Zsuzsanna Cziráki

20b The Ottoman Court as a Special Venue for European Diplomacy

1 European Diplomats at the Sublime Porte

An impressive number of studies in several languages have discussed the European presence at the Sublime Porte at various periods of time, but they are mostly embedded in different historiographical traditions and national narratives. There is no doubt that a general history of European diplomatic activities in the Ottoman context represents an urgent need in contemporary diplomatic history. It is also widely understood that this challenge would obviously demand broad cooperation between specialists, which has not yet been possible. Considering the complexity of the issue, it goes without saying that it would be impossible to cover every important aspect in this section. While being aware of the obstacles and challenges of a full description, the main endeavour is to highlight some prominent issues that have influenced general knowledge on the subject of European diplomatic actions at the Ottoman court so far. The period to be discussed here will cover more than two centuries, from the decades of rapid military expansion during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent (c. 1494–1566) to the eighteenth century when the position of the Ottoman Empire changed significantly in the political and military arenas of imperial rivalry. During this time, European views of the Ottoman Empire changed, redefining the sultan's realm from a dangerous and largely unknown imperium to a potential ally with attractive cultural trademarks.[1]

Related to this, the period in question became known as a time of rapidly increasing interactions between the Ottoman Empire and the European powers. Both the massive military expansion of Süleyman I's imperium as well as the economic possibilities that could be exploited by merchants had raised intense interest from Europe, which thus led to the establishment of diplomatic outposts in the sultan's realm. Keeping in mind the early modern evolution of diplomatic activity that led towards the formation of modern embassies as well as the relationship between the growing diplomatic networks and European state-building, it is possible to understand the Sublime Porte as a special venue for European diplomacy in the early centuries of the modern era. Therefore, scrutiny will be placed upon the interactions between European states through

---

1 Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around it* (London et al., 2006), 53, 73–74; Virginia H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman, "Introduction: Situating the early modern Ottoman world," in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, ed. Virginia H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman (Cambridge, 2007), 1–12; Heidrun Kugeler, Christian Sepp and Georg Wolf, "Einführung: Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Ansätze und Perspektiven," in *Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Ansätze und Perspektiven*, ed. Heidrun Kugeler, Christian Sepp and Georg Wolf (Hamburg, 2006), 9–35; Matthew S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (London et al., 1993), 1–19.

their representatives at the seat of Ottoman government with an aim to achieving their country's individual goals on the stage of international relations by using intricate and sometimes impressively elaborated communicative strategies. Addressing the divergent political culture between the Ottoman and non-Ottoman world on the European continent through the combination of diplomatic history and court history, the issue arises of what fundamental parameters defined the European diplomats' action in the special political sphere of the sultan's court.[2] To begin with, three main aspects are proposed for consideration. These focus on the motives and characteristics of relations between states, as well as the intensity of the European presence at the sultan's court.[3]

2 Aspects of Establishing Contact with the Ottoman Court

There appear to have been two basic motives in terms of the incentives for European courts to establish relations with the Ottomans. On the one hand, commercial interests first triggered negotiations with the Ottoman government in Constantinople and resulted in promising trade agreements, the so-called "capitulations" (*'ahdname*) granted by the sultan. In order to facilitate the highly lucrative exchange of products between East and West, an increasing number of European states (Venice, Genoa, France, as well as England and later the Netherlands) acquired the privilege of establishing commercial outposts in the territory of the Ottoman Empire in the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries. This process was accompanied by the subsequent development of a skilled premodern diplomatic apparatus in Constantinople that was also suitable for handling affairs of political nature. As a result, European outposts settled at the Sultan's court increasingly took on political character and facilitated interstate relations in terms of war, peace, truces and alliances between European states and the Ottoman Empire.[4]

