

## OTTOMAN *FETIHNAMES* THE IMPERIAL LETTERS ANNOUNCING A VICTORY

During these last years in order to write the history of the Ottoman empire historians refer more and more to the documents produced by the Ottoman chancellery: scholars attempt not only to present information contained in them in the light of their historical background, but also to treat their actual formal aspects: Ottoman paleography and diplomatics are now focusing historians' attention: the study of external and internal characteristics of state documents may throw a new light on their value and meaning even if the rich lexical variety in the Ottoman diplomatic terminology, increased by the use of synonymous terms of Arabic, Persian and purely Turkish origin, is sometimes puzzling. Different terms are frequently used interchangeably in the same document. The *ahitname*, for instance, contains sometimes the elements of a truce (*hudna* in Arabic), sometimes those of a safe-conduct (*aman* in Arabic), and in this last case it appears to be a *berat*. At the turn of the sixteenth century the *ahitnames* given to France, England and Netherlands were real *berats*, derived from the notion of *aman*, but they were based on the capitulations given to Venice which were derived from the notion of truce and were written in the form of *nişan* from the end of the previous century<sup>1</sup>. Another fact which produces even more confusion is that in European literature the term *ferman* is often applied to all Ottoman-Turkish documents.

In the field of diplomatics many essays have been written about *ahitnames*, *berats*, *buyruktus*, *defters*, *tezkeres*; much less work has been done on the document called *fetihname*<sup>2</sup>. According to Ottoman diplomatics a *fetihname* is a document which contains an official announcement of victory, but the same word is also referred to literary exercises which describe a military exploit. For this reason many *fetihnemes* are available but very few of them were surely produced by the Ottoman imperial

---

<sup>1</sup> M.P. Pedani Fabris, *La dimora della pace. Considerazioni sulle capitolazioni tra i paesi islamici e l'Europa*, Venezia 1996 (Quaderni di studi arabi. Studi e testi, 2), p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> L.Fekete, *A fetihnaméról*, «A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv – és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei», XIX/1-4 (1963), pp. 65-101; G.L. Lewis, *The utility of Ottoman fetihnemes*, in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by B. Lewis and P.M. Holt, London 1962, pp. 192-196; G.L. Lewis, *Fathname*, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 2, Leiden 1983, pp. 839-840.

chancellery. In his articles about these documents G.L. Lewis writes: «It is difficult to be precise on this subject because of the dearth of original *fathnames* available for study... the last word cannot be said on this subject until more work has been done in the Ottoman archives...». For this reason the *fetihnames* which were sent to the doge of Venice and are still kept in the Venetian State Archives are of a great value: they are clearly original and official documents. Two of them are written in Greek, six in Ottoman, the Italian translations of other seven still exist, but we know that at least twenty-six *fetihnames* were brought to the doge's feet by Ottoman envoys between 1482 and 1604<sup>3</sup>.

The Venetian State Archives keep many Ottoman documents dating from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth one. Most of them are kept in a collection called *Documenti turchi*, which has been recently put in order and described in a new catalogue<sup>4</sup>. The bulk of this collection is formed by documents produced by Ottoman imperial and provincial chanceries: there are letters of sultans and grand viziers addressed to the doge and his small council (the *signoria*, in Turkish *beyler*); there are letters of *beylerbeyis*, *sancakbeyis* and *cadis* addressed to Venetian provincial authorities and officials at all levels. Other documents were added to this collection, above all during the twentieth century. The archivists of that period, who did not know the languages of the countries of the Near East, put together scattered documents written in Arabic, Ottoman, Armenian, Hebrew. In this way they created a chaotic miscellany

<sup>3</sup> Cfr. at the end of this article the list with the archival and bibliographical references of the documents.

