

THE OTTOMAN CAPITULATIONS: TEXT AND CONTEXT

M. Olon, “A most agreeable and pleasant creature”? Merzifonlu Kara Mustafā Paşa and the Dutch in the Levant (1668-1682)

Introduction

Merzifonlu Kara Mustafā Paşa (c1635-25 December 1683), third vizier from the famed house of Köprülü, is to this day remembered as one of the most terrible Ottoman statesman to have ever held office. In the course of his career as grand admiral (1661-1666), deputy grand vizier (1663, 1666-1670, 1676), and ultimately grand vizier (1676-1683), the opinions held of him by the European representatives in Istanbul - even before the fiasco of Vienna - declined steeply from “a wise and experienced person, of a smooth behaviour” to “this grievous oppressor of all Christendom”.¹

At first sight, the reason for Kara Mustafā Paşa’s unpopularity with his European contemporaries appears to have been money, which he extracted from their communities in a “stream of *avantias* during the years 1676-1683”.² But surely Kara Mustafā was not the first grand vizier to do that; his two adopted relatives and predecessors Mehmed and Fāzıl Ahmed Köprülü for instance, were responsible for some famous *avantias* of their own, without their reputation with the Europeans suffering greatly from it. In fact, all their complaints aside, Europeans living and working in the Levant seem to have been realistic enough to regard commercial and legal disputes with their hosts as part of the trade.

If the accustomed commerce-related conflicts are not quite responsible, what, then, made relations with Kara Mustafā so unbearable; and more importantly, is there any need to reconsider the received image of him? This article will argue that there is indeed such a need. The general image we have of this grand vizier is to no small extent determined by the emotionally charged descriptions of his character by his European contemporaries. As a matter of fact, the sheer number of vehement denunciations historians have had to account for, has made it very difficult for them to consider the history of his rule in a detached manner. In this respect, it is worth noting that there exists no Ottoman equivalent to the European litany handed down to us.

An explanation for the extreme dislike displayed by the Europeans might be sought in Kara Mustafā’s policy of ruthlessly subjecting even the most fundamental diplomatic rules and capitulatory articles to the conjunctures of his rule, or - put more favourably - to the needs of the state he served.³ To illustrate the shape this deliberate policy took and the manner in which it transformed how Kara Mustafā was perceived even before the Vienna campaign, we will take a look at the correspondence of Justinus Colyer, Dutch envoy (first resident, then

¹ Rycout, Paul, *The history of the Turkish empire from the year 1623 to the year 1677*, London, 1680-1679, p. 333; and Abbott, G.F., *Under the Turk in Constantinople. A record of Sir John Finch’s embassy. 1674-1681*, London, 1920, p. 359, respectively.

² Heywood, C.J., “Karā Mustafā Pasha, Merzifonlu, maktül”, in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, Leiden, 1960-... (hereafter cited as *EI2*), iv, p. 589b-592b, 591a. On *avantias* - Ottoman demands on European nationals, deemed unjust and in violation of the capitulations - see Olon, Merlijn, “Towards classifying *avantias*: A study of two cases involving the English and Dutch nations in seventeenth-century Izmir”, in: *Friends and rivals in the East: studies in Anglo-Dutch relations in the Levant from the seventeenth to the early nineteenth century*, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Alexander H. de Groot and Maurits H. van den Boogert, Leiden, 2000, p. 159-186.

³ On the capitulations, see Wansbrough, J., and İnalçık, Halil, “İmtiyāzāt”, in: *EI2*, iii, p. 1178b-1189b.

ambassador) in Istanbul from 1668 to 1682. From his correspondence a small collection of encounters will be presented that is both illustrative of the attitudes with which this statesman and the European representatives sent to his government approached one another, as it is indicative of the policies and politics underlying these attitudes.

Where the correspondences of the other European representatives in Istanbul become extremely hostile immediately after Kara Mustafā's becoming grand vizier, Colyer's is one significant exception begging to be explained. Unfortunately, Colyer's correspondence has not received the same measure of attention as that of De Nointel, Finch or even his Venetian colleagues. This we can attribute to the fact that it is in the Dutch language and concerns the at that time declining commerce of a geopolitically important but minor European power. But this relative insignificance is also an advantage, for it allows us to compare between Kara Mustafā's politically laden relations with the French, English and Venetian envoys and his politically neutral relations with the Dutch. An added advantage of regarding the period through Justinus Colyer's correspondence is that his envoyship (1668-1682) encompasses almost completely Kara Mustafā Paşa's stay as deputy grand vizier and grand vizier (1666-1683), thereby providing a unique opportunity to trace his exceedingly terrible reputation in a continuous fashion and with a oneness of voice.

But before going over to Colyer's correspondence, let us first establish more firmly the nature of Kara Mustafā's reputation and the stations marking his rise to power.

From “pleasant creature” to “corrupted barbarian”

On 6 August 1668 Dutch Resident Justinus Colyer had his first ever audience at the Ottoman court in Edirne (Adrianople). Quite impressed with the entire proceedings and with his auditor in particular, he entered the following “Description of the person, stature and years of the *Kā'immakām* of Adrianople” in his daybook:

The said *kā'immakām* is twenty eight to twenty nine years of age, of great intellect and eloquence; a most agreeable and pleasant creature. He has a large broad beard, and is of average stature. He never wears gold, silver or silk clothing; this being a general order of the empire, but solely applicable to the grand vizier and the said *kā'immakām*, so as to avoid them stooping to avanias for the sake of splendid robes.⁴

Interestingly, the *kā'immakām*, or deputy grand vizier, referred to is Merzifonlu Kara Mustafā Paşa, would-be conqueror of Vienna in 1683, and a strong candidate for the title of most vilified Ottoman statesman in history. Considering, one might be tempted to ascribe Colyer's sympathetic description to his inexperience at the time. He had first arrived in the Ottoman Empire only five months earlier and had not yet been in direct contact with those at the top of

⁴ Algemeen Rijksarchief, Den Haag, the Netherlands (hereafter cited as ARA), Consulaat Smyrna (hereafter cited as CS) 684, f. 63b, n.d. (end of 17th century). For the reader's convenience all Dutch quotations in this article have been translated into English. Similarly, and for uniformity's sake, Ottoman names and terms that are rendered in a non-current Latinised form in the original Dutch texts, have been retransliterated from Ottoman according to modern standards (but without diacritics). In quotations in the original English, French, or Italian, Latinised Ottoman names and terms, if unclear, are followed by their italicised modern transliteration between square brackets, and, if they are non-current, by their current equivalents (if these exist). The published version of this *daghregister*, and particularly Colyer's description of Sultan Mehmed IV, later caused great scandal in the Dutch Republic and such an international incident that the States General had to denounce and retract it: “A pained, morose and extremely melancholy creature. A large scar on his countenance, which Sultan Ibrahim his father, with the intent of killing him, inflicted on him with a knife. A sharp nose, two pointy erected moustaches and no beard beneath. He has no less than seven fistulas or fontanels. Is absolutely no lover of women, but more so of hunting. Cruel and very bloodthirsty at heart.” ARA, CS 684, f. 63b, n.d.. The printed version; Colyer, Justinus, *Oprecht journael van 't geene de heere Justinus Coljer, ..., The Hague, 1668.*

Ottoman hierarchy. But in another equally positive account of this official from the - more experienced and considerably more authoritative - hand of Paul Rycaut (English consul in Izmir from 1667 to 1678), dated 1680, he is referred to as “a wise and experienced person, of a smooth behaviour, and a great courtier”.⁵ Furthermore, in a report prepared in 1675/76 for the marquis de Nointel, French ambassador in Istanbul from 1670 to 1679, it is said that “L’humeur du Pacha est fort bonne, quoiqu’elle soit un peu prompt.”⁶

But these and other such statements may be considered exceptions. Much more current are the extremely hostile accounts, mostly of later dates. In the *relazione* of his embassy, Giovanni Morosini di Alvisè, Venetian *bailo* in Istanbul from 1675 to 1680, tells us that Kara Mustafâ Paşa was “Nato per *castigo* de’ popoli in luogo *oscuro* dell’Asia in vicinanza di Trebisonda [Trabzon; sic] e tra il *più vili* domestici” and that he was “tutto venale, crudele e ingiusto”.⁷ Around 1680/81 John Finch, English ambassador in Istanbul from 1674 to 1681, characterised him as “a Vesier who is of a temper to doe anything for money and nothing without it” and referred to him as “this grievous oppressor of all Christendom”.⁸

Nor did the initial enthusiasm of our positive commentators persist. On 27 February 1679, eleven years after his first meeting with Kara Mustafâ, Justinus Colyer’s admiration had turned into severe frustration as he described him as “extremely avid and intransigent in all his dealings”. He was joined in this by Jacobus van der Merct, treasurer to the Dutch consulate in Izmir, who wrote home on 21 October 1681 describing him as “a griffin with ravenous claws, since he proceeds solely with violence and sheer tyranny” and by Jacob van Dam, Dutch consul in Izmir from 1668 to 1689, who, on 4 March 1679, described “a man of great enterprise and exorbitant procedures against the Christian nations”.⁹ Judgements became even harsher after the events before Vienna had run their course. In the second edition of his great *History* (published in 1700) Rycaut remembered him as “a person of violence, rapine, pride, covetousness, false, perfidious, bloody, and without reason or justice”.¹⁰

Modern history has felt little need to add or adjust. Kara Mustafâ was until relatively recently still universally recognised as a “despote de basse espèce, barbare corrompu, qui porta au plus haut degré l’avidité d’argent proverbiale des Turcs”, and now at best as “un vizir assez exceptionnel tant dans ses exigences financières que dans sa xénophobie”.¹¹

⁵ Rycaut, *The history of the Turkish empire*, p. 333. For general overviews of Merzifonlu Kara Mustafâ’s life and career, and for the opinions Paul Rycaut and other contemporary commentators held of him, see Anderson, Sonia, *An English consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut at Smyrna, 1667-1678*, Oxford, 1989, p. 242 and passim; and Heywood, “Karâ Mustafâ Paşa”, passim and his bibliography (p. 592a-592b) in particular.

⁶ Galland, Antoine, *Journal d’Antoine Galland pendant son séjour a Constantinople (1672-1673)*, ed. Charles Schefer, Paris, 1881, ii, p. 197.

⁷ My italics. *Relazioni degli stati Europei lette al senato dagli ambasciatori Veneti nel secolo XVII. Turchia*, ed. Nicolo Barozzi and Guglielmo Berchet, Venice, 1871, i/1, p. 207.

⁸ Abbott, *Under the Turk in Constantinople*, p. 359.

⁹ ARA, Staten-Generaal (hereafter cited SG) 6913, Justinus Colyer to the States General, 27 February 1679; ARA, Levantse Handel (hereafter cited as LH) 125, Jacobus van der Merct to the Board of Directors of Levant Trade (hereafter cited as DLH), 21 October 1681; ARA, LH 98, Jacob van Dam to Justinus Colyer, 4 March 1679.

¹⁰ Rycaut, Paul, *The history of the Turks. 1679 ... 1699*, London, 1700, p. 1.

¹¹ Stourdza, A.C., *L’Europe orientale et le rôle historique des Maurocordato (1660-1830)*, Paris, 1913, p. 9. Mantran, Robert, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1962, p. 548.

It should come as no surprise that an event like the second Ottoman siege of Vienna, which caused a considerable amount of panic throughout Europe, would mar forever the reputation of the person responsible (although the stark contrast with the opinions held in the West of that first Ottoman besieger of Vienna, Süleyman the Magnificent, raises some interesting questions in this respect).¹² After all, it is the winners who write history. But even when leaving the Vienna issue aside and concentrating on the 25-odd years of Kara Mustafâ's career preceding his downfall, it becomes clear that something had already gone terribly wrong in his relations with the European representatives and communities much earlier on. That "something" - as indicated above - lies at the heart of the topic of these proceedings; the "text and context of the Ottoman capitulations".

A career in the making

Little can be said with certainty about Kara Mustafâ's life before his first becoming a public figure in 1656. What we do know, has been skillfully summarized by Colin Heywood in his article on Kara Mustafâ Paşa in the Encyclopaedia of Islam (2nd edition), on which the following is largely based.¹³

Most probably, Kara Mustafâ was born in the village of Marınca near Merzifon around 1635 as the son of a cavalry officer (*sipâhî*), who was said to have served under Köprülü Mehmed Paşa during his career in the Asian provinces.¹⁴ It is not certain when, but at some time during his youth, probably as a teenager, Kara Mustafâ was introduced into the Köprülü household to enhance his opportunities of starting an administrative career, as was common for ambitious and intelligent Ottoman youths with well-connected fathers. Köprülü had him educated alongside his natural son Fâzıl Ahmed; an indication that Kara Mustafâ enjoyed a position of some preference to other *iç oğlans* (young servants/pages) taken into the household. He is reported to have held a number of positions within the household's inner service (*enderün*; privy), eventually being employed as Köprülü Mehmed Paşa's *telhîsci* ("the official who presents his employer's memoirs and reports to the sultan") shortly after his assuming the grand vizierate on 15 September 1656. It was in this capacity that, in September 1658, he brought Sultan Mehmed IV the news of the Ottoman army's taking of the Transylvanian fortress of Yanova. As a reward the sultan made him *küçük mîrâhor* (master of the lesser stable).¹⁵ 15 February 1660 Kara Mustafâ was promoted to the governor-generalship of Silistria (*Silistre beylerbeyliği*; on the Walachian border). In April 1661 he superintend the journey of Tarhân Sultân (the sultana-mother, or, *vâlide sultân*) from the court in Edirne to Istanbul, after which he was promoted to the rank of vizier and appointed to the governorship (*vâilîk*) of Diyarbakr.¹⁶

¹² Compare Veinstein, G., "Süleymân", *EI2*, ix, p. 832b-842a, passim.

