

A STUDY OF THE THIRD ENGLISH AMBASSADOR
HENRY LELLO'S
REPORT ON THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE (1597-1607)

Thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in History

Başak Çeliktemel

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY

2012

“A Study of the Third English Ambassador Henry Lello’s Report on the Ottoman Empire
(1597-1607)”

“Üçüncü İngiliz Elçisi Henry Lello’nun Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ile ilgili Raporu üzerine bir
Çalışma (1597-1607)”

Başak Çeliktemel (108671003)

Prof. Suraiya Faroqhi -----
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Fatma Jale Parla -----

Assoc. Prof. M. Erdem Kabadayı -----

Approval date:

Number of pages:

Anahtar Kelimeler

- 1) Henry Lello
- 2) Hediye verme
- 3) Has adam
- 4) Sarayıçi rekabet
- 5) Baskı ve Katledilme

Key words

- 1) Henry Lello
- 2) Gift-giving
- 3) Favourite
- 4) Palace rivalries
- 5) Suppressions and Murders

ABSTRACT

This M.A. thesis aims to analyze trans-imperial and diplomatic relations within the framework of English Ambassador Henry Lello's report (1597-1607) that is set within the multilayered network of administrative systems between the Ottoman Empire and England during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Lello's report is about palace rivalries, suppressions and murders in the Ottoman Empire. The trans-imperial mediators, in other words diplomats, interpreters and merchants, were among the Sultan's "favourites". The "favourite" was obliged to serve multiple masters/employers within a multilayered network of obligations. While the "favourite" had critical roles in the trans-imperial administrative system, s/he was concurrently servant of the Sultan and the King/Queen. One of the main goals of my thesis, within the framework of Ambassador Henry Lello's report, is to examine different levels of master/employer relationships and gift-giving process that was entrenched within the Ottoman cultural tradition and that eventually became a diplomatic requirement in trans-imperial relations.

ÖZET

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve İngiltere'nin imparatorluklararası diplomatik ilişkiler ağına odaklanan bu yüksek lisans tezi, İngiliz elçisi Henry Lello'nun (1597-1607) raporu çerçevesinde geç on altıncı yüzyıl ile erken on yedinci yüzyıllardaki idari sistemin karmaşık ilişkilerini ve yapısını tarihsel bir analizle gözlemlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Lello'nun raporu, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu saray çevresindeki yarış, baskı ve katledilmeler hakkındadır. İmparatorluklararası aracılar, bir diğer deyişle diplomatlar, çevirmenler ve tüccarlar, Sultan'ın "has adamlar"ından oluşmaktaydı. Bu "has adam", pek çok efendisine/işverenine karmaşık bir zorunluluklar sistemi dâhilinde hizmet etmekteydi. "Has adam" imparatorluklararası idari sistemde kritik rollere sahipken aynı zamanda, Sultan'ın ve Kral'ın/Kraliçe'nin hizmetkârı da olabilmekteydi. Bu bağlamda tezimin temel amacı, İngiliz elçisi Henry Lello'nun raporu ışığında, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda kültürel geleneğin köklü bir parçası olan ve imparatorluklararası ilişkiler sarmalında bir gerekliliğe dönüşen armağan verme sürecine yoğunlaşarak farklı düzeylerdeki "hizmetkâr ve efendi" ilişkilerini incelemektir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to a number of people who made invaluable contribution to my M.A. thesis research and writing process at different stages. I owe special thanks to my thesis advisor, Prof. Suraiya Faroqhi, for her encouragement and inspiring suggestions. I was delighted to study this topic with Prof. Faroqhi not only because of her immense knowledge on the material culture of the Ottoman Empire but also her precious guidance and support which have been so helpful to me as a young historian during this period of my academic life.

I worked at different libraries and research centers throughout the research period of my thesis. I am thankful to various staff members of the following institutions that made this study possible: Boğaziçi University Abdullah Kuran Library, İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations, İstanbul Bilgi University Library. Especially İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM) has been a very supportive working environment throughout my studies.

I would like to express my gratitude to Günhan Börekçi for whole heartedly sharing some important sources with me. Also I would like to thank to Ameer Shorawardy whose work has inspired this thesis along the way. Furthermore I shall acknowledge E. Natalie Rothman's help for sharing her unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Special thanks also go to my family, friends and colleagues. I owe special thanks to my friend Nicola Verderame who was helpful obtaining and translating the *Bailos' Relazionies* which have been crucial sources. Yasin Özdemir has also helped me translating French sources; I acknowledge his help with gratitude. I furthermore would like to thank my family members, Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen, Martin K. Thomen and M. Gökhan Aslan, for their encouragement and immense help throughout conducting my master's research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Sources and Method.....	3
1.2. Summary of the Chapters.....	8
2. CHAPTER ONE: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ANGLO-OTTOMAN TRADE AND DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.....	10
2.1. The First English Ambassador, William Harborne (1542-1617).....	16
2.2. The Second English Ambassador, Edward Barton (1562 (?)- 1597).....	26
3.1. Henry Lello's Ambassadorship (1597-1607).....	33
3.2. The Organ of Thomas Dallam.....	34
4.1. The Ottoman Military Campaigns in Hungary, 1593-1606.....	45
4.1.1. The Grand Vizier Sinan Pasha.....	46
4.2. The Analysis of Henry Lello's Report in Comparison to Other Chronicles.....	48
4.2.1. The Grand Vizier Damad İbrahim Pasha.....	54
4.2.2. The Grand Vizier Hadım Hasan Pasha.....	56
4.2.3. Grand Vizier Cerrah Mehmed Pasha.....	58
4.2.4. The Death of Esperanza Malchi.....	60
4.2.5. Death of Damad İbrahim Pasha.....	63
4.2.6. The Grand Vizier Yemişçi Hasan Pasha.....	64
4.3. The Continuous Ottoman-Habsburg War.....	66
4.3.1. Kaymakam Güzelce Mehmed Pasha.....	68
4.3.2. Yemişçi Hasan Pasha's Supersession and Deaths in Lello's Report.....	71
4.3.4. The Death of Şehzade Mahmud (June 7, 1603.....	73
4.3.5. The Grand Vizier Malkoç Ali Pasha and the Death of Sultan Mehmed III (December 22, 1603).....	77
4.4. Enthronement of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617).....	77
4.4.1. Kasım Pasha's Death.....	80
4.4.2. Grand Vizier Malkoç Ali Pasha's Expedition to Hungary and his Death.....	81
4.4.3. The Death of <i>Kaymakam</i> Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha.....	82
4.4.4. Sofu Sinan Pasha.....	82
4.4.5. Bursa Expedition of Sultan Ahmed I (1605).....	83
4.4.6. The Grand Vizier Lala Mehmed Pasha's Death.....	85
4.4.7. The Grand Vizier Derviş Pasha and his Death.....	86
4.4.8. The Grand Vizier Kuyucu Murat Pasha.....	89
5. CONCLUSION.....	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	96
APPENDIX.....	102