<sup>4</sup> I "*Documenti turchi*" dell'Archivio di Stato di Venezia, inventario della miscellanea a cura di M.P. Pedani-Fabris, con l'edizione dei registi di A. Bombaci, Roma 1994. Cfr. also L. Fekete, *A Velencei Állami Levéltár "Documenti turchi" c. gyűjteménye*, «Levéltári Közlemények», (Mar.-Dec. 1929), pp. 130-138; A. Bombaci, *La collezione di documenti turchi dell'Archivio di Stato di Venezia*, «Rivista degli studi orientali», 24 (1949), pp. 95-107; A. Bombaci, *Les thoughras enluminés de la collection de documents turcs des Archives d'Etat de Venise*, in *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di arte turca*, Napoli 1965, pp. 41-55, pls XV-XXVI; P. Sebastian, *The Turkish documents in the Venetian State Archives. A note on the Indice Bombaci*, in *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*, Napoli 1982, pp. 497-513; M.H. Şakiroğlu, *Venedik Arşivi ve Kitaplıklarından Türk Tarih ve Kültürüne Ait Kayıtlar*, «Erdem», III/7 (ocak 1987), pp. 111-134; A. Fabris, *A Velencei Állami Levéltár török iratai: adalékok Magyarország történetéhez*, «Keletkutatás», (1990), pp. 56-62; M.H. Şakiroğlu, *Venedik Arşivi ve Kitaplıklarından Türk Tarih ve Kültürüne Ait Kayıtlar II*, «Erdem», VI/17 (mayıs 1992), pp. 437-480. Many Venetian documents are edited in: M.T. Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki vesikalar k, İlyatında kanunî Sultan Süleyman devri belgeleri*, «Belgeler», 1/2 (1964), pp. 119-220; M.T. Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki Türkçe belgeler koleksiyonu ve bizimle ilgili diğer belgeler*, «Belgeler», V-VIII/9-12 (1968-71), pp. 1-151.

which has been now put in chronological order, but for small series of documents or letters with their inserts which have been kept together.

Other Ottoman documents may be found scattered among other papers in the Venetian State Archives: for instance in the archive of the *Cinque savi alla mercanzia*, which had competence on trade, in that of the Senat of the Venetian Republic<sup>5</sup>, in that of the Venetian bailos in Constantinople<sup>6</sup> and so on. The *fetihnames* were kept among other letters written by kings, popes and emperors: they are now in the *Documenti turchi* and in the *Lettere e scritture turchesche*, a series which was kept in the secret chancellery of the state. The translations of the most ancient *fetihnames* are transcribed in the diary of a sixteenth century Venetian nobleman, Marino Sanudo<sup>7</sup>.

According to some scholars a *fetihname* is formed by fifteen parts: 1) praise of God; 2) encomium on the Prophet; 3) the sovereign's duty to relieve oppression; 4) reasons for ending the wrong-doing of the tyrant in question; 5) the sultan's departure; 6) the multitude of his troops; 7) the position of the enemy; 8) the boldness of the enemy; 9) description of the battle; 10) the sultan's victory; 11) thanks to God; 12) occupation of the enemy's territory; 13) this success to be proclaimed by land and sea (only to *fetihnames* addressed to the sultan's own dominions); 14) the names of the place to which the *fetihname* is sent and of the bearer; 15) the sultan's joy at the victory, his communication of the good tidings to the recipient and his request for prayers<sup>8</sup>.

The documents kept in Venice prove that this pattern was not closely followed by the imperial chancellery clerk who wrote them. They have the usual diplomatic structure of imperial names (writings), that is to say: the *davet/invocatio*; the *tuğra*; the *unvan/intitulatio*; the *elkab/inscriptio*; the *dua/salutatio*; the *nakil/narratio*, which is very long in the *fetihnames*; the *hüküm/dispositio*, which usually contain also the name of the envoy who brought the document and, then, the injunction to rejoice for the sultan's victory; the *tekid/roboratio*, usually the simple formula *şöyle bilesiz, alâmet-i şerife i'timad kılâsız*; the *tarih/datatio cronica* and the place of issuance of the document, the *mahall-i tahrir/datatio topica*<sup>9</sup>. In no Venetian *fetihname* there is the

---

<sup>5</sup> S. Carbone, *Note introduttive ai dispacci al Senato dei rappresentanti diplomatici veneti. Costantinopoli, Firenze, Inghilterra, Pietroburgo*, Roma 1974 (Quaderni della Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato, 14), pp. 43-50.

