

The Legal Foundations of the Commercial Relations between The Ottomans and Neapolitans

Mehmet Demiryürek*

Abstract

Having gained the *ahdname*, *ahdname-i hümayûn* or capitulation, a European nation was permitted to establish an embassy in Istanbul and consulates in the ports of the Ottoman Empire. In 1740, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies gained an *ahdname* as a result of the attempts made by her king. The aims of this study are: to evaluate the capitulation of 1740 granted to *Sicilyateyn*, to identify the early ambassadors of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and their dragomen in the Ottoman capital and to explain the concept called *hadd-i itidal* concerning the dragomen from the Ottoman point of view in the 18th century. The evidence used is derived principally from the records of the Nicosia qadi's court and of the Ottoman Prime Ministry archives in Istanbul.

Keywords

Cyprus, Ottoman, Neapolitan, trade, dragoman, capitulation

Introduction

There were five main actors as regards the commercial relations between the Ottomans and the European nations in the 18th century; capitulations, ambassadors, consuls, dragomen and dragomen's servants. The capitulations were granted by the Ottomans. Ambassadors were appointed by the European kings and the rest of the actors were commissioned by the ambassadors in the Ottoman capital. This study will focus on the Neapolitan ambassadors and

* Prof. Dr., Hitit University, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of History – Çorum / Turkey
mehmetdmryrk@gmail.com

their dragomen in the Ottoman capital in the 18th century. Therefore, it is the aim of the present study to describe the main legal structure of the commercial relations between the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the Ottomans in the 18th century. For this reason, an attempt has been made to reveal the legal foundation of the Ottoman-Neapolitan commercial intercourses, on the basis of the capitulation of 1740, as they appeared from the Ottoman point of view. This period is of considerable interest in the economic history of the Mediterranean, in that the new European actors, such as Sweden, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Denmark, Prussia, Russia and Spain began to enter the Mediterranean world and played an important role in both the economic and political life of the Mediterranean world, by gaining capitulation from the Ottomans, founding their own consulates in the Ottoman ports, and consequently sharing an interest in Mediterranean trade. The European nations gaining capitulation in the 18th century were Sweden (1737), the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (1740), Denmark (1757), Prussia (1761), Russia (1774) and Spain (1782). Boogert (2005: 7) added the Habsburg Empire (1718) and Tuscany (1747) to the list. These European nations instituted their own consulates in some Ottoman ports such as Smyrna, Aleppo (via Alexandretta), Larnaca (Cyprus), Durres, Morea, Chios, Salonika and Athens. When the European merchants visited these ports and encountered a problem, they used to apply to their consulate and the consul or vice-consul used to solve their problems. The merchants visiting those ports had to pay a tax to the consul, called *konsülato* (consulage) (Wood 1964: 209).

The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies was the third European nation gaining capitulation from the Ottomans in the first part of the 18th century and began to found its own consulates in Ottoman ports under the *ahdname* of 1740. These developments were the result of the attempts of her King, Don Carlos (Subhi 2007: 618). The capitulation granted to Naples also had a significant and different structure owing to its articles. The prior capitulations granted to France, England, the Netherlands and Sweden were not bilateral, but the Naples capitulation was. Therefore, the Naples capitulation of 1740 seems to us to be the first *ahdname* providing similar privileges for both a European nation and the subjects of the Ottoman bilaterally, except for the Venetian capitulation of 1718. In addition, this capitulation treaty was published by Francesco Ricciardi and Gabriel Noradounghian in Italian and French respectively (D'amora 2004: 717). As far as is known, it has not been published or summarized in English yet. Therefore, it has been attempted to summarize the Naples capitulation of 1740 in English and to compare it with the Sweden capitulation of 1737, and the Denmark capitulation of 1757 and the Germany (Prussia)

capitulation of 1761 on the basis of bilateralness. On the other hand, Turan's (1993) and D'amora's researches (2004) are important. The first examines the diplomatic relations between Naples and the Ottomans in the mid-18th century on the basis of the visiting Naples by the representative of the Ottomans, Hüseyin Efendi, and the second contained the *Gümrük Tarife Defterleri* (customs tariff registers) dated 1801 and 1851. Although Uzunçarşılı's (1983) study revealed some significant findings related to the diplomatic relations between the Ottomans and Neapolitans, it does not include commercial relations and therefore, it can be said that it was a useful short introduction to the diplomatic relations between the two states. One can see very little findings germane to the commercial relations between the Kingdom of Two Sicilies and Ottoman Empire and dragomen of European Embassy in Istanbul in Çiçek's (1996), Çevikel's (2000), Erdoğan's and Özkul's (2005, 2011 and 2013) researches. The article called "İmtiyazât" by İnalçık (1986) was not included any statement of the Neapolitan Capitulation of 1740. It is clear that very little is known regarding commercial relations between the Ottomans and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Therefore, it is of interest to find out the legal foundation of the commercial relations between the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the Ottomans under the *ahdname* of 1740. In this respect, in this present study the *ahdname* granted by the Ottoman sultan to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies in 1740 relating to commerce and the privileges of the consuls will be examined.

The Ottomans and Neapolitans

Prior to 1740, the Neapolitan and Sicilian merchants traded under the French, Dutch and Austrian flag in the Levant in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries respectively. Although the French capitulation of 1569 did not include any article concerning the Neapolitan and Sicilian merchants, a new article was added in 1581. According to it, the Sicilian merchants could trade under the French flag in the Ottoman ports (İnalçık 2000: 244). The French capitulation of 1673 also emphasized this right (MM, vol.1, 2008: 13). However, according to a registration in the *Felemenk Ahkâm Defteri* (the Netherlands Register) in the Ottoman Archives, the merchants from *Çiçilya* and *Messina* traded under the Dutch flag in Albanian ports and they paid the customs tax like the Dutch. (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri (hereafter BOA, DED), Defter no: 22/1, p.71, hüküm no: 271). The records of the French consulate in Cyprus also confirm that there were commercial relations between Cyprus and Naples and Sicily in the latter half of the 17th century (Louzidou 1991: 276, Louzidou 1995: 90, 146, 153, 307, 359). In 1707, the Ottoman Sultan sent a rescript to the qadi of Smyrna so that the

Sicilians and Messinians could trade under the French flag in Smyrna and pay the customs tax like the French merchants (İE.HR, Dosya no: 7, Gömlek no: 675). The Neapolitan, Sicilian and Messinian merchants traded under the Austrian flag in Ottoman ports throughout the 18th century (Elibol 2011: 181,186).