---

2 For the development of Ottoman diplomacy see the chapter by Güneş Işıksel in this volume.
3 Dorothee Linnemann, "Visualising 'State-Building' in European-Ottoman Diplomatic Relations," in *Structures on the Move: Technologies of Governance in Transcultural Encounter*, ed. Antje Flüchter and Susan Richter (Heidelberg, 2012), 251–269; Gábor Ágoston, "The Ottoman Empire and Europe," in *The Oxford Handbook of early modern European History, 1350–1750, Vol. II: Cultures and Power*, ed. Hamish Scott (Oxford, 2015), 612–637; Florian Kühnel, "Westeuropa und das Osmanische Reich in der Frühen Neuzeit: Ansätze und Perspektiven aktueller Forschungen," *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 42 (2015), 251–283.
4 Examples for works processing this viewpoint include: Maurits van den Boogert, *The Capitulations and the Ottoman Legal System: Quadis, Consuls, and Beratlıs in the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 2005); Suraiya Faroqhi and Gilles Veinstein, *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire* (Leuven, 2008); Daniel Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire 1642–1660* (Seattle et al., 1998); Alexander H. de Groot, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic: A History of the Earliest Diplomatic Relations 1610–1630* (Leiden, 2012); Jean-Michel Casa (ed.), *Le Palais de France à Istanbul: Un demi-millénaire d'alliance entre la Turqie et la France* (Istanbul, 1995); Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore, 2008).

At the same time, there was also a group of European states for whom diplomatic relations with the Ottoman government became an urgent need because they were confronting its overwhelming military power. After the conquest of the Balkan Peninsula in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, several states in Central and South-eastern Europe – including the Kingdom of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy as well as Poland, Walachia and Moldavia – were seriously affected by the Ottoman claim for hegemony. Accordingly, these states experienced the Ottoman presence as a frequent and quite devastating threat, often causing damage or a loss of territorial integrity in addition to calamitous economic and social consequences. Whatever the motivating factors, most European sovereigns decided it was necessary, if not inevitable, to open a channel of communication with the Sublime Porte by the end of the seventeenth century. In doing so they prepared the way for modern embassies by creating and maintaining a diplomatic apparatus to manage Ottoman relations.[5]

In connection with this, the criterion of sovereignty presents itself as a further important factor in the relation between the European courts and the Porte. If one takes a closer look at the early modern European diplomatic presence at the Sublime Porte, it becomes clear that the term "European" encompasses two characteristic groups according to the nature of the country's relationship to the sultan's realm. On the one hand, there were European sovereign states – such as Venice, France, the Habsburg Monarchy (including the lands of the Bohemian and Hungarian crowns), England, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and Muscovy – that had characteristic political and legal systems supported by Christian ideology and diplomatic traditions. However, on the other hand were the European tributaries of the Ottoman Empire with restricted sovereignty. These states developed a complex and sophisticated relationship with the Porte that spanned the very different ideologies and political concepts of the East and the West. The history of the relations between the Ottoman Empire and European sovereigns has attracted significantly more scholarly interest so far, but it is clear that this side of the issue does not fully cover European diplomatic activity in Constantinople by any means.[6]

Some parts of South-eastern Europe – the Republic of Ragusa, the Principality of Transylvania and the principalities Moldavia and Walachia – had fallen under Ottoman rule in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and took on roles as state-level go-betweens, since their traditional ties to Christian Europe had not been abandoned either. For example, their territories had not been transformed according to Ottoman-Islamic rules, they had no significant Muslim populations and they retained a certain

---

5 Halil Inalcik, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica* 2 (1954), 103–129; Goffman, *Britons*, 13–44.
6 Ágoston, "Ottoman Empire," 612–637; Jan Hennings, "Information and Confusion: Russian Resident Diplomacy and Peter A. Tolstoi's Arrival in the Ottoman Empire (1702–1703)," *International History Review* 41 (2009), 1003–1019; Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th–18th Century): An Annotated Edition of Ahdnames and Other Documents* (Leiden et al., 2000); Kármán Gábor, *A Seventeenth-Century Odyssey in East Central Europe* (Leiden, 2016), 124–126.

amount of autonomy in terms of internal affairs, including the election of their sovereigns and the composition of their ruling elites. To date, it is a common view in the relevant scholarship that the strong Ottoman control resulted in an intricately intertwined political situation in these states, precisely reflecting the overlapping spheres of influence of the rival empires. [7]

Viewed from the perspective of the intensity of diplomatic relations, a further significant aspect can be pointed out, touching upon the frequency of the diplomatic contacts between a specific state and the Porte. According to the most basic theories in the relevant scholarship, Ottoman envoys appeared rather sporadically in late medieval and early modern Europe.[8] Considering the relatively small number of Ottoman diplomatic missions beyond the borders of the Ottoman Empire, the European representatives and diplomatic outposts in Constantinople remained important political links to the outside world for the sultan. Following the pioneering example of medieval Venice, several European states created a permanent diplomatic outpost at the sultan's court. Primarily for the establishing of truce or peace treaties, it was also customary to send temporary missions to the sultan's court led by skilful diplomats. In early modern times, however, many European states made use of both temporary missions and a permanent diplomatic presence in Constantinople at the same time. France, the Habsburg Monarchy (which in the seventeenth century increasingly represented the Spanish branch of the family, however, mostly informally), England and the Netherlands followed Venice's example in establishing their own permanent embassies led by a resident envoy (called *chargé d'affaires* from the eighteenth century) in order to have a direct and stable link to the Ottoman court. However, they did not abandon the practice of sending a special ambassador – usually a high-ranking official with a splendid entourage – to settle the most sensitive political issues.[9]

