

Capitulations and Negotiations

The Role of the Venetian Consul in Early Ottoman Egypt

Yutaka HORII

Introduction

The Ottoman Empire (1299-1922) expanded its territory to Anatolia and the Balkans during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and, in 1516-17, annexed the land of the Mamlūks (1250-1517). Thus the Ottomans put the greater part of the Eastern Mediterranean under their rule; this situation continued essentially until the end of the eighteenth century. The European Levant trade, with a medieval tradition, continued under Ottoman rule; the Levantine cities were still part of the front line of European trading nations in the Early Modern period. Therefore, the method of adjusting interests in which the Europeans were involved in the local societies is an interesting subject. From this point of view, this paper will shed some light on consular negotiation under the Ottoman capitulations.

The Venetians in Egypt are especially noteworthy. Egypt was on the trade route connecting the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea, and the Mediterranean Sea, and one of its foundations of prosperity during the Later Middle Ages was the transit trade of spices. Alexandria, the main port city on the Egyptian Mediterranean coast, was a major point of the Levant trade and was where many European merchants were living and trading. The spice trade stagnated at the beginning of the sixteenth century when the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean blockaded the Levant; it revived, however, with the Ottoman eastward expansion in the middle of the century¹. The Venetians were in a leading position for European trade in Egypt in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, so their point of view may be useful to make clear the system of maintaining the Levant trade under the Ottoman rule.

1 Consular Negotiation in the Capitulations

The origin of Ottoman capitulations goes back to the Later Middle Ages. As Italian city-states advanced into Mediterranean trade in the eleventh century, Islamic dynasties managed

1 H. İnalcık and D. Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 315-363.

the trade by applying the principles of *Sharī'a* (the Islamic Law). Although the *Sharī'a* regards the state of hostility between Islam and non-Muslim communities as normal, a temporary truce between them can be approved if it benefits Muslims. In that case, granting the *amān* or the safe-conduct mutually concludes a friendly relation and the traffic between them becomes possible. The non-Muslims granted the *amān* are allowed to live and act in the Muslim territory under the status of *musta'min*². The conditions of living and acting for the European *musta'mins* were provided by the negotiations between the envoy sent from the home country and the Muslim ruler, or the negotiations between the colony and the Muslim ruler. The agreed rules were effective because they were written in the Muslim ruler's decrees (*marsūm*), which were sent to the officials in the territory. Such decrees played a role as treaty documents because they were also sent to the other-party country to notify it of the agreement. In these decrees, some legal limitations concerning the status of *musta'min* were eased and various rights and obligations of Europeans were stipulated according to each situation. Most of these rules became customs³.

During the Ayyūbid era (1169-1250) and the Mamlūk era, the Europeans in Alexandria, with its Mediterranean coast location, had obtained many rights from the sultan in order to engage in trade smoothly. The fundamental rights that became customs at the end of the fifteenth century were as follows⁴: The Venetians, Genoese, etc. could organize the colony (residents' community) of each nation and hold the trading house (*fondaco, funduq*) for each nation's exclusive use; each colony's administration and legal judgements were provided by the consul (*console, qunṣul*) sent from the home country or elected in the colony (i. e., the consular jurisdiction); the consul had the right to negotiate with the sultan; the merchants also had the right to request the sultan's judgement in quarrels with Muslims; the cargo of their wrecked ships had to be returned to the owner if it was salvaged; collective responsibility for the debts, etc. of a person belonging to the same nation could not be imposed on them; responsibility for other nations' piracy against Muslims could not be imposed on them; and the sultan had to punish the Muslims who plundered their ships.

The Ottoman Empire also shared this tradition of treaty and, since the middle of the

2 M. Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, Baltimore, 1955, pp. 162-169, 202.

3 For the formation of commercial privileges of Europeans in the Later Middle Ages, see J. Wansbrough, "Imtiyāzāt, i," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., vol. III, Leiden, 1971, pp. 1178b-1179a.

