struggles. Michael Starzer saw Caspar Gratiani as capable, very well-connected, and willing to cooperate, since Gratiani persistently demonstrated his will for collaboration and shared information without expecting anything in exchange. On the contrary, he even supported the resident financially by granting him several loans in times of need. The benefits of Gratiani's other activities and connections allowed him to invest in potentially profitable relationships and be persistent in his efforts. Starzer's strong recommendation for including Gratiani in the Ottoman embassy to Emperor Matthias in July 1614 contributed to his further development as a diplomat with considerable merits as a mediator during the Habsburg-Ottoman negotiations for signing the new ratification of the Zsitvatorok peace treaty.

### **Acknowledgments**

This study is financed by the European Union - NextGenerationEU, through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, project No BG-RRP-2.004-0008-C01. The publication itself is a result of the work on a sub-project of Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” on the topic: “Diplomacy in the New Times. Between Ideology and Practice” (contract No. 70-123-485/28.06.2023”).

### **NOTES**

1. Starzer, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/ Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Staatenabteilungen (ÖStA/HHStA StAbt), Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, 132v.
2. Methodologically, along with the analysis of primary sources, the biographical method was also used, see: Pironkova 2023.
3. All primary sources used in the current article are preserved and accessible at the Austrian State archives. In their article on the mission of Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein in 1628, Gergeli Brandl and János Szabados mention another collection of Starzer's correspondences at the Archive of Sopron (Ödenburg), which hasn't been researched yet, see: BRANDL/SZABADOS 2021, 76.
4. On Starzer's birthplace see CZIRÁKI 2020, p. 57; on Herberstein's embassy see: SPULER 1935, 330.
5. See Starzer's final relation from 13 October 1622: STARZER, M., 1622. *Final relation*. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 108, Konv. 5, fol. 1r – 2r.
6. See: Szabados 2018, Cziráki 2020, Brandl – Szabados 2021, Papp 2013, Stoy 1984, Hiller 1998.
7. BONOMO, P., 1610. *Memorial*. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 92, Konv. 2, fol. 29r.
8. In a recently published study Robyn Dora Radway dedicates a whole chapter to the housing of the imperial diplomats offering a thorough inside on their life in the Ottoman capital, see: RADWAY, D. R., 2023. *Portraits of Empires. Habsburg Albums from the German House in Ottoman Constantinople*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 14 – 39.
9. On the lack of incoming instructions, see: STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fol. 30r.; STARZER, M., 1615. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 98, Konv. 1, fol. 10r+v.
10. Thus, for example, in 1584 the former imperial resident in Constantinople David Ungnad (1573–1577) headed the Aulic war council (Hofkriegsrat), see: REGELE 1949, 73. After his return from the Ottoman capital, his colleague Paul von Eitzing (1584–1587) became a member of the Lower Austrian Constituent Assembly (Landtag von Niederösterreich).

11. On the transfer of knowledge between the Habsburg diplomats see: CZIRÁKI, 2020.
12. On trans-imperial agents or go-betweens see the works of Natalie Rothman and Emrah Safa Gürkan.
13. For sources about his activities as a dragoman see: MANEA-GRGIN 2006, 57 – 58.
14. See for example: IANCOVICI, I., 1895. *Narratio de Gasparo Gratiani, Moldaviae princeps*. In: HURMUZAKI, E. (ed.) *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor* Supl. Vol. II/2; PETRICIUS, I. I., 1620. *Historia rerum in Polonia gestarum anno 1620*, Cracoviae; HAMMER-PURGSTALL, J. *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*. Vol. IV, Pest, 1829; IORGA, N., 1900. *Manuscripte din biblioteci străine relative la istoria românilor*. ARMSJ. Seria II, Vol. II (1898 – 1899), București; GASSAUER, R., 1958. *Gaspar Graziani. Ein Fürst der Moldau von Habsburgs Gnaden*. In: *Buletinul Bibliotecii Române din Friburg*. Vol. IV, Freiburg.
15. See for example: OTTOMAN EMBASSY, 1615. *Letter to Emperor Matthias*. Draft of a peace treaty. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 100, Konv. 1, fols. 66r.
16. Manfred Stoy gives a detailed account of how that happened, which won't be further discussed in the present article. See: STOY 1984, 66 – 67.
17. According to Manfred Stoy's research, Gratiani wasn't in Istanbul in the spring months of 1611. See: STOY 1984, 61.
18. Starzer wrote: „[...] wie dan der Casparus bei mir selbst ... angehalten [...]“, STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fols. 207r.
19. Ibid.
20. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fols. 122 – 123, 132 – 133.
21. Archduke Ferdinand of Inner Austria and future Emperor Ferdinand II (1619 – 1637) was the son of Archduke Charles II, son of Emperor Maximilian II, see: STROHM-EYER 2012, 30.
22. STARZER, M., 1612. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 94, Konv. 2, fol. 284v. In the next years, he served the interests of the Spanish crown even more actively by playing a mediatory role in the secret peace negotiations between Madrid and Istanbul.
23. According to Starzer, the Archduke had acknowledged Gratiani's potential during the rule of Emperor Rudolf II. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fols. 132v.
24. Ibid., fol. 123r.
25. For a description of such a situation see: STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fol. 27r.
26. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fol. 123r.
27. STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fol. 207v.