¹³ Heywood, "Karâ Mustafâ Paşa", which is not only an excellent overview of Kara Mustafâ's life and career, but also a very good guide past all the pitfalls in the European and Ottoman accounts recording his rise and fall. Also from Süreyya, Mehmed, *Sicill-i 'Osmânî*, Istanbul, 1897-1898, p. 402 (which, however, is erroneous in its chronology).

¹⁴ On the different positions Köprülü Mehmed Paşa held during these years, see Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, and R.C. Repp, "Köprülü", *EI2*, v, p. 256a-263a, 256b-257b.

¹⁵ A function which brought him into close contact with the sultan, since it involved the "care and maintenance of the sultan's privy stable or *khâss âkhûr* located in the second court of the Topkapı Palace opposite the kitchens" and particularly of "a small number of exceptional show horses belonging to the sultan personally". Murphey, R., "Mîr-âkhûr", *EI2*, vii, p. 88a-89b, 88a. In this context it should be remembered that Sultan Mehmed IV was called *avcı* ("the hunter") for good reason. Kramers, J.H., "Mehemmed IV", *EI2*, iv, p. 982a-983a, 982a-982b.

¹⁶ For the regency of Tarhân Sultân and the Köprülü's, see Kramers, "Mehemmed IV", passim.

Upon the death of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa and his son Fāzıl Ahmed's succession to the post of grand vizier (31 October/1 November 1661), Kara Mustafā Paşa was appointed grand admiral of the Ottoman fleet (*kapudan-ı deryā; kapudan paşa*), which he remained until February 1666. While retaining his *kapudanlık*, he also became deputy grand vizier (*sadāret kā'immakāmi*) during Fāzıl Ahmed's *Hungarian* campaign of 1663.¹⁷ This made him both the second and third highest ranking official of the empire. His tenure as grand admiral was largely taken up by naval preparations for Köprülü's prolonged campaign for the final reduction of Venetian-held Crete (the last campaign in the drawn-out War over Candia, 1645-1669).

In the extensive reassignment of posts preceding the departure of the grand vizier's army for Crete, Kara Mustafā was first removed from the office of *kapudan* and promoted to the rank of second vizier (February 1666), and subsequently made deputy grand vizier again (9 May 1666), which he remained for the full duration of the grand vizier's absence from court (15 May 1666-27 June 1670).¹⁸ As during his *kapudanpaşalık*, Kara Mustafā's activities as *kā'immakām* were aimed largely at sustaining the grand vizier's efforts on Crete. Apart from the setback of being demoted to the rank of third vizier (31 July 1666) to make room for the promotion to second vizier of another favourite of the sultan, his tenure and standing at court seem to have been relatively secure during this period. After the capitulation of Crete (5 September 1669) and the grand vizier's return to Edirne, Kara Mustafā was dismissed from his *sadāret kā'immakāmlığı*, but maintained his rank and popularity with the sultan as a courtier and *rikāb kā'immakāmi* (deputy of the stirrup).¹⁹

He joined the Polish campaign of 1672 as a reasonably successful commander, and was appointed chief plenipotentiary to negotiate a cessation of hostilities that turned out to be very favourable to the Ottomans (annexation of Podolia; protection of Ukraine). Although holding no high administrative office for some four years, his influence at court remained undiminished; as part of the circumcision festivities held in Edirne²⁰ he was affianced to the sultan's youngest daughter (i.e. became *nāmzed*, 29 May 1675).²¹

The year 1676 marked the ending of the grand vizierate of Köprülüzāde Fāzıl Ahmed Paşa and his succession by Kara Mustafā Paşa. During the last phase of Ahmed Paşa's illness, his public functions had already been taken over by Mustafā (from 28 July 1676 onwards). Then, on 3 November 1676 - while accompanying the sultan from Istanbul to Edirne in the capacity

¹⁷ April to November, Danişmend, İsmail Hâmi, *İzahlı Osmanlı tarihi kronolojisi*, Istanbul, 1972, iii, p. 431-432.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 436-440.

¹⁹ *Rikāb*, literally meaning stirrup, was used to refer to "the service of the sultan or simply his presence". "It is from this connection that we have the use of the words *rikāb-ı hümāyūn* or *rikāb* in the sense of interim or substitute. When the Grand Vizier moved from place to place, the government was thought to go with him and there was appointed "to the sovereign a substitute for the Grand Vizier who was called *rikāb kā'immakāmi*" (Bianchi, *Dict.*, 1 ed.; Perry, *A view of the Levant*, London 1743, 37)." Deny, J., "Rikāb", *EI2*, viii, p. 528b-529b, 529a.

²⁰ For descriptions of these festivities, at which all European representatives at the *Porte* (the Ottoman government) were expected to be present, see *Extracts from the diaries of John Covel, 1670-1679*, in: *Early voyages and travels in the Levant*, ed. J. Theodore Bent, London, 1893; and Nābī, Yūsuf, *Vekāyi'-i hutān-ı şehzādegān-ı hazret-i sultān Mehmed Gāzī*, which is also available in transliteration; Levend, A.S., *Nabî'nin Surnamesi*, Istanbul, 1944.

²¹ Her name is given as "Küçük Sultān" by Heywood ("Karā Mustafā Paşa") and Süreyya (*Sicill-i 'Osmānī*). Yılmaz Öztuna - whose work contains many errors - gives "Emetullāh (Ümmî) (Küçük) Sultan" (*Devletler ve hanedanlar*, ii, *Türkiye (1074-1990)*, Ankara, 1989, p. 202). As for the age of the parties; in October 1676, when the actual marriage had not yet taken place, Colyer estimated that of Kara Mustafā at forty, and that of his fiancée at three. ARA, LH 98, Justinus Colyer to DLH, 9 October 1676.

of *yol kā'immakāmu* - he received his appointment to the highest post of the empire; a post he held until his execution in Belgrade on 25 December 1683.

Kara Mustafā Paşa - kapudan, kā'immakām (1666-1670)

So when and how was it, that this promising statesman, so strongly connected to the Köprülü house and careers, and expected to continue the policies of his predecessors with respect to the European merchant communities residing in the empire, begot this reputation of terror?

Strikingly enough, it was not during his years as *kapudan* (23 December 1661-6/19 February 1666); an office which by its nature implied a considerable amount of contact with European shipping. What's more, the port city of Izmir, home to the largest and richest European trading communities of the empire, was under threefold control of the *kapudanpaşalık*: The city itself was freehold property (*hāss*) of the chief secretary of the admiralty (*tersāne-i 'amīre kethüdası*), who administrated it through a *kādī* (judge; civil administrator); the province (or *sancak*) of *Sugla* of which it was part, with its capital at *Urla*, was governed by a *deryā beyi* (fleet governor) appointed by the *kapudan* and answerable to him alone; and as part of the *kapudan's beylerbeyilik* (governor-generalship) the security of the city, its bay, its province, and even part of its hinterland and surrounding shorelines, the upkeep of its fortifications, and the availability of vital supplies were all the direct responsibility of the *kapudan* himself.²² We can be absolutely certain that the European communities and their consuls and ambassadors would have commented extensively upon any unfriendly behaviour. But even during Kara Mustafā's active command in the region throughout 1662²³, nothing much out of the ordinary was reported.

It is at the very end of his service as *kapudan* and during his succeeding tenure as *sadāret kā'immakāmu* (9 May 1666-17 June 1670), that we start to hear the first complaints²⁴ about Kara Mustafā. In the words of Colin Heywood:

[He] was subsequently put in charge of naval preparations for the planned final reduction of Crete. His actions at this time, in attempting to commandeer for transport purposes ships of the European maritime powers, were resisted by their representatives at the Porte [the Ottoman government], and contributed materially to the exaggerated accounts concerning him which became current in Europe.²⁵

²² On the *tersane-i 'amire* (the imperial dockyards; the home base of the *kapudan paşa*), the *deryā beyi*, the *kapudan-ı deryā* and his *beylerbeyilik* of *Cezā'ir-i Bahr-ı Sefīd*, see Uzunçarşılı, İ. H., *Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilatı*, Ankara, 1948, passim; and the relevant articles in *EI2*: Uzunçarşılı, İ. H., "Bahriyya (3. The Ottoman navy)", i, p. 947a-948b; Lewis, B., "Daryā-begī", ii, p. 165b; Özbaran, S., "Kapudan Paşa", iv, p. 571b-572b; Beckingham, C.F., "Djazā'ir-i Bahr-ı Safīd", ii, p. 521b-522a. On Izmir and its administration, see Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahatname*, Istanbul, 1985, p. 40-41 and onwards; and Katip Çelebi, *Kitāb-ı Cihānnümā*, Istanbul, 1732, p. 669-670.

²³ Heywood, "Karā Mustafā Paşa", p. 590a.

²⁴ There had been some commandeering of French vessels in 1661, but this was rightly perceived to be a consequence of France's strained relations with the Ottoman Empire during the Ottoman-Venetian war of 1645-1669. Duparc, Pierre, *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les Traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Revolution Française*. vol. xxix, *Turquie*, Paris, 1969 provides a clear overview of the Ottoman-French controversy during this period.

²⁵ Heywood, "Karā Mustafā Paşa", p. 590b. On Kara Mustafā's commandeering of English shipping, see Anderson, *English consul*, p. 174-178; - of French shipping, see Masson, Paul, *Histoire du commerce français dans le Levant au XVIIe siècle* (Paris 1896), p. 12 and passim; - of Dutch shipping, see Dam van Isselt, W.E. van, "Avaniën in de Levant", *De Navorscher*, LVI/10 (1906), p. 525-577, 527-531.

Although these commandeering actions were not taken lightly at the time, they were not the reason behind what Heywood rightly terms “the exaggerated accounts”. Naturally, there was much protesting and posturing. But after all was said and done, irritations had not run so high as to overcome prudence - as we may infer from the positive descriptions of *kā’immakām* Kara Mustafā of still later dates. The Europeans in the Levant were well aware of the sensitivity of the issue of Crete and of the immense importance the Porte attached to the final attempt to gain the entire island. As their petitions make clear, they also realised that in this, Kara Mustafā was merely following orders. At this point, the most irritating side to his behaviour would have been his unwillingness to accept bribes to make the commandeering-problems go away. This willingness to forgive (if not to forget) is evident in Colyer’s correspondence on the case of *d’Oude Tobias* (the ship “The Old Thobias”).

The Old Thobias (1668)

Having arrived in Izmir aboard a Dutch convoy of seven ships on 12 April 1668 to take up their positions as Dutch consul of Izmir and Dutch resident to Istanbul respectively, Jacob van Dam and Justinus Colyer were summoned before the *kādī* of Izmir on 30 April 1668. There, they were confronted with a *fermān* (command; order) from Istanbul drawn up “in the first quarter of the noble moon of Zilkade, in the year 1078”.²⁶ In it, *kā’immakām* Merzifonlu Kara Mustafā Paşa, who had just returned from a stay at Lárisa with the sultan²⁷, ordered the requisitioning of a Dutch ship for grain transports from Izmir to Köprülü’s besieging army on Crete:

Command of the Grand Signor, given to his *Kā’immakām* of Constantinople [Istanbul], addressed to the *Kādī*, *Kapıcıbaşı* [leader of the guards], Customer [*gümrük emîni*; customs collector] and Dutch Consul of the scale or port of Smyrna [Izmir]. / Be it known unto you that my highest order will be; that, it being very necessary at present that larger quantities of grain be sent to the island of Candia [Crete], 25,000 kilos of grain will be sent thither from the scale of Smyrna on a Dutch ship, being big and strong, which will be chartered, and the moneys needed to that end, will be taken, and you will pay those to them [the Dutch] out of the revenue of the aforementioned scale²⁸ and the customs, and draw up a public act of the money given them. And my notable command also orders that the said grain be laden into the said ship as soon as possible, and will be dispatched in all hurry and haste to the said island, [...].²⁹

Van Dam and Colyer immediately went to work, attempting to have the order reversed. They petitioned the *kādī* of Izmir, grand vizier Köprülüzāde Fāzıl Ahmed Paşa, and his *kethüdā* (steward; personal representative) Mahmūd Ağa, calling upon them to honour the article of the Dutch capitulation designed to protect the Dutch against commandeering (*angariye*; *corvée*), but to no avail.

The Dutch capitulation then in force was that of 1612 (confirmed in 1634). The only article that dealt with commandeering was article 47:

²⁶ Between 13 and 22 April 1668.

²⁷ “so as to observe more closely the progress of the siege of Kandiye”, Heywood, “Karā Mustafā Paşa”, p. 590b.

²⁸ “scale”, from Italian “scala”; (sea)port.

