

## **Inventing a War. In Search of the Concept of the Last Austro-Turkish War over the Balkans (1788–1791)**

*Yevhen Horb*

Institute for Human Sciences, Austria/  
Center for Urban History, Ukraine  
e-mail: [eshorb14@gmail.com](mailto:eshorb14@gmail.com)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-9782-9194

### **Abstract**

The Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 was one of the failed attempts by the Austrians to “reconquer” the Balkans. Probably for this reason, this military conflict is still awaiting a monographic interpretation both in American/European and Turkish historiography. For two centuries now, historians have been searching for the concept of the last Austro-Turkish War over the Balkans, and the present article is one of the first attempts to characterize the problems researchers face when they take up this issue. The article also outlines promising directions for further studies.

### **Keywords**

Austro-Turkish War (1788–1791), Dubica war, Military Frontier, Eurocentrism, historiography, historical geography

### **Introduction**

The last Austro-Turkish War represents a major gap in modern military historiography. This fact could be explained by the decline of traditional military historical studies and their shift to the field of the so-called “new military history.” However, as will be shown below, this has not been the case. Active interpretation

of the problems of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 slowed down around the middle of the 20th century; afterward, only a few separate research theses emerged. This indicates a crisis in the problem’s conceptualization rather than a loss of interest in the issue. The aforementioned crisis, in turn, stems from the crisis in the search for new sources and in the interpretation of those that are already known.

The Austro-Turkish confrontation in the late 18th century erupted when the whole world turned its attention to France. It was, after all, the time of the French Revolution and the resulting wars. We believe that the historiography of all the conflicts that took place prior to the fall of Napoleon suffers, in one way or another, from Francocentrism. Since the Holy Roman Empire’s last war against the Ottomans started at the beginning of the aforementioned period of revolutionary wars, the Austro-Turkish War appears to be in the “historiographical shadow,” i.e., on the margins of military historiography. This research field consists of a series of almost clichéd studies that follow the same pattern, duplicating each other, and are dependent on the factually rich overviews of the hostilities carried out by the imperial army in all theaters of war published in the 19th century by German historians. All serious studies on the subject took those overviews into account. The researchers drew not only facts from them but also the very pattern of presenting and assessing the events.

If the history of the European wars in the late 18th and early 19th centuries can be characterized as Francocentric, the history of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 can be described as Austrocentric. The same is true of most of the studies concerned with the problems of military and political conflicts between the East and the West written by European and American historians. The present article is an attempt to revise this tradition of Austrocentrism and proposes new directions of research that would “revive” the military historical studies of the last Austro-Turkish War. To achieve this goal, we need to address the issue of the terminology, analyze the current state of knowledge in this field and its source base, as well as identify new and promising lines of research. It is noteworthy that the article is not an overview of historiography and sources in the traditional sense but rather an attempt – although not the first one – to introduce the reader to this topic.

Already in 1983, the *Austrian History Yearbook* published an article by Paul P. Bernard, a researcher of the Joseph II era, which, judging by its title, qualifies as an attempt to conceptualize the problems of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791.<sup>1</sup> Bernard himself favored the works of Karl A. Roeder Jr., describing them as the very first reliable studies of the eastern policy pursued by Joseph II and of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 in particular. We will refer to Roeder’s work at a later point. As for Bernard’s article, ambitiously subtitled “Some Further Thoughts,” it was another overly generalized and selective overview of the history of the last Austro-Turkish War, which did not go beyond summarizing the recent (at that time) literature on the topic.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul P. Bernard, “Austria’s Last Turkish War. Some Further Thoughts,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 19 (1) (1983), 15–31.

The American historian also outlined a number of aspects of the history of the war that required further research. Thus, Bernard's overview was not much more than a kind of guide to help familiarize oneself with the subject.

