SEVEN OTTOMAN DOCUMENTS
FROM THE REIGN OF MEHMET II

by

V. L. Ménage

When, on 28 July 1463, Venice declared war on the Ottoman Empire, she embarked on a struggle that was to drag on for nearly sixteen years and to result, with the loss of Euboea and northern Albania, in a grievous weakening of her power in the Aegean and an increase in the Ottoman threat to the Adriatic. Venice had not sought the war: to protect her wealthy commerce by means of an accommodation with the "foes of Christendom" had always been her policy, a policy which, piously reprehended by other Christian powers, was to leave her now bereft of powerful allies. Nor was the Sultan, Mehmed II, inflexibly determined to maintain a state of war. Although he had, by his conquest of Bosnia and by provocation in the Morea, forced the war on Venice, more than once during the long hostilities the Sultan himself set on foot negotiations for peace and on several occasions showed himself prepared to receive a Venetian embassy. Indeed hardly one of the sixteen years passed without a peace-feeler being extended by one side or the other.

The seven documents here presented concern various of these abortive negotiations. They were discovered by my colleague Dr. John Wansbrough (who has most kindly put photographs of them at my disposal) in Busta 161 of the series Procuratori di San Marco, missi in the Venetian State Archives. This file is labelled "Commissaria di Angelo Malipiero, capitano de galere di Barbaria ", with no hint that Ottoman documents are included in it, so that they are mentioned neither in Professor Bombaci's handlist available at the Frari nor in his article  on the Turkish documents preserved there.

Of the seven, six emanate from the Sultan, two of these being drawn

THE DOCUMENTS

1. 24 May 1471, Constantinople. Letter in Italian from Међеммед II to the Doge Cristoforo Maro stating the terms on which he is prepared to make peace. Plate XXX.

Text:

[invocatio] (none)

[ tughrā] محمد بن معد خان مانثر دايان

11 Mahamet dey gra (tia) turchie et grecie Imp(erator) Illust(issimo) e excellentissimo domino cristofaro [dh]mauro duci veneziaco Salutem. Alla porta della segnoria n(ost)ra sono venuti li ambasciati della ex(ellentina) v(ostra) 49 i quali anno praticato la paxe secondo lo t(enu)mop posto. La qual la segnoria n(ost)ra liberande(n)te c(on)cede de [aue]r bona paxe c(on)la ex(ellentina) v(ostra) così damar cho me da terra c(on)li modi e c(on)dicio(ni)e frascripti. v(jtli)ch(e) la segnoria [d]tvostra se obliga restituire allo dominio n(ost)ra la isola de staliimi ch(e) f onostra occupata p(er) vi i(n) questa [g]uerra / e similemcnte tuti li lochi tolto da noi i(n) lo brazo de maina: remanendo a vui malasiasi laqual 49i auti tolto dal mano de alt(ri) e similiti desi debitori restituire anul croa occupata p(er) vui dapoi lamorte 49de schender. dello resto urament ognuno of una delle p(ar)te tengna quello ch(e) allo presente tene e possede. 49Dechiarendo ch(e) la mea segnoria se obliga de evacuapre tutto quello territorio fosse occupato p(er) li 49mei delle iuridicio(ni) passade de modono e corno(n) neapoli de roman e de tutti alt(ri) n(ost)ri lochi. Li am 49basciadori della illust(re)isima u(ost)ra Segnoria me anno p(re)gato p(er) parte della ex(ellentina) v(ostra) ch(e) debia la sen 12 segnoria n(ost)ra fare paxe c(on) rodo e c(on) cipri. Venendo li ambasciati loro la segnoria n(ost)ra fara 49paxe c(on)li dicit a com- piacentia u(ost)ra. Li altri v(ost)ri recomendati usati senumereran(n)i o i(n) li capituli ch(e) 49sono usitato p(er) lo passato. della moneta tolta alla segnoria n(ost)ra da bartolomei giorghi li ambasiat 49i della ex(ellentina) v(ostra) ve informenti(n)io quello ch(e) la segnoria n(ost)ra li aue dicto cosi dei capituli passati.

Data c(on)stineiopolli Aanno n(ost)re fidei 49docclxxv die xxiiij mai di.

8 Only a few of the questions which they raise can be touched on here: I limit myself to presenting the documents, with a brief commentary, and setting them in their historical context.

Translation:

[ tughrā] Muḥammad son of Murād Khān, ever victorious

Меđеммед, by the grace of God Emperor of Turkey and Greece, to the most renowned and distinguished lord Cristoforo Mauro, Doge of Venice, greeting.

To the Porte of Our Majesty have come Your Excellency’s ambassadors, who have treated for peace as in the former time; which our Majesty freely grants, to have good peace with Your Excellency, both by sea and by land, on the terms and conditions hereunder written, namely:

That your Signory be obliged to restore to our dominion the island of Lemnos, which was ours and has been occupied by you in this war, and likewise all the places seized from us in the Bracco di Maina, there remaining to you Malvasia, which you seized from the possession of others; and likewise you must restore to us Croia, occupied by you since the death of Iskender. Beyond this, indeed each of the parties is to hold that which he holds and possesses at the present time, with the declaration that My Majesty undertakes to evacuate whatever territory may have been occupied by my people of the former jurisdictions of Modon and Coron, Napoli di Romania, and of all other places of yours.

The ambassadors of your most renowned Signory have prayed me, on behalf of Your Excellency, that Our Majesty should make peace with Rhodes and Cyprus. Upon their ambassadors presenting themselves Our Majesty will, to give you satisfaction, make peace with the aforesaid.

Your other customary submissions will be set out in detail in the capitulations which have been in force in the past.

Concerning the money seized from Our Majesty by Bartolomeo Giorgi, Your Excellency’s ambassadors will inform you of what Our Majesty has said to them, and likewise concerning the former capitulations.

Given at Constantinople, in the year of our faith 875, on the 24th day of May.

2. Middle decade of Rabi’ I 882/23 June–2 July 1477, Constantinople. Ferman in the sanjak-beys of Rumeli, ordering them to grant passage and protection to a Venetian ambassador travelling to the Porte. Plate XXXI.

Text:

[invocatio] هو

[ tughrā] (as in Doc. 1) مفتخر الامراء الكرام روم انلى ستنجاقل قئ بكرل ادام عزهم

توقع ردق واصل اولجاق معلوم الاماک شمكدیحالا
وَندِنِيكُمُ الْأَلْجِيْسِيّيَّةَ دِرَكَاهُمُ ّكَفْ أَشْهَمُهُمُ كَمْلُكَ اسْتَرْتَحُوا
الْأَصِيْبَةَ يَوْمَ يُنْعِدُهُمُ كَذِكْرُ أَلْجِيْسِيّ لِأَشَاطِرُكَ ّكَبَّ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ قَبَّظُ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ أَسْتَرْتَحُوا مَعَ وَتَضَرُّذُ
أَلْجِيْسِيّ يَلَمْسَهُهُ بِحَذَمَهُ أَدْمَلُ ّقُشُوبُ كَمْلُكَ ّكَبَّ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ قَبَّظُ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ أَسْتَرْتَحُوا مَعَ وَتَضَرُّذُ
دِرَكَاهُمُ اسْتَرْتَحُوا يَلَمْسَهُ بِحَذَمَهُ أَدْمَلُ ّقُشُوبُ كَمْلُكَ ّكَبَّ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ قَبَّظُ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ أَسْتَرْتَحُوا مَعَ وَتَضَرُّذُ
عَلَّمَتُ شَرْفُ ازْتَعَانُهُ أَسْلَامُ أَسْلَامُ أَسْلَامُ أَسْلَامُ أَسْلَامُ أَسْلَامُ ّكَبَّ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ قَبَّظُ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ أَسْتَرْتَحُوا مَعَ وَتَضَرُّذُ
تَحْرِيرًا ّمَا اسْتَرْتَحُوا دِرَكَاهُمُ ّكَبَّ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ قَبَّظُ حَكَّمَتُهُمُ أَسْتَرْتَحُوا مَعَ وَتَضَرُّذُ
فَمَا يُنْفَرُوْنَ

Translation:

[invocatio] He!
[jughra] (as in Doc. 1)

The ornaments among the noble commanders, the begs of the sanjak of Rumeli, may our glory endure!

When the exalted sign arrives, be it known that at this present the ambassador of Venice wishes to come to my Porte, lofty as the Heavenly Sphere; this being so, I have commanded that through the jurisdiction of whichever of you the afore-mentioned ambassador may wish to come up you are not to prevent or molest him but to depute competent men as his escort and send him on his way and enable him to reach my exalted Porte.

Thus you are to know: you are to place reliance upon the noble sign.

Written in the middle decade of Rab‘ I in the year 882.

In the residence
of Constantinople

3. 25 February [1478], Constantinople. Safe-conduct in Italian issued by Mohammed II, permitting the Venetian ambassador Tomaso Malipiero and his suite to travel to the Porte and return to Venetian protection. Plate XXXII.

