

www.forumhistoriae.sk



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)



© 2022 The Author(s)
© 2022 Institute of History,
Slovak Academy of Sciences

The Capture and Trade of Captives by Hungarian Soldiers during István Koháry's General-Captaincy in Szécsény and Filákovo

Szalma, Štefan

Keywords

captive, slave, trade of captives, Ottomans, Serbs

DOI

[10.31577/forhist.2022.16.2.5](https://doi.org/10.31577/forhist.2022.16.2.5)

Author

Štefan Szalma
Historický ústav Slovenskej akadémie
vied, v. v. i.
Klemensova 19
P. O. Box 198
814 99 Bratislava
Slovak Republic
Email: szalmaistvan7@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-8826-2344

Cite

SZALMA, Štefan. The Capture and Trade of Captives by Hungarian Soldiers during István Koháry's General-Captaincy in Szécsény and Filákovo. In *Forum Historiae*, 2022, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 58-73, doi: 10.31577/forhist.2022.16.2.5

Abstract

SZALMA, Štefan. The Capture and Trade of Captives by Hungarian Soldiers during István Koháry's General-Captaincy in Szécsény and Filákovo.

The trade of captives was part of everyday life on the Ottoman-Hungarian borderland during the 17th century. Despite the peace between the Habsburgs and Ottomans in the years 1606–1663, frequent looting expeditions and constant skirmishes occurred between the two empires. The local trade of captives also flourished, which included raiding expeditions for the sole purpose of acquiring captives, negotiations regarding ransom and standards for keeping and redeeming captives. Interest was so great on both sides such that in the 17th century, an extensive system of customs and unwritten rules existed, largely accepted by both Ottoman and Hungarian rulers. The focus of this article is on the involvement of Hungarian soldiers in the field of captive trading during the time of the general captainships of István I. Koháry. Cases examined concern primarily the garrisons of Filákovo, Szécsény, Balassagyarmat and to a lesser extent, other surrounding castles, all sourced from the Koháry family archive located in the Banská Bystrica State Archive. Attention is centered on cases where people were taken captive from the ranks of the civilian population (mostly subjects of Ottomans), and not explicitly Ottoman soldiers or dignitaries. The aim here is a study of the behavior of soldiers towards the general population in the above-mentioned territories, and an observation of the application of specific customs connected with the trade of captives in practice.

The focus of this article is on the involvement of Hungarian soldiers in the area of captive trading during the time of the general captaincy of István I. Koháry. Case studied concerns primarily the garrisons of Filákovo, Szécsény and Balassagyarmat, and other surrounding castles. The majority of attention is focused on incidents where individuals were taken captive from the ranks of the civilian population (mostly subjects of Ottomans), and not explicitly Ottoman soldiers or dignitaries. Of course, from the context of the sources used, it is not possible to clearly assess in each case whether the captives were also lower-ranking soldiers. In most occasions, however, it is explicitly written that they are Ottoman subjects, two-sided taxed subjects from both the Hungarian and the Ottoman side, or only subjects from the Hungarian side. The aim of the present article is a study of the behavior of soldiers towards the civilian population

The study was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under Contract no. APVV-17-0398 A Journey to Modern Society. Three Centuries of the Early Modern Period and research grant VEGA 2/0028/19 Theoretical and Methodological Questions of History of Crime Research in Slovakia / Hungary.

in the abovementioned territories and an observation of the application of individual customs and standards related to the trade of captives in practice. The primary source for this research is the Koháry family archive located in the Banská Bystrica State Archive.¹ The examples presented mostly come from the territory of Novohrad county, the vilayets of Buda and Jáger and in some cases, also more distant counties and Ottoman territorial administrative units. Such cases often concern captives named by the authors of the sources as “Rác/Rácok” or “Serbs”; however, the aim of this article is not a detailed study of ethnic affairs in such lands. Therefore, only the previous research on Serbs and the fact that their ethnic or religious affiliation could influence the Hungarian soldiers' attitude towards them is considered.² Further conclusions are not made regarding any affiliation in this work because in the relevant period, the term “Rác” can refer to several different ethnic groups and the migration of Serbs into Hungary took place in several waves from the Middle Ages.³ For this reason, only general facts are presented about the phenomenon of Serb communities and subsequently individual cases are studied not from the position of ethnicity, but only from the perspective of their status as captives.

The Ottoman-Hungarian trade of captives maintained an unwritten rules and customs, which were accepted by both sides. Historiographers and Turkologists have exposed the regularity of this phenomenon by analyzing a number of cases scattered amongst a range of archival funds. Therefore, a rich knowledge of available scientific literature is important to consider when studying individual cases. Many scientific works in published literature on the successor states of the Hungarian Kingdom deal with the topic of Ottoman-Hungarian captive trading. Basic material includes the work of Géza Pálffy,⁴ in which he detailed the most important regularities and features of the captive trade. Pálffy primarily points to the use of customs and unwritten rules that

- 1 Ministerstvo vnútra Slovenskej republiky (MV SR), Štátny archív v Banskej Bystrici (ŠA BB), fond (f.) Koháry–Coburg I-V. (KC I-V).
- 2 About Serbs see MOLNÁR, Antal. A Szerb ortodox egyházszerkezet a hódolt Magyarországon. In CSÁKI, Tamás – GOLUB, Xénia (eds.) *A Szerb székesegyház a Tabánban – Az eltűnt Rácváros emlékezete*. Budapest : Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, 2019; SZAKÁLY, Ferenc. Szerbek Magyarországon – szerbek a magyar történelemben. (Vázlat.) In ZOMBORI, István (ed.) *A szerbek Magyarországon*. Szeged : Móra Ferenc Múzeum, 1991, pp. 11–50; KUČEROVÁ, Kveta. *Chorváti a Srbi v strednej Európe. K etnickým, hospodárskym a sociálnym otázkam v 16. – 17. storočí*. Bratislava : Veda, 1976. A work which also includes information on the inhabitants and ethnic questions: DÁVID, Géza. *Pasák és bégek uralma alatt. Demográfiai és közigazgatás-történeti kutatások*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 2005. Also about ethnicity of Ottoman garrisons: HEGYI, Klára. *A török hódoltság várai és várkatonasága. I. kötet. Oszmán védelmi rendszer Magyarországon*. Budapest : História, MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2007, p. 233.
- 3 The predominance of Serb inhabitants in territories controlled by the Ottomans is also mentioned in the letter of Pál Szepessy from November, 1671. He expresses the concern that Hungary might very well become a second Serbia (nem többé Magyar, hanem Rácország). MICHELIS, Georg. *Habsburg Empire Under Siege: Ottoman Expansion and Hungarian Revolt in the Age of Grand Vizier Ahmed Köprülü (1661 – 1676)*. Montreal : McGill-Queen's University Press, 2021, p. 368. Well-known Hungarian turkologist Lajos Fekete emphasized that the period of the Ottoman-Hungarian neighborhood is often referred to as the “Turkish world” or “törökvilág,” but considering the ethnic situation among the Ottomans, it would be more appropriate to use the phrase “Bosnian world” or “Serbian world” (bosnyákvilág, rácvilág). HEGYI 2007, p. 233.
- 4 PÁLFFY, Géza. A rabkereskedelem és rabtartás gyakorlata és szokásai a XVI–XVII. századi török-magyar határ mentén. (Az oszmán-magyar végvári szokásjog történetéhez). In FONS, 1997, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 5–78.