<sup>6</sup> M.H. Şakiroğlu, *Venedik Arşivinde Bulunan İstanbul Balyosu Arşivi Üzerinde bir Araştırma*, in *Studia turcologica*, pp. 469-480.

<sup>7</sup> M. Sanudo, *I diarii*, Venezia 1879-1903, 58 volumes.

<sup>8</sup> İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı devletinin saray teşkilâtı*, Ankara 1945, p. 288; M.S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı belgelerinin dili (Diplomatik)*, İstanbul 1994, pp. 159-160.

<sup>9</sup> Only two Venetian *fetihnames* were issued *bi-yurt*: in 1541 near Ösek and in 1543 near Semendire; the others were issued in Tabriz (1514 and 1535), in "the city of Alâüddevle"

*tehdid/minatio*, that is to say an ominous warning of stern measures to be proceeded with against those who do not act according to the sultan's will<sup>10</sup>.

On considering Venetian *fetihnames* according to the previous points, we note that the praise of God is reduced to a brief formula. The encomium on the Profet is not usually present; in the most ancient original, that of 1515, in its place there are some words about the sultan's ancestor: "you must know that with the grace of heavenly God and my parents' (*recte* ancestors') blessing..." («ginóskekte pôs mé tén boéthia toû 'epouraníou theoû kai mé tén 'euchén tón gonéon mas...»). The causes of the war (No. 4), if expressed, remind in a general way the sultan's promise of fighting the infedel or the necessity of fighting the enemy. In the same way the multitude of the Ottoman troops (No. 6) is not usually stressed; in the October-1535 *fetihname*, however, the sultan's army is said to be as numerous as the stars and his commander-in-chief's troops as violent as the waves. The Venetian documents are much more precise about the sultan's leaving (No. 5), the position of the enemy (No. 7), the description of the battle and of other exploits (No. 9), the sultan's victory (No. 10) and the occupation of the enemy's country (No. 12). The dates of battles are usually very precise, with the indication of even the exact day of the week they happened although, above all in the most ancient documents, the military exploits are not described at great length. The style is generally laconic but it may impress the imagination of a reader who is awaiting for the verbosity and the solemn words of literary *fetihnames*. One of the most ancient original *fetihnames* still existing, an uigur account of Mehmed's victory over Uzun Hasan in 878/1473, is laconic in style and full of informations as the Venetian documents<sup>11</sup>.

This plain style is used to describe the most cruel or glorious actions. In the *fetihname* of 1532 for the Hungarian campaign the walls of the city of Ösek seem to touch the sky. In the 1541 one there is the image of two bridges one built to cross the Danube, the other the Drave; during the siege of Buda the Christian artillery illuminated the battle field in the night and the following morning the still alive Christians threw themselves into the river and were drowned; the churches of Buda were turned into mosques and the sultan attended the Friday prayer: the *hutbe* was then pronounced in his name. The same image of churches turned into mosques can be found in the October-1543 *fetihname* which describes the conquest of Székesféhérvár; in that

---

(1515), Konya (1516), Halep (1516 and 1548), Belgrade (1521, 1529, 1532, 1601, 1604), Amid (1535), Buda (1543), Sofya (1566) and even Constantinople (1597).

<sup>10</sup> In Latin diplomatics the word *sanctio* usually refers to a fine in money; a general menace of stern measures (not money) is called *minatio*.