When it comes to the Ottoman perspective, Europe's diplomatic representatives appear to have been referred to in a similar manner. Envoys are described more or less consistently as *elçi* ("temporary envoy") or *kapı kethüdası* ("resident envoy"). This dual nomenclature for diplomatic emissaries characterised most of the European tributaries under Ottoman suzerainty as well, although in a somewhat modified form. An important aspect of being an Ottoman vassal was that these rulers sent a yearly tribute to the sultan usually via distinguished delegations of dignitaries who were also com-

---

7 For a solid overview and thought-provoking case studies see the recent proceedings concerning the tributary states of the Ottoman Empire: Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević (ed.), *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden et al., 2013); Gábor Kármán (ed.), *Tributaries and Peripheries of the Ottoman Empire* (Leiden et al., 2020).

8 Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire*, 6.

9 Arno Strohmeyer and Norbert Spannenberger, "Einleitung," in *Frieden und Konfliktmanagement in interkulturellen Räumen*, ed. Arno Strohmeyer and Norbert Spannenberger (Stuttgart, 2013), 11–28; for a concise summary on the diplomatic missions of Europeans to Constantinople recently: Christine Vogel, "Istanbul as a Hub for Early Modern Diplomacy," in *European History Online* (2021), accessed April 21, 2022, http://www.ieg-ego.eu/vogelc-2020-en; E. Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca/NY, 2011).

missioned to negotiate the current issues between their lord and the sultan. Further-more, some tributaries were allowed to maintain a permanent outpost in Constantinople, which seems to have functioned similarly to the permanent embassies of the sovereign states. The assessment of the residents from tributary states was mostly influenced by the extent to which the state in question was incorporated into the empire's bureaucratic system and on the balance of the political power in its relationship with its suzerain.[10]

3 Common Features of European Diplomacy at the Sublime Porte

In whatever modalities the relationship between individual European states and the Sublime Porte may have differed, there were some common features that characterised the presence of their representatives at the Sublime Porte. During the period of the mature Ottoman Empire that is being focused upon, conflicts between states were progressively settled through diplomatic means. Currently, Constantinople is considered to have been the site of an intriguingly complex political life with extensive connections to both eastern and western countries. This wide-ranging geographical scope for imperial politics made the seat of the Ottoman government a promising space for the diplomacy of European states, inspiring them to a wide variety of manoeuvres.[11]

Most of the fundamental features of Constantinople's political scene for Europeans that were to shape the inter-state relations in the long run became apparent soon after the first diplomatic contacts. A presence at the sultan's court obviously offered the opportunity to collect genuine information on Ottoman high politics as well as for the Ottomans to acquire information about Europe. After having settled down on the shores of the Golden Horn, the primary objective of every diplomatic mission was necessarily gaining access to the relatively coherent Ottoman bureaucracy, to the most powerful factions in the Topkapı Palace and to the households of Ottoman dignitaries, with the goal of creating a successful Ottoman policy for their country. However, the attention of the European representatives was not at all limited to bilateral issues with the Ottomans. They carefully followed the activity of their colleagues on the diplomatic stage of Constantinople, since foreign policy was largely influenced by domestic power struggles. In accordance with this, developing an outpost with well-

---

10 Sándor Papp, "The System of Autonomous Muslim and Christian Communities, Churches, and States in the Ottoman Empire," in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević (Leiden et al., 2013), 375–419.
11 Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire*, 26.

connected agents brokering deals between states at the sultan's court ultimately meant a projection of the intricate European political context onto the Ottoman capital.[12]