### The Problem of Definition

Discussions about the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 begin already at the definition stage since the name of the interstate conflict we used at the beginning of the article is not universally recognized. A good example of this is the variation in how this conflict is called in different language versions of Wikipedia, the popular online encyclopedia, which, no matter whether we like it or not, is for many people the first step in learning about any topic. Those wishing to obtain a more or less unbiased understanding of the course of the Austro-Turkish confrontation of the late 18th century can refer to the German or Turkish Wikipedia articles as well as the better-known English one. All three provide three different names and dates of the conflict: the Russo-Austro-Turkish War of 1787–1792 (the German version),<sup>2</sup> the Ottoman-Austrian War of 1787–1791 (the Turkish version),<sup>3</sup> and the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 (the English version).<sup>4</sup>

The problem that immediately arises concerns determining the timeframe of the war and the advisability of considering the Russo-Turkish and the Austro-Turkish conflicts as a single conflict. On the one hand, the answer to this question is obvious: the Russian Empire and the Holy Roman Empire were allies in the war against the Ottomans; thus, these two conflicts can be considered one war. However, in the course of the confrontation, the allies could not agree about the expected results of the war and began separate negotiations with the enemy; as a result, the Holy Roman Empire ended the war a few months earlier than Russia, which was still actively engaged in hostilities. Moreover, Emperor Joseph II started the war against the Ottomans in February 1788, later than the Russians did; thus, we are dealing with two separate military conflicts. The designation “Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791” appears more appropriate in the light of the research presented here. However, let us emphasize again that it is not universally recognized. The use of alternative names, such as “the Habsburg-Ottoman War,” does not seem justifiable to us, as it is an example of the outdated dynastic

<sup>2</sup> Wikipedia, *Russisch-Österreichischer Türkenkrieg (1787–1792)*, [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russisch-%C3%96sterreichischer\\_T%C3%BCrkenkrieg\\_\(1787%E2%80%931792\)](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russisch-%C3%96sterreichischer_T%C3%BCrkenkrieg_(1787%E2%80%931792)) [accessed June 27, 2022].

<sup>3</sup> Wikipedia, *1787–1791 Osmanlı-Avusturya Savaşı*, [https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/1787-1791\\_Osmanl%C4%B1-Avusturya\\_Sava%C5%9F%C4%B1](https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/1787-1791_Osmanl%C4%B1-Avusturya_Sava%C5%9F%C4%B1) [accessed June 27, 2022].

<sup>4</sup> Wikipedia, *Austro-Turkish War (1788–1791)*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Turkish\\_War\\_\(1788%E2%80%931791\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Turkish_War_(1788%E2%80%931791)) [accessed June 27, 2022].

approach to historiography. The chaos in the definitions present in the popular online encyclopedia reflects the corresponding chaos in the scientific literature on the subject.

The most widespread definition in modern historical science calls the war of 1788–1791 “the last Turkish war,” which is a term suggested by Austrian researchers, particularly by the already-mentioned Karl A. Roider Jr.<sup>5</sup> This approach is the result of the “monopolization” of the conflict in national historiography. The name “the last Turkish war” suggests that we are only talking about the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 since it was indeed the last war for Austria, as opposed to Russia, which experienced four more wars with the Ottoman Empire (not counting the events on the Caucasian frontline during World War I). At the same time, Russian historiography, both modern and of the imperial era, considers the hostilities between the imperial army and the Ottomans in the Balkans as part of the Russo-Turkish War of 1787–1792. Shortly after its conclusion, it was called “Catherine the Great’s second Turkish war,” which was an early example of the “monopolization” of the war by national historiography.<sup>6</sup>

Not so widespread, though no less illustrative, example of such a “monopolization” is the term “Dubica war” used by Croatian and Bosnian scholars in reference to the events of 1788–1792. This designation is associated with the Austro-Turkish fighting for the fortress of Dubica (now Kozarska Dubica in Bosnia and Herzegovina), which took place mainly in 1788. These fierce battles were only an episode in the three-year war. Nevertheless, historians in some Balkan countries applied the name “Dubica war” to the entire war of 1788–1791,<sup>7</sup> although this approach has been limited to their local historiographies.

### The State of Research and Historiographical Clichés

In this article, we will not analyze in detail the entire historiography of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791, as this subject requires a separate study. However, it is worth mentioning a few works that have become milestones in expanding our knowledge of the Holy Roman Empire’s last Turkish war. They are not very numerous.