<sup>11</sup> R. Rahmeti Arat, *Un yarlık de Mehmed II, le Conquérant*, «Annali del R. Istituto superiore orientale di Napoli», n.s., 1 (1940), pp. 25-68 (*Fatih Sultan Mehmed'in yarlığı*, «Türkiyat Mecmuası», 6 (1939), pp. 285-322).

occasion the Christians' corpses filled the square of the city and were so many that they reached the gate of the castle. In the 1597 one, the rivers near Eger are said to have been red of the enemy's blood for three days. The historian Naima states that the *nişancı* Lam Ali Çelebi wrote the Eger *fetihname* and was dismissed to have exalted too much the part played by the third vizier, Çigalazade Sinan paşa, in this occasion. In the Venetian *fetihname* the paşa is not exalted at all, while some words are spent to praise the Tatar khan's behaviour; the document describes the conquest of the fortress, protected by seven circuits of walls and the death of about five thousand Christians; according to it an heavenly army protected the Ottoman fighters. In any case we have to consider that this document was issued in Constantinople, at the end of şaban 1005 (9-18 April 1597), while the city was conquered in October 1596: since a *fetihname* was usually written few days after the victory it describes, we can imagine that another document may have been written, but not sent to the sultan's friends<sup>12</sup>.

Much more words were used to praise Sinan paşa in a letter about the conquest of the cities of Veszprém and Palota written at the end of receb 1002 (12-21 April 1594) by Ferhad paşa, who was on the point of taking Sinan's place as grand vizier<sup>13</sup>. This letter is perhaps not a real *fetihname*: in the first part it describes the grand vizier's victory but in the second part Ferhad give to the doge military information. In any case we know that also a grand vizier could send a *fetihname*: for instance in 1601 two similar documents were sent to Venice from Belgrado, one with the *tuğra* of the sultan and the other with the pençe of the grand vizier<sup>14</sup>. At this point mention has to be made of the July-1535 *fetihname* where the grand vizier İbrahim's deeds are greatly exalted. In the text of this imperial letter Süleyman refers to him as *serasker sultan İbrahim paşa*. Just during this Persian campaign İbrahim's authority and pretensions reached their height. In the *elkap* of a document he issued in that period there is written

---

<sup>12</sup> Na'ima, *Ta'rih*, İstanbul 1283, I, p. 173; Lewis, *The utility*, p. 193. L. Fekete (*A Velencei Állami levéltár magyar vonatzokású fethnamei*, «Levéltari közlemények» (Mar-Dec. 1926), pp. 139-157, in particular p. 144) says that for Eger victory two similar *fetihnames* were sent, one to Venice and another, shorter, to Constantinople. Cfr. also Ahmed Feridun beg, *Mecmu'a-i minşe'at's-selatin*, İstanbul 1264-74 (1848-58), vol. 2, pp. 2-3, where no mention of the massacre of the garrison is made. Of course a comparison between the *fetihnames* edited by Feridun and the Venetian ones has to be made (I'm preparing it), but the aim of this article is only to present the documents kept in Venice.

<sup>13</sup> Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 1056; Sinan became grand vizier for the third time in *rebiyüla'ahir* 1001 (5 Jan.-2 Feb. 1593) and was dismissed on 6 *cemaziyüla'ahir* 1003 (16 Feb. 1595); Ferad became grand vizier for the second time in *cemaziyüla'ahir* 1003 (1 Feb.-11 Mar. 1595) and was executed on 29 *şevval* 1003 (7 Jul. 1595).

<sup>14</sup> Fekete, *A Velencei Állami... fethnamei*, pp. 154-157.

*kaimmakami saltanat*, while his army dellâl ended with the words *serasker sultan emridür*<sup>15</sup>.