gradually formed on the borderland. From a geographical and subject matter point of view, other works by authors from Hungary⁵ and Slovakia⁶ are also important, including those written on slavery or more specifically, on the topic of slavery within the Ottoman Empire.⁷

The Ottoman-Hungarian captive business also had its own particulars, which arose due to the clash of two different cultures, though largely influenced by the Ottoman view of slaves and the existence of systemic slavery in the Otto-

- 5 Also important on this topic is the publication DÁVID, Géza – FODOR, Pál (eds.) *Ransom Slavery along the Ottoman Borders (Early Fifteenth – Early Eighteenth Centuries)*. Leiden; Boston : Brill, 2007, pp. 1–193. Data about the trade of captives is contained in the publication DÁVID, Géza – FODOR, Pál. I. Bayezid döneminde Osmanlı–Macar mücadelesi ve bunun Macaristan'daki etkileri. In ÖCALAN, Hasan Basri – KARAASLAN, Yusuf Ziya (eds.) *Uluslararası Yıldırım Bayezid sempozyumu, 27–29 Kasım 2015, Bursa*. (Türk Tarih Kurumu yayınları, VIII/28.). Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2019, pp. 129–148. A study on slavery in the culture of Islam and in the Ottoman Empire FODOR, Pál. Adatok a magyarországi török rabszedésről. In *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 1996, vol. 109, no. 4, pp. 133–142. ILLIK, Péter. Magyar rabok soproniakhoz írt könyörgő levelei a XVII. századból. In *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 2013, vol. 2, pp. 510–521; KOMJÁTI, Zoltán, Igor. A török foglyok szerzésének lehetőségei és korlátai Füleken Koháry István főkapitányságának idején (1667–1682). In ÚJVÁRY, J. Zsuzsanna (ed.) *Az oszmán-magyar kényszerű együttélés és hozadéka*. Piliscsaba : Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészeti és Társadalomtudományi Kara, 2013, pp. 271–286; TARKÓ, Ilona. Anyagi kultúra a rabtartók által követelt és megkapott áruk alapján a Batthyány birtokokon a XVI – XVII. században. In ÚJVÁRY 2013, pp. 255–270. The author also wrote a dissertation with a similar title: TARKÓ, Ilona. *Rabkereskedelem és anyagi kultúra a XVI-XVII. században a Batthyány család levéltára alapján* (Ph. D. thesis). Piliscsaba : PPKE BTK, 2013. In this work, she deals with the phenomenon of captive trading in connection with material culture, and also focuses on ransom repayment with various items of material culture. Her research is based on sources from the archive funds of the Batthyány family. TÓTH, Hajnalka. *Török rabok Batthyány I. Ádám uradalmaiban*. In *Aetas*, 2002, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 136–153.
- 6 On the Hungarian Chamber and finances provided for liberation of captives: KOHÚTOVÁ, Mária. Uhorská komora a vojaci v tureckom zajatí. In BAĐURÍK, Jozef – SLÁDEK, Kamil (eds.) *Politický zrod novovekej strednej Európy. (500. výročie narodenia Ferdinanda I. – zakladateľa habsburskej monarchie)*. Prešov : Vydavateľstvo Michala Vaška, 2005, pp. 179–183. On the topic of the possibilities of redeeming soldiers and nobles from captivity and Ján Balassa: MALINIÁK, Pavol. Pomoc alebo hrozba? Kapitán banských miest Ján Balaša a jeho vzťahy k mešťanom a zemanom (so zreteľom na bitku pri Sečanoch). In FERENCOVÁ, Helena (ed.) *Rod Balašovcov v 13. až 19. storočí*. Modrý Kameň : SNM – Múzeum bábkarských kultúr a hračiek, 2013, p. 163–165. Also a chapter about captives: MARKUSKOVÁ, Helena. *Hospodárske a sociálne pomery v gemerskej stolici pod osmanským panstvom v 17. storočí* (Ph. D. thesis). Bratislava : Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 2013, pp. 173–177. About the Pálffy-Ottoman correspondence and the phenomenon of captives: CELNÁR, Michal. Listy osmanských hodnostárov adresované Mikulášovi Pálfiemu 1588 – 1594. In *Historický časopis*, 2022, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 193–215. The current article discusses some cases also mentioned in the work on the Ottoman letters about captives from the time of István I. Koháry's general captaincy in more detail: SZALMA, István. A Koháry I. Istvánnak címzett oszmán rabkereskedelemmel kapcsolatos iratok [Ottoman letters about captives addressed to István (Stephanus) I. Koháry]. In *Keletkutatás*, 2021, no. 2, pp. 57–73.
- 7 Among Turkish authors, historian Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı must be mentioned, who has published several works on the topic of slavery in recent years. Her piece on slave markets also offers a number of terminological contexts and valuable data in many spheres of this phenomenon: YAĞCI, Zübeyde Güneş. İstanbul Esir Pazarı. In YAĞCI, Zübeyde Güneş – YAŞA, Fırat – İNAN, Dilek (eds.) *Osmanlı devleti'nde kölelik: ticaret, esaret, yaşam*. İstanbul : Tezkire Yayıncılık, 2017, pp. 57–90. Regarding female slaves in the Ottoman Empire YAĞCI, Zübeyde Güneş. Osmanlı devletinde köle kadınlar. In KAYA, Miyase Koyuncu – YILMAZ, Bedriye (eds.) *Tanzimat öncesi Osmanlı toplumunda cinsiyet, mahremiyet ve sosyal hayat*. Ankara : Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2018, pp. 207–223. From a methodological point of view, important literature includes: CONERMANN, Stephan – ŞEN, Gül (eds.) *Slaves and Slave Agency in the Ottoman Empire*. Bonn : V&R Unipress, 2020. An edition of sources with an introductory study, especially on captives and slaves in the territories of Africa during the 16th–18th Century: KLARER, Mario. *Verschleppt, Verkauft, Versklavt. Deutschsprachige Sklavenberichte aus Nordafrika (1550-1800). Edition und kommentar*. Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 2019. However, it is important to know the specifics of slavery even outside of the Ottoman Empire, in this regard: HAGEDORN, Jan Hinrich. *Domestic Slavery in Syria and Egypt, 1200 – 1500*. Bonn : V&R Unipress, 2019.