Text:

[invocatio] (none)
[jughra] (as in Doc. 1)

---

* Literally: "objects of pride."
Translation:

[-invocatio] (as in Doc. 1)

Given in My Imperial residence at the city of Constantinople, on the 25th day of the month of February.


[Fornam to the Venetian ambassadors (Tomaso Malipiero and his secretary Alvice Menciti) urging them to come to the Porte without hesitation.

Plate XXXIII.

[44 cm. × 14.5 cm., 10 lines]

Text:

-invocatio-

By the authority and content of these presents I give, grant and assign full, comprehensive, binding and secure safe-conduct, and a comprehensive, binding and secure guarantee to the excellent ambassador of the most renowned Signory of Venice, Messer Tomaso Malipiero, that he may come freely and safely through all places and lands of My empire and to My Imperial Porte, by land, with all his retinue, company and servants, and with the horses, carriages, money, silver, gear and goods of the said excellent ambassador and of all his company of whatever rank they be; commanding all My captains, sanjak-beys, timariots, kadas and slaves, and all officers of whatever character they be, under pain of My displeasure and anger, that not the slightest difficulty be caused to the said ambassador, his company and his servants, together with their goods, but rather that every favour, protection and courtesy of which they stand in need be supplied, so that he may come to My Porte.

And when he comes to My presence and to the Imperial Porte aforesaid, whether he makes peace with My Majesty or does not make peace, so too freely and honourably, with all the attentions above-written, he may depart thence without any obstruction either to their persons or to their possessions and travel through all the places and lands belonging to Me as is written above, so that he may depart to his land in safety; commanding all those above-named that on his return just as on his coming honour and courtesy be shown to the said Messer Tomasio, ambassador, as aforesaid, of the said most renowned Signory of Venice.

And this document, guarantee and safe-conduct has been written by My imperial command by the hand of one of My Latin clerks.

And as guarantee and confirmation of the safe-conduct above-mentioned, it is signed with My customary Imperial sign; and as assurance and security of the aforesaid, I make oath by the Lord God Who created heaven and earth, and by our prophet Muhammad, and by the 124,000 prophets of God, and by the road and paths which we follow, and by the sword with which I gird myself, and by the Muslim faith which we Muslims profess, that this guarantee and safe-conduct aforesaid made at My command be fixed, confirmed and binding, and that in no way in any detail will it be infringed, either by My own person or by any of My viziers, pashas and officers, of whatever rank they be, but rather maintained in its entirety and by all, as is set out in its content.

Translation:

[invocatio] He!

[tajbur] (as in Doc. 3)

The ornaments among the commanders of the lands outside the [Muslim] community, the ambassadors of Venice, may they come to a good end!

When the exalted sign arrives, be it known that at this present you have asked for authorization in the matter of setting out for My Porte,
the refuge of the world, and coming here on an embassy on behalf of the
lords of Venice; now therefore, since you are coming here as ambassadors
you need feel no hesitation or caution, but may come and present your-
selves at My threshold, the abode of felicity, and make known to the foot
of My lofty throne whatever business and affairs you have.

Thus you are to know—indeed that a matter like this is not an
occasion for fears and fancies is known to every intelligent man.

Thus you are to know; you are to place reliance upon the noble sign.

Written in the last decade of Dhu’l-Qa‘da in the year 882.

In the residence
of Constantinople

5. First decade of Muḥarram 883/4-13 April 1478, Constantinople. Nīshān
ordering the kadi and sanjak-bey to afford passage and provide an escort
to Venetian ambassadors travelling to and from the Porte. Plate XXXIV.

[dimensions not recorded, 13 lines]

Text:

[fughrā] (as in Doc. 1)

شأنهم مباهين للعالم، فيذكروا: إلهنا مالك، كله يخشى الله من أعينه
أولئك الذين يصنفون كذالك. ويبقى الشارع أتراك يعيشون، هو قوين
وجيز من الذين يتأثرون، ويصنعون، ويسبكون، ويسبكون، وهي كذلك.

وإنما يأتوا من أجل مصالحهم، ونظامهم، ونظامهم، ويستحسن
مصلحة أمير الامام، ولن ينزعوا مصالحهم، ولا ينزعوا
معروضاته، ولا ينزعوا مصالحهم. وان كونوا

Written in the first decade of the sacred Muḥarram in the year 883.

In the residence
of Constantinople

Translation:

[invocatio] (none)

[fughrā] (as in Doc. 1)

The order conveyed by the Imperial sign and the felicitous device—
may God Almighty preserve its validity " until the day when they are
raised "! 4—is this, that:

<for the business of making peace> 8 At this present, since
authorization has been sought for ambassadors to come to My lofty
Porte from the lords of Venice and since they have requested a letter of safe-
conduct, 9 I have granted permission and have given them this
noble command; 

And I have commanded that at whatever time their ambassadors
may set forth and proceed, and at whatever place in My well-protected
dominions they may appear, the beys and kadi of the sanjak in which
that place is found are to provide men to travel with them as escort and
send them on their way and enable them to reach My lofty Porte, and
they are not to interfere in any way at all with them or their possessions
or their gear. And when they for their part have come and have submitted
to My Porte, the refuge of the world, whatever business and affairs there
may be (to transact) and are due to return, they are to be sent back,
whether the business of making peace is concluded or not: both on their
coming and on their returning back no-one is to molest or hinder them, but
they are to travel freely and arrive at the place from which they first came.

Thus they are to know; they are to place reliance upon the noble sign.

Written in the first decade of the sacred Muḥarram in the year 883.

In the residence
of Constantinople

4 Koran, VII, 13, XV, 36, etc.

5 These words have been added as an afterthought, see p. 88 below.

8 i.e. ḥuwa-nāme, see pp. 88-8 below.
from that direction and sets out for My lofty Porte, through the jurisdiction of whichever of you he may wish to come up, none of you is to prevent him; and when he is given leave to depart from here and is due to go back there, you are not to impede or repel him. 

Thus you are to know; you are to place reliance upon the noble sign.

Written in the first decade of Rabī‘ I in the year 883.

In the camp
at Egri Dere

7. No date (? June 1478), no place of issue (? the Ottoman camp outside Scutari). Letter in Greek from an Ottoman officer (Dī‘ūd b. ʿAbd Allāh) to a Venetian ambassador (? Tomaso Malipiero); the sender acknowledges the ambassador's letter, which reported that he had reached Alessio, that Ahmed Bey (? Evrenos-oghlu Ahmed, sanjak-bey of Albania) had given him an escort, but that he had been robbed by the armatoles; the sender promises to do his best to recover the stolen property and urges the ambassador to proceed on his mission. Plate XXXVI.

Translation: 

To the most honourable, renowned and wise ambassador, worthy of all honour. Let me inform you that I have received your letter and acquainted myself with what you write to me. You write to me that because of the weather and because of the rain you were delayed in reaching Lesi. You write to me, however, that you met with Ahmat Beg, and he sent his voyvoda to accompany you and [...] to [...] return from you. The amarolois appeared and wounded their men and seized both your horses and your baggage, and they took baggage of yours to the value of five to six hundred ducats.

As soon as I saw your letter, I sent a slave and an order that they should seek for it, and I trust in God that I shall find it. Do not feel distress or anger; but just [...] do all that you can and carry out the service as the Grand Signior commanded you.

1 To give a confident transcription of this document and to comment on it fall quite outside my competence. In the hope that a specialist will subject the text to detailed study, I confine myself to giving a tentative translation; for this I am indebted to Mr. V. Demetriades, whose help I most gratefully acknowledge.

8 For this reading of the name in the penche see p. 100 below.

9 Obscure: is a word missing after vovot.

10 ἵππος ("perspicuity" or "help") appears to be used here as a respectful address, "your honour" or "your excellency".
written in Greek the equivalent of the "dei gratia" formula does not appear until the reign of Bāyazid II. 6 Similarly, the equivalent of the phrase "alla porta della segnoria nostra" appears (as a calque?) in a slightly later letter in Greek. 7 In the final date, the day and month (24 May) are recorded by the solar calendar, but the year is that of the Hijra (875, beg. 30 vi. 1470). The same combination is found in documents of this period written in Slavonic, e.g. Truhelka, no. 38: 24 September 877 (= 1472); no. 40: 8 July 879 (= 1474); no. 41: 24 September 879 (= 1474). An example of this hybrid dating in a document in Greek, Bāyazid II's letter of 30 November 893 (= 1488), is found in the "Liber Gracae", where there is a further example for a document in Italian, his letter of 20 February 892 (= 1487). 8

Document 3.

