



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Venetian-Seljuk Treaty of 1220

Author(s): M. E. Martin

Source: *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 95, No. 375 (Apr., 1980), pp. 321-330

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/569312>

Accessed: 24/11/2008 09:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=oup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The English Historical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Notes and Documents

*The Venetian-Seljuk treaty of 1220**

IN the *Liber Albus* is preserved an agreement made in 1220 between the Venetian podestà in Constantinople, Jacopo Tiepolo, and the Seljuk sultan of Konya, Alā al Dīn Kaykubādh I.¹ The text is a Latin version of the podestà's reply to the sultan who had approached the podestà through an embassy. The reply encapsulates the sultan's original application and also contains certain assurances given to him by the podestà. The agreement is a document of some importance. It belongs to a critical phase in the development of Venetian policy in the Levant and is the first substantial evidence for the establishment of political and commercial relations between Venice and the Turks of Anatolia.² The form of the treaty is itself remarkable. It involved an exchange of chrysobulls, issued on the one part by the sultan and on the other, not by the doge, but by the Venetian podestà in Constantinople. The text of the agreement shows that both documents were indeed chrysobulls. The phrase in the preamble, 'Recipientes ex parte altitenentis, felicis, magni generis, magni Soldani Turkie, domini Alatini Caicopadi, idest legatum suum gloriosum, familiarem eius . . . , a quo recipientes nos scriptam conuentionem pacis Soldanee sue potestatis, id est chrusobolum eius superscriptum rubeis litteris, et inferius sigillatum

* I am much indebted to Dr A. A. M. Bryer, to Dr Michael Rogers and, especially, to Professor V. L. Ménage for discussion of various aspects of this essay.

1. The text of the agreement is preserved in the *Liber Albus* fos. 52-54 which was compiled on the orders of the doge Andreas Dandolo (1343-1354). There are also versions in the *Liber Pactorum*, I, fos. 243-4 and the *Liber Pactorum*, II, fos. 258-60. It is edited by G. L. F. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig* (Vienna, 1856), ii. 221-5. Their text is virtually that of the *Liber Albus*, except that the phrase 'et despotis' which appears in the protocol between 'imp(er)ij R(omanie)' and 'eiusdem(que) imp(er)ij' is omitted. Tafel and Thomas note only some of the variants occurring in the *Libri Pactorum*, but none of these variants alters the sense significantly. The treaty has been discussed by W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant* (French ed., Leipzig, 1923), i. 302-4; by A. Schaubé, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets* (Munich and Berlin, 1906), pp. 221-2; by O. Turan in *Islam ansiklopedesi* fasc. 63 (Istanbul, 1955), 658-9; by the same scholar (with Turkish translation) *Türkiye Selçukluları hakkında resmi vesikalar* (Ankara, 1958), pp. 121-46; by T. Talbot Rice, *The Seljuks* (London, 1961), p. 103; and by C. Cahen, 'Le commerce anatolien au début du xiii^e siècle', *Mélanges Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951), pp. 96-97 and *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (London, 1968), pp. 165-6. The studies of Kaykubādh I's reign by H. Jansky, 'Selçuklu sultanlarından Birinci Alaeddin Keykubad'ın emniyet politikası' in *Armagan Zeki Velidi Togan'a* (*Symbolae in honorem Z. V. Togan*) (Istanbul, 1950-5), pp. 117-26; by R. Fahrner, 'Alaeddin Keykubad', in *Robert Boehringer, eine Freundschaft* (Tübingen, 1957), pp. 193-231, and by C. Cahen in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd. ed. B. Lewis et al. (Leiden and London, 1954-), fascs. 73-74, pp. 817-18, do not deal with the treaty.

