

Pour citer cet article/ To quote this article : E. Pauli et C. Watzka, « Christian captives redeemed by the Austrian Trinitarians from the Ottoman Empire, the Tataric regions and the "Barbary" states, 1690-1783», dans *La guerre de course en récits (XVIe-XVIIIes)*. *Terrains, corpus, séries*, dossier en ligne du Projet CORSO, novembre 2010, URL <http://www.oroc-crlc.paris-sorbonne.fr/index.php/visiteur/Projet-CORSO/Ressources/La-guerre-de-course-en-recits>.

CHRISTIAN CAPTIVES REDEEMED BY THE AUSTRIAN TRINITARIANS FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, THE TATARIC REGIONS AND THE "BARBARY" STATES, 1690-1783

ELISABETH PAULI AND CARLOS WATZKA

Universität Graz



« Tres unum sunt », Trinitarian Church, Bratislava (Photo C. Watzka)

The following paper presents some main findings of sociological-historical inquiries into the phenomenon of ransoming captives in early modern Europe, as conducted by the Trinitarians, a Catholic monastic order.¹ Our research focuses on the activities of that order's Austrian branch, which was active in Central Europe and organized redemptory voyages to the Ottoman Empire, the Black Sea Region and Northern Africa from 1688 to 1783.²

The Trinitarians in the Habsburg monarchy in early modern times – an introduction

Since its origins at the end of the 12th century, this religious community concentrated on the specific task of liberating Christians, held captive and enslaved in Muslim-ruled countries. The community soon spread throughout the Catholic-dominated countries of the Mediterranean, where frequent fighting between Muslim and Christian armies and fleets created a great demand for their specific kind of charitable as well as diplomatic work. Therefore, during early modern times also, the principal personalities behind the organization of the order were based in France and Spain.³

¹ For the general history of the Trinitarian order cf. Anthony D'Errico, *The Trinitarians. An overview of their eight hundred year service to god and humanity*. Rome s.a. [1998], Thierry Knecht, *Les Trinitaires. Huit siècles d'histoire*, Saint-Michel 1993, Paul Deslandres, *L'Ordre des Trinitaires pour le rachat des captifs*, Toulouse/Paris 1903 (2 vol.), Giulio Cipollone, *La famiglia Trinitaria (1198-1998). Compendio Storico*, Rome 1998, Giulio Cipollone, *Trinità e liberazione tra Cristianità e Islam. La regola dei Trinitari*, Assisi 2000, Giulio Cipollone (ed.), *La Liberazione dei 'cattivi' tra Cristianità e Islam. Oltre la crociata e il ġihād: Tolleranza e servizio umanitario*, Città del Vaticano 2000, Marisa Forcina, Nicola Rocca (ed.), *Tolleranza e convivenza tra Cristianità ed Islam. L'Ordine dei Trinitari (1198-1998)*, Lecce 1998, Bonifacio Porres Alonso, *Libertad a los cautivos. Actividad redentora de la Orden Trinitaria*, vol. 1, Córdoba/Salamanca 1997, Juan Pujana, *La Orden de la Santísima Trinidad*, Salamanca 1993.

² There is not very much research literature particularly dealing with the history of the Trinitarian order in the Habsburg Empire and the Holy Roman Empire of 17th and 18th century until now. Recent publications are: Elisabeth Pauli, *Befreiung aus tyrannischer Gefangenschaft. Der Trinitarierorden in der Habsburgermonarchie (1688-1783) und die Rückführung christlicher Sklaven aus dem Osmanischen Reich und seinen Vasallenstaaten*. In: *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 90/2 (2008), p. 351-378, Elisabeth Pauli, *Der Orden der Allerheiligsten Dreifaltigkeit von der Erlösung der Gefangenen und seine Tätigkeit in den habsburgischen Ländern (1688-1783)*, in: Heidemarie Specht, Ralph Andraschek-Holzer (ed.), *Bettelorden in Mitteleuropa – Geschichte, Kunst, Spiritualität*, St. Pölten 2008, p. 133-164, Ernstpeter Ruhe, *Dire et ne pas dire: Les récits de captifs germanophones et les cérémonies de retour*, in: François Moureau (ed.), *Captifs en Méditerranée (XVI^e-XVIII^e siècles). Histoires, récits et légendes*, Paris 2008, p. 119-133, Ernstpeter Ruhe, *L'aire du soupçon. Les récits de captivité en langue allemande (XVI^e-XIX^e siècles)*, in: Anne Duprat, Émilie Picherot (ed.), *Récits d'Orient en Occident*, Paris 2008, p. 185-200, Thierry Knecht, *Les religieux trinitaires déchaussés dans les Etats héréditaires des Habsbourg du siège de Vienne à l'érection de la Province Saint-Joseph (1683-1727)*, published online: <http://www.trinitarianhistory.org>. From the older ones, the most important are: Moritz Gmelin, *Die Trinitarier oder Weißspanier in Österreich*. In: *Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie* 10 (1871), p. 339-406, Richard von Kralik, *Geschichte des Trinitarierordens. Von seiner Gründung bis zur seiner zweiten Niederlassung in Österreich*, Wien/Innsbruck/München s.a. [1920], Quirin de Leeuw, *Die Trinitarier. Ein alter Orden mit jungem Herzen*, Mödling 1984. Moreover two master thesis have to be cited: Ruth Koblizek, *Die erste Niederlassung des Ordens der unbeschuhten Trinitarier in Wien*, master thesis, Wien 1995, Elisabeth Pauli, *Die Trinitarier in Österreich von 1688 bis 1783*, master thesis, Graz 2004. The dissertation of Elisabeth Pauli, being in completion at the moment, will give a survey of the contents of research literature existing so far.

³ Cf. D'Errico, *The Trinitarians*, esp. p. 447-457, where all houses of the Trinitarian order world-wide are named with their founding dates.

Nonetheless, the internal differences over theological and disciplinary, as well as political and economical matters – not uncommon amongst Catholic orders during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation –, caused a division of the Trinitarian order into several congregations during the 16th century: the old-type Calced Trinitarians, two kinds of reformed French Trinitarians and also a new congregation of Spanish Discalced Trinitarians, were the major entities which emerged at the end of this process around 1600, and these were acknowledged by the supreme ecclesiastical authority, the Holy See, as autonomous monastic organizations.⁴

Like the ancient, united order, its reformed spin-offs benefited from their status as mendicant orders, which were allowed to collect alms for their charitable work, at least in theory, without any restrictions. This relates both to the ecclesiastical sphere⁵ – for which the full exemption from the bishoprics' jurisdiction has to be mentioned as a most significant achievement that allowed a coordinated, trans-regional pursuit of the order's aims – and to the secular sphere, although the for this, of course, the order was dependent on the goodwill of the relevant worldly political authorities.

Yet, particularly for governments of European regions, in which warfare with Muslims and abduction of Christian subjects for the purpose of slavery was a serious and constant problem, the order's support was obviously quite attractive during early modern era, perhaps not least due to the expertise that had already been built up within the Trinitarian order in handling difficulties that were linked to such a field of action as the ransom and exchange of captives of war and victims of manhunts.⁶

Moreover religious orders like the Trinitarians were seen as potential partners in the project of re-catholicization and Catholic reform.⁷ Both intense inter-religious warfare and the existence of a political project of "Catholic reform", were present in the case of the Austrian Habsburg Monarchy in late 17th century, and the establishment of the order – namely the Spanish Discalced Trinitarians – there in 1688 was in fact motivated by the siege of Vienna in 1683 and, more

⁴ Cf. D'Errico, *The Trinitarians*, p. 159-202.

⁵ The status of the Spanish Discalced order, which is the relevant congregation for Central Europe, in ecclesiastical law is documented most completely in the *Bullarium Discalceatorum Sanctissimae Trinitatis ab erectione eiusdem Ordinis Congregationis Hispanicae*, manuscript in the Archive of the Trinitarian Order in San Carlino alle quattro fontane, Rome. The internal legal system of the order is laid down in: Antonius a Conceptione (ed.), *Regula Primitiva et Constitutiones Patrum Discalceatorum Ordinis Sacntissimae Trinitatis Redemptionis Captivorum*, Rome 1738 (reprinted Rome 1851).

⁶ Cf. the forthcoming dissertation of Elisabeth Pauli.

