



# A Contribution to the History of Ottoman-English Diplomatic and Commercial Relations: The Ahdname of 1612

## Osmanlı-İngiliz Diplomatik ve Ticari İlişkileri Tarihine Bir Katkı: 1612 Ahidnâmesi



Ahmet Tekin\*



\*PhD, Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, Mediterranean World Studies, Istanbul, Türkiye

ORCID: A.T. 0000-0002-8394-8280

### Corresponding author

Ahmet Tekin,  
Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences,  
Mediterranean World Studies, Istanbul, Türkiye  
E-mail: ahmet.tekin@istanbul.edu.tr

Submitted: 31.03.2023

Revision Requested: 29.05.2023

Last Revision Received: 07.06.2024

Accepted: 05.02.2024

### Citation:

Tekin, Ahmet. "A Contribution to the History of Ottoman-English Diplomatic and Commercial Relations: The Ahdname of 1612." *Tarih Dergisi - Turkish Journal of History*, 82 (2024): 133-167. <https://doi.org/10.26650/iutd.20241274860>

### ABSTRACT

This study analyzes existing literature by examining the *ahdname* of 1612, which has yet to have been explored in the literature. The *ahdnames* granted to England established the framework for the rights and obligations associated with the navigation of ships flying the English flag in Ottoman waters, as well as the movement, residence, and commercial activities of English merchants within Ottoman domains. After the first *ahdname* was granted to England in 1580 during the reign of Sultan Murad III (1574-1595), the scope of future *ahdnames* was expanded with later additions. This study will first briefly introduce the *ahdnames* granted to England and then elaborate on the process leading up to the *Ahdname* of 1612. Despite not being particularly groundbreaking in terms of its articles, the *ahdname* of 1612 is quite valuable due to the additions and revisions to previous *ahdnames*. Moreover, this *ahdname* provides a crucial opportunity upon examination with reference to earlier works in the literature to track the development of English privileges from 1580-1612.

**Keywords:** 17<sup>th</sup> century, history of diplomacy, Ottoman State, England, *ahdname*, Ahmed I

### ÖZ

Bu çalışmada, literatürde daha önce müstakil olarak ele alınmamış olan 1612 tarihli İngiltere ahidnâmesi değerlendirilerek mevcut bilgiler tartışılmaktadır. İngiltere'ye verilen ahidnâmeler, İngiltere bayrağı altında bulunan gemilerin Osmanlı sularında seyri seferi ve İngiliz tüccarının Osmanlı Devleti sınırları dahilinde dolaşması, ikamet etmesi ve ticari faaliyetler yürütmesi ile ilgili hak ve yükümlülüklerin çerçevesini belirliyordu. Sultan III. Murad döneminde (1574-1595), 1580 yılında İngiltere'ye bahşedilen ilk ahidnâmeden sonra zaman içinde yapılan eklemelerle İngiliz ahidnâmelerinin kapsamı genişletilmiştir. Bu makalede, İngiltere'ye verilen ahidnâmelere dair genel bir giriş sunulduktan sonra 1612 yılına giden sürece değinilecektir. 1612 ahidnâmesi, ihtiva ettiği maddeler açısından kendi başına çığır açan bir metin olmasa da evvelki maddelerin teçdid ve revize edilmesinin yanı sıra yeni hükümlerin ihdas edildiği bir düzenleme olması bakımından oldukça kıymetlidir. Zira 1612 tarihli ahidnâme, 1580'den 1612'ye kadar olan İngiliz ahidnâmelerini kümülatif olarak gönerecek söz konusu imtiyazların gelişim sürecini takip etmeyi mümkün kılar.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** 17. Yüzyıl, Diplomasi Tarihi, Osmanlı Devleti, İngiltere, Ahidnâme, I. Ahmed



## Introduction

“*Ahdname*” refers to documents containing the Ottomans’ commercial privileges granted to foreign states or peace treaties agreed upon with them. These documents can be characterized as commercial, political, or commercial-political based on their contents. The Ottoman State agreed on *ahdnames* with Hungary between the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> centuries for political reasons, although the *ahdnames* with Venice can be referred to as commercial-political due to the articles they included<sup>1</sup>. The *ahdnames* granted unilaterally by the Ottoman State to France, England, and the Netherlands, were primarily commercial in nature<sup>2</sup>. These granted foreign merchants essential commercial privileges, established significant legal and consular powers for European ambassadors and consuls, as well as provided wide-ranging rights and exemptions to those under their protection<sup>3</sup>.

The Ottoman State issued certain privileges regulated by *ahdnames* to *harbîs*<sup>4</sup> in conformity with Islamic law. In this way, *harbî* would be given an *aman* (safe-conduct)<sup>5</sup>. Thus, referred as *müste’men* (beneficiaries of safe-conduct), individuals or groups gained a level of protection that ensured their safety and the safety of their property in Ottoman domains<sup>6</sup>. The scope and content of an *ahdname* varied according to the group and strategy to which they were allocated. An *ahdname* would be formalized through an ambassador who would arrive to conclude the accreditation process while presenting gifts. Failure to adhere to any of these stages would bring the procedure to a halt. When the sultan changed, existing “*ahdnames*” were renewed if the successor deemed it appropriate<sup>7</sup>.

Although many studies have been conducted on this significant topic in the history of Ottoman diplomacy, no thorough collection of the *ahdnames* has yet been published. One may

- 
- 1 Hans Theunissen, “Ottoman-Venetian Diplomatics: The ‘Ahd-names The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of Political-Commercial Instruments together with an Annotated Edition of a Corpus of Relevant Documents”, *Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies*, I (1998), p. 234; Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, “Ahidnâme”, *DİA*, I, p. 536.
  - 2 Halil İnalçık, “İmtiyâzât”, *EP*, III, p. 1179; Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th-18th Century): An Annotated Edition of ‘Ahdnames and Other Documents*, Brill, Leiden, Boston, Köln 2000, p. 6; Güneş Işıksel, “Ottoman Diplomacy”, *The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy*, ed. Gordon Martel, Wiley-Blackwell, West Sussex 2018, p. 5.
  - 3 Michael Talbot, “A Treaty of Narratives: Friendship, Gifts, and Diplomatic History in the British Capitulations of 1641”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 48 (2016), p. 358.
  - 4 In Islamic law, *harbî* is a term used to describe foreigners due to relations that carry the potential for conflict. Ahmet Özel, “Harbî”, *DİA*, XVI, p. 112-114. In the Ottoman context, those are the subjects of countries which did not have a peace agreement with the Ottomans.
  - 5 “The concept of *aman* is applied to describe a safe conduct granted to any individual living in a land not under Islamic rule wishing to pass through or temporarily reside in an Islamic country. It could be granted to an individual or a group” Edhem Eldem, “Capitulations and Western trade”, *The Cambridge History of Turkey: Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603–1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006, p. 293.
  - 6 Mehmet İpşirli, “Eman”, *DİA*, XI, p. 78.
  - 7 Halil İnalçık, “İmtiyâzât”, *DİA*, XXII, p. 246.

claim that the main reason for this deficiency is the existence of unidentified *ahdnames*. In this context, I will first present an overview account of the *ahdnames* granted to England before delving into the processes that led up to the *ahdname* of 1612, which has never been examined in detail. Furthermore, when compared to other research in the literature, this *ahdname* provides a substantial chance to follow the evolution of English privileges from 1580-1612. As a result, the purpose of the article is to set the path for further analysis of existing literature by analyzing the *ahdname* of 1612, which has yet to be explored. Although its articles are not quite groundbreaking, *ahdname* can be beneficial for its additions and revisions to prior ones.

## English *Ahdnames* until the year 1612

The *ahdnames* granted to England were documents that determined the rights of the English within the Ottoman domains as well as the basis for those rights. The first privilege was granted in 1580 under the reign of Murad III (r.1574-1595)<sup>8</sup>, and the final one was granted in 1675 through which English privileges were further defined and extended in detail<sup>9</sup>. The literature has plenty, sometimes contradicting, findings concerning the quantity and dates of *ahdnames* granted to the English between 1580 and 1675. *Ahdnames* identified by Reşat Ekrem Koçu<sup>10</sup>, Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu<sup>11</sup>, Michael Talbot<sup>12</sup>, and Fariba Zarinebaf<sup>13</sup> are not in agreement<sup>14</sup>. Despite there being no consensus on the dates or numbers of the *ahdnames*, there is a general acceptance of their content.

- 8 For the *ahdname* of 1580, see. BOA, *ADVNSMHHM.d*, nr. 43, p. 246-247; *Münşe'ât Mecmûası*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi Koleksiyonu, nr. 3345, p. 171-172; pages 9-10 in today's numerals. Richard Hakluyt, *Voyages in Eight Volumes*, III, Dent, London 1962, p. 55-61. The 1580 *ahdname* has been published by researchers: Ahmet Refik, *Türkler ve Kraliçe Elizabeth (1200-1255)*, İstanbul Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat, İstanbul 1932, p. 19-21; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "On Dokuzuncu Asrın Başlarına Kadar Türk-İngiliz Münasebâtına Dair Vesikalar", *Belleten*, XIII/51 (1949), p. 617-619. Hamit Dereli, *Kraliçe Elizabeth Devrinde Türkler ve İngilizler*, Anıl Matbaası, İstanbul 1951, p. 123-25; Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Türk-İngiliz Münasebelerinin Başlangıcı ve Gelişmesi (1553-1610)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara 1953, p. 182-86; Susan A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, 1578-1582: A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1977, p. 86-89; Büşra Kütükçü Aktaş, *Osmanlı Diplomatîğinde Ahidname Formunun Doğuşu ve Gelişimi (XIV-XVI. Yüzyıllar)*, İstanbul University, PhD Thesis, İstanbul 2022, p. 608-611.
- 9 See BOA, *A.DVNS.DVE.d*, nr. 35/1. Also, for an analysis of the 1675 *ahdname* in terms of Islamic law, see. Kübra Öztürk, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İngiltere'ye Verdiği 1675 (H.1086) Tarihli İmtiyâznâmenin İslam Hukuku Açısından İncelenmesi*, Marmara University, Master's Thesis, İstanbul 2019.
- 10 Reşat Ekrem, *Osmanlı Muahedeleri ve Kapitülâsiyonlar: 1300- 1920 ve Lozan Muahedesi 24 Temmuz 1923*, Türkiye Matbaası, İstanbul 1934, p. 50, 52, 53, 57, 62, 63, 66, 67, 72.
- 11 Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol: Osmanlı-İngiliz İktisadî Münasebetleri (1580-1850)*, TTK, Ankara 2013, p. 27-40 and 35-37.
- 12 Michael Talbot, *British-Ottoman Relations, 1661-1807: Commerce and Diplomatic Practice in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul*, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2017, p. 28-29.
- 13 Fariba Zarinebaf, *Mediterranean Encounters: Trade and Pluralism in Early Modern Galata*, University of California Press, California 2018, p. 118.
- 14 Among the aforementioned studies, the most reliable work is that of Kütükoğlu, who provides comprehensive information on the English *ahdnames*. For a fresh discussion regarding the number and dates of *ahdnames* granted to the English, see. Ahmet Tekin, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin İngiltere'ye Verdiği Ahidnâmelere Dair Bazı Yeni Tespitler (1580-1675)", *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10/2 (2023), p. 574-586.