1. INTRODUCTION

The Study of the Third English Ambassador Henry Lello's Report on the Ottoman Empire (1597-1607) is an investigation of English Ambassador Henry Lello's report by utilizing translator Orhan Burian's rereading of it. Although Henry Lello's report reveals the political rivalries and struggles of the seventeenth century Ottoman administration, it has been yet under-investigated subject. One of my main objectives is to understand and explain how Lello's report depicts the Ottoman palace rivalries, suppressions and murders in the palace during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This report is important to understand the Ottoman imperial and trans-imperial courts that witnessed a crucial series of "crisis and changes" in the dynastic, political, socio-economic, and military structures during this period and region when "disunity" and "disobedience" transformed into civil uprisings and military coups.

This research aims to shed light on the dynastic, socio-economic, and military structures of the period, in which we see three different reigns of Ottoman Sultans, respectively, Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-1595), Sultan Mehmed III (r. 1595-1603), and Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617). Also I focus on the reigns of Queen Elizabeth I (r. 1558-1603) and King James I (r. 1603-1625) in England. This research emerges from a keenness to illustrate the relationship between master and servant in the Ottoman imperial and trans-imperial courts. Lello claims that he wrote about the important statesmen in his report. His ultimate goal was to demonstrate the rivalries between important figures of the time and to convey the internal dynamics of the Ottoman Empire. Sultan Ahmed I had to operate in a complicated network of factionalism and favouritism that was occupied by both the members of his court and also the imperial government. Günhan Börekçi

discusses that Sultan Murad III, Sultan Mehmed III and especially Sultan Ahmed I initiated new means of asserting their sovereign authority among the Ottoman ruling elite and the royal favourites in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries,¹ Leslie P. Peirce describes that “the sultan’s authority rested on his ability to maintain control of the ruling elites and satisfy their expectations. The sultan maintained control principally by manipulating factions and preventing any one political constellation from gaining a monopoly of power.”² It is worthy exploring Lello’s report that chronicles these “crises and changes” and other contemporaries. His accounts indeed are in accordance with what Selaniki Mustafa Efendi, Peçevi İbrahim Efendi (as the primary sources), Naima Mustafa Efendi and Joseph Von Hammer Purgstall (as the secondary sources) described in their works.

This thesis also focuses on the important figure of Safiye Sultan who created and manipulated domestic political factions and acted as regent for the *şehzades*. Peirce notes that after the death of Sultan Süleyman in 1566, the Ottoman Empire never fully recovered. Süleyman’s successors had no vigor and ability and this “opened the door to the meddling of harem women who did not hesitate to exploit their influence over “weak-minded” sultans to satisfy their “lust” for power and wealth. Clearly, this crisis had political preoccupation of its period about the power of Ottoman women sultanate. There was a distinction between the young and old generation of Ottoman women sultanate. “One aspect of this generational divide was the control by the senior generation of the sexual activity of the junior, reproductively active, generation. The close of control of

¹ Günhan Börekçi, *Factions and Favourites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-17) and his Immediate Predecessors*, Ohio State University: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 2010, pp. 150-153.

² Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, USA: New York-Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. ix-x.

sexually active, childbearing women in traditional Islamic culture is well-known, but it is important to note that the behaviour of males was also scrutinized. The junior generation was subordinated not only to elder females but also to ‘postsexual’ female elders. A major error in the modern critique of royal women’s power is the failure to recognize the distinction between female generations.”³

My interest in studying Lello’s report within the backdrop of this fascinating period struck my curiosity more in this subject. The interrelations between various events and occurrences of the period and important figures allowed me to see the connections and continuities with this very report.

1.1. Sources and Method

This research utilizes various archival sources in the forms of governmental reports, bureaucratic correspondence and other related unofficial sources. English Ambassador Henry Lello’s report is an essential source to trace the diplomatic negotiations between Ottomans and other states of the time. Apart from Lello’s report, I focus on certain chronicles that were written in the same period such as the chronicles of Selaniki,⁴ Peçevi,⁵ Naima⁶ and Hammer.⁷(Naima and Hammer were not contemporaneous with Selaniki and Peçevi) In doing so, I employ a comparative

³ Peirce, 1993, p. viii-ix.