Oskar Criste, an Austrian military historian from the early 20th century, was one of the first scholars to propose a comprehensive overview of the campaign conducted by the troops of the Holy Roman Empire in the Balkans between 1788 and 1791.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Karl A. Roider Jr., *Austria’s Eastern Question, 1700–1790*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982, 169.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, the two-volume monograph by Russian military historian Andrey Petrov, on which the subsequent Russian historiography of the issue relies: Andrey Petrov, *Vtoraâ tureckââ vojna v carstovovanie imperatricy Ekateriny II 1787–1791 g.*, Vols. 1–2, Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiâ N. Golike, 1880.

<sup>7</sup> It is used nowadays, too. See, for example, Elma Korić, “Bosansko pograničje u vrijeme Dubičkog rata 1788–1791,” *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 65 (2016), 213–37.

<sup>8</sup> Oskar Criste, *Kriege unter Kaiser Josef II*, Wien: L.W. Seidel, 1904.

His work was a kind of general summary of the documents published in the late 19th century in the Austrian chronicle *Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift* on the basis of materials from Viennese archives. However, Criste still followed the pattern of analyzing the course of the war according to the territorial principle, i.e., in relation to particular army corps, such as the Croatian or Slavonian army corps, the Main Army, etc. This approach was used by the press of the late 18th century, which informed its readers of the successes of the Austrian army on the Turkish front, as well as by the first compilers who declared that they were creating an “unbiased” history of the Turkish War fought by Joseph II.

In addition to Criste’s contribution, it is impossible not to mention the earlier work of Franz Vaníček, who specialized in the history of the so-called Military Frontier. When presenting the events of the Austro-Turkish War, he devoted much attention to analyzing the participation of the border troops of the imperial army in the conflict.<sup>9</sup> Despite being rich in facts and drawing on materials from the Viennese archives, Criste’s and Vaníček’s works have one major flaw, characteristic of all European and American historiography: the Ottoman side is deprived of its “voice.” In the publications of many scholars, there are only “faceless” Ottomans, with no information given about their numbers, organization, or names of commanders. We will consider this peculiarity in more detail when talking about the problem of the focus of the studies concerned with the last Austro-Turkish War.

Another important step in studying the problem from the perspective of the analysis of hostilities was a series of articles by Hungarian researcher István Rédvay, published on the eve of and during World War II.<sup>10</sup> Rédvay’s studies provided an overview of the 1778 military campaign in accordance with the territorial principle. The historian based his research on documents from Austrian and Hungarian archives and paid special attention to Hungarian participation in the war. In our opinion, Rédvay’s works are the most significant and, at the same time, underestimated contribution to the topic of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791. Today, he is hardly mentioned even by the experts in this field. It seems that his studies, published between 1939 and 1943, became “victims” of World War II.

The most recent overviews of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 include works by Karl A. Roider Jr.,<sup>11</sup> Matthew Z. Mayer,<sup>12</sup> and the no less important publication by

<sup>9</sup> Franz Vaníček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze. Aus Originalquellen und Quellenwerken geschöpft*, Vol. 3, Wien: Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1875.

<sup>10</sup> István Rédvay, “Az erdélyi szorosok védelme 1788-ban,” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 40 (1) (1939), 229–57; idem, “II. József török háborúja (1788–1790). (Első közlemény),” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 43 (1) (1942), 1–28; idem, “II. József török háborúja (1788–1790). (Második közlemény),” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 43 (1) (1942), 179–200; idem, “II. József török háborúja (1788–1790). (Harmadik közlemény),” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 44 (1–2) (1943), 1–34.

<sup>11</sup> Roider Jr., *Austria’s Eastern Question*, 169–88.