From time to time, states with an *ahdname* may suggest the implementation of particular “privileges” that would benefit their interests. A case in point is the edict of 1588, which promised new additions to the *ahdname* of 1580<sup>15</sup>. Updates that were considered appropriate were given as supplements in the form of an edict and incorporated into the text of the *ahdname* at its renewal. In the occurrence of a conflict between an *ahdname* and an edict, law, or regulation, the former shall prevail<sup>16</sup>. The English ambassador, Paul Pindar (1611-1620), detailed the difficulties encountered in practice notwithstanding the privileges accorded to English merchants. In response, his plea that the articles of the *ahdname* be implemented in cases where they conflicted with other decrees was accepted. This development was included in the *ahdname* text of 1612 as follows:

“... *Bavlu Bindar [Paul Pindar] nâm beyzâde Âsîtâne-i sa'âdetime geliüb ba'zı zamânda 'ahidnâme-i hümayûna muhâlif evâmîr-i şerîfe virilüb anın gibi 'ahidnâme-i hümayûnumuza muhâlif virilen ahkâm haberimiz olmadın hükkâm huzûrunda ibrâz olundukda zikr olunan ahkâm 'ahidnâme-i hümayûnumuz târihinden mu'ahhar olmağla 'ahidnâme-i hümayûn mazmûnu ile 'amel olunmayub evâmîr mücebi ile 'amel olunur ol-takdirce elimizde olan 'ahidnâmeye muhâlif olursa o makûle evâmîr-i şerîfe ile 'amel olunmayub 'ahidnâmemiz mücebince 'amel olunmasın müşârûnileyh efendim kralın murâdudur deyü i'lâm etdüğü pâye-i serîr-i a'lâma 'arz olundukda müşârûnileyh kralın ricâsı benim 'izz-i huzûr-ı fa'izü'n-nûrumda makkûl-ı hümayûnum olub ellerinde olan 'ahidnâme-i hümayûna muhâlif mukaddemâ ve şimdiden sonra ihrâc olunan evâmîr-i şerîfe hükkâm huzûrunda ibrâz olundukda 'amel olunmayub hükkâm dai'mâ mazmûn-ı 'ahidnâme-i hümayûnumla 'âmil olunmak bâbında fermân-ı kazâ-cereyanımız sâdır olmuşdur anın gibi 'ahidnâme-i hümayûnuma muhâlif olan evâmîr-i şerîfe ibrâz idenlerin ellerinden alınub istimâ' olunmaya ve fermân-ı 'âlîşânım bu vechile sâdır oldu...’”<sup>17</sup>*

*Ahdnames* remained in effect during the reign of the sultan who granted them. The economic and political prospects of the Ottoman State were taken into consideration when granting or renewing an *ahdname*. Although uncommon, granting more than one *ahdname* to the same state occurs during the reign of the same sultan<sup>18</sup>. The agents of the states with an *ahdname* were zealous in their efforts to maintain and expand their privileges. This depended on the implementation of another practice: gift giving<sup>19</sup>.

15 *Münşe'ât Mecmûası*, p. 173. Büşra Aktaş Kütükçü used this text for her dissertation from a *mecmua* in the Esad Efendi collection. Although she claims to have identified this text for the first time, Mübahat Kütükoğlu had previously pointed out the record. See. Aktaş, p. 382-383. Kütükoğlu confidently acknowledges that these privileges in the edict were included for the first time in the 1601 treaty, as they are not found elsewhere. See. Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 30, fn. 84.

16 İnalçık, “İmtiyâzât”, p. 246.

17 See. Transcription.

18 For example, during the reign of Ahmed I, it is determined that England was granted more than one *ahdname* (in 1604, 1607, 1612 and 1614). See. Tekin, p. 580.

19 For a study aiming to contribute to the theory of gift giving and receiving in the Muslim world, see. *Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts*, ed. Linda Komaroff, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles 2011. On the significance of gift-giving in the Islamic world as a means of formalizing alliances,

English representatives in Istanbul showed their eagerness to have the *ahdnames* renewed with their well-selected gifts. However, the success of this endeavor was sometimes only realized long after the sultan ascended to the throne. The reason behind such a “delay” seems to be the economic dimension of gift giving. A new ambassador had to be received in the presence of the sovereign before he could officially begin his mission, as was customary. The envoy was required to have the proper letters and diplomatic presents from the royal he represented ready before the audience. Moreover, it was customary to present gifts not only to the sultan, but also to the higher ranks of the state and some of its officials<sup>20</sup>. The execution of this practice was fairly expensive. At this point, the English appear to have adopted a “stalling” strategy in order to avoid incurring such enormous expenses.

For instance, the second English ambassador to Constantinople named Edward Barton (1591/3-1597), although acting as an ambassador, was not officially recognized as one for a while since he had not yet appeared before the court. A *nâme* from Istanbul was sent to the queen, stating that she must send an envoy to ensure her demands were properly understood. However, the English monarch explained that sending a new envoy was unsafe due to her disputes with Spain over Gibraltar, and announced that she would send a new envoy only in the spring of 1593<sup>21</sup>. As a result, after his “assumption of office” in 1588, Barton presented the Queen’s letter and gifts to the sultan in October 1593 and received official recognition as an ambassador<sup>22</sup>.

When Mehmed III (r. 1595-1603) ascended the throne in 1595, the agenda for the Levant Company and the Crown once again was expenses. The accession of a new sultan, less than two years after Barton’s letters and gifts, proved troublesome for the English. The new

---

indicating power, and expressing or using political agendas, see. Linda Komaroff, “The Art of the Art of Giving at the Islamic Courts”, *Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts*, ed. Linda Komaroff, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles 2011, p. 17-32. On the Ottoman-Venetian gift-giving see. Julian Ruby, “The Serenissima and the Sublime Porte: Art in the Art of Diplomacy, 1453-1600”, *Venice and the Islamic World, 828-1797*, ed. Stefano Carboni and Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2007, p. 90-119. One of the fundamental practices of diplomacy in the Ottoman State was the exchange of gifts. On the subject of gift-giving in the context of Ottoman-British relations, see. Talbot, *British-Ottoman Relations, 1661-1807*, p. 105-40. For a study that draws attention to the presentation of gifts to renew the *ahdnames* by utilizing the Sultan’s friendship and its aspect that strengthens the rhetoric of alliance through friendship, see. Talbot, “A Treaty of Narratives”.

20 For an example of the gift presented to the Grand Vizier by an ambassador before his audience with the Sultan, see. Mahmut Halef Cevrioğlu, *XVII. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı-Habsburg Diplomatik İlişkileri ve Osmanlı Diplomasisi*, İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University, Phd Thesis, İzmir 2021, p. 126-128. For an example of gifts given to diplomatic officials, see. Cevrioğlu, p. 156-160.

21 The transcription of the decree found in the Ottoman archive was included in a master’s thesis, albeit with minor deficiencies. See. Aylin Dengiz Ökke, *Mühimme Defterlerinde Kayıtlı Avrupalı Hükümdarlara Gönderilmiş Nâme-i Hümayûnlar (1545-1696)*, Marmara University, Master’s Thesis, İstanbul 2020, p. 206-207; Susan A. Skilliter, *The Turkish Documents Relating to Edward Barton’s Embassy to the Porte (1588-1598)*, University of Manchester, Phd Thesis, 1965, p. 60-61. Also, see. Refik, *Türkler ve Kraliçe Elizabet*, p. 24-25, Document no: 11.

22 Skilliter, *The Turkish Documents Relating to Edward Barton’s Embassy to the Porte (1588-1598)*, p. 79.

sultan was expected to renew the *ahdname*, but this required, as was customary, greeting the new sultan with congratulatory letters and gifts, and therefore a considerable expenditure<sup>23</sup>. Henry Lello (1597–1606), who was temporarily in charge of English affairs in Ottoman domains after Barton’s death in 1597, reminded the Levant Company in a letter written in 1598 of the necessity of immediate action for the appointment of a new ambassador as well as the ratification of their charter<sup>24</sup>. Yet, it was not until 1599 that the English could come to congratulate the Sultan with new letters and gifts. It was only then that the term of the new ambassador, Henry Lello, became an official one. Thanks to this “well-planned” timing, double expenses were avoided via congratulating the new sultan and accrediting the new ambassador at the same time<sup>25</sup>. Despite the delays, Lello managed to have the English *ahdname* renewed and even have new privileges added to it. The *ahdname* was renewed in 1601, with a broader scope, and among the most notable changes was the article on Holland. This issue reflects the rivalry between England and France. In fact, before 1601, the Hollanders, as a state without an official name, were obligated to trade in the Levant under the flag of France, which held this privilege<sup>26</sup>.

The rivalry between England and France dates back to 1580 when the English were granted to trade in well-protected domains. The debates, which involved both the ambassadors of the two states and the Ottoman administration, lasted around thirty years<sup>27</sup>. The key component of the rivalry was determining under which state’s flag the Dutch merchants were allowed to

- 
- 23 Alfred C. Wood, *A History of The Levant Company*, Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., London-Liverpool 1964, p. 27.
- 24 John Sanderson, *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602*, ed. William Foster, The Hakluyt Society, London 1931, p. 175.
- 25 The gift was splendid enough to make the long delay forgettable and to renew and extend the privileges granted to the English. Upon its arrival in Istanbul, the gift made a tremendous impression and was greatly admired. For more information on this gift, see Dallam’s journey from England and his experiences in Istanbul. *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant: I.- The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam, 1599-1600. II.- Extracts from the Diaries of Dr John Covel, 1670-1679. With Some Account of the Levant Company of Turkey merchants*, ed. James Theodore Bent, Ashgate Ebook, Surrey 2010, p. 1-98.
- 26 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, III/2, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara 1982, p. 235; Bülent Arı, *The First Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul: Cornelis Haga and the Dutch Capitulations of 1612*, Bilkent University, Phd Thesis, Ankara 2003, p. 67-69. It is plausible, in theory, that they sail under the French flag. However, it should be noted that the jurisdiction over the Dutch was disputed between England and France during the time of the English Ambassador Barton until 1609. Approximately between 1596 and 1609, the Dutch travelled back and forth through the Ottoman realms under either English or French jurisdiction.
- 27 For 16th-century rivalries and developments, see. De Lamar Jensen, “The Ottoman Turks in Sixteenth Century French Diplomacy”, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16/4 (1985), p. 451-70. The Venetians were also involved in this rivalry and acted in alliance with the French ambassador. This is quite understandable because the arrival of the English in the Levant caused two losses for the Venetians. Firstly, the Venetians’ revenues from trade decreased. Secondly, the intermediary role of the Venetians, who sold English fabrics to the east, would end. This meant a contraction in both import and export activities for Venice. *Skilliter, The Turkish Documents Relating to Edward Barton’s Embassy to the Porte (1588-1598)*, p. 4. On the rivalry between England and France, also see. Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı’na Giden Yol*, p. 47-75. For an article on this particular rivalry, which covers the Dutch case in detail, see. Arthur Leon Horniker, “Anglo-French Rivalry in the Levant from 1583 to 1612”, *The Journal of Modern History*, 18/4 (1946), p. 289-305.



operate. Although this issue appears to have been somewhat settled in the English Treaty of 1601, which was renewed primarily to the efforts of English ambassadors Edward Barton and his successor Henry Lello, conflicts and complaints persisted<sup>28</sup>.

The Dutch were to trade under the English flag after the renewed English *ahdname*. As a result, various ships from the four Dutch provinces were to fly the English flag, and the English consuls were to act as their representatives upon their arrival and departure to and from Ottoman ports, as well as to pay the English consular fees<sup>29</sup>. In reality, based on Sanderson's communication, one may claim that the Dutch were under the English flag in Ottoman lands prior to 1601. Sanderson reports in his letter to Richard Colthurs (1597-1606), the English consul in Aleppo, in 1600 that the Grand Vizier informed him of the fact that the Sultan had received a request from the French embassy regarding the Dutch. However, in his response, the Sultan stated that this prerogative was granted to England. Sanderson continues his letter by stating, among England's privileges, there was a distinct provision specifically for the Dutch, and that a copy of this document would be delivered to Colthurs as soon as possible<sup>30</sup>.