⁷ Cf. the vast literature on the phenomenon of "counter-reformation", for the Austrian case i.e.: Thomas Winkelbauer, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, Wien 2004, part 2, and Rudolf Leeb et al. (ed.), *Geschichte des Christentums in Österreich*, Wien 2005, p. 145-360.

precisely, by the enormous loss of population caused by the far-reaching devastation of imperial Western Hungary and eastern Lower Austria, the core land of the Habsburg Monarchy, by the Ottoman and Tataric forces during this campaign.⁸

As is widely known, warfare between the Ottoman and the Habsburg Empire continued afterwards until the end of the 17th century, followed in the early 18th century by two transient phases of (more or less respected) peace 1700-1714 and 1719-35,⁹ and the two Austro-Ottoman wars of 1714-18 and 1736-39, which interrupted them. Moreover, at the "military border" (a region not called so by the Austrians) a "minor war" continued even during the specified times of peace, and led to enormous casualties, too, particularly regarding regional villagers and border settlers, of whom thousands were taken captive even during formal "peace times".¹⁰

Therefore, captives' redemption was an unquestioned and urgent task in the Habsburg Monarchy during the first half of the 18th century, and a lot of redemption voyages by the Trinitarians – 20 between 1690 and 1750 – were destined mostly for the Ottoman Empire itself and the Crimean Tataric Khanate in the Black Sea region.¹¹

Moreover, a remarkable network of Trinitarian houses was built in the Habsburg Monarchy to support the activities of the convent in Vienna (founded in 1688), which extended primarily within the Eastern parts of the Habsburg monarchy: By 1728, when a special Austrian Province of the order was founded, it had established twelve settlements, including Vienna: Illava (1695), Bratislava (1697), Prague (1707), Trnava (1712), Komárom (1714), Alba Julia (1716), Eger (1717), Belgrade (1718), Pera/Constantinople (1723), Zašová (1724), Sárospatak (1728).¹²

This pattern of expansion changed, particularly during second half of the 18th century, when there was a long-lasting period of peace between both the Austrian and the Turkish Empire, and 'minor' border war also produced fewer of its evil outcomes for the Austrian side, due to the increasing military power of the latter, improved political relationships to the Ottomans, and, last

⁸ Regarding the political and military history of the conflict between the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empire during 17th and 18th century cf. Josef Matuz, *Das Osmanische Reich. Grundlinien seiner Geschichte*, Darmstadt 1996, Klaus Kreiser, Christoph Neumann, *Kleine Geschichte der Türkei*. Stuttgart 2009, Marlene Kunz, Martin Scheutz, Karl Vocelka, Thomas Winkelbauer (ed.), *Das Osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie*, Wien 2005, Heinz Kramer, Maurus Reinkowski, *Die Türkei und Europa. Eine wechselhafte Beziehungsgeschichte*. Stuttgart 2008, Ekkehard Eickhoff, *Venedig, Wien und die Osmanen. Umbruch in Südosteuropa 1645-1700*, Stuttgart 1988.

⁹ Note that the period of 1700-1714 was exactly that of the war of Spanish succession, so that altogether it was not at all a period of peace in Austria, but only between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans. Likewise, the years of 1733-1735 brought the war of Polish succession.

¹⁰ Cf. Geza David, Pal Fodor (Hg.), *Ottomans, Hungarians and Habsburgs in central Europe. The military confines in the era of Ottoman conquest*, Leiden u.a. 2000.

¹¹ Cf. Porres Alonso, *Libertad*, p. 616f.

¹² Cf. Pauli, *Befreiung aus tyrannischer Gefangenschaft*, p. 363, Antonio ab Assumptione, *Arbor Chronologica ordinis Excalceatorum Sanctissimae Trinitatis*, Rome 1894, p. 140.

but not least, because of the fact that the Crimean Tatars were already under heavy pressure from the Russian forces.¹³ Therefore, the number of Imperial subjects held captive within Eastern and South-Eastern Europe and Turkey, the prime 'target group' for the activities of the Austrian Trinitarians, dwindled constantly during these decades.

This is also reflected in the fact that newly founded Trinitarian settlements in the Habsburg monarchy were already becoming rare in the 1730s, and ceased after the 1750s. The last residences built were in Budapest (1738), Holešov (1748), Makkos Maria (1749), Štěnovice (1753) and Graz (1756).¹⁴ Corresponding to these shifts, Austrian Trinitarians tried to expand their "work field" to other Muslim-ruled countries, namely to the 'Barbary states' of Northern Africa, where a lot of Christians were still enslaved by pirates even in the late 18th century,¹⁵ particularly because considerable parts of Italy had fallen under the rule of the Austrian Habsburgs during the 18th century.¹⁶

Nevertheless, the dynamics of the activities of the Austrian Trinitarian province diminished from about the beginning of the reign of Maria Theresa, maybe to some extent because of the enormous challenges the Austrian state, economy and society had to face right from her uptake of power in 1740, which gave the Prussian King a pretext to attack the Habsburg monarchy, explicitly breaking the constitutional laws of the Holy Roman Empire, causing the two Silesian wars of 1740-42 and 1744-48.¹⁷ Similarly, the seven years' war of 1756-1763 surely did not contribute to a strong public interest in the fate of Austrian captives in the Muslim countries; the heavy military and economic troubles the elites and the population of the Habsburg monarchy had to face in these years were for the most part not related to religious conflict between Christians and Muslims at all.

¹³ Cf. i.e. Günther Stökl, *Russische Geschichte. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Stuttgart 1997, Boris Ischboldin, *Essays on Tatar History*, New Delhi 1973.

¹⁴ Cf. Porres Alonso, *Libertad a los cautivos*, p. 616f.

¹⁵ For this phenomenon cf. Robert Davies: *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters. White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast and Italy, 1500-1800*, New York 2004, Salvatore Bono, *Piraten und Korsaren im Mittelmeer. Seekrieg, Handel und Sklaverei vom 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 2009, Salvatore Bono, *Corsari nel Mediterraneo. Cristiani e Musulmani fra guerra, schiavitù e commercio*, Milano 1997; Salvatore Bono, *Les corsaires en Méditerranée*, Rabat 1998, Salvatore Bono, *I corsari barbareschi*, Torino 1964, Salvatore Bono, *Schiavi musulmani nell'Italia moderna. Galeotti, vu' cumprà, domestici*, Perugia 1999. Cf. also: Wolfgang Kaiser, *Frictions profitables. L'économie de la rançon en Méditerranée occidentale (XVI^e-XVIII^e siècles)*, in: Simonetta Cavaciocchi (ed.), *Ricchezza del mare. Ricchezza dal mare, sec. XIII-XVIII*, Florence 2006, p. 689-701, Wolfgang Kaiser, *Négociier la liberté. Missions françaises pour l'échange et le rachat de captifs au Maghreb (XVII^e siècle)*, in: Claudia Moatti (ed.), *La Mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée, de l'Antiquité à l'Époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et d'identification*, Rome 2004, p. 501-528.

¹⁶ Cf. i.e. Adam Wandruska, *Österreich und Italien im 18. Jahrhundert*, Wien 1963.

¹⁷ For the history of violent conflicts between states in Europe during the 18th century cf. i.e. Walter Demel, *Europäische Geschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts: ständische Gesellschaft und europäisches Mächtesystem im beschleunigten Wandel*, Stuttgart 2000.

Probably even more importantly, enlightened thought did its part in undermining the legitimacy of religious orders¹⁸ and especially of charitable almsgiving in late 18th century Austria, too, whilst a liberal laissez-faire policy was on the rise, that, at its worst, intended to ridicule the help for those unfortunates, who fell into captivity during travels, by declaring them being of questionable moral character, and even collaborators of the Turks.¹⁹

Because of this, but also due to the decline in the numbers of Christian captives in Muslim-ruled countries already mentioned, the numbers of people freed by the Austrian Trinitarians fell significantly during the course of 18th century, particularly after 1750: Whilst more than 3.000 captives were liberated by the Austrian Trinitarians during the first 20 redemption voyages during the 61-year period between 1690 and 1750, only about 850 were rescued by the 11 missions undertaken within the 34-year period from 1750 to 1783; computed as annual rates, this means an average of approximately 50 redeemed persons per year in the late 17th and the first half of the 18th century, but only about the half this number after 1750.²⁰

Searching and examining the *catalogi captivorum*

In the following section, we concentrate on quantitative aspects of the analysis of sources, which relate to the captives themselves who were liberated by the Austrian branch of the Trinitarian order, their sociological and demographic characteristics and some aspects of their captivity and liberation that can be reconstructed by the use of surviving documents for larger numbers of people.