The first *fetihname* which exists in Venice, even if in translation, refers to the battle of Çaldıran; it was written on the 3 September 1514. Feridun gives ten different documents for this battle<sup>16</sup>. The Venetian one contains the sultan's two invitations to the shah to engage battle, but not to convert himself, as it is written in the letter for prince Süleyman reported by Feridun. In both there is no mention of firearms, which were then used by the Ottoman, but in the Venetian one the description of the battle is very accurate; the shah is said to have divided his army into two parts; there is the description of the Persian commander-in-chief Ustacaoğlu's death and of the *Rumeli beylerbeyi*'s death; it is also written that two important women of the shah's court were taken prisoner by the sultan.

The two most ancient Venetian original *fetihnames* are in Greek. One dates 15 June 1515 and refers to Selim's victories of Kemah (18 May) and over Alâüddevlé (11 June); the other was written on 13 November 1529 in Belgrade and it is the last Ottoman imperial document written in Greek kept in Venice. They both have the date with the exact day and not with the part of the month, but this may depend on the language used to write them. In fact other Greek *name-i hümayuns* are dated with the day while documents in Ottoman have usually the part of the month; this fact happens even in the case of two Ottoman originals, in two different languages, one the exact translation of the other<sup>17</sup>. The 1515 *fetihname* bears some resemblance with the document sent to the ruler of Egypt Qansuh al-Ghawri in the same occasion<sup>18</sup>. The Egyptian document was accompanied by the head of Alâüddevlé himself and this fact left al-Ghawri speechless. One of the Venetian *fetihnames* too was accompanied by a gift of this kind. The document, dated 2 July 1516 in Konya, was in fact brought to Venice with the head of a Persian lord, called «Gasbin» in the Italian translation<sup>19</sup>, and the news of the victory over the Persian governor of Diyarbekir Karakhan. The Ottoman envoy who reached Venice with this *fetihname* was Mustafa *çavuş* and he was lodged in

---

<sup>15</sup> M.T. Gökbilgin, *Ibrahim paşa*, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 3, Leiden 1979, pp. 998-999.

<sup>16</sup> Feridun, *Mecmu'a-i*, vol. 1, pp. 386-396.

<sup>17</sup> Cfr. for instance I "Documenti turchi", nn. 101 (Ottoman original), 103 (Greek original) in the middle of the moon of *safer* 909/8 August 1503; nn. 109 (Ottoman original), 110 (Greek original) in the middle of the moon of *rebiyülahır* 909/6 October 1503; nn. 167 (Ottoman original), 169 (Italian original) *şaban* 923/8 September 1517. Among Ottoman documents the *tezkeres* were always dated with the exact day and not with 'the beginning', 'the middle', or 'the end' of the month.

<sup>18</sup> Feridun, *Mecmu'a-i*, vol. 1, pp. 409-13 (three documents for this victory).

<sup>19</sup> Of this document there is now only the Italian translation.

the Dario palace on the Grand Canal, in front of St. Mark's square: from that time onwards people tell awful tales about that building; it is said to bring ill luck to its owners many of whom, in fact, died of a violent death, even in recent years.

A peculiar character of the Venetian *fetihnames* is that they were brought to Venice by Ottoman envoys. From 1482 to 1604 four documents were brought by *sipahioğlans*, one by a *silâhdar*, one by a court official, twelve by a *çavuş*, one by a *müteferrika* and *kapıcıbaşı*, one by a court physician, and four by the two most important *divan-ı hümayun tercümanı* of the sixteenth century: Yunus bey bin Abderrahman (son of Giorgio Taroniti from Modon) and İbrahim bey (the Polish Joachim Strasz). Only one document does not bear the indication of the person who brought it<sup>20</sup>.

Another element which is present in all the Venetian original *fetihnames*, but the last one, is that on their verso there are the words *Venedik dojine* (in 1535 one *Venedik dukasina*). Other *name-i hümayuns* sent to the doge of Venice in the same period do not have notes of this kind. This fact may indicate that many rolls, which looked alike, were prepared to be sent to different persons; the name on the verso might be used to recognize them in order to put each one into the right *kese* with the right *kulak*. Lewis's hypothesis, that there was only one true *fetihname* for every victory, may be so confirmed.