2. For the significance of the period, F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge* (Paris, 1959), pp. 88-93, esp. p. 89.

aurea forma sui sigilli, . . .’ and the later phrase ‘. . . secundum tenorem chrusoboli bone memorie patris et fratris sui, et secundum tenorem chrusoboli eiusdem sue Soldanee dominationis; . . .’ show the issue of a chrysobull on the part of the sultan and his predecessors. The closing phrase of the concluding protocol, ‘Que propria manu et ore super sancta Dei euanglia iuravit meus dispositus, cum qua in presenti chrusobolosanguineis litteris scripsit mea dominatio, et forma sigillii nostri aurei inposita est, et sanguineo sirico sigillato.’, shows that the podestà also confirmed the agreement by issuing a chrysobull.¹ As though conscious of the special form of the documents, the scribe who drew up the Latin version felt it appropriate to dilate on their appearance. Other agreements between Venice and the Muslim powers were in the form either of *precepta* or *pacta*.²

The Seljuk sultans of Konya seem to have authenticated their decrees and letters in a variety of ways. Sometimes a form of signature, the *tugra*, was employed,³ but Ibn Bibi frequently alludes to the sultan’s seal ring and on one occasion refers to its use in validating a document.⁴ In communications addressed to the Latin powers, however, the later Seljuks seem to have favoured the old imperial Byzantine form of the chrysobull. The use of the chrysobull by the Seljuks is found not only in the agreement under discussion but also on at least one other occasion. When the sultan Ghiyatheddin Kaykhusraw II sent an embassy to Baldwin II, the Latin emperor of Constantinople, in 1242/3, the envoy carried with him letters of credence furnished with a golden bull.⁵ Again, a letter of 1214 from

1. The word chrysobull occurs seven times. ‘Sirico’ = ‘cum filo serico’, the usual method of affixing the seal by a silk thread in imperial Byzantine documents; cf. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 350. The use of red ink in the subscription was of course also a Byzantine practice, and was adopted not only by the podestà but by the Latin emperor: R. L. Wolff, ‘The Latin empire of Constantinople’, in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton, ii (Philadelphia, 1962), 190, and the same writer’s ‘A new document from the period of the Latin empire of Constantinople: the oath of the Venetian podestà’, *Annuaire de l’Institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves*, xii (1952) (= *Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, iv [Brussels, 1953]), 560.

2. E.g. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 188–9 (*preceptum*), 272–3, 274–6 (*pacta*).

3. S. M. Stern, *Fātimid decrees* (London, 1964), pp. 149–51.

4. H. W. Duda, *Die Seltshukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 92–93, 101, 121: a copy of the agreement would have been kept in the state archive, *ibid.* 67, 279.

5. A letter of Baldwin II to Queen Blanche describes how, ‘Ipse Soldanus nuncium suum proprium una cum nostro cum solemnitate magna et exeniis pluribus ad nos misit: videlicet quandam potentiorum ac grandiorum de suis partibus Admiraldum, cum litteris de credulitate bulla sua aurea communitis’, A. Du Chesne, *Historiae Francorum scriptores* (Paris, 1639–49), v. 425. Kaykhusraw I was at one time an exile in Constantinople and may have become familiar with Greek usages there, Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 115. A member of the important Byzantine family of the Gabrades served as envoy of Kaykubād to pope Gregory IX and to Frederick II, G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della terra santa e dell’oriente francescano*, ii (Quaracchi, 1906–), 298–9; A. A. M. Bryer, ‘A Byzantine Family: the Gabrades’, *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* xii (1970), 181. On the employment of Greek scribes by the Seljuks and

Hugh Lusignan, king of Cyprus, to Izz al Dīn Kay-kāūs I refers to the 'sworn chrysobulls' (ὄρκωμτικῶν χρυσεβούλλων) received by the king from the sultan.¹ In this case however it may be that 'chrysobull' is meant loosely to signify an official despatch, rather than in a literal sense, for elsewhere in the correspondence the sultan's communications are spoken of simply as 'γράμμα' or '(ἐγ)γραφα'.²