<sup>12</sup> Matthew Z. Mayer, *Joseph II and the Campaign of 1788 against the Ottoman Turks*, Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 2000; idem, *Joseph II and the Austro-Ottoman War, 1788–1791*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Michael Hochedlinger.<sup>13</sup> The first two historians present the events (mainly those on the diplomatic front) through the prism of actions carried out by certain personalities of the Austrian political scene of the late 18th century, such as Wenzel Anton, Prince of Kaunitz-Rietberg, and Emperor Joseph II. Hochedlinger's synthesis, on the other hand, also includes a general overview of the scientific literature on the topic, which, however, omits much of the historiographical contribution of the 19th–20th centuries.<sup>14</sup> All three authors simplify the events considerably and pay too much attention to the diplomatic vicissitudes of the Austro-Turkish War. Again, the Ottoman side is “deprived of its voice,” which is characteristic of European historiography in general. Paul P. Bernard tried to draw attention to this already in the 1980s, writing about “the silence of the Balkans.”<sup>15</sup> However, his call was not heard by historians.

A similar approach is observed in modern Turkish historiography of the conflict. The situation is complicated by the fact that Turkish historical science has traditionally been isolated. It would not be an exaggeration to say that Turkish researchers are captivated by sources from Ottoman archives and depend solely on the contributions of the previous generations of scholars, in particular on the fundamental works of Ahmed Cevdet Pasha. Cevdet's *Tarih* (History) was based on the sultan's archives and the works of chroniclers who had preceded him as the court historiographer. In terms of methodology, Cevdet did not go much beyond traditional Ottoman chronicles, but the factual abundance of his work is impressive. This potential is actively exploited by Turkish historiography, and Cevdet's work is nowadays the cornerstone of any study of Turkish history in the period between 1774 and 1826. The historian had access to contemporary European sources but used them only marginally.<sup>16</sup> It is a paradox that the situation has not changed since he published his work a century and a half ago: even today, Turkish historiography is characterized by isolation from global historical science, lack of criticism of sources, and schematism.

When we use the phrase “Turkish historiography,” we refer only to the research conducted in modern Turkey. It does not apply to Ottoman studies, which are developing in research and university centers in Europe and the United States.<sup>17</sup> In the 1970s, another work appeared that was of great importance to Turkish historiography as a whole. This was the multi-volume *Osmanlı Tarihi* (Ottoman history) by İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, which was essentially a compilation of all the achievements of Turkish historiography, abounding with facts from the sources in Ottoman

<sup>13</sup> Michael Hochedlinger, *Austria's Wars of Emergence, 1683–1797*, London: Routledge, 2016, 382–6.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*, 397.

<sup>15</sup> Bernard, “Austria's Last Turkish War,” 15.

<sup>16</sup> Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Târîh-i Cevdet*, Vol. 2, İstanbul: Sabah, 1972.

<sup>17</sup> For a clear differentiation between Turkish historical science and foreign Ottoman studies, see, for example, Robert Zens, “Turkish Historiography in the United States,” *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 8 (15) (2010), 149–77.

archives.<sup>18</sup> The overall poor quality of research on the course of the Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 in Turkish historiography persists to this day: only one scientific interpretation of the topic has been written so far. It is Serhat Kuzucu’s unpublished dissertation, which uses the term “Ottoman-Russian war.”<sup>19</sup> Kuzucu focused on the Russian front of the war and described it very thoroughly, mainly because he drew on old Russian imperial historiography to do it. As for the confrontation with the Austrians, the historian never went beyond the “canons” of the national historiography, remaining faithful to the Istanbul archives and sticking to a specific set of sources, which we will discuss below.

### The Problem of Sources and Focus

The overview of key works in the field of studies of the last Austro-Turkish War presented above gives us an opportunity to point out similar weaknesses of both American/European and Turkish historiography: the focus on only one side of the conflict, with no exceptions to this tendency so far. This state of affairs is due to the specificity of the source base that constitutes the background of the research on the subject. We are referring here to the so-called “native archives,” beyond which the researchers do not go.

The main obstacle for European researchers who want to study Turkish archival sources of the Ottoman era is the fact that the latter are written in the Ottoman language. Translations of Ottoman sources into modern languages are not published even in Turkey. The practice that has become widespread is the publishing of texts transliterated into the Latin alphabet. However, it does not solve the problem of difficulties in using those sources. Turkish historical science, in turn, has facilitated the publication of texts from Ottoman sources from the late 18th century due to the practice of preparing dissertations on particular historical or literary events. Studies of this kind are regularly published in Turkey.<sup>20</sup>

However, no matter how quickly translations of sources are published, it will not solve the problem of the informational potential of documents from Ottoman archives for the study of the last Austro-Turkish War since there were no regimental offices in the Ottoman army. Thus, war diaries, relays, current orders of commanders, and other documents created in the Ottoman camp have not survived to the present day.