man Empire.⁸ According to surviving sources, slaving expeditions were undertaken as early as 1403, e.g., Ottomans from Thessaloniki also traveled to the territory of Hungary in order to obtain captives and slaves. According to later data, during the 15th century, the inhabitants of Hungary were also the objects of “akıncı” attacks.⁹

Over the course of several decades, the customs and unwritten rules associated with capturing, imprisoning and selling captives gradually developed. The possibility of redeeming captives also advanced, and captives progressively acquired a special social status which came with certain rights. Both sides participated in these activities; therefore the rules created by the collaboration of Ottoman and Hungarian society were mostly accepted by both parties. At the same time, such practices can be classified as border customs (végvári szokások, Grenzbrauch), similar to the order that was accepted among the Hungarian and the Ottoman border castles (rendtartás a magyar és török végházak között).¹⁰ This mutual acceptance of the rules by the Ottoman and Hungarian sides is also referenced in a statement regarding deadlines for delivery of ransom in a letter of captives from Eger (“mind Magyar Török törvényi azt tartja...”).¹¹

Regarding the trade of captives during the 17th century, it should be clarified that we are not talking about the rare capturing of a few people during war or some occasional excursions. Looting expeditions for the sole purpose of obtaining captives (in the case of the Ottomans, expeditions called “çete/çete”) and the subsequent complex process of their sale or liberation was part of everyday life on the borderlands in the 17th century, and even in the years before. Essentially, it was an illegal but tolerated possibility of earning money for soldiers, as well as actual “employment” for other, militant elements of society.¹²

The Ottoman phenomenon of capturing of people from Hungary and trading them took on greater proportions during the 16th century, when a large number of people were taken into captivity. It was also connected to the frequent wars, flourishing long-distance slave trade and probably also with the initial phase of the consolidation of Ottoman power in the territories of former medieval Hungary.¹³ The time from the end of the Fifteen Years' War, i.e. 1606,

8 The mode of thinking, in which a group of people is considered a commodity, has its roots in Roman law. Like Christianity, Islam was strongly influenced by late ancient culture and therefore these monotheistic worlds inherited the Roman concept of property and ownership. CONERMANN – ŞEN 2020, p. 12. However, captives on the Ottoman-Hungarian borderland also had a number of rights and a status that distinguished them from slaves, despite the fact that their owners, following the example of the slaves of the Ottoman Empire, also considered them property and mentioned them in testaments. SZAKÁLY, Ferenc. Ali kóppányi bég sarca. (Adalékok a hódoltság magyar kereskedelem problematikájához) In MARTOS, Mária (ed.) *Folia Historica 2 (A Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum Évkönyve)*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1973, p. 37. Of course, even in the relevant period, it is possible to find different meanings of the term “captive” in different cultures. Also, captives enjoyed different statuses in different countries.

9 DÁVID – FODOR 2019, pp. 137–138.

10 PÁLFFY 1997, pp. 5–6.

11 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC V, no. 16 280.

12 PÁLFFY 1997, p. 17.

13 PÁLFFY 1997, pp. 8–11.

represented the longest period of mutual peace between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs that either had experienced up to that time. Thanks to mutual agreements and valid peace treaties, no open military conflict occurred until 1663,¹⁴ though historiography often refers to this time as “a period of peace marked by wars” (in Hungarian terminology “háborús békeévek”). This term is preferred because despite existing peace treaties, the political-military and social situation cannot be called undisturbed. Small military operations by both sides did not stop, and for the people of the 17th century, there were also some customs that they could not relinquish, even during this period.¹⁵ The seizure of inhabitants was common not only for the Ottomans, however. Hungarian soldiers also made extra money through captive trading. The local trade in captives as directed by both sides intensified significantly during the 17th century, especially between the years 1606–1663.¹⁶ Occasionally subjects from the Hungarian side were taken, which then became a part of negotiations between the captured subjects landowners and the captains of the soldiers who had carried out the specific operation. Of course, motivation varied, but the most attractive reason, for both sides, was the possibility of obtaining a financial sum from ransom. It is well-known that soldiers often faced existential problems and therefore such action could offer the possibility of a certain financial improvement for both sides. It is necessary to add that the uncertain borders of these two empires were the front lines, even in peacetime, and the soldiers' mentality also adapted. For Hungarian soldiers, it was the fact that Ottoman, Turkish or Serb captives earned them “extra” ransom, as supplies and wages were received irregularly.¹⁷ As for the Ottomans, they were forced to some extent to adapt their methods and goals to the Habsburg-Hungarian side, whose desire was not to acquire actual slaves for economic or military use, but captives who retained some trade capital, so they could subsequently demand ransom.¹⁸

In the case of Ottoman capture by the Hungarian side, it is also necessary to distinguish between the factual wrongdoings of Christian soldiers and the justified capture of Ottomans in territories belonging to Hungarians at that time. Namely, among the duties of the captains, or the captain-generals of individual castles, was also reporting non-compliance in the event that there was a breach of peace by the Ottomans. In these situations, crimes had to be reported to the pasha of Buda, and at the same time to the “bey” to whom the Ottoman soldier in question belonged. Of course, duties of the Hungarian captains also included the responsibility to capture those Ottomans who, in times of peace, had invaded a sovereign's possessions or looted there.¹⁹ These duties resulted from individual peace treaties concluded between the Ottomans

14 SKOVAJSA, Miloslav. *Habsbursko – osmanské mierové zmluvy 1498 – 1615* (Ph. D. thesis). Bratislava : Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 2014, p. 186.