The employment of the gold seal by a Venetian podestà is, so far as is known, a unique case. While the doge of Venice on occasion used a gold seal, for example in 1210 when the doge, Pietro Ziani, and the despot of Epirus, Michael Comnenus, exchanged chrysobulls confirming a treaty, at other times the doge used only a lead seal.³ Little is known of the seal of the podestà. The office of podestà of course conferred immense authority on the holder, especially as the first podestà, Marino Zeno, was chosen in Constantinople between the death of the doge Enrico Dandolo on 1 June 1205 and the election of his successor, Pietro Ziani, on 5 August 1205. Intermittently at least the podestà claimed the title of Despot, the title chosen initially by Theodore Lascaris in Nicaea and later employed by the rulers of Epirus.⁴ It may have been this title, with its suggestion of regency or deputising for the imperial power itself, that made the podestà consider that the gold seal befitted his dignity. At the end of the treaty, the podestà refers to himself as issuing a *chrysobullum verbum*, that is a *chrysobullos logos*, the instrument by which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Byzantine emperors had made concessions to the Venetians.⁵ Here the form is

the use of a lead seal by a Danişmend, Sp. Vryonis Jr. 'The Byzantine legacy and Ottoman forms', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 23/24 (1969/70), 275 and the same writer's, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (California, 1971), p. 470.

1. S. P. Lampros, "'Η ελληνική ὡς ἐπίσημος γλώσσα τῶν σουλτάνων", *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων*, v (Athens, 1908), 46; Turkish translation in Turan, *Türkiye selçukluları*, pp. 139-43.

2. Lampros, pp. 46, 48 and 51.

3. The agreement with Epirus, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 119-20; in a document of 1259 the use of a gold seal in the doge's name is especially noted, *ibid.* iii. 31. For the use of a lead seal by the doge, *ibid.* ii. 175, 180.

4. On the podestà, *cf.* the two works of Wolff cited in p. 322 n. 1 above; also Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne*, pp. 79-81, 88-93 and S. Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel xiii secolo* (Naples, 1966), pp. 88-91. Jacopo Tiepolo is the first podestà known to have used the title of Despot, Wolff, 'A new document', p. 560: *cf.* also V. Lazzarini, 'I titoli dei dogi di Venezia', *Nuovo archivio veneto, nuova serie*, v (1903), 271-311, esp. 297. A seal of a podestà surnamed Quirini (several members of the family held the office) is published by G. Schlumberger, F. Chalandon and A. Blanchet, *Sigillographie de l'orient latin* (Paris, 1943), p. 209. The material is not specified, but the context makes it clear that it is of wax, and not of lead as stated by T. Bertelé, 'Moneta veneziana e moneta bizantina', in A. Pertusi (ed.) *Venezia e il levante fino al secolo xv* (Florence, 1973), p. 16 n. A seal of the podestà is mentioned but unfortunately not described in Tafel-Thomas, i. 574.

5. *E.g.* Tafel-Thomas, i. 115-24. The chrysobull was the instrument by which, some months before the agreement under discussion, Theodore Lascaris, emperor of Nicaea, made concessions to the Venetian podestà; Tafel-Thomas, ii. 205-7. When in 1234

usurped, not by the Latin emperor, but by a Venetian official. The podestà evidently chose the most portentous diplomatic form available to him in order to impress upon the Seljuk sultan the power of the Venetians. No doubt the Seljuks were already aware that the Venetians were a force to be reckoned with; certainly the sultan of Egypt seems at times to have regarded the doge, rather than the Latin emperor, as the effective ruler of Constantinople.¹