4 See the Mamlūk sultan's decrees issued in 1489, 1497, and 1507 which recognize the rights of Florentines: J. Wansbrough, "A Mamlūk Commercial Treaty Concluded with the Republic of Florence 894/1489," in S. M. Stern (ed.), *Documents from Islamic Chanceries*, Oxford, 1965, pp. 39-79; *idem*, "Venice and Florence in the Mamluk Commercial Privileges," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. XXVIII (1965), pp. 483-523; *idem*, "The Safe-Conduct in Muslim Chancery Practice," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. XXXIV (1971), pp. 20-35. The customary rights which Venetians had obtained by the fifteenth century are reflected in these decrees. Most clauses of the decree of 1497 were applications of rules which had been agreed upon between the Mamlūks and the Venetians in 1442 (Wansbrough, "Venice and Florence", pp. 486-497).

fourteenth century, formed the norms concerning friendship and trade with Venetians, Genoese, etc. The Ottoman sultan showed the rules agreed with these nations in the *ahdname* (“treaty document”) whose form is a decree (*nişan*). The *ahdnames* were issued for concluding new friendship, renewing it at the enthronement of a new sultan, re-concluding for the end of war, etc.; they were sent to officials in the Ottoman territory and to the other party’s country, and called by the Europeans “capitulations.” The rules in the *ahdnames* granted to Venice in the sixteenth century can be classified into four categories: the preconditions for making an *ahd* (contract, treaty); maintaining order on the seas; rights and obligations of Venetians in the Ottoman territory; and treatment of fugitive slaves, criminals and debtors. These rules were attributed to the Venetians in Syria and Egypt after the annexation of Mamlūk territory in 1516-17. Many of them were attributed to the draft of treaty made by the Ottomans and France in 1535 and the *Ahdname* of 1569 granted to France, probably for the first time⁵. England obtained the *ahdname* for the first time in 1580 to enter the Levant trade, and the Dutch Republic did the same in 1612. Thus the system of *ahd* kept the order of friendship and trade between the Ottoman Empire and the European nations during the Early Modern period⁶.

In short, the Ottoman capitulations covered the Eastern Mediterranean because of Ottoman expansion. This universalization involved the unification of various rules that had been established in the Eastern Mediterranean. Its process seems to be easy, in general, because both the Mamlūks and the Ottomans had the same norms concerning fundamental rights such as consular jurisdiction and prohibition of collective responsibility. Moreover, after the annexation of Mamlūk territory, the Ottomans added rules similar to the Mamlūk rules in the *ahdnames*. In some cases, however, the Ottomans and the Mamūks, reflecting the structures of their own ruling systems, made different rules concerning the same matter⁷.

The Ottomans and the Mamlūks demonstrated a method of adjusting interests in which the Europeans in the Levantine cities were involved in the rules of negotiation or trial. The consul (or Venetian *bailo*, in Istanbul) and ordinary merchants were stipulated separately⁸. For

5 The development of *ahdnames* granted to Venice is discussed in the following article: Y. Horii, “16seiki-zenhan no Osuman-teikoku to Venetsia: Afudonāme bunseki o tōshite (The Relation between the Ottoman Empire and Venice in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century: From the Analysis of the *Ahdnames*),” *Shigaku-zasshi*, vol. CIII, no. 1 (Jan. 1994), 34-62 (in Japanese).

6 For the history of Ottoman capitulations in the Modern period, see H. İnalcık, “İmtiyāzāt, ii,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., vol. III, Leiden, 1971, pp. 1179a-1189b; A. H. de Groot, “The Historical Development of the Capitulatory Regime in the Ottoman Middle East from the Fifteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries,” *Oriente moderno*, vol. XXII (LXXXIII), part 3 (2003), pp. 575-604.

7 The subsuming Mamlūk norms by the Ottoman capitulations are discussed in the following articles: Y. Horii, “Venetian Consul and Residents in Egypt under Ottoman Conquest,” in *Veneziani in Levante, musulmani a Venezia (Quaderni di studi arabi)*, vol. XV (1997), Suppl.), pp. 121-132; *idem*, “Higashi-chichūkai-sekai ni okeru Isrām-kokka to Kaijō-chitsujo, 1482-1521 (Islamic States and Maritime Order in the Eastern Mediterranean, 1482-1521),” *Historia Juris: Hikaku-hō-shi Kenkyū*, vol. VI (1997), pp. 28-44 (in Japanese).