An account of the actual conduct of the redemption voyages, as well as detailed analyses of the order's spiritual and intellectual self-definition, its organizational development, personal structure, financing patterns, political and social position within the Habsburg monarchy of 17th and 18th century etc., will be presented in the doctoral thesis of Elisabeth Pauli which is currently being completed,²¹ and will probably be in print in 2011/12. The fundamental structures regarding most of these aspects can be found in the older and, particularly, the recent research literature on the Austrian Trinitarians.

¹⁸ Cf. i.e. Jean Mondot (ed.), *Le Lumières et leur combat/Der Kampf der Aufklärung*, Berlin 2004.

¹⁹ Cf. de Leeuw, *Die Trinitarier*, p. 26.

²⁰ Sources cited below.

²¹ Elisabeth Pauli, *Die Befreiung christlicher Gefangener durch den Trinitarierorden im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Graz (phil. Diss.), forthcoming.

Pour citer cet article/ To quote this article : E. Pauli et C. Watzka, « Christian captives redeemed by the Austrian Trinitarians from the Ottoman Empire, the Tataric regions and the "Barbary" states, 1690-1783», dans *La guerre de course en récits (XVIIe-XVIIIes)*. Terrains, corpus, séries, dossier en ligne du Projet CORSO, novembre 2010, URL <http://www.oroc-crlc.paris-sorbonne.fr/index.php/visiteur/Projet-CORSO/Ressources/La-guerre-de-course-en-recits>.



From *Annales – Momnument, Prague*. In Joannes a San Felice, *Annalium Provinciae Sancti Josephi Ordinis Excalceatorum Sanctissimae Trinitatis Redemptionis Captivorum Libri Decem* [...], Vienna 1739, p. 562.

The following presentation focuses on selected main outcomes of contextualized quantitative analyses of contemporary serial sources on redeemed persons, the so called *catalogi captivorum*, lists that were compiled by the Trinitarians themselves in order to document their work – for themselves, for their sponsors and for a general public potentially able to contribute to further redemption activities. These findings stem from the research on the Trinitarian order within the Habsburg monarchy, which the present authors have been conducting since the year 2006 within the framework of a research project on charitable monastic orders in early modern Central Europe, situated at the Center for Social Research at the University of Graz, and financed by the Austrian Science fund.

The aforementioned *catalogi captivorum* contain a specific composition of information on each redeemed captive, although sometimes some parameters are missing for some of the persons listed in those documents, and even the features mentioned vary slightly between them. For most cases, the existing lists²² contain the names of the liberated captives (and thus, an indication on their gender, too), their age, counted in years, their home countries, the duration of their captivity, and the amount of the ransom that was paid for them. For a large proportion of entries – more than half – the region where the individual was held captive (finally redeemed), is given, his or her professional or social status is indicated, and/or some remark on the institution or person that had given the money for this particular ransom, is made. Sometimes, the type of captivity is noted, too, but in that regard a clear bias can be perceived, because in nearly all of such cases, it was slavery on the galleys, which – as the most miserable and pitiful kind of captivity known in those days – seemed worth pointing out particularly.

²² (Josephus a SS. Sacramento), *Relatio Austriacae Redemptionis captivorum. In Constantinopolitana Civitate peractae Anno Jubilei 1700 et Sanctissimo D. N. Clementi XI. P. O. M. Dicata*, Romae 1700, (Joannes a S. Francisco), *Catalogi Captivorum ex Turcia, & Tartaria Budziackensi Redemptorum*, Romae 1715, (Michael a S. Josepho), *Notitia Captivorum in Tartaria Redemptorum a Sac. Ordine Excalceatorum SS. Trinitatis Redeptionis Captivorum Congregationis Hispaniarum*, Romae 1720, (Andreas a Cruce), *Redemptiones Captivorum Constantinopoli, & Tripoli liberatorum per Familiam Redemptricem Discalceatroum SSme Trinitatis, Provinciarum Germaniae, & Status Veneti*, Romae 1730, (Georg a. S. Josepho), *Verzeichnis deren gefangenen Christen [...]*, Wien [1741], (Augustinus a SS. Trinitate), *Verzeichnuß deren gefangenen Christen [...]* Wien [1750], (Antoninus a S. Ferdinando), *Catalogi Captivorum Christianorum [...]*, Wien [1751], (Antoninus a S. Ferdinando), *Catalogi Captivorum Christianorum [...]*, o.O. [1753], (Xaver a S. Joannes Nepomuk), *Catalogi Captivorum Christianorum [...]*, Wien [1756], (Joachimus a S. Anna), *Catalogi Captivorum Christianorum [...]*, Wien [1759], Giovanni Constanzo Caracciolo (Hg.), *Catalogo de Christiani schiavi riscattati [...]*, Roma 1764, (Daniel a Resurrectione Domini), *Verzeichniß der gefangenen Christen [...]*, Wien [1768], (Benedictus a S. Felice), *Verzeichniß der gefangenen Christen [...]*, Wien [1771], (Bernardinus a Beata Virgine), *Verzeichniß der gefangenen Christen [...]*, Wien [1773], (Bartholomeus a S. Nicolao), *Catalogi Captivorum Christianorum [...]* Wien [1776], (Anselmus a S. P. Joanne de Matha), *Verzeichniß der Gefangenen Christen [...]*, Wien [1780], (Engelbertus a Matre Dei), *Catalogi Christianorum tum redemptorum tum adiutorum [...]*, Wien [1783]. (The names set in brackets in the bibliography below refer to the *pater redemptor*, the Trinitarian responsible for the redemption travel. Year numbers set in brackets indicate the end of the redemption travel, but not to a printing date, which often is missing.)

Unfortunately it was, despite all efforts, not possible to find surviving copies of *catalogi redemptorum* for all redemptory missions undertaken by the Austrian Trinitarians during their presence in early modern Habsburg monarchy 1688-1783: Although it is sure that hand-written lists were compiled right from the beginning,²³ the early lists of the period before 1699/1700 have not survived in any accessible way within an archive or as a print. Yet numbers of freed captives were quite small during the early stages of the orders' activities in the Habsburg Empire: 168 people were redeemed during the first five missions in the decade 1690-1699. Obviously the order first had to adapt to the conditions there and the new main 'target regions' of Eastern Europe. The conduction of the mission to the Tatar regions, to which the first redemptions were destined, caused specific, enormous problems.²⁴

Whilst the large redemption of 1699/1700, when the Trinitarians freed over 440 Christians from the Ottoman Empire, is documented by a printed catalogue, information is again lacking for all three smaller redemptions that followed between 1701 and 1710. For the next decades, the redemptive missions of 1714/15, 1719/20, 1725-30 and 1740/41 are documented by printed catalogues, which survived in some archives; yet we could not come by any hand-written or printed lists covering the redemptions of the Austrian Trinitarians in 1724/25, 1733/34, 1737/38, 1743/44, 1744/45 and 1746/47. It seems very probable that after these enterprises printed lists were compiled, too, but there is not even any indication of such prints in contemporary publications by the order or in the research literature, and no trace of them in any of the archives we were able to consult until now.²⁵ At least, for the period from the 20th redemption in 1747-50 onwards, a complete series of *catalogi redemptorum*, handed down in various archives, could be composed and analysed by the present authors. Thus, altogether we dispose of 17 out of (potentially) 31 *catalogi redemptorum* (55 %), which cover 2228 out of 3932 persons (57 %) liberated from captivity in Muslim-ruled countries by the Austrian branch of the Trinitarians between 1690 and 1783.²⁶

An overview of all redemption voyages conducted by the Austrian branch of the Trinitarians between 1688 and 1783 is presented in table 1 below.²⁷

²³ Cf. Joannes a San Felice, *Annalium Provinciae Sancti Josephi Ordinis Excalceatorum Sanctissimae Trinitatis Redemptionis Captivorum Libri Decem [...]*, Wien 1739, p. 101, 116-118, 145f., 214-216, 253.

²⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 124-148, and Pauli, *Befreiung aus tyrannischer Gefangenschaft*, p. 367.