The document opens with a dating formula, 'Anno domini Dei et Saluatoris nostri Jhesu Cristi,' but the year is not in fact stated. The date given in the body of the text is 'the month of March in the eighth indiction', that is, March 1220, for the eighth indiction ran from September 1219 to September 1220. This is the date given by Tafel-Thomas and generally accepted.² However this date, March 1220, is irreconcilable with the accession date of Kaykubādh I as given in a number of standard works which place his accession only at the end of 1220. This date for Kaykubādh's accession seems to be derived from H. W. Duda's German translation of the chronicle of Ibn Bībī which has 4 Shawwāl 617 = 2 December 1220 as the death-date of Kaykubādh's predecessor, Izz al-Dīn Kay-kāūs I. Duda cites an inscription on Kay-kāūs's mausoleum in confirmation of this date.³ However, V. L. Ménage points out the existence of two silver coins of Kaykubādh I securely dated 616, that is, 19 March 1219–7 March 1220; these prove that Kaykubādh was already sultan at least by the first week of March 1220. Ménage also observes that the date given in Duda's translation of Ibn Bībī occurs only in the abridgement of 1284/5 and not in the original of 1281, and that the inscription commemorates the completion of the mausoleum, not the death of Kay-kāūs.⁴ Jacopo Tiepolo is known to have been podestà in Constantinople on 10 December 1219 and in June 1220, so the date of March 1220 falls within the period of his tenure of

certain Cretans sought assurances from the doge, they asked him to send them a chrysobull (grissovolum). They evidently expected the doge to continue the administrative practices of their former Byzantine masters, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 325. On the form of the *chrysobullos logos*, F. Dölger and J. Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre* (Munich, 1968), pp. 117–25.

1. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 190.

2. *Ibid.* ii. 221. Dandolo, who briefly mentions the treaty, assigns it to the fourteenth year of the dogeship of Pietro Ziani, that is to the period Aug. 1218 to Aug. 1219; this is perhaps because he records it in the same sentence as the treaty with Lascaris which belongs to Aug. 1219, A. Dandolo, *Chronica per extensum*, ed. E. Pastorello in L. Muratori, *RISS*, xii (Bologna, 1938), 281. Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne*, p. 89 n. 1, gives the date as October 1219.

3. Duda, *Ibn Bibi*, p. 90. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 124, has 'end of 1220' for Kay-kāūs's death. In the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (English text), fasc. 73–74, Kay-kāūs is said to have died in '618/end of 1220' and Kaykubādh's accession is given as 618/1220, pp. 813, 817. However 618 is in fact 25 Feb. 1221–14 Feb. 1222. In the French text, *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, fasc. 73–74, p. 846, Kay-kāūs's death is placed 'fin 1221'.

4. These points are made in a recent letter from Professor Ménage to me. The coins are published in Ismail Ghalib, *Takvim-i meskûkât-i selcûkiyye* (Istanbul, 1309/1891–2), p. 26.

office.¹ The date as given in the text of the *Liber Albus* is therefore compatible with both the Seljuk and the Venetian sources.

The treaty renews the stipulations of two earlier thirteenth-century agreements between the Venetian podestà in Constantinople and the sultans of Konya, but even before these agreements it is reasonable to suppose some trade between Venice and the Turks. In the chrysobull of 1082/4 Alexius Comnenus conceded freedom of trade to the Venetians throughout the empire and singled out some thirty-two localities for particular mention, presumably because these were places where his officials were most likely to encounter Venetians.² Among these localities were Chios, Abydos and Strobilos, and since Turks are known briefly to have occupied Chios and Abydos in the 1090s and to have ravaged Strobilos in 1103,³ it is probable that some contact between Venetians and Turks occurred: certainly in the twelfth century the opportunities for such contact must have been many. The two earlier agreements, also in the form of chrysobulls, are attributed to the father and brother of Kaykubādh I. The father is Kaykhusraw I who was sultan for the second time between c. 1205 and 1211: the brother was his successor, Kay-kāūs I. It appears therefore that Kaykubādh, soon after his accession, confirmed the previous agreements just as formerly, on the death of a Byzantine emperor, the Venetians applied to his successor for confirmation of their privileges. Such an application for renewal was normal procedure and was a safeguard against the sudden seizure of property on the death of a ruler.⁴ In this instance however it seems to have been the sultan who sent envoys to the podestà rather than the Venetians who appeared as suppliants before the sultan. Furthermore, these agreements with the Seljuks, unlike the agreements of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries between Venice and the Byzantine emperors which extended for an unlimited period, were for two years only. It may then have been simply a question of application for renewal on the expiry of the previous treaty. These short-term agreements are not remarkable; both Venetian and Turkish agreements of limited duration are known from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁵

1. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 215-21: Wolff, 'A new document', 560.