The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, with its capital, Naples, was founded in 1734 (D'amora 2004: 718, Salvatorelli 1982: 584). Having gained its independence, the new king, Carlo di Borbone, attempted to develop the economic structure of the new state and on 7 April 1740, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies gained an *abdname* from the Ottomans as a result of the attempts made by her king (D'amora 2004: 719, Turan 1993: 82, Uzunçarşılı 1983: 239). Finocchietto, who conducted the peace negotiations between the Ottomans and Neapolitans in 1739-1740, was sent to Istanbul by the king of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Don Carlos, as the first ambassador to Naples in 1740 (Uzunçarşılı 1983: 239). The central or local Ottoman sources called the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies generally *Sicilyateyn* (MM, vol: 1, 2008: 55; KŞS, Defter no: 17, p.6). In addition to this, the capitulation of 1740 called the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies *İtalya Krallığı* (The Kingdom of Italy) (MM, vol. 1, 2008: 63). On the other hand, the Ottoman rescripts made use of the name of *Italian flag* and *Italian noblemen* for Naples' flag and Neapolitan consuls in the Ottoman ports respectively. To illustrate, according to a rescript dated 29 October 1740, the Neapolitan consul in Smyrna was *an Italian nobleman* and his duty was to deal with the problems of merchants and subjects coming with their ships under the *Italian flag* (*İtalya bayrağı altında gemileriyle gelen tüccâr ve reayasının umûr ve husûsların görmek*) (BOA, A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p.81, Hüküm no: 17). However, prior to the 19th century, Italy was not a single state or nation. It was the name of a country (Richards 2002: 4-5, 121) which included many states, such as Genoa, Venice, Tuscany and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The divided situation of Italy lasted until the second part of the 19th century, when Italy became a single state and nation.

The Capitulation of 1740 Granted to 'Sicilyateyn'

In 1785, the Ottoman Sultan sent a firman to Cyprus. According to this firman dated 2 November 1785 registered in the records of the Nicosia qadi's court, the ambassador of Naples sent a petition to the Ottoman Sultan. According to the ambassador, although a Neapolitan merchant visiting Cyprus, Leonardo Testila, was an honest man and had not disturbed anyone, El-haj İbrahim from Nicosia had claimed that Leonardo

Testila was indebted to him for twenty-seven *куруş* (piaster) and he had applied to the Nicosia Court. The *Naib* of Nicosia had invited Leonardo Testila to the Court where he was beaten and insulted. During this time, even though Leonardo Testila had requested for some time to be given him to inform the situation to his consul and appoint the consul as a guarantor, he was not listened to. He was beaten again and imprisoned for some days, and the above mentioned amount was collected without the approval and information of the consul.

According to the ambassador's point of view, this situation was unjust and contrary to the *ahidname-i hümayun*. Was the ambassador right? What did the capitulation granted to Naples mean? Were there any differences between the Neapolitan capitulation of 1740 and those of the other European nations?

The *ahdname* dated 7 April 1740 granted by the Sultan Mahmut I (1730-54) to the the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies had twenty-one articles (MM, vol.1, 2008: 55-65) and they can be summarized as follows:

1. The Ottoman Empire and *Sicilyateyn* have made peace and the Ottomans have given permission to the Neapolitans to trade in Ottoman lands freely, like the French, English, Dutch and Swedish.
2. The ships and the subjects of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies will pay 3 per cent customs tax in the ports and customs houses of the Ottomans, like the other European friendly nations in return for the ships and the subjects of the Ottomans having the same rights in the countries of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.
3. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies can establish its own consulates in the whole parts and shores of the Ottoman Empire via the Neapolitan ambassador in Istanbul. Its ambassadors, consuls, dragomen of the consuls and the consuls' men will have the same rights as those of other friendly nations.
4. The subjects of Naples and travellers from Naples will be treated like other European friendly nations concerning religious matters. When the merchants or subjects of the Kingdom or the merchants trading under its flag die in any part of the Ottoman Empire, their inheritances will not be confiscated by the judges or officers of the Ottomans. The inheritances will be handed over to their representatives or consuls, so that they can give the inheritance to the dead person's inheritors, in accordance with his will. If the deceased person does not have a will, his heritage will be handed over to his agent, consul or his partners living in the place where he died. If there is no agent or con-

sul in the place where he died, his inheritance will be registered and held by the qadi, according to the Islamic Law, and later this inheritance will be handed over to someone appointed by the ambassador.