<sup>18</sup> İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, Vol. 5.6, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995.

<sup>19</sup> Serhat Kuzucu, *1787–1792 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı*, Elazığ: Fırat Üniversitesi, 2012.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, Ali Osman Çınar, *Mehmed Emin Edîb Efendi'nin Hayatı ve Târîhi*, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 1999; Ahmet Üstüner, *Yusuf Paşa'nın Sefernâmesi (Sefer-nâme-i Serdâr-ı Ekrem Yusuf Paşa)*, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2005; Ümmügülşüm Filiz Bayram, *Enverî Tarihi: III. Cilt (Metin ve Değerlendirme)*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2014.

Meanwhile, Austrian archives abound with similar documents from the imperial army. The problem of Austro- or Turkocentrism is thus explained by the state of the source base. Creating a comprehensive and unambiguous history of the Austro-Turkish War is impossible, but European scholars are simply obliged to use the informational potential contained in Ottoman sources in their research. In addition to historical narratives, these include documents of the sultan's chancellery (*hatt-i sharif* or *hatt-i humayun*), which are the first step for Turkish historians when they start researching any issue from the Ottoman era.

### Promising Directions and Conclusions

All the difficulties in studying the problem of the last Austro-Turkish War, which we have discussed above, have not prevented a number of researchers from formulating certain thematic directions in which the historiography of this issue can develop. These directions are largely concentrated in the field of local history and specialized historical disciplines. Recently, a pervasive surge of interest in particular aspects of the Austro-Turkish confrontation in the late 18th century can be seen in the historiography of the various Balkan states. Bernard's aforementioned statement about "the silence of the Balkans" is no longer true. Most likely, the situation will now take the opposite turn. The new promising directions include the study of the history of individual fortress cities during the war undertaken by Turkish historians,<sup>21</sup> the fate of Turkish captives,<sup>22</sup> the state of the destruction suffered by particular territories as a result of the war (e.g., Banat where fierce fighting took place),<sup>23</sup> the reception of the war in culture,<sup>24</sup> etc.

<sup>21</sup> Hakan Engin, *1787–1792 Osmanlı-Rus, Avusturya Harpleri Sirasinda İbrail Kalesi*, Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi, 2013; Cengiz Fedakâr, "1787–1792 Osmanlı-Avusturya, Rus Savaşları'nda Bender Kalesi," in *Prof. Dr. Erdoğan Merçil'e Armağan 75. Doğum Yılı*, İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2013, 383–93; idem, "Belgrad Kalesi'nin İşgali (1787–1792 Osmanlı-Avusturya, Rus Savaşlarında)," *History Studies* 11 (4) (2019), 1153–78.

<sup>22</sup> Lázár Balázs, "Turkish Captives in Hungary during Austria's Last Turkish War (1788–91)," *Hungarian Historical Review* 2 (2015), 418–44; idem, "Az ottomán hadifoglyokkal való bánásmódszabályozása II. József török háborúja (1788–1791)," in *Tanulmányok Pollmann Ferenc tiszteletére*, ed. Mihály Krámlí, Kálmán Mészáros, Budapest, 2019, 121–8; idem, "Ottomán hadifoglyok Szigetváron II. József török háborúja idején," *Az MTA PAB Hadiörténeti Munkabizottságának közleményei* 1 (1) (2020), 153–68.

<sup>23</sup> Costin Feneşan, "Pierderile Banatului in razboiul austro-turc din 1788–1789," *BANATICA* 30 (2020), 233–74.