²⁹ This dragoman’s translation and several other documents on the case in; ARA, LH 123, Jacob van Dam and Justinus Colyer to DLH, 5 May 1688. The Dutch had been relatively fortunate; the French had already been forced to send eleven ships and several more requisitioned French and English ships were awaiting departure in Izmir harbour. The reason behind this Ottoman commandeering was that the Venetians had recently destroyed seven large Ottoman ships off Crete. Van Dam van Isselt, “Avaniën in de Levant”, p. 527-529.

ve kalyūnları u gemileri her kangı iskelede olursa tamām gümrüklerin ‘ahdnāme mücibince verdikden soñra ba‘zı angariye için alıkomayalar ve angariye teklif eylemeyeler / After their galleons and ships have paid full customs duties according to the capitulation in whatever scale it may be, they may not be detained for some corvée (*angariye*) nor may it be proposed.³⁰

Naturally, the *kā’immakām* was also aware of this article and had circumvented it by not exacting *angariye* pure and simple, instead turning it into a forced lease, just as he had done, and would continue to do, in similar cases with the other European trading communities. But there is a more significant reason for the failure of the petitions; the near-complete control both the grand vizier and his deputy exerted over the chain of authorities involved in the order and in fact over practically every official concerned with the administration of foreign commerce.

Table 1: Names and relevant offices and family connections of the Ottoman officials involved in the commandeering of the Old Thobias (1668)³¹

1. Köprülü Mehmed Paşa	former grand vizier	father of 2 and 3
2. Köprülüzāde Fāzıl Ahmed Paşa	former governor-general of Aleppo former deputy grand vizier	brother of 3 father (in-law) of 4
3. Merzifonlu Kara Mustafā Paşa	grand vizier former grand admiral	son of 1 brother of 2
4. Kaplan Mustafā Paşa	deputy grand vizier future grand vizier grand admiral	uncle (in-law) of 4 (adopted) son of 1 son (in-law) of 2
5. Mustafā Ağa	future governor-general of Aleppo former customs collector of Izmir/Chios	nephew (in-law) of 3 father of 6
6. Mahmūd Ağa	former customs collector of Istanbul former steward of 1	father (in-law) of 7 client of sultana-mother
7. Hüseyin Ağa I	customs collector of Istanbul steward of 1	son of 5 brother (in-law) of 7
8. Hüseyin Ağa II	customs collector of Izmir/Chios poll-tax collector of Izmir/Chios future poll-tax collector of Istanbul future customs collector of Istanbul future poll-tax collector of Izmir/Chios	son (in-law) of 5 brother (in-law) of 6 client of sultana-mother client of 3 client of 3 client of 7

The table serves to illustrate that during the administrations of Köprülüzāde Fāzıl Ahmed Paşa and Merzifonlu Kara Mustafā Paşa, the offices of poll-tax (*harāç*³²) collector of Istanbul, poll-tax collector of Izmir and Chios, customs collector of Istanbul, customs collector of Izmir and Chios, and steward of the grand vizier were all firmly linked to each other, to the palace-faction (sultana-mother; *vālide*) and through friendship, marriage, and employment to Fāzıl Ahmed’s as well as Kara Mustafā’s households.

³⁰ Groot, A.H. de, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic. A history of the earliest diplomatic relations. 1610-1630*, Leiden, 1978, p. 244 and 257. *Angariye* (“angary” in English) is the requisitioning by a belligerent state of neutral possessions, and refers to the right of belligerents to destroy or use in case of need, neutral possessions within their territory or on the open seas, be it in defence or in attack. *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal op CD-Rom*, Rotterdam, 2000.

³¹ Galland, *Journal*, i, p. 87 and passim; Galland, Antoine, *Le voyage à Smyrne. Un manuscrit d’Antoine Galland (1678)*, ed. Frédéric Bauden, Paris, 2000, p. 123, 170-171 and passim; ARA, LH 123, Jacob van Dam and Justinus Colyer to DLH, 5 May 1688; Kreutel, Richard F., *Kara Mustafa vor Wien: 1683 aus der Sicht türkischer Quellen*, ed. Karl Teply, Graz, Wien, Köln, 1982, Index.

³² *Harāç* (or *cizye*) was the annual poll-tax payable by non-Muslim subjects of the sultan (*zimmīs*). By virtue of their capitulations the European merchants were exempt since they qualified as protected foreigners (*müstemin*), not *zimmīs*.

Faced with so formidable a network of alliances, the Dutch stopped petitioning and decided to give in. In a general meeting of the Izmir nation³³ it was decided to use “d’Oude Tobias”; the most run down barge they could muster.³⁴ The nation bought the ship from its captain for 10,200 eight-reals, which it advanced with interest.³⁵ In the end, the ship never made it past Chios for fear of cruising Venetian men-of-war. It had lain there for three months before Colyer, during his first audience with Kara Mustafâ, pledged to indemnify the Ottomans for half its cargo and obtained permission to have it unloaded and released.³⁶ The Old Thobias returned to home waters in 1669 and was never to return to the Levant again. Part of the 10,220 eight-reals was recouped by reselling the ship to its captain, and the interest and costs of the ship’s release by collecting an additional consular duty of 1,25 % from the next Dutch convoy to arrive in Izmir.³⁷

*Colyer’s audience (1668)*³⁸

6 May 1668, the day after the Dutch nation of Izmir had decided to place “d’Oude Tobias” at the Ottomans’ disposal and had agreed upon an apportionment of the projected costs of the resident’s first audience at court, Colyer embarked for Istanbul to take up his embassy. His ships arrived there on the 25th and he entered the city in procession on the 31st. After settling in, preparations immediately began for the journey to Edirne, where he and Van Dam would present their credentials. Having received 28,000 *akçe* from Kara Mustafâ to meet preliminary expenses, Colyer and his train left for Edirne July 26th.³⁹ Van Dam and his train left Izmir on the 19th and the two parties met up outside Edirne on the 29th. During its stay in Edirne from 3 to 24 August, the Dutch delegation felt it was treated with extraordinary magnanimity, receiving gifts and treatment on equal footing with the representatives of the Porte’s most valued European allies, particularly from Kara Mustafâ.⁴⁰

³³ In European parlance “nation” was the term commonly used to refer to the non-Muslim communities of the Ottoman Empire; i.e. the Dutch/French/English/Venetian nations, but also the Ottoman Jewish, Armenian and Greek nations.

³⁴ As much is admitted in the correspondence home, but may also be verified from a list of all Dutch ships (incl. the ambassadorial and consular duties levied from them according to the worth of their cargo) arrived in Izmir between 12 April 1668 and 31 October 1671: The convoy under Commodore Hendrik van Toll with which Van Dam and Colyer had arrived in Izmir, had included seven merchantmen; “The Old Thobias” was about 60% smaller than the bigger vessels in the convoy. ARA, CS 676, DLH to States of Holland and West-Friesland, f. 204b-209b, 1676.

³⁵ In the Levant in 1668 the common exchange rate of the eight-real was about 110 *akçes* (that of the lion dollar 100 *akçes*). See also footnote 39.

³⁶ ARA, CS 684, f. 64a-65a.

³⁷ Van Dam van Isselt, “Avaniën in de Levant”, p. 537.

³⁸ For the full account of Colyer’s arrival in Istanbul and his audiences at Edirne, see Colyer, *Oprecht journael*.

³⁹ ARA, CS 684, f. 53b-54a. In the Levant in 1668 28,000 *akçes* were worth about 120 Venetian ducats, 255 Spanish eight-reals, or 280 Dutch lion dollars. Pamuk, Şevket, *A monetary history of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge, 2000, p. 144. According to Colyer’s account of 17 September 1668, the total expenses of the audience amounted to 7,500 lion dollars. ARA, CS 684, f. 73a. This amounted to slightly more than Colyer’s total annual salary as it was fixed in 1675; 5,000 eight-reals and 7,500 guilders. Schutte, O., *Repertorium der Nederlandse vertegenwoordigers, residerende in het buitenland 1584-1810*, The Hague, 1976, p. 308. At the time one eight-real was reckoned worth slightly more than 2,5 guilders (a rix-dollar). By way of comparison; the fixed part of the salary of the kâdî of Izmir was 500 *akçes* per day (appr. 1,825 lion dollars a year), a captain or a pilot in the service of the Dutch navy received a monthly salary of about 30 guilders (appr. 144 lion dollars a year), a sailor of about 11 guilders a month (appr. 52 lion dollars a year). Boxer, C.R., *The Dutch Seaborne Empire 1600-1800*, London, 1965, p. 337-341; Dillen, J.G. van, *Van Rijkdom en regenten*, The Hague, 1970, p. 439-480; and Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahatname*, Istanbul, 1985, p. 40.

⁴⁰ These were the German Emperor, the Grand Duke of Moscovy and the King of Poland. Kara Mustafâ bestowed 25 vests (tabards) upon them, which was a considerable honour since the French and English had

This partiality was also in evidence during Colyer's audience with him⁴¹; he not only received the resident with courtesy, but also acceded to Colyer's every request concerning mercantile affairs, issuing four dragomans' *berats* to Colyer and no less than fifteen *fermāns* in favour of the Dutch to several Ottoman officials in Istanbul, Izmir and Chios.⁴² When he left Edirne, Colyer had good reason to look upon Kara Mustafā as positively as he did.⁴³

Creditors and commandeering (1669-1670)

The remainder of Kara Mustafā's tenure as *kā'immakām* passed without the Dutch coming into any major conflict with him. In the course of 1669 and 1670, there were some trade related disputes between a number of Dutch factors of Izmir and their Ottoman creditors, felt by the Dutch to have been instigated by the *kādī* of Izmir for his own profit. Kara Mustafā's involvement in these seems to have been limited to adjusting them; that is, to negotiating settlements between the parties (informally) as referee and (formally) as acting president of the *divān-ı hümayūn* (the Ottoman cabinet and supreme court in Istanbul). Although the rulings in all these cases were in favour of the Dutch, there was some irritation about the expenses they had to make to get the cases heard to begin with, and about the "fees" Kara Mustafā charged for his services.

In March 1670 all European ships then in the harbour of Izmir were commandeered for troop transport. This time the order came directly from Grand Vizier Fāzıl Ahmed Paşa, who was demobilising his army from Crete after its capitulation (4 September 1669). Consul van Dam managed to get a number of ships sailing under the Dutch flag released from this duty by sending his chief dragoman to Crete with a petition and some presents. Some problems with the *kādī* of Izmir set aside, matters were resolved with relative ease. Kara Mustafā, whose importance as *kā'immakām* was declining steadily as the grand vizier resumed the reins of government, was not involved.⁴⁴

Interlude (1670-1676)

Upon his brother's return to the court in Edirne in 27 June 1670, Kara Mustafā was relieved of his office of *sadāret kā'immakāmi*. Perhaps having fallen out of favour with Fāzıl Ahmed (for having schemed against him during his long absence, it was rumoured), he was removed from real administrative power. But the grand vizier did not stop there; he also loosened Kara Mustafā's grip on the administration of foreign trade by ridding himself of his "particular friend" customs collector Hüseyin Ağa (I; see Table 1), for whom Kara Mustafā had procured promotion from the Izmir to the Istanbul customs.⁴⁵

never received more than 12. Gifts from the sultan included 10 live sheep, 100 hens, 50 white breads, 20 sugar breads, 20 wax candles, 25 eight-reals a day for the table, 230 eight-reals for furniture. Dam van Isselt, W.E. van, "Eenige lotgevallen van Jacob van Dam, consul te Smirna van 1668-1688", *Bijdragen voor Vaderlandsche Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde* (hereafter cited as *BVGO*), vi (1907), 78-136, p. 102-103.

⁴¹ See also above and footnote 4. Normally, audiences would be given by the sultan and his grand vizier, but since Fāzıl Ahmed Köprülü was in Crete conducting the siege, Deputy Grand Vizier Kara Mustafā Paşa observed his functions.

⁴² These dragomans' *berāts* (diplomas for the embassy's interpreters) and *fermāns* (imperial orders) have all been lost, but fortunately an elaborate description of their contents does still exist in ARA, CS 684, f. 64a-65a.

⁴³ See footnote 4.

⁴⁴ ARA, SG 6911, folders 1669-1670, passim; ARA, CS 676, f. 204b-209b; ARA, CS 684, f. 73b-80a; ARA, LH 124, folders 1669-1670, passim; Van Dam van Isselt, "Avaniën in de Levant", p. 533-538.

⁴⁵ The customs collector of Istanbul was also the empire's chief customs collector, to whom all other customs collectors were answerable. These officials were tax-farmers; they purchased their "farm" (*iltizām*), i.e. their right to collect customs, on an annual basis through a bidding procedure. The relation between Kara Mustafā

Just as the war with Venice over Crete had prompted his father Mehmed Köprülü to invest in Izmir's defences⁴⁶, so Fāzıl Ahmed now focussed his attention on the city. Over the next years he unfolded plans for a large scale building project in Izmir, designed to stimulate the city's international trade and enhance the administration's control over it. He ordered and personally financed the construction of a new *bedestān* (covered market), a *gümriük* (customs house), a central *hān* (caravansary; inn), a number of other *hāns*, a complex of public baths and stables, a far-ranging aqueduct with an accompanying system of fountains and springs, and numerous other public works. These were all administered through *vakfs* (pious foundations), of which a total of seventy-three was added to the infrastructure of Izmir. The new *bedestān* and *gümriük* were completed in 1675, but building on the other structures continued under Kara Mustafā's supervision until their completion in 1677.⁴⁷ This meant that the introduction and enforcement of accompanying procedures was left up to Kara Mustafā, whose reputation in the eyes of the Europeans would diminish considerably by the Ottomans' new potential for the exact collection of customs.