5. When there is a dispute between the consuls or their dragomen and another person and the sum is more than 4000 *akçe*, the case will be heard in Istanbul. When there is a dispute between subjects of the Ottomans and subjects or merchants of the Kingdom or those under the protection of the Kingdom, concerned with buying and selling or commerce or any other reason, they will go to the qadi's Court. However, unless one of the dragomen of the Neapolitans is in the court, their case will not be heard by the qadi. In addition, the qadi will not hear the case, without a valid promissory note concerning their debts or sponsorships. When there is a dispute between Neapolitan merchants, this case will be heard by their consuls and dragomen according to their own laws. This rule will also be valid for Ottoman subjects visiting the countries of the Kingdom.
6. The judges and the officers of the Ottomans will not disturb or insult the subjects of the Kingdom, whoever these subjects are, and they cannot send them to prison without a good reason. When one of the subjects of the Kingdom is arrested, and his agent or his consul demands him to be handed over, he will be handed over to them and punished, according to his crime later.
7. The Ottoman Empire will appoint an Ottoman consul [*şebbender*] and send him to Messina so that the merchants and the subjects of the Ottomans can feel themselves under Ottoman protection. Ottoman merchants and subjects will have the same privileges as merchants and subjects of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.
8. The ships of both sides when under pressure owing to quarantine will be helped by experts in both Ottoman and Neapolitan ports. Wrecked ships and their cargoes and other things will be handed over to the consuls, so that the consuls can return them to their owners.
9. Neither Ottoman ships nor Neapolitan ships can be forced to convey soldiers or ammunition.
10. Ottoman ships going to the ports of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies will be accepted after being put in *lazaretto*.
11. When Ottoman warships and those of the Kingdom pass each other, they will hoist their flags and salute each other by firing their cannons. Their merchant ships will also act in a friendly manner when they meet. When warships of both nations meet merchant ships of either side, they will help them and only two persons, either than the boat-

- men, will be sent by the warships so that they can check the documents of the merchant ships. If they agree that their documents are valid, they will return to their warships, after receiving sealed copies of the documents and pictures of their flags given by the merchant ships.
12. If one of the subjects of the Kingdom converts to Islam in front of one of the consuls or dragomen, the goods belonging to others which he has (except his own things) will be handed over to his agent and consuls to be submitted to their owners and to pay his debts.
 13. The goods of subjects of the Kingdom or merchants trading under its flag will not be attacked and these subjects or merchants will not be disturbed unless they are enlisted in the army of the Ottomans' enemies. If one of the ships of the Kingdom with valid documents is seized by Ottoman corsairs, the subjects, merchants and goods in that ship will be handed over to the Kingdom. Subjects and merchants of both sides in the ships of enemies captured by both sides will be handed over to the above mentioned states.
 14. Both Ottoman and Neapolitan prisoners will be released with the intervention of special representatives in exchange for an appropriate ransom or they will be released bilaterally without any ransom. Prisoners must be treated by the owners of the prisoners in a friendly manner until they are released.
 15. If one of the subjects of the Kingdom smuggles goods, he will be punished like the subjects of other European friendly nations. The merchants of the Kingdom will have the right to employ brokers of different religions. Nobody will intervene in their trade. The ships of the Kingdom coming to Ottoman ports will be examined like the ships of other friendly states.
 16. When Ottoman ships enter the ports of the Kingdom, they will be protected by the Kingdom and Ottoman ships will not attack to the ships of the friends of the Kingdom.
 17. The subjects of the Ottomans, especially the corsairs from Ulcinj in Albania will recognize the ships of the Kingdom as the ships of a friendly nation and when they reach Albanian ports, they will be helped like the ships of other friendly states, in return for the Ottoman subjects and the Ulcinj's corsairs in Albania will trade with the subjects of the Kingdom freely. If some people oppose the rules mentioned above and caused a damage and loss, this damage and loss will be compensated. Ottoman ships will also have the same privileges. The *Kingdom of Italy* will have the right to make a similar settlement with Algeria, Tunisia and Tripoli under Ottoman rule.

18. Ships of enemies of the Ottomans and those of the Kingdom will not be allowed to be equipped in their ports. Both the ships of the Ottomans and those of the Kingdom will be protected from any ships entering the ports and flying enemy flag; moreover, enemy ships will not be allowed to leave the port until twenty-four hours have passed after the ships of the Ottomans and those of the Kingdom have left the port. However, if an enemy ships captures another ship illegally and there is no chance to help it; this situation will be accepted as an exception beyond the settlement. The subjects and merchant ships of the Ottomans and the Kingdom will not be allowed to fly an enemy flag or use a *yol kâğıdı* (a document giving permission to travel freely); otherwise the involved officer of the ship will be hanged, and his ship and other belongings will be considered as loot.
19. When the merchants of the Kingdom arrive in the Ottoman ports, they will also pay the consulage, called *konsülata*, for their consuls and ambassadors as well as paying their customs tax. In addition to this, no one will obstruct the subjects of the Kingdom from loading commercial goods onto their ships, except for gunpowder, cannons, guns and other goods, which have been prohibited to be exported.
20. The subjects of the Kingdom and the people under its protection will be treated just like other European friendly nations concerning trade. Officers must not demand different coins except for current coins and the subjects of the Kingdom and the people under its protection must pay a certain tax for their coins.
21. When ships are about to leave ports, they will not be prevented by a case pretext. Such cases will be heard by the consul immediately. No one can demand the subjects of the Kingdom, whether married or unmarried, to pay *cizye* and other taxes. Whether it was explained in this *ahidnâme-i hümayûn* clearly or not, the subjects or merchants of the Kingdom will have the same rights as those of other friendly nations.

In the case of 1785, the ambassador of the Neapolitans in Istanbul, Don Kalilmon Ledolf, requested the Sultan to send a rescript to the administrators of Cyprus so that Leonardo Testila could be repaid the twenty-seven piasters and no one could intervene with him but should protect him under the *ahdname*. The Ottoman Sultan accepted his request and sent a rescript to Cyprus. According to the rescript dated 2 November 1785, the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul examined the *ahidname-i hümayun* given to the Neapolitans and kept in the *Divan-ı Hümayun* (Sublime Porte). The rescript stated that, according to the *ahidname-i hümayun*, the judges and officers of the Ottomans must not disturb or insult the subjects of the

Kingdom, whoever these subjects were, and they could not send them to prison without any reason. When one of the subjects of the Kingdom is arrested, if his agent or his consul demanded him to be handed over, he should be handed over to them and punished, according to his fault later. Under these circumstances, the ambassador of the Neapolitans was right. Therefore, the firman enjoined the *Muhassıl* (Governor of Cyprus) to act under the *ahidname-i hümayun*, to invite the *Naib* of Nicosia to the Court and hear the case. If the situation was the same as in the report of the ambassador, the above mentioned amount should be returned to Leonardo Testila and the *Muhassıl* would also make sure to prevent a similar situation from happening again.