<sup>24</sup> Matthew Head, "'In the Orient of Vienna': Mozart's 'Turkish' Music and the Theatrical Self," in *Ottoman Empire and European Theatre*, Vol. 1: *The Age of Mozart and Selim III (1756–1808)*, ed. Michael Hüttler, Hans Ernst Weidinger, Vienna: Hollitzer Verlag, 2013, 603–14; Reinhard Buchberger, "The Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 as Reflected in the Library of the Viennese Bibliophile Collector Max von Portheim," in *Ottoman Empire and European Theatre*, Vol. 2: *The Time of Joseph Haydn. From*

No less important are source studies on the informational potential of the periodicals from that time. A vivid example of this kind of research is a recent monograph by Polish author Małgorzata Karkocha.<sup>25</sup> Turkish researcher Hacer Topaktaş, in turn, has looked at the Eastern question during the Austro-Russo-Turkish conflict through the prism of Franciszek Piotr Potocki's embassy.<sup>26</sup>

In our opinion, one of the promising directions are historical geographical studies. On the one hand, they are needed because of the huge collection of cartographic materials preserved in European and Turkish archives, which include both general geographical maps from the late 18th century and maps (plans) of particular military operations, sieges of fortresses, and field battles. The informational potential of cartographic sources can match and sometimes even surpass that of historical narratives. There is already some progress in this direction.<sup>27</sup> It is impossible to ignore the problem of verifying historical and geographical nomenclature used in the sources from that period. Identification of a significant number of geographical names mentioned in Ottoman and Austrian sources poses obvious difficulties. The author of this article has mentioned some of them in his monograph about the military campaign of 1788.<sup>28</sup>

We deliberately tried to present the broadest panorama possible of the state and prospects of research on the problem of the history of the last Austro-Turkish War in order to precisely outline those areas that require the attention of modern researchers of the subject, not only historians but also linguists, cultural and literary scholars, and geographers. We still do not have a comprehensive overview of the hostilities of 1788–

---

*Sultan Mahmud I to Mahmud II (r.1730–1839)*, ed. Michael Hüttler, Hans Ernst Weidinger, Vienna: Holitzer Verlag, 2014, 231–54. See also particular sections of the project Mozart & Material Culture: 1788–1791: *Austro-Turkish War*, <https://mmc.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/entities/event/austro-turkish-war/> [accessed June 30, 2022]; *W. A. Mozart, Music for the Memorial to Field Marshall Gideon Laudon*, <https://mmc.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/souvenirs/souvenir-and-expression-in-mozarts-music/w-mozart-music-memorial-field-marshall-gideon-laudon/> [accessed June 30, 2022].

<sup>25</sup> Małgorzata Karkocha, *Flagrante bello. Wielka wojna wschodnia w relacjach prasy warszawskiej (1787–1792)*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2021.

<sup>26</sup> See the Polish edition of her research: Hacer Topaktaş, *Osmańsko-polskie stosunki dyplomatyczne. Poselstwo Franciszka Piotra Potockiego do Stambułu (1788–1793)*, Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas, 2017. The book is a Polish-language version of the study: Hacer Topaktaş, *Osmanlı-Lehistan Diplomatik İlişkileri. Franciszek Piotr Potocki'nin İstanbul Elçiliği (1788–1793)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014.

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Iva Salopek Bogavčić, “Prilog istraživanju ratnih događanja na gradiškom području tijekom rata 1788.–1791.,” *Scrinia Slavonica* 7 (1) (2007), 161–200; Korić, “Bosansko pogranje”; eadem, “Jedna osmanska karta osmansko-austrijskog razgraničenja na području sjeverozapadne Bosne po odredbama Svištovskog mira (1791),” in *Bosna i Hercegovina kroz historiju. Povodom 40 godina naučnog rada akademika Mithada Kozličića: zbornik radova*, ed. Elvira Islamović, Bihać–Tuzla: Naučno društvo za razvoj društvenih i humanističkih nauka Bihać, Naučno društvo pravnika Tuzla, 2021, 103–12; Dan Dumitru Iacob, “Un plan militar austriac din 1788 privitor la orașul Iași și imprejurmile sale,” *Historia Urbana* 29 (2021), 201–25.

<sup>28</sup> Eugen Gorb, *Belgrad – Oczaków. Konfrontacja Imperium Osmańskiego z koalicją rosyjsko-austriacką w 1788 roku*, Zabrze–Tarnowskie Góry: Inforteditions, 2021.