Kara Mustafā Paşa had survived the reversal which had been the result of the return of the grand vizier through the personal protection of the sultan. After two years at court he rebuilt his career during Fāzıl Ahmed's Polish campaigns, in which the sultan took an active interest. During these campaigns he proved himself a capable commander and tough negotiator. In 1672 he concluded a cessation of hostilities with the Poles at Buçaş (Buczacz), which was so harsh that the Polish Diet refused to ratify it, opening the door to the Polish and Ukrainian campaigns of '73, '74, '75 and '76.⁴⁸ As the grand vizier's health declined (from November 1674 onwards) Kara Mustafā's power increased, a process culminating in his assuming the functions of grand vizier in July 1676 and finally in his appointment to the grand vizierate in November of the same year.

Kara Mustafā Paşa - grand vizier (1676-1683)

The first months of Kara Mustafā's grand vizierate were spent in Edirne; with the latest news from court reaching the European representatives in Istanbul through their own and the Porte's dragomans. A change of grand viziers usually brought about considerable changes in the empire's key posts and all news was feverishly analysed for hints of the new administration's policy regarding European political and mercantile affairs. 31 January 1677, Colyer first reported home on the subject:

The changes regarding the high ministers of this realm since my last of 9 November of the previous year, are the following. The *paşas* or governors of places and frontiers adjoining Christendom have been moved and have most been sent to other governorships in Asia Minor. The *kā'immakām* of Constantinople, *kapudan paşa*, or admiral of the sea, and the *bostancıbaşı*,

and Hüseyin Ağa (I) figures prominently in all contemporary accounts, but see Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 123 and 170-171 in particular. Galland tells us Hüseyin Ağa felt the grand vizier might move against him and left his post to make the pilgrimage (*hacc*), which was a common method of officials out-of-favour to get out of the way before they got hurt.

⁴⁶ Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 103; Iconomos, Constantin, *Étude sur Smyrne*, ed. Bonaventure F. Slaars, Izmir, 1868, p. 42-43.

⁴⁷ Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 105-110; Ülker, Necmi, *The rise of Izmir, 1688-1740*, Ann Arbor, 1975, p. 36-39. The new customs office drastically limited the opportunities for smuggling and the evasion of customs and ambassadorial and consular duties. The European merchants' frustration with the Ottoman administration's increased ability to more accurately monitor and tax the international trade flowing through Izmir (which had by then become the most important Levant port) resulted in an endless series of protests and commercial disputes.

⁴⁸ Gökbilgin and Repp, "Köprülü", p. 260b; Heywood, "Karā Mustafā Paşa", p. 590b.

being the chief forester, have all been continued in their charges. Süleymân Ağa, chief secretary [*kethüda*] of the late grand vizier, has been made master of the great stable [*büyük mîrâhor*]. One of the sultan's or concubines of the grand signor, called the wife sultana [*hâseki sultân*], was delivered of a young princess. The *paşa*, recently appointed by the Porte over that of Tunis, was violently rejected by its inhabitants, and has returned here. That *paşa*, to obtain that governorship, spent vast treasures, and principally to the aforesaid Süleymân Ağa, who alone enjoyed 600 purses from him, each purse being 500 rix-dollars. The current grand vizier having become acquainted with this, as well as with the exorbitant moneys that the *bostancıbaşı* of Adrianople, one of the favourites of the grand signor [the sultan], who was to construct a new building there for the sultan's women (during the emperor's stay here last year), is charging for it, has brought both great men to account; such that much is feared for their persons. The entire court will return here towards the month of March, at which time the Christian ministers will have to personally congratulate him on his high office with extra presents.⁴⁹

All considered, Colyer thought it safe to conclude that Kara Mustafâ would continue most of the policies of his predecessor, and it was hoped that this would be in the same spirit of uprightness for which Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa was remembered, by the Dutch and the English at least. The almost immediate reappointment of Hüseyin Ağa (I) as chief customs collector, although not welcomed in equal measure by all European merchant communities⁵⁰, seemed at least to confirm their expectations. Less than a month after the new grand vizier's festive return from Edirne of April 12th, French ambassador De Nointel, ranking highest among the European representatives in Ottoman protocol, was the first to put the assessment of the corps diplomatique to the test.

First audiences (1677)

Because of their at times barely concealed sympathy and even intelligence and military support for the Austrians during the 1664 Battle of Saint Gotthard and for the Venetian defenders' efforts on Crete, the French had not been on good footing with the Köprülüs. Previous French ambassadors had personally suffered the consequences of their own and their king's actions, to the extent of being imprisoned in Istanbul's *Yedikule* tower.⁵¹ In spite of this recent history, Louis XIV and Colbert had developed great designs for the Levant and for the future of Ottoman-French trade and relations, and expected the Ottomans to cooperate. The plan was to gain a complete French monopoly of the Levant trade and full and exclusive access to the Red Sea and the overland trading routes connecting the Mediterranean to the Far East. With these instruments the French would displace the other European trading nations from the Levant as well as the East India trades. In this vision, the Ottomans would cooperate for the sole purpose of increasing tax revenue; they would have greater control over the flow of trade through their domains, with the added advantage of adding to their revenue taxes from the rerouted Cape trade now flowing through their territories. Apart from the Ottomans' commitment to these grandiose designs, ambassador De Nointel (1670-1679) was expected to obtain the Porte's sincere apologies for its treatment of his predecessors, and acknowledgment of his status as equal to the sultan and as standing above all other rulers.

Fâzıl Ahmed Köprülü had no intention of signing over the empire's entire international trade to one nation for the delusion of gaining more power through it. Aiding France as it was

⁴⁹ ARA, SG 6912, Justinus Colyer to SG, 31 January 1677; ARA, LH 98, Justinus Colyer to DLH, 31 January 1677.

⁵⁰ See footnote 47.

⁵¹ On Ottoman-French relations during the grand vizierates of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa, Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa and Merzifonlu Kara Mustafâ Paşa, see Vandal, Albert, *L'odyssée d'un ambassadeur. Les voyages du marquis de Nointel (1670-1680)*, Paris, 1900; and Duparc, *Recueil des instructions*; p. i-xvi (p. xiii for the *yedikule* episode).

engaged in a series of wars for the domination of Europe's richest entrepôt the Dutch Republic (the Franco-Dutch and Franco-Allied wars of 1672-1678) was not an attractive proposition to the Ottomans. This not least since France had proven itself fickle in its friendship during his own and his fathers Cretan and Austrian campaigns, and since the king of France was arrogating for himself a rank equal to his own lord's. He had renewed France's capitulation in 1673, giving it rights equal to the English, and awarding it the religious protection of the Christian nations of the Ottoman Empire and had left it at that. Now, with a new grand vizier heading government, De Nointel was ordered to see if he could revive their plans, at the very least (re)gaining undisputed precedence over the representatives of all other nations.

Due to De Nointel's insistence on an adjustment of protocol in favour of the French, his audience of 2 May 1677 ended in utter disaster, wasting any chance of French diplomatic success with the Ottomans for years to come and destroying De Nointel's career in the process. The Dutch resident gleefully described the audience and the subsequent course of events in a letter to the Board of Directors of Levant Trade, dated 24 May 1677, which merits extensive quotation because of the insight it provides into Kara Mustafâ's politics and the European envoys' response to it:

The second instant [2 May 1677] the first audience with the current grand vizier was permitted to the Lord ambassador of France; who, having ridden on horseback from his palace [the French embassy in Pera] to the channel [the Golden Horn] with very great pomp in the morning, having passed the same in twenty barges, and having arrived in that prince's seraglio [*serail*; palace], was led into the room of the *kethüda* or chief secretary of the grand vizier, where he was told to await the return of His Excellency from the divan (being the [supreme] court). Three hours had passed before the said minister was advised that the grand vizier had left the divan, and another hour before he was advised to come to the audience chamber. This long and unusual waiting being perceived as an affront (which it indeed is) by the French ambassador, deliberately inflicted on him in the presence of the assorted nations, His Excellency, entering de said audience chamber and seeing the seat of the grand vizier (being a bench or stool on top of a large sofa covered with tapestries, which is a place elevated one and a half feet) and his own beneath the said sofa on the floor, at once instructed his chief dragoman to pick the bench up and place it on top in the front of the sofa. Which having been thus executed, His Excellency too stepped onto the sofa, and intending to seat himself on the stool, was at once given notice that his place was not on top, but beneath the aforementioned sofa. This disconcerted the said ambassador to such a degree that he himself took the said stool up from the front of the sofa, and placed it close and to the right-hand side of the seat or bench of the grand vizier (which was high above), at once seating himself on it. Many great men of the empire being present there, and the grand vizier having been informed by them and by his chief page of that act, immediately ordered Mr. Alexander Mavrocordati, chief dragoman of the realm, to explain to the ambassador his error and add that he should kindly refrain from an action so extravagant. But this falling on deaf ears, the *çavuşbaşı*, being the chief executor of orders, was commanded to de facto remove the said stool from the sofa and put it down on the floor where it had been placed before. He [the *çavuşbaşı*] presently and with great fury appeared in the audience chamber and in a loud voice, and with an attitude of perfect contempt for his people, ordered the said bench (on which the ambassador was seated) to be taken from under him. Which was executed with such skill that the Lord ambassador could scarcely save himself from tumbling down. Seeing himself stripped of all honour and civility, but on top of that showered with all sorts of public ignominy and vicissitudes, and doubtlessly fearing worse, he stepped off the said sofa and departed, saying in parting that (if he were treated in such a fashion) he did not even want an audience with the grand vizier. Which having been reported to His Excellency, prompted the following response from him: let him have it with him who be damned, then. The following afternoon and evening the grand vizier, of his own accord and with great courtesy, had the Lords ambassadors of England and of Venice, as well as the States General's minister, yours truly, informed of his wish to receive them the next day. To this day, this courtesy has never been practiced by any grand vizier. But the current, after all being no less highly placed than his predecessors, wanted merely to find out how the other ministers would look upon the

encounter described above. The Lord English ambassador responded that his indisposition didn't allow him to perform the said call, this because (so I have been informed), firstly, the grand vizier had given precedence to France in that ceremony, and, secondly, that he, being an ambassador of a king who did not yield to France, now found himself implicated in the actions of the said French ambassador. The Lord ambassador of Venice, and the States General's minister have not felt those impediments, and as a consequence have not attached ourselves to the circumstances of another, but have in this adhered to the old custom, namely that the Christian ministers, be they from a king or from a republic, in their first audience with a newly appointed grand vizier of this realm are generally received below the sofa. And had the Lord ambassador of France not previously been treated with such disdain as having to wait for so long, I am sure that he would not have let himself be carried to such extremities. The 3 instant [3 May 1677] at ten in the morning the aforesaid Venetian minister had his audience seated on a stool below the sofa, during which some difficulties occurred because the chief dragoman of that republic wanting to mediate, the grand vizier objected and ordered the abovementioned Mr. Mavrocordati to relate what the ambassador wanted to make known. At first not being obeyed in this, the affair stood to end very badly for the chief dragoman on account of the grand vizier's quick-temperedness, but the Lord ambassador prevented this with great foresight by shortening his compliment.⁵²

Colyer had his own audience that same day and was again received with exceptional courtesy, being allowed as a mark of respect to ride his horse through the palace gate, past the guardsmen and officials lined up across the outer court, and right up to the palace steps where he was received by the Porte's abovementioned chief dragoman, Mavrocordato. He was not taken to the steward's office to wait, but was led straightaway to the audience chamber, where he was again welcomed by Mavrocordato, who showed him his stool beneath the sofa and introduced him to the chief officials of the empire. The grand vizier presently appeared amid loud cheers, greeted the ambassador in passing by bringing his right hand to his chest and bowing his head, and stepped onto the sofa. The grand vizier's bench and Colyer's stool were picked up and put directly opposite one another, one on top of the sofa, the other below it. Being seated, Kara Mustafā personally bid him welcome, referring to him as "Lord ambassador" ("elçi bey"). Colyer thanked him, congratulated him on his appointment, and presented him with the required gifts. While coffee, sherbet, rose water and incense were brought in and taken, he and Kara Mustafā Paşa discussed Europe's current wars, with Mavrocordato interpreting the whole time. The audience ended with the usual ceremony, the grand vizier taking his leave of Colyer with two nods of the head.⁵³

Regarding the French and English ambassadors' audiences, Colyer tells us that De Nointel afterwards tried to obtain another audience by "capitulating" on the subject of the stool, but was denied one, while the English ambassador, John Finch, had gone into hiding in his country house. He also mentions that the resident of Genoa had not been able to obtain an audience.⁵⁴ Colyer ends his letter with the remark that "the government under the current vizier will to all appearances be very severe", which, however, was not in reference to his contacts with Europe, but to the methods by which he eliminated any internal threat to his position, as is illustrated by a list of the high Ottoman officials whose severed heads had recently been displayed in front of the palace and in Istanbul's public places.