2. Tafel-Thomas, i. 51-54.

3. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 81; P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche* (Istanbul, 1934), p. 3.

4. For an example of an application for renewal, see the events following the accession of John II Comnenus in 1118 as described in *Historia ducum veneticorum*, ed. H. Simonsfeld, *MGH, SS*, xiv (1846), 73 and by Dandolo, p. 232. The fear of seizure is apparent in the agreement between Venice and the ruler of Aleppo in 1225, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 257.

5. Dandolo gives many examples, pp. 229-303. In 1283 a Venetian envoy to the Byzantine court was given the power to make an agreement to run between seven and ten years, as he thought best, R. Cessi, *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia* (Bologna, 1932-1950), iii. 49-54. The Seljuk - Cypriot treaty was for three years only, Lampros, p. 48.

Cahen suggests that although the agreement with Kaykubādh was for two years only, it was probably more or less tacitly renewed.¹ It is in fact known that in 1228 a Venetian envoy named Filippo Iuliano was in Konya where he encountered another Venetian, Marco Longo, a member of an embassy sent by Narjot de Toucy, *bailli* of the Latin emperor. Iuliano noted with some indignation that Longo presented the sultan with gifts of armour and weapons.² Unfortunately the object of Iuliano's embassy is unrecorded; but he was the envoy of the doge, not of the podestà. Perhaps it is to be concluded that until the early 1220s, the podestà managed relations with the Seljuks but thereafter the doge took negotiations into his own hands.³ It may be possible to assign a more precise date to the concession associated with Kaykhusraw I, for in March 1207 the sultan took Antalya from Aldobrandini, a Tuscan adventurer formerly in Byzantine employ, and in 1209 Venice acted as intermediary between the Latin emperor and the sultan in arranging a truce.⁴ It is tempting to speculate that the Venetians took this opportunity to negotiate an understanding with the sultan which would guarantee their access to, and commercial interests in, the newly conquered port. Routes from Antalya extended across the plateau of Asia Minor and it was a convenient port of call for Venetian merchants trading with Rhodes, Cyprus, Lajazzo and the Syrian ports.⁵ The value of the concessions was further increased by the Seljuk occupation of Kalonoros in 1221 and subsequently of other coastal towns in the region.⁶ In the north the acquisition of Sinope in 1214 gave the Seljuks a permanent outlet to the Black Sea where Venetian traders were already active.⁷

The commercial and judicial clauses of the treaty and their implications must now be considered in detail. The treaty provided

1. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 166.

2. Cessi, *Deliberazioni*, i. 208. Iuliano is not known to have had any earlier association with the Levant. In 1227 an F. Iuliano was witness to an incident in Venice and he had also been podestà in Chioggia, *ibid.* i. 185, 190.

3. The doge supervised negotiations with Aleppo in 1207-8 and in 1225, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 64, 256.

4. Duda, *Ibn Bibi*, pp. 44-46; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 120. Antalya was re-occupied for a time by the Franks between 1210 and 1216, Duda, pp. 61-64; S. Lloyd and D. S. Rice, *Alanya* ('*Ala'iyya*') (occasional publication of the British School of Archaeology in Ankara, 1958), p. 52. For the Venetians as intermediaries, E. Gerland, *Geschichte des Lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel* (Homburg v.d. Höhe, 1905, rpt. Darmstadt, 1966), i. 211.