1791 that would take into account the achievements of modern global historiography. We are not even talking about in-depth studies of particular aspects of the history of the aforementioned war. In our opinion, the rapid development of research related to this topic, which has been going on since the early 2000s, does not solve the main problem. In order to find the solution, we must first acknowledge all the weak points and gaps in national historiographies.

## References

- Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Târih-i Cevdet*, Vol. 2, İstanbul: Sabah, 1972.
- Balázs Lázár, “Az ottomán hadifogyokkal való bánásmódszabályozása II. József török háborúja (1788–1791),” in *Tanulmányok Pollmann Ferenc tiszteletére*, ed. Mihály Krámlí, Kálmán Mészáros, Budapest, 2019, 121–8.
- Balázs Lázár, “Ottomán hadifogyók Szigetváron II. József török háborúja idején,” *Az MTA PAB Hadtörténeti Munkabizottságának közleményei* 1 (1) (2020), 153–68.
- Balázs Lázár, “Turkish Captives in Hungary during Austria’s Last Turkish War (1788–91),” *Hungarian Historical Review* 2 (2015), 418–44.
- Bernard Paul P., “Austria’s Last Turkish War. Some Further Thoughts,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 19 (1) (1983), 15–31.
- Buchberger Reinhard, “The Austro-Turkish War of 1788–1791 as Reflected in the Library of the Viennese Bibliophile Collector Max von Portheim,” in *Ottoman Empire and European Theatre*, Vol. 2: *The Time of Joseph Haydn. From Sultan Mahmud I to Mahmud II (r.1730–1839)*, ed. Michael Hüttler, Hans Ernst Weidinger, Vienna: Hollitzer Verlag, 2014, 231–54.
- Çınar Ali Osman, *Mehmed Emin Edib Efendi’nin Hayatı ve Târîhi*, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 1999.
- Criste Oskar, *Kriege unter Kaiser Josef II*, Wien: L.W. Seidel, 1904.
- Engin Hakan, *1787–1792 Osmanlı-Rus, Avusturya Harpleri Sirasında İbrail Kalesi*, Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi, 2013.
- Fedakâr Cengiz, “1787–1792 Osmanlı-Avusturya, Rus Savaşları’nda Bender Kalesi,” in *Prof. Dr. Erdoğan Merçil’e Armağan 75. Doğum Yılı*, İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2013, 383–93.
- Fedakâr Cengiz, “Belgrad Kalesi’nin İşgali (1787–1792 Osmanlı-Avusturya, Rus Savaşlarında),” *History Studies* 11 (4) (2019), 1153–78.
- Feneşan Costin, “Pierderile Banatului în războiul austro-turc din 1788–1789,” *BANATICA* 30 (2020), 233–74.
- Filiz Bayram Ümmügülüm, *Enveri Tarihi: III. Cilt (Metin ve Değerlendirme)*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2014.
- Gorb Eugen, *Belgrad – Oczaków. Konfrontacja Imperium Osmańskiego z koalicją rosyjsko-austriacką w 1788 roku*, Zabrze–Tarnowskie Góry: Inforeditions, 2021.
- Head Matthew, “‘In the Orient of Vienna’: Mozart’s ‘Turkish’ Music and the Theatrical Self,” in *Ottoman Empire and European Theatre*, Vol. 1: *The Age of Mozart and Selim III (1756–1808)*, ed. Michael Hüttler, Hans Ernst Weidinger, Vienna: Hollitzer Verlag, 2013, 603–14.
- Hochedlinger Michael, *Austria’s Wars of Emergence, 1683–1797*, London: Routledge, 2016.
- Iacob Dan Dumitru, “Un plan militar austriac din 1788 privitor la oraşul Iaşi şi împrejurimile sale,” *Historia Urbana* 29 (2021), 201–25.