Among the numerous examples that demonstrate the amount of intrigue involved in the jostling for potential alliances against a "common" enemy in the sultan's court, the French-Ottoman friendship doubtlessly deserves a distinguished position. Spanning over more than two centuries, the Habsburg-French rivalry for continental hegemony made French kings seek an alliance with the Ottoman court by both encouraging Ottoman military campaigns against the Habsburg dominions and supporting opponents of the dynasty despite the relatively wide-spread condemnation in Europe of any fraternisation with the Ottoman "infidels." Nevertheless, European diplomatic activity at the sultan's court also included mediation between the Ottoman Empire and its rivals, a role that British diplomacy performed at the conclusion of the Austro-Ottoman War (1716–1718), when the kingdom took the lion's share in mediating peace between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs. Simply put, the dynamically changing European alliances simultaneously shaped both European-Ottoman relations as well as diplomacy amongst the European representatives at Constantinople, and not exclusively in terms of the sovereign states.[13]

Although Christian tributaries on the periphery of the Ottoman Empire differed from Europe's sovereign political entities regarding their political traditions and legal frameworks in many ways, they were not exempt from the subtle power plays that characterised the international diplomatic arena of the Ottoman Porte. Their connection to the centre of Ottoman government was their primary gateway to the rest of the world. They maintained lively relations with neighbouring tributaries and Ottoman provinces, and some of them even maintained a semi-official diplomatic network at the European courts, at least temporarily. Their web of entangled diplomatic activity appears to have opened up another distinctive sphere of interactions at the Sublime Porte. Since the tributaries were frequently hot spots for the conflicts between the empires, sovereign states interested in the region also maintained relations with these states through their representatives in Constantinople, largely by way of discreet negotiations and information gathering. The relevant features of this secret diplomacy at the sultan's court were embodied in Constantinople by a virtual political arena for real conflict zones in Europe, with significant permeability for both sovereign and non-sovereign states. The most famous example may have been the diplomatic manoeuvres of the protestant alliance during the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), which included not only representatives of the rebel Bohemian states to the Sublime Porte

---

12 See for instance on this issue: John-Paul Ghobrial, *The Whispers of Cities: Information Flows in Istanbul, London, and Paris in the Age of William Trumbull* (Oxford, 2013).

13 Michael Hochedlinger, "Die französisch-osmanische 'Freundschaft' 1525–1792: Element antihabsburgischer Politik, Gleichgewichtsinstrument, Prestigeunternehmung – Aufriß eines Problems," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 102 (1994), 108–164; Mary Wortley Montagu, *Letters and Works by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu 1689–1762, Vol. 1*, ed. James Archibald Stuart-Wortley-Mackenzie Wharncliffe (London, 1837), 257–402.

but also the envoys of Transylvania, who were supported by the ambassadors of France and the Netherlands against the envoys of the Habsburg dynasty.[14]

As a result, every state represented by an envoy or agent was able to come into contact with one another on the shores of the Golden Horn through formal or informal channels. Communication in this multifaceted diplomatic arena encompassed high-level Ottoman dignitaries on the one hand – above all the grand vizier, the grand mufti (şeyh-ül-islam) and the head of the Imperial Chancellery (reis efendi) – and the actors of European diplomacy on the other, along with other subjects of various realms present in Constantinople's intercultural landscape. Creating and operating an extensive network of patrons, informants and go-betweens based on these groups with sometimes conflicting multiple loyalties while also establishing a strong link to the Ottoman court required well-trained and sufficiently experienced diplomatic personnel usually centred on the envoys.[15] They were expected to delve into court circles themselves or through a proxy – most frequently a fully accredited interpreter of eastern languages at the Sublime Porte – to exchange the necessary information and perform negotiations. This was a complex challenge that took a great deal of skill to manage. First, envoys were often left to make crucial decisions on their own due to the huge geographical distance between the rulers and their representatives acting in the field. This limited the flow of information, and thus the central control over day-to-day affairs. Second, envoys also had to cope with the fact that they usually did not have an opportunity to speak with the Ottoman ruler himself. They only met him twice at most, during the welcoming and farewell audiences that marked the beginning and the end of a diplomatic mission. Instead, meeting dignitaries gained importance. Encounters within highly formalised settings according to Ottoman fashion also came to the forefront when a new sultan acceded to the throne or a military triumph was celebrated. However, none of these key experiences differed significantly from diplomatic practice in Europe's court circles, nor was the simultaneous exploitation of both formal and informal channels in politics unique.