The French and English *ahdnames* were renewed in 1604, following the accession of Sultan Ahmed I (r.1603-1617) to the throne. It is worth noting that the item enabling the Dutch to trade under the English flag, as in the previous *ahdname*, was preserved. Nevertheless, the problem of Dutch protection was not fully addressed, plus, the French and English consuls in various ports continued to disagree on the matter<sup>31</sup>. This was most likely owing to an article in the French *ahdname* from 1604 which states that countries other than England and Venice could conduct trade under the French flag<sup>32</sup>. Talbot finds it noteworthy that the British were allowed jurisdiction over Dutch traders in Ottoman countries as part of the additions made to their Capitulations in 1607, which of course occurred prior to the Dutch Capitulations' issuance in 1612<sup>33</sup>. Talbot's comment is partially correct. Indeed, the Dutch were granted the right to trade under their own flag in the *ahdname* of 1612, having previously been subject to English jurisdiction. However, it is more convenient to date the jurisdiction privilege to 1601

28 For the *ahdname* of 1601, see. Feridun Bey, *Mecmûa-i Münşeatü's-Selâtin*, 2, İstanbul 1285, p. 473-477; Kurat, p. 204-208; Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 29-34.

29 Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 33. The four provinces are Holland, Zeeland, Friesland, and Gelderland.

30 Sanderson, p. 199. In 1601, Lello also informed his superiors that the coming and going of the Dutch under the jurisdiction of England was ensured by the Sultan's order and that this would be recorded in their charter. See. Horniker, p. 301.

31 Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 54.

32 Kütükoğlu, considering the fact that the treaty granted to the English was a few days after the French, finds it more reasonable to interpret the fact that the Dutch not being mentioned in the French treaty, although various nations were, as a sign that they were left under the jurisdiction of England. Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 54.

33 Talbot, *British-Ottoman Relations, 1661-1807*, p. 32.

rather than 1607. What's more intriguing is that in 1607, the English secured a privilege that allowed not just the Dutch but also other Europeans without a charter to enter and exit well-protected domains under the English flag<sup>34</sup>.

Ottaviano Bon (1604-1609), the Venetian ambassador in Istanbul, attributed the privilege granted to English envoy Thomas Glover (1606-1611) to a series of presents, as well as the fact that only the English provided the sultan with powder and arms. However, when the French Ambassador learned of this destructive conduct, he made such vigorous protestations, citing his ancient capitulations, that further action was put on hold<sup>35</sup>. Shortly afterwards, the French had this privilege annulled, but for several years, the two sides continued to quarrel over the flag issue. The simple fact remains that ambassador Thomas Glover acquired a privilege that permitted not just the Dutch, but all other Europeans (with the exception of the French and Venetians) to travel under the English flag. It was only after instructions from Robert Cecil that Glover reached an agreement with the French ambassador in October 1609 that the English should not claim jurisdiction over any foreigners other than the Dutch<sup>36</sup>. This agreement can be confirmed by Contarini (1608-1612), the dispatch of the Venetian ambassador in Constantinople. According to his communication of October 3, 1609, when the French ambassador (de Salignac) paid him a visit, he informed him that he and the English ambassador had struck an agreement. As a result, the Dutch revenues were to be divided evenly between the English and French consuls<sup>37</sup>.

A dispatch dated two weeks later mentions that the secretaries of the French and English ambassadors apparently brought a copy of this agreement made by their ambassadors to the Venetian embassy for safekeeping<sup>38</sup>. This was a precautionary measure to ensure proof in the event of a future disagreement.

According to the agreement:

*a- of the consular fees exacted from the merchant ships that come from the seventeen provinces of Flanders and the Low Countries or from elsewhere into the Levant, a fair division shall be made, the French Consul taking half and the English Consul half, both of imports and exports;*

*b- the English Consuls may not take fees from any other shipping than that of the seventeen Provinces;*

*c- The present accord shall hold good during the entire period of the Ambassadors' residence. They pledge their word of honour to make no innovation of any kind whatsoever;*

34 Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 54. Kurat states that this privilege was canceled at the end of 1607. The French ambassador "confirmed that the privilege of the 'flag' belonged to the French alone." Kurat, p. 116.

35 *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, 1603-1607*, ed. Horatio F. Brown, X, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London 1900, p. 475-486, No: 712.

36 Sanderson, p. 238.

37 Brown, *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*, 1904, 11, p. 358-375, No: 644.

38 *Ibid.*, No: 669.



*d- the moment this accord is signed both parties shall inform their respective Consuls, that they may at once conform their conduct to its terms;*

*e- the accord is to be signed and sealed by both Ambassadors and given to the Illustrious Bailo for custody and reference in case of dispute, but each must inform the other of this reference and if one does not appear at the time intimated the other shall be at liberty to consult the document;*

*f- if difficulties arise as to the interpretation of any clause, the Bailo with two French and two English merchants shall decide<sup>39</sup>.*

Despite the accord, quarrels between the English and French did not come to an end. While this continued from time to time in Istanbul, these countries entered into serious conflicts involving their neighbors in their own regions. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, especially Anglo-Dutch relations were shaped by a serious economic rivalry. King James I (r.1603–1625) was aware of the importance of the Dutch as a growing maritime power. Robert Cecil, who had been in charge of foreign affairs during Queen Elizabeth’s reign, was known to have had influence on King James I in making important decisions on matters concerning the Dutch, but when Cecil died in 1612, the strained Anglo-Dutch relations began to deteriorate<sup>40</sup>. That year was the exact year when the Dutch were granted an *ahdname* from the Ottomans.

Moreover, foreign envoys in Istanbul collaborated to prevent the establishment of Ottoman-Dutch relations, as it would be against their own interests. In this period, the ambassadors of England, Venice, and France kept in contact with each other in the Ottoman capital and acted together to drive the Dutch out of the region. In this regard, the English envoy met with the Venetian ambassador, Contarini, and informed him that he did not want the Dutch representation in Istanbul and that an alliance between the Ottomans and the Dutch would be damaging to everybody. Upon the arrival of the new French ambassador (de Sancy) in Istanbul, the English ambassador stated that he had determined to align himself with the French envoy in order to “advise” the sultan to stick with his old friends rather than making new ones<sup>41</sup>. However, these efforts proved inconclusive, and the Dutch were granted the privilege of trading under their own flag in the well-protected domains<sup>42</sup>. As a result, the protracted dispute between the embassies in Istanbul over the Dutch was officially resolved.

39 Ibid., No: 670.

40 Gerald Malcolm David Howat, *Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, St. Martin’s Press, New York 1974, p. 54-59.

41 *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, 1610-1613*, XII, ed. Horatio F. Brown, His Majesty’s Stationery Office, London 1905, p. 171-90, No: 273.

42 For studies on the establishment of Ottoman-Dutch relations, see. Bülent Arı, “Early Ottoman-Dutch Relations”, *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, ed. Kemal Çiçek vd., I, Yeni Türkiye, Ankara 2000, p. 317-324; Mehmet Bulut, *Ottoman-Dutch economic relations in the early modern period 1571-1699*, Hilversum, Verloren 2001, p. 107-28; Arı, “The First Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul”: Alexander H. De Groot, *The Netherlands and Turkey: Four Hundred Years of Political, Economical, Social and Cultural Relations*, Gorgias Press, 2010, p. 9-14, 29-37, 139-60; Tijn Vanneste, *Intra-European Litigation in Eighteenth-Century Izmir: The Role of the Merchants’ Style*, Brill, 2021, p. 22-28.

The English *ahdname* of 1612 contains a referral to the past and then expounds that the gifts sent by the king of England and Thomas Glover's request for the approval of his ambassadorial mission had both been accepted three years after Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617)'s ascension to the throne. The document emphasizes Glover's appeal to add certain matters to the existing *ahdname*. One issue was related to allowing those who did not have their ambassadors at the Porte to trade within the Ottoman State. The privilege Ambassador Glover was seeking to obtain was to allow such communities to trade under the flag of one of the European states to which the Ottoman State had already granted an *ahdname*. In this respect, many merchant groups would prefer trading under the English flag and applying to English consuls. Although the Dutch merchant community preferred to trade under the English flag prior to 1612, the French ambassador was able to obtain a concession during the reign of Mehmed III (r. 1595-1603), during the Siege of Eger, stating that European merchants could only trade under the French flag in Ottoman domains and apply to French consuls. During Glover's ambassadorship, however, Sultan Ahmed I reaffirmed the *ahdname*, asserting that the Dutch might trade under the English flag if they so desired, that they could apply to English consuls, and that French consuls could not force merchants to do anything against their will<sup>43</sup>.

Quarrels between England and France over the protection of Dutch communities ended when the Dutch were finally granted the privilege of trading in the well-protected domains under their own flag in 1612. The article concerning the Dutch is preserved in the *ahdname* granted to England in 1612. At first glance, to assume that maybe this condition had been renewed in 1612 seems reasonable because the Dutch *Ahdname* of 1612 was only granted later on in that year. However, the same issue was repeated even in the later *ahdnames*. This calls into question the other possible interpretation that it might have been due to conservatism or to the attitude of the Ottoman chancery clerks regarding such diplomatic matters<sup>44</sup>.

## The English *Ahdname* of 1612

Based on the first *ahdname* provided to the English, there are no direct privileges conferred to them other than free trade, the power to appoint consuls, and the right to settle disputes among themselves. The basic framework of the first treaty is characterized by a majority of provisions requesting Ottoman protection and care for the English. Some of these include refraining from capturing the English, releasing them if captured, not interfering with their trade, and not imposing further taxes on them. As is typical, the clauses end with a warning to the Ottomans not to violate the treaty<sup>45</sup>.

43 See. Transcription.

44 Groot, *The Netherlands and Turkey*, 129, p. 133.

45 To trace the privileges granted to England before 1612, see. Kütükoğlu, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol*, p. 27-34. Also, see. David Fisher, *Development and Organization of English Trade to Asia: 1553-1606*, University of

Following the first years of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, in addition to addressing tax issues, the first charter was relatively elaborated. It included privileges for new areas of Ottoman sovereignty (such as the Black Sea) where the English could trade, as well as introducing additional privileges such as free movement and trade of nations without representatives in Constantinople in Ottoman territory under the English flag. The 1612 edition addressed the same topics as the previous one, but it also featured additional articles on various other topics. The *ahdname* granted to England in 1612 has not yet been found in the Ottoman or British archives. However, titled *Treaty of Capitulation between Sultan Ahmed I and King James I of England*, the *ahdname* of 1612 is found among the 25 documents registered under *Various Ottoman Turkish documents* in the Uppsala Ottoman Heritage classification in the Digital Collections category of the Uppsala University Library<sup>46</sup>. These documents were donated to the library by Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld (1655-1727). It is quite likely that Sparwenfeld acquired this *ahdname* during one of his travels, considering that he had purchased many books, manuscripts, scrolls, and letters throughout his life. A keen traveler and interested in classical and Oriental studies, Sparwenfeld served the state at various levels throughout his career. He not only collected various books during his travels in the Netherlands, France, Russia, Italy, Spain, and Tunisia, but also met scholars as well as people involved in libraries and archives. Throughout his life, he collected precious books and documentation, almost all of which he personally paid for and donated to Swedish libraries after organizing the collection thematically and by language<sup>47</sup>.