The Principal Characteristic of the Neapolitan Capitulation of 1740

The French capitulation of 1673 and 1740, the English of 1675, the Dutch of 1612 and 1680 and the Swedish of 1737 did not contain any statement or sentence concerning commercial privileges when Ottoman merchants or subjects visited the aforementioned European countries. One can see that the Venetian *ahdname* of 1718 did include a short statement relating to this issue: The subjects of both sides could trade safely in each other's country (MM, vol. 2, 2008: 182). However, as seen above, the Neapolitan *ahdname* of 1740 did contain more comprehensive articles concerning bilaterality. To illustrate, according to article 7, "the Ottoman Empire will appoint an Ottoman consul [*şehbender*] and send him to Messina so that the merchants and subjects of the Ottomans can feel themselves under Ottoman protection. Ottoman merchants and subjects will have the same privileges as the merchants and subjects of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies." One cannot see a similar article in *ahdnames* before the Neapolitan capitulation of 1740. The Danish capitulation of 1757 emphasized in its article 17 that "the above mentioned articles are valid concerning the subjects and merchants of Ottomans and the people under its protection, as they are valid relating to the subjects and merchants of Denmark" (MM, vol.2, 2008: 59). This sentence was included in article 7 of the Prussian capitulation of 1761 (MM, vol. 2, 2008: 89). The Russian capitulation of 1783 also contained a bilateral character. One can find these features in articles 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 29, 44, 80 and 81 of the Russian capitulation of 1783. Nevertheless, the capitulations granted to Denmark, Prussia and Russia in the 18th century did not contain an article concerning the establishment of the Ottoman consulates in the above mentioned European countries. As for the Spanish capitulation of 1782, it looks like the Neapolitan capitulation of 1740 by virtue of its bilaterality. For instance, article 7 of both *ahdnames* concerned the

establishment of Ottoman consulates in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and Spain respectively (MM, vol. 1, 2008: 217; vol. 2, 2008: 60).

Another characteristic principle of the capitulations granted to European nations in the 18th century is the restriction of the number of dragomen employed by foreign ambassadors and consuls in the Ottoman Empire. The French capitulation of 1740 and Russian capitulation of 1783 did not include any restriction concerning the number of dragomen. However, the Swedish capitulation of 1737, the Danish capitulation of 1757 and the Prussian capitulation of 1761 did contain a restriction relating to the number of dragomen. According to these capitulations, Swedish, Danish and Prussian ambassadors in Istanbul could employ at the most four dragomen and their consuls in the Ottoman ports could employ only one dragoman (MM, vol. 1, 2008: 152, 57, 87). These restrictions were also emphasized by Boogert (2005: 65) in his research. As to the Neapolitan capitulation of 1740 and the Spain capitulation of 1782, they did not have any such restriction. This issue was expressed in article 3 of both capitulations. According to it, the Ottomans would treat the Neapolitans concerning the consuls, dragomen of the consuls and servants of the dragomen just as they treated the other European friendly nations (MM, vol. 1, 2008: 216; vol.2, 2008: 58-59). However, as seen, this sentence is not clear enough. Which nations were friends of the Ottomans? Theoretically, all nations which gained capitulations were friends of the Ottomans. In the case of a dispute between the Ottomans and Neapolitans or Spaniards which capitulation would be applied? French or Danish? Orhonlu (1974: 180) argues that the number of the dragomen employed by a foreign consul in the Ottoman Empire was merely two in the 18th century. A *berat* dated 29 June 1787 registered in the *İspanya Nişan Defteri* (Spanish Register) supports Orhonlu's opinion. According to it, the statement 'the Ottomans will treat the Neapolitans concerning the consuls, the dragomen of the consuls and the servants of the dragomen just as they treated other European friendly nations' in the Spanish Register meant that the number of an ambassador's dragomen was four and that of consuls was two (BOA, DED, Defter no: 46/1, p.49, Hüküm no: 35). As to the statement 'the Ottomans will treat the Neapolitans concerning the consuls, the dragomen of the consuls and the servants of the dragomen just like other friendly nations' in the *Sicilyateyn* Register meant that the number of an ambassador's dragomen was four in 1774 (BOA, DED, Defter no: 96/1, p.97, Hüküm no: 122) and that of consuls was two in 1772 (BOA, DED, Defter no: 96/1, p.96, Hüküm no: 120), as a result of the new regulation made by the Ottomans concerning the dragomen in 1758.

The Naples Ambassadors in the Ottoman Capital in the 18th Century

The capitulation of 1740 both made it possible for the Neapolitan King to appoint his own ambassadors to Istanbul and for the Neapolitan ambassadors to set up Neapolitan consulates in the Ottoman ports with the aim of improving the commercial relations between the Ottomans and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Uzunçarşılı argues (1983: 241) that Ambassador Finocchietto arrived in 1740 and served only for one year. He was succeeded by Nikola de Mayo. He served until 1748 and was followed by Gollime Ludolf in the same year, as the vice-ambassador. In 1750, he was appointed as the ambassador of Naples and served until 1761, when he was succeeded by his son, Konstantino Ludolf. However, the *Sicilyateyn Nişân Defteri* (The registers of the Kingdoms of the Two Sicilies) in the Ottoman Archives in Istanbul does not confirm the above mentioned findings. According to the *Sicilyateyn Nişân Defteri*, ten Neapolitan diplomatic representatives succeeded one another from 1740 to 1840, While from 1740 to 1803 the status of the Neapolitan ambassadors in the Ottoman capital was ‘ambassador’ or ‘vice-ambassador’, from 1803 to 1840, except for Rozef Kont de Ludolf, as ‘minister plenipotentiary’, this status was ‘chargé d’affaires’.