15 HEGYI, Klára. *A füleki szandzsák*. Budapest : MTA BTK, 2019.

16 PÁLFFY 1997, pp. 8–11.

17 KOMJÁTI 2013, p. 271.

18 FODOR 1996, p. 140.

19 ÁGOSTON, Gábor – OBORNI, Teréz. *A tizenhetedik század története*. Budapest : Pannonica Kiadó, 2000, p. 133.

and the Habsburgs during the 17th, starting with the Peace of Žitava and its fifth and sixth points which sought to regulate Ottoman-Hungarian relations in the borderlands. However, these points were not adhered to in full. The Peace of Žitava marked the beginning of the second stage of the “peace period,” which in practice was not peaceful at all. The Peace of Žitava was renewed again in 1608 and also confirmed later in other peace treaties, e.g. in Vienna (1615), Komárno (1618), Gyarmat (1625), as well as during peace negotiations in 1627 and 1642.²⁰ For this reason, it is also necessary to examine the specific circumstances related to individual complaints regarding the capture of Ottomans by Hungarian soldiers as in some cases, they may have been legitimate arrests based on individual peace agreements.

In the second half of the 17th century, the Peace of Vašvár included a ban on the unauthorized taking of captives, though the observance of peace treaties looked very different in practice. Based on this and the decree of the Court Military Council, the general captains of the borderlands attempted to force captains and captain-generals to comply with prohibitions. However, the commanders were certain in the fact—and the same also applies to earlier periods—that they had to take into account that sometimes violations by soldiers occurred out of necessity (lack of food, supplies). Moreover, the Ottomans could also exaggerate and lie about real losses, and sometimes reports and allegations could include bad intentions on the part of the Ottomans or the accuser in question. Therefore, they selected information and opened investigations only in egregious cases, or what was considered appropriate to resolve. This occurred especially if ordered to do so by the Court Military Council. There were also periods when a ban on taking captives was ordered, not for the sake of peace, but rather to kill as many enemy soldiers as possible. Komjáti also pointed out that after the Peace of Vašvár, during numerous bans, it was not possible to stop soldiers from giving up their—until then “law suffering”—source of income which compensated for insufficient supplies. They often completely ignored all orders and sometimes even went against the will of their immediate superiors, forcefully leaving the castle in order to acquire captives. If successful, a part of the eventual ransom or part of the spoils was nearly always donated to their superior, winning his silence and avoiding being reported. If a report was made, soldiers often claimed that the expedition was undertaken with the permission of their captain or superior.²¹

During the periods of peace (1568–1591 and 1606–1663) captives were obtained through looting expeditions, wandering or raids, primarily undertaken to collect taxes from the “enemy” side, though also to simply loot a village and take its horses and cattle. These periods were characterized by small skirmishes on both sides and expeditions called “csata” in Hungarian or “çete” in Turkish. It must be emphasized that today’s Hungarian term “csata” also

20 ILLIK, Péter. *Török dúlás a Dunántúlon – Török kártételek a nyugati-dunántúli hódoltsági peremvidéken a 17. század első felében* (Ph. D. thesis). Piliscsaba : PPKE BTK, 2009, pp. 10–11. HEGYI 2019, p. 98.

21 KOMJÁTI 2013, pp. 276–279.

meant a smaller group of horsemen or foot soldiers that went on a harvesting expedition in the period of the Ottoman neighborhood,²² though at present, it primarily refers to a battle or fight. It is important to explain this term in the context of the 17th century because of the large number of sources written in Hungarian. In modern Turkish, the term “çete” simply means “a group of people.” Terminology seen in journalism such as “çete harbi” (guerrilla war) is derived from this.²³

The following pages will focus on instances of individuals captured by soldiers from several fortresses on the Hungarian side. Victims were mostly Ottoman subjects or bilaterally taxed subjects of both the Hungarian and Ottoman sides.

Filakovo, located in Novohrad county, was occupied by the Ottomans in 1554 and became the center of the *sanjak* of Filakovo.²⁴ However in 1593, it again fell into the hands of the Habsburgs.²⁵ According to some estimates, the Hungarian defense line maintained around 90 castles during the 17th century with the fortresses gradually divided into six main captaincies. Filakovo was an important part of the fifth (mining) captaincy, which was based first in Levice, later in Nové Zámky and then after its conquest, in Leopoldov.²⁶ After Eger fell into Ottoman hands, it was replaced by Tokaj, Szendrő and then Filakovo.²⁷ Filakovo defended the mining towns against possible Ottoman attacks, which could be expected from Eger and the Ottomans from Buda.²⁸ Szécsény was the third most important castle of the mining captaincy during the 17th century,²⁹ which fell into Christian hands as early as 1593 and from that time maintained a Hungarian garrison.

The cases analyzed here occurred during the period of the general captaincy of István I. Koháry, who was appointed shortly after 23 September 1647 as

22 PÁLFFY 1997, p. 8.

23 CSÁKI, Éva. *Török–magyar szótár*. Budapest : Balassi Kiadó, 1995, p. 92.

24 KOMJÁTI, Zoltán Igor. *Egyetértésben a közös érdekért - A füleki végvár működtetése Koháry István főkapitányágának idején (1667 – 1682)*. Dunajská Streda : Vámbéry Polgári Társulás, 2015, p. 6.

25 IŞIK, Mustafa. *XVI. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Hakimiyyetinde Budin* (Ph. D. thesis). Sakarya Üniversitesi : Mayıs 2013, pp. 77–78.

26 It is estimated that in the middle of the 16th century, the chain of fortresses numbered 100–120, and in the 17th century, about 90 castles. FUNDÁRKOVÁ, Anna. *Barokový aristokrat*. Bratislava : VEDA, 2018, pp. 90–91. Due to involvement in European power struggles, the Habsburg side tried to maintain peace with the Ottomans through diplomacy. Therefore, in the first 40 years of the 17th century, the number of border castles with a royal garrison was reduced to the previously mentioned 90 castles. PÁLFFY, Géza. A török elleni védelmi rendszer szervezetének története a kezdetektől a 18. század elejéig. In *Történelmi Szemle*, 1996, vol. 38, no. 2–3, p. 207. The study is also available in English: PÁLFFY, Géza. The Origins and Development of the Border Defence System against the Ottoman Empire in Hungary (Up to the Early Eighteenth Century). In GÉZA, Dávid – FODOR, Pál (eds.) *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe: The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest*. Leiden; Boston; Köln : Brill Academic Pub, 2000, pp. 3–69. Similarly, on the castles of the borderland ÁGOSTON – OBORNI 2000, *A tizenhetedik század*, p. 126.