The characteristics of the *Ahdname* of 1612 are not available on the website, so unfortunately giving the exact dimensions or material information about its paper is not currently possible. However, pre-Tanzimat *ahdnames* were known to be single pieces of paper created by rolling several papers into each other that would be glued together and have varying lengths according to the length of the text. The widths also seemed to vary<sup>48</sup>. Based on its appearance, the *ahdname* of 1612 is a single piece of paper written in a *divanî* script with black ink, which was the preferred style for the *ahdnames* of the Ottoman classical period. Additionally, a yellowish paper [*âbâdî*] produced from silk and imported from India, China, and Central Asia is what the Ottomans usually used and preferred in their correspondence with foreign rulers<sup>49</sup>. This type of paper had larger dimensions and was more suitable for emphasizing the splendor of the sultan. The paper was generally polished or coated with a

London, PhD Thesis, London 1970, p. 142-143.

46 <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:alvin:portal:record-55603> [Access 24.01.2021] I thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sait Türkhan for bringing this *ahdname* to my attention. In 2021, a master's thesis made detailed use of this treaty. See. Rabia Demir, *Osmanlı-İngiliz Diplomatik Münasebetleri (1580-1699)*, İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University, Master's Thesis, İzmir 2021, p. 78-90.

47 See, Svenskt biografiskt lexikon, <https://sok.riksarkivet.se/sbl/mobil/Artikel/20002> [Access 24.01.2023].

48 Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)*, İstanbul 1994, p. 168.

49 I am grateful to Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu for sharing with me the knowledge that this type of paper is called *âbâdî*.

fluid mixture consisting of water and eggs, giving it a glossy appearance<sup>50</sup>. This technique applied on paper was referred to as *âharlama*<sup>51</sup>.

Granted by Ahmed I, the *ahdname* of 1612 has a flamboyant *tughra* (sultan's seal) adorned with floral designs in gold, red, and blue colors preceding the text. This *tughra* is a good example of the use of semi-stylized floral motifs for decorative purposes, which were widely used in the Ottoman State in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>52</sup>. The *ahdname* mostly consists of former privileges and includes additional ones awarded to the English, as well as extended versions of previous articles. The new privileges specifically addressed personal law and the rights of diplomatic officials, as well as navigation and trade.

The first aspect of personal law that one encounters for the first time is how the cases of those who committed crimes in the Ottoman domains, either from England or acting under the English flag, would be handled. Accordingly, if anyone under English responsibility sheds blood or commits misdemeanor, the legal authorities in the relevant place would hear their cases. However, the cases would not be heard in the absence of English ambassadors and consuls.

When it comes to the rights of embassy officials, it is convenient to include dragomans in this category since they were employees of the embassy or consulate. In the previous *ahdnames*, there were articles regarding the imprisonment, indebtedness, and death of individuals under English jurisdiction. However, in 1612 it was also specified how dragomans should be treated in similar situations. Dragomans were not to be imprisoned without informing their ambassadors and consuls. If a dragoman was imprisoned at the behest of the ambassadors or consuls and died, the ambassadors would confiscate his property if he was from England. If he was an Ottoman subject, his property would be given to his heir, if he had one; if he did not have one, it would be confiscated by the *Bayt-al mal* officials (this might be put simply as inheritance authorities).

Another issue related to the rights of embassies was “consulage”. The payment, known as consulage was levied on all goods and financed the embassy and consulate expenses<sup>53</sup>. Merchants who imported or exported goods had to grant this payment to the consul of the state

50 Kolodziejczyk, p. 39.

51 For information on *âharlama* see. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)*, p. 22.

52 Gülnur Duran, “Osmanlı Tezhip Sanatında Natüralist Üslûpta Çiçekler”, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 31 (2018), p. 179-80. For examples of 16th-century *tughra* in *ahdnames* and their evolution, see. Aktaş, p. 82-95.

53 Geoffrey R. Berridge, *British Diplomacy in Turkey, 1583 to the present: A study in the evolution of the resident embassy*, Brill, Nijhoff, Leiden-Boston 2009, p. 28. Foreign merchants in the Ottoman realm were obligated to pay a tax known as consular right or *cottimo*. This tax was supposed to be paid to their representatives with certainty and without exception. See. Özgür Oral, “1763 Tarihli İzmir Rûsüm-ı Reftiye Tarifesine Dair Yeni Bulgular”, *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları*, 53 (2020), p. 303.

under whose flag they traded<sup>54</sup>. This payment was necessary for the continuity of trade in the Levant<sup>55</sup>. Although the *ahdname* stipulated that the consulage for the goods loaded on ships within the Ottoman realms and the customs be paid, it was learned that some merchants from Chios, Muslims, *müste'men*, and *harbî* merchants did not comply with this. Consequently, it was determined that regardless of who owned the cargo placed on the ships, the consular right should be paid in accordance with the *ahdname*, and that this matter should be brought under control. One of the two aspects related to navigation and trade are the articles on customs. In this charter, it is mentioned that English ships visited Algeria and the Maghreb and carried a large number of pilgrims to the Port of Alexandria. This is not surprising. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, these pilgrims preferred to arrive in Egypt on a French or English ship, as they offered better protection against attacks by Maltese pirates<sup>56</sup>. However, when the ships arrived in Alexandria, local officials demanded duties on all commodities on board, even though they had not been unloaded from the ship and forbade them from carrying any passengers. They even insulted the merchants by demanding customs from ships destined for Istanbul, even though no goods had been unloaded. As a result, an article was enacted asserting that customs duties would be applied on products unloaded from ships arriving in Istanbul, Alexandria, Tripoli (Trablusşam), and other locations, but not on goods that were not unloaded.

The second component of customs concerns indigo trade. In 1612, an article was introduced stating that when merchants from England or sailing under the English flag purchased indigo, they were required to pay the same amount of tax as Venetian merchants but not more. The issue must have been added to the *ahdname* as a result of complaints made to the English ambassador in Istanbul about the product's market demand and competitiveness. The Ottomans imported and exported indigo, which was used to dye garments and in a variety of other uses<sup>57</sup>. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, weaving products known as 'coarse blue cottons' were dyed with indigo<sup>58</sup>. Among the dye substances, indigo in particular occupied an important place

54 Kütükoğlu, "Ahidnâme", p. 538.

55 Mortimer Epstein, *The Early History of the Levant Company*, G. Routledge & Sons, London 1908, p. 157.

56 Suraiya Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj Under the Ottomans 1517-1683*, I.B. Tauris, London-New York 2014, p. 142. For an analysis of pilgrimage in economic and political contexts from the Ottoman perspective, see. p. 146-173.

57 On the indigo trade of Venice in the eighteenth century, see. Özgür Oral, *Osmanlı-Venedik Ticari İlişkileri (1763-1794)*, İstanbul University, PhD Thesis, İstanbul 2017, p. 260. It is known that in 1598, an English apprentice began to gain commercial experience in the indigo trade in Aleppo, see. M. Sait Türkhan, *18. Yüzyılda Doğu Akdeniz'de Ticaret ve Haleb*, İstanbul University, PhD Thesis, İstanbul 2014, p. 133-134. For a study on the use of indigo in traditional Turkish marbling, see. Ayşe Sözdemir Aşlamacı, *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi'ndeki Bazı Evkâf Defterlerinde Kullanılan Ebrûlar*, Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf University, Master's Thesis, İstanbul 2018.

58 Coarse blue cottons dyed with indigo were produced in large quantities as early as the 16th century and were shipped from İzmir to Marseilles for public consumption. Additionally, these types of cottons were shipped to America to be worn by slaves on plantations. See, Halil İnalçık-Bülent Arı, "Türk-İslam-Osmanlı Şehirciliği ve Halil İnalçık'ın Çalışmaları", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 6 (2005), p. 48.

among the goods in demand in the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Aleppo trade<sup>59</sup>. Therefore, it was important for the English to bring this issue to the agenda and have it added to the *ahdname* in order to avoid problems with the local authorities in line with their needs.

The article on Caffa is another aspect related to navigation and trade. It is striking that both the *ahdname* of 1601, which is cited by Sanderson, and the edict of 1588 cover this article, whereas in the works of Kurat and Feridun Bey which incorporates the *ahdname* of 1601, there is no mention of it. Caffa, located on the Crimean coast of the Black Sea, was one of the most important ports for navigation and trade. When the Ottoman army largely established their control over the Black Sea in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, they allowed the trade of Italian city-states such as Venice, Genoa, and Florence in this region for a while longer. It is widely accepted in the literature that the gradual closing of the Black Sea to foreign trade began in the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>60</sup>. İdris Bostan states that the Black Sea was completely closed to foreign trade at the end of the 16th century and remained so throughout the 17th century<sup>61</sup>.

Officially, if not in effect, an article in the English *ahdname* allowed them to trade in the Black Sea. Although the Ottomans awarded France an *ahdname* before the English, they had no trading privileges in the Black Sea before or after 1604<sup>62</sup>. Even the Dutch, the so-called latecomers to the Levant, were granted with a detailed clause in 1612 that allowed them to trade in the Black Sea<sup>63</sup>. Zarinebaf contends that European merchants other than the Dutch did not have this right, which is inaccurate<sup>64</sup>. It is widely recognized that, despite the Black Sea being “strictly closed” to international trade, several states were allowed advantages in their *ahdnames*. The English had a privileged relationship with the Black Sea dating back to previous eras. According to Kurat and Sanderson, who referred to the *ahdname* of 1601, the English were permitted to travel to the Black Sea region for trade by land or sea<sup>65</sup>. Feridun Bey’s work also mentions these privileges<sup>66</sup>. It is crucial to note that the 1588 decree’s grant

59 Robert Mantran, “XVI ve XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Asya Ticareti”, trans. Zeki Arıkan, *Bellekten*, LI/201 (1987), p. 1438. In the 18th century, English interest in indigo continued in Aleppo, albeit to a lesser extent. See, M. Sait Türkhan, “Doğu Akdeniz’de İngiliz Ticareti: İskenderun-Londra Hattında İngiliz Ticaret Filosu (1704-1706)”, *Avrasya İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 4/1 (2016), p. 27-60.

60 Mikail Acıpınar, “Ahidnâmeler Çerçevesinde Karadeniz’de Ticaret ve Yabancı Tüccarların Durumu (XV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)”, *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5/12 (2015), p. 327.

61 İdris Bostan, “Rusya’nın Karadeniz’de Ticarete Başlaması ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu (1700-1787)”, *Bellekten*, LIX/225 (1995), p. 353. For the reasons why the closure of the Black Sea to trade was necessary for the Ottoman State, see, Acıpınar, p. 326-327.

62 Acıpınar, *ibid.*, p. 321-324.

63 Groot, *The Netherlands and Turkey*, p. 148, 159.

64 Zarinebaf, p. 123.

65 “from the Don River to Azov, to Moskov and to the Russian provinces” See, Kurat, p. 207 and Sanderson, p. 286.

66 It is noteworthy that the Feridun Bey copy, despite having almost twice as many privileges, shares the same date (1601) as the Kurat and Sanderson copies. Furthermore, most of the articles in Feridun Bey’s copy are also present in the *ahdname* of 1612. Assuming that the 1601 copies of Kurat and Sanderson are complete,



of privilege involving the Black Sea does not appear in the *ahdname* of 1601 as seen in Kurat's and Feridun Bey's works. The English were allowed license to trade in the Black Sea in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, as evidenced by this early document. The phrases "from the Don River to Azov, Moskov, and the Russian provinces" and "when the wind is contrary and ships coming to Istanbul fall into Caffa or a neighborhood in those directions" provide additional proof of this<sup>67</sup>. The privilege is also recognized in the *ahdname* of 1601 cited by Sanderson. The place written as "Raffa" in this text should be Caffa<sup>68</sup>. Therefore, leaving aside the Italian city-states, it is possible to argue that England was the first state in Europe, which was granted permission to access the Black Sea.