⁵² ARA, LH 98, Justinus Colyer to DLH, 24 May 1677.

⁵³ On Ottoman ceremony in general, see Groot, A.H. de, "Marāsim (4. In the Ottoman Empire)", *EI2*, vi, p. 529b-532a; and Ö. Nutku, "Mawākib (4. In the Ottoman Empire)", *EI2*, vi, p. 858a-865b. The ceremony used by Kara Mustafā Paşa in receiving Ottoman grandees is described in Galland, *Journal*, ii, p. 199-200, 204-205 ("Les différentes manières de recevoir le Grand Seigneur, le Visir, le Moufti et les autres").

⁵⁴ Sources on these events abound. See for instance Vandal and Duparc (see footnote 51); North, Roger, *The Life of Sir Dudley North ...*, London, 1744, p. 74-76; and Abbott, *Under the Turk in Constantinople*, passim.

It is at this juncture that we see Kara Mustafâ's reputation receive its first serious and irreversible dents; less than a year into his grand vizierate and as a direct consequence of his first rapports in that capacity with the European representatives in Istanbul. The failed audience exasperated De Nointel and Finch (who had inadvertently and without necessity allowed himself to be drawn into a similar position). Stalling audiences was a proven tactic of the Ottomans to gain space for political manoeuvring and to make it clear to the Europeans that they were *granted* audiences and privileges. But categorically being denied an audience was something usually reserved for states on the brink of war with the Ottomans. Strictly speaking, it rendered the capitulations of the states involved worthless. For without confirmation of their privileges, the ambassadors had no supreme authority to turn to in case of disputes.

In their letters home, both the English and French ambassadors attributed what had happened exclusively to what they considered to be the base character and ignorance of the grand vizier. Capitalising on prejudices prevalent in Europe at the time to masquerade their own inadequate handling of the affair, they suggested that the cause of the grand vizier's refusal to grant them an audience was the "proverbial arrogance and avidity of the Turks"; meaning that he was trying to find out what they would be willing to sacrifice for a second chance and taking pleasure in humiliating them. Unfortunately, these biased explanations have found their way into even much of the more recent literature on Kara Mustafâ Paşa, in which he is invariably described as an extortionate xenophobe. Explanations like these, however, ignore the fact that Colyer had no problems whatsoever during his audience; quite the contrary. To ascribe this to his willingness to go along with Kara Mustafâ in sitting below the sofa or in using the Porte's dragoman Mavrocordato is also not quite convincing, for it fails to account for the marked difference between the events preceding the actual audience of De Nointel and that of Colyer.

If we credit Kara Mustafâ with slightly more capabilities and insight, and take the international arena in which he was operating into consideration, a more realistic picture emerges. In light of the evidence available on his conduct throughout his grand vizierate, we may certainly assume that confronted with the excessive demands of Louis XIV and his ambassador, he did his utmost best to press home the point that the sultan and his ministers considered themselves superior to the French king and his emissary. But any explanation of what took place during and following these audiences, should also take into account Kara Mustafâ's preoccupation with European affairs and their bearing on the Ottoman position. Not only was his grand vizierate marked by an endless succession of campaigns against Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Russia; this preoccupation was also evident in his diplomatic contacts with Europe. In this respect, it is more than revealing that he continued Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa's experienced foreign affairs advisor Mavrocordato⁵⁵, and, what's more, personally insisted on making active use of his expertise in all his contacts with the European envoys. If we add to this the fact that in giving audiences Kara Mustafâ regularly inquired after the latest

⁵⁵ The Phanariote Alexander Mavrocordato (1637-1719) succeeded Panagiotis (Panaioti Nicousios) to the office of imperial dragoman in 1673. Having studied medicine in Padua, he was not only Fâzıl Ahmed's and Kara Mustafâ's foreign affairs advisor but also their, as well as the sultan's, personal physician. On the Phanariotes, see Mordtmann, J.H., "Fener", *EI2*, ii, 879b-880a; on Panagiotis, Galland, *Journal*, i, p. 18n1-19. The most comprehensive work on Mavrocordato I know of is that of Stourza (*L'Europe orientale et le rôle historique des Maurocordato (1660-1830)*, Paris, 1913).

political and military developments in Europe⁵⁶ and - in doing so - proved well-informed about its wars, it becomes clear that his diverging treatment of De Nointel and Colyer must be considered a calculated political act. After all, the Dutch were fighting a war for their very survival as an independent nation against an alliance headed by France, and this survival was considered by many as a crucial obstacle to any further increase in the French king's power and realm. All of which is not to say that Kara Mustafā's diplomacy was as clever as his predecessors.

Şeker bayramı (1677)

Almost seven months later, the antagonism that was the result of the events of 2 and 3 May had still not been mended. 25 November 1677 saw the end of the month of Ramadan and the start of the festivities marking the breaking of the fast (*şeker bayramı*). On this day, the foreign envoys usually sent their dragomans to congratulate the grand vizier during an audience and present him with gifts to a certain fixed value. But the interpreters of English ambassador (Finch) and Genoese resident (Spinola) were refused their audiences; the former because his employer had avoided having his ever since the "stool"-incident, the latter because he had already been in Istanbul for two and a half years without having presented his credentials and the gifts from his *kral* (king).⁵⁷ Here too, it was claimed that the sole motive behind Kara Mustafā's behaviour was his lust for money. But just as with the first audiences discussed above, the grand vizier's treatment of the Dutch and Venetians contradicts this.

After intense negotiations the grand vizier agreed to receive Finch and Spinola as soon as possible (but without setting a date), provided they compensated for their previous disrespect by adding to their usual gifts "current gold sequins" to the value of 5,000 lion dollars for the grand vizier, and the same to the value of 1,000 lion dollars for the grand vizier's steward and the *re'īs ül küttāb* (secretary of state). This increase in gifts worried the other representatives, who complained that the English and Genoese had increased their gifts regardless the consequences of their actions for the other nations. Their worries proved premature however, for the presents offered by Colyer and Venetian *bailo* Morosini were graciously received, although they had not been increased.⁵⁸

Imposition of harāç - the protection system (1678)

Up until this point, the European representatives in Istanbul had not been unanimous in condemning Kara Mustafā Paşa. The rather obvious distinction between those denouncing him and those considering him as severe but fair a grand vizier as his predecessor, was whether they were treated as representing allies or foes. This in its turn depended on the geopolitical situation as well as on the manner in which they approached him.

⁵⁶ Another example: "Il est fort curieux de nouvelles et lorsque M. le Bayle de Venise eut audience, il s'informa fort de l'état des guerres de la France avec l'Espangne, l'Allemagne et la Hollande." 1672; Galland, *Journal*, ii, p. 205. See also Heywood, "Karā Mustafā Paşa", p. 591a.

⁵⁷ The reason for this is not entirely clear. Colyer claims it was because the Genoese resident did not want to present the required gifts to Kara Mustafā Paşa. ARA, LH 98, Justinus Colyer to DLH, 9 December 1677. This is not entirely unlikely, since the value represented by Genoese trade, and thereby the amount of money the resident could spend on "public relations", was negligible when compared to that of France, England or Holland.

⁵⁸ The "usual" gifts, to which the English and Genoese had added now added money, consisted in "gold, and woollen cloth, as well as satin and tabby [watered taffeta] vests". ARA, LH 98, Justinus Colyer to DLH, 9 December 1677.

This changed between 1 and 18 January 1678. On that last day, Colyer informed the States General that “every day, we see the maxims of this present government incline more and more to the extreme prejudice of all Christian nations”. The immediate cause of his alarm was a *fermān* issued by the grand vizier:

Now the grand vizier at the beginning of this month had notice given to all Christian public ministers that each of them should hand over to a specially commissioned *kādī* a list of all his merchants that had got married in these parts, of the names and number of his dragomans, and of the names and number of his indigenous servants; and also that all consuls and dragomans of the entire realm would within the space of three months have to request new *berats* from the Porte on pains of being considered ordinary subjects; and, regarding the dragomans of this country, that they will have to pay the *harāç* to which all natives of the realm that are not Turks [i.e. Muslims] are liable, which is in direct violation of all capitulations.⁵⁹ And for all these matters no other explanation can be given, except that it is the will of him who holds the power to carry them out. The specific purpose of which is to bring all Christian [i.e. European] merchants that have contracted marriages here under the said *harāç*, and to gain a good sum of money from the new *berats*. For fear of new *avanas*, all public ministers have provided the aforementioned lists to the said *kādī*, and undertaken to convey orders to their respective consuls and dragomans residing beyond this place [Istanbul] to comply with the notice given.⁶⁰

The *fermān* caused considerable distress among the European communities of the Ottoman Empire and the Ottoman subjects that were under their protection. Not so much because of the measures it dictated, but because of their wider implications. The *harāç* tax was not a financial burden the Europeans and their protégés would not be able to bear.⁶¹ Similarly, obtaining new *berāts* - though more costly - was also not an insurmountable financial drain on the embassies since they would be reimbursed by selling them to the recipients.

The real problem was that the plans of the grand vizier, if carried through, would disrupt the entire system that enabled the European merchant communities to conduct their trade through their Ottoman connections. This is not the place to describe in detail the circumstances and workings of this “protection system”; suffice to say that the European merchants in the Ottoman Empire conducted their trade through Ottoman wholesalers and brokers with the

⁵⁹ Although the existence of this *fermān* is widely attested in both archival and printed sources (but erroneously as having been issued in December 1677), I have so far not been able to locate an Ottoman copy. Nevertheless, we can claim with some certainty that it did not order *haraç* to be levied from all dragomans in the service of European ambassadors and consuls regardless (“and, regarding the dragomans of this country, that they will have to pay the *harac* to which all natives of the realm that are not Turks [Muslims] are liable”). Considering the tendentious nature of Colyer’s correspondence on the matter (see also further down), it is more likely that what is discussed here, is a further qualification of the previous sentence, and in reference to those dragomans that have upon re-examination not been considered eligible for new *berāts* since they were not actually dragomans but only held their posts nominally.

⁶⁰ ARA, SG 6913, Justinus Colyer to SG, 18 January 1678.

⁶¹ The non-Muslims of Izmir, for instance, are reported to have paid it at a rate of 2 to 4 lion dollars annually. On the non-Muslim communities of Izmir and the *harāç* they paid, see Ülker, *The rise of Izmir*, p. 230-234; Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 135-143; and Bruyn, Cornelis de, *Reizen door de vermaardste delen van Klein Asia, de eilanden Scio, Rhodus, Cyprus, Metelino, Stanchio, &c. Mitsgaders de voornaamste steden van Aegypten, Syrien en Palestina*, Delft, 1698, p. 153. See also Cahen, Claude, and İnalcık, Halil, “Djizya (1. General; and 2. Ottoman)”, *EI2*, ii, p. 559a-565b, which confirms the amounts. It has to be kept in mind, however, that these were nominal rates; the actual rate at which a given individual paid it, could vary considerably, depending on what nation (*tā’ife*; community) he belonged to and the arrangements that nation made internally to fulfill its fiscal obligations *en group*. Thus, Galland (*Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 136, 140-141) tells us it was customary for the Jewish and Greek *tā’ifes* to exempt their religious leaders from the tax and make up for the difference by increasing the burden for others. Similarly, the richer members of a *tā’ife* (among which were the - officially exempt - dragomans) could be expected to contribute in proportion to their wealth to spare the poorer ones.

assistance of Ottoman dragomans and warehousemen, who were protected non-Muslims (*zimmīs*). These Greek, Armenian and Jewish Ottoman middlemen were drawn to trade with the Europeans by virtue of those articles of the capitulations that offered to Ottoman personnel of the European embassies and consulates the same exemption from Ottoman taxes it did to the Europeans (*müstemin*). Although many of these Ottoman connections were not exactly personnel, they were extended this European protection through nomination to a “nominal” dragomanship or vice-consulship by one of the European representatives in Istanbul, with conferral of their office being effected with a *berāt* granted by the Ottoman central administration. In this context, the question of their having to pay *harāç* or not was not merely one of purchasing the protection of the Muslim ruler (here; the Ottoman sultan) for a few dollars, but encompassed further liability to a number of commercial dues and taxes (*tekālīf-i ‘örfiyye*) which could amount to much more. Liability to those taxes would effectively negate the competitive edge they had gained through European protection.⁶²

But as we have seen, the Ottoman “employees” of the Europeans were not the only ones the *fermān* aimed at. European merchants that had taken *zimmī* wives were also to be subjected to *harāç*. Such a measure would effectively “naturalize” those merchants and their families to Ottoman subjects. This was not only of great consequence for the merchants themselves, but also for the European officials representing them, since they stood to lose some of their richest subjects.