Table 1: *The Neapolitan Representatives in Istanbul from 1740 to 1840 According to the Sicilyateyn Register in Ottoman Archives*

Name	Status	Duration
(Guiseppe) Finocchietto	Ambassador	1740-1742
Kavalir de Mayo	Ambassador	1742-1748
Don Kalilmon Ledolf (Gugliemo Ludolf),	Vice-ambassador	1748-1755
Don Kalilmon Ledolf (Gugliemo Ludolf),	Ambassador	1755-1791
Don Konstantino Ledolf (Ludolf)	Ambassador	1791-1803
De Marini	Chargé d’affaires	1803-1805
Don Konstantino Ledolf (Ludolf)	Ambassador	1805-1817
Rozef/Zozef Kont De Ludolf	Minister plenipotentiary	1817-1825
Kavalir Romano	Chargé d’affaires	1825-1834
Can Arifo	Chargé d’affaires	1834-1838
Teromar Torana Rizen	Chargé d’affaires	1838-1840

The Dragomen of the Neapolitan Ambassadors in the Ottoman Capital in the 18th Century

Having come to Istanbul as the Neapolitan ambassador in 1740, Guiseppe Finocchietti began to appoint dragomen for him and set up Neapolitan consulates in Ottoman ports. When the new Sultan, Osman III (1754-57), enthroned in 1754 and the *berats* of the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen were renewed by the new Sultan in 1755-1757, the Neapolitan ambassador still had ten dragomen (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p.91, Hüküm no: 71,76; p. 92, Hüküm No: 78,79,8485,86; p.93, Hüküm No: 87, 90,91,95). Six of the ambassador's dragomen were also dragomen under former Sultan Mahmut I (1730-1754) and their *berats* were renewed. Two of them were appointed by the ambassador newly and two of them were appointed in place of former dragomen, one of whom resigned and the other was dismissed.

Table 2: *The Dragomen of the Neapolitan Embassy in Istanbul from 1740 to 1749 According to the Sicilyateyn Register in Ottoman Archives*

Name of the Dragoman	His Status	Date of Appointment
Tabilli Konstantin Anpaki, son of Dimitriyaki	Chief dragoman	29 October 1740
Petro, son of Baron	Second dragoman	November 1740
Avram, son of Şua (?)	Dragoman	1 July 1741
Menahim, son of Şua (?)	Dragoman	1 July 1741
İsak, son of Avram	Dragoman	1 July 1741
Lukaki, son of Sütraki	Chief dragoman (in place of Tabilli Konstantin)	1 July 1741
Yakob, son of Sektos	Dragoman	19 June 1742
İsteriyo, son of Andreya	Dragoman	19 June 1742
Abram, son of Aron	Dragoman	17 September 1742
Panayoti, son of Kosta	Dragoman	20 March 1743
Toma, son of Domoda	Dragoman	7 May 1746
Canto Lefteros İspiyonti from Hanya	Dragoman (in place of Toma, son of Domoda)	September 1746
Petro, son of Baron	Chief dragoman (in place of Lukaki, son of Sütraki)	17 November 1749

According to the *Sicilyateyn* Register, from 1758 to 1764 the Neapolitan ambassador in Istanbul had only seven dragomen. Six of the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen were also dragomen under former Sultan Osman III (1754-1757) and their *berats* were renewed by the new Sultan Mustafa III (1757-1774). The only new dragoman appointed in this period was Cozeye, son of Şayer appointed as second dragoman on 24 January 1764. Petro, son of Baron was the chief dragoman throughout this period. However, the chief dragoman Petro, son of Baron was dismissed by the ambassador by virtue of the complaint by *Reis-ül-küttâb* (the Ottoman Foreign Minister) in 1765. The *Reis-ül-küttâb* asserted that chief dragoman Petro, son of Baron had visited statesmen's houses, compiled the news and dispatched to the European nations in Istanbul. In his opinion, his behaviour was overt treachery. Soon, the second dragoman Cozeye, son of Şayer was appointed as chief dragoman (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p.92, Hüküm no: 78; p.95, Hüküm no: 115).

Table 3: *The Dragomen of the Neapolitan Embassy in Istanbul from 1755 to 1757 According to the Sicilyateyn Register in Ottoman Archives*

Name of the Dragoman	His Status	Date of Appointment
Panayoti, son of Kosta	Dragoman (old)	May 1755
İsak, son of Avram	Dragoman (old)	August 1755
İsteriyo, son of Andreyea	Dragoman (old)	26 December 1755
Petro, son of Baron	Chief Dragoman (old)	27 December 1755
Hayim, son of Musa	Dragoman (in place of Menahim, son of Şua?)	11 March 1755
Muhikâr (?), son of Toros	Dragoman (new)	10 February 1756
Avram, son of Şua (?)	Dragoman (old)	22 February 1756
Mihail, son of Abot	Dragoman (in place of Abram, son of Aron)	19 June 1742
Canto Lefteros İspiyonti from Hanya	Dragoman (old)	19 February 1757
Yosef, son of Dimitri from Aleppo	Dragoman (new)	19 May 1757

Table 4: *The Dragomen of the Neapolitan Embassy in Istanbul from 1758 to 1765 According to the Sicilyateyn Register in Ottoman Archives*