²⁵ Therefore, if anyone could suggest to us, were we could find any of these documents, we would be very grateful. It still has to be kept in mind that maybe they did not survive at all.

²⁶ Two further catalogues, hand-written and referring to a small number of freed, should exist within a Spanish and an Austrian library according to some earlier researchers, but were not found by us yet because of apparently wrong or out-dated signatures given in the texts that refer to their existence.

²⁷ The table comprises information from the following sources: Joannes a S. Felice, *Annales*, p. 101, 116-118, 145f., 214-216, 253, 264, 294, 337, 412, 475, 558-561, 718f., 771, Porres Alonso, *Libertad*, p. 616f., Antonius ab Assumptione, *Arbor Chronologica*, p. 135f., and the catalogues cited above.

Pour citer cet article/ To quote this article : E. Pauli et C. Watzka, « Christian captives redeemed by the Austrian Trinitarians from the Ottoman Empire, the Tataric regions and the "Barbary" states, 1690-1783», dans *La guerre de course en récits (XVIIe-XVIIIes). Terrains, corpus, séries*, dossier en ligne du Projet CORSO, novembre 2010, URL <http://www.oroc-crlc.paris-sorbonne.fr/index.php/visiteur/Projet-CORSO/Ressources/La-guerre-de-course-en-recits>.

Table 1: Redemptions by the Austrian branch of the Trinitarians 1690-1783 - overview

Nr.	time-period	catalogue (year)	liberated persons	costs in florins	destinations of the redemption travels	patres redemptores
1.	1690-91	n.a.	16	1723	Bud.	Maurus a Conceptione
2.	1691-92	n.a.	23	2076	Bel. u.a.	Joannes a S. Augustino
3.	1692-93	n.a.	34	5968	Crim.	Maurus a Conceptione
4.	1695-96	n.a.	45	9667	Bel.	Joannes a S. Augustino
5.	1698-99	n.a.	50	9480	Bud.	Joannes a S. Augustino
6.	1699-00	CC 1700	442	22.985	Bel., Rus., Adr., Const.	Josephus a SS. Sacram.
7.	1702-03	n.a.	85	19.552	Const., Bud.	Josephus a SS. Sacram.
8.	1706-07	n.a.	105	20.694	Const., Crim.	Joannes a S. Felice
9.	1709-10	n.a.	124	27.856	Const.	Joannes a S. Felice
10.	1714-15	CC 1715	123	26.273	Const., Bud.	Josephus a Jesu Maria
11.	1719-20	CC 1720	555	73.394	Bel., Const., Bud.	Josephus a Jesu Maria
12.	1724-25	n.a.	228	57.408	Const., Bud., Crim.	Joannes a S. Felice
13.	1725-30	CC 1730	231	56.537	Const., Adr., Bud.	Michael a Assumptione
14.	1733-34	n.a.	211	48.770	Salon, Const., Tun. u.a.	Andreas a S. Gertrudis
15.	1737-38	n.a.	77	18.364	Const.	Georgius a S. Josespho
16.	1740-41	CC 1741	330	60.802	Salon., Const., u.a.	Georgius a S. Josespho
17.	1743-44	n.a.	106	14.891	unknown	Ambrosius a S. Ignatio
18.	1744-45	n.a.	99	33.628	unknown	Antonius a S. Fernando
19.	1746-47	n.a.	81	31.989	unknown	Antonius a S. Fernando
20.	1747-50	CR 1750	109	24.354	Rus., Salon., Const., Alg. u.a.	Augustinus a SS. Trinitate
21.	1750-51	CR 1751	47	16.425	Rus., Const., Tri. u.a.	Antonius a S. Fernando
22.	1751-53	CR 1753	77	46.585	Rus., Const., Alg., Tri. u.a.	Antonius a S. Fernando
23.	1753-56	CR 1756	83	33.481	Rus., Salon., Const., Alg. u.a.	Xaverius a S. Joannes N.
24.	1756-59	CR 1759	51	46.005	Salon., Const., Alg., Tri., u.a.	Joachimus a S. Anna
25.	1760-63	CR 1763	67	45.263	Const., Alg., Tun., Salé u.a.	Bernardinus a Virgine
26.	1765-68	CR 1768	77	44.447	Const., Alg., Salé u.a.	Daniel a Resurrectione
27.	1768-71	CR 1771	54	23.022	Const., Alg., Tri., Salé u.a.	Benedictus a S. Felix
28.	1771-73	CR 1773	121	102.652	Const., Alg., Masc., Tri. u.a.	Bernardinus a Virgine
29.	1773-76	CR 1776	63	36.562	Const., Alg. u.a.	Bartholomeus a S. Nicolao
30.	1777-80	CR 1780	83	46.679	Const., Alg., Masc. u.a.	Anselmus a S. J. de M.
31.	1780-83	CR 1783	135	56.001	Const., Alg., Tri. u.a.	Engelbertus a Matre Dei
Σ			3932	1,06 Mio.		

Pour citer cet article/ To quote this article : E. Pauli et C. Watzka, « Christian captives redeemed by the Austrian Trinitarians from the Ottoman Empire, the Tataric regions and the "Barbary" states, 1690-1783», dans *La guerre de course en récits (XVIe-XVIIIes). Terrains, corpus, séries*, dossier en ligne du Projet CORSO, novembre 2010, URL <http://www.oroc-crlc.paris-sorbonne.fr/index.php/visiteur/Projet-CORSO/Ressources/La-guerre-de-course-en-recits>.

Annotations pertaining to table 1:

The column "catalogue" shows whether a list of redeemed persons (*catalogi captivorum* = CC) was available to us, and gives the year of publication; "n.a." means "not available". The following basic information – as the sum of freed captives, costs, destinations and member of the order in charge for the particular operation – is known for (nearly) all redemptions. Yet the *numbers of freed persons* slightly differ in some cases between the sources, as the *Annales Provinciae*, the *Catalogi captivorum* and the *Arbor Chronologica*. In those cases, the numbers given in the *Annales Provinciae* or the *Catalogi captivorum* are displayed in the table.

For one redemption (Nr. 10 of 1715) the surviving catalogue lists considerably more people (123) than the *Annales* (111), obviously due to some addition of liberated people omitted in earlier calculations. And the numbers for one redemption, Nr. 6 of 1700 differ largely between the *Annales Provinciae*, which count 442 redeemed, and the *Arbor Chronologica*, that states a sum of 520, probably by erroneously taking into account a number of people freed by the Austrian "Grand Ambassador" during his travel to Constantinople, on which the Trinitarians had accompanied him – cf. Joannes a S. Felice, *Annales*, p. 278-287. For the redemption of 1720 (Nr. 11) it has to be added that the surviving catalogue is only a partial one, listing 124 out of 555 liberated men, women and children – Cf. *ibid.*, p. 718.

The *total cost of the redemptions* – the amount of ransom paid at each redemption, partially including the travel expenses as well – are given here, yet rounded to entire florins, according to the data in Porres Alonso, *Libertad*, p. 616f., who relies on a summary file from the archive of the order's convent in Rome, San Carlino alle Quattro Fontane. Figures for costs given in the Catalogues and/or the *Annales Provinciae* differ from them quite often, too, but mostly only to a minor degree. These differences probably result from various forms of contemporary calculations of total costs, particularly regarding the handling of travel expenses, which either could be calculated separately or included into the ransom figures by adding a proportional value for each liberated person, the latter case probably being the more usual one. The *destinations of the redemption voyages* are presented in the table only in a selective manner (comprising those regions and cities mentioned at the title page of the catalogues). The abbreviations indicate: Adr. = Adrianople, Alg. = Algiers, Bel. = Belgrade, Bud. = Budzak region, Const. = Constantinople, Crim. = region of the Crimea, Masc. = Mascara, Rus. = Ruszík, Salon. = Saloniki, Tri. = Tripolis, Tun. = Tunis

Because redemption catalogues up to 1699 are missing, we refer only to those from 1699/1700 to 1783 in the following presentation.²⁸ For a more detailed analysis, we also divided this time-span into two parts, a first period from 1700 to 1741, and a second one from 1742 to 1783, each covering 42 years. Significant differences between those two periods can be observed even for such fundamental aspects as the gender relation of the ex-captives: Whilst for the whole 18th century a relation of about 82 % males and 18 % females can be observed for altogether 2222 persons (for 6 children, no indication of sex was given in the catalogues), this ratio is 72 % to 28 % for the period 1700-1741 but 94 % to 6 % for 1747-1783.