8 Another paper, in the near future, will discuss the capitulatory rules concerning the trial that involves European merchants in connection with the legal administration.

the consul or *bailo*, how to make the rule was different between Ottomans and Mamlūks. The Mamlūks, by the decree of 1497, applied to the Florentines those rules already applied to the Venetians, and, in the article 34, recognized the following right: “if their consul wishes to come to the Noble Portals (*al-abwāb al-sharīfa*, the sultan’s court) for an injustice (*ẓulm*) which has befallen him or one of his merchants in the port, or letters have come for him from his country for doing their affairs, he can come to the Noble Portals”⁹. Such a kind of norm actually functioned; for example, in Mamlūk Egypt the Venetian consul in Alexandria negotiated frequently with the sultan in Cairo for diplomatic and commercial matters¹⁰. On the other hand, the office of Venetian *bailo* in Istanbul (Constantinople) had existed from the Byzantine era and was resumed at 1454, one year after the Ottoman conquest of the city. This office had originally had the roles of diplomatic representative and head of the colony. However, no rule of negotiation or trial concerning the *bailo* appeared in the Ottoman *ahdnames* up to the *Ahdname* of 1517. Considering the change in the *Ahdname* of 1521 granted for renewing the treaty at the enthronement of Sultan Süleyman I (ruled 1520-66), it seems likely that the *bailo*’s right against the sultan was limited until that time. In this *ahdname*, the following text was added:

“And if there is someone’s dispute with *bailo*, it should occur at my Prosperous Threshold (*südde-i saadet*, the sultan’s court) in Istanbul. The matter should be heard at my Noblest Council (*Divan-ı Âlişan*). However, if I am away on a campaign successfully, such disputes occurring involving *bailo* should be heard through the judge (*kadı*) in front of the *bey* who was appointed for the guarding of God-guarded Istanbul”¹¹.

It continued to appear in subsequent *ahdnames* repeatedly¹². This rule is common with the above-mentioned Mamlūk rule as to the right to demand the sultan’s judgment, but does not necessarily show the contemporary customary norm in the Ottoman Empire. Because Marco Minio, a Venetian envoy sent to Istanbul to negotiate for obtaining this *ahdname*, wrote in his report (*relazione*) as the reason for addition of this rule that, until that time, the *bailo* involved in dispute had been taken to *kadı* and it was a “very dishonorable matter”¹³. This new rule probably reflected the rising of the *bailo*’s

9 Wansbrough, “Venice and Florence,” p. 508.

10 E. Ashtor, *Levant Trade in the Later Middle Ages*, Princeton, 1983, pp. 414-415; Y. Horii, “The Mamlūk Sultan Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī (1501-16) and the Venetians in Alexandria,” *Orient*, vol. XXXVIII (2003), pp. 178-199.

11 Archivio di Stato di Venezia (hereafter “ASV”), Documenti Turchi (hereafter “DT”), no. 188, ll. 44-46.

12 The rule in the *Ahdname* of 1540: ASV, DT, no. 426, ll. 60-62; *Ahdnames* of 1567, 1575, 1576, 1595, 1604, 1619, 1625, and 1641: H. Theunissen, “Ottoman-Venetian Diplomacy: The ‘Ahd-Names. The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of a Political-Commercial Instruments together with an Annotated Edition of a Corpus of a Relevant Documents,” *Electric Journal of Oriental Studies* (<http://www.let.uu.nl/oosters/EJOS/EJOS-1.html>), vol. I (1998), no. 2, pp. 481, 514, 554, 572, 586, 605-606, 621, 631.

13 E. Albèri (ed.), *Relazioni degli ambasciatori al Senato*, ser. III, vol. III, Florence, 1855, pp. 87-88.

authority and, in Syria and Egypt, meant the continuation of the concerned Mamlūk norm. In fact, the Venetian consul in Alexandria negotiated frequently on commercial matters with the Ottoman governor, a new ruler of Egypt, as we see in the next chapter.