- Karkocha Małgorzata, *Flagrante bello. Wielka wojna wschodnia w relacjach prasy warszawskiej (1787–1792)*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2021.
- Korić Elma, “Bosansko pogranje u vrijeme Dubičkog rata 1788–1791,” *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 65 (2016), 213–37.
- Korić Elma, “Jedna osmanska karta osmansko-austrijskog razgraničenja na području sjeverozapadne Bosne po odredbama Svištovskog mira (1791),” in *Bosna i Hercegovina kroz historiju. Povodom 40 godina naučnog rada akademika Mithada Kozličića: zbornik radova*, ed. Elvira Islamović, Bihać–Tuzla: Naučno društvo za razvoj društvenih i humanističkih nauka Bihać, Naučno društvo pravnika Tuzla, 2021, 103–12.
- Kuzucu Serhat, *1787–1792 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı*, Elazığ: Firat Üniversitesi, 2012.
- Mayer Matthew Z., *Joseph II and the Austro-Ottoman War, 1788–1791*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Mayer Matthew Z., *Joseph II and the Campaign of 1788 against the Ottoman Turks*, Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 2000.
- Mozart & Material Culture, *1788–1791: Austro-Turkish War*, <https://mmc.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/entities/event/austro-turkish-war/> [accessed June 30, 2022].
- Mozart & Material Culture, *W. A. Mozart, Music for the Memorial to Field Marshall Gideon Laudon*, <https://mmc.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/souvenirs/souvenir-and-expression-in-mozarts-music/w-mozart-music-memorial-field-marshall-gideon-laudon/> [accessed June 30, 2022].
- Petrov Andrey, *Vtoraâ tureckââ vojna v carstvovanie imperatricy Ekateriny II 1787–1791 g.*, Vols. 1–2, Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiâ N. Golike, 1880.
- Rédvay István, “Az erdélyi szorosok védelme 1788-ban,” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 40 (1) (1939), 229–57.
- Rédvay István, “II. József török háborúja (1788–1790). (Első közlemény),” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 43 (1) (1942), 1–28.
- Rédvay István, “II. József török háborúja (1788–1790). (Harmadik közlemény),” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 44 (1–2) (1943), 1–34.
- Rédvay István, “II. József török háborúja (1788–1790). (Második közlemény),” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 43 (1) (1942), 179–200.
- Roider Jr. Karl A., *Austria's Eastern Question, 1700–1790*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Salopek Bogavčić Iva, “Prilog istraživanju ratnih događanja na gradiškom području tijekom rata 1788.–1791.,” *Scrinia Slavonica* 7 (1) (2007), 161–200.
- Topaktaş Hacer, *Osmanlı-Lehistan Diplomatiği İlişkileri. Franciszek Piotr Potocki'nin İstanbul Elçiliği (1788–1793)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014.
- Topaktaş Hacer, *Osmańsko-polskie stosunki dyplomatyczne. Poselstwo Franciszka Piotra Potockiego do Stambułu (1788–1793)*, Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas, 2017.
- Üstüner Ahmet, *Yusuf Paşa'nın Sefernâmesi (Sefer-nâme-i Serdâr-ı Ekrem Yusuf Paşa)*, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2005.
- Uzunçarşılı İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, Vol. 5.6, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995.
- Vaniček Franz, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze. Aus Originalquellen und Quellenwerken geschöpft*, Vol. 3, Wien: Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1875.
- Wikipedia, *1787–1791 Osmanlı-Avusturya Savaşı*, [https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/1787-1791\\_Osmanlı\\_Avusturya\\_Savaşı](https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/1787-1791_Osmanlı_Avusturya_Savaşı) [accessed June 27, 2022].

Wikipedia, *Austro-Turkish War (1788–1791)*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Turkish\\_War\\_\(1788%E2%80%931791\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Turkish_War_(1788%E2%80%931791)) [accessed June 27, 2022].

Wikipedia, *Russisch-Österreichischer Türkenkrieg (1787–1792)*, [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russisch-%C3%96sterreichischer\\_T%C3%BCrkenkrieg\\_\(1787%E2%80%931792\)](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russisch-%C3%96sterreichischer_T%C3%BCrkenkrieg_(1787%E2%80%931792)) [accessed June 27, 2022].

Zens Robert, “Turkish Historiography in the United States,” *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 8 (15) (2010), 149–77.