5. Venetians from Syria are mentioned in the text of the treaty. For the presence of Venetians in Byzantine Antalya, R. Morozzo della Rocca and A. Lombardo, *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei sec. xi-xiii* (Turin, 1940), no. 90. The Venetian maritime statutes of 1255 refer to Venetians plying between Antalya and Alexandria, Tafel-Thomas, iii. 430-1: see also Heyd, i. 303. On the routes across Asia Minor, Cahen, 'Commerce anatolien', pp. 91-93, 95-96; Lloyd and Rice, pp. 44-45; K. Erdmann, *Das Anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1961).

6. Duda, *Ibn Bibi*, 104-9; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 124.

7. Duda, *Ibn Bibi*, 64-69; Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, nos. 478, 479 and 541.

that payment of duty by Venetian merchants should be at a standard rate of 2 per cent except for certain totally exempted categories of merchandise. Reciprocal guarantees for the safety of the subjects of both parties to the treaty and their property in the event of shipwreck or other misfortune were agreed. The Venetians were to enjoy certain judicial privileges in the territories of the sultan.

The provision for the payment of duty at a standard rate of 2 per cent was a concession of great value. Although the Venetians traded duty-free in the Latin empire and in some other Christian states such as Epirus, Nicaea and, later, Little Armenia,¹ the rate of 2 per cent *ad valorem* was exceptionally low. Cahen considers the normal rate would have been at least 10 per cent.² In the Venetian treaty of 1207/8 with Aleppo, the general rate was 12, reduced in 1225 to 6 per cent.³ Payment at so low a rate as 2 per cent is only occasionally encountered elsewhere, as for instance, in 1217 when Guy, Lord of Byblos, reduced the duty payable by Venetians from 4 per cent and four *quarroblas* to 2 per cent and two *quarroblas*.⁴ Scarcely less valuable was the simplicity of the system in contrast to the elaborately graded system of tariffs in other Muslim states. The Seljuk concession must greatly have facilitated commercial transactions. Earlier and contemporary sources for the history of commerce in the Levant often give the impression that harassment by officials and disputes about liability as much as the duties themselves vexed merchants and imperilled relations between merchants and rulers.⁵

1. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 121-2, 206 and 426-7. In Armenia duty on certain classes of metals was still payable by Venetians resident abroad.

2. Cahen, 'Commerce anatolien', 96; *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 165.

3. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 65, 257. There was a general trend towards lower duties: cf. J. Riley-Smith, 'Government in Latin Syria and the commercial privileges of foreign merchants' in D. Baker (ed.) *Relations between east and west in the middle ages* (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 110, 113 and 117.

4. Tafel-Thomas, ii. 196-7. '*Quarrobla*' = *keration* (the word originally denoted the weight of a carob seed): a *keration* was 1/24 of a *solidus*. Fractional percentages were commonly expressed in *keratia*, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 398; Riley-Smith, p. 130 n. 113. Early in the next century the Pisans paid only 2 per cent on trade in Pera, B. Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. Evans (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), p. 41.

5. Examples of more complex systems of tariffs are to be found in the terms of the agreements between Venice and Antioch in 1153 (Tafel-Thomas, i. 133-5), between Venice and the Muslim Lord of Saone in 1229 (*ibid.* ii. 272-3) and between Venice and Aleppo in 1207/8 and 1229 (*ibid.* ii. 62-66 and 274-6). The way in which the bull of Alexius I to the Venetians (*ibid.* i. 51-54) grants total immunity from taxation and then proceeds to list all the taxes which the Venetians do *not* have to pay suggests that disputes about liability to the various taxes easily arose. The precision in the classification of goods exempt from certain duties in a privilege of John Ibelin, Lord of Beirut, in 1222 anticipates and is concerned to prevent disputes over the status of different categories of merchandise (*ibid.* ii. 232-4). An agreement with Egypt in the early thirteenth century also indicates concern about unjust exactions (*ibid.* ii. 185-7). On the problems arising from the complexity of tolls and the attempts at evasion, see G. Rouillard, 'Les taxes maritimes et commerciales d'après les actes de Patmos et de Lavra', *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, i (Paris, 1930), 277-89, esp. 288-9; C. Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades* (Paris, 1940), pp. 477-8 and 'Douanes et commerce dans les