The wording of this safe-conduct, presumably based on European diplomatic practice, may be compared with that of the safe-conduct in Latin, issued by Mehmed II to Christians wishing to enter Ottoman territory to ransom their enslaved relations (Truhelka, no. 69), in which are echoed numerous phrases of Doc. 3. 9 This Latin document, like our Doc. 3, is dated merely by the (solar) day and month, as is a letter of Bāyazid II to Ragusa (Truhelka, no. 153) in Latin, and some of Mehmed II's letters in Slavonic (Truhelka, nos. 20, 22, 23, etc.). Where the Latin safe-conduct has merely "Datum ex chancelarii imperii nostri signoque nostro solito [i.e. the fugērō] signatum", the

6 See the 'akd-nāme of September 1481 (Miklosich and Müller, iii, 319) and the Sultan's letter of April 1485 (op. cit., p. 352).
7 Op. cit., p. 294: "opus...hāquas reddidit potius. The "Porto", of course, is no specific locality, but the "presencia" of the Sultan, wherever he may be: this is nicely illustrated by a phrase in the instructions of the Venetian ambassador Capello and Coco, of Nov. 1470 (for which see p. 162 below): "...dirigite vos ad portam tecli ubi illam esse intellegueritis."
9 E.g.: "...iustissimae ac imperaminis scribentes presentes aportas et manifestas litteras ac fidem et plenam, ampliam, tutam, validam et securum saluam conductun cumibus et singulis quibusdam nationibus ait conditiones sint.

10 E.g.: "...volentes et mandantes...omnis capitaneis terra, suanquis, tamaritis, chondia et alia quibuscunque officiiis et servitutibus suis, et suis saluis nostris, etuis etiam saluis nostris, quibus nostrum saluum conductum observent et observari facient sub pena indignationem nostram."
corresponding sentence of Doc. 3 is preceded (lines 28-9) by the reference to "mei scrivani Latino\n", attesting the existence at the Porte of a special staff of clerks for correspondence in Latin and Italian. Doc. 3 has further, unlike the Latin document, the corroborating oath.

There is as yet no study on the oath employed by Ottoman rulers.\n
Examples are to be found in documents of this period written in Greek and in Slavonic,\nwhile a contemporary example in Turkish appears in a berāsh of Mustafa II, probably of 1453, granting protection to the Franciscan monks of Bosnia and permitting brethren from outside Ottoman territory to come and go freely.\n
An oath usually (but not invariably) corroborates a treaty (\"ahd-nâmes\") as it appears also in the berāsh for Roman Catholic monks and (here) in a safe-conduct,\nseems to be associated particularly with the concerning of anāmān.\n
In Doc. 3 the Sultan swears by (1) God the Creator, (2) the Prophet, (3) the 124,000 prophets of God, (4) the \"way\" (\"sabīl Allāh\") which he follows, (5) his sword, and (6) the Muslim faith. All these clauses are found in other contemporary oaths,\nhowever, being rare;\nsuch an oath lacks two clauses usually found: the \"seven muṣṣāf\", and the \"soul\" or \"life\" of the Sultan's ancestors, himself or his children. The forms \"mūsara\" and \"mūšana\" (line 35) appear to be Slavonic: \"mūsman\" is found in the Slavonic text of the \"ahd-nâme\" granted by Murād II to Ragusa in 1442. It appears indeed, as in Doc. 3, in the course of the oath.\n
Was the \"scrivano Latino\" translating from a model formula in Slavonic?

\n\\n11 See for the moment the notes at Elezović, i/1, 1140–1; and at p. 233 of F. Babinger and F. Dolger, \"Meinecke H. Fünftes Staatsverträge\" in Orientalia Christiana Periodica, xx (1949), 255–66 (ops. F. Dolger, Byzantinische Diplomatik, 1906, p. 289); and also Elisabeth Zachariasen, \"Mja sjedvanog vodjara veve Xhpla\'ishqen\", in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, lv (1965), 254–65 (especially 259–60).

12 In Greek: in the treaty of 1446 (see preceding note), and Miklosich and Müller, iii, 286 (of 1450), 297 (of 1453), 280 (of 1454), 289 (of 1479), 313 and 318 (of 1482); in Slavonic: Trebukha, no. 6 (of 1442), no. 15 (of 1483), no. 71 (of 1481).

13 Elezović, i/1, 1139–45 = i/2, 223. For the circumstances in which this document was issued see F. Babinger, Meinrod über Kreuzzug und seine Zeit, Munich 1953, p. 240.

14 A safe-conduct issued by Shaikh al-Din Pasha to Ragusan ambassadors in 1441 (Trebukha, no. 4) is also ratified by an oath.

15 I refrain from any further reading from following up this question here since Dr. Wasmuirthg. is, I understand, preparing a study on which we will involve this point.

16 It appears in Trebukha, no. 71 (p. 65, lines 12–13), the \"ahd-nâme\" of 1481 in Slavonic.

17 Trebukha, no. 6, line 4 (three further references in the index, s.v. mūsara – but mūsara – later in the document (p. 16, 1, 18). The equivalent passages in the oaths of no. 15 (l. 4) of 1480 and no. 71 (p. 65, l. 15) of 1481 have mūsara –.
were at this time (June 1478) all under arms, encamped before Scutari. The address of Doc. 2, to the sanjak-beys of Rumeli, is in the shortest possible form: already in a document of 8/9/1493 (Kraelitz, no. 21) is added the honorific phrase ḍhanuʿl-qadr wa-t-tīriq. The address of Doc. 4 is (so far as I know) unique: ẓafīkhīr umarāʾ khālīf al-miṣla Ṣaʿīdī ṣulṭānī ḍasār al-aswāq bīl-khyar. In general it corresponds to the address on documents to the “begs” of Ragusa: ẓafīkhīr umarāʾ al-miṣla al-maṣṣiḥiya Daḥruni bi-ǧīḥān beṯerī bi-Ḥādi. In all, we should expect al-miṣla al-maṣṣiḥiya we find the phrase khālīf al-miṣla. That phrase, literally “the opposite of the community [of Allāh],” means “non-Muslim lands” is apparent from a parallel use in Saʿd al-Dīn’s Taʿlīl as-Sāḥib (i, 33, line 10), where in describing Jem’s reception in Rome (in 1493) Saʿd al-Dīn makes the Pope ask him what his intention was in coming khālīf-i mīllet arāsina. The use of the phrase, less courteous than al-miṣla al-maṣṣiḥiya, in our document may have been prompted by the existence of a state of war, so that the normal protocol did not apply. Whereas the form is (Docs. 2, 4, 6) have the older form maʿlum ola kim, in the nishān (Doc. 5) we find ... olūr ki, with the ki written as a loop, as in the bayārūdum ki of Docs. 2, 5, and 6, and in the chan-ki of Doc. 4, line 4 (but not the karch-ki of Doc. 5, line 4). In the context of the Turkish documents, one point only calls for extended comment: the term al-jān, which, with its appearance in Doc. 5, is attested for the fourth time in published contexts. Its earliest appearance is in a document issued at Istanbul by Mahmūd Pasha, then Grand Vizier and beylerbeyp of Rumeli, in Jumādā I 867/January 1463 (Elčević, i/1, no. 13 = i/2, no. 5 = Uzunçarşılı, pp. 137-8 and pl. 36). According to the exposition, the bearer, Franco

---

10 See below, pp. 110-11.
11 Elčević, i/2, no. 81 of 906/1503, no. 93 of 911/1506, and (with iznālar for begleri) no. 127 of 910/1514.
12 The phrase is reproduced in works depending on Saʿd al-Dīn: Solak-kide, p. 298; Ḥāfez, Sāhil-i Ṣaʿīdī, Moscow 1961, p. 688. The meaning “non-Muslim lands” is confirmed when the wording of Saʿd al-Dīn’s source is compared; he is here following, in a close paraphrase, the Wāqīʾ-i Sāhilān from the “OEKM,” idem, p. 22, which has ḍasār-i mīllet arāsina gelbined maṣṣiḥiya asdār, and continues: Ghiyāsh-i daḵšī ẓafīkhīr umarāʾ al-miṣla al-maṣṣiḥiya daḵšū ṣulṭānī ẓafīkhīr umarāʾ al-miliṭe gelbīn maṣṣiḥiya asdār, bethi ḍari̇na gechebe šoda ṣulṭānī ḍasār wa-t-tīriq, “[Jem] replied: ‘To come to non-Muslim lands was not intended; on the contrary I asked the people of Rhodes to provide passage for me to pass into Rumeli.’”
13 For this “schleierform” and its development see F. Witzel’s note at p. 111 of his Za einigen fruhottomanischen Urkunden (V.), in WVZK, iii (1981), 110-47.