In 1612, it is seen that the privileges granted in the time of Thomas Glover were renewed and additions were made. In 1612, the permission the English had received in 1588 for the Black Sea trade appears:

*"İngilterelü tüccârî vesâir âdemleri satun aldıkları metâ'dan memnû' olmayan metâ'ı bey' u şîrâ için deryâdan ve karadan Ten suyundan Azağa ve Mosku[kov] ve Rus vilâyetlerine metâ' alub gidüb ve memâlî-i mahrûseme ol cânibden metâ' getirüb bey' u şîrâ idüb ve vilâyet-i 'Acemden kuvvet-i kâhiremiz ile feth olunan vilâyetlere metâ' alub gidüb getürmek istediklerinde kimesne mâni' olmayub zikr olunan metâ'dan feth olunan yerlerde kadîmden ne vechile gümrük alınugelmîş ise gerü olvehile alınub ziyâde almayalar ve rüzgâr muhâlif olmağla İstânbûla gelecek gemileri Kefeye veyahüd ol câniblerde bir mahalle düşdükde hüsn ü rızâlarıyla bey' itedin kimesne cebren metâ'ların çıkarub almayalar ve ol câniblere varan gemilerine kimesne mâni' olmayub muhavvef ve muhâtara olan yerlerde hükkâm gemilerin ve içinde olan âdemlerin ve metâ'ların koruyub sıyânet eyleyeler."*<sup>69</sup>

However, it is noteworthy that, despite being included in the *ahdnames*, the clauses that stipulated the right to conduct trade without restriction in the Black Sea remained reserved as a right that *was not* exercised and *could not* be exercised. This is in complete contrast to those related to the Mediterranean, and it is a subject that has not been studied much, as much as it is remarkable<sup>70</sup>. Kemal Beydilli finds it incomprehensible that such an article was added even though the use of this privilege would be prohibited. In his opinion, the first initiative to open the Black Sea for commerce began in the last quarter of the 18th century on account of Russia<sup>71</sup>. Nevertheless, there have been cases in which permission was granted to sail in the Black Sea for trading purposes as well as incidents of unauthorized sailing.

the significantly higher number of articles in Feridun Bey's work may make it possible to speculate that the *ahdname* may have been issued after 1601. Feridun Bey, *Münşeâtü's-Selâtin*, II, p. 473-477.

67 *Münşe'ât Mecmûası*, p. 173 (11).

68 Sanderson, p. 286. The name of the city is written as Caffa or Kaffa in English. However, based on the 1588-dated edict mentioning Kefe, it is likely that Sanderson was also referring to it.

69 See. Transcription.

70 Kemal Beydilli, "Karadeniz'in Kapalılığı Karşısında Avrupa Küçük Devletleri ve 'Miri Ticâret' Teşebbüsü", *Belleten*, LV/214 (1991), p. 687.

71 Beydilli, *ibid.*, p. 688-692.

There are three pertinent examples from the early 17th century for this specific case regarding England. First, in a letter dated March 15, 1609, Thomas Glover informs Sanderson of the Royall Defence's departure for the Black Sea. Despite strong opposition, Glover secured both a license and various arrangements for the Royall Defence. According to the information provided in this letter, the envoy informs the Levant Company of its desires to trade in the Black Sea and adds that the Royall Defence sailed for Keefe along with various destinations on March 15 as the first English ship to be seen across the Black Sea. In his letter to Sanderson dated 5 April, he also mentions that the Royall Defence had returned from the Black Sea the day before with no collision or casualties<sup>72</sup>.

A few months later, an order was issued to the qadis in and around Caffa upon the information that an English ship was crossing the Black Sea towards Caffa to buy agricultural products, timber, and other commercial items. The order required that the ship in issue not receive any items from the docks and be returned to Istanbul unloaded, as well as any information regarding the piers it had visited and the merchandise it intended to purchase<sup>73</sup>. Glover does not appear to have received the same clearance as the Royall Defence.

It cannot be a coincidence that Glover reports the interest of the Levant Company in Black Sea commerce. Action must have been taken in this direction, since the following year the Venetian ambassador in Istanbul, Contarini, notes in his report dated May 2, 1610, that several English merchants came to Istanbul with this intention. For this purpose, an office would be established in Trabzon, and the merchants, who had already been to Persia, would transport the silk from Persia to Trabzon, then to Istanbul, where it would be transferred to the Christian lands. If this were to happen, the silk trade of Venice in Syria would be severely affected<sup>74</sup>. Although Contarini did not name any merchants, one of them can be identified as John Midnall based on Glover's letter to Robert Cecil on May 19, 1610.

According to Glover's account, a controversy had been concocted around the English merchant John Midnall. Evidently, Midnall had asked the ambassador to give him all kinds of support, including granting him free passage in order to locate a trading route to Trabzon and then overland to Georgia and Persia. In accordance with his request, Midnall was granted permission and additional precautions were made to assure his safety. With his safety ensured, the merchant chartered a small ship to carry him and his two young English companions to Trabzon with all of their belongings and money. According to Glover, Grand Vizier Murad Pasha retrieved the ship immediately after it had sailed at the instigation of his adversaries in Constantinople. All of their possessions and money were confiscated on the grounds that they were spies for the Shah of Iran. Glover stipulated that the basis for this was that Midnall

72 Sanderson, p. 261-262.

73 Acipinar, p. 329-330.

74 Brown, *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*, 1904, 11, p. 476-484, No: 886.

could speak Persian. Upon hearing of the situation, he went to Murad Pasha and sought to resolve it. At the end of an intense process, the merchant was vindicated and received all his money and possessions back<sup>75</sup>.

The premise is that the Black Sea supplied a significant source of wealth for the Ottomans, as well as the security of the state's northern boundaries and capital security, which influenced the decision to close the Black Sea to international trade<sup>76</sup>. It was probably for these reasons that the Grand Vizier of the time did not want the English to establish a connection with Iran via the Black Sea. The Venetian ambassador reasons the opposition to such an attempt for two reasons. The first is that it was against the interests of the Ottomans. The second reason was that Georgian and Armenian merchants were aware that the English profits from this business would reduce their own profits<sup>77</sup>.

## Conclusion

The *ahdnames* established a legal framework for international trade and the persons who engage in it on Ottoman territory. These documents allow us to comprehend the interaction between the Ottoman Government and the other states. Furthermore, the *ahdnames* provide unique insights into the relationship between Istanbul and London. Upon reviewing the available material, it is obvious that the *ahdnames* bestowed to England provide an exceptional chance to identify the privileges conferred to the English for the first time in the Ottoman territories. After England acquired its first *ahdname* in 1580, over time, the privileges were further expanded. The 1612 *ahdname* discussed in the present article sheds light on the evolving nature of the connection between the two states. Furthermore, it provides for an in-depth evaluation of the changes in this relationship in light of the past, as well as insight into England's position in the Ottoman realm. After evaluating the occurrences leading up to the *ahdname* of 1612, it is obvious that England was the first Western European power to be granted the right to trade on the Black Sea. This document involves the rights of the English in some matters relating to personal law, the rights of embassy officials, as well as navigation and trade for the first time.

75 Sanderson, p. 297-298. Glover was perhaps right to blame or suspect his colleagues. After all, the Venetian ambassador had already written a report on May 2 expressing his concerns. Also, in his report of May 29, he stated that such an incident was beneficial for their merchants in Aleppo and Tripoli. See. Brown, *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*, 1904, XI, p. 484-498, No: 921. According to Demir, the record of the order within the Kamil Kepeci (KK) is related to the John Midnall incident. However, it is important to exercise caution when considering Demir's account due to the discrepancy in dates; the date of Kamil Kepeci record is 1609, while the John Midnall incident occurred in May 1610. It is worth noting that John Midnall, shortly after his departure for Trabzon, was forced to return, and his goods were confiscated. However, in the example from KK, the ship sailed to Caffa, was requested to return empty, and was asked for information regarding its movements. See, Demir, p. 86-87.

76 Acipinar, p. 327.

77 Brown, *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*, 1904, XI, p. 484-498, No: 921.

## Transcription

1. İftihârü'l-ümerâ'i'l-izâmi'l-İseviyye muhtâr-ı küberâ'i'l-fihâm fi'l-milleti'l-Mesihîyye muslih-i mesâlih-i cemâhiri't-tâ'ifeti'n-Nasrâniyye sâhib-i ezyâlî'l-haşmeti ve'l-vakâr sâhib-i delâ'ili'l-mecd ve'l-iftihâr
2. İngiltere ve Françe ve Hiberne ve Britanya-yı Kebîr vilâyetlerinin Kralı Yakob [Jacob] *hutimet 'avâkıbıhu bi'l-hayr* mukaddemâ vilâyet-i mezbûre kraliçesi dergâh-ı sa'âdet-destgâhımızdaki melâz ve melce'-i selâtin-i
3. cihân ve me'âz [u] penâh-ı havâkîn-i devrândır müdebbir beyzâde ve âdemleri ve gemileri ile pişkeşleri gelüb vâsıl olub ve irsâl etdikleri hedâyâ hayyiz-i kabûlde
4. vâki' olub ve bundan akdem firdevs-mekân cennet-aşiyân garîk-i rahmet-i rahmân dedem Sultan Murad Hân *tâbe serâhu* zamânında Âsitâne-i sa'âdete âdem gönderüb izhâr-ı muzâfât
5. ve ihlâs ve iş'âr-ı meveddet ve ihtisâs eyleyüb ol tarafdân âdemleri gelüb gitmek bâbında isticâze eylediklerinde merhûm ve mağfûrun leh zamânında icâzet-i hümâyûn olub
6. menâzil ü merâhilde ve me'âbir ve benâdirde deryâda ve karada kimesne rencide ve remide eylemeye deyü ahkâm-ı şerife verilmekle merhûm ve mağfûrun leh babam Sultan Mehmed Hân
7. *aleyhi'r-rahmet-i ve'l ğufrân* zamânında dergâh-ı ma'delet-penâhlarına hulûs-ı taviyyet ve safâ-yı akidet üzere 'arz-ı ihlâs ve ihtisâs eyleyüb Françe ve Venedik
8. ve Leh vesâ'ir 'atebe-i 'ulyâmıza 'arz-ı ihlâs eyleyen krallar ile mâbeynimizde mün'akid olan muvâlât ve musâfât muktezâsınca müşârünileyhâ ile dostluk üzere
9. olub âdemleri vesâ'ir tercümânları memâlik-i mahrûsemize emn ü emân üzere metâ'ları ile gelüb ticâret eyleyüb ve müşârünileyhim krallara dostluk muktezâsınca
10. verilen 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûn-ı 'izzet makrûn ve ahkâm-ı şerife mücebince müşârünileyhâ cânibine dahi verilmek bâbında istid'â-yı âtîfet eylemekle merhûm müşârünileyh dedem
11. *tâbe serâhu* zamânında 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûn ve ahkâm-ı şerife verilüb ve hâlâ dahi müşârünileyhâ tarafından vech-i meşrûh üzere 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûn verilmesi husûsu
12. pây-e serîr-i sa'âdet-masîr-i pâdişâhânelerime 'arz ve takrîr olundukda müşârünileyhânın istid'âsı hayyiz-i kabûlde vâki' olub müşârünileyh dedem *tâbe*