²⁸ As the sources for this analysis are collectedly cited above, no further bibliographical indications for the *catalogi captivorum* and complementary sources are given below.

It is remarkable that even in the first decades of the 18th century men were clearly dominant among the liberated captives; this was obviously due to the large number of military personnel that fell into the hand of the enemy during warfare. From the 1740s onwards, the proportion of women among the freed sank even more, because the main risk for Central European Christians of falling into Muslim captivity was no longer violent fighting on land, but pirate assault during sea travel in the Mediterranean. Just because of the high risks accompanying every trip by ship during early modern time, 'normal' people not working as sailors, tradesmen, soldiers or in similar professions avoided it as much as possible, and often women were even formally excluded from ship transport.

These factors mentioned obviously also influenced the age structure of the liberated captives in general, showing a propensity for persons of ages with potentially high value for labour and/or warfare (between 20 and 40). Still, the medium value for age among the freed was quite high at 35,4 years for the whole period 1700 to 1783, 34,5 for the period up to 1741 and 36,4 afterwards. This is partly due to the comparatively small numbers of children involved (particularly during the second half of the 18th century), but also a consequence of a surprisingly high proportion of elderly people among the freed slaves: 38 % of all documented cases of redemptions relate to persons aged 40 and older, although those aged 60 years or more, were a minority of only about 6 %. They were cheaper and their owners often wanted to get rid of them if they were not able to work anymore.

But in the early period of 1700-1741, the proportion of children under 10, 12 %, was also quite high. A lot of them obviously were robbed as babies or very small children and did not bear a family name in the catalogue, a hint that they were separated from their parents either during their violent deportation itself, or afterwards during captivity at an age when they were too young to keep a trace of their original family affiliation in mind. The proportion of such young persons among the liberated sank within the second half of the 18th century, to an average of only 4% of all redeemed.

A further basic parameter regularly given in the catalogues is that of the home country. One might expect the samples of people ransomed by the Austrian Trinitarians to consist of Austrians or persons originating in the Habsburg Empire, but this is true only to a certain degree: Whilst – concerning the whole period 1700-1783 – two-thirds of the persons listed in the Austrian *catalogi captivorum* indeed originated from some part of the Central European Austrian Empire, this was not the case for one third (see table 2 below).

Pour citer cet article/ To quote this article : E. Pauli et C. Watzka, « Christian captives redeemed by the Austrian Trinitarians from the Ottoman Empire, the Tataric regions and the "Barbary" states, 1690-1783», dans *La guerre de course en récits (XVIIe-XVIIIes)*. *Terrains, corpus, séries*, dossier en ligne du Projet CORSO, novembre 2010, URL <http://www.oroc-crlc.paris-sorbonne.fr/index.php/visiteur/Projet-CORSO/Ressources/La-guerre-de-course-en-recits>.

Table 2: Regional origin of the captives liberated by the Austrian Trinitarians 1700-1783

Region	1700-41		1742-83		1700-83	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Hungarian crown lands</i>	329	27,6	149	15,7	478	22,3
Kingdom of Hungary ^A	226	19,0	84	8,9	310	14,5
Kingdoms Croatia and Slavonia ^B	29	2,4	41	4,3	70	3,3
Grand principality Transylvania ^C	74	6,2	24	2,5	98	4,6
<i>The Banat</i> ^D	59	5,0	22	2,3	81	3,8
<i>Austrian hereditary states</i>	250	21,0	199	21,0	449	21,0
Archdukedom Austria ^E	189	15,9	30	3,2	219	10,2
Inner Austria ^F	31	2,6	21	2,2	52	2,4
Austrian Coast Land ^G	5	0,4	82	8,6	87	4,1
Prince-county of Tyrol ^H	11	0,9	47	5,0	58	2,7
Austrian Fore Lands ^I	14	1,2	19	2,0	33	1,5
<i>Bohemian crown lands</i>	147	12,4	72	7,6	219	10,2
Kingdom of Bohemia ^J	67	5,6	39	4,1	106	5,0
March-county Moravia ^J	34	2,9	16	1,7	50	2,3
Duchy of Silesia ^K	46	3,9	17	1,8	63	2,9
<i>Austrian Italian possessions</i>	54	4,5	152	16,0	206	9,6
Dukedom Milan ^L	14	1,2	83	8,7	97	4,5
Dukedom Mantova ^L	5	0,4	21	2,2	26	1,2
Grand-Duchy of Tuscany ^L	2	0,2	48	5,1	50	2,3
Kingdoms Naples, Sicily & Sardinia ^M	33	2,8	--	--	33	1,6
<i>Austrian Netherlands</i> ^N	8	0,7	15	1,6	23	1,1
<i>Habsburg Monarchy together</i>	847	71,2	609	64,2	1456	68,1
German non-Habsburg countries ^O	177	14,9	194	20,4	371	17,3
Italian non-Habsburg countries ^P	17	1,4	79	8,3	96	4,5
Spain and Portugal ^Q	16	1,3	30	3,2	46	2,2
Poland-Lithuania ^R	43	3,6	6	0,6	49	2,3
Russia ^S	22	1,8	2	0,2	24	1,1
Denmark and Sweden ^T	9	0,8	1	0,1	10	0,5
Ottoman Empire ^U	30	2,5	20	2,1	50	2,3
Tartary ^V	18	1,5	0	0,0	18	0,8
Others ^W	1	0,1	3	0,3	4	0,2
<i>Total (valid cases)</i> ^X	1190	100	949	100	2139	100

Pour citer cet article/ To quote this article : E. Pauli et C. Watzka, « Christian captives redeemed by the Austrian Trinitarians from the Ottoman Empire, the Tataric regions and the "Barbary" states, 1690-1783», dans *La guerre de course en récits (XVIe-XVIIIes). Terrains, corpus, séries*, dossier en ligne du Projet CORSO, novembre 2010, URL <http://www.oroc-crlc.paris-sorbonne.fr/index.php/visiteur/Projet-CORSO/Ressources/La-guerre-de-course-en-recits>.

Annotations pertaining to table 2:

A: As an entity again under Habsburg rule after 1699; consisting, apart from the area of modern-day Hungary and other regions, also of Upper-Hungary, today Slovakia.

B: Partly under Ottoman control until 1699; today parts of Croatia.

C: Under Austrian rule since 1699, today part of Romania

D: Temesvar Banat, Austrian since 1718, today Vojvodina and South-Eastern Romania.

E: Consisting of Lower and Upper Austria

F: Consisting of the dukedoms of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, and the coast land. The latter is displayed separately here for thematic reasons.

G: The 'litorale', consisting primarily of the city of Trieste, the County of Görz/Gorizia with Gradisca and the Austrian March-county of Istria, all mainly Italian-speaking regions, an integral part of Austria and the Holy Roman Empire. Moreover the city of Fiume, under Hungarian rule, is included here, too.

H: Including the bishopric of Trento, thus also the Italian-speaking population.

I: Consisting of the 'Major-Offices' (*Oberämter*) Bregenz, Breisgau, Offenburg, Rottenburg, Günzburg, Stockach, Altdorf, Tettnang and the city of Konstanz, all situated within South-Western Germany.

J: together today's Czech Republic.

K: The main part annexed to Prussia after 1742, only the Southern region around Troppau remaining Austrian.

L: Under Austrian rule since 1714 resp. 1708 and 1737. For the purpose of this statistics, all persons from these Northern Italian regions were counted as Habsburg subjects, even if taken captive and/or freed (the latter applying only to 2 individuals) before their homeland became a part of the Austrian monarchy, for the purpose of comparison.

M: Austrian from 1714 resp. 1720 only until 1720 resp. 1735. For the purpose of this statistics, all persons from these Southern Italian regions freed from 1742 onwards were not counted as Habsburg subjects, even if taken captive at a time, when their home countries yet belonged to the Austrian monarchy.

N: Large parts of today's Belgium, Austrian since 1714

O: The territories belonging to the Holy Roman Empire, but not under Habsburg rule; moreover Switzerland, Prussia and Kurland as at that time German-dominated states outside the old Reich were although included in this category.

P: Territories on the Italian Peninsula including the islands Sardinia and Sicily after the Habsburg rule, Corsica, the Venetian territories at the Dalmatian coast and the Republic of Ragusa, today Dubrovnik.