Apart from the general absence of dynastic politics encompassing primarily marriages, the main difference between the European and Ottoman diplomatic venue lay mostly in cultural practices which can be observed right at the beginning of the diplo-

---

14 Gábor Kármán, "The Diplomacy and Information Gathering of the Principality of Transylvania," in *A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations 1541 – 1699, Vol. 2,* ed. Gábor Almási et al. (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2014), 69 – 84; on the relevant Dutch diplomacy recently: Hans van der Sloot and Ingrid van der Vlis, *Cornelis Haga 1578 – 1654: Diplomaat en pioneer in Istanbul* (Amsterdam, 2012); Arno Strohmeyer, "Der Dreißigjährige Krieg in der Korrespondenz des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn (1629 – 1643)," in *Dynamik durch Gewalt?: Der Dreißigjährige Krieg (1618 – 1648) als Faktor der Wandlungsprozesse des 17. Jahrhunderts,* ed. Michael Rohrschneider and Anuschka Tischer (Münster, 2018), 315 – 335. On Dutch diplomacy see also the article by Helmer Helmers and Nina Lamal in this volume.
15 Ágoston Gábor, "Birodalom és információ: Konstantinápoly a kora újkori Európa információs központja," in *Az értelem bátorsága: Tanulmányok Perjés Géza emlékére,* ed. Gábor Hausner (Budapest, 2005), 31 – 60.

matic missions to Constantinople. Before entering the Ottoman capital, European envoys were officially welcomed by both Ottoman functionaries and representatives of other non-Muslim states who escorted them through the gates of the city following mutually agreed ceremonial routine based on old traditions. Throughout their stay there, the envoys' capability of digesting Ottoman rules of interaction was tested on several occasions. Just to name two plausible examples, they often attended formal and informal banquets at the Ottoman court where they were expected to adapt largely alien traditions of eating, seating and conversation. They had similarly to decode many cultural features of political importance, e.g. envoys had to understand that sticking out the "tui"– that is the flag of the prophet – at the Topkapı Palace indicated the general mobilisation of the Ottoman army.[16]

In case of ignorance, the above-mentioned audience – the ceremonial peak of Ottoman-European interactions at the Porte – could also turn into a nasty experience: foreign envoys were often brought before the ruler with their arms pinned to their body by janissaries and they were rarely allowed to sit down in the Divan. It has to be noted here that permission for an official audience at the Ottoman court was not easy to obtain and had to be meticulously managed by both sides. Instead, it was much easier to gain access to decision-makers in an informal way, such as by visiting a targeted functionary incognito at their home or sending an interpreter with a confidential message. In this way, envoys were able to maintain their well-established contacts with Ottoman officeholders even in cases when official relations were supposed to have been cut off, particularly during military confrontations. Places where contacts between Ottoman and European functionaries occurred far beyond the Topkapı Palace, and included various venues in Constantinople from the grand vizier's saray to the garden palaces (*konak*) of other dignitaries on the outskirts of the metropolis. Similarly, European representatives found a way to keep in touch largely by visiting one another at their embassies, which were situated for the most part in the Galata/Pera section of the city that had been harbouring European – primarily Italian – merchant colonies since Byzantine times. Personal connections built upon sympathies or political alliances were a side feature of diplomatic manoeuvres and remained characteristic throughout the period, while fierce hostility between certain envoys was not unknown either. As noted above, European diplomats at the Sublime Porte were seemingly expected to perform their services within a varied diplomatic universe combining both Ottoman and inter-European politics. Besides this, strict ceremonial rules were followed outside the Ottoman context as well. European envoys not only welcomed newly arriving colleagues on their approach to Constantinople as mentioned above,

---

16 Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire*, 7; Christine Vogel, "Der Marquis, das Sofa und der Großwesir: Zur Funktion und Medialität interkultureller diplomatischer Zeremonien in der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Die Audienz: Ritualisierter Kulturkontakt in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Peter Burschel and Christine Vogel (Köln et al., 2014), 221–245; Ernst D. Petritsch, "Zeremoniell bei Empfängen habsburgischer Gesandtschaften in Konstantinopel," in *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell in Europa und im Mittleren Osten in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Ralph Kauz, Giorgio Rota and Jan Paul Niederkorn (Wien, 2009), 301–322.

but they visited each other privately or on behalf of their overlords and celebrated funerals, weddings and births together – both for the royal families and their own families – according to European traditions, as was the case at domestic royal courts.[17]