The treaty gave the Venetians total exemption from payment on corn, pearls, precious stones and both worked and unworked gold and silver. Although the recovery of agriculture in Asia Minor in the early thirteenth century is well attested both in the Greek empire of Nicaea and in the Seljuk lands,¹ there seems to be no other reference to the export of corn by the Seljuks until late in the century, when Canale mentions the Turks, together with many other peoples, as suppliers of corn to Venice in the famine of 1268.² Pegolotti, writing in the first half of the next century, implies that corn was exported to the west from Asia Minor.³ It was perhaps to stimulate trade in a surplus of corn that the sultans allowed the Venetians to carry it duty free. The import of corn into the growing city of Venice was an important consideration in the minds of the Venetian authorities.⁴

The exemption of the other categories – pearls, precious stones, gold and silver – is perhaps to be explained by the fact that these served on occasion as a substitute for coinage. The Polos, for instance, carried jewels both as a medium of exchange and as a repository of value.⁵ Pearls and precious stones and metals were commonly exempted from payment of duty or given special rates in treaties with the Muslim powers.⁶ These total exemptions together with the low, standardized rate, must have given the Venetians an edge over their competitors in the Seljuk lands.⁷

Other clauses accorded protection to Venetian vessels shipwrecked in Turkish waters or seeking refuge in Turkish ports. Venetian subjects aboard non-Venetian ships were promised similar protection. Even non-Venetian pilgrims falling into Turkish hands were to be set free. Reciprocal clauses gave similar assurances in the event of Turks falling into Venetian hands, and the Venetians undertook to respect Turkish property in the event of death and to make amends for any losses the Turks might sustain through theft while in places under Venetian jurisdiction. While similar provisions

ports méditerranées de l'Égypte médiévale d'après le Minhadj d'Al-Makhzumi', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, vii (1964), 217–314, esp. 242 and 291 ff. and Riley-Smith, pp. 113 and 117.

1. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 155–9; M. Angold, *A Byzantine government in exile: government and society under the Lascarids of Nicaea* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 103–4, 116: after the coming of the Mongols in 1243 the Seljuks imported corn from the empire of Nicaea.

2. Martin da Canal, *Les estoires de Venise* ed. A. Limentani (Florence, Civiltà veneziana, fonti e testi, xii, serie terza, 3, n.d.), pp. 326–9.

3. Pegolotti, pp. 56, 58.

4. In 1210 the Despot of Arta (Epirus) allowed the unrestricted export of corn to Venice, Tafel-Thomas, ii, 122. The importance of Crete to Venice was due not only to its geographical position but to its corn, *ibid.* ii, 132, 140, 163, 245; Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne*, p. 137.

5. *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, ed. H. Yule (London, 1871), i, 2. See also, Bertelé, p. 4.

6. Tafel-Thomas, ii, 64, 339, 452 and 487.

7. These competitors are known to have included Pisans (mentioned in the treaty itself), Provençals and Genoese, Heyd, i, 303.

are to be found in some other commercial treaties of the period, the pledges given in the treaty of 1220 were more extensive than was usual: the degree of security afforded to Venetian merchants must have encouraged them to venture into Seljuk markets.¹ The protection promised to Turks on board vessels falling into Venetian hands perhaps reflects, like the building of the celebrated arsenal at Alanya (the former Kalonoros), a growing Turkish involvement in maritime affairs.²