⁴ Selâniki, Mustafa Efendi. *Tarih-i Selâniki (1003- 1008/1595- 1600)*, Vol. 2, Mehmet İpşirli (ed.), Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

⁵ Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Peçevi Tarihi II*, Hazırlayan: Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları: 467, Ankara, 1982.

⁶ Naima Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Naima (Ravzatü’l Hüseyin Fi Hulâsati Ahbâri’l-Hâfikayn) I*, Mehmed İpşirli, Türk Tarih Kurumu: Ankara, 2007.

⁷ Hammer (Baron Joseph Von Hammer Purgstall), *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi* Vol. 4, (translated from German.) Mümin Çevik, Üçdal Neşriyat: 1989.

perspective which enables me to pinpoint the differences and similarities between these chronicles and Lello's report's accounts, narratives and structure.

Likewise, Agostino Nani and Leonardo Dona's works are significant to understand the spirit of the early modern period in the Ottoman Empire. They are Venetian diplomats, who were called Venetian *bailos*. Agostino Nani (1555-1622) was in Istanbul between 1600 and 1602. Leonardo Dona (1536-1612) was in Istanbul in the year of 1595.⁸ Dona states that the relations between the ruler and his subjects were characterized in the dynastic and political structures as a series of "crisis and changes" in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Nani suggests that the natural means of tyrannical government and oppression was the natural condition of its subjects.⁹ Nani also notes that "Relations between the ruler and his subject are characterized by violence rather than by common reference to a body of laws and legal institutions. The subjects were caught in the grip of fear because the Sultan was the master of their property and lives. His viziers were suppressed too, for those who have raised the highest level had a reason to fear the most brutal fall. At the slightest incident, the Sultan could 'remove' their heads. But if he 'causes trembling' in everyone around him, he too is ruled by suspicion and fear, for he can trust no one."¹⁰ We can clearly read Lello's entire report via the instrument of these explanations.

⁸ Eric R. Dursteller, "The Bailo in Constantinople: Crisis and Career in Venice's Early Modern Diplomatic Corps", *Mediterranean Historical Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (December 2001), p.30.

⁹ Borekçi, 2010, p. 1.

¹⁰ Agostino Nani, 1603, 35, in Lucette Valensi, *Venice and the Sublime Porte: the Birth of the Despot*, trans.by Arthur Denner, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993, p. 74. Valensi notes that "On Venetian diplomacy and ambassadorial reports, see M. Armand Baschet, *La diplomatie venitienne: les princes de l'Europe au XVI siecle d'apres les rapports des ambassadeurs venitiens*, Paris: H. Plon, 1862. The entire series of reports from the sixteenth century are found in Eugenio Alberi, *Relazioni delgi ambasciatori veneziani al senato durante il secolo decimosesto*, ed. Societa Editrice Fiorentina presso Giorgio Franz in Monaco, 1855. The reports from Istanbul appear in 3rd ser., I (Florence, 1840), 2 (1844), 3 (1855), app. (1863). Seventeenth-century reports are in Da Nicola Barozzi and Guglielmo Berchet, *Le*

Also I rely on some recent scholars' works such as Ahmed Refik,¹¹ Hamit Dereli,¹² Akdes Nimet Kurat¹³ and Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu¹⁴ who have extensively worked on the Anglo-Ottoman relations within a broader political, diplomatic, and socio-economic perspective. Especially, Kurat presents a valuable and detailed study on this topic. I also examine Western historians' works such as Gerald MacLean¹⁵ and Alfred C. Wood's¹⁶ books which are fundamental sources on the travel books and on the Levant Company. Richard Hakluyt's¹⁷ and Susan Skilliter's¹⁸ books are also crucial sources for this research's scope. Caroline Finkel's work, entitled *The Administration of Warfare: the Ottoman Military Campaigns in Hungary, 1593-1606*, is the fundamental monograph analyzing the administration of the Ottoman army within a specific historical context. The book focuses on how the Ottomans used their resources as an army to fight in the northwest of the empire.¹⁹

relazioni degli stati europei lette al senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo decimosettimo, serie II, Francia, Vol. III, Venezia: Dalla prem tip di Pietro Naratovich, 1863. Some of these reports have been reproduced in facsimile in Luigi Firpo, *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al senato, Vol. 13: Costantinopoli, 1590-1793*, Bottega d'Erasmus, Torino, 1984, included in this volume but not in Alberici's collection is a report by Leonardo Dona, present in 1596 (309-370). As Alberici's edition does not follow chronological order, I list the reports in chronological order below and indicate by volume and page number where they appear in his collection." 1993, p. 104.

¹¹ Ahmed Refik Altınay, *Türkler ve Kraliçe Elizabeth 1200 -1255*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Fakültesi, 1932.

¹² Hamit Dereli, *Kraliçe Elizabeth Devrinde Türkler ve İngilizler*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Fakültesi, 1951.

¹³ Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Türk-İngiliz Münasebetlerinin Başlangıcı ve Gelişmesi (1553-1610)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Fakültesi, 1953.

¹⁴ Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı-İngiliz Münasebetleri I (1580-1838)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Fakültesi, 1974.

¹⁵ Gerald MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

¹⁶ Alfred C. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, London: Frank Cass & Co Ltd, 1964.

¹⁷ Richard Hakluyt; Edmund Goldsmid (ed.), *The Principal Navigations Voyage Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*, London & Toronto: by J. M. Dent and Sons Limited, Vol. 3-5, 1927.

¹⁸ Susan A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey 1578-1582*, London: British Academy, 1977.

¹⁹ Caroline Finkel, *The Administration of Warfare: The Ottoman Military Campaigns in Hungary, 1593-1606*, Wien: VWGÖ, 1988, p. 9.