*serâhu* virdüğü

13. ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûn mücebince müceddeden ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûn-ı ‘adâlet-makrûn ‘inâyet edüb müşârünileyhâ kraliçe tarafından ricâ olunduğu üzere İngiltere ve İngiltere
14. bayrağı altında yürüyen tüccâr tâ’ifesi memâlik-i mahrûseye getirdikleri altûn ve gurûşdan resm alınmayub beylerbeyiler ve kâdîlar ve defterdârlar ve darbhâne emînleri
15. dahl u ta‘arruz eylemeyüb ve gurûşunuz akçe kat’ ideriz deyü rencîde ve remîde itmeyeler barut vesâir verilmek memnû‘ olan metâ‘ ve âlet-i harbden gayrı
16. memnû‘ olmayan metâ‘ı gemilerine tahmîl etdiklerinde kimesne mâni‘ olmaya ve Sebte boğazından vilâyetlerine varub gelmeğe mecâl olmadığı zamânda memâlik-i mahrûsemde
17. vâki‘ olan limânlarda ve iskelelerde yatub kendü hâllerinde alış viriş idüb kimesne mâni‘ olmaya ve İngiltere tâ’ifesi ve İngiltere bayrağı altında yürüyenlerin
18. da‘vâ ve husûmeti vâki‘ oldukda tercümânları veyâhûd vekîlleri hâzır olmayınca da‘vâların hükkâm istimâ‘ itmeyüb ve dört bin akçeden yukarı olan da‘vâları
19. Âsitâne-i sa‘âdetimde istimâ‘ oluna ve İngiltere tâcirleri ahvâli içün memâlik-i mahrûsemizde nasb u ta‘yîn etdikleri konsoloslarının ne makûle da‘vâları olur ise âsitâne-i sa‘âdetime ‘arz
20. olunub elçilerinin ma‘lûmu olmadın konsolosları habs olunub evleri mühürlenmeye ve ref’ olunmaya İngiltere ve İngiltere bayrağı altında yürüyenlerden biri mürd olsa
21. ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûna muhâlîf emvâl ve erzâkına beytû’l-mâlcılar mâl gâ’ibdir deyü dahl u ta‘arruz etmeyeler ve İngiltere tâ’ifesine verilen evâmir-i şerife ve şimden sonra
22. virilecek ahkâm-ı münîfe muhkem ve mü’ekked olub tâife-i mezbûreye ve sancâkları altında yürüyenlere da‘imâ fâ’idelü ve nef’lü ola ve kassâmlar ve kâdîlar tarafından resm-i kısmet
23. taleb olunmaya ve konsolosları istedikleri yasâkçıyı ve olıgeldüğü üzere murâd idindikleri kimesneyi tercümânlıkda istihdâm idüb yeniçerilerden ve gayrıdan cebr ile kimesne
24. hıdmetlerine karışmaya ve sâkin oldukları evlerinde kendülerin ve âdemlerinin

- kifâf-ı nefsleri için şıra sıkub hamr eylediklerinde kimesne mâni‘ olmaya ve yeniçeri kûllarımdan
25. ve gayrıdan her kim olur ise olsun bir nesnelere istemeyüb ve cebr ile almayub zulm ve ta‘addî itmeyeler ve Haleb’de ve İskenderiye’de vesâ’ir yerlerde vâki‘ olan gümrüklerin
  26. bi’t-tamâm edâ etdiklerinden sonra ziyâde bir akçe ve bir habbe taleb olunmaya ve kassâb akçesi nâmına bir akçe ve bir habbe alınmaya ve Âsitâne-i sa‘âdetimde olan Françe padişâhı İngiltere kraliçesi
  27. elçilerinin Filandrelü tüccârı husûsunda nizâ‘ları olub ikisi dahi rikâb-ı hümâyûnuma ‘arz-ı hâller sunub zikr olunan Filandre tüccârı memâlik-i mahrûseye geldüklerinde kendü
  28. bayrakları altında gelmek ricâ eylediklerinde iki tarafa dahi hatt-ı hümâyûn ile fermân olunmuşken sâbıkan vezîr-i a‘zam olub ba‘dehu kapudân iken vefât iden Cigalazâde Sinân
  29. Pâşâ Filandre tüccârı tâ‘ifesi İngiltere kraliçesine ta‘yîn olunub nâme-i hümâyûn virilmek gerekdir deyü i‘lâm idüb mûmâileyh deryâ taraflarının hâkimi ve ehl-i vukûfu
  30. olmağla sâ’ir vüzerâ-yı ‘izâm dahi müşârünileyhin re’yi üzere ‘amel olunmak münâsibdir dedikleri pâye-i serîr-i a‘lâya ‘arz olundukda müşârünileyh kapudân vesâir
  31. vüzerâ-yı ‘izâm münâsib gördükleri üzere Filandre vilâyetlerinden Hollandiye ve Zelendiye ve Firislendiye ve Gelderlendiye nâm dört pâre vilâyetlerin<sup>78</sup> tüccâr tâ‘ifesi İngiltere kraliçesi
  32. bayrağı altında gelüb gidüb ve sâ’ir İngiltere tüccârı gibi kendü metâ‘larından ve gemileri ile getürdükleri sâ’irin metâ‘ından konsolosluk hakkın vesâ’ir ‘avâ’idin
  33. İngiltere kraliçesinin elçisine virüb min-ba‘d Françe elçisi tarafından dahl u ta‘aruz olunmaya deyü hatt-ı hümâyûn ile fermân-ı âlişân sâdır olmağla bu ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûn
  34. mücebince ‘amel olunub ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnda mestûr olan şartların ve ‘ahd u emânın ta‘aruz ve ihtilâline müte‘allik bir hüküm-i hümâyûn ihrâc olunur ise Âsitâne-i sa‘âdetimde olan

78 Holland, Zeeland, Friesland and Gelderland.



35. İngiltere elçisine i'âm olunub ol dahi zikr olunan ihtilâle ve ta'arruza müte'allik olan husûsların cevâbın vire ve Haleb'de ve Mısır'da vesâ'ir memâlik-i mahrûsede olan
36. İngiltere bâzergânları kendü hâllerinde alış viriş idüb cemî' metâ'larından mukaddemâ alınugeldüğü üzere yüzde üç akçe gümrük virüb ziyâde virmeyeler ve gemileri tahmîl etdükleri
37. metâ'larının bir limânda gümrüğün virüb ol limânda metâ'ları satılmaz ise âhar limâna alub gidüb dâhil olduklarında gümrük talep olunmaya ve gemilerine tahmîl idüb getürdükleri gümrük
38. alınugelen metâ'larının konsolosluk hakkın İngiltere konsoloslarına bî-kusûr edâ ideler ve memâlik-i mahrûsemizde vâki' olan beylerbeyiler ve beyler kullarımıza ve kâdîlara ve 'umumen iskele emînlerine
39. ahkâm-ı şerife irsâl olunub fermân-ı kazâ-cereyânımız bu vechile sâdır oldu ki mâdâmki müşârünileyhâ tarafından şerâ'it-i 'ahd u peymân ri'âyet ve kavâ'id-i sulh u emân kemâ yenbağî
40. sıyânet oluna bu tarafdan dahi kendü mâlları vesâ'ir esbâb ve metâ'ları ile eğer deryâdan gelen kalyonları vesâ'ir gemileri ve içlerinde olan âdemleridir
41. ve esbâb ve metâ'larıdır ve mâllarıdır ve eğer karadan gelen âdemleri ve davârları ve esbâb ve mâlları ve metâ'larıdır asla bir ferd dahl u ta'arruz etdürmeyüb kendü hâllerinde
42. ve kâr u kesblerinde olalar ve eğer memâlik-i mahrûsemize ve eğer âhar vilâyetlere gider iken ve gelür iken rençberliklerinde iken bir tarikle esîr olur ise ol asıllar gerü halâs olalar
43. ve kalyonları vesâ'ir gemileri cemî' zamânda iskelelere ve limânlara vesâ'ir memâlik-i mahrûsemize emn ü emân üzere gelüb gideler anun gibi deryâda furtına
44. müzâyaka virdükde vesâ'ir levâzımında hâzır bulunan eğer hâssa gemiler halkıdır ve eğer gayrıdır mu'âvenet idüb ve akçeleri ile zâd u zevâdeleri tedârikinde kimesne
45. mâni' olmayub dahl u ta'arruz kılmaya ve ol diyâr tâcirleri ve tercümânları vesâ'ir âdemleri karadan ve deryâdan memâlik-i mahrûsemize gelüb bey' ü şirâ ve ticâret idüb
46. şöyle ki oligelan 'âdet ve kânun üzere rüsûm-ı 'âdiyelerin virdüklerinden sonra gelişde ve gidişde kapudânlardan ve deryadâ yürüyen re'islerden ve gayrıdan ve asker halkından

47. kimesne mâni' olmaya kendülere ve âdemlerine ve esbâb ve davârlarına dahl u ta'aruz eylemeyeler ve İngilterelinin biri medyûn olsa deyn borçludan taleb olunub alına ve kefil olmayacak
48. âhar kimesne tutulub taleb olunmaya ve eğer biri mürd olsa esbâb ve emvâlin kime vasiyyet ider ise ana virile vasiyyetsiz mürd olur ise konsolosları ma'rifeti ile ol-yerlü
49. yoldaşına virile kimesne dahl eylemeye ve İngiltere ve ana tâbi' olan yerlerin bâzergânları ve konsolosları memâlik-i mahrûsemizde bey' ü şirâ ve ticâret ve kefâlet husûslarında
50. vesâ'ir umûr-ı şer'iyeye oldukda kâdîya varub sebt ü sicil etdirüb veya hüccet alalar sonra nizâ' olur ise hüccet ve sicile nazar olunub mücebi ile 'amel oluna
51. bu ikisinden biri olmayub mücerred şâhid-zor ikâmet itmekle hilâf-ı şer' da'vâ iderler ise mâdâmki kâdîlardan hüccetleri olmayub ve sicilde
52. mukayyed bulunmaya anın gibi tezvîr itdirilmeyüb hilâf-ı şer' olan da'vâları istimâ' olunmaya ve ba'zı kimesneleri şetm eylediniz deyü iftirâ edüb şâhid ikâmet
53. eyleyüb mücerred celb ü ahz için hilâf-ı şer'-i kadîm rencîde ve remîde eylemek istediklerinde men' olunalar ve bunlardan biri medyûn olsa veyâ bir vechile müttehim
54. olub gaybet eylese anın gibi kefâletsiz âhar kimesne tutulmaya ve İngiltereliye müte'allik esîr bulunur ise ki konsolosları taleb idüb İngilterelü idikleri
55. zâhir olub şübhe olmak ihtimâli olmaz ise alınub İngiltereliye vireler İngiltere ve ana tâbi' olan yerlerden memâlik-i mahrûsemizde mütemekkin olanlar eğer
56. evlü olsun ve eğer ergen olsun rencberlik ideler anlardan harâc taleb olunmaya ve İskenderiye ve Şâm Trablûsuna ve Cezâyir ve Tûnus ve Trablûsgarb ve Mısır iskelelerine ve gayrı yere
57. ta'yîn itdükleri konsolosların tebdil eyleyüb yerlerine ol hıdmetin 'uhdesinden gelür âdemler ta'yîn idüb gönderdikde kimesne mâni' olmaya eğer tercümânları mühim maslahat üzere ise
58. gelince tevakkuf oluna ammâ anlar dahi te'allül eylemeyüb tercümânların ihzâr ideler ve İngilterelünün biri biri ile nizâ'ları olsa mezbûr elçileri ve konsolosları 'âdetlerince
59. fasl ideler kimesne mâni' olmaya şöyle ki levend kayıkları deryâdan varub İngilterelüleri 'ahidnâme verildüğü târihten sonra esîr idüb getürüb Rûmili'nde