Q: Most Spanish, two liberated Portuguese (after 1741)

R: The Polish people ransomed were not counted as Austrian subjects here in general, although the southern parts of the reign became Austrian in 1772.

S: Including all White-Russian and Ukrainian places classified as "Russian" within the catalogues.

T: Nearly all Danish, one liberated Swede (after 1741)

U: Including the vassal states of Walachia and Moldavia.

V: Primarily children born there.

W: Each one person from the Netherlands, from Georgia, Persia and America.

X: Note that for 89 out of 2228 persons (4 %) documented in the catalogues available, no information on their home-country was given. The percentages in the table refer to the sum of cases valid for analysis.

The most numerous subgroup of freed captives is formed by 478 persons (22 %) stemming from the kingdom of Hungary, closely followed by 449 people (21 %) from the Austrian hereditary states. 219 ex-captives were from the lands of the Bohemian crown (10 %), and 206 persons (nearly 10 %) from Italian regions under Austrian possession during the 18th century. Further 81 persons redeemed (4 %) originated from the Temesvar Banat – under direct rule of the Austrian *Hofkriegsrat* (Court war council) from the peace treaty of Passarowitz in 1718 until 1779, when it was integrated into Hungary– and 23 persons (1 %) from the Austrian Netherlands.

If one looks at the regional distribution at the level of single provinces, and the temporal development, too, it becomes very clear, that this composition of the home-countries of the freed captives reflects the geographical focuses of Christian-Muslim-warfare, and its shifts during the 18th century, too: Whilst the inhabitants of Hungary, Transylvania and the eastern hereditary lands form the major groups of liberated persons until ca. 1740, thus representing the regions directly affected by the Turkish and Tartaric incursions, followed by persons from the populated Bohemian lands, the picture changes clearly during the second half of the 18th century, when people from the small Austrian coast land formed the largest subgroup within the Austrian hereditary states, being nearly as many captives as those from the vast Hungarian heartland. It corresponds to the fact that the proportion of people from Habsburg Italy among the redeemed rose strongly, as they – by their traditionally strong involvement into naval trade – were now at much higher risk of being enslaved than the ordinary people living within Central Europe.

Similar shifts can be observed when looking at those ex-captives who did not originate from some part of the Habsburg Empire of the time: As already stated, more than 30 % of all persons registered in the Austrian *catalogi captivorum* were not from territories ruled (directly) by the Habsburgs. The largest proportion of them – 371 cases (17 % of all) is formed by people from German countries, for which the Austrian Trinitarians felt particularly responsible, too. Of course, the common belonging to the legal commonwealth of the Holy Roman Empire, which involved a special responsibility on the part of the Emperors for all of its inhabitants, played an important role here. The second largest group of freed subjects from territories not under direct Habsburg rule, 96 persons (about 5 %), were Italians, stemming particularly from Venice, Geneva and the Papacy. People from this category, like the “Austrian Italians” mentioned above, were mainly freed by the Austrian Trinitarians during the period after 1741.

But the Austrian Trinitarians also freed a considerable number of persons from other, more distant regions. Most Western Europeans freed by the Austrian Trinitarians were Spaniards (44 documented cases for the whole period, 2 %), which points to the traditional political relations

between both reigns as well as at the bonds of the Austrian Trinitarians with the Iberian Peninsula, where the order's reformed, discalced congregation was founded at the end of the 16th century.²⁹ The Austrian *patres redemptores* also engaged in liberating people from outside Habsburg-ruled Central and Eastern European countries, which – apart from Poland – lacked their 'own' settlements of the Trinitarian order to perform this task. Still, most Eastern Europeans ransomed by them were characterized as being from “Poland” (49 persons or 2 %), but one has to bear in mind that this notion can indicate the very vast region of the whole Polish-Lithuanian kingdom. Moreover, there was a very close cooperation between the Austrian and the Polish branch of the Trinitarians, particularly during the late 17th and early 18th century.³⁰ Indeed, most freeing of Polish people by the Austrian order's organization fell into this early stage of its activity in Eastern and South Eastern Europe. Interestingly, the number of “Russians” freed by them was, with more than 20 persons, considerable, too, and even some – very probably Protestant – Scandinavians over the years were rescued by this kind of Catholic charity. At first it may be surprising that for another not too small number of freed Christians “home-countries” within the Ottoman Empire or the “Tartar” were stated within the catalogues (the relevant regions mentioned were: Bosnia, Bulgaria, Constantinople, Greece, Moldavia, Serbia, Turkey, Walachia): In nearly all of this cases, this relates to children of foreigners born there in captivity. Finally, we find exceptional single cases like a Catholic clergyman formerly living in Hungary, but born in Persia, a 14-year old Georgian boy, and a former galley-slave with an Italian name, said to be originating from “America”, who were all helped to freedom by the Austrian Trinitarians too.

All in all, the information on the fatherlands of the freed people show that the Austrian Trinitarians of 18th century were far from performing a “national” task only in their charitable work of redemption, but – according to the postulates of Catholicism - acted with respect to the international community of Christianity. This is also manifest in the fact that the Trinitarians did not at all confine themselves to ransoming members of the Catholic Church, but exerted their activities also for the redemption of Protestant and Orthodox Christians. Indeed, they placed a special emphasis on the liberation of “heretics”, of course linked with the aim of converting them to the “true Christian belief”, to Catholicism.³¹

²⁹ Cf. d'Errico, *The Trinitarians*, p. 159-174, also: Juan Pujana, *Hl. Johannes Baptist von der Empfängnis. Reformator des Ordens der Allerheiligsten Dreifaltigkeit*, Rom 1975.

³⁰ Cf. Joannes a S. Felice, *Annales*, Pauli, *Befreiung*, p. 366.

³¹ The confession – most of the captives were of course of catholic faith – usually is not mentioned for single captives within the catalogues, but the topic is displayed in lengthier publications, such as: Joannes a San Felice, *Triumphus Misericordiae, id est Sacrum Ordinis SSS. Trinitatis Institutum Redemptio Captivorum, cum Adjuncto Calendario Ecclesiastico Historico Universi Ordinis*, Wien 1704, p. 158.

As already mentioned, the *catalogi captivorum* also allow us to classify the redeemed persons concerning their professions and social status. Yet relevant data is available only for 917 out of 2228 cases, as the pertinent indications are often missing, and particularly women are nearly never classified in this regard. Thus, for only 21 out of 410 women are any indications given here apart from the eventual status as "wives" (19 of those cases pertain to "settlers" at the Austrian-Ottoman border region), but regarding the men redeemed, for 896 out of 1812 some remark on professional or social status was made. Taking only the male persons into further account, for which a more detailed statistical analysis makes sense in this case, one finds the military personnel dominating clearly in both periods, the soldiers and officers together summing up to 689 (77 % of 896 known cases, see table 3).

Table 3: Status and profession indications for the captives liberated by the Austrian Trinitarians 1700-1783 – men according to phase of redemption

status indication	1700-1741		1747-1783		1700-1783	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
without indication	413	34,6	503	55,5	916	50,6
with specific indication	493	65,4	403	44,5	896	49,4
total (valid cases)	906	100	906	100	1812	100
<i>among them:</i>						
nobility	2	0,4	2	0,5	4	0,4
clergymen	2	0,4	10	2,5	12	1,3
officers in military	20	4,1	12	3,0	32	3,
soldiers	457	92,7	200	49,6	657	73,3
naval captains	0	--	17	4,2	17	1,9
seamen (mil. or civic)	1	0,2	93	23,1	94	10,5
tradesmen	1	0,2	23	5,7	24	2,7
servants, employees	5	1,0	6	1,5	11	1,2
handicraftsmen	5	1,0	33	8,2	38	4,2
border settlers	0	--	7	1,7	7	0,8

The second largest group is made up of the seamen and captains, together 111 persons or 12 %. Compared to that, only small numbers of identified professions relate to “civil” activities, like handicraftsmen, tradesmen and servants. Still, it has to be said that an indication of profession is

lacking in more than the half of all cases (1311 of 2228 altogether), and it seems quite obvious that the person's belonging to some military unit was seen as more important and thus was more frequently noted than membership of a civil profession. In particular, very simple occupations were not listed in the catalogues at all (if not exercising military or navy professions). Therefore, all that can be said for certain is that at least 31 % of all male persons (those with and those without status indication) in the lists stemmed from the military, and at least 6 % from the navy. In any case military and navy staff formed a huge proportion of all persons freed – nearly 40 % – the rest being civilians of various professions.