Günhan Börekçi's work which is unpublished Ph.D. dissertation is a helpful source to convey the changing dynamics of power and patronage at the Ottoman imperial court in Istanbul during the early modern Ottoman era.²⁰

For the details of trans-imperial subjects, it is worthy looking at unpublished Ph.D. dissertations: For instance Natalie Rothman extensively discusses the concept of trans-imperial subjects which means “colonial émigrés, redeemed slaves, converts and Christian and Jewish Ottoman subject in Venetian service, articulated geopolitical and ethnolinguistic categories.” In other words they were “the links between changing notions of ‘East’ and ‘West’ ”.²¹ Also she includes other corrections and revisions of the existing literature. Moreover Ameer Sohrawardy explains that the concept of trans-imperial subject with the real actors (or mediators), who were William Harborne, Thomas Dallam and Henry Lello during this period in the Ottoman Empire.²² Additionally, Hedda Reindl-Kiel's work is good source to trace which kinds of gifts were given during these periods. For the Ottoman society the meaning of gifting had hierarchical structures which existed in small groups and sub-groups. The etiquette was used to all hierarchies and also as a part of a person's honour. A special part of this etiquette was covered “by gift exchange which precisely made the status of the present's receiver visible and tangible. Thus gifts established not only real values but also what we might call symbolic capital in kind.”²³

²⁰ Börekçi, 2010, p. 1.

²¹ Natalie Rothman, “Between Venice and Istanbul: Trans-Imperial Subjects and Cultural Mediation in the Early Modern Mediterranean”, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 2006.

²² Ameer Sohrawardy, “Trans-Imperial Mediations of the ‘Turk’: Early Modern Depictions of Ottoman Encounter in English Drama and Non-Fiction Prose”, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Graduate School-New Brunswick, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, The State University, 2010, p. xiv.

²³ Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “Ottoman-European Cultural Exchange: East is East and West is West, and Sometimes the Twain Did Meet Diplomatic Gift Exchange in the Ottoman Empire”, *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies*, State, Province, and the West Volume II, eds. Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey, 2005, p. 114.

Additionally, Fatih Yeşil's master's thesis²⁴ is very helpful to find the fundamental readings for the period under discussion. He focuses on the dynastic marriages that some of the bureaucrats attempted to marry the sultanas in order to gain access into the dynasty and eventually became more powerful.

On the other hand, Peirce also focuses on the same subject suggesting that dynastic marriage "was accomplished primarily by means of the dynasty's control of appointment to office, but also through forms of household patronage, especially the marriage of select officials into the royal family. Women could and did play key roles in all of these sovereign functions."²⁵ Baki Tezcan's Ph.D. dissertation²⁶ is a very helpful source for the early modern Ottoman Empire's bureaucratic life. He shows that between 1578 and 1606 there was a newly developing political patronage system.

Additionally, Maria Pia Pedani's work²⁷ is a crucial research for tracing the Ottoman women's actions such as the Sultan's mothers (*valide*). Above-referred source is especially valuable to trace Safiye Sultan who played an active role in the state-affairs and the patronage activities is an important woman figure for this study.

²⁴ Fatih Yeşil, "III. Selim döneminde bir Osmanlı bürokrati Ebubekir Ratib Efendi" Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi: 2002. His master thesis was published as a book, entitled *Aydınlanma Çağında Bir Osmanlı Kâtibi Ebubekir Râtib Efendi (1750-1799)*, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 2011.

²⁵ Peirce, 1993, pp. 9-10.

²⁶ Baki Tezcan, "Searching for Osman a Reassessment of the Deposition of the Ottoman Sultan Osman II (1618-1622)", Princeton University: 2001. His Ph.D. Dissertation was published entitled *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*: New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

²⁷ Maria Pia Pedani, "Safiye's Household and Venetian Diplomacy", *Turcica*, 32, 2000.

1.2. Summary of the Chapters

This thesis consists of three chapters. In the first chapter, *Establishment of the Anglo-Ottoman Trade and Diplomatic Relations in the Sixteenth Century*, I investigate the trans-imperial relations between England and the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century. I set the historical background by looking at the trade relations between England and the Ottoman Empire in the early sixteenth century. I attempt to compare these trade relations to other European states that engaged in commercial activities in the Ottoman lands. For this purpose I contextualize certain diplomatic relations in the context of gift-giving ceremonies between two states. Gift-giving was a remarkable way to initiate diplomatic and economic relations among world leaders and powers during this period. As I explore the gift-giving practices in the first chapter, I scrutinize it in depth in the second chapter as well.

Unforgettable Competition, the second chapter is about the stories behind these gifts and their visual features. Exploring monumental gift-giving within specific cases not only allow me to study the symbolization of power relations inside the court, but also the status of various state actors and their hierarchies. While gift-giving played a fundamental role in diplomatic relations, it was also a part of larger cultural traditions of the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, the trans-imperial mediators could be ambassadors, interpreters, and merchants; in addition there were Sultan's "favourites" who served his/her multiple masters and/or employers. This relationship between master and servant required a complex system of obligations. The favourites could have a critical role in the trans-imperial administration.

In the third chapter, I demonstrate how the report of the third English Ambassador Henry Lello depicts palace rivalries, suppressions and murders in the empire during this distinct milieu. Lello describes the Ottoman Empire's internal affairs when he was in the Sublime Porte as an Ambassador between 1597 and 1607. His report is worthy investigating in many ways due to its content and descriptions on the consolidation of power in the palace and patronage relations among Ottoman Sultans. In this respect, there were three important official figures about whom I dwell on exploring their positions and power relations between the Ottoman sultan, his favourites and courtiers. The vizier comes who was in charge of administering the Ottoman court. Secondly, the *ulema*, and lastly various court factions and Janissaries and the *sipahis*²⁸ are investigated in order to understand the competing power networks in the Empire.