If one looks at the intra- and inter-imperial encounters on Constantinople's diplomatic stage from the viewpoint of European diplomats, precedence is always a crucial point to consider.[18] Signals to display the authority and superiority of the rulers they represented followed essentially European patterns. Events attended by the Christian representatives, in particular church ceremonies, were performed in accordance with a strict order of precedence that ensured a leading position for the Imperial ambassador representing not only the Habsburg Monarchy but also the Holy Roman Empire. This tradition was rooted in European practice but was frequently questioned by the French ambassadors. Another generally relevant and striking example of the full scale of a diplomat's activity in this complex political-cultural context was the patronage of Christian churches under Ottoman rule by European sovereigns. Although Christian solidarity was a force that joined the European envoys, the support for churches became a highly disputed privilege with significant symbolic meaning in the Latinate world soon after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. This issue included control over the holy sites in Jerusalem and the extension of Western influence in the Orthodox patriarchate of Constantinople. These attempts often hearkened back to armed conflicts based on religion amongst the European powers in the era of the Counter-Reformation.[19]

Envoys accepted at the sultan's court could run an embassy in which non-Ottoman subjects were granted a certain amount of protection by the Ottoman ruler. However, political conflicts radically limited this restricted extraterritoriality. Life at the embassies largely conformed to domestic household rules, while members established

17 Ronald G. Asch, "Freundschaft und Patronage zwischen alteuropäischer Tradition und Moderne: Frühneuzeitliche Fragestellungen und Befunde," in *Varieties of Friendship: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Social Relationships,* ed. Bernadette Descharmes et al. (Göttingen, 2011), 265–286; Hillard von Thiessen, "Gestaltungsspielräume und Handlungspraktiken frühneuzeitlicher Diplomaten," in *Praktiken der Frühen Neuzeit: Akteure, Handlungen, Artefakte*, ed. Arndt Brendecke (Köln et al., 2015), 199–209; Karl Teply, *Kaiserliche Gesandtschaften ans Goldene Horn* (Stuttgart, 1968), passim; Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen: Internationale Beziehungen 1559–1660* (Paderborn, 2007), 100–118, 201–215; Tetiana Grygorieva, "Zur Selbstdarstellung polnisch-litauischer Botschafter im frühneuzeitlichen Istanbul," in *Die Audienz: Ritualisierter Kulturkontakt in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Peter Burschel and Christine Vogel (Köln et al., 2014), 81–100; Montagu, *Letters and Works*, 257–402.
18 Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, "Zeremoniell als politisches Verfahren: Rangordnung und Rangstreit als Strukturmerkmale des frühneuzeitlichen Reichstags," in *Neue Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Reichsgeschichte*, ed. Johannes Kunisch (Berlin, 1997), 91–132.
19 Steven Runciman, *Das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel vom Vorabend der türkischen Eroberung bis zum griechischen Unabhängigkeitskrieg* (München, 1970), 218–309; Gunnar Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik* (Wiesbaden, 1968); Ovidiu Olar, "Orthodoxy and Politics: The Patriarch Nikon of Moscow, the Prince Mihnea III Radu and the Great Church of Constantinople," in *The Rites Controversies in the Early Modern World*, ed. Ines G. Županov and Pierre Antoine Fabre (Leiden et al., 2018), 233–263.

contacts with the society of Constantinople, creating space for cultural transfer. Records of the exchange of diplomatic gifts – clockwork devices, brocade, woollens, furs and certain animals such as English dogs – provide a glimpse into the scale of products introduced or promoted at the Sublime Porte by Europeans.[20] It is also well known from art history that "Western style" clothing, armour decoration and portraiture had an effect on Ottoman art through the influence of ambassadors.[21] Conversely, they also transmitted luxuries of the Ottoman court to Europe, including a variety of clothes (e.g. caftans), plants, animals and culinary items such as sweets and coffee.[22] These objects, as well as information in the ambassadorial reports and visual documentation depicting Oriental curiosities, became a highly esteemed part of royal – and noble – display. Regarding the wide variety of challenges at the sultan's court, European rulers preferably selected envoys and members of diplomatic delegations who had certain cultural capabilities in the Oriental context, were experienced in Eastern affairs and had a proper command of the relevant languages.[23] In summary, diplomatic encounters at the sultan's court contributed significantly and in numerous ways to the integration of the Ottoman Empire into the environment of early modern diplomacy between political entities based on international law, and thus the effect of this on the evolution of modern intercultural diplomacy is difficult to overstate.