2 *Consular Negotiations through the Administrative Network*

The expansion of Ottoman power formed the wide-ranging administrative network connecting inside and outside the empire. After the annexation of Mamlūk territory in 1516-17 by the campaign of Sultan Selim I (1512-20), the Ottoman Empire ruled Syria and Egypt through the governors (*beylerbeyi*) and other officials sent from the sultan's court in Istanbul. In Egypt, the Ottoman administration had been established in the ten or so years that followed the conquest¹⁴. For military affairs, seven regiments made up of Ottoman infantry and cavalry, *mamlūk* cavalry, and native soldiers were established, primarily for the defense of Cairo, the governorate capital. The influential Ottoman men appointed to the office of *sancak beyi*, leading their own soldiers, supported and checked the governor's administration and defended Cairo and some other main local cities. As for financial affairs, most of the taxes levied all over Egypt were sources of the sultan's revenue (*hass*). The chief treasurer (*defterdar*, *nazır-ı emval*) sent from Istanbul supervised the levying of taxes. The *emins* and *kâşifîs* (financial supervisors) controlled the various kinds of *mukataas* (units of the source of revenue of the imperial treasury) in both urban and rural areas, and the *amils* (tax collectors) executed the levying. Immediately after the conquest, the Ottomans introduced a tax farming system in the urban areas, and Jewish financiers (*şarrāf*) who were rich in funds emerged as customs farmers in the main ports. For judicial affairs, the chief judge (*kazasker*) sent from Istanbul supervised the courts in Cairo. For the courts of local cities, the judges (*kadı*, *qāđī*) were also appointed in Istanbul.

In Alexandria, immediately after the Ottoman conquest in 1517, the Mamlūk governorship (*nā'ib al-Iskandarīya*) was abolished and the *kadı* and *emin* became main administrators. In the Diary (1496-1533) written by a Venetian nobleman named Marino Sanuto, the *emin* appears first in 1518 and the *kadı* in 1520¹⁵. After 1525, the Jewish customs farmers led the trade control of the seaport and often oppressed the Venetians in their activities¹⁶. In the reports (*relazioni*) of Daniele Barbarigo (1549-53) and Lorenzo Tiepolo (1553-56)¹⁷, the two

14 For the Ottoman administration in Egypt in the sixteenth century, see S. M. es-Seyyid Mahmud, *XVI. Asırda Mısır Eyâleti*, Istanbul, 1990; M. Winter, *Egyptian Society under Ottoman Rule 1517-1798*, London and New York, 1992, pp. 29-49; D. Behrens-Abouseif, *Egypt's Adjustment to Ottoman Rule: Institutions, Waqf and Architecture in Cairo (16th and 17th Centuries)*, Leiden, 1994, chaps. 3-6.

15 Marino Sanuto, *I diarii*, 58 vols., Venice, 1879-1902, repr., Bologna, 1969-1970, vol. XXVI, coll. 163-164, vol. XXIX, coll. 575-576.

16 Y. Horii, "Venetians in Alexandria in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century," *Annales of Japan Association for Middle East Studies*, vol. XX, part 2 (2005), pp. 137-138 (in pp. 131-144).

17 The report of Daniele Barbarigo (1554): ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, ff. 31v.-37r.; C.

Venetian consuls of Alexandria for the 1550s, the *kadı* was still one of the main administrators in the seaport, but the *emin* does not appear, and the *sancak beyi* appears as another main administrator. The activities of the Jewish customs farmers still continued and they were called “master of port (*scalliero*)”¹⁸.

Under the Ottoman expansion, the Venetian administrative network connecting the homeland and the Levantine cities was also reorganized and integrated. According to the traditions of the Middle Ages, the Venetians kept their colonies in the Levant. The *bailo* and consuls represented each colony. According to the orders from the home country Senate and the decisions of the local councils (mainly *Consiglio di XII* or Council of Twelve), they provided the colony’s administration and legal judgements and also negotiated with the local ruler. Until 1517, the *bailo* in Istanbul under the Ottomans had not usually communicated with the consuls in Damascus and Alexandria under the Mamlūks, nor did these two consuls have any close connections with each other. After the annexation of Mamlūk territory, the centrality of Istanbul in the Eastern Mediterranean heightened, and the *bailo* in Istanbul began playing the part of linchpin in the administrative network connecting the homeland and the consuls¹⁹.