²⁸ Börekçi, 2010, p. 5.

2. CHAPTER ONE: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ANGLO-OTTOMAN TRADE AND DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

The trade between England and the Ottoman Empire started in the early sixteenth century. Compared to the trade relations between the Ottoman Empire and Genoese and other countries such as, France, Venice, the English were the late comers. Kate Fleet explains that the Genoese merchants played an important role in the development of the early Ottoman economy. They were integrated into the Ottoman economy, like an insider, with their capital and professionalism. In early 1390's Genoese and other European, in other words Latin merchants, operated as tax farmers for the Ottomans. Later in the fifteenth century, also the Latins could be the tax farmers.²⁹ When the Ottomans invaded Rumelia in 1352, they had good relations with Genoese who were having a War with the Venetians. Ottomans granted them some capitulations and the treaty still exists, although the entire text from June 7, 1387 was lost.³⁰

I will scrutinize the commercial and trade relations between England and Ottoman Empire in this chapter. The trans-imperial mediators played an influential role in defining trade relations between England and Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century. Hence, I will examine the mediators such as merchants, ambassadors, and translators along with their different occupations and functions within this milieu. These above-mentioned mediators, employed by the Ottoman Empire, contributed to development of trade and diplomatic relations between these two countries.

“In the sixteenth century European states trading in the Ottoman Empire could be classified in three categories: states to which the sultan granted treaties of capitulations

²⁹ Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*, Cambridge University Press: 1999, pp. 134-139.

³⁰ Halil İnalçık, *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, “Osmanlı Dönemi Kapitülasyonların Karakter ve Mahiyeti”, İhvan-ı Safâ, İskit: 2000, p. 247.

embodying rights of extra-territoriality, states which obtained treaties of peace and friendship allowing them the privileges of official representation at the Porte and of freedom of trade in the Ottoman domains, and non-treaty states.”³¹

Particularly, France established itself as the pre-eminent Western power in diplomatic and commercial relations with Ottoman Empire in the early sixteenth century. Although the date of the treaty of capitulations was known as 1536, Gilles Veinstein propounds that this is not factual; actually France gained the first capitulation on October 18, 1569.³² Claude du Bourg was sent to organize the treaty and eventually he obtained it without further difficulty. Ambassador Noailles states that this treaty of 1572 was the most advantageous of all times.³³

Under this capitulation, France gained jurisdiction over the Christian traders in order to enter and trade within the ports of the empire by using the French flag. In this way Christian merchants were under the protection of the French ambassador and consuls.³⁴ Furthermore, France shared those privileges with Venice but in the Ottoman ports and territories, it just privileged itself.³⁵ If other countries were trading, they were obliged to pay tax to France. Differently, England was exempted of paying taxes to France, firstly England tried to initiate and establish strong relations with the Ottoman Empire by sending skillful merchants. By this way England aimed to be a power in Mediterranean -like Venice and France- without being forced to pay these taxes. Levant

³¹ Arthur L. Horniker, “Anglo-French Rivalry in the Levant from 1583 to 1612”, *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Dec., 1946), p. 291.

³² Gilles Veinstein, “Les capitulations Franco-Ottomanes de 1536 sont-elles encore controversables?” *Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community*, eds. Markus Koller, Vera Constantini, Brill, 2008, pp. 73-74. I am grateful to Yasin Özdemir for his translation from French.

³³ Quoted in İnalçık, 2000, p. 248

³⁴ Horniker, 1946, p. 289.

³⁵ Refik, 1932, p. 5.

Company's³⁶ activities were delayed and England was so far from the Ottoman Empire.³⁷ Consequently, it could be suggested that the diplomatic relations between England and Ottoman Empire began later than other states. One of the main reasons of this delay was the late English political consolidation that resulted in limited number of merchandises. After 1550's, the attitudes of some merchants in Levant Company changed England's future.

England considered Islam as a mediating force in its internal conflicts. After Queen Elizabeth (r.1558-1603) was excommunicated by the Pope, she proposed an imperial trade alliance with the Ottomans. English citizens supported the decision of the Queen and accepted to enter Ottoman ports. The 'Turks' as being the symbol of Ottomans did not have a good reputation among the English. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, English conceived the 'Turks' as 'Terrible Turk'. Lucette Valensi explains "the concept of 'Terrible Turk' that the awesome empire of the Grand Signor inspired a fascination. This was combined with an admiration and aversion, yet never sympathy or support. However, the Great Signor was still considered as Christians' greatest enemy although it was only hinted."³⁸ Well, he certainly was an enemy of the Habsburgs. During these periods there was not the concept of Ottoman or Ottomannes yet, which actually became available later on. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the so-called notorious reputation of 'Turks' was apparently common among the Europeans. Due to Ottoman Empire's overwhelming power and strong army, the Grand Turk 'holds in his hands the keys to all Christendom, such that he could easily penetrate

³⁶ Levant Company or Turkey Company was an English company whose aim was to regulate English trade with the Ottomans.

³⁷ Kurat, 1953, p. 1.