Selective Bibliography

Aksan, Virginia H., and Daniel Goffman (ed.), *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* (Cambridge, 2007).

Almási, Gábor, Szymon Brzezinski, Ildikó Horn, Kees Teszelszky and Áron Zarnóczki (ed.), *A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations 1541–1699, Vol. 2* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2014).

---

20 Harriet Rudolph, "The Material Culture of Diplomacy: The Impact of Objects on the Dynamics of Habsburg-Ottoman Negotiations at the Sublime Porte (1530–1650)," in *Politische Kommunikation zwischen Imperien: Der diplomatische Aktionsraum Südost- und Osteuropa,* ed. Gunda Barth-Scalmani, Harriet Rudolph and Christian Steppan (Innsbruck, 2009), 211–238.

21 Faroqhi, *A Cultural History*, 66–72.

22 Anne Goldgar, *Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age* (Chicago et al., 2007); see also the contributions of the following volume focusing on the cultural exchange between the Ottoman Empire and European states in the early modern period: Zoltán Biedermann (ed.), *Global Gifts: The Material Culture of Diplomacy in Early Modern Eurasia* (Cambridge, 2017).

23 Among many examples for interested envoys with special skills in Oriental languages and culture see above all: François Savary Brèves, *Relation des voyages de Monsieur de Brèves,* ed. Jacques Du Castel (Paris, 1628); Oghier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *The Turkish Letters of Oghier Ghiselin de Busbecq, Imperial Ambassador at Constantinople, 1554–1562,* trans. Edward Seymour Forster (Baton Rouge, 1927); Karin Ådahl, *The Sultan's Procession: The Swedish Embassy to Sultan Mehmed IV in 1657–1658 and the Rålamb Paintings* (London, 2007); Zsuzsanna Cziráki, "'Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister:' Wissensübertragung unter Diplomaten der kaiserlichen Interessenvertretung an der Hohen Pforte in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts," *Chronica: Annual of the Institute of Szeged* 19 (2019), 42–83.

Ágoston, Gábor, "The Ottoman Empire and Europe," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern European History, 1350 – 1750, Vol. II: Cultures and Power*, ed. by Hamish Scott (Oxford, 2015), 612 – 637.

Barth-Scalmani, Gunda, Harriet Rudolph and Christian Steppan (ed.), *Politische Kommunikation zwischen Imperien: Der diplomatische Aktionsraum Südost- und Osteuropa* (Innsbruck, 2009).

Biedermann, Zoltán (ed.), *Global Gifts: The Material Culture of Diplomacy in Early Modern Eurasia* (Cambridge, 2017).

Burschel, Peter, and Christine Vogel (ed.), *Die Audienz: Ritualisierter Kulturkontakt in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Köln et al., 2014).

Dursteler, Eric, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore, 2008).

Faroqhi, Suraiya, *The Ottoman Empire and the World around it* (London et al., 2006).

Goffman, Daniel, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire 1642 – 1660* (Seattle et al., 1998).

Kauz, Ralph, Giorgio Rota and Jan Paul Niederkorn (ed.), *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell in Europa und im Mittleren Osten in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Wien, 2009).

Kármán, Gábor, and Lovro Kunčević (ed.), *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden et al., 2013).

Kühnel, Florian, "Westeuropa und das Osmanische Reich in der Frühen Neuzeit: Ansätze und Perspektiven aktueller Forschungen," *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 42 (2015), 251 – 283.

Petritsch, Ernst D., "Zeremoniell bei Empfängen habsburgischer Gesandtschaften in Konstantinopel," in *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell in Europa und im Mittleren Osten in der Frühen Neuzeit,* ed. by Ralph Kauz, Giorgio Rota and Jan Paul Niederkorn (Wien, 2009), 301 – 322.

Rothman, E. Nathalie, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (New York, 2012).

Rudolph, Harriet, "The Material Culture of Diplomacy: The Impact of Objects on the Dynamics of Habsburg-Ottoman Negotiations at the Sublime Porte (1530 – 1650)," in *Politische Kommunikation zwischen Imperien: Der diplomatische Aktionsraum Südost- und Osteuropa*, ed. by Gunda Barth-Scalmani, Harriet Rudolph and Christian Steppan (Innsbruck, 2009), 211 – 238.

Talbot, Michael, *British-Ottoman Relations, 1661 – 180: Commerce and Diplomatic Practice in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul* (Rochester, 2017).