The problems occurring between the Venetians and the Ottoman power in Egypt were often resolved through the wide-ranging administrative network connecting the Ottoman Empire and Venice. The consul of Alexandria generally made negotiations with the governor of Egypt. If their interests were opposed and the matter was unsolvable, the governor and the person concerned sometimes reported it to the sultan’s court, and the consul reported to the home government or the *bailo* in Istanbul. In such a case, the problem became a matter of negotiation between the *bailo* or envoy and the grand vizier and viziers in the sultan’s court. And the *bailo* or envoy sometimes succeeded in having the sultan issue decrees favorable for them. Thus the Venetians were able to resolve some Egyptian problems, if not all, through the negotiations in Istanbul. For example, in Alexandria from 1525 to 1533, the Jewish customs farmers, supported by the governor, controlled trading according to their benefits and oppressed the Venetian trade; the Venetians confronted them with negotiations in Istanbul to maintain their trading activities²⁰. This situation was in contrast with that under the Mamlūks; in their later era, the conflicting commercial interests of the Mamlūk sultan and the Venetians

Poma, “Il consolato veneto in Egitto con le relazioni dei consoli Daniele Barbarigo (1554) e Marco Zen (1664),” *Bollettino del Ministero degli Affari Esteri*, ser. 1, 109 (1897), pp. 483-495. The report of Lorenzo Tiepolo (1556): ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 31, fascicolo Alessandria, ff. 1r.-15v.; busta 62, ff. 51r.-61r.; Lorenzo Tiepolo, *Relazioni dei consolati di Alessandria e di Siria per la Repubblica Veneta negli anni MDLII-MDLX*, ed. E. Cicogna, Venice, 1857.

18 See the following part in the report of Barbarigo: ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, ff. 35v., 36r.; Poma, “Il consolato veneto,” pp. 492, 493.

19 For the formation of Venetian consular network in the Early Modern period, see M. P. Pedani, “Venetian Consuls in Egypt and Syria in the Ottoman Age,” *Mediterranean World*, vol. XVIII (2006), pp. 7-9 (in pp. 7-21).

20 See n. 16.

became serious and trade between them stagnated²¹.

For the negotiations between Venetians and the Ottoman power as to Egyptian affairs, the reports of Daniele Barbarigo and Lorenzo Tiepolo in the 1550s tell us much. According to Barbarigo, since the Jews at that time gained complete control over the distribution of goods between Cairo and Alexandria, he negotiated with the governor, Semiz Ali Paşa (1549-53), for permission to dwell in Cairo to make Venetians purchase spices and grains directly; he succeeded in this, and moved the consulate to Cairo in 1553²². His successor, Tiepolo, negotiated frequently with the governors, Mehmet Paşa (1554-56) and İskender Paşa (1556-59), for matters concerning trade control. For example, he requested tax exemption at the customhouse in Alexandria for silk fabrics brought in to be presents to the governor and high officials; tax exemption at the Nile port of Būlāq in Cairo for wine supplied to consul and merchants, as it was usage in the whole Ottoman land; and levying no charge upon the other provisions supplied for the nation except the agreed tax. For the first matter, he had the governor issue the order as he requested it after “many hardships and expenses”²³. When Mehmet Paşa tried to force Tiepolo to make Venetians purchase a certain quantity of pepper at a high price for the chief treasurer, Tiepolo protested against this governor to have him stop it²⁴. Tiepolo frequently had to do difficult negotiations with the governor on the matter of purchasing grains because the distribution of grains in Egypt at that time was under the governor’s control, the Jews had the right of selling grains to the Christians, and Egypt was lacking in wheat and broad beans in 1555²⁵.

Many instances of negotiation concerning the management of capitulatory rules can be found, and some of them were done through the above-mentioned wide-ranging administrative network. Under the Mamlūks, as mentioned above, the cargo of the wrecked ship of a friendly European nation had to be returned to the owner if it was salvaged. The same rule was prescribed in the Ottoman *ahdnames* granted to Venice²⁶. In relation to this, an instance can be found: when the Venetian ship named Fedela was wrecked at Abū Qīr in the eastern suburbs of Alexandria, Daniele Barbarigo stayed in the place for fifteen days and recovered the properties

21 Horii, “The Mamlūk Sultan Qānšūh al-Ghawrī.”

22 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 33r.; Poma, “Il consolato veneto,” p. 487. The move of the Venetian consulate to Cairo has already been mentioned in Horii, “Venetians in Alexandria,” p. 139. Considering that the European colonies in Egypt had traditionally been limited to the coast region, this was a remarkable advancement for the Venetians.