³⁸ Valensi, 1993, p. 23.

the Christians's entrails,' states Marco Minio in 1522."³⁹ Another explanation is made by the unknown chronicle author from Ferrara: "the Grand Turk tortured 30 thousand people, when the Turkish army of 300 thousand soldiers sieged Constantinople to occupy the city in May 29, 1453. And following day the Turks occupied the fortress (Pera) where the Genoese were located. After conquering the fortress, the Grand Turk caused many atrocities by having the emperor of Constantinople and number of seigneurs and chivalries beheaded and murdering the rest of the residents of the city."⁴⁰

Although the image of 'terrible Turk' was present, England started to be more tolerant to the newly formed trade relationship with the Ottoman Empire.⁴¹ Thereby it was expected that this relationship would have contributed to England's future commercial interests, which was to gain more privileges. The first privilege was given to a successful English merchant, Anthony Jenkinson, by Sultan Süleyman (r. 1520-1566) just before Sultan Süleyman went to war to Aleppo against Persia. Even though it is not certain, one of the sources claims that this privilege was probably given in December of 1553.⁴² According to historian Susan A. Skilliter, quoted from British geographer Richard Hakluyt's "Voyages", the privilege was given between December 7, 1553 and March 24, 1554.⁴³ According to Hakluyt's records, before Jenkinson's attempts, there

³⁹ Minio, 1572, p. 75 in Valensi, 1993, p. 28.

⁴⁰ *Diario ferrarese dall'anno 1409 sino al 1502 di autori incerti*, ed. G. Pardi, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, 2nd edn, xxiv, pt 7, Bologna: 1928-33, p. 37, in Giovanni Ricci, *Türk Saplantısı: Yeniçağ Avrupası'nda Korku, Nefret ve Sevgi*, İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005, p. 31.

⁴¹ Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 1. For detailed information on the subject of trans-imperialism see Rothman, 2006.

⁴² Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 9.

⁴³ Skilliter, 1977, p. 7 Order (ferman) from Süleyman I to the officials of Tripoli in Syria, Constantinople, Alexandria, and all the cities and towns in the Ottoman Empire, on behalf of Anthony Jenkinson. Aleppo, [between 7 December 1553 and 24 March 1554].

were also several visits of English merchants to the Levant between 1511 and 1534⁴⁴ and between 1550 and 1553.⁴⁵

Jenkinson's privilege was granted to him alone as a result he was protected against taxes when he was trading in the Ottoman ports. Jenkinson did not try to benefit from this privilege because at that time Muscovy Company was founded which granted to English merchants immense trade privileges in Russia and suitable land for English cotton trade.⁴⁶

Skilliter queries why Sultan Süleyman granted him privileges without getting any diplomatic support and wealth in return. She also questions whether a historian should believe the fact that Sultan Süleyman was so impressed by the young Jenkinson. But, Skilliter does not answer these questions.⁴⁷ Anthony Jenkinson was a good merchant and he was successful in gaining the privilege. Kütükoğlu notes that not only he gained the privilege from Sultan Süleyman but also he succeeded to take a letter from the Russian Czar. This letter was a permission of trading in Russian ports.⁴⁸

After Anthony Jenkinson's initiation there were some other English citizens who lived and traded in the Ottoman lands for a period of time. Not only the merchants but also the residents were important figures who contributed to establish commercial and political relations between the Empire and England. One of these figures was William Denis who lived in Istanbul's *Avrat Pazarı* district in 1560. Also William Malim, who spent eight months in the Empire, kept a journal in Istanbul in 1564. Another resident

⁴⁴ See more; Hakluyt, Goldsmid, 1927, p. 2

⁴⁵ See more; Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. 3, 1927, p. 50.

⁴⁶ Kütükoğlu, Vol. 3, 1974, p. 9.

⁴⁷ Skilliter, 1977, p. 9.

⁴⁸ Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 10.

was Thomas Cotton who spent a week on September 14-23, 1566 in Istanbul. Cotton published newsletters on English residents and England.⁴⁹

Another important merchant was Thomas Cordell who was the member of Mercer's Company and Spanish Company in 1577. Cordell was also the director of the Levant and East India Companies; additionally he was a member of the Venice Company. Cordell was known as the pioneer of the new drive to establish trade with the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁰

During Queen Elizabeth's reign English traders were seen in Mediterranean lands much more than before, particularly after Battle of İnebahtı (Battle of Lepanto) in 1571.⁵¹ Battle of İnebahtı was between the Crusade Armada and the Ottoman Navy. Significantly this was the first defeat of the Ottoman Navy.⁵² England had started to pursue trade Mediterranean directly since 1573. In the early years, the merchants' ships appeared in Christian sides of Mediterranean but after 1579-80 they also started to appear in the Eastern Mediterranean. The detailed information on the English attempts to establish official trade relations with the Ottomans will be covered in the following chapters. Queen Elizabeth proposed an imperial trade alliance with the Ottoman Empire against Catholic Spain. When Queen Elizabeth was excommunicated by the Pope in February 1570, she and her followers had isolated themselves from Catholic Europe. There was also a struggle between the Protestant sovereign - the Queen - and Catholic Spain.⁵³

⁴⁹ Skilliter, 1977, p. 10.

⁵⁰ Skilliter, 1977, p. 11.

⁵¹ Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 7.

⁵² See, Nicola Capponi, *Victory of the West: The Story of the Battle of Lepanto*, Oxford, UK: MacMillan, 2006; Roger Crowley, *Empires of the Sea: The Siege of Malta, the Battle of Lepanto, and the contest for the center of the World*, United Kingdom, London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2009.

⁵³ Lisa Jardine, "Gloriana Rules the Waves: Or, the Advantage of being Excommunicated (and a Woman)", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Sixth Series)* 14: 2004, p. 211.