---

(?) Bokanić, had requested an al-jān mektebi so that he might come from Ragusa and settle at Novabdro; the dispositio states that “this khān” has been issued to him so that he and his people, being treated as raʿāyā, may live unmolested on the Imperial khāṣṣ there. The term appears again in a group of four documents, very similar to one another, preserved in MS. fonds turc ancien 39 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. All four—nos. 4, 8, 9, 10, in the edition of K. Anhegger and H. Inaleck and the translation of N. Beldiceanu—are nishāns giving authority to and laying down the powers of the government supervisors (yasabbel) of silver-mines in Serbia and Bosnia. Only the last is dated: Raḥīm II 880/August 1475. Among the provisions is one whose common text can be reconstructed thus: We-buyūrdum ki al-jān verib būyūrātā ve charkhkāhlārī ve maʿdene mānāsī onun hikālī [-i] no. 8 only) ki hārājā hēmeynēsē raʿiyye yalamlamāt ola gelārdūh ṭaḏenlerī šeneldelē: “And I have commanded that he [i.e. the supervisor, yasabbel], is, by giving al-jān, to cause to be brought in miners and engineers and people qualified at mining [-i, not being enregistered as payers of hārāj or as anybody’s raʿāyā], who may make the mines prosper.” The addition in no. 8, most probably a gloss, makes it clear that the miners to be recruited are immigrants from the dar al-barb; hence the al-jān by virtue of which they can enter Ottoman territory is amīn. In commenting on this passage Anhegger and Inaleck adduce from Kemāl’s Selâfīn name (completed in 895/1490) the couplet: Kiliyī jehl-āle oshā i devarūn a ḏawwān verī kīftūnān al-jān: “That ruler of the age [i.e. Bayezid II] took Kiliya by force and granted al-jān to its inhabitants.” This passage, when compared with other accounts of the campaign, confirms the meaning of al-jān, for it is used here as a synonym
for the amân mentioned by ‘Ashiqpasha-zade (ed. F. Giese, p. 187, l. 13) and in the felâh-nâmé (Ferîdûn, Munshi‘u al-Sulâhîn, i, 296, line 1).

The word was unfamiliar to the copyist of the Paris MS.; only in no. 8 does he write امّان (Âman), the other three contexts having the vocalization îrîjîn indicated. The latter spelling is certainly incorrect, for Kemâl’s metre demands a dissyllable, and other Paris MSS. which give the texts of nos. 8 and 10 read here îrîjân,29 the spelling found also in 15th-century tahtîr-register.30 The misspelling however, most easily explicable as a misreading of امّان (Âman), does suggest a possible etymology: îl w-i-jân, usually contracted to îl-jân,31 “peace 34 and [guarantee of] life.” Be that as it may, the meaning of the phrase îl-jân-nâmé found in Doc. 5, parallel to the îl-jân maclebî mentioned in the document issued by Mahmûd Pasha, is clear: it is “a letter conferring amân,” i.e. a safe-conduct.

In Ottoman usage there seems to have been no single term regularly employed for “safe-conduct.” In Ottoman documents of this period the safe-conduct issued by a European ruler is referred to as amân kâdhîlî (? a calque of litterae securitatis) 32 and that of the Sultan, in words put into the mouth of an Italian, as vece kâdhîlî 33; and the author of the 34

28 Beldiceanu, p. 162, n. 8.
29 Anháger and Inalcik, p. 8, n. 19.
30 The simple juxtaposition of two nouns is a normal feature of Turkish, needing no illustration; but it is worthwhile to point out the parallel provided in Elezovic, i/2, no. 32, line 5 îl-gûn, but line 11 îl-a-gûn.
31 This (I extended) meaning of îl, first attested by Mahmûd Kâshgharî (Udîn Lughat al-Turk, ed. Kiliçli Rifat, i, 50 = B. Atayal’s translation, i, 49: al-sûb bayna ‘î-malikhayn) and given also by Abdâyýnî (Kitâb al-Tabâhî . . . , ed. A. Câdirgân, İstanbul 1883, p. 20) is not itself found in Ottoman but lies behind the well-attested meaning “at peace” (as opposed to yakhi, i.e. Yawâshûr-i Vecer Sîlbi, i and ii, s.v. îl (d) 3, and iv, s.v. îl oelma), whence ülük, “peace” (ITS, i-iii, s.v. ülük).
32 In the report of the Ottoman agent Barkî published by Ş. Turan in Belleten, xxv/103 (1962), 547, referring to the passport of the Duke of Savoy. The term, with the meaning “safe-conduct”, was known to Meninski and (I hence) Zeyrek. Zât-î-Pîgir Efendi, who went on a diplomatic mission to Vienna in 1099/1688 (in time of open war) uses the terms emâ kâdhîlî and passporto kâdhîlî for the safe-conduct sent him by Maximilian of Bavaria (Şîhâbî, ii, 653). An Ottoman report of about 1780 (Belleten, xxv/101 (1962), 154) uses the term amân buyûkdânu for the document which the authorities at Jedda sent to European ships wishing to enter harbour.
33 So I interpret vece kâdhîlî in the report of another Ottoman agent published by Ş. Uzuncârlı (see Belleten, xxv/85 (1960), 462 and 476). The terms amân “[grant of] security” “and evê “submission [under promise of security]” were, it appears, in common parlance almost overlapping in meaning: in later texts (e.g. Pechiev, ii, 104) amân and evê are practically synonymous and amân kâdhîlî means “terms of surrender.”

Wâqîât-i Sulân Jan explains a salvo condotte as being a mûthâqû-nâmé,35 which Sa’d-al-Din in his turn paraphrases (i, 23) as ‘aâd-nâmé. In the later Ottoman safe-conduits of 996/1589 and 989/1583 published by J. H. Mordtmann,36 no specific term is used: the documents themselves are called merely hûm or ferminî, and they are referring âzız or idhîn.37 Perhaps no specific term was necessary, for the conditions under which a hûm might travel in Muslim lands were already covered by the ancient doctrine of amân, for which the locution êl-jân seems to be no more than a transient synonym.38

Document 7.

The use of Greek in correspondence emanating from Ottoman statesmen is well attested, the earliest example being Saraja Pasha’s letter of 1437 to the inhabitants of Yanya; Doc. 7, however, appears to be the earliest known original letter.

37 The letter of protection issued by ‘Isâ Beg to a “Latin” merchant in 888/1484 (Elezovic, i, no. 16 = i/2, no. 7) is called merely maclebî; a document issued to Transylvanian merchants by the beylerbegi of Eulda in 887/1779 is called in its text temessûh (M. Guboglo, Faleografie și diplomatia Turc-româna, Bucharest 1988, p. 173, n. 15; Guboglo lists also, at p. 85, the terms amân-nâmé and yel-formăci for “safe-conduct”).
38 There is a problem of terminology here. The “Geleziertet” of 888/1483 published by Kralitz (no. 21), a fermâci ordering the sanjak-beys, kadias, and su-bâlûças of Rumelî not to hinder a Ragusa agent nor to permit his horses to be seized for the courier-service, is similar in form and content to the “safe-conducts” in Turkish published here, but strictly speaking it is not quite of the same class, for Ragusa did not belong to the dâr al-karb: the Ragusans were bul and khâriezûs (Kralitz, no. 2), regarded as dhimmî (Kralitz, no. 7; Elezovic, i, 250), the tribute which they paid was jizya (Kralitz, no. 3), and they are on occasion even given the dâ‘î’s zîdâ ‘turbah (Elezovic, i/3, no. 37), usually reserved to Muslims. The fermâci was no doubt a great convenience to the Ragusan agent, and he would not in practice (for practice and theory may differ) have ventured on the journey without it, but juridically it was not essential to his safety. Similarly the five Tmitirî “Passbrieue” published by H. R. Koerner (Staatsbcher der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952, pp. 90—104 and 179—85) are no more than letters of recommendation, issued by a Muslim ruler to be carried by Muslim travelling through Muslim lands: they are “passports” in the modern sense, in that the sovereign “requests and requires” that his own subject he protected and assisted. The documents borne by the Venetian ambassadors are on a different footing, for here the hostile power guarantees a temporary protection to which the ambassador as such was in theory entitled, but which might not otherwise embrace his attendants.
The unguainly stiffly-drawn penche, like some others of the period, imitates the Sultan’s tağhrâ and appears at the head of the document. Not without hesitation I read the name “Dâ’ûd b. ‘Abd Allâh”, as follows: the lowest horizontal stroke with the short vertical stroke to its right gives dâl; the left-hand hastâ gives alf; the next horizontal stroke, with the loop to its right, gives waaw; immediately above it, to the left, is a second dâl. The wide loop to the left swinging right across the paper stands for bn, as does one of the two loops of the tağhrâ. The prominent ‘ayn is followed by a “tooth” (for kâ) at the foot of the right-hand hastâ, and then by a dâl; the right-hand hastâ is the initial alf of Allâh, the lik filling the central space. With this reading, I identify the sender as the Dâ’ûd Pasha who was in 1478 beylerbey of Rumeli and was later, for most of the first half of Bâyazid II’s reign, Grand Vizier. At first sight this identification is precluded by the fact that the same Dâ’ûd Pasha signed himself, as Grand Vizier, “Dâ’ûd b. ‘Abd al-Wad-dîd”; my reasons for maintaining the identification are set out in an excursus in pp. 112-8 below.