By the agreement, the sultan conceded certain judicial privileges to the Venetians in his domains: in any dispute arising between Venetians and other Latins – the Pisans are mentioned by name – judgment was to be given by appropriate Venetian officials, unless the case was one of assault with a weapon, or theft. In these cases judgment was reserved to the sultan's court. This clause ensured that commercial cases involving only Latins would be settled by the Venetians. Nowhere else did the Venetians obtain a comparable advantage; although frequently enjoying special legal privileges, these privileges extended in other instances only to the settlement of disputes between the Venetians themselves, between those living in Venetian quarters, or between the Venetians and the subjects of the ruler who made the concession.³ The legal standing *vis-à-vis* their rivals secured by the Venetians in this agreement was superior to any they enjoyed in the Levant outside their own colonies. However, the treaty gave the Venetians no right to property, no possession of *fondaco*, mill, church or bath such as they held in many eastern cities, both Christian and Muslim⁴; nor was there any assurance, such as the Venetians enjoyed at Aleppo, that the Venetian merchant

1. The right to plunder a shipwrecked vessel was of course taken for granted, cf. Usāmah ibn-Mundiḡh, *Kitāb al-P'tibār*, trans. P. K. Hitti, *Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian gentleman* (edition of Beirut, 1964), p. 61. For examples of treaties affording protection in the event of wreck, Tafel-Thomas, i. 87, 134; ii. 122, 206, 232, 273, 276 and 484. The Seljuk-Cypriot agreement of 1216 promised protection in case of wreck but implies that such protection was unusual, Lampros, p. 49. In other treaties rulers reserved their full or partial rights to wreck, for example, Leo III of Armenia in 1271 (Tafel-Thomas, iii. 116). The ruler of Aleppo retained 15 per cent of salvage in a treaty of 1225, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 257.

2. Lloyd and Rice, pp. 16–18; Cessi, iii. 125.

3. The *pactum Warmundi* of 1123 assigns commercial cases between Venetians and cases where the defendant is a Venetian to a Venetian court, but carefully reserves cases where a Venetian is plaintiff to the royal court, Tafel-Thomas, i. 87. In a privilege of 1201 Leo II of Armenia reserves all cases between Venetians and others to the royal court, *ibid.* i. 384. See also the privileges granted to the Venetians in Constantinople by Alexius III Angelus in 1198, Tafel-Thomas, i. 273–6, and the comments of C. M. Brand, *Byzantium confronts the west* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), pp. 202–3. The Venetians in Saone had the right to settle internal disputes, Tafel-Thomas, ii. 273. In Antioch all cases in which a Venetian appeared as defendant were resolved in their own court, *ibid.* i. 134. In his report, the Venetian *bailli* in Syria in 1243 stoutly upheld the right to judge non-Venetians in the Venetian quarter of Tyre, *ibid.* ii. 358. In Beirut however John of Ibelin retained jurisdiction in all criminal cases, *ibid.* ii. 231.

4. For example, in a Christian city, Acre, *ibid.* i. 85; in a Muslim city, Aleppo, *ibid.* ii. 65, 276.

community would not be punished for the misdeeds of one of its members.¹

The provisions of the commercial agreements made by the Mediterranean powers often appear arbitrary, complex and difficult to interpret in their details. They perhaps represent compromises reached after hard bargaining. This treaty gave the Venetians very favourable tariffs, security and a strong legal position: in short, the concessions most likely to benefit merchants seeking to penetrate relatively new markets. The absence of rights to property and of explicit provision for the settlement of disputes among the Venetians themselves and of protection for the community against reprisals for the action of its members, support this view that in the Seljuk lands the Venetians were only few in number and ill-established. They had as yet no need of the communal and property rights so assiduously sought and obtained elsewhere. If the treaty shows the Venetians as poised to exploit the potential of the Seljuk markets, the agreement was no doubt equally acceptable on the Turkish side. All the eastern rulers profited greatly from the commerce that passed through their territories and the Seljuk rulers were, more than most, concerned to foster and promote mercantile activity in their domains.²

University of Birmingham

M. E. MARTIN

1. *Ibid.* ii, 276.

2. Riley-Smith, *passim*, shows the benefits accruing to the rulers of Latin Syria who fostered trade. Ibn Bibi was aware how often the Seljuk sultans acted from commercial motives, e.g. (trans. Duda), pp. 44-46, 68, 130-2, 138-9 and 142-3. Also, Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 122-3 and 126.