2.1. The First English Ambassador, William Harborne (1542-1617)

England sent an ambassador after it began trading with the Ottoman Empire. William Harborne was the first ambassador and was born at Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, around 1542.⁵⁴ He was one of the preeminent bailiffs in 1571 then he was elected in the parliament in 1575 yet. This election was rescinded the same year. England aimed to gain trade relations with the Ottoman Empire on regular basis by assigning the first ambassador in the mid-sixteenth century, approximately 1575.

Harborne played a crucial role in defining diplomatic relations between England and the Ottoman Empire. He investigated the conditions of Ottoman diplomacy and was assigned to organize the relations between the Ottoman and English masters - sultan/queen- namely Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-1595) and Queen Elizabeth. Harborne was named as a “servant” of both Queen Elizabeth and Sultan Murad III who are his “masters.” As a “servant” he was assigned to contribute to trade relations effectively between England and Ottoman Empire.⁵⁵ Hence, Harborne presented himself at the Sublime Porte with a letter from Queen Elizabeth to Sultan Murad III on March, 15 1579.⁵⁶ The Queen’s letter was written to ask the Sultan Murad III to obtain free trade in the Ottoman domains under the English flag.⁵⁷ Additionally, in Queen Elizabeth’s epistle, it was emphasized that the Queen was “the most invincible and most mighty defender of

⁵⁴ Skilliter, 1977, p. 34.

⁵⁵ Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 13. Here, being a “servant” does not mean that Harborne is from lower-class. He is the mediator of the trade relations between Ottomans and England, helping the traders and their agents/servants.

⁵⁶ Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. 3, 1927, pp. 51-52.

⁵⁷ Germigny report, March 24, 1580 to Henry III, in Arthur Leon Horniker, “William Harborne and the Beginning of the Anglo-Turkish Diplomatic and Commercial Relations”, *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol.14, No. 3, 1942, p. 295.

the Christian faith against all kind of idolatries, of all that live among the Christians, and falsely profess the Name of Christ.”⁵⁸

As a trans-imperial mediator, Harborne accompanied the two great Londoner merchants, Edward Osborne and Richard Staper, in their travels to the Ottoman Empire. The aim the Levant Company was to regulate English trade with the Ottomans.⁵⁹ Harborne also entrusted the tasks of the representatives of Osborne and Staper to have commercial privileges in the Empire. Osborne and Staper⁶⁰ sent following agents⁶¹ via Poland to Istanbul: Joseph Clements (as the agent of Osborne) and John Wright (as the agent of Staper). These two agents acted as servants and mediators for their masters. Clements and Wright had represented their masters’ occupations and wealth in the Empire. Joseph Clements stayed in Istanbul for eighteen months to secure a safe conduct from Sultan Murad III by the mediation of William Harborne. Hence, Edward Osborne succeeded to get free access into the highness dominions.⁶²

As it was noted before, England became isolated from Catholic Europe after the Queen’s excommunication in 1570. Indeed she was interested in developing relations with Ottoman Empire. Harborne was also known by the Ottomans as a ‘Lutheran *elçisi*’ or Lutheran Ambassador⁶³ who was responsible in Ottoman Empire for the citizens of Protestant states. Harborne was also a member of the Church of England, he inclined

⁵⁸ Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. V, 1927, p. 175.

⁵⁹ Horniker, 1942, p. 294.

⁶⁰ He was apprenticed when he was seventeen to William Hewett who was a cloth-worker and one of the principal merchant in London. In 1561, Osborne had become a famous merchant in London. Richard Staper was a less prominent merchant than Osborne. However Staper was a significant actor of the trade with Ottomans and East India. Albert Lindsay Rowland, *English Commerce and Exploration in the Reign of Elizabeth*, Burt Franklin, New York: 1968, pp. 5–7. Edward Osborne was born in Kent probably in 1530.

⁶¹ Samuel C. Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose Islam and England during the Renaissance*, New York, Oxford University Press: 1937, p. 152

⁶² Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. 3, 1927, p. 51.

⁶³ Skilliter, 1977, p. 37.

towards Calvinism. According to the Ottomans, the English were Protestants who had rebelled against the Pope. In Islamic terms, ‘Lutheran *mezhebi*’ -the Lutheran sect- was in opposition to the Pope’s sect.⁶⁴

It was not the first time for the Ottoman Empire to ally with a non-Muslim state against a mutual enemy. Ottomans cooperated with the Byzantine in the fourteenth century. Christine Isom-Verhaaren notes that “The Ottomans and the French viewed their allies from multiple perspectives, not solely as adherents of different religions, and their religious differences did not prevent them from pursuing joint military action against their mutual enemies. The Ottomans were one “other” for western Europeans and to the Ottomans the western Europeans were also an “other”, but it is crucial neither to exaggerate nor to minimize the differences between them. The Ottomans were not the same as the French, the Italians, the Spanish, the English, or the Germans, but neither were they an alien people with any connections to their neighbours to the west and north.”⁶⁵ Harborne was respected by the Ottomans because he was the Ambassador of Lutherans who was against the Pope, in other words the Catholic Church.

As a mediator Harborne established close relations with the principal people of Seraglio.⁶⁶ Some of the administrators with whom Harborne was in contact were the following: The Grand vizier Sokullu Mehmed Pasha,⁶⁷ his doctor Salamon,⁶⁸ Sultan

⁶⁴ Skilliter, 1977, pp. 36-37.

⁶⁵ Christine Isom-Verhaaren, *Ottoman-French Interaction, 1480-1580: A Sixteenth Century Encounter*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago: 1997, p. 2. Her Ph.D. Dissertation was published entitled *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century*, London&New York, I. B. Tauris& Co. Ltd., 2011.