28. STARZER, M., 1612. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 94, Konv. 2, fol. 283v.
29. Ibid., fols. 283v – 286r.
30. See for example: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 57, Konv. 1, fol. 159–165; Kt. 72, Konv. 1, fol. 157; Kt. 74, Konv. 1, fol. 132 – 133.
31. See for example: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 21, Konv. 3, fol. 78; Kt. 45, Konv. 3, fol. 78, fol. 83; Kt. 58, Konv. 1, fol. 17; ÖStA/FHKA, RA, Kt. 276, fol. 70.
32. See for example: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 96, Konv. 1, fols. 139r – 140v, 189r.
33. MOLART, H., 1613. *Letter to Michael Starzer*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 96, Konv. 2, fols. 19v, 30r.
34. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fol. 132r.
35. Ibid, fol. 123r.
36. For the first written peace treaty between Vienna and Constantinople from 1547 see: PETRITSCH 1985.
37. STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fol. 125v – 126r.
38. The diplomat claims that the Venetian embassy maintained four dragomans at its service and never suffered from the shortage of trusted interpreters, see: STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fol. 125v – 126r; Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fols. 122v – 123v. Sending young boys from the own lands to Constantinople to learn Ottoman Turkish and later become dragomans was also a Venetian practice (since 1551), which the Habsburg residents sought to implement since the mid-1560s, see: ROTHMAN 2009, 773.
39. During the 17th France and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth also started educating their dragomans, see: BALBOUS 2015.
40. See for example: RIJM, K., 1570. *Letter to Emperor Maximilian II*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 26, Konv. 3, fol. 234, fol. 236; RIJM, K., 1571. *Letter to Emperor Maximilian II*. Letter. Kt. 27, Konv. 5, fol. 17.
41. In recent years the scientific interest towards dragomans in the Early modern period has risen considerably. Giving a detailed discussion and list of historiography on Early modern dragomans exceeds the focus of the current study. Several studies deserve the attention of readers interested in the topic, but at least the works of Natalie ROTHMAN (2009, 2012, 2021) and Emrah Safa GÜRKAN (2012, 2015, 2018) should be mentioned. Also, Zsuzsanna CZIRÁKI's article "Language Students and Interpreters at the Mid-seventeenth-century Habsburg Embassy in Constantinople" (2016), analyzes the activity of the imperial interpreters mainly during the 1640s and 1650s.
42. Described as the son of good and honest people, Damiani spoke good Turkish, perfect Italian, also Greek, and his mother language was German. He had made a good