27 CZIGÁNY, István. *Reform vagy kudarc? Kísérletek a magyarországi katonaság beillesztésére a Habsburg Birodalom hadseregébe 1600 – 1700*. Budapest : Balassi Kiadó, 2004, p. 71.

28 KOMJÁTI 2013, p. 271.

29 KOZICZ, János. A török elleni harcok vitézi hagyománya a Koháry családban. In KOZICZ, János – KOLTAI, András (eds.) *Koháry István emlékkönyv a kecskeméti piarista gimnázium alapításának 300. évfordulójára*. Budapest; Kecskemét : Piarista Rend Magyar Tartománya, 2015, p. 31.

captain-general of the Szécsény and Hollókő fortresses.³⁰ Ten years later, on 14 February 1657, he was appointed by the Court Military Council captain-general of Filakovo Castle.³¹

The garrisons of these castles, similar to those of other castles on the Ottoman-Hungarian border (Hungarian and Ottoman), went on looting expeditions even during peacetime, during which they also took people into captivity, including soldiers as well as the civilian population. This happened for the reasons previously mentioned above.

Civilian population in the territory of the condominium were guaranteed some security from Hungarian soldiers if they also recognized Hungarian authority, i.e. if they paid taxes and also respected the Hungarian landowner. Despite these informal rules, there are many known cases where Hungarian soldiers took subjects who had paid taxes to both sides captive. Something similar was mentioned on 26 July 1654, in a letter to István I. Koháry from Ostrihom archbishop, György Lippay, regarding resolution of the case of the abbot of Földvár, Miklós Pozsgai, and Gyuricza Rác. Pozsgai reported to Lippay that soldiers from Balassagyarmat,³² in the vicinity of Földvár had captured a Serb named Gyuricza Rác. Gyuricza was a subject of the Ottomans but also of Pozsgai. The soldiers sold the man to István Koháry for 160 florins and claimed that he did not pay taxes to the Hungarian side. Rác was released by Koháry on the promise that he pay two hundred thalers plus include other valuables in the ransom. In his letter, Lippay begged Koháry to release Rác from his debt on the grounds that he was a subject of Pozsgai and paid taxes, so the soldiers did not have the right to take him into captivity or sell him to Koháry. Lippay also argued that this was damage to church property.³³ In sources dating from the 17th century, the name “Földvár” can mean several locations but in this case it is Dunaföldvár.³⁴ A Benedictine abbey had been located on this territory since the Middle Ages.³⁵ According to Turkish sources, in 1590 the town may have had around 870 inhabitants with the vast majority being Hungarian.³⁶ In 1630, the abbot of Földvár was canon György Vasvári, and he wrote at that time that the town was inhabited by Serbs and “Hungarians.” The Hungarians paid about 20 Hungarian florins to the abbot and also added other gifts. However, he writes that the Serbs have a good relationship with the Turks, that is why they pay him nothing and do not even

30 PÁLMÁNY, Béla. Gróf Forgách Ádám és báró Koháry István zálogszerződései a szécsényi uradalom tárgyában (1647 – 1650). In PÁLMÁNY, Béla (ed.) *Fejezetek Szécsény történetéből - Nagy Iván Történeti Kör Évkönyv 2012 - 4*. Salgótarján : Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Nógrád Megyei Levéltára : 2013, p. 443. MOCSÁRY, Antal. *Nemes Nógrád vármegyének történelmi, geographiai és statisztikai esmertetése III*. Pest : Trattner, 1826, pp. 189–190. SZABÓ, András Péter. *Személynévmutató - életrajzi adattár*. In SZABÓ, András Péter (ed.) *A szécsényi seregszék jegyzőkönyve 1656 – 1661*. Salgótarján : Nógrád Megyei Levéltár, 2010, p. 336.

31 KOMJÁTI, Zoltán Igor. *A füleki végvár működtetése Koháry István főkapitányának idején (1667 – 1682)* (Ph. D. thesis). Debrecen : Debreceni Egyetem, 2011, p. 8.

32 In the source, *Gyarmat*. Today, Balassagyarmat, Hungary.

33 MV SR, SA BB, f. KC I. no. 564.

34 Today, Tolna county in Hungary.

35 <http://lexikon.katolikus.hu/F/f%C3%B6ldv%C3%A1ri%20ap%C3%A1ts%C3%A1g.html> 30. 10. 2021.

36 IŞIK 2013, p. 214.

want to obey him. The village of Kömlőd also belonged to the abbey, which was then inhabited by Serbs. In addition to other gifts, they also paid a monetary tax of six Hungarian florins a year.³⁷

Serbs living in the town could refuse to pay taxes to the Hungarian side as they were under protection of the Ottoman garrison there. But the inhabitants of the mentioned village had to pay taxes or they could expect attacks from the “hajduchs” (border guards), as a reprisal.³⁸

The Ottomans intervened in favor of Christians if they were their subjects. A significant part of letters and requests from the Ottomans regarding captives concern Christian subjects, on behalf of whom the Ottomans mediated to the captains of the castles or other Hungarian authorities. In 1653, the pasha of Pest, Mustafa, addressed his complaint to the captain-general of Szécsény (later captain-general of Filakovo), István I. Koháry, in the interest of a Serb subject named Vukovo. He was also a subject who paid taxes to both the Hungarians and the Ottomans and was captured by Hungarian soldiers. Mustafa got information that a few days prior, Koháry had temporarily released the man on the condition that other captives vouched for him. Koháry then sent Vukovo to Győr to see István Zichy.³⁹ In Győr, it was legally established that Vukovo properly paid taxes, even to his Hungarian landowner and for this reason the soldiers had no right to apprehend him. The iron shackles were removed from his feet. However, the Hungarian side took advantage of the situation and the Hungarian landlord restricted Vukovo from fulfilling his duties towards his Ottoman landowner. Mustafa warned Koháry in the letter that Vukovo was a subject who also had obligations towards the Ottomans.⁴⁰

Regarding the name of this captive (“rác Vukovo rab”), it is appropriate to also mention a few related thoughts. In fact, the letter also mentions a second “Serb Vukovo” (az másik rác Vukovo). Therefore, it is also possible that the name Vukovo did not refer to a specific person, but to a geographical origin; the location where the person came from. However, the letter may also refer to names as the first name Vuk is still widespread among Serbian-speaking people. Such first names also existed among the Ottomans in the ranks of new Muslim converts in the Hungarian territories, less common in the 16th century but more frequent from the 17th century on. In 1573, names such as Hussein Vuk or Turhan Vuk appear in the ranks of the “mustahfizes” in

37 ANDRÁSFALVY, Bertalan. Duna mente népének ártéri gazdálkodása Tolna és Baranya megyében az ármentesítés befejezéséig. In BALOG, János (ed.) *Tanulmányok Tolna megye történetéből VII. Szekszárd* : Tolna Megyei Tanács Levéltára, 1976, p. 51.