Name of the Dragoman	His Status	Date of Appointment
İsteriyo, son of Andreya	Dragoman (old)	19 March 1758
Panayoti, son of Kosta	Dragoman (old)	4 February 1759
Hayim, son of Musa	Dragoman (old)	23 December 1759
İsak, son of Avram	Dragoman (old)	16 June 1761
Canto Lefteros İspiyonti from Hanya	Dragoman (old)	6 November 1761
Yosef, son of Dimitri from Aleppo	Dragoman (old)	14 October 1761
Cozeye, son of Şayer	Second Dragoman (new)	24 January 1764
Cozeye, son of Şayer	Chief Dragoman (in place of Petro, son of Baron)	16 January 1765

There is evidence that the Ottoman Government imposed a new restriction, called *hadd-i itidal* (at the most), concerning the number of dragomen employed by the Neapolitan ambassadors in 1774. According to the new regulation, called *nizâm-ı cedid* (new order), the Neapolitan ambassador could employ only four dragomen for himself. For this reason, it had to erase the registrations of six dragomen employed by the Neapolitan ambassador (BOA, DED, Defter No: 96/1, p.94, Hüküm No: 103). However, at the beginning of 1774 the Neapolitan ambassador had only seven dragomen, not ten. Therefore, the *berat* of Panayoti, son of Kosta and those of İsak, son of Avram, Canto Lefteros and Yosef, son of Dimirti from Aleppo were cancelled by the Sultan on 16 March 1774 (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p.94, Hüküm no: 103; p.95, Hüküm no: 109, 110,112). Although Petro, son of Baron, former chief dragoman, was dismissed on the grounds of his treachery before this regulation, it was stated that his registration was erased by virtue of the regulation dated 16 March 1774 (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p.95, Hüküm no: 113). As a consequence, the number of dragomen of the Neapolitan ambassador fell to three after the new regulation was applied. Therefore, the Neapolitan ambassador sent a sealed petition to the Sultan and requested the Sultan to give permission for him to appoint a fourth dragoman, in that he now had only three dragomen, who were Cozeye, son of Şayer, İsteriyo, son of Andreya and Hayim, son of Musa. His request was accepted and Sübteri, son of Dimitri

was appointed as the amabassador's dragoman (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter o: 96/1, p.97, Hüküm no: 122).

From 1775 to 1790, the number of the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen did not exceed four. After 1774 a new dragoman appointment could only be made when the old dragoman died, resigned or was dismissed.

In 1789, when Selim III (1789-1807) was enthroned, the *berats* of the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen were renewed. However, in 1790-91, the Neapolitan ambassador in the Ottoman capital had three dragomen, who were İbrail, son of Elyas; İsak, son of Menteş and Avram, son of Yasef (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p. 105, Hüküm no: 182; p.107, Hüküm no: 198; p.108, Hüküm no: 203,208). Another Ottoman document which contained the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen in 1790-91 confirms these dragomen (BOA, Fon Kodu HAT, Dosya no: 176, Gömlek no: 9779). In essence, the reason for the decrease in the number of the dragomen, whether ambassador's or those of consuls, was the regulations promulgated by the Ottoman Government concerning dragomen and their servants in the second half of the 18th century.

Table 5: *The Dragomen of the Neapolitan Embassy in Istanbul from 1775 to 1784 According to the Sicilyateyn Register in Ottoman Archives*

Name of the Dragoman	His Status	Date of Appointment
Mihail, son of Yosef	Dragoman (since İsteriyo, son of Andreyra died)	8 March 1775
Menteş, son of İsak	Dragoman (since Hayim, son of Musa died)	7 April 1775
Abrahani, son of Maçoaya	Dragoman (since Cozeye, son of Şayer died and his post was transferred to Salonika)	7 March 1777
Cebraıl, son of Yosef Dimitri Doda	Dragoman (since Mihail, son of Yosef died)	21 May 1779
Musa, son of Yosef	Dragoman (since Süteri, son of Dimitri resigned)	4 August 1780
İsak, son of Menteş	Dragoman (since Menteş, son of İsak died)	16 December 1780
İbrail, son of Elyas	Dragoman (Cebraıl, son of Yosef Dimitri Doda resigned)	17 February 1783
Mıgırdıç, son of Arakel	Dragoman (since Musa, son of Yosef died)	16 July 1784
Avram, son of Yasef	Dragoman (since Mıgırdıç, son of Arakel resigned)	3 April 1784

However, in the same years the number of the English and French ambassadors' dragomen was ten and their *berats* were renewed by the new Sultan (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 35/1, p.135-137; Defter no: 27/2, p.149,150,154). As seen in the table 6, in the last decade of the 18th century, the European ambassadors in the Ottoman capital who had dragomen in excess of *hadd-i itidal* were those of France and England.

Table 6: *The Number of the Dragomen of the Foreign Ambassadors in the Ottoman Capital According to the Ecnebi Registers in the Ottoman Archives in the Last Years of the 18th Century*

Name of the State	Number of the dragomen	Year(s)
The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies	3	1790-1791
England	10	1789
France	10	1789-90
The Netherlands	4	1789-90
Denmark	4	1790-99
Sweden	4	1791-1799
Prussia	3	1789
Spain	2	1789-90
Venice	1	1792