- start with reading and writing in Ottoman Turkish and would make great progress if he were taught by a native teacher. STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fol. 125v – 126r.
43. According to a document issued by the Court Finance Chamber in April 1613, Damiani received a monthly allowance from the imperial court of 30 thalers from November 1612, see: COURT FINANCE CHAMBER, 1613. *Letter to Johan Paul Damiani*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kart. 96. Konv. 1, fol. 27r+v.
- 44 Matthias del Faro was on active service during the missions of all eight Habsburg resident diplomats between 1559 and 1594 and met with the embassy of Adam of Herberstein in 1608 after the end of the Long Turkish War. On Matthias del Faro see: STOYANOVA, 2017. However, due to unpaid rewards worth several thousand gulden, he couldn't be convinced to continue working for the Habsburg embassy after the war, HERBERSTEIN, A., 1609. *Letter to Archduke Matthias*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 92, Konv. 1, fol. 2v. In a letter from September 1611 Starzer mentions Joan Francisco del Farro, the son of the late dragoman, STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Archduke Matthias*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 3, fols. 64r+v.
45. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fols. 132v – 133r.
46. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fol. 30r.
47. Paul Damiani was sent back to Constantinople only in mid-June, see Hans Molart's letter to Starzer: MOLART, H., 1614. *Letter to Michael Starzer*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fol. 35r+v.
48. "[...] *dise und vergangene Wochen zu undterschiedlichen mallen bei Mehemet Aga befunden, unnd weilen ich kheine vertrautte person die ich an statt eines Dragomans brauchen möcht, hab ich Den Casparum Gratiani mit mihr Dort hin zu gehen vermögt [...]*", STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fol. 27r.
49. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fol. 20r.
50. The diplomat quoted the accounts of many elderly people that they had never seen such a thing, there were many deaths, among the dignitaries, the Turks fled out of the city with women and children, and the foreign ambassadors also had all fled the city, see: STARZER, M., 1615. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 100, Konv. 1, fol. 159r.
51. Most of Starzer's predecessors from the second half of the 16th century, as well as the ones who came after him, faced similar financial difficulties. In case they could afford it, they fell back on their personal resources in the hope of later compensation by the imperial court.
52. STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fol. 206r.



53. “[...] So bin ich auch mit geld so ganz und gar gelasten, hin unnd wider gelt auf Interesse aufgenommen daß ich shier nicht wais wo ich lenger zu meiner täglichen notturfft was werde aufbringen khüenen, den ohne geldt alhie im wenigsten nichts khann aufgericht werden [...]“, STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fol. 76.
54. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fols. 132v–133r.
55. GRATIANI, C., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/FHKA, RA, Kt. 321, fol. 199r.
56. AULIC WAR COUNCIL, 1614. *Expençe register*. In: ÖStA/FHKA, RA, Kt. 321, fol. 206r – 207r.
57. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 2, fols. 138v – 139r.
58. “[...] Ich hoffe zu Gott es werde herr Casparo Gratiani welcher den 16 passato von hinen verraist vor ankunfft diß lengst am Kay. hof angelangt sein [...]“, STARZER, M., 1615. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 98, Konv. 1, fol. 10r.
59. According to Starzer, he planned to continue towards the German lands to visit the imperial court and offer himself to the service of the emperor, see: STARZER, M., 1612. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 94, Konv. 2, fol. 200v–201v. Around the time when Gratiani left for Italy in July 1612, his nephew Peter Hrinčić, who had arrived in Constantinople, offered himself to the service of the House of Austria, arguing that his family, faithful to the Habsburgs, had fought against the Ottomans on the border in the Croatian lands. Claiming to be fluent in German, Italian, and Croatian, to have already made progress with reading and writing in Ottoman Turkish, and also to have acquired the necessary knowledge of the Ottoman Empire and the state of its affairs, he wanted to be installed on Habsburg service, continue his language training, and become one of the embassy’s dragomans, see: STARZER, M., 1612. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 94, Konv. 2, fol. 226r – 227r. A year later, in July 1613, the correspondence between Starzer and the president of the Aulic War Council Hans von Molart reveals that Hrintschitsch was considered as a potential servant. He had written to Molart, who then asked the resident to observe and inform him about his qualities, MOLART, H., 1613. *Letter to Michael Starzer*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 96, Konv. 2, fols. 19v.
60. STARZER, M., 1612. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 94, Konv. 2, fols. 201r – 202r.
61. On the inner-dynastic cooperation between Vienna and Madrid in their diplomatic relations with the Ottoman court during the second half of the 16th century, see: Stoyanova 2020.
62. To avoid any suspicions, Gratiani wanted to accommodate him in the housing of the English ambassador, whom he knew from before. After realizing that he had