The pieces of paper used for the Venetian *fetihnames* are usually long. The still existing documents have the following measures: 1515, mm. 220x560 about (the upper part of the paper is torn); 1529, mm. 380x1300 about (the upper part of the paper is torn); 1535, mm. 290x1130; 1541, mm. 400x1380; July 1543, mm. 380x565; October 1543, mm. 345x1050; 1548, mm. 340x570; 1597, mm. 410x1650.

Another striking character of *fetihnames* is that they were sent to Ottoman official and dependent rulers as well as some Western states. This fact introduces the problem of what Ottomans thought about the states that signed a truce with them or accepted a general safe-conduct. Some Muslim jurists maintained that, besides the land

---

<sup>20</sup> Here is the list of the Ottoman envoys: Karagöz *sipahioğlan* (1482), Alaeddin *çavuş* (1484), a slave (1497), İlyas *silâhdar*, slave of Ali *paşa* (1507), Mahmed *sipahioğlan* (1514), Süleyman *çavuş* (1515), Mustafa *çavuş* (July 1516), Mehmed bey *sipahioğlan* (August 1516), Halil *çavuş* (1521), Hasan bey court official (?) (1523), Ali *sipahioğlan* (1526), Yunus (1529), Yunus (1532), ? (July 1535), Mehmed *çavuş* slave of İbrahim (October 1535), Murad *çavuş* (1541), Şecca *çavuş* (July 1543), Murad *çavuş* (October 1543), Ferhad *çavuş* (1548), Hüseyin *çavuş* (1549-1550), İbrahim (1554), İbrahim (1566), a *çavuş* (1597), Bartolomeo Coressi, court physician (1601), Halil *çavuş* (1601-1602), Hıdır *müteferrika* and *kapıcıbaşı* of the grand vizier (1604); cfr. M.P. Pedani-Fabris, *Ottoman diplomats in the West: the Sultan's Ambassadors to the Republic of Venice*, «Tarih incelemeleri dergisi», 11 (1996), pp. 187-202.

of Islam (dar al-Islam) and the land of war (dar al-Harb), there was also the land of agreement (dar al-'ahd) or of truce (dar al-sulh) for which the state of war had been suspended. For al-Bafi's the dar al-'ahd was a land inhabited by the Infedels who had accepted to pay *harac* to a Muslim ruler in order to have his protection. On the other hand the Aanafite juridical school, which was the school followed by Ottomans, did not accepted this division of the world but included the countries which accepted a *sulh*-relationship in the dar al-Islam. The other party was of course free to have a different view of the character of the tribute he payed. This theory may explain why the tribute payed by Western states to the sultan was often called *harac* in Ottoman documents<sup>21</sup>. From this point of view also a *fetihname* may be consider a propaganda letter sent to subordinate authorities to give them information about the sultan's victories.

Maria Pia Pedani-FABRIS

---

<sup>21</sup> Pedani-Fabris, *La dimora della pace*, pp. 37-38.



*Ottoman Fetihnames The Imperial Letters Announcing A Victory*

*Fetihnames sent to the doge of Venice*

(for some of them there is only the news that they were received<sup>22</sup>)

No. 1

Date: 1482.

About: Cem sultan.

Notes: –

No. 2

Date: 1484.

About: Moldavia (“Kara-boğdan”).

Notes: –

No. 3

Date: 1497.

About: Persia and Wallachia.

Notes: –

No. 4

Date: 1507.

About: Alaüddevle.

Notes: –

No. 5

Date: 1514, 3 September.

About: Persia, Çaldıran.

Notes: Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 20, pp. 317-8 (Italian translation)

No. 6

Date: [1515], 15 June.

About: Kemah, Alaüddevle.

Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 165 (Greek original), n. 166 (Italian translation); Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 20, pp. 556-7 (Italian translation); the Greek original edited by F. Miklosich-J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevii sacra et profana*, Vienna 1865, 3 vol., pp. 359-360, n. XLII (dated [1513] *recte* [1515]).

---

<sup>22</sup> Cff. the list of Ottoman envoys in Pedani-Fabris, *Ottoman diplomats in the West*, pp. 194-202.

Maria Pia Pedani-Fabris

- No. 7  
Date: 1516, 2 July.  
About: Persia.  
Notes: Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 22, p. 462 (Italian translation).
- No. 8  
Date: 1516, 7 August.  
About: Egypt.  
Notes: Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 23, pp. 397-398 (Italian translation).
- No. 9  
Date: 1521, 20 September.  
About: Hungary.  
Notes: Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 32, p. 70 (Italian translation).
- No. 10  
Date: 1523.  
About: Rhodes.  
Notes: –
- No. 11  
Date: 1526.  
About: Hungary.  
Notes: Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 43, pp. 51-52 (Italian translation).
- No. 12  
Date: 1529, 13 November.  
About: Vienna.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, 250 (Greek original); Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 52, pp. 370-372 (Italian translation); the Greek original edited by Miklosich-Müller, *Acta et diplomata*, pp. 361-364, n. XLIV.
- No. 13  
Date: 1532, 10-19 October.  
About: Hungary.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 289 (Italian translation); Sanudo, *I diarii*, vol. 57, pp. 330-331 (Italian translation).
- No. 14  
Date: 1535, 2-11 July.

*Ottoman Fetihnames The Imperial Letters Announcing A Victory*

- About: Persia.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 342 (Ottoman original); Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki*, V-VIII, n. 136.
- No. 15  
Date: 1535, 19-27 October.  
About: Persia.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 345 (Italian translation).
- No. 16  
Date: 1541, 22 September-1 October.  
About: Hungary.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 463 (Ottoman original), n. 464 (Italian translation). Another similar document sent to Süleyman paşa, J. Thury, *Török-Magyarkori történelmi emlékek*, Budapest 1893, *Török történetirök*, I, pp. 392-396.
- No. 17  
Date: 1543, 14-23 July.  
About: Hungary.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 507 (Ottoman original), n. 508 (Italian translation); Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki*, I, n. 6.
- No. 18  
Date: 1543, 10-19 October.  
About: Hungary.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 509 (Ottoman original), 510 (Italian translation); Fekete, *A Velencei Állami... fethnamei*, pp. 144-148; Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki*, V-VIII, n. 613.
- No. 19  
Date: 1548, 23 November-1 December.  
About: Persia.  
Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Documenti turchi*, n. 640 (Ottoman original), 641 (Italian translation); Gökbilgin, *Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki*, V-VIII, n. 133.
- No. 20  
Date: 1549-50.  
About: -  
Notes: -

No. 21

Date: 1554.

About: –

Notes: –

No. 22

Date: 1566, 10-19 November.

About: Hungary.

Notes: Fekete, *A Velencei Állami... fethnamei*, pp. 148-150.

No. 23

Date: 1597, 9-18 April.

About: Eger.

Notes: Venetian State Archives, *Lettere e scritture turchesche*, f. 5, cc. 187 (Ottoman original), 181 (Italian translation); *Documenti turchi*, n. 1091 (Italian translation); Fekete, *A Velencei Állami... fethnamei*, pp. 151-154. Another similar document sent to Constantinople, I. Korácson, *Török-magyar oklevéltár*, Budapest 1914, p. 180, n. 1.

No. 24

Date: 1601, 26 January-4 February.

About: Hungary.

Notes: Fekete, *A Velencei Állami... fethnamei*, pp. 154-157.

No. 25

Date: 1601-1602.

About: Hungary.

Notes: –

No. 26

Date: 1604.

About: Hungary.

Notes: –