Groot (2009: 64) argues that 'from the early days of the capitulatory regime' the Ottoman Government 'tried to restrict the abuse of the diplomatic protection' and made some new regulations in the last years of the 18th century. However, as far as I am concerned, prior to the 18th century the Ottoman Government did not impose any restriction concerning the dragomen, especially the number of the dragomen. The Ottoman Government began to take steps to regularize the consular and dragomanship system, in that from the early years of the 18th century the dragomanship and consular system was corrupted by the European ambassadors in the Ottoman capital. According to a rescript dated 10 October 1758, after 1730 the number of the dragomen of the ambassadors in Istanbul and those of the consuls in the Ottoman ports had exceeded the *had-i itidal* (at the most). For this reason, after this date when the dragomen employed by France, England, the Netherlands and Venice in Istanbul or the Ottoman ports after 1730 died or left their post, their post or dragomanship would not be granted to other persons. In addition to

this, if the number of dragomen of the European nations, such as Sweden, Austria and *Sicilyateyn* granted by the capitulations after 1730 were in excess of the *had-i itidal* (at the most), their post or dragomanship would not also be granted to other persons, when they died or left their post (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 16/4, p.183, Hüküm no: 394). Two other firmans registered in the records of the Nicosia qadi's court confirms the regulation of 1758. In 1758, 1766 and 1786 the Ottoman Government examined the number of the dragomen in Cyprus, Aleppo, Salonika, Smyrna and other places where foreign consuls were, by sending firmans (KŞS, Defter no: 19, p.29; Defter no: 21, p.27). As a consequence, it can be said that the turning point concerning the dragomen employed by foreign representatives in the Ottoman capital is the year of 1730. One can see that the overt articles restricted the number of the dragomen in the Swedish capitulation of 1737 and the Danish capitulation of 1757 and the Prussian capitulation of 1761. All these measures were calculated to prevent corruption concerning the dragomen and their servants, to decrease the number of Ottoman non-Muslim subjects under the protection of European nations, and to assure the order and thereby a preferable structure for the state.

It is evident that these regulations affected the dragomen of the Neapolitan ambassador and those of Neapolitan consuls, although the Neapolitan capitulation of 1740 did not contain overt articles concerning the number of the dragomen employed by the Neapolitan ambassadors and consuls. In comparison, the number of dragomen of the English or French and those of other European nations in the capital of the Ottoman Empire in the last decade of the 18th century, such as Naples, Spain, Denmark, and Sweden, it is quite evident that the number of dragomen was related to their political power over the Ottoman Government and so far as the English and French were concerned, the Ottoman Government could not impose the rule of *hadd-i itidal*.

As to the nationality of the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen in the Ottoman capital, none of them were Muslim but were non-Muslims subjects of the Ottoman Empire. According to Groot (2009: 61,66,68), in the early period of the capitulatory system, the European representatives in the Ottoman capital preferred to employ non-Muslim Ottoman subjects, especially Greek Orthodox, Armenians and Jews. They were the mouth, eyes, and ears of the ambassadors. However, 'during the eighteenth century, the number of Jewish and Greek dragomen declined. Armenians and, especially Latins took their place'. As far as the Neapolitan ambassadors' dragomen in the 18th century is concerned, it is very difficult to determine the nationality of the Neapolitan ambassador's dragomen accurately. Yet, it can be guessed that they

were mainly Armenians, Greek Orthodox and Jews, by focusing on their names and some registrations. However, it is possible that there were also Latins among them. To illustrate, chief dragoman Petro, son of Baron was an Armenian (*ermenî-ül-asl*) (BOA, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 96/1, p.92, Hüküm no: 78), whereas Mıgırdıç, son of Arakel, Panayoti, son of Kosta and İsterio, son of Andreyra were Greek Orthodox. Hayim, son of Musa, İsak, son of Menteş, Avram, son of Yosef, Menahim, son of Şua and Cozeye, son of Şayer were Jews and the last one latin.

Conclusion

Consequently the Ottomans continued to grant capitulations to the European nations in the 18th century. They, however, were more careful about this issue in the 18th century and the capitulations given in the 18th century, except for the French capitulation of 1740, were different from the previous ones. The Ottomans not only included new articles in the capitulation agreement, such as the restriction concerning the dragomen employed by the European ambassadors and consuls and the bilateralness of the privileges given to the Europeans, but also they tried to make new regulations related to the dragomen and their servants in the 18th century, because the European powers granted capitulation corrupted their privileges. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies gained a capitulation in 1740. Her main aim was to strengthen her economic and commercial activities in the Mediterranean. However, she was not one of the most powerful nations in Europe, unlike especially the French and English and it was affected by the development relating to the capitulations, dragomen and dragomen servants.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Neil Breton and Assist Prof. Dr. Murat Hişmanoğlu for their valuable recommendations.

References

Unpublished Sources

A. The Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry in Istanbul

1. (BOA, DED)

BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 11/1. (Denmark)

BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 16/4. (Venice)

BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 22/1. (The Netherlands)

- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 27/2. (France)
- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 35/1. (England)
- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 46/1. (Spain)
- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 49/1. (Sweden)
- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter no: 73/2. (Venice)
- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter No: 96/1. (Sicilyateyn)
- BOA, Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Tasnifin Kodu: A.DVNS.DVE.d, Defter No: 97/2. (Sicilyateyn)

2. BOA (Documents)

BOA, Fon Kodu: HAT, Dosya No: 176, Gömlek No: 9779.

BOA, Fon Kodu: İE.HR, Dosya no: 7, Gömlek no: 675.

B. The Records of The Nicosia Qadi Court (KŞS) in the National Archives of North Cyprus in Kyrenia

KŞS, Defter No: 17, H.1158-1161.

KŞS, Defter No: 19, H.1180-1182.

KŞS, Defter No: 21, H.1198-1212.

Published References

- Boogert, M. H Van Den (2005). *The Capitulations and the Ottoman Legal System*. Lediden-Boston: Brill.
- Çevikel, Nuri (2000). *Kıbrıs Eyaleti 1750-1800*. Gazi Mağusa: Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Çiçek, Kemal 1998. Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yabancı Konsolosluk Tercümanları. *Kıbrıs'tan Kafkasya'ya Osmanlı Dünyasında Siyaset, Adalet, Raiyyet*. Trabzon: Derya Kitabevi. 172-183.
- D'amora, Rosita (2004). "The Diplomatic Relations Between Naples and the Ottoman Empire in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: Cultural Perceptions". *The Ottoman Capitulations: Text and Context*. Eds. M. Boogert-K. Fleet Naples: The Scilitter Center for Ottoman Studies. 715-727.
- Dutelli-Louzidou, A. P. (1991). *Consulat de France a Larnaca (1660-1696), Documentes Inédits Pour Servir a l'histoire de Chypre*. Tome I. Nicosie: Imprime a Chypre Par Theopress LTD.