23 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 31, fascicolo Alessandria, f. 2r.-v.; ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 52r.; Tiepolo, *Relazioni dei consolati*, p. 11.

24 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 31, fascicolo Alessandria, f. 5r.; ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 53v.; Tiepolo, *Relazioni dei consolati*, pp. 14-15.

25 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 31, fascicolo Alessandria, ff. 6v.-8v.; ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, ff. 54v.-56r.; Tiepolo, *Relazioni dei consolati*, pp. 16-19.

26 The rule in the *Ahdname* of 1502: ASV, DT, no. 73, ll. 24-26; *Ahdname* of 1513: ASV, DT, no. 161, ll. 27-29; *Ahdname* of 1517: ASV, DT, no. 167, ll. 31-33; *Ahdname* of 1521: ASV, DT, no. 188, ll. 36-38; *Ahdname* of 1540: ASV, DT, no. 426, ll. 51-53.

of 50,000 ducats, a part of the cargo²⁷. He also negotiated with the governor, Semiz Ali Paşa, to have him return the artilleries that had been loaded on the Venetian ships named Fedela and Vacca and, after the shipwreck, put in the fortresses²⁸.

Under the Mamlūks, as mentioned above, the sultan had to punish the Muslims who plundered the ships of friendly European nations. In the Ottoman *ahdnames* granted to Venice in 1521, and after that, rules were prescribed that the sultan had to punish the pirates plundering Venetian ships and the Venetian subjects captured by the pirates had to be returned to the Venetian side if they had not become Muslims²⁹. In relation to this, two instances can be found. First, when the plunderage of the Venetian ship named Barbara occurred in Alexandria, Daniele Barbarigo immediately took the “certificate (*giustificazioni*)” of the event from the *kadi* and the *sancak beyi*, and asked the governor for his “favor for justice” to have him send a letter of “good form” to the sultan’s court. Barbarigo also send a messenger to the *bailo* in Istanbul to report the event in detail. The problem seems not to have been solved in the term of Barbarigo’s consulate; in his report, he insists on the necessity of immediately sending envoys from Venice to the grand vizier Ahmet Paşa and the governor of Egypt to recover the loss³⁰. Second, Barbarigo recovered two Venetian slaves according to “the clauses with the sultan” (*ahdname*) “without spending as much as one ducat.” One of them had been captured by Muslims ten years ago, and the other three years ago. The matter that one of them had already “promised to be Turk (Muslim) and worshipped in the mosque” did not deter the recovery³¹. Perhaps, this conversion was a compelled camouflage and was made outside the application of the capitulatory rules.

Under the Mamlūks, as mentioned above, the friendly European nations could not have imposed on them the responsibility for other nations’ piracy against Muslims. The Ottomans also distinguished the friendly nations from the European corsairs, and cooperation with the corsairs was prohibited to the Venetians by the *ahdnames*³². In relation to this, two instances can be found. First, some Turks (Muslims) had been captured by a Maltese brigantine (the Knights of St. John or the Hospitallers) at Zante, were ransomed in Messina, and appeared in front of the governor of Egypt. They obtained the governor’s order to make Daniele Barbarigo send his man to recover their loss and their captured companions, or to make him pay all. Barbarigo was able to negotiate with the governor easily because he had already moved the consulate to Cairo, and to defend the Venetians’ “rights (*ragioni*)” without any expenditure and without reporting to the sultan’s court. The “rights” probably means the rule that the

27 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 33r.; Poma, “Il consolato veneto,” pp. 486-487.

28 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 34v.; Poma, “Il consolato veneto,” p. 490.

29 The rules in the *Ahdname* of 1521: ASV, DT, no. 188, ll. 19-21, 31-35; *Ahdname* of 1540: ASV, DT, no. 426, ll. 32-34, 47-50.