Another aspect of interest is the duration of captivity. In this case, data is available for 1985 out of 2228 cases (89 %). Because of its nature as a metric variable (at least principally), arithmetic averages can be computed in this case. The rounded results are 10 years and 3 months as mean duration of captivity for the whole period of 1700-1783, and 12 years 6 months and 7 years 5 months for the two part-periods respectively. Therefore, within the second half of the 18th century, people were liberated much earlier on average.

As the catalogues provide data for the area where these persons were ransomed, too – at least for a considerable number, 1391 out of the 2228 cases (62 %) documented at all –, we are also informed about the probable place of their captivity, although it can not, of course, be assumed, that in any case these people were held captive at the same place for all the time they stayed after arriving at their 'destination' – and particularly not for those who remained slaves for decades. A classification, which refers to the political entities of the Ottoman Empire, its vassal states Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli, the Sultanate of Morocco (with Salé) and Tatar, shows that the Ottoman Empire was, as could be expected, by far the most important area (see table 4):

Table 4: Persons liberated by the Austrian Trinitarians according to region and phase

Region	1700-1741		1747-1783		1700-1783	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ottoman Empire	364	61,7	411	51,3	775	55,7
Tatary	222	37,6	9	1,1	231	16,6
Algiers and Maschera	4	0,7	323	40,3	327	23,5
Tunis and Tripolis	--	--	42	5,2	42	3,0
Morocco and Salé	--	--	16	2,0	16	1,2
Total	590	100	801	100	1391	100

775 captives, that is 56 % of all accountable cases, were liberated somewhere within the Ottoman Empire; the second important 'market' for ransoming Christians from Central and – as we saw earlier – Southern Europe obviously was Algiers. From the city of Algiers or, in a minority of cases, from the town of Mascara, 327 people were redeemed (24 % of the known cases). This area is followed in importance by the Tatar region, from which 231 men and women were saved by the Austrian Trinitarians (17 %). Only small numbers of captives were freed in the other mentioned states, summing up to 58 persons (4 %). From those redeemed in the Ottoman Empire, nearly 6 tenths were bought (or exchanged) in the capital Constantinople (456 persons), whilst the remainder divides quite equally over three areas: the cities of Salonika and Smyrna (120 persons together), the rest of South East-Europe (94), and Minor Asia (105). Therefore, the urban 'hotspots' of the slave trade within the Ottoman Empire become quite visible here.

Another very interesting result can be observed, again, if we differentiate between the earlier and the later parts of the 18th century. While the figures for the Ottoman Empire itself remain quite stable, diminishing to some degree from the first to the second period (from a proportion of 62 % to one of 51 %), the change is striking for the Tatar and Barbary regions: Northern Africa played virtually no role as a destination for the Austrian Trinitarians up to 1741, whilst the Tatar region was a very important destination, and 38 % of the documented freed persons in the period 1700-1741 were liberated there. The picture is completely reversed during the period from the 1740s onwards: Now, the numbers of redeemed from Tatar tend towards zero, but there are hundreds of cases of redemption in Northern Africa, mostly in Algiers, accounting for nearly half of all persons ransomed during these later stages.

Of course, all the variables discussed here, derived from the catalogues of redeemed, can be analyzed not only separately, but also regarding the combinations that can be found between them. Here we confine ourselves to the aspect of ransoms paid for the captives. First of all one can compute the average ransom paid for one individual across all redemptions using the specific data on this issue, which is 397 fl.³² Since a minor part of the expenses obviously did not constitute full ransom prices – which one can deduce from the expression "helped with ... [amount of money]" instead of "redeemed with ... [amount of money]", it is more significant to separate these two categories, which leads to the result of an average ransom of 498 fl., whilst the subsidies for those

³² To make the display of average 'prices' more readable, the calculated numbers are rounded up or down to full florins, omitting fractions or values to be given in *Kreuzer*. To give an understanding of the values of money presented here, some comparison may be useful: A qualified handicraftsman earned about a third of an Austrian florin per working day during the first half of the 18th century. Therefore, he may have got an annual wage (in money and/or goods) about 50 to 100 fl. per year. Until the 1780s, prizes and wages rose somewhat, but not to a large extent.

who obviously already had saved some money on their own during captivity to buy themselves free was 111 fl. in average.

Still, impressive differences appear, if one compares different socio-demographic categories of redeemed captives, too. Taking only the cases in which the full amount of ransom was noted by the Trinitarians, it can be seen, for example, that there was a significant gender bias, with women 'costing' on average 244 fl., and thus being much 'cheaper' than men, for whom a mean price of 539 fl. had to be paid. Prices also varied a lot according to the age of the ransomed at the time, as can be seen in the table below:

Table 5: Average prices paid by the Austrian Trinitarians according to age of captives (1700-1783, only full ransoms included)

Age class	N	mean price	Age class	N	mean price
up to 9	127	214 fl.	50 to 59	139	479 fl.
10 to 19	55	315 fl.	60 to 69	499	304 fl.
20 to 29	223	543 fl.	70 to 79	15	297 fl.
30 to 39	269	564 fl.	80 and more	4	366 fl.
40 to 49	258	494 fl.	total	1139	467 fl.

Men and, less frequently, women, 'in their prime' – namely adults between about 20 and 40 years – obviously were rated most valuable on average, be it in regard to their workforce value or to other personal features related to age, such as attractiveness, whilst older captives as well as children and teenagers were – again, of course, in mean – considered less valuable. The very low figures for children under 10 are particularly noteworthy.

Moreover it can, of course, be shown, that the social status of the slaves played a major role in determining their 'prices'. Yet the social rank was not the only element of price-calculation, but also the practical and economic value the Muslim owners could derive from the workforce of their captives, which obviously contributed a lot as well. Only by this assumption can one explain why Christian ex-soldiers were, on average, 'for sale' much more cheaply than handicraftsmen. The particular need of skilled workers in Northern Africa is even reported in contemporary publications: Whilst a person characterized as handicraftsmen – and therefore probably also skilled as such – represented an average selling value of not less than 887 fl., an 'ordinary' soldier or seamen could be bought free with a mean ransom of ca. 420-430 fl., that is, less than half the money. Servants,

employees and rural settlers were not very expensive either – the mean ransom for such persons was about 460 fl. Apparently because of their social status within Christian societies, higher prices had to be paid for redeeming clergymen, the mean ransom for priests and monks being 578 fl., which clearly did not reach up to that of the skilled manual workers mentioned already. Still, high military value and/or secular social rank and wealth was taken into account by the Muslim sellers of the captives, as naval captains and military officers, but also noblemen and tradesmen were among those professional classes rated highest in ransom, which on average was fixed at more than 700 fl. for a person belonging to one of these groups, and even above 1000 fl. mean for the rare cases of captured army officers and noblemen registered in this sample.

Similarly large differences in ransom amounts are to be found, if regional variances are taken into account, regarding the places where the captives were bought back. As can be seen in the table below, prizes for Christian slaves were much higher in Northern Africa than in the Ottoman Empire itself, and liberating captives from the Tataria was comparatively cheap, too.

Table 6: Average prices of persons liberated by the Austrian Trinitarians, according to the region of ransoming activity (only full ransoms included)³³

Region	1700 - 1741		1747 - 1783		1700 - 1783	
	N	mean prize	N	mean prize	N	mean prize
Constantinople *	142	404 fl.	84	391 fl.	226	399 fl.
Ottoman Empire (rest)	91	221 fl.	114	375 fl.	205	306 fl.
Tartary	212	209 fl.	7	447 fl.	219	217 fl.
Tunis and Tripolis	--	----	27	397 fl.	27	397 fl.
Algiers and Mascara	4	948 fl.	315	944 fl.	319	944 fl.
Morocco and Salé	--	----	16	2512 fl. (!)	16	2512 fl. (!)
Total	449	280 fl.	563	759 fl.	1012	546 fl.

Particularly within the states of Algiers, Morocco and Salé, ransoms reached multiples of those asked for in Constantinople or other cities under direct Ottoman rule. This is true for the entire 18th century, but in the first half of the century the activities of the Austrian Trinitarians within the Barbary States were marginal, if numbers of freed are considered, and started only around the middle of the century. Another interesting point is that costs for redemption in the Eastern Barbary

³³ The category Constantinople in the table includes some cases where we cannot decide whether the redemption took place in Constantinople or in Adrianople.