The articles of the capitulations which Colyer and his colleagues claimed the *fermān* was in contravention of, but to which the Ottoman government and its *harāççis* (*cizyedārs*; poll-tax collectors/farmers) no doubt considered it a long overdue specification, in the Dutch capitulation in force at the time ran as follows:

[art. 32:] ve anlara tābi‘ olub memālik-i mahrūsemizde mütemekkin olanlar eger evlü olsun ve ergen olsun rençberlik edenler anlardan harāc taleb olunmaya [art. 33:] ve elçileri hidmetinde olan künsülüsler ve tercümānlar olageldüğü üzere harācdan ve kassābiyyeden ve tekālīf-i ‘örfiyyeden mu‘āf olalar [art. 34:] ve Iskenderiyye ve Tarabulus-i Şām ve Cezā’ir ve Tunus ve Cezā’ir-i ğarb ve Mıŝr iskelelerine ve ğayrlara ta’yīn étdükleri künsülüslerin tebdīl édüb gönderdikde kimesne māni‘ olmaya / [art. 32:] From the subjects of the [Dutch Provinces] who have become residents in our well-guarded dominions, whether married or bachelor, and exercising trade, tribute (*harāc*) may not be demanded. [art. 33:] The consuls and dragomans who are employed by their ambassador are exempt from tribute, *kassābiye*-tax and extraordinary taxes (*tekālīf-i ‘örfiyye*), as has become usual. [art. 34:] Nobody may present obstacles when [the Dutch] appoint consuls to the scales of Alexandria, Tripoli of Syria, the Archipelago, Tunis, Algiers, Cairo and other places, change them, appoint men capable of such a task in those places and despatch them.⁶³

The first thing we must conclude from these articles, is that the *fermān* was not in direct contravention of them. The capitulations were susceptible to varying interpretations depending on many circumstances, such as the goodwill of local officials or the Porte, the conduct of the European merchants or nations in question, etc..

With regard to article 32, the Europeans claimed they could marry whomever they wished, whether they were subjects of the sultan or not. Although their assertion had legality beyond

⁶² Boogert, Maurits Hubrecht van den, *Ottoman dragomans and European consuls. The protection system in Eighteenth-century Aleppo*, Leiden, 2001, passim. For further (quick) reference to the protection system and *harāç*, see İnalçık, “İmtiyāzāt”; Schacht, J., “Amān”, *EI2*, i, p. 429a-430a; Fekete, L., “Berāt”, *EI2*, i, 1170a-1171a; Lewis, B., “Berātli”, *EI2*, i, 1171b; Cahen, Cl., “Dhimmā”, *EI2*, ii, 227a-230a; Cahen and İnalçık, “Djizya”, p. 559a-565b; and İnalçık, “İmtiyāzāt”, p. 1179a-1188b.

⁶³ Transliteration and translation; De Groot, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic*, p. 241-242 and 255.

the capitulations⁶⁴, this had always remained a controversial matter and there had been many cases where a tax-collector, *kādī*, or governor had tested the proportionate strength of both principles by trying to levy *harāç* or other taxes reserved for Ottoman subjects such as *kassāmiye* (*resm-i kismet*; inheritance-tax).⁶⁵ Such cases then had to be resolved by giving bribes and presents to the officials involved, or to various officials in the central administration to obtain a *fermān* confirming the applicability of the capitulatory article. Since this had to be done with some regularity, the European trade organisations pressed the ambassadors and consuls to discourage and prevent as much as possible such “mixed” marriages.⁶⁶ That this policy did not succeed we can infer from the frequent reiteration of orders to that effect.

The *fermān* was also not in direct violation of articles 33 and 34, since it did not order all Ottoman dragomans and vice-consuls to be made liable to *harāç*. As indicated above, this would have meant completely lifting their protection, making it virtually impossible for them to exercise their duties. We can be absolutely certain that the Porte had no intention of dislocating the foreign trade of the empire by making it impossible for the Europeans to function within the Ottoman context. Therefore, we may safely discount Colyer’s assertion to the contrary as an exaggeration designed to alert the home front to the seriousness of the problem.⁶⁷

As becomes clear from Colyer’s further correspondence on the matter and is corroborated by a number of other sources, the grand vizier’s order was aimed at curbing the practice of the European representatives of selling nominal positions (i.e. *berāts*), which was considered a dangerous erosion of the Ottoman tax-base. The extent and consequences of the protection

⁶⁴ Khadduri, Majid, *War and peace in the law of Islam*, Baltimore, 1995, which is a summary of Islamic jurisprudence and Ottoman law on relations between Muslims and non-Muslims: “Once the harbī becomes a *musta’min*, he is allowed to bring with him his family and children; to visit any city of *dār al-Islām* except the holy cities of the Hijāz; to reside permanently in *dār al-Islām*, if he accepted the status of *dhimmī* and paid the *jizya*; and to marry a *dhimmī* woman and take her back with him to *dār al-harb* (conversely, if the harbī were a woman and married a *dhimmī* man, she had no right to take him with her to *dār al-harb* since this might constitute potential power for use against *dār al-Islām*.” (p. 166) and “If the *musta’min*, after he returned to *dār al-harb*, leaving his property in the *dār al-Islām*, suddenly died; his property could not be taken out of *dār al-Islām* by his heirs; instead, it would be confiscated by the State. But if the *musta’min* died while he was in the *dār al-Islām*, the *amān* granted was still valid for his property; his heirs could therefore take it out of the *dār al-Islām* if they wanted to do so.” (p. 168).

⁶⁵ See Orhonlu, Cengiz, “Kassām”, *EI2*, iv, 735b-736a; and İnalçık, “İmtiyāzāt”, p. 1179a-1188b. The articles in the Dutch capitulation of 1612 exempting the inheritances of Dutch subjects from *kassāmiye*, or from seizure by the sultan if there were no known/recognized heirs, ran; “[art. 7:] If a subject of the Dutch Provinces dies, Treasury officials may not interfere with his goods contrary to the capitulation, saying that they are the property of unknown owners, or on any other pretext.”, “[art. 9:] The dividers of inheritances (*kassām*) and the cadis may not demand the duty on the division of inheritance.”, and “[art. 29:] If a person dies, his goods and possessions must be given to whom he has bequeathed them. If a person dies intestate, they must be given to his local partner by way of his consul. Nobody may interfere.” De Groot, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic*, p. 251 and 254, transliteration on p. 238 and 241.

⁶⁶ Two such cases are discussed extensively in Olnon, “Towards classifying *avantias*”, p. 159-186. Daniel-Jan de Hochepeid tells us that consular protection was henceforth withdrawn from English and Dutch merchants who had taken local wives. ARA, CS 684, f. 49a-50a. For instructions concerning such marriages and the actions to be taken against merchants contracting them, see the States General’s draft regulation of 1673 and order of 1675, in Dam van Isselt, W.E. van, “Het ontwerp-regeeringsreglement voor de Levant van 1673 en het Formulier van 1675, *BVGO* as *BVGO*, vi (1907), p. 379-429, 407-288; and the Levant Company’s instructions to John Finch’s successor to the Istanbul embassy, James Chandos, in Public Record Office (Kew), SP 105/145, f. 82-92.

⁶⁷ See footnote 59.

system are matters still under discussion. Maurits van den Boogert has recently shown that the large numbers generally thought to have been involved, need considerable downward adjustment, particularly when talking about the 17th seventeenth and early 18th centuries.⁶⁸ But, nonetheless, the phenomenon clearly worried Kara Mustafā worried. March 13nd, Colyer further informed the States General about the matter:

More and more each day, they continue to treat the Christian nations here very badly, and to utterly destroy the capitulations with the sole purpose of eventually making not only all our merchants, be they married or bachelor, tributaries of this realm, but also of subjecting them to its laws, thereby extracting their masters' subjects and goods from the jurisdiction of their respective Christian ministers to the total ruin of all commerce. Our and the other capitulations clearly state that married and single Franks [Western Europeans] should not be made to pay *harāç*, which is tribute. This, the grand vizier has now interpreted to the contrary with regard to those married, and has given strict order to collect the tribute from them. By this they are brought under the law of the land, outside our protection, and their goods in life as in death under the violence of the Turks. All complaints, arguments and remonstrances were rejected, and the requested audiences about this with the grand vizier were refused with threats. All ministers are stuck and stand with their hands tied, and the dragomans dare not raise the matter for fear of being treated very badly. I have several times addressed the Lords ambassadors of England, France, and Venice, and suggested it might be wise to jointly, but separately, submit our memorandums on this serious matter to the grand vizier. They showed willing to do so, but none of them has so far started. [...] We have three merchants here, who are married; De Brosses, Van Breen, and Croesen, *whom I hope to liberate from the said tribute by giving each of them a title of consul of some small scale* [port] hereabouts. At the moment I am attempting this, but success is not assured. But the principle matter meriting your attention, is the consequence and outcome, for it is very clear to us that, if the interested kingdoms and republics of Christendom do not take joint action, all unmarried merchants will with certainty be treated in like manner, and they themselves as well as their effects will be placed beyond the authority of the ministers (as indicated above), which would make it inadvisable for anyone to send his effects here. For a tributary that dies here, whether he has children or not, the Turkish hand is immediately put on his home, and if there are children, it divides the inheritance and collects ten to a hundred for itself; and if there are no children or known heirs of the same blood, the inheritance is kept under the rule of Turkish justice until a legitimate heir appears.⁶⁹

The grand vizier had left Istanbul to join the sultan's hunt shortly after having issued the *fermān*. But since this was a matter of such consequence that it needed his constant support to be enforced (as we will see below), execution of the order was delayed until the signing of the Treaty of Zurawno with Poland and his return to Istanbul in the second week of March.⁷⁰ Upon the court's return to Istanbul, final preparations for the upcoming Ukrainian campaign immediately started, feeding assumptions of the European representatives that the sole purpose of the *harāç* order had been to raise money for the campaign. And indeed, with Kara Mustafā back in Istanbul, the *voyvoda* (district governor) of Galata rather half-heartedly started collecting the poll-tax from some European subjects. In order for us better to understand subsequent events, it is necessary to discuss them in light of their broader administrative and political context.

⁶⁸ Van den Boogert, *Ottoman dragomans and European consuls*, passim. Interesting in this context, is Galland's assertion that "Ils [the Venetians] ont un consul à Smyrne avec quatre marchands seulement. Mais le consul a près de 1200 Grecs de Tines sous sa protection, ou se faisant passer pour tels pour être exempts du carache, moyennant quoi ils lui donnent un écu chaque année pour reconnaissance; ce qui sert à faire la meilleure partie de ses gages qui auraient été extrêmement diminués si le commandement du Grand Seigneur, que le vizir avait publié pour obliger au carache tous les Francs mariés à des femmes du pays comme les sujets de Sa Hautesse, avait eu lieu." Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 125.

⁶⁹ My italics. ARA, SG 6913, Justinus Colyer to SG, 1 March 1678.

⁷⁰ A full contemporary Dutch translation of the treaty of Zurawno (or Zarnów as it was known in Europe at the time; Izvence in Turkish), which is dated 7 March 1678, can be found in *ibid.*, 13 March 1678.

Imposition of harāç - alliances and the struggle for power (1678-1682)

Galata and Pera, across the Golden Horn from Istanbul proper, were the townships where the majority of Istanbul's non-Muslims and all Europeans resided under the protection of their embassies. Together with the township of Üsküdar, on the other bank of the Bosphorus, they constituted the district of *hawāss-ı refī'* or *hāsslar kazāsi*, which was administratively separate from Istanbul proper and had its own civil and "military" governors; a *kādī* and a *voyvoda*. The district belonged to the *hāss-ı hümayūn* (private estates of the sultan; imperial lands) and its tax revenues were assigned to the imperial treasury. In the period under discussion, the treasury annually farmed out the tax revenues from the district as *iltizām* tax farms. The collection of *harāç* from the non-Muslims of Galata and Pera was one of these farms. In 1678, the tax farmer (*mültezim*) that had contracted to collect this *harāç* was Kara Mustafā's client chief customs collector Hüseyin Ağa (I; see Table 1), who had also purchased the post in 1672. For the collection of his revenues, particularly in cases where payment was refused and duress or force was necessary, he depended on the *voyvoda* and his soldiers (*sekbān*), who were specifically appointed to safeguard the treasury's interests.⁷¹

And so it happened that the *voyvoda* of Galata, when confronted with the refusal of the assessed Europeans to pay the desired *harāç*, decided to arrest a number of them - only to release them again without any payment having been made upon complaints of their representatives.⁷² At first sight, this sudden change of heart might seem strange. But it can be accounted for by taking into consideration some of the changes in government that had resulted from Kara Mustafā's departure. Antoine Galland, who had arrived in Izmir on March 8th and followed the matter from there, tells us that;

[...] on avait déjà commencé de l'exiger [the *harāç*] de quelques Français à Constantinople. Mais on cessa de le demander depuis que le Grand Seigneur fut sorti et qu'il eut passé sous ses tentes, hors de la ville, pour se mettre ensuite en campagne. L'on a su que ce fut sur une forte contestation qui se forma sur ce sujet entre le mussahib [*musā'ib*; gentleman in waiting on the sultan/favourite], le grand vizir et le douanier, Hussein Aga, qui avait mis dans la tête du vizir de faire cette contravention aux privilèges accordés à tous les princes chrétiens comme une invention ingénieuse pour tirer une bonne somme d'argent.⁷³

This favourite of the sultan, who managed temporarily to suspend Kara Mustafā's order as soon as the Ottoman court and army had left Istanbul (19 to 21 March) was Musāhib Mustafā Paşa. He had married the sultan's daughter Hatīce Sultān in 1675⁷⁴ and was now engaged in a struggle with the grand vizier for ascendancy at court. But this was not the only power struggle being fought out over Kara Mustafā's control over the financially important customs

⁷¹ Hüseyin Ağa obtained the poll-tax farm in 1672 (Galland, *Journal*, i, p. 87) and also held it in 1678 (Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 123 and 126). In that last year, he travelled to Izmir with two galleys in his capacity of *harāç*-collector to collect from the English nation there 100,000 lion dollars, which was the Ottoman administration's claim on the inheritance of a deceased English merchant (Samuel Pentlow) that had taken a *zimmī*-wife (Van Dam van Isselt, "Avaniën in de Levant", p. 547; Olon, "Towards classifying *avaniās*", p. 159-186.). On *hāss*-lands and their administration, see Orhonlu, Cengiz, "*Khāss*", *EI2*, iv, p. 1094a-1096b; on the *hāsslar kazāsi* in particular, see İnalçık, Halil, "Istanbul", *EI2*, p. 224a.