38 ANDRÁSFALVY 1976, p. 51.

39 Štefan Zichy was the vicarious captain general in Győr in the years 1646–1655. PÁLFFY, Géza. Kerületi és végvidéki főkapitányok és főkapitány-helyettesek Magyarországon a 16–17. században. Minta egy készülő főkapitányi archontológiai és „életrajzi lexikonból”. In *Történelmi Szemle*, 1997, vol. 39, no. 2, p. 278.

40 At the same time, Osman begged Koháry not to harm the captive, the messenger or the other captives, and reminded him to observe the Ottoman-Habsburg agreements. MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC V, no. 12 089. In less detail, this case is discussed in the article SZALMA 2021, A Koháry I., pp. 70–71.

Buda and Pest.⁴¹ The name Vukman was common among Bosniaks, which is mentioned in a source from 1572, “Vukman isimli zimmî ölmüş,”⁴² for example. Variations of the names Rad-, Niko-, Drag- and Vuk- are common in the rosters of the castle garrisons, and often the same person's name was written in different forms. These names belonged to Serbs, Bulgarians and other ethnic groups who lived side by side in the Balkans and “borrowed” their first names from each other. The mixing of names was even more intense in the Hungarian territories under the Ottomans. With the Serbs, it is also important to take into account the fact that first names in the Balkans very often consisted of two names; the first name of the person in question as well his father's first name.⁴³ Alternatively, the translator may have conflated two first names into one.

In Ottoman sources, ethnicities are mentioned in the event of converts coming from territories where many captives were taken to the Ottoman Empire. The interest of the Ottomans in thinking in more detail about phenomena such as ethnicity, that is, a group of people that differed in some way from the observer, and the religion of infidels increased during the period when they met new rivals in the form of Venice and Hungary, the territories of Western Christendom. For Western Christians, there were no mass conversions of people to Islam, it happened only in individual cases. The Turkish of the early modern period did not have a suitable word to describe this new form of Christianity, except for the loose designation of “kâfir” (gyaur). The Ottomans thus started using the names of ethnic groups and it is possible that the purpose was to express religious affiliation. In official documents, the conversion of Orthodox Christians was mentioned only in rare cases. In contrast, in the case of conversion of Western Christians to Islam, they were included more often.⁴⁴

It is also known that distorted versions of names occur frequently in contemporary sources, especially in the case of “foreign” ethnic groups. Since this is a source of Ottoman provenance written and translated by an interpreter, logically there is a considerable chance of mistakes connected with writing names. The same often happened in the case of other sources, even in individual Ottoman ranks, which were regularly mistaken for names in translations or written incorrectly. Another example is the imprecise equivalent of names such as *Amhat* or *Amhet* instead of *Ahmed*, and the like.

The author of the abovementioned letter, pasha Mustafa, is also mentioned regarding another case of a Serb captive named Vukovo in a complaint made

41 HEGYI 2007, p. 34. *Mustahfiz*es were elite infantry of the castle garrison under the command of the captain and his deputy. HEGYI 2019, p. 291.

42 GÖKBILGIN, Tayyib. Sokollu Mehmed Pasanin bir Talimati ve 1572 tarihinde Bosna ile alakadar birkac vesika. In *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 1958, no. 6–7, p. 161.

43 In villages that were inhabited by people from the Balkans, there are often cases where up to three first names were attributed to one person. They did so in case the given person also had unmarried sons, indicating the father's name, the person's own name and the names of his sons, which causes even more confusion (e.g. Vujič, grandfather, Nikola, father and unmarried sons Bogdan and Ilije, etc.). HEGYI 2007, pp. 302–303.

44 HEGYI 2007, pp. 262, 264–265.

about the captive's shackles. It should be noted that shackles or manacles played a key role regarding the status of captives. They were also decisive from the point of view of customary law. Based on this, they were also called "iron slaves/captives" or "captivus ferreus," a term was used to refer mainly to those with shackles on both legs. Those who paid a special amount in advance were exempted from wearing them. This fee had name, "ransom for handcuffs" or "ransom for iron" (vas vagy bilincsváltóság). However, the majority of captives did not take this option, which was also due to the fact that people were more likely to pity beggars with handcuffs as there was less suspicion that they were dealing with a fake. On the other hand, the "captivus ferreus" had special rights, which was acquired only in the case of permanent handcuffs. They were protected by common law legislation, which forbade beating or further handcuffing. In addition, such a status provided certain advantages in specific situations.⁴⁵ Regarding the shackles of the aforementioned Vukovo, Mustafa only knew that he had given money to a man from the city of Pomáz⁴⁶ who had promised to remove the shackles and hand over the ransom to his owner, the jailer. However, Mustafa claimed that harm was inflicted on the captive. He begged Koháry to investigate what actually happened. Mustafa wanted to know the truth so that no further harm would come to his subject. The alleged perpetrator denied the captive's version. However, pasha Mustafa did not mention exactly whether the person really removed the shackles and whether harm was done, which would also make sense, or whether he just took the money without removing the shackles.⁴⁷

Cases of Ottoman subjects being taken captive by Hungarian soldiers were as frequent as the looting of their villages. So it was also for Serbian people who were subjected to looting by Hungarian soldiers, most likely from Szécsény. In 1652, "bey" Ömer wrote to István Koháry about Serb subjects who had received a letter of protection in 1626, stating that they would not be exposed to injustice. Despite this, soldiers from the Hungarian side took these subjects into captivity, including women and children, and robbed them of their cattle or whatever they could. Since they were subjects properly paying taxes to the Ottomans, Ömer pleaded with Koháry to restrain the soldiers from committing transgressions and warned him that "such a situation cannot lead to anything good."⁴⁸

The letter of protection was not helpful for Serb subjects either, even in the case of an operation written about in a letter by a soldier from Szendrő (Szendrov), Ferenc Dobóczy, to the vice-captain of Filakovo, László Fekete, on

45 PÁLFFY 1997, pp. 39–40. The practice of shackling captives was different in some periods of the 17th century. In 1670, for example, Pavol Esterházy reproached Štefan II. Koháry as the pasha of Jáger accused him of the fact that despite the peace agreement, the people of Filakovo let captured Ottomans walk in handcuffs for 40 days. This shows that there were certain limits in determining ransom and accessing captives. Koháry claimed that the pasha was lying, but nevertheless ordered an investigation and promised his superior that he would send him a report as soon as possible. KOMJÁTI 2013, p. 275.