- _____, (1995). *Consulat de France à Larnaca (1696-1699), Documentes inédits pour servir a l'histoire de Chypre*. Tome II. Nicosie: Imprime à Chypre Par Theopress LTD.
- Elibol, Numan (2011). “Avusturya Tüccar Gemilerine Ait Veriler Işığında Osmanlı-Avusturya Deniz Ticareti (1700-1800)”. *Osmanlı Dönemi Akdeniz Dünyası*. Eds. Haydar Çoruh, M.Yaşar Ertaş, M. Ziya Köse. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay. 175-201.
- Erdoğan, Mehmet Akif (2008). XVIII. Yüzyıl Sonlarında Kıbrıs'ta Avrupalı Konsololar ve Tercümanlar. *Kıbrıs'ta Osmanlılar*. Lefkoşa: Galerî Kültür Yay. 239-249.
- Groot, Alexandeed (2009). *The Netherlands and Turkey*. İstanbul: The Isis Press.
- İnalçık, Halil (2000). “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi”. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi*. Eds. Halil İnalçık, Donald Quataert. Çev. Halil Berktaş. C.1. İstanbul: Eren Yay. 227-269.
- _____, (1986). “İmtiyazât”. *Encyclopaedia of Islâm*. Vol. 3. Leiden and London: E. J. Brill-Luzac & CO. 1178-1189.
- Mariti, Abbe (1792). *Travels Through Cyprus, Syria and Palestine with a General History of the Levant*. Vol. 1. Dublin.
- MM (2008)=*Muahedât Mecmuası* 1. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- MM (2008) =*Muahedât Mecmuası* 2. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Orhonlu, Cengiz (1974). “Tercüman”. *İA*. C.12/a. İstanbul: MEB Basımevi.
- Özkul, Ali Efdal (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- _____, (2011). “Kıbrıs'taki İngiliz Konsololuğu ve Faaliyetleri”. *Osmanlı Dönemi Akdeniz Dünyası*. Eds. Haydar Çoruh, M. Yaşar Ertaş, M. Ziya Köse. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yay. 303-351.
- _____, (2013). “The Consuls and Their Activities in Cyprus Under the Ottoman Administration 1571-1878”. *Turkish Studies* 8/2: 251-257.
- Richards, Denis (2002). *An Illustrated History of the Modern Europe 1789-1984*. England: Longman.
- Salvatorelli, Luigi (1982). “İtaly (History)”. *Encyclopaedia Americana*. V.15. USA: Grolier Incorporated. 553-614.
- Subhi Mehmet Efendi (2007). *Subhi Tarihi*. Haz. Mesut Aydın. İstanbul: Kitabevi.
- Turan, Şerafettin (1993). “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ile İki Sicilya Krallığı Arasındaki Ticaretle İlgili Gümrük Tarife Defterleri”. *Belgeler* 7-8: 80-167.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı (1983). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. C. 4/2. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yay.
- Woods, Alfred C. (1964). *A History of the Levant Company*. Liverpool: Frank Cass & Co Ltd.

Osmanlı - Sicilyateyn Ticari İlişkilerinin Yasal Temelleri

Mehmet Demiryürek*

Öz

Osmanlı padişahları tarafından *Ahdname*, *ahdname-i hümayun* veya kapitülasyon verilen Avrupalı milletler İstanbul'da büyükelçilik, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu limanlarında da konsolosluklar kurabilirdi. 1740 yılında, İki Sicilya Krallığı (*Sicilyateyn*) kralı tarafından yapılan girişimlerin bir sonucu olarak İki Sicilya Krallığı'na kapitülasyon verildi. Bu çalışmanın amacı *Sicilyateyn*'e verilen 1740 kapitülasyonlarını değerlendirmek, 18. Yüzyılda Osmanlı başkentinde bulunan İki Sicilya Krallığı büyükelçileri ile büyükelçi tercümanlarını tespit etmek ve tercümanlarla ilgili olarak söz konusu yüzyılda uygulamaya konulan *badd-i itidal* düşüncesini Osmanlı bakış açısıyla incelemektir. Çalışmada Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi belgeleri ile Lefkoşa Kadı Sicilleri kayıtları kaynak olarak kullanılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Kıbrıs, Osmanlı, Sicilyateyn, ticaret, tercüman, kapitülasyon

* Prof. Dr., Hitit Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü – Çorum / Türkiye
mehmetdmrkr@gmail.com

Правовые основы торговых отношений между Османским государством и Неаполитанцами

Мехмет Демирюрек*

Аннотация

Европейские государства, получившие «ахднаме», «ахднаме-и хумаюн» или другими словами капитуляции Османского государства имели право открыть посольство в Стамбуле и консульства в портах Османской империи. В 1740 году в результате инициатив короля Королевства обеих Сицилий Королевство получило капитуляции Османской империи. Целями данного исследования являются оценка и анализ османской капитуляции 1740 года, предоставленной Королевству обеих Сицилий, выявление имен послов и переводчиков, работавших в Посольстве Королевства Обеих Сицилий в столице Османской империи в 18 веке и анализ концепции «хадд-и итидал», касающейся деятельности переводчиков с точки зрения Османского государства. В работе в качестве источников использованы материалы Османского архива при аппарате Премьер-министра в Стамбуле и судебные записи Никосии.

Ключевые слова

Кипр, Османское государство, Неаполитан, торговля, переводчик, капитуляция

* Проф.док., университет Хитит факультет естествознания и литературы кафедра истории – Чорум / Турция
mehmetdmryrk@gmail.com