⁷² Colyer mentions the arrest and release of his physician Henning Wolde (ARA, SG 6913, Justinus Colyer to SG, 23 April 1678), and Galland that of several unidentified Frenchmen (Galland, *Voyage à Smyrne*, p. 123 and 126).

⁷³ *Ibid*, p. 123.

⁷⁴ He died in 1686. *Ibid*, p. 272, footnote 4.

and poll-tax *iltizāms*. As we will see further on, another competitor of the grand vizier (who in the end would cost him his head), Kara Ibrāhīm Paşa, also got involved.⁷⁵

The first days of April, with the army and court still encamped at an hours distance of Istanbul in preparation for the march to the front, the European representatives had sent their dragomans to congratulate Kara Mustafā's newly appointed *kā'immakām* 'Abd al-Rahmān 'Abdī Paşa on his high office.⁷⁶ During these audiences, the new deputy grand vizier had refused to listen to any of their complaints concerning the imposition of *harāç* and had successfully insisted on an enlargement of the gifts usually presented on such occasions, adding "flatly; these are different times now, they should know that the grand vizier is present here, and they should be careful that no complaints are made to him."⁷⁷ Then, on the 30th of April, the campaign was launched and the army and court left the environs of Istanbul. With the commanding presence of the grand vizier out of the way, Colyer immediately detected a change in atmosphere. He had pleaded his cause with Kara Mustafā's interpreter and advisor Mavrocordato, who had undertaken to obtain the new *berāts* for him during the campaign. Colyer had furnished him with the funds to effect the purchase and had good hopes of arranging the matter in the court's absence by handing out bribes.⁷⁸

On 6 July, however, the matter was still unresolved and Mavrocordato's *berāts* had still not arrived. But Colyer had been able to make some progress by petitioning Kara Ibrāhīm Paşa, who had obtained the *sadāret kā'immakāmlığı* while also keeping his post of *kapudan* (grand admiral). It appears he had deliberately cultivated this connection and was now reaping the benefits.⁷⁹ Since the departure of the court the *voyvoda* had started apprehending some Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Venetians over the *harāç*. Their ambassadors had thought it too dangerous to resist publicly the execution of the grand vizier's order and had arranged the matter privately by compensating the *voyvoda*, without openly acknowledging their merchants' liability to the poll-tax. Colyer took a different course and asked Kara Ibrāhīm to hear him against the *voyvoda*. His request was accepted, but it took until 17 August until the hearing actually took place, the reason for the delay in all likelihood being *harāç*-collector Hüseyin Ağa's preoccupation with the Pentlow-affair.⁸⁰ During the hearing of 17 August Colyer produced the Dutch capitulation and the *voyvoda* a *hatt-ı şerif* (an imperial decree written the sultan himself) to the effect that Europeans who had taken *zimmī* wives were liable

⁷⁵ Kara Ibrāhīm Paşa had started out as a protégé of Kara Mustafā Paşa, but gained such prominence that he became a threat to his patron's position, and eventually managed to persuade the sultan to have him executed. See Parmaksızoğlu, İ., "Ibrāhīm Paşa, Kara", *EI2*, iii, p. 1001b; and Kreutel, Richard F., *Kara Mustafa vor Wien: 1683 aus der Sicht türkischer Quellen*, ed. Karl Teply, Graz, Wien, Köln, 1982, index and passim. See also footnote 83.

⁷⁶ On this official, see Babinger, Fr., "'Abdī Paşa", *EI2*, i, p. 97a.

⁷⁷ ARA, SG 6913, Justinus Colyer to SG, 23 April 1678.

⁷⁸ "Sir Mavrocordato has accepted to advance our cause in the army and has promised to send us the new berats and commands [*fermāns*] for the consuls, dragomans and merchants. This, on the condition that we provided him beforehand with all the funds necessary to obtain them, which we have done today. Meanwhile, our merchants have in the matter of the harac not been molested any further then with threats, but beyond execution. Every day we can now observe more clearly that it is solely about money." Ibid., 1 May 1678.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 13 March 1678. The missive describes Colyer's audience of 7 March 1678 with kapudan Kara Ibrāhīm Paşa; an audience which he, by his own admission, intentionally had during the court's absence (when it was on hunting expedition). Colyer tells us that Kara Ibrāhīm "is a gentleman about fifty years of age, of good appearance, and one of the favourites of the sultan." The discussion mainly concerned the Western Europe's navies, their movements and their ships' technical specifications. Significantly, Kara Mustafā's and Kara Ibrāhīm's tenures as *kapudan* signalled the full adoption of sailing galleons as the basis of the Ottoman fleet. Uzunçarşılı, "Bahriyya (3. The Ottoman navy)", p. 948a.

⁸⁰ See footnote 71.

to all imperial taxes, after which the *kā'immakām* promised to consider the matter. Over the next couple of days of sending Dutch chief dragoman Theijls to the *divān* to see where matters stood, it became clear to Colyer and his nation that they too would have to pay off the *voyvoda* if they wanted to keep him at bay. It seemed that even with Kara Ibrāhīm holding the second and third highest posts of the empire (that of *sadāret kā'immakāmi* and *kapudan-ı deryā*) and presiding over the proceedings, the *divān* could not bring itself to rule against the grand vizier on this matter and commit itself openly to Kara Ibrāhīm's cause.⁸¹

Until Kara Mustafā's return to Istanbul on 20 April 1679 matters stayed as they had stood after all European nations had persuaded the *voyvoda* to stop arresting more merchants. But the grand vizier's return to Istanbul immediately tipped the scales it again. With his position very much strengthened after a year in the proximity of the sultan and a successful campaign⁸², and after having Kara Ibrāhīm Paşa dismissed as *kapudan* and *kā'immakām* and demoted to fifth vizier (25 November 1678)⁸³, he seemed as implacable as ever:

Immediately after the said days of rejoicing [in honour of the victorious return of the sultan and grand vizier to Istanbul] all the Lords ambassadors and other ministers requested audiences with the grand vizier. Those of France and England have had theirs the 7th, and your honours' minister, yours truly, the 14th of the previous [month; June], in the same manner as during the previous audience: namely, the grand vizier sitting above, and the said ministers below the sofa. The aforementioned Lords ambassadors of France and England among other discourses spoke of the *harāç* or tribute, which had been instituted against their merchants (that had been married here) the previous year, but they were at once repudiated in the most severe terms, which persuaded the Lord Venetian ambassador and myself not to bring up the subject to avoid further embitterment. [...] Consequently, nothing out of the ordinary happened during my visit, except for the grand vizier during the giving of the presents inquiring of me, whether it was certain that France had evacuated all the places it had previously conquered in our country.⁸⁴

The imposition of *harāç* on foreign merchants with local wives was to remain a contended issue until Kara Mustafā's disgrace and execution in 1683. This is interesting in light of the constant exclamations by the European ambassadors and residents that Kara Mustafā had only issued the *fermān* because he wanted the Europeans to buy him off in the first place. This is the pot calling the kettle black. However convinced they were that the grand vizier was always in desperate need of money with which he could finance his immense household, his campaigns or keep up his standing at court; the fact of this case remains that no matter how much they offered, he never accepted any money to abrogate the order.⁸⁵ One has to wonder; could this have been a matter of principle? In any case, with no further arrests being made over it, it appears that this *fermān* had served its original purpose and was now forgotten. But the issue which it had addressed was never definitively resolved; from time to time similar

⁸¹ ARA, Legatiearchief Turkije (hereafter cited as LAT) 1060, Justinus Colyer, Jan van Breen, Gasparo Charelles, François de Brosses, Jan Croesen and Abraham de Vivier in the Chancery of the Dutch embassy of Istanbul, 20 August 1678. The *voyvoda* was presented with the relatively moderate bribe of 5 vests of Dutch cloth, 5 vests of silk and 30 lion dollars.

⁸² Heywood, "Karā Mustafā Paşa", p. 591b.

⁸³ Parmaksızoğlu, "Ibrāhīm Paşa, Kara", p. 1001b. By the time the Vienna campaign got underway in 1683, Kara Ibrāhīm had been promoted to third vizier and reappointed *kā'immakām* again through the sultan's protection. It was in this capacity that he successfully intrigued against Kara Mustafā when the siege of Vienna failed. After Kara Mustafā's execution (25 December 1683) he succeeded him as grand vizier (December 1683; dismissed 17 December 1685; exiled March 1686; executed June 1687).

⁸⁴ ARA, SG 6913, Justinus Colyer to SG, 29 June 1679; the audience is also described extensively in ARA, CS 684, f. 46b-47a.

⁸⁵ The size and functioning of Kara Mustafā's household, which numbered in the hundreds and hundreds even when he was still *kā'immakām*, is minutely described in a memoir appended to Galland, *Journal*, ii (p. 186-207).

attempts to impose *harāç* on dragomans, vice-consuls, and foreign merchants that had taken local wives, would occur.⁸⁶

The sting is in the tail (1680-1682)

After the troubles with the *harāç*, an increasing irritation with Kara Mustafā is discernible in Colyer's correspondence, even if he managed to stay on relatively good terms with him for the remaining duration of his embassy. Things that would have amused him some years before (such as the stool-incident), he now commented on with growing disgust, even if the Dutch ran no risk at all. This change in attitude is very clear in his correspondence on the problems of the English ambassador, Finch, and the recently arrived new Venetian *bailo*, Cuirano, ran into with Kara Mustafā Paşa and Hüseyin Ağa in October-November 1679 - the former over a large amount of cloth he had imported free of duty under the pretense that it was for personal use, but was now suspected of selling; the latter over a number of slaves that had fled their Ottoman masters and were hiding aboard the two Venetian men-of-war that had carried the new *bailo* to Istanbul.⁸⁷

Colyer's new sympathy for the misadventures of his colleagues, was not reciprocated. His old colleagues were all replaced within the space of a few months, and lacking the support and perhaps advice of his old friend Venetian *bailo* Morosini, he fell victim to the jealousy of the newcomers. In December 1679 an alliance of Genoese ambassador Levanto, Venetian *bailo* Cuirano, French ambassador Guilleragues and English ambassador Finch (who would be recalled in 1681), out of frustration with the preferential treatment Colyer received from Kara Mustafā while at the same time being the lowest-ranking European envoy in Istanbul, decided to make it clear to the grand vizier that he was not an ambassador but a mere resident. They were so successful that the next petition Colyer sent Kara Mustafā was returned with the reply that he should stop referring to himself as *elçi* (ambassador/envoy) and use *kapı kethüdası* (representative of a provincial governor) instead, paired with the imputation that the States General were showing the Porte disrespect by sending an envoy of such low rank to represent them. The result was that the States General decided to make Colyer the first full-fledged Dutch ambassador in Istanbul. With the time it took for correspondence to travel back and forth between Istanbul and Amsterdam (approximately 1½ months each way) it was 10 April 1680 that the States General promoted Colyer, and May that he actually received his promotion.

The last years of Colyer's embassy (which ended with his death in Istanbul on 28 December 1682) and Kara Mustafā's grand vizierate (which ended with his execution in Belgrade on 25

⁸⁶ ARA, LAT 1088, for example, contains a number of Ottoman *fermāns* issued specifically in response to attempts to impose the tax on the Dutch and their protégés: one stating that the Dutch are exempt from *harāç* (1690); one stating that the dragomans, their sons and their servants are exempt from *harāç* (1692); one stating that five servants of the consul of Izmir are exempt from *harāç* (1701); one stating that the dragomans, their sons and their servants are exempt from *harāç* and other taxes (1705); and another one again stating that the Dutch are exempt from *harāç* (1709). PRO, SP 105/334, which is a register of Ottoman *fermāns* concerning the English nation of Izmir during the consulship of William Raye (1677-1703) contains a similar *fermān* "for freeing 5 of the consuls servants from haratch" (f. 27).

⁸⁷ ARA, CS 684, f. 50a-50b. The capitulations stipulated that ambassadors and consuls could import the furnishings, food and drink they needed for private use, free of customs. Although this meant that they were not permitted to sell the duty-free imports, this was of course very difficult for the Ottomans to monitor and transgressions abounded. In the case of the Venetian ships harbouring the runaway slaves, although there were witnesses to the contrary, the Venetians denied having them and refused to hand them over or have their ships visited by the Ottoman authorities. When things came to a head and they were visited with force, all slaves were rowed ashore or thrown overboard.