46 Today, in Pest county, Hungary.

47 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC V, no. 12 089.

48 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC V, no. 12 093.

14 July 1661. In the letter, Dobóczi complained that recently several soldiers from Filakovo had started committing violations. A few months prior, they had taken a certain number of cattle belonging to a village named Otlak and more recently, they plundered the village of Kakucs, killing 14 people and taking nine captives who were forcibly dragged to Győr, specifically mentioning that they were Serbs. They also took around three hundred cattle from the village and set the village on fire. The incident occurred despite the fact that the villagers had a letter of protection issued to them by the palatine. The leaders of the looting soldiers were János Lazar and István Somogyi.⁴⁹

The case is quite ironic due to the fact that Ferenc Dobóczi himself, Mihály Szél, another soldier from Szendrő, also carried out numerous military operations in the years 1642–1667, during which they managed to tax several municipalities in different regions. During this time, both men acquired properties based on donations from the king and the palatine. A list of taxed municipalities has been preserved from the estates of the two mentioned families which details, for example, Serbs from one wasteland in Csongrád County who started paying taxes to soldiers, giving 10 thalers in the years 1643–1655. The list also includes Kakucs, from where in 1648–1660 “every man” paid one florins per year and they were to deliver one pair of boots annually. In these years, they indeed met the Hungarian requirements.⁵⁰ Borovszky identifies the location as the County of Békés, which makes it clear that it is the Kakucs wasteland, which was located near the village of Kétegyháza⁵¹ in today’s Hungary. This is also proof that the Hungarian soldiers were able to lead expeditions over relatively large distances.

The letter reveals other interesting connections. It says that Ján Lazar was captured in Győr, but he was probably temporarily released. It is also stated that he is guaranteed to collect the part of the cattle that he got as loot, further revealing that he was probably released based on the guarantee of Pál Fráter. The document in which Pál Fráter vouched for János Lazar was also problematic. Dobóczi wrote that Lazar was released despite the fact that Pál Fráter claimed that he wrote the letter to him in a very drunken state.⁵² This means that he tried to get out of the situation and apologize for vouching for Lazar. Finally, nine captives from Győr were released as Pavol Fráter himself acknowledged that they had been captured wrongfully. Dobóczi also sent Fráter’s letter to the vice-captain and pleaded with him to arrest as murderers the soldiers who had participated in this operation. He also begged him to get the soldiers to return the stolen cattle to the residents of the damaged villages. Otherwise, Dobóczi would turn to the palatine.⁵³

49 SZALMA, Štefan. Uhorské a osmanské výpravy vedené za účelom získania zajatcov. In ŠESTÁK, Mišo (ed.) *Zborník zo stretnutia priateľov regionálnej histórie. VII.* Hradište : Občianske združenie Priatelia histórie Novohradu, 2021, pp. 41–42; The original source is the letter: MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 814.

50 BOROVSZKY, Samu. Csanád vármegye története 1715-ig. 1. kötet: A vármegye általános története. Budapest, 1896, pp. 236–237, 239.

51 *Magyarország helynévtára.* Pest 1863, s. 16.

52 “...igen részeg volt, mikor az levelet adta..” MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 814.

53 SZALMA 2021, Uhorské a osmanské, p. 42.

Dobóczy's name appears in sources in connection with captives even later. On 13 March 1663, in a letter from Filakovo, István Oroszlányi informed István Koháry about Dobóczy's financial affairs. He mentions that one soldier from Balážske Ďarmoty, Antal Laczkó, who had six captured Serbs in his possession, traveled to Koháry. They were probably subjects of Dobóczy, who had promised the soldier one hundred pigs for the aforementioned Serbs. The pigs were to be herded to Filakovo by other Serbs (probably Dobóczy's subjects), who, according to the plan, were to bring a total of three hundred animals. Regarding the six captured Serbs, Laczkó said that he had bought them from the people of Ónod⁵⁴ and Szilágyis for money, and that he saw no benefit from it. It is said that they came across the Serbs "just like that" in the wasteland and did not capture them during a purposefully led expedition.⁵⁵ The soldier, also had cash on him as Dobóczy promised him the sale of additional pigs from the mentioned three hundred total. Dobóczy came to Filakovo from Štítnik⁵⁶ with Ebeczky and demanded the money from Oroszlányi. The author of the letter withheld it from the soldier as there were disputes about the amount in Filakovo.⁵⁷

The letter also mentions another Serb who was captured by a soldier. Allegedly, this seventh Serb was not part of the negotiations regarding the exchange of captives for animals. He arrived in Filakovo earlier and, according to Antal's testimony, delivered 40 thalers and one head cover called "calpac" (kalpak/kalpag).⁵⁸ The captive then took 20 thalers from Dobóczy and had a receipt for it. The author of the letter asked Koháry to solve the mentioned cases and to hear all those who were affected by the problems outlined. He also asked Koháry to write to Balassagyarmat in the interest of the soldier at the beginning of the letter, since Dobóczy had begun threatening him. Without specifics, he also mentioned that Dobóczy had come to them last year as well, complaining that the soldiers had taken cattle from his Serb subjects. Allegedly even then, he demanded the soldiers to be punished.⁵⁹

During the times of the Ottoman-Hungarian neighborhood, standards and customs associated with the trade of captives included not only inheriting captives, but also their resale. New owners could operate with them as if they had caught them themselves. On 5 December 1658, László Fekete Iványi wrote to István I. Koháry on the matter of Serb captives stating that he had handed over four Serbs belonging to the Palatine in Filakovo, Serbs were still in Filakovo at the time of the letter.⁶⁰ Koháry had probably ordered the detainees be released as he wrote that despite this, they still haven't left and are in Miklós Deák's house. Fekete claimed that these are Serbs who pay taxes and their ransom belongs to the Palatine, since he had

54 Today in Hungary, Borsod-Aba-Zemplén county.

55 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I. no. 794.

56 Today in Slovakia. In the source Csetnek.

57 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 794.