To comment on the Greek text is not my province, and I note only a few points in passing. The spelling is almost entirely phonetic. The spelling of ἀνάπεραυλὸς “ambassador” with a lambda (line 2: αὐσωρεμανγυ) is a Slavism (cf. Serbo-Croat polušar). The spelling ἀναφραυλὸς (lines 9-10 = ἀναφραυλοῦ) in this relatively early attestation of the word prompts the question whether Turkic marâlis might not after all derive from Gk. ἀναφραυλός “sinner”, as Hammer proposed, rather than from ἀνεφηραυλός (from Ln. arratus), as has gained general acceptance. Ρούμες (lines 11-12), literally “clothes”, has the more general meaning of “gear, possessions” (cf. Ital. roba and also, at this period in Turkish, qımâş). The voyvoda was a subordinate officer of the sanjak-bey, whose duties at this period are obscure. That he held some territorial jurisdiction, however, is apparent from a document of 912/1507 (Elezović, i/1, no. 140 = i/2, no. 97 = Uzunçarşı, 138-9), in which the sanjak-bey of (?)Herzegovina orders “Kâstim voyvoda” to protect Ragusan ambassadors from bandits in all parts of his voyvodalik and to give them an escort to the frontier—a situation similar to that which lies behind Doc. 7.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY

Document 1 concerns the negotiations of 1471, conducted by Francesco Capello and Niccolò Cocco. These, the Venetians believed, had been initiated by the Sultan’s stepmother, the Serbian princess Mara, who was

43 G. Meyer, Neugriechische Studien, II (SBAK, Wien, 130, 1884), 56.
then living in seclusion near Mount Athos." Her intervention with the Sultan would have received a ready hearing: with the storming of Negroponte in July 1470 he had achieved a major objective, the possession of Venice’s principal naval base in the Aegean, and he was no doubt aware of the efforts being made by Pope Paul II to promote a coalition against him and of the Signory’s attempts to expose him to a war on two fronts by embroiling him with Uzun Hasan.

Early in October 1470 the agents of the Princess and her sister Catherine arrived in Venice, and towards the end of the following month the ambassadors were elected and given their instructions: they were to wait at Corfu for their safe-conduct, and travel by sea or by land as it prescribed; they were to visit the Princess in order to present the Signory’s thanks and to discover from her what their reception was likely to be; and on being received at the Porte they were to propose peace on the basis of *uti possibilis*—the Venetian authorities were resigned to the loss of Negroponte.

Almost immediately afterwards, however, the situation appeared to change in Venice’s favour, for on 22 December the Pope’s endeavours were rewarded by the signature of the League of Lodi. New instructions, dated 2 January 1471, were sent post-haste to catch the ambassadors before they left Corfu or to overtake them on their journey. The main item of their instructions was now that they were to attempt to negotiate the recovery of Negroponte, offering, if necessary, up to 250,000 ducats for it; but if it appeared from their reception that it would be imprudent to mention the subject, they were at liberty to refrain. In the peace were to be included Venice’s allies, the Lusignan King of Cyprus, the Knights of Rhodes, the despot of Santa Maura, and other principalities of the Aegean. The ambassadors were instructed to report back by letter on the progress of the negotiations and to await, in the Ottoman dominions, the Signory’s reply.

---

1 Nagy and Nyáry, ii, no. 159 (dispatch of 22 April 1471).
2 Cappicus, pp. 6-7: “consensu navi, primum ad Denzettia filiam... indes terrestris itinerem Byzantium se confundat.” De Collis was told by the Doge that the princess and her sister had accompanied the ambassadors to Istanbul (Nagy and Nyáry, ii, no. 157, of 14 June).
3 Nagy and Nyáry, ii, no. 155 (31 May).
6 Op. cit., no. 109 (1 July). Babinger, apparently regarding the arrival of this Ottoman envoy as a new demarche, does not link up the incidents relating to this embassy (Erobérer, pp. 69 and 22-24 = Conquérant, pp. 346-7 and 358-60); but at this time Capello and Cocco were staying at the Porte, in obedience to their instructions (Cornet, p. 20): “Et de omnibus rebus et difficultatibus occurrerantibus nobis per vestras litteras distinctam et particulariter data notificam, redescendo vos interim ad eum locum in qua aut per terrum vostras fuerit ordinatus aji vos visum fuerit, et ibi responsum et mandatum nostrum expectaret.”
garrison.19 The Braccio di Maina (now Mani), the rocky arm of the Peloponnesse which ends in Cape Matapan, was, then, as for centuries before and since, the home of intractable mountainarreers and pirates; upon the arrival in the Peloponnesse in the summer of 1463 of the Venetian expeditionary force under Bertoldo d’Este, the Mainiates had rebelled and massacred the Turkish garrisons in the vicinity.14 Croia (Krije in Albania), the hereditary seat of George Castriota (“Iskender Beg”) and his principal base throughout his long resistance to the Ottomans, had been formally surrendered to Venice after his death in January 1468 by his son John; but it had in effect been a Venetian outpost for some years before, and a Venetian garrison had held it during Mehmed’s campaign of 1466.

To Malvasia (Montemvasia), the impregnable “Gibraltar of Greece” off the east coast of Laconia, the Sultan makes no claim for, unlike Lemnos, Maina and Croia, it had never been occupied either by himself or by one of his vassals. It had held out during the Ottoman campaign of 1465 when the other possessions of the despots Thomas and Demetrius were lost, but the city-fathers, not trusting entirely in their wealth and the natural strength of their island-fortress, had placed themselves under the protection of the Pope; then, with the outbreak of the war, they too had invited Venice to station a garrison there.15

There is in the letter no mention of Negroponte. Either the Sultan regarded the demand as too far-fetched to deserve a reply (a report was current in Venice that he had dismissed the ambassadors as soon as the subject was raised)16 or the ambassadors found the atmosphere so unpromising that, as their instructions permitted them to do, they refrained from mentioning it. The Sultan agrees to include Cyprus and Rhodes in the peace, and is willing to renew the capitulations (i.e. of April 1454).

The last sentence of the letter concerns a complaint which was raised at every discussion and was finally disposed of in the treaty of 1479. When Venice declared war, her Bailo at Istanbul and many of the Venetian merchants there were arrested and their goods were confiscated; but among those who managed to flee were Bartolomeo Giorgi (Zorzi) and

Girolamo Michiel, who held the concession for working the alum-mines. The Sultan claimed that they owed the Treasury 150,000 ducats.17 The question of this debt had arisen in 1468, when Leonardo Boldi was conducting negotiations,18 and was to be discussed again in 1475. The sum of 100,000 ducats which Venice undertook to pay by the terms of the treaty of 1479 was, it is true, described in the actual instrument 19 as a general indemnity for all losses sustained by the Sultan and his subjects; but it was recognized in Venice as being the settlement of the Sultan’s claim against the concessionaires.20

Unless the last words of the letter—"The ambassadors will inform you of what I have said ... concerning the former capitulations"—conceal a demand for heavy tribute, the Sultan’s terms are by no means so outrageous as public opinion was allowed to believe. The otherwise well-informed Domenico Malipiero, who knows of the principal demand, the cession of Lemnos, pretends that the Sultan demanded the ludicrous sum of 100,000 ducats a year as kharaj (100,000 ducati all’anno de caraggio)21; and Gherardo de Collis, pressed by his Duke to discover what the Sultan’s terms were, made three reports between 30 June and 3 August,22 each shown by our document to be inaccurate and exaggerated: he too had heard that there was a demand for heavy tribute, 50,000 ducats a year.23

17 Navagero, p. 1123.
18 Navagero, p. 1133.
19 Mäkiäisch and Müller, p. 207.
21 Malipiero, p. 67. Malipiero claims that the ambassadors replied "that the Signoria would rather see the earth destroyed to its foundations than pay tribute to anyone", which is absurd: under the earlier capitulations the Venetian authorities had readily paid "tribute" (la kharaj) on a small scale, it is true, but concealing the principle that in respect of the territories concerned they were the vassals (khasqg-i-giau) of the Sultan.
22 Nagy and Nyáry, ii, no. 158 (26 June), no. 160 (3 July), no. 185 (3 August). Babinger makes de Collis report that the Sultan was demanding the cession of Crete, Corfu and other islands (Babinger, pp. 320–1 = Conquistas, p. 388), but so excessive a demand was not even rumoured; de Collis wrote: "... che la Signoria lussia al Turcho Napoli de Romani et Croya, ... et che per lo resto de terra firma et de lo isole Candia, Corfu et Stalimini et certe altre isolete de lo arcipelago, andro stimo etc, che la Signoria al paga de Caragio sive tributio ducati l. mille l’anno," i.e. Venice was to retain these places but against payment of tribute.
23 See preceding note. By the treaty of 1479 which ended the war Venice was obliged to pay no more than 10,000 ducats annually.
The Venetian authorities, knowing that public opinion was all in favour of peace, were perhaps not unwilling that inflated rumours should circulate. The protraction of the negotiations gave them a full year’s breathing-space, with no hostilities undertaken by either side, and during this year the tide seemed to be turning in their favour. They may not have attached great hopes to the schemes which they were fostering for procuring the Sultan’s assassination; but the Treaty of Lodi was signed, and the courting of Uzun Hasan seemed at last to promise results: while Capello and Cocco were still on their way to Istanbul, Quirini had returned from Tabriz, and by April 1471 Caterino Zeno was in Tabriz and Uzun Hasan’s envoy was in Venice seeking munitions.