30 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, ff. 32v.-33r.; Poma, “Il consolato veneto,” p. 486.

31 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 35r.; Poma, “Il consolato veneto,” pp. 491-492.

32 The rule in the *Ahdname* of 1502: ASV, DT, no. 73, ll. 17-19; the rules in the *Ahdname* of 1513: ASV, DT, no. 161, ll. 17-18, 18-21; *Ahdname* of 1517: ASV, DT, no. 167, ll. 20-21, 21-24; *Ahdname* of 1521: ASV, DT, no. 188, ll. 21-22, 22-26; *Ahdname* of 1540: ASV, DT, no. 426, ll. 35-36, 37-39.

Venetians could not be imposed the responsibility for the other nation's piracy³³. Second, when the galleys of the prior of Capua belonging to the Hospitallers plundered the ship of the governor of Egypt, the Egyptian Jews who were in competition with the Venetians reported to the governor that the galleys were supplied arms and munitions in Venetian Cyprus. Barbarigo appealed to the governor as to the falseness of this report, but the governor sent the report to the sultan's court according to the Jews' report. Then Barbarigo obtained the copy of governor's report and sent it with instructions to the *bailo* in Istanbul. Receiving it, the *bailo* appealed to the sultan's court. Finally, the governor understood that the Jews gave false testimony³⁴. The focus of the problem in this case is obviously whether the Venetians had responsibility for the other nation's piracy.

There was a case that the Venetians were imposed responsibility because of the capitulatory rules. Under the Mamlūks, as mentioned above, the Europeans of the friendly nations could not be imposed collective responsibility for the debts, etc., of a person belonging to the same nation. In the Ottoman *ahdnames* granted to Venice in 1513 and after that, the same rule was prescribed for the *bailo* and the merchants. However, the *bailo* must report the problem to the home government to ask instructions for the settlement³⁵. According to the Lorenzo Tiepolo's report, the person named Filippo de Cassinis (origin unknown) who had been doing business for Venetian subjects in Alexandria traded corals for spices, etc., with a slave of one Turk. But the owner of the slave was not contented with this. The Turk therefore came to Cairo "to find out Cassinis to confuse him," but Cassinis had already left there. Then the Turk went to Istanbul, obtained a decree addressed to the governor of Egypt and the *sancak beyi* and *kadı* of Alexandria, and went back to Cairo. Following the decree, the governor İskender Paşa summoned Tiepolo and demanded that he find out the person in question or his agents as a head of the colony, or assume the responsibility himself. To this, Tiepolo insisted that the person in question had already left there, the dealings concerned had not been done during the term of his consulate, and, according to "the clauses obtained by the sultan" (*ahdname*), he could not be imposed anyone's responsibility. The governor did not consent to it. The *divan*, a regular meeting of high officials presided over by the governor, decided to demand that the Venetian *doge* find out the person in question and send him or impose on his agents the responsibility. This was just before Tiepolo was leaving his post; he was made to promise to report this matter to the *doge* in the home country³⁶.

33 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, ff. 34v.-35r.; Poma, "Il consolato veneto," p. 491.

34 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, f. 35r.; Poma, "Il consolato veneto," p. 491.

35 The rules in the *Ahdname* of 1513: ASV, DT, no. 161, ll. 36-37, 37-38; *Ahdname* of 1517: ASV, DT, no. 167, ll. 41, 42; *Ahdname* of 1521: ASV, DT, no. 188, ll. 47-48, 48; *Ahdname* of 1540: ASV, DT, no. 426, ll. 64-65, 65.

36 ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 31, fascicolo Alessandria, f. 14r.; ASV, Collegio, Relazioni, busta 62, ff. 59v.-60v.; Tiepolo, *Relazioni dei consolati*, pp. 26-27.

Conclusion

Under the expansion of Ottoman power and the formation of the Ottoman administration in Egypt, the Venetian colony with medieval tradition was maintained and the consul's right to negotiate with the ruler continued. Some instances in the middle of the sixteenth century, mentioned here, prove that the consular negotiations were connected closely to the wide-ranging administrative network centered in Istanbul; Ottoman capitulations were managed through such a system. This seems to be one of the features of the Eastern Mediterranean in the Early Modern period.