- already left Constantinople, Gratiani brought Dapino to Starzer's house, where he stayed until they left together for Italy in the middle of July. STARZER, M., 1612. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 94, Konv. 2, fols. 283v – 286r.
63. EMPEROR MATTHIAS, 1612. *Letter to Michael Starzer*. Letter. ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 95, Konv. 1, fol. 62r.
64. STARZER, M., 1615. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 98, Konv. 1, fol. 10r+v.
65. Nasuh Pasha was an Ottoman statesman of Albanian origin. He served as Grand Vizier between August 1611 and October 1614. He was strangled on the sultan's orders on 17 October 1614.
66. References to the ongoing raids and tensions between the Ottomans and the Maltese order at sea can be found in Starzer's reports. On 5 February 1611, for instance, he reported about the extremely stormy and turbulent weather conditions that winter which had caused the loss of many marine vessels. One heavy storm alone had sunk over 30 ships near Alexandria, among which was a big recently captured Maltese vessel. During that winter 5 ships of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and several Maltese vessels had remained at the island of Rhodos and blocked the passage from Egypt, so that no ship could reach Constantinople. Furthermore, around the end of December 1610 an Ottoman ship with 51 noble Egyptians on board, which had set sail to Egypt, was attacked and captured by the Maltese. STARZER, M., 1611. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 93, Konv. 1, fols. 66v – 67r.
67. STARZER, M., 1613. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 96, Konv. 2, fols. 19v.
68. STARZER, M., 1614. *Letter to Hans von Molart*. Letter. In: ÖStA/HHStA StAbt, Türkei I, Kt. 97, Konv. 1, fol. 122r.
69. Ibid., fol. 132r.
70. Ibid., fol. 123v.

## REFERENCES

- BALBOUS, C., 2015. Das Sprachknaben-Institut der Habsburgermonarchie in Konstantinopel. *Transkulturalität – Translation – Transfer*, vol. 18. Frank & Timme.
- CZIRÁKI, Z., 2020. “‘Mein Gueter, väterlicher Maister’: Wissenstransfer unter Kaiserlichen Gesandten an der Hohen Pforte in der Ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts”. *Chronica* 19 (September): pp. 42 – 83. <https://ojs.bibl.u-szeged.hu/index.php/chronica/article/view/34022>.
- BRANDL, G.; SZABADOS, J., 2021. The Burden of Authority – The Preparations for the Ambassadorial Mission to Constantinople of Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein in 1628. In: PAPP, S., ERNŐ, M. G. (eds.). *New ap-*

- proaches to the Habsburg-Ottoman diplomatic relations*. Fontes et Libri. Tanulmányok/Studies, Szeged, pp. 63 – 86.
- FLOAREȘ, D., 2013. O tiparitură din Anvers privitoare la evenimente din domnia lui Gaspar Grațiani (1620). In: *Cercetari Istorice* (Serie Noua), no. 32, pp. 195 – 210.
- GÜRKAN, E. S., 2012. *Espionage in the 16th Century Mediterranean: Secret Diplomacy, Mediterranean Go-Betweens and the Ottoman-Habsburg Rivalry*. Georgetown University. [https://www.academia.edu/1838003/Espionage\\_in\\_the\\_16th\\_century\\_Mediterranean\\_Secret\\_Diplomacy\\_Mediterranean\\_go-betweens\\_and\\_the\\_Ottoman-Habsburg\\_Rivalry\\_-\\_Ph.D.\\_Diss.\\_Georgetown\\_University\\_2012](https://www.academia.edu/1838003/Espionage_in_the_16th_century_Mediterranean_Secret_Diplomacy_Mediterranean_go-betweens_and_the_Ottoman-Habsburg_Rivalry_-_Ph.D._Diss._Georgetown_University_2012).
- GÜRKAN, E. S., 2015. Mediating Boundaries: Mediterranean Go-Betweens and Cross-Confessional Diplomacy in Constantinople, 1560-1600. *Journal of Early Modern History*, vol. 19, pp. 107 – 128.
- GÜRKAN, E. S., 2018. Dishonorable Ambassadors Spies and Secret Diplomacy in Ottoman Istanbul. *Archivum Ottomanicum*, no. 35, pp. 47 – 61.
- MANEA-GRGIN, C., 2006. Neobičan knez na moldavskom prijestolju: Hrvat Gašpar Graziani (1619 – 1620.). *Povijesni prilozi*, vol. 25, no. 30, pp. 51 – 77. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/12753>.
- PAPP, S., 2013. Friedensoptionen und Friedensstrategien des Fürsten Gábor Bethlen zwischen dem Habsburger- und Osmanenreich (1619 – 1621). In: SPANNENBERGER, N, STROHMEYER, A. (Eds.). *Frieden und Konfliktmanagement in interkulturellen Räumen: das Osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Stuttgart, pp. 109 – 128.
- PETRITSCH, E. D., 1985. Der habsburgisch-osmanische Friedensvertrag des Jahres 1547. *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs*, vol. 38, pp. 49 – 80.
- PIRONKOVA, M., 2023. On the Problem of the Biographical Method in the Historical and Social Studies. In: *Ilstoricheski Pregled (Historical Review)*, vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 155 – 168. ISSN 0323-9748. [in Bulgarian].
- RADWAY, D. R., 2023. *Portraits of Empires. Habsburg Albums from the German House in Ottoman Constantinople*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- REGELE, O., 1949. Der österreichische Hofkriegsrat: 1556 – 1848. *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs: Ergänzungsband*; 1,1. Wien: VerldÖsterrStaatsdruckerei.
- ROTHMAN, E. N., 2009. Interpreting Dragomans: Boundaries and Crossings in the Early Modern Mediterranean. In: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 771 – 800. doi:10.1017/S0010417509990132.
- ROTHMAN, E. N., 2012. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*. 1st ed. Cornell University Press.