The terms of the Venetian reply to the Sultan’s letter are not known, but they amounted to a rejection. Nevertheless the Sultan, concerned at the threat offered by the alliance with Uzun Hasan, approached Venice again the very next spring with the invitation to send an embassy. Venice was in no hurry to accept. An ambassador was appointed and given his instructions, but was kept waiting at Corfu throughout the year, evidently because the Signory was hoping for good news from the East. The first reports were encouraging: a detachment of Uzun Hasan’s troops, having tricked the Ottoman beylerbey into allowing them passage through the Sultan’s territory, sacked Tokat and stirred up trouble in Karaman. But later in the year this force was destroyed near Konya, and with Mehmed’s defeat of Uzun Hasan in August 1473 the hopes which Venice had reposed in the alliance came to nothing.

---

22 See p. 103, n. 11 above.
23 Cippus, p. 7: “Dum legati profisciscentur, dum de conditionibus agitur, in mittenda etiam atque remittenda littera, tota aetas effluxit.”
24 For these points see F. Babinger, “Jaqšib Pascha, ein Leibarzt Mehmed’s II.” in Rivista degli Studi Orientali, xxxvi (1961), 87–113, and idem, Enchirid., pp. 300–10 = Confratelli, p. 547.
25 Cippus, p. 7: “Et quam de conditionibus non convenienst, legati per litteras, quasi paucis conditiones Turcos offerret Senatori certiorem reddunt. Veneti reiectis conditionibus, ex Senatori decreto legatos domum revocant.” Cippus, as well as Malipiero (p. 67), reports what happened to the ambassadors: “Interim Francisca Capelus ferebatur, Nicolaus alter legatus, primum piscatoria navicula Luminum, inde nactus Venetan triremum, Creman se contulit.”
26 The course of this embassy, with the procrastinations of the Venetian authorities, is now fully set out by F. Babinger, Darius, pp. 61–70.
27 There remains the question how Docc. 1, the original letter to the Doge, came to be lodged in the Malipiero file at the Archives (see p. 81 above). Perhaps Tomaso Malipiero, with whose envoys in 1477–8 the remaining documents are concerned, took this letter with him on those missions, as a reminder of the terms offered earlier, and on his return filed it away with the other, more personal, papers.

---

96 Navagero, p. 149, according to which the Jew died “nel principio di Gennaio [scil. 1479, N.S.]” and the Senate took the decision to send an embassy in the same month; but this date must be wrong. It means, if Document 2 of June–July 1477 was (as I suggest) written to be taken to Venice by this agent, that he took six months over the journey; and the Senate, presumably in response to this initiative, had decided what terms it would accept early in November (Romanin, p. 378). Malipiero seems to be referring to this incident of the Jewish agent when he says (p. 117): “A’ 22 de Novembris dito [scil. 1477]. Turchi ha testis de General [i.e. Loredano] de far pace.”
97 Navagero, p. 1151.
98 In 1468 the Venetian authorities had sent a Jewish agent to the Porte to procure a safe-conduct (Babinger, Darius, pp. 56–7); in 1477 they asked the Albanian lord of Drivasto to act for them (op. cit., p. 58); in 1475 an agent of the Princess Mara brought the necessary document to Venice (op. cit., p. 81, n. 1).
more elaborate safe-conduct in the form of letters patent, setting out in full detail the immunities of the ambassador—named as Tomaso Malipiero—and his entourage, and ratified by an oath. Though the year of issue is not given, it must be contemporary with Document 4, in Turkish, issued between 24 February and 5 March 1478. This is in the form of a formān, addressed to the Venetian ambassadors—in the plural. Its wording is somewhat unconventional; after the dispositio has emphasized that they may travel with confidence, the formulae of corroboration are interrupted after shekylī behistī by a curt postscript, which says in effect: "There is no need for all this suspicion and fuss."

It is not difficult to reconstruct what had happened. Venetian ambassadors, travelling in time of open war, were well aware of the necessity to ensure that their safe-conducts were precisely worded. We have noticed the report that Capello and Cocco made difficulties in 1471 because their safe-conduct covered only one ambassador, and in 1475 Girolamo Zorzi sent his safe-conduct back for revision three times. Malipiero cannot have been satisfied with Document 2: it was six months old and it was very lacunose in its expressions, with no extended statement of the immunities guaranteed, no mention of the ambassador's companions, and no reference to his return from the Porte to Venice. Before finally leaving Venetian protection he must, from somewhere along the Adriatic coast, have asked for a more precise document. He received in return the lengthy Document 3, written in Italian so that he could satisfy himself of its content, and promising in the most elaborate detail immunity for himself and all his retinue and their goods, both for the outward journey and the return, regardless of the issue of the negotiations.

---

88 P. 103 above. In their instructions of 27 November 1470 they were warned (Cornet, p. 18): "Verum habeatur ab omnibus vobis deligens consideratio et advertentia, ut salvosconductus sit bene amplius et suicienter ultra personas vestras et familie vestre, etiam pro golo et zuma, et omnibus qui in ea fuerint, eundo, stando, et redeundo." When at one point they were ordered not to set out from Corfu at all they were advised to excuse themselves either by a diplomatic illness or by finding fault with the safe-conduct: "aut cum tarditate ipsius salvosconducti..., aut cum simulatore irritantis alterius vestrum, aut denique cum dubitacione aliquis salvi conducti predicti." (Cornet, p. 18).

89 Malipiero, p. 112.

Cf. Navagaro, p. 1151: "[Malipiero] nel principio dell’ anno successivo 1478 [by which presumably, more Venetiano, he means March] avuta la commissione dal Senato, mandò a chiamare salvoscondotto per andare a Constantinopoli." Hammner (GOB, ii, 183) makes Malipiero arrive in Istanbul early in January and obtain a truce until mid-April, which is a complete misunderstanding.

---

86 Da Leze, p. 99 (one of the passages of this text which evidently incorporates the account of Angiolo); taken prisoner at Negroponte, he was at this time in the service of the Sultan and was present on the Scutari campaign of 1478.

87 Navagaro, p. 1152.

88 A safe-conduct was, in other words, a "return ticket" to and from the Porte: the data of issue is no indication of when the document was actually used.

89 Malipiero, p. 117; Balesinger, Erbecker, p. 205 = Conquered, p. 449.

90 Da Leze (Angiolo), p. 100.

91 According to Barletius, fol. 239v., the abhā'ī arrived on 14 May, the date given also (and with the correct day, Thursday) by Da Leze (7 Angiolo), p. 103.

92 According to Angiolo, however (Da Leze, p. 99), Malipiero had learned on his first embassy that the Sultan was preparing, truce or no truce, to march against Scutari, so perhaps it was no surprise to him to meet the Ottoman army on the road.
journey, for he found the Sultan, already on the march to Albania, encamped outside Kustendil. He protested at the breaking of the truce were brushed aside, and he was informed that once more the Sultan’s terms had been raised: the cession of Scutari, Drivasto and Alessio was now demanded. Once again Malipiero had to return to Venice for new instructions.

Still covered by Document 5, he took with him this time also Document 6, a safe-conduct, in the form of a ferma to the kadi of Rumeli, for the Venetian envoy who should return after these further consultations. It was issued, between 2 and 11 June, at “the camp at Egri-dere.” Egri-dere (‘crooked stream’, Slavonic Kriva Reka) is the name of the river along whose valley runs the main route from Kustendil to Üsküb after the crossing of the Devê-bayrîr Pass (now on the frontier between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia); in the 17th century there was built near the head of the valley a fortified station called Egriderë Palanka, now the township Kriva Palanka. Here or elsewhere (as the document reveals), some 30 km. south-west of Kustendil and two or three stages further on his road to Albania, the Sultan was encamped when Malipiero took his leave, to hasten back to Venice.

Document 7 suggests that his journey was not uneventful. This letter is written in barbarous Greek, and is undated; the addressee is not named, and the identity of the sender not beyond doubt. It may indeed have no connection at all with Malipiero’s journeys. But the fragments of internal evidence—the names Dâ’d, Ahmed Beg and Alessio, and even the reference to bad weather—all fall into place on the assumption that it was sent by Dâ’d Pasha to Malipiero on this, his second, journey home.