60. veya Anadolu'da satarlar anın gibileri bulduklarında gereği gibi dikkat ve ihtimâmla teftiş olunub her kimin elinde bulunur ise kimden aldığı bulduralar esîr Müslümân olmuş ise
61. alan kimesneye akçesi andan alıvirilüb âzad olub salıvirile ve memâlik-i mahrûsemizden deryâ yüzüne çıkan gemiler ve kadırgalar ve donanmalar deryâda İngiltere gemilerine
62. buluşduklarında biri birine dostluk idüb zarar u ziyân itmeyeler. Venediklü ve Françelü vesâ'ir dostluk üzere olan krallara virilen 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûnda mestûr ve mukayyed olan
63. husûslar İngilterelünün hakkında dahi mukarrer olub şer'-i kadîm ve 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûna muhâlif kimesne mâni' ve mezâhim olmaya ve kalyonları vesâ'ir gemileri memâlik-i mahrûsemize geldiklerinde hıfz u sıyânet
64. olunub emîn ü sâlim gideler eğer esbâb ve emvâli yağmâ olunmuş bulunur ise gâret olunan esbâb ve emvâli ve gemilerinin âdemleri zuhûra gelmesi bâbında sa'y u ikdâm olunub ehl-i fesâd her kim olur ise
65. olsun gereği gibi haklarından geline ve İngilterelü tüccârı vesâ'ir âdemleri satun aldıkları metâ'dan memnû' olmayan metâ'ı bey' u şirâ için deryâdan ve karadan Ten suyundan
66. Azağa ve Moskov ve Rus vilâyetlerine metâ' alub gidüb ve memâlik-i mahrûseme ol cânibden metâ' getürüb bey' u şirâ idüb ve vilâyet-i Acem'den kuvvet-i kâhiremiz ile feth olunan
67. vilâyetlere metâ' alub gidüb getürmek istediklerinde kimesne mâni' olmayub zikr olunan metâ'dan feth olunan yerlerde kadîmden ne vechile gümrük alınugelmiş ise gerü olvechile alınub ziyâde
68. almayalar ve rüzgâr muhâlif olmağla İstanbul'a gelecek gemileri Kefe'ye veyahûd ol câniblerde bir mahalle düşdükde hüsn ü rızâlarıyla bey' itmedin kimesne cebren metâ'ların çıkarub
69. almayalar ve ol câniblere varan gemilerine kimesne mâni' olmayub muhavvef ve muhâtara olan yerlerde hükkâm gemilerin ve içinde olan âdemlerin ve metâ'ların koruyub sıyânet eyleyeler
70. zarar u ziyân olmaya ve lâzım olan zâd ü zevâdelerin bulunan yerlerde akçeleriyle almakda ve esbâbların tahmîl için araba ve gemi tutmak istediklerinde şöyle ki

71. âhardan tutulmuş olmaya kimesne mâni‘ olmayub ol cânibden İstanbul’a getürdükleri metâ‘dan mâdâm ki âhar yerde satmak için çıkarmayalar İstanbul’a gelince
72. gümrük alınmayub bunda geldikte alınub emîn ü sâlim varub gelüb ticâret eyleyeler ve beylerbeyiler ve kapudânlar ve sancâk beyi küllarım ve deryâda yürüyen kapudân küllarım ve kâdîlar ve emînler
73. ve hâssa re‘isler ve gönüllü re‘isler zikr olunan ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnun mazmûn-ı adâlet meymûnu ile ‘amel idüb hilâfına cevâz göstermeyeler işbu zikr olunan ‘ahd üzere
74. mâdâm ki sadâkat ve ihlâsda sâbit-kadem ve râsih-dem olalar bu cânibden dahi şerâ‘it-i ‘ahd ü emân kemâ-kân mer‘î ve muhterem tutulub aslâ bir vechile hilâfına cevâz gösterilmeye
75. deyü merhûm ve mağfûrun leh babam Hüdâvendigâr *tâbe serâhu* zamânında mufassal ve meşrûh ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûn virilüb ve hâlâ mûmâileyh İngiltere kralı Âsitâne-i sa‘âdetime gemileri ile
76. gönderdüğü pîşkeş elçisi olub İngiltere vilâyeti beyzâdelerinden olan Tomar Glover [Thomas Glover] rikâb-ı hümâyûnuma gelüb mûmâileyh kralın irsâl etdüğü pîşkeş ve hedâyâ
77. mûmâileyh elçi yedinden vâsıl olub makbûl-ı hümâyûnum olmakla müşârünileyh kral ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnuma ba‘zı husûslar ilhâk olunmasın murâd eyledüğü müşârünileyh elçi defter
78. idüb i‘lâm eyleyüb cümleden merhûm ve mağfûrun leh ceddin sultân Süleymân hân *tâbe serâhu* zamân-ı şeriflerinde İspanya ve Portakal ve Ankona ve Çiçilye ve Florentin
79. ve Katalan ve cümle Flandrelü vesâ‘ir harbî tüccâr tâ‘ifesi memâlik-i mahrûsime bey‘u şirâ için gelüb gitmeğe ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûn virilüb ve ol ‘ahidnâmede konsolos
80. nasb ideler deyü mukayyed olub lâkin her cins konsoloslarına harcların çekmeğe kudretleri olmamağla âsitâne-i sa‘âdetde dostluk üzere olan kralların kangısının
81. bayrağı ile gelmek murâd idinürler ise gelüb ve kangı konsolosu isterler ise mürâca‘at idüb gelüb gidüb kendü ihtiyârlarına tefvîz olunmağla husûs-ı mezbûr için
82. niçe def‘a ahkâm-ı şerife virilüb zikr olunan tüccâr tâ‘ifesi İngilterelülerin bayrağı altında gelüb gitmeğe ihtiyâr idüb ve benderlerde konsoloslarına mürâca‘at iderler iken

83. zikr olunan harbî tâ'ifesi France elçileri birer tarikle 'ahidnâmelerine ilhâk etdirüb ve benderlerde konsoloslarına cebren mürâca'at ettirmek istediklerinde zikr olunan tüccâr ahvâli
84. divân-ı hümâyûnumda mürâfa'a olunub görüldükde gerü harbî tüccârın ihtiyârlarına tefvîz olundukda tâ'ife-i mezbûre İngiltere konsoloslarına mürâca'at ederler iken merhûm
85. ve mağfûrun leh babam Sultan Mehmed hân *tâbe serâhu* Eğri seferine gitdikde âsitâne-i sa'âdetimde olan elçilerden biri gitmeyüb dostluğa ve sadâkate binâ'en ol zamân olan
86. İngiltere elçisi ma'an gidüb France elçisi garazen mahzâ bir fitne bâ'is olsun deyü İskenderiye'de olan İngiltere konsolosun bî-günâh salb etdirüb andan mâ'adâ harbî
87. tüccâr tâ'ifesi France konsoloslarına mürâca'at ettirmek için bir tarikle 'ahidnâmelerine kayd itdirüb İngiltere vesâ'ir bir tâife husûs-ı mezbûr için mukaddem ve mu'ahhar 'ahidnâme ve evâmir-i şerîfe
88. ibrâz iderler ise 'amel olunmaya deyü kayd itdirmekle Françelü tarafından dahlden hâlî olmadığı i'lâm olunub ol şart makbûl olmayub üslûb-ı sâbık üzere zikr olunan
89. harbî tüccâr tâifesi İngiltere konsoloslarına mürâca'at idüb Françelü tarafından dahl olunmamak için müceddeden 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûna kayd olunmasın ricâ etmeğin zikr olunan
90. vilâyetlerde olan harbî tüccâr tâ'ifesi ellerinde vech-i meşrûh üzere olan ahkâm-ı şerîfe mücebine İngiltere konsoloslarına mürâca'at eyleyüb ve bu husûs müceddeden
91. 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûnuma kayd olunmak fermânım olup ve İngiltere gemileri memâlik-i mahrûseme geldiklerinde Cezâyir ve Mağrib yakasına uğrayub ehl-i İslâmdan niçe hüccâc İskenderiye'ye çıkmak
92. için alub İskenderiye'ye geldiklerinde ümenâ ve 'ummâl gemide olan cümle metâ' taşra çıkmadın gümrük taleb idüb te'addî itmekle yolcu almakdan munkatî' olmuşlardır vesâ'ir
93. İstanbul'a gelen gemilerimizden dahi taşra çıkmayan esbâb ve metâ'dan gümrük taleb idüb rencîde olunurlar imiş İstanbul ve İskenderiye ve Trablusşam vesâ'ir memâlik-i
94. mahrûseye gelen gemilerinden taşra çıkan metâ'dan gümrük alınub taşra çıkarılmadığı metâ'dan gümrük alınmayub ve memâlik-i mahrûsemde İngiltere ve İngiltere bayrağı altında yürüyenlerden

95. biri kan vesâ'ir kabâhat eylediklerinde memâlik-i mahrûsemde olan hükkâm İngilterelünün elçileri ve konsolosları ma'rifetleri ile ma'an görüb yalnız görmekle hilâf-ı şer'
96. ve mugâyir 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûn te'addî eylemeyüb ve memâlik-i mahrûseme gelen İngiltere gemilerine tahmîl olunub gümrük alınugelen metâ'dan konsolos olanlar hakların alalar deyü 'ahidnâmelerinde mukayyed iken
97. ba'zı Müslümân tüccârı ve Sâkızlı vesâ'ir müste'men ve harbî olanlar konsolos hakkın virmekte te'allül iderlermiş vech-i meşrûh üzere gemilerine tahmîl olunan metâ' her kimin olur ise olsun
98. gümrük alınan metâ'dan 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûn mücebince konsolosluk hakkın virüb 'inâd ve muhâlefet eylemeye ve Haleb'de ticâret eden İngilterelüler ve bayrağı ile gelen tâcirler civid satun alub
99. gemilerine tahmîl eylediklerinde gümrük vesâ'ir rüsûmu Venedik tüccârı virdikleri üzere virüb ziyâde bir akçe virmeyeler ve Âsitâne-i sa'âdetimde olan İngiltere elçileri krallarının vekîlleri olmağla
- 100.tercümânları dahi kendülerin vekîlleri olub cürmleri vâki' oldukda elçilerine ve konsoloslarına i'lâm olunmadın habs olunmayub anlar ma'rifeti ile habs olunub ve tercümânlarından biri
- 101.mürd oldukda İngiltere'den gelmiş ise metrûkâtın elçileri kabz idüb bu cânibden ise vârisi var ise vârisine virilüb yoksa beytü'l-mâlcılar kabz eylele ve zikr olunan hususlarda
- 102.min-ba'd vech-i meşrûh üzere 'amel olunmak fermânım olmuşdur ve sâbıkan İngiltere elçisi mukaddemâ gelüb taht-ı sa'âdet-baht üzere cülûs-ı 'izzet-me'nûsum vâki' olmağla zikr olunan 'ahidnâme-i
- 103.hümâyûnun tecdîd olunmasın müşârünileyh kral tarafından istid'â etmeğın ben dahi mukarrer tutub tecdîd-i 'ahd eyleyüb işbu 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûn-ı mevhibet-makrûnu inâyet ve erzanî kılub
- 104.müceddeden 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûnum verilmiş idi hâlâ müşârünileyh kralın elçisi olan kıdvetü'l-ümerâ'i'l-milleti'l-Mesihîyye 'umdetü'l-küberâ-yi fi't-tâifeti'n-Nasrâniyye Bavlü Bindar [Paul Pindar] nâm beyzâde Âsitâne-i
- 105.sa'âdetime gelüb ba'zı zamânda 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûna muhâlif evâmir-i şerîfe virilüb anın gibi 'ahidnâme-i hümâyûnumuza muhâlif virilen ahkâm haberimiz