- ROTHMAN, E. N., 2021. *The Dragoman Renaissance. Diplomatic Interpreters and the Routes of Orientalism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- SPULER, B., 1935. Die Europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel bis zum Frieden von Belgrad (1739). Teil 3. Listen der in Konstantinopel anwesenden Gesandten bis in die Mitte des 18. Jhdts. *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven, Neue Folge*, vol. XI, no. 3 – 4), pp. 313 – 342.
- STOY, M., 1984. Das Wirken Gaspar Gracianis (Grațianis) bis zu seiner Ernennung zum Fürsten der Moldau am 4. Februar 1619. In: *Südost-Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Geschichte, Kultur und Landeskunde Südosteuropas*. Vol. 43. Oldenbourg/ München, pp. 49 – 122.
- STOYANOVA, A., 2017. The Dragomans of the Habsburg Embassy in Constantinople in the Second Half of the 16th Century: The Story of Matthias del Faro. *History Studies*, vol. 18, Limerick: University of Limerick, pp. 95 – 108. <http://hdl.handle.net/10344/8904>.
- STOYANOVA, A., 2020. *Vienna, Madrid and the Habsburg-Ottoman relations, 1555–1606*. Unpublished dissertation. Sofia University.
- STROHMEYER, A.; EDELMAYER, F. (Eds.), 1997. Die Korrespondenz der Kaiser mit ihren Gesandten in Spanien: 1: Der Briefwechsel zwischen Ferdinand I., Maximilian II. und Adam von Dietrichstein : 1563 – 1565. *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur der Iberischen und Iberoamerikanischen Länder*, 3, Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik.
- STROHMEYER, A., 2012. Die Habsburger Reiche 1555 – 1740. WGB, Darmstadt.
- STOY, M., 2021. Das Wirken Gaspar Gracianis (Grațianis) bis zu seiner Ernennung zum Fürsten der Moldau am 4. Februar 1619. *Südost-Forschungen*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 49 – 122. <http://bsb0sit-zepweb01.bsb.lrz.de/portal/index.php/sof/article/view/9216>.
- SZABADOS, J., 2023. *Die Karriere des deutschen Renegaten Hans Caspar in Ofen (1627 – 1660) im politischen und kulturellen Kontext*. Fontes Rerum Austriacarum, II. Abteilung: Diplomataria et Acta, 100. Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, <https://doi.org/10.1553/978OEAW92787>.

✉ **Dr. Aneliya Stoyanova**  
ORCID iD 0000-0001-9423-9992  
Sofia University  
Sofia, Bulgaria  
E-mail: [aneliya.an.st@gmail.com](mailto:aneliya.an.st@gmail.com)