43 According to Navagero (p. 1152) “in Sofia”, but this is an approximation; Angilehê, who was in the Ottoman camp, is precise (Da Lezze, p. 100): “(Malipiero) giunto a una città chiamata la Bana, dove sono molti bagni caldi, e il piano di detta città trovò il Gran Turco accampato con grand’ esercito…” “Bana” (or “banyâ”) is the normal Bulgarian word for a hot-spring (cf. Ewliyâ Chelebi, Seyyid-emne, iii, 309: bu diyânda bânya bânda derer), and stands as or forms part of numerous place-names; but the town “Banâ” par excellence was Kustendil.


45 When Silemiçtî in March 1837, he spent two nights at the banak of “Kustendil Ilías” and reached Üsküb in five stages (Ferdiçin, Muncâda âl-Şâlihtîn, i, 308; here the name “Egri-dere” is not mentioned).

Dâ’d Pasha was at the time of this campaign beylerbey of Rumeli. Sent on with his sipahîs ahead of the Sultan, he had arrived before Scutari a few days after the akbâhs in the latter half of May, to begin preparations for the siege by casting guns and building a bridge over the Boyana. Over this bridge, completed on 1 June, he had planned to send a raiding-force to ravage the countryside beyond, but heavy rainstorms obliged the raiders to return empty-handed and suspended all activity for some days. Meanwhile the siege of Croia, some 70 km. to the south, was drawing to an end. For more than a year the fortress had been closely invested by an Ottoman force under the command of the sanjak-bey of Albania, Evrenos-oğlu Ahmed. Upon the approach of the Sultan the garrison abandoned all hope; on 25 June they surrendered on terms, only to be massacred. The Sultan then turned north, reaching Scutari—where Dâ’d Pasha had meanwhile been joined by the Beylerbey of Anadolu and the Janissaries—on 2 July.

Through this turbulent scene, in early June, Malipiero had to make his way. The letter suggests that on entering Albania he got in touch with Evrenos-oğlu Ahmed, who, as sanjak-bey, was responsible for his safety on these last stages of his journey. Ahmed Bey sent him an escort under the command of his vojvod, but the unseasonable storms which had hindered Dâ’d Pasha held them up, and they were attacked and robbed by the martos— the irregular bands, half-soldier and half-brigand, that infested these districts. Alessio, at the mouth of the Drina, midway between Scutari and Croia, was still in Venetian hands (it was to be taken, plundered and burnt by the two beylerbeyes towards the end of August). Before dismissing his escort, to enter Alessio and take ship for Venice, Malipiero must have written a letter of complaint to Dâ’d Pasha, Ahmed Bey’s superior officer, who was encamped only two or three hours’ riding away. Document 7, on this reconstruction, is Dâ’d Pasha’s plenary reply.

Document 6, the safe-conduct for a third journey which Malipiero brought away from Egriderë, did not go unused, for in spite of the Sultan’s...
uncompromising attitude the Venetian authorities retained a faint hope of saving Scutari by negotiation. Some time in July, when the siege was at its height, Malipiero returned, accompanied (as on his first embassy) by the secretary Alvise Manenti. 33 Coming up the Boyana in a light galley as far as a place called San Celso, 44 he himself stayed aboard and sent the secretary on into the Sultan's camp, escorted by 40 Ottoman horsemen (and evidently protected by Document 6). Needless to say this final attempt was fruitless, and it was only with difficulty that Manenti escaped Mehmed's wrath and regained the galley. Malipiero, it seems, immediately resumed his duties with the fleet, 45 for it was Manenti who in Venice, on 27 July, reported the failure of the mission. 46

Though reduced to the most desperate straits, Scutari held out. The Sultan withdrew on 8 September, followed shortly by the Anatolian troops and later by the troops of Rumeli; but the investment was rigorously prosecuted by Evrenos-oghlu Ahmed Bey, to whom had been entrusted all the siege-material. On 4 January 1479 Venice finally took the hard decision to admit that Scutari could not be saved, and despatched Giovanni Dario to Istanbul to make the best terms he could.

THE PATRONYMICS OF CONVERTS

In the Ottoman Empire, as in other Islamic societies, it was the practice that a convert to Islam whose natural father remained an infidel adopted as his father's name 'Abd Allah, "slave of Allah," or a name formed by substituting for the name of God one of the "beautiful names" (al-asna al-husna)—'Abd al-Latif, 'Abd al-Qadir, etc. Thus the historian finds in the patronymic used by an Ottoman dignitary a criterion indicating whether the personage was Muslim-born or recruited, through the deshirmiése or otherwise, into Ottoman service. 47

These patronymics were in fact rarely used. Ottoman historians and biographers, knowing them to be fictitious, ignore them. They are found occasionally in peniciles, on gravestones, and on seals, but commonly only in legal documents, so that the most fruitful source for determining the patronymic of an individual is a waqfyye for an endowment made by himself or one made by a colleague which he attested as witness. 48 The examination of the sources easily accessible to me has revealed some peculiarities, which have a bearing on the reading "Dâ'id b. 'Abd Allah", which I have proposed for the penicile of Document 7.

In the middle of the 15th/16th century the use of "b. 'Abd Allah" seems to have been almost universal: this was the patronymic used by the great Mehmed Pasha, 49 by Murad II's viziers Saruca, Iśağ 5 and Shihâb al-Din, 60 by the beylerbey Dayil Karaja, who was killed at Belgrade, 61 by another Iśağ, who was beylerbey in 861/1457, 7 by an Ibrâhîm, who was lala to Mehmed II, 8 and by a certain Doghan, who was Yenicâher Aghâ at Varna; and later in the century the defterdar "Tütünûzî" 5

---

43 De Lezez [Angioldello], p. 102.
44 No locality of this name is mentioned by K. Jireloch in his "Scutari und sein Gebiet im Mittelalter", in L. von Thaléczy, Ílyricz-Albanische Forschungen, 1, Munich 1916, pp. 94-124; behind the "San Celso" of De Lezez stands perhaps "San Sirzi" (S. Sergiu), the regular landing-place for Scutari, situated two-thirds of the way up the Boyana (Jireloch, pp. 117-18).
45 Malipiero was sent in command of ten galleys to attempt to defend Anzio (Navagere, p. 116); and on 18 September the Senate wrote to him and to the Admiral Loredano urging them to do their utmost to hold Scutari (Romarin, p. 380).
46 Malipiero, p. 110. Angioldello implies (De Lezez, p. 107) that Manenti was received by the Sultan, but Malipiero says: "non ho potuto negoziare col Signor Turco, ma ha trattato con un Basel."
Ahmed is called in his waqfey of (885/1483) "b. ‘Abd Allāh". But among the witnesses signs to the waqfey of Tütünasiz Ahmed, the (third?) vizier Mesih signs himself "b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāyy" and the (second?) vizier Dī′ūd as "b. ‘Abd al-Wadīd"; the same Dī′ūd Pasha, now Grand Vizier, is again "b. ‘Abd al-Wadīd" in a document of 901/1496, and his two consort-colleagues are "All b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāyy" (i.e. Khūdīn ‘Ali Pasha) and "Iskender b. ‘Abd al-Ǧaḥfaṣār".

It seems to have become the fashion for viziers to use more recherché patronyms; and throughout the following century the same fashion is found: Hersek-zade Ahmed Pasha is named "‘Ahmed b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāyy" in his waqfey of 917/1511, and his witness, Khūdīn Sinān Pasha, is "Sinān b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāyy"; Lutfi Pasha, in his Āṣaf-nāme, calls himself "b. ‘Abd al-Mu′in"; GüzeljeQSims Pasha, in a document of 957/1554, is "b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāyy"; the architect Sinān (not a vizier, but certainly a person of consequence) is "b. ‘Abd al-Mennān"; Pertev Pasha signs himself "b. ‘Abd al-Şāmed"; in 980/1572–3 the viziers sign themselves "Mehemned "toute court" (i.e. Sokollu, the Grand Vizier), "Pyâle b. ‘Abd al-Ǧaḥmaṇ", "‘Ahmed b. ‘Abd Allāh" (an exception), "Maḥmūd b. ‘Abd al-Mu′in" and "Muṣṭafā b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāyy"; ten years later the Grand Vizier Siyyunwaş again uses no patronymic but his colleagues are "Mesih b. ‘Abd al-Ǧaḥmaṇ", "Mehemned b. ‘Abd al- مليك" and "‘Irāhimm b. ‘Abd al-Wahhaṃb".