December 1683) relations between the two became slightly more troublesome, although never to the extent of becoming as discordial or disrupted as had previously been the case with Colyer's colleagues. We should briefly mention two cases that touched upon the basic principles underlying the capitulations; the physical punishment with lethal consequences of Colyer's secretary François de Brosses in the *divān-ı hümayūn*, and the forced renewal of the Dutch capitulation. Despite the seriousness of these issues, they do not seem to have had a profound impact on the way in which Colyer regarded Kara Mustafâ Paşa. And since both cases have received elaborate attention elsewhere⁸⁸, we will limit our discussion of them mainly to what they can tell us about Kara Mustafâ Paşa and his interpretation of the capitulations.

17 May 1680 secretary De Brosses was tried and convicted in the *divān* in connection with a sum of 1,000 lion dollars he had loaned a Greek inhabitant of Istanbul several years earlier. When this original debtor, a woman named Safira, defaulted in August 1679, the debt was taken over by the metropolitan of Chios. However, he denied having incurred it and took his case to the Ottoman authorities. The case was heard by Chief Justice of Rumelia (*Rūmelī kādī-‘askeri*) Hāmid Efendi, who ruled in De Brosses' favour and provided him with a *hüccet* (written proof) to the effect that the loan would expire after a further six months (i.e. in February 1679) and would then be settled by the *kādī* of Galata. The agreed date having arrived, De Brosses dispatched a dragoman to the *kādī* of Galata with the *kādī-‘asker*'s and several other *hüccets* and obligations (*temessüks*) supporting his case, as well as with a *fermān* by Kara Mustafâ ordering the *kādī* of Chios to collect the loan with force if necessary. The *kādī* decided the claim should be taken to Chios, but the person deputised by De Brosses' to collect the debt was surprised by four disguised Turks in the stairwell of the metropolitan's house, severely beaten and robbed of all the documents supporting the case. After this, the metropolitan again denied the debt in front of the *kādī* of Chios, forcing De Brosses to obtain copies of his lost documents from the records of the *Rūmelī kādī-‘askeri*. On De Brosses' request Colyer now successfully petitioned the grand vizier for a *fermān* ordering the *kapudan paşa* and the *kādī* of his fleet to examine the matter. But in the meantime the metropolitan had left Chios and committed himself to the protection of the patriarch of Istanbul, who now filed the case with the *divān-ı hümayūn*. There, matters came to such a head that Kara Mustafâ saw no other means of getting the truth out, than confronting De Brosses with an actual line-up of twenty possible debtors in the assembled *divān*. Between all the false beards - at least so he claimed in his defence - De Brosses failed to point out his debtor the metropolitan whom he had only met once eight months before, and was punished by being bastinadoed, receiving 200 blows under the feet (which eventually led to his death on 16 October 1682).

It was unusual - even during Kara Mustafâ's grand vizierate - for European subjects who lost a lawsuit to be sentenced to physical punishment, and particularly one so stark. Nevertheless, neither the hearing the case in the *divān*⁸⁹, nor the sentence handed down, was contrary to the

⁸⁸ On the De Brosses case, see Dam van Isselt, W.E. van, "De mishandeling van den legatie-scretaris De Brosses te Constantinopel", *BVGO*, 7/viii (1937), p.77-103, which also comprises De Brosses' own description of the event (p. 91-95). On the renewal of the Dutch capitulation, see Van Dam van Isselt, "Avaniën in de Levant", p. 548-556. A French translation of the Dutch capitulation of 7 November 1680 in Noradounghian, Gabriel Efendi, *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman*, i. 1300-1789, Paris, 1897, p. 169-181.

⁸⁹ While lawsuits involving European and Ottoman Muslim subjects were outside their jurisdiction, the consular courts could hear cases (such as this one) between Europeans and *zimmīs*. But if one or all of the parties involved decided to apply to the Ottoman *kādī*-courts, these could also hear them. So as to be better able to protect and represent their subjects in such cases, the European nations had obtained the capitulatory privilege of having cases representing a value of above 4,000 *akçes* (equivalent to 33,33 lion dollars) heard in the imperial

letter of the capitulations - although it might be regarded as going against the spirit; the extending of protection (*amān*) to subjects of friendly nations. So why did De Broses receive a punishment normally reserved for Ottoman subjects? The description of the case Colyer's son-in-law Daniel-Jan de Hoche pied has left us, provides us with a possible answer:

About which [treatment] your honours' said ambassador [Colyer] complained to the grand vizier, but never received satisfaction. But the grand vizier did send him answer that he had not known the said De Broses to have been his Excellency's secretary (although it is certain the vizier knew him full well), adding that he could not have imagined a secretary of an ambassador having a long beard and going about dressed *a la turca* [in the Turkish fashion], as the said De Broses used to do, and even less that he could speak the Turkish language, in which he was proficient, and what's more, that he would come and plea his own case in the full divan, that such was the responsibility of the dragomans, for it has to be noted that even though your honours' ambassador's chief dragoman Theyls had accompanied him, he insisted on defending his own cause against all practice customary there, which was rightly thought to have been the reason that this misfortune befell him, to which the haughty humour of the vizier then in power [Kara Mustafā Paşa], who had long before contemplated the means with which he could taunt and abuse the European nations, will have contributed to no small extent.⁹⁰

Apparently, De Broses' "Turkish manners" had been interpreted by Kara Mustafā as presumptuousness and as such had resulted in his punishment *a la turca*. We know from his correspondence on the matter, that Colyer for one agreed to this. Although it meant the end of his faithful right-hand man, he blamed the event entirely on him and took no further action.⁹¹

The last significant run-in the Dutch had with Kara Mustafā Paşa, concerned their capitulation. Although the first Dutch capitulation (of 1612) had been confirmed in 1634, it had never been expanded, because the States General and the Board of Directors of Levant Trade balked at the prohibitive costs involved in such a project. Instead of regularly seeking to have additional privileges inserted in new capitulations at huge costs and with relatively little effect, as the other capitulatory powers were in the habit of doing⁹², the Dutch policy had always been to depend on *fermāns* confirming and specifying the articles of their's. This policy of constantly renegotiating the application of the capitulation on the basis of individual cases and in response to specific needs, had proven to be relatively inexpensive and effective, but had left them with an outdated document and a large number of *fermāns* to safeguard its validity and relevance.

Then, on 16 August 1680, while hearing a dispute between the Dutch nation of Istanbul and chief customs collector Hüseyin Ağa (I), grand vizier Kara Mustafā Paşa decided he would have no more of this ancient bundle of paper with its "scraped out letters" and confiscated the Dutch capitulation.⁹³ With the capitulation held hostage by the grand vizier, who showed no intention whatsoever of returning it, Colyer was left no other choice then to apply for renewal. He dreaded the States General's reaction and minutely described all his dealings

divān and then only upon the condition that a European dragoman was present. İnalçık, "İmtiyāzāt", p. 1180b-1181a. On the jurisdictions of consular and *kādī*-courts (*mahkemes*) and on their actual functioning in day-to-day practice, see the case studies in Van den Boogert, *Ottoman dragomans and European consuls* (p. 91-174).

⁹⁰ ARA, CS 684, f. 80a-80b.

⁹¹ François, or Francesco, de Broses had been secretary to the Dutch embassy since 1664, vice-chancellor since 1665, provisional resident from 1665 to 1668, and secretary again since 1669, and simultaneously treasurer since 1675. Schutte, *Repertorium*, p. 307.

⁹² For a survey of the history of the capitulations of all nations, see İnalçık, "İmtiyāzāt", passim.

⁹³ ARA, CS 684, f. 81a: "[...] replied that our capitulation was very antiquated and that it contained several scraped out letters".

with the grand vizier to convince them he had acquitted himself of his duties and had opposed as long as possible the forced renewal; in this, he naturally made much of Kara Mustafâ's intransigence. The States General decided in favour of renewal on the condition that the new capitulation should contain various clarifications with regard to articles (of the capitulation of 1612) which had given rise to disputes over the years. After extensive negotiations between Colyer and Kara Mustafâ, it was decided that the Dutch were to receive their new capitulation upon payment of the enormous sum of 33,072 lion dollars. The new Dutch capitulation was eventually handed over 7 November 1680; it contained some minor additions to the articles concerning ambassadorial and consular duties, the shipping of goods for Muslim merchants, and the conversion of Dutch subjects to Islam.⁹⁴

Conclusion

Anyone investigating the European presence in Izmir during the grand vizierates of Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa and Merzifonlu Kara Mustafâ Paşa, cannot be but puzzled by the seemingly contradicting references to the latter. Kara Mustafâ Paşa has gone down in history as a blinded and ruthless xenophobe; yet, his dislike of foreigners did not keep him from having a large residence constructed for himself right next to the English consulate on the main street of Izmir's bustling European quarter during the first years of his grand vizierate.⁹⁵ He is credited with little understanding of the empire's foreign trade and how to administer it; yet, he completed with his own funds his predecessors large-scale construction effort to facilitate that trade and was closely involved with its administration through his association with customs collector Hüseyin Ağa. His interest in the empire's foreign trade is said to have gone no further than regarding it as supplier of ready cash for his own needs; yet, his government's handling of mercantile affairs seems rather to betray efforts to impose a consistent and effective set of rules to come to grips with the elusive flow of European trade through Izmir.⁹⁶

The same kind of contradictions are prevalent in the correspondences of the European envoys in Istanbul and in the broader literature dealing with his politics in general or his person in particular - although one has to look for them very carefully between a mass of unanimous condemnations. As Colin Heywood cautiously suggests in his article on Kara Mustafâ in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, the history of his rule, and by extension perhaps also his personal

⁹⁴ On the taking hostage of the capitulation and the subsequent negotiations for renewal, see *ibid.*, 80b-86a. On the handing over of the new capitulation and the apportionment of the costs of renewal, see ARA CS 676, f. 255b-256b, Justinus Colyer and Dutch Nation of Istanbul to Jacob van Dam and Dutch Nation of Izmir, 21 November 1680. The text of the articles of this new capitulation was almost identical to that of 1612; the abovementioned additions were made to articles 13, 47, 48 and 49.

⁹⁵ In the legend to his famous panorama of Izmir, Dutch artist Cornelis de Bruyn (who visited Izmir in 1678 and again in 1680) noted that the house he had drawn standing smack in the middle of the main street ("Frank Street" as it was called) of the European quarter of Izmir between the Venetian and English consulates was "the house of the vizier Cara Mustafa Pasha, which is the largest and most stately of Frank Street". Bruyn, *Reizen*, p. 24. This residence is not mentioned in the list of "les maisons du pacha" in the memoir appended to Galland, *Journal*, ii (p. 186-207), p. 203, which does include those in Istanbul, Edirne, Lârisa, Merzifon, and Galatasaray (Pera). Since this memoir was prepared between March 1675 and October 1676 (Heywood, "Karâ Mustafâ Paşa", p. 589b), and since Kara Mustafâ - as we have seen above (see the "Interlude" paragraph) - spent most of his time between 1670-1676 in Edirne and on campaign in the Balkans, he most probably had the Izmir residence constructed between his assumption of the grand vizierate in July/November 1676 and De Bruyn's arrival in July 1678; perhaps to oversee the progress of Fâzıl Ahmed's Izmir construction program he was now funding.

⁹⁶ On the Ottoman government's problems with administering this trade prior to the Köprülü era, see Daniel Goffman, *Izmir and the Levantine world, 1550-1650*, Seattle and London, 1990, *passim*.

character, are susceptible to divergent interpretations.⁹⁷ The central question here is whether we should regard him as a grand vizier who managed to destroy in a mere seven years (1676-1683) a legacy it had taken Mehmed and Fāzıl Ahmed Köprülü twenty years (1656-1676) to build, or as a faithful executor of Köprülü policy doing his utmost to conserve and consolidate that legacy of overextension and overdependence on unstable alliances against the odds.

If we discard for a moment the judgments of his contemporaries and look at the bare facts, they overwhelmingly point in that latter direction: As an adoptive son of Mehmed Köprülü, educated alongside Fāzıl Ahmed Köprülü, rising to power through the protection of his adopted father as well as his adopted brother, and successfully serving under both of them, he should certainly be considered a Köprülü grand vizier by pedigree. As for his administration; its make-up shows considerable continuity with that of Fāzıl Ahmed Paşa, to a large extent relying on the same men and political households. Related to this are his foreign policies; both his efforts to stabilise the empire's northern frontier, and those to enhance the administration's control over the international trade of the empire, were a direct consequence and continuation of Köprülü policy. Even his treatment of the European envoys to his government was not all that different from his predecessors, in fact only changing slightly in response to pressing issues and specific circumstances.

Clearly, in discussing someone as notorious as Kara Mustafâ Paşa, we should not trust blindly the judgments and accounts of his European contemporaries, particularly where his reputation as a destroyer of capitulatory rights is concerned. Both sides were operating on certain assumptions under certain pressures to achieve certain goals. It is the historian's task to comprehend all of these as fully as possible before drawing any definitive conclusions. I do not have the pretension that this article succeeded in doing that, but hope at least that it has shown that a re-evaluation of Kara Mustafâ Paşa's rule and character, or, at the very least, his relations with the European envoys to his government, is long overdue.

⁹⁷ Heywood, "Karâ Mustafâ Paşa", p. 591a-591b.