olmadın hükkâm huzûrunda ibrâz olundukda

- 106.zikr olunan ahkâm ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnumuz târihinden mu’ahhar olmağla ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûn mazmûnu ile ‘amel olunmayub evâmir mûcebi ile ‘amel olunur ol takdîrce elimizde olan
- 107.‘ahidnâmeye muhâlif olursa o makûle evâmir-i şerîfe ile ‘amel olunmayub ‘ahidnâmemiz mûcebince ‘amel olunmasın müşârûnileyh efendim kralın murâdıdır deyü i’lâm etdüği pây-e-i serîr-i a’lâma ‘arz olundukda
- 108.müşârûnileyh kralın ricâsı benim ‘izz-i huzûr-ı fa’izü’n-nûrumda makbûl-ı hümâyûnum olub ellerinde olan ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûna muhâlif mukaddemâ ve şimdiden sonra ihrâc olunan evâmir-i şerîfe hükkâm huzûrunda
- 109.ibrâz olundukda ‘amel olunmayub hükkâm dâ’imâ mazmûn-ı ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnumla ‘âmil olunmak bâbında fermân-ı kazâ-cereyânımız sâdır olmuşdur anın gibi ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnuma muhâlif olan evâmir-i şerîfe
- 110.ibrâz idenlerin ellerinden alınub istimâ‘ olunmaya ve fermân-ı ‘âlîşânım bu vechile sâdır oldu ki mâdâmki hâlâ İngiltere kralı olan Yakob *hutimet ‘avâkıbuhu bi’l-hayr* merhûm ve mağfurun leh babam
- 111.ve dedem Hüdâvendigâr *tâbe serâhumâ* zamânlarındaki gibi ‘atabe-i ‘ulyâmla dostlukta sâbit-kadem ve râsih-dem ola işbu ‘ahidnâme-i hümâyûnumla ‘amel olunub evvelde ‘akd olunan ‘ahd u mîsâk
- 112.ve bu ahidnâme-i hümâyûnuma muhâlif vaz‘ sâdır olmaya şöyle bileler ‘alâmet-i şerîfe i’timâd kılalar tahrîren fî evâsıt-ı şehri Rebî’ü’l-evvel sene ihdâ ve ‘ışrîn ve elf min ba’dü’l hicreti’n-nebeviyye.

Be-makâm-ı dârü’s-saltanati’l-aliyye (el)-mahrûse Kostantıniyyetü’l-mahmiyye

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

**Grant Support:** The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

## References

### Primary Sources

Başkanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA)

A.DVNS.DVE.d, 35/1.

ADVNSMHM.d, 43.

The Ahdname of 1612 <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:alvin:portal:record-55603>

*Münşe'ât Mecmûası*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi Koleksiyonu, 3345.

Bent, James Theodore, ed. *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant: I.- The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam, 1599-1600. II.- Extracts from the Diaries of Dr John Covell, 1670-1679. With Some Account of the Levant Company of Turkey merchants*, Ashgate Ebook, Surrey 2010.

*Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, X, 1603-1607, ed. Horatio F Brown, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London 1900. British History Online, Access 24.12.2022, <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol10>.

*Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, XI, 1607-1610, ed. Horatio F Brown, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London 1904. British History Online, Access 16.12.2022, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol11>.

*Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, XII, 1610-1613, ed. Horatio F Brown, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London 1905. British History Online, Access 24.01.2022, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol12>.

Feridun Bey, *Mecmûa-i Münşeâtü's-Selâtin*, II, İstanbul 1285.

Hakluyt, Richard, *Voyages in Eight Volumes*, III, Dent Dutton, London 1962.

Sanderson, John, *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602*, ed. William Foster, The Hakluyt Society, London 1931.

## Secondary Sources

Acıpinar, Mikail, "Ahidnâmeler Çerçevesinde Karadeniz'de Ticaret ve Yabancı Tüccarların Durumu (XV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)", *Ordu University Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5/12 (2015), p. 319-336.

Aktaş, Büşra Kütükçü, *Osmanlı Diplomatiğinde Ahidname Formunun Doğuşu ve Gelişimi (XIV-XVI. Yüzyıllar)*, İstanbul University, PhD Thesis, İstanbul 2022.

Arı, Bülent, "Early Ottoman-Dutch Relations", *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, ed. Kemal Çiçek-Ercümen Kuran-Nejat Göyünç-İlber Ortaylı, Yeni Türkiye, Ankara 2000, I, 317-324.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The First Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul: Cornelis Haga and the Dutch Capitulations of 1612*, Bilkent University, PhD Thesis, Ankara 2003.

Berridge, Geoffrey R., *British Diplomacy in Turkey, 1583 to the present: A study in the evolution of the resident embassy*, Brill, Leiden, Boston, Nijhoff 2009.

Beydilli, Kemal, "Karadeniz'in Kapalılığı Karşısında Avrupa Küçük Devletleri ve 'Mîrî Ticâret' Teşebbüsü", *Belleten*, LV/214 (1991), 687-756.

Bostan, İdris, "Rusya'nın Karadeniz'de Ticarete Başlaması ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu (1700-1787)", *Belleten*, LIX/225 (1995), 353-394.

Bulut, Mehmet, *Ottoman-Dutch economic relations in the early modern period 1571-1699*, Verloren, Hilversum 2001.

Cevrioğlu, Mahmut Halef, *XVII. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı-Habsburg Diplomatik İlişkileri ve Osmanlı Diplomasisi*, İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University, PhD Thesis, İzmir 2021.

Demir, Rabia, *Osmanlı-İngiliz Diplomatik Münasebetleri (1580-1699)*, İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University,

- Master's Thesis, İzmir 2021.
- Dereli, Hamit, *Kıralıçe Elizabeth Devrinde Türkler ve İngilizler*, Anıl Matbaası, İstanbul 1951.
- Duran, Gülnur, "Osmanlı Tezhip Sanatında Natüralist Üslûpta Çiçekler", *Süleyman Demirel University Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 31 (2018), 177-199.
- Eldem, Edhem, "Capitulations and Western trade", *The Cambridge History of Turkey: Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603–1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006, III, 281-335.
- Epstein, Mortimer, *The Early History of the Levant Company*, G. Routledge & Sons, London, New York 1908.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya, *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj Under the Ottomans 1517-1683*, I.B. Tauris, London, New York 2014.
- Fisher, David, *Development and Organization of English Trade to Asia: 1553-1606*, University of London, PhD Thesis, 1970.
- Groot, Alexander H. De, *The Netherlands and Turkey: Four Hundred Years of Political, Economical, Social and Cultural Relations*, Gorgias Press, 2010.
- Horniker, Arthur Leon, "Anglo-French Rivalry in the Levant from 1583 to 1612", *The Journal of Modern History*, 18/4 (1946), 289-305.
- Howat, Gerald Malcolm David, *Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1974.
- Işksel, Güneş, "Ottoman Diplomacy", *The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy*, ed. Gordon Martel, Wiley-Blackwell, West Sussex 2018, II, 1-13.
- İnalçık, Halil, "İmtiyâzât", *Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, III, 1179-1189.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "İmtiyâzât", *DİA*, XXII, 245-252.
- \_\_\_\_\_-Bülent Arı, "Türk-İslam-Osmanlı Şehirciliği ve Halil İnalçık'ın Çalışmaları", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 6 (2005), 27-56.
- İpşirli, Mehmet, "Eman", *DİA*, XI, 77-79.
- Jensen, De Lamar, "The Ottoman Turks in Sixteenth Century French Diplomacy", *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16/4 (1985), 451-470.
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem, *Osmanlı Muahedeleri ve Kapitülâsiyonlar: 1300- 1920 ve Lozan Muahedesi 24 Temmuz 1923*, Türkiye Matbaası, İstanbul 1934.
- Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th-18th Century): An Annotated Edition of 'Ahdnames and Other Documents*, Brill, Leiden, Boston, Köln 2000.
- Komaroff, Linda, ed., *Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts*, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Art of the Art of Giving at the Islamic Courts", *Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts*, ed. Linda Komaroff, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles 2011, 17-32.
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet, *Türk-İngiliz Münasebetlerinin Başlangıcı ve Gelişmesi (1553-1610)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara 1953.
- Küttükoğlu, Mübahat S., "Ahidnâme", *DİA*, I, 536-540.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Balta Limanı'na Giden Yol: Osmanlı-İngiliz İktisadî Münâsebetleri (1580-1850)*, TTK, Ankara 2013.

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)*, İstanbul 1994.
- Mantran, Robert, "XVI ve XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Asya Ticareti", trans. Zeki Arkan, *Belleten*, LI/201 (1987), 1433-1444.
- Oral, Özgür, "1763 Tarihli İzmir Rüsüm-ı Reftiye Tarifesine Dair Yeni Bulgular", *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları*, 53 (2020), 303-317.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Osmanlı-Venedik Ticari İlişkileri (1763-1794)*, İstanbul University, PhD Thesis, İstanbul 2017.
- Ökke, Aylin Deniz, *Mühimme Defterlerinde Kayıtlı Avrupalı Hükümdarlara Gönderilmiş Nâme-i Hümayûnlar (1545-1696)*, Marmara University, Master's Thesis, İstanbul 2020.
- Özel, Ahmet, "Harbî", *DİA*, XVI, 112-114.
- Öztürk, Kübra, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İngiltere'ye Verdiği 1675 (H.1086) Tarihli İmtiyâznâmenin İslam Hukuku Açısından İncelenmesi*, Marmara University, Master's Thesis, İstanbul 2019.
- Refik, Ahmet, *Türkler ve Kraliçe Elizabet (1200-1255)*, İstanbul Matbaacılık ve Neşriyat, İstanbul 1932.
- Ruby, Julian, "The Serenissima and the Sublime Porte: Art in the Art of Diplomacy, 1453-1600", *Venice and the Islamic World, 828-1797*, ed. Stefano Carboni and Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, New York 2007, 90-119.
- Skilliter, Susan A., *The Turkish Documents Relating to Edward Barton's Embassy to the Porte (1588-1598)*, University of Manchester, PhD Thesis, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, 1578-1582: A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1977.
- Talbot, Michael, "A Treaty of Narratives: Friendship, Gifts, and Diplomatic History in the British Capitulations of 1641", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 48 (2016), 357-398.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *British-Ottoman Relations, 1661-1807: Commerce and Diplomatic Practice in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul*, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2017.
- Tekin, Ahmet, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin İngiltere'ye Verdiği Ahidnâmelere Dair Bazı Yeni Tespitler (1580-1675)", *Dokuz Eylül University Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10/2 (2023), 574-586.
- Theunissen, Hans, "Ottoman-Venetian Diplomats: The 'Ahd-names The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of Political-Commercial Instruments together with an Annotated Edition of a Corpus of Relevant Documents", *Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies*, I (1998), 1-698.
- Türkhan, M. Sait, *18. Yüzyılda Doğu Akdeniz'de Ticaret ve Halep*, İstanbul University, PhD Thesis, İstanbul 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Doğu Akdeniz'de İngiliz Ticareti: İskenderun-Londra Hattında İngiliz Ticaret Filosu (1704-1706)", *Avrasya İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 4/1 (2016), 27-60.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, "On Dokuzuncu Asrın Başlarına Kadar Türk-İngiliz Münasebâtına Dair Vesikalar", *Belleten*, XIII/51 (1949), 573-648.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, III/2, TTK, 3th Ed., Ankara 1982.
- Vanneste, Tjil, *Intra-European Litigation in Eighteenth-Century Izmir: The Role of the Merchants' Style*, Brill, 2021.
- Wood, Alfred C., *A History of the Levant Company*, Frank Cass And Co. Ltd., London, Liverpool 1964.
- Zarinebaf, Fariba, *Mediterranean Encounters: Trade and Pluralism in Early Modern Galata*, University of California Press, Oakland, California 2018.
- <https://sok.riksarkivet.se/sbl/mobil/Artikel/20002>.

# APPENDIX

## The Ahdname of 1612