Thus after about 1480 the great men seem only to have been "b. ‘Abd Allāh". One explanation might be that there was a general change of fashion and that newly-recruited converts, formerly dubbed indiscriminately "b. ‘Abd Allāh", were now given a variety of patronyms. Against this however is the fact that relatively obscure converts continue to appear almost invariably as "b. ‘Abd Allāh". A waqfey of Mehemmed

---

**References:***

3. Kracitse, pp. 162 and 166, and Tufiş xiliş (Kracitse’s misreading "‘Abd al-Wahhaṃ") is corrected by Elezović, i/1, 277/1.
mother of Selim I. Of the 89 men, 72 are "b. 'Abd Allāh", and these are nearly all obscure individuals. Of the 17 others, five are probably Muslim-born in spite of the patronymic, and eight are probably pashas or beys. Only four of the 89 are inconspicuous people with patronymics in "Abd + a "beautiful name".23

These samples indicate that throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Muslim converts who do not rise to greatness are almost invariably called "b. 'Abd Allāh", and so are the great men too until about the reign of Bāyazīd II; but from then onwards the great men are rarely "b. 'Abd Allāh" but almost always use a patronymic incorporating a "beautiful name".

Since all boys and young men who had been forcibly taken into Ottoman service necessarily started their careers in obscurity, it seems to follow that an officer who eventually achieved high rank must at some stage have signaled his rise in the world by abandoning the "b. 'Abd Allāh" which he shared with thousands of his fellow-converts and adopting a rarer patronymic. If the change were made late in the officer's career, after he had begun to make his mark, we might expect to find indications of it in the documents; and indeed there are, from the reign of Bāyazīd II (with which particularly we are here concerned), three fairly conclusive examples.

1. Yāhūyā Pasha. Sa'd al-Dīn knows of only one Yāhūyā Pasha to flourish in this reign, whose career he summarizes as follows (ii, 220-1): having been beylerbe of Rumeli at the end of the reign of Mehmed the II24 he was dismissed (in favour of Dū'īd Pasha) in 887; from 893 until 897 he was again beylerbe of Rumeli, and then sanjak-bey of Bosnia until 897, when he became beylerbe of Anadolu; in 909 he became beylerbe of Rumeli for the third time, and in 911 was appointed vizier. In documents of this and the following years, his name does indeed appear, as vizier 25; and in 912/1506 he is named in one of his waqfyes as "Yāhūyā Pasha b. 'Abd al-Ḥāyyā".26 Who then is the beylerbe (amīr umrarī al-mu'mīnīn) Yāhūyā Pasha b. 'Abd Allāh, whose name appears twice in Bāyazīd's waqfye of Dū'īd-Qa'da 898/August 1493?27 No other Yāhūyā Pasha is known who at this time could have been mentioned in the waqfye as beylerbe.28 It would appear that Yāhūyā Pasha, having been content to be "b. 'Abd Allāh", in 898, later—perhaps upon his promotion to the vizierate in 911—adopted the rarer patronymic as "b. 'Abd al-Ḥāyyā".

2. Iskender Pasha. Sa'd al-Dīn similarly knows only one Iskender Pasha (ii, 218). At the death of Mehmed the II, he had been sanjak-bey of Bosnia; in 888, when Khādīr-Beg-oghlu Mehmed Pasha was promoted to the vizierate, he succeeded him as beylerbe of Rumeli, holding office until 890: from 894 to 895 he was a vizier, when he again became sanjak-bey of Bosnia, to remain there until his death in 912. Documents do indeed show him as fourth vizier in 895, 896 and 898;29 and in 911/1406, still fourth vizier, he signs himself "Iskender b. 'Abd al-Ḥāffār".30 In the Sultan's waqfye of 898/1493, however, two Iskenders are named: umīr-i helīr, wissār-i haffar, hastā-i Iskender Pasha bīn 'Abd al-Ḳādir and umdar al-awzā'ar Islamlīr Pasha bīn 'Abd Allāh.31 The three other vīzīrs in this year were Dū'īd, Ībrāhīm (Chandarlı) and Khādīm "Allī. All three Iskenders—b. 'Abd Allāh, b. 'Abd al-Ḳādir, and (later) b. 'Abd al-Ḥāffār—must, it would appear, be one and the same man.

3. Muṣṭafā Pasha of Ușkūb. At least three Muṣṭafā Pashas flourished.
in this period, and are very difficult to distinguish. One of them is the founder of one of the principal mosques of Üsküb. In the inscription on his türbe beside the mosque (he died in 925/1512) he is called simply "Muştafa Paşa"; but in the foundation-inscription, dated 898/1492, over the principal door of the mosque he is called "Muştafa b. 'Abd Allah". The waqfâyeye for this mosque and other pious foundations was drawn up 22 years later, in 920/1514; but here the founder is called "Muştafa Paşa b. 'Abd al-Kerim".

Here then are three persons who, having been called "b. 'Abd Allah", reappear with more elaborate patronymics. This small problem deserves further investigation, and perhaps one of our Turkish colleagues, with the resources of the archives at his disposal, will pursue it. It can however already be said that although DÎÔd Pasha, as vizier, signs himself "b. 'Abd al-Wadîd" in 888/1483 and 901/1496, this does not necessarily exclude the identification of the DÎÔd b. 'Abd Allah named in the penche as the same DÎÔd, who in 885/1478 had been beylerbeys of Rumeli.

---

39 Certainly not, as Evelyn believed (Sûlûtû-l-nâmâ, v, 586), "Koja Muṣṭafâ Paşa, as is shown by E. Hasko Ayvârdî in Fâyûk Dergisi, iii (1966), 157. Koja Muṣṭafâ Paşa had, as haşâât-banî, gone on a mission to Italy in connection with the custody of Prince Yem (and was popularly believed to have poisoned him); becoming Grand Vizier in Shawâbâd 917 (Ç. Uluçay, in Türk Dergisi, vii/10 (1964), 122); he was executed shortly after Selim's accession on suspicion of being a partisan of Prince Aţâzâd ; he is buried at Bursa (K. Bayuqâl, Bursa ve anıları, Bursa 1969, p. 180, no. 40). This must be the "shâhâd" or "mûlâtî" Muṣṭafâ Paşa who appears in land registers as "Muṣṭafâ Paşa b. 'Abd al-Mu'tâm" (M. T. Gökâbilgi, Ezâne, pp. 441-8, especially 441, last line).

40 Elzevâr, i/1, 188-9 = i/2, 202, and cf. Fâyûk Dergisi, iii (1966), 158 and resim 23.

41 Elzevâr, i/1, 261 = i/2, 83, and cf. Fâyûk Dergisi, iii, 157 and resim 22.

42 Elzevâr, i/1, no. 163, pp. 713-813, see especially at p. 721, l. 164 and p. 800, l. 106.

43 The case of Iskender Paşa raises the further question whether some dignitaries chose to use two (or more ??) "beautiful names" indiscriminately.

---

THREE LETTERS FROM THE OTTOMAN "SULTANA" ŞÂFIYE TO QUEEN ELIZABETH I.

by

S. A. Skilliter.

The first of the three Turkish letters which are the subject of this study was sent to England in 1593 by Şâfiye, then Murâd III's Khaşêci—that is to say, as mother of his son and heir Mehmed, first-lady in the Sultan's harem. She had great influence over the Sultan and in the contemporary European reports she is usually called the "Sultana". After the death of Murâd III (1574-95), throughout the reign of her son Mehmed III (1595-1603), she enjoyed the all-powerful position of Wangile Sultan—"Sultana Mother". It was at this time, in 1599, that our second and third letters were written to Queen Elizabeth.

In order to provide comparison with the letters sent to England, a letter of the Khâshêci Şâfiye to the Signoria of Venice has been added as an appendix to this article, together with the copy of a letter written to the Doga and Signoria by a Wangile, perhaps by Nûr Bâni, the Venetian mother ofMurâd III.

The first letter became famous, soon after its arrival in England, when Richard Hakluyt printed it in Italian and English translations in the 1598-1600 edition of The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation. Its Turkish original, which is preserved in the British Museum, is published here for the first time.

1 For Khaşêci and Wangile Sultan see s.p. in EI (articles by C. Huart and J. Deny).
2 I found the Venetian letters when searching for the two "Sultana" letters noted by Hammer (GOR, ix, 286-7, nos. 781, 786) as being in the Archivio di Stato, Venice. They do not appear to be the same as his, which may still await discovery. Further "Sultana" letters, from Süleymân I's Khaşêci Khremî Sultan and his daughter Mîhrînî Sultan, are catalogued by Z. Abrahâmovics in Katalg dokumentow tureckich, i, 104-5, 106-7.
3 Res. 311-12—Glasgow reprint, vi (1904), 114-15.
4 P. Wittek was the first to point to the possibility of its existence in the I.M., in an article published during the last war, when verification was impossible; see his "The Turkish documents in Hakluyt's "Voyages"", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xlv, 87 (1947), 129-39. I should like to thank Professor Wittek here for all his advice and assistance to me.