States, Tunis and Tripoli, were much lower, and similar to those usually paid in the Ottoman Empire. The reasons for this are unclear, but the high sums that had to be paid by the Trinitarians for liberating Christians in Algiers for certain are - at least partially - caused by the fact that its economy to a high degree relied upon slave-work and slave-trade.³⁴ Moreover, the fact that slaves could hardly escape from the Barbary Coast, whilst there was at least a small chance for those in the Ottoman Empire, especially in the Balkans, could have influenced the level of the prizes, and it is important to see that in the Western North African states, Algeria and Morocco, the slave traders used to demand much higher prices due to the fact, that most of the captives there were French and Spanish, and thus from relatively wealthy states which, even more importantly, had a strong tradition of redeeming their enslaved compatriots.

The enormous sums that were necessary to buy all the captives were sponsored not least by the Aristocracy of the Habsburg Monarchy, particularly during the second half of the 18th century. From 1700 to 1740 between a fifth and a quarter of the ransom sums specified in the surviving catalogues stemmed from either "alms of the province", from foundations from aristocrats or from the emperor himself (private, court or state budget), and the rest, nearly a third, from "means of the order" not further detailed. But within the second half of the 18th century, more than half of the money spent for redemption purposes derived from charitable foundations established by the noble families Savoy-Liechtenstein, Batthyány, Christalnig, Decorei, Harrach, Kohary, Nemay, Rottal, Spork, Szeszeny, Szirmay, Thauszy, Zadolsky and Zichy.³⁵

From the capital rents (!) donated by those high-ranking aristocrats more than 250.000 florins went towards the liberation activities of the Trinitarian order. This was about half of the total sum spent within the period 1747-1783, which is fully documented. Compared to that, the 54.000 florins given by the Court and the State authorities for redemption purposes, seem modest, and are exceeded twice over by the sum of more than 140.000 fl. that the Austrian Trinitarians had gained as "alms of the province", that is, as results of the collecting activities regularly performed within the Habsburg Empire, but also the parts of the Holy Roman Empire outside Hapsburg rule. Therefore, nearly one third of the money that was used for the liberation of captives was donated by people from various social strata, probably excluding only the very poor due to their straitened circumstances, and the noblest aristocrats, who preferred establishing these particular foundations with large amounts of capital, which represented their wealth, prestige and 'mercy'.

³⁴ Cf. Davies, *Christian Slaves*.

³⁵ Cf. the *catalogi redemptorum*, where these foundations are indicated.



Trattato delle miserie che patiscono i Fedeli Christiani Schiavi de' Barbari, Rome, 1647

Résumé

The Trinitarians, a catholic mendicant order founded in the middle ages, played an important role in the field of Christian-Muslim relations until the late 18th century by engaging in ransoming and exchanging Christian captives from Muslim-ruled countries. The Austrian branch of the Trinitarians, belonging to the Spanish Discalced Congregation, was active mainly in the Black Sea region and the Ottoman Empire very quickly after its foundation in 1688, trying to liberate and bring home some of the tens of thousands unfortunate victims of the manhunts conducted by the Turkish and Tataric forces during the 'Great Turkish War' from 1683 to 1699, the Habsburg-Ottoman wars of 1714-18 and 1736-39, but also the periods of formal peace in between, for the purpose of requisition of slaves. After the 1740es, when there were no larger violent conflicts at the southern and eastern border of the Austrian monarchy, and thus numbers of captives to be ransomed diminished within the Ottoman Empire and the Tatar, the Austrian Trinitarians increasingly

occupied themselves with freeing Habsburg subordinates, who had fallen victims to piracy by the 'Barbary states' in the western Mediterranean, too.

With the help of so-called *catalogi redeptorum*, lists of freed persons, we were able to reconstruct the fundamental sociodemographic features of a majority of those people bought free or exchanged by the Austrian Trinitarian order during the 18th century, and presented some basic outcomes of our research above (whilst a broader display of results will be delivered soon in a monographic publication). The typical liberated person was male - more than 80 % - and adult, but not aged; more than 80 % were between 20 and 59 years old. Interestingly an examination of the indication of home-countries, given in the catalogues, shows that not by far all of the liberated stemmed from the Austrian Habsburg Monarchy, as could have been expected maybe. Only slightly more than the half of the liberated captives stemmed from its core lands – the Austrian hereditary states, the Bohemian and Hungarian crown lands – altogether. Germans from not Habsburg-ruled parts of the Holy Roman Empire played an important role, too, counting up to nearly a fifth of all documented cases of liberated captives. This is quite explicable, as the Austrian Trinitarians regularly collected alms within the "Reich", too, and therefore of course, there was a special obligation to free also people from these regions. Further 10 % of the freed were subordinates of the Habsburgs, but originated from their Italian possessions. Still, the Austrian Trinitarians obviously felt responsible for them, too. And, finally, more than 10 % of the freed persons were from regions not legally linked towards the Habsburg dynasty at all. This shows clearly that political borders did play a role for the charitable activity of the Trinitarians, but not a rigidly excluding one. Even confessional belonging to the Catholic Church was a renounceable criterion, which is documented by dozens of individuals stemming from definitively 'heretic' or 'schismatic' parts of Europe, like Scandinavia or Russia. Contemporary writings from members of the order in Austria, like the *Annales Provinciae* and the *Triumphus Misericordiae* of P. Joannes a San Felice, clearly confirm this point, too. One hoped for the conversion of those fellow Christians towards 'only true' Catholicism, of course, but the patres redemptores did not treat a conversion as precondition for being redeemed – as long as the person was Christian at all – but rather hoped for the later insight of these people into the spiritual superiority of a confession being that devoted to mercy and charity towards the nearest.

Of course, the social and professional status of the liberated Christians would be of high interest, too; yet information on this area is far less complete. Anyhow, it is evident that people from all social strata are represented among them. Little surprisingly, members of the military and the – civic or armed – navy play a particular important role, counting up to at least about 40 % of all

captives liberated. Among those professions explicitly indicated in the sources, one moreover finds tradesmen, handicraftsmen and servants, and a few people can clearly be identified as members of the Austrian (respectively Hungarian) nobility. Apart from the latter, those characteristics are almost exclusively given for the male proportion of the freed.

In average, they had to wait for more than 10 years for their liberation, although there are unfortunate individuals, who were rescued only after several decades of slavery abroad. More than half of the men, women and children ransomed by the Austrian Trinitarians during 18th century, and documented in the surviving *catalogi redemptorum*, were bought or exchanged within the Ottoman Empire, but Algiers was an important place for redemption, too, even if nearly exclusively after 1740/41, and every sixth of the captives was located in the Tataric ruled regions at the Black sea.

Prices, which frequently were noted, too, of course vary according to the sociodemographic characteristics already mentioned. Interestingly, women were, in average, considerably 'cheaper' than men. Less surprising is the fact, that adults between 20 and 40, again of course in average, were more 'expensive' than younger and older people, who could not be used that intensely for work. Regarding the stated professions, the mean ransom was the highest for handicraftsmen, whilst soldiers and seamen could be bought free for only half of the money each. But ransom heights also varied distinctly between various regions of the Muslim world, being most expensive in Northern Africa, particularly in Morocco, and comparingly low in the Ottoman Empire and the Tartary. As an overall average, ca. 500 imperial florins had to be paid for the ransom of one person (if only the data of full ransom numbers are taken into account). Prices for Christian captives of course had a certain tendency to rise during the time space 1700-1783, like all prices did, but there is no extraordinary increase to be seen at a general level.

Of course, the Trinitarian friars had to raise their financial means for the ransoming activities, before conducting them, and the sources examined here often also refer to this aspect, reporting separately donations by the state and the court, particular foundations established by the high nobility, and funds gained by the common alms collection. It may be seen as a remarkable feature of early modern European society that enormous amounts of money were donated for charitable purposes – among them the one of the ransom of captives, and that not only those – who could afford it easily, did contribute to the achievement of this aim, but also a vast number of 'common people'. Altogether, the enormous amount of more than 1.000.000 florins was spent by the Trinitarian order between 1690 and 1783 for the redemption of nearly 4.000 human beings.