58 In Hungarian text *kalpag*: A type of head cover. KISS, Gábor – KOHÁRY, Anna – MANDL, Orsolya (eds.) *Régi magyar szavak magyarázó adatbázisa*. Budapest: TINTA Könyvkiadó, p. 218

59 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 794.

60 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 781.

purchased them from someone else. He also stated that the ransom money for the Serbs is with Miklós Deák.⁶¹

Of course, during the war years, looting operations proliferated even more as battles offered more opportunities for soldiers to acquire valuable capital. On 21 April 1664, Martin Unger wrote in a letter to István I. Koháry about an expedition of several soldiers, among whom he mentions Pál Olasz, Ján Császár and others. The soldiers sent four Serbs, probably captives, and 20 “Serb” horses to Filakovo. The loot was acquired near the village of Jánoshalma,⁶² (in the letter “Jankó”). The soldiers who brought the Serbs did not have any new information, only that around 300 Tatars were also staying near the village. In connection with the Tatars, he also mentioned more loot; not long ago they managed to take several horses from them.⁶³ Another case is known from the same village of a Serb captive in 1656,⁶⁴ Péter Cziffra Jankói, who belonged to a soldier named János Gesztelyi, was being managed. The latter testified that, according to general custom, he usually released his captives temporarily and gave them a few days to collect the ransom. Based on a guarantee, he also released the captured Serb but received news that he had jumped into the Danube and died. However, Gesztelyi suspected that he had been deceived and therefore called on the guarantors to deliver him the captive or his corpse. If this was not possible, he demanded that the guarantors (other captives) pay the debt; however, if the guarantors could prove that the captive died on that date, then Gesztelyi would waive the ransom.⁶⁵

Sometime before 1663,⁶⁶ a resident of Szécsény, István Nagy, summoned Bartolomej Szentpéteri from the village of Martonoš⁶⁷ to come to Szécsény by the date of St. Paul, 25 January, when the market in Szécsény was also usually held.⁶⁸ In the discourse of that period, captives were perceived as part of their owner's property to some extent, and were mentioned in last wills as part of the assets divided among the heirs. Financial matters, debts and income from

61 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 781.

62 Today, in Hungary, Bács-Kiskun county. Previously, in Bodrog county.

63 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC I, no. 803.

64 SZABÓ 2010, p. 80.

65 /14./ Anno 1656. die 19. septembris. /XVII/ Secunda levata causa. In SZABÓ 2010, pp. 80–81.

66 The letter is undated but was probably composed sometime before 1663 because it was written in Szécsény, which was in the hands of the Habsburgs until 1663. At that time, Captain-General Štefan I. Koháry had to set the castle on fire, order the garrison to leave the fortress and subsequently Szécsény fell into the hands of the Ottomans.

67 Today in Serbia, in the territory of the former Bács-Bodrog county. A small Serbian population lived there. Hungarian soldiers went on expeditions even to such distances for the purpose of taxing the population and taking captives. Also in 1641, soldiers from Filakovo looted near Szeged, which is located near the aforementioned village. The inhabitants asked the pasha to allow them to come to an agreement with the commander from Filakovo, János Gombkötő, about the payment of taxes so that the soldiers would let them be. REIZNER, János. *Szeged története. I kötet*. Szeged : Szeged szab. kir. város közönsége, 1899–1900, p. 154. <http://www.bibl.u-szeged.hu/reizner/01/1132.htm> 20. 10. 2021.

68 MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC V, no. 13 614. Markets in Szécsény on the day of Sv. Pavol were so important before 1552 that even the Ottomans supported their realization. PÁLMÁNY, Béla. A végvár-mezővárostól a városig. Balassagyarmat polgári fejlődése az újkorban 1552 – 1870. In TYEK-VICSKA, Árpád (ed.) *Nagy Iván Történeti Kör Évkönyv*. Balassagyarmat : Nagy Iván Történeti Kör, 1997, p. 16.

them were inherited in the same way.⁶⁹ It is clear from the letter that István Nagy's wife received "property" from her previous husband in the form of an unsettled 50 thalers, which was to be paid to him by a Serb captive whom he had released temporarily. Nagy reminded Szentpéteri of this obligation, because the captive had promised to pay the 50 thalers and Szentpéteri had vouched for him when he was released. However, witnesses testified that the captive had paid off his debt to Szentpéteri in the form of four head of cattle. It is understood from the context of the letter that Szentpéteri made an agreement with the captive to settle the debt with the captive's owner, and apparently this never occurred. For this reason, the author of the letter called on the addressee to come to Szécsény on 25 January, threatening that if he does not show up and pay his debt, he will go to his home, drag him out of the house and forcefully take from him not 50, but 100 thalers.⁷⁰

Conclusion

Eight sources from the period of István I. Koháry's general captaincy revealing specific details on the captive trade were explored above. These included victims of looting expeditions by soldiers from Filakovo in two cases, Szécsény soldiers in two instances, two cases by Balassagyarmat soldiers and in two more examples, the looters were unspecified Hungarian soldiers. An additional case from the source editions and literature was mentioned where the actors were soldiers from Szécsény, and one more where soldiers from Szendrő were involved.

These cases explored above show that individual units of Hungarian soldiers were able to lead looting expeditions to territories quite far from the border. At the same time, the fact that there were several landowners collecting taxes or other capital from inhabitants of the more distant Ottoman-controlled counties also proves that the Hungarian side was quite skillful in this area. These examples further confirm that it cost the Hungarian side a lot of effort to maintain its influence in essentially lost territories, at least in such a modest way.

Such examples also confirm the theory proposed by historian Péter András Szabó that several captives from the ranks of the Serbs crossed over to the Hungarian side in order to be freed. This is known thanks to some evidence that in the ranks of the soldiers of garrison of castles, there are more people with the surname Rácz. This is documented, for example, by the names in the list of soldiers during the distribution of loot.

Two-sided taxation of subjects in the territory of the condominium guaranteed a certain form of protection. However, in some places, the target of attacks could be those also subject to Hungarian taxes, and could even be subjects on church property. Of course, in the case of Serbs who paid taxes, there was leniency on the part of the prelates, and thus they protected these

⁶⁹ SZAKÁLY 1973, p. 37.

⁷⁰ MV SR, ŠA BB, f. KC V, no. 13 614

subjects, that is, they demanded the captains keep their soldiers in check and release individuals who had been taken to captivity despite the fact that they were paying taxes.