⁶⁶ W. Eton, *A Survey of the Turkish Empire*, London, 1801, republished England: Gregg International, 1972, p. 396 in Yeşil, 2002, p. 22. The term of “seraglio” symbolizes the centre of administration in the Western sources. But this term was changed as “Porte” or “Sublime Porte” in the beginning of seventeenth century.

⁶⁷ Ethnically Bosnian, Sokullu Mehmed’s real name was Mehmed Sokoloviç. He was born in Sokoloviçi village in Rudo of Visegrad in 1505. After he was appointed as Kaptan-ı Derya, he managed to be grand

Murad III's master Hoca Saadeddin Efendi⁶⁹ and lastly the “dragoman” of *Divan-ı Hümayun* Mustafa Çavuş (Beg).⁷⁰ It is important to note that the term ‘mediator’ was generally used for people from superior classes.⁷¹

Akdes Nimet Kurat notes that Harborne had given gifts to Sokullu Mehmed Pasha.⁷² Obviously, gifting was very important for the sake of constructing diplomatic relationships and mediating trade. The principal administrators of Seraglio played a crucial role in social and diplomatic terms among the authorities. Functional mediators like Harborne facilitated by building social, economic and diplomatic ties. These connections served Harborne to reach the culmination of his career which was the letter from Sultan Murad III to Queen Elizabeth (dated 8 Muharram 987/March, 15 1579, Constantinople). This letter contained information about Harborne and the English merchants -Staper and Osborne- that they had full freedom of trade in the Ottoman domains, similar to the French and Venetian merchants.⁷³ This letter was the first official document which was sent from the Sublime Porte to England.⁷⁴ William Harborne left Istanbul to deliver the letter at the end of March, in 1579.

In addition to the letter of Sultan Murad III, Mustafa Çavuş (Beg), the translator of the Sublime Porte, wrote another letter that was addressed to Queen Elizabeth on

vizier. Radovan Samarcic, *Dünyayı Avuçlarında Tutan Adam: Sokullu Mehmed Pasha*, İstanbul: Gençlik Yayınları, 1995, p. 8.

⁶⁸ The real name of this Jewish doctor was Salamon. Samarcic, 1995, pp. 346-347.

⁶⁹ Born in 1536 in İstanbul, Hoca Saadeddin had a good education. After the death of Nevali Efendi, who was the teacher of Mehmed III, or in some sources Molla Nasuh Efendi, he became Mehmed III's new teacher. After Mehmed Efendi's death Şeyhülislam Bostanzade became the twenty-second *Şeyhülislam* of the Ottoman Empire in 1598. Abdurrahman Daş, *Osmanlılarda Münşeât Geleneği, Hoca Saadeddin Efendi'nin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Münşeâtı*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2003, pp. 100-102-103.

⁷⁰ Kütükoğlu, 1974, p. 11-12; Çavuş were used as an ambassador who shaped Ottoman and European diplomatic relations as a mediator, Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p. 44.

⁷¹ Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 13.

⁷² Kurat, 1953, p. 21.

⁷³ Skilliter, 1977, p. 55.

⁷⁴ Kurat, 1953, p. 22.

March, 15 1579. Mustafa *Çavuş* was also a mediator in commercial and diplomatic relationships between England and the Ottoman Empire. The main argument of the letter was that Mustafa *Çavuş* helped Harborne in order to gain some privileges.⁷⁵ Additionally Mustafa *Çavuş* pointed out that he was able to give assistance to Queen Elizabeth's Sacred Royal Majesty against all their enemies. Also he confirmed the full alliance of Sultan Murad III.⁷⁶

English authorities aimed to make a stronger alliance with the Ottoman Sultan against the King of Spain because of the plans to start a war with Catholic Spain.⁷⁷ In order to gain a more comprehensive alliance, Queen Elizabeth sent a response to the Sultan on October 25, 1579 via Harborne and Mustafa *Çavuş* to the Sultan Murad III.⁷⁸ She requested not only the granting of the privilege to Harborne, Osborne and Staper, but also asked for admission of all Englishmen for trading in the Ottoman lands. Queen Elizabeth's second request was about the liberty of all English captives especially in the North of Africa. Lastly, the Queen noted that Ottoman merchants were able to trade in England where they could find abundance of utilities. The letter was not only about the commercial relations but also was on other political and religious issues. In the letter the Queen emphasized that Ottomans and English believed in the same God in opposition to the Catholics. Hereupon, the Queen aimed to maintain a strategic alliance which contained commercial, political and religious ties. Queen Elizabeth also wrote a letter to

⁷⁵ Kurat, 1953, p. 32.

⁷⁶ Skiliter, 1977, p. 59.

⁷⁷ Dereli, 1951, p. 77; Refik, 1932, p. 4.

⁷⁸ Kurat, 1953, pp. 23-25.

Mustafa *Çavuş* by thanking him for leading Harborne. Also she added that she was looking forward to having his help in the future.⁷⁹

Harborne returned to Istanbul with Queen's letter at the end of 1579 or probably in the beginning of 1580. Harborne struggled to release the treaty until the end of the May of 1580. He had bribed some administrators in the Sublime Porte. The Grand vizier Sokullu Mehmed Pasha and Mustafa *Çavuş* helped him very much to finalize the agreement. Richard Hakluyt notes that the agreement was completed on June 1580.⁸⁰

In brief, this treaty allowed England to gain rights similar to the French and Venetians which were dealt with mainly trading under the English flag in the Ottoman domains. Indeed, the treaty was just one-sided. It contained twenty two clauses which guaranteed English merchants a safe trade, in other words exclusion of any forms of inhibition, capture and attack in the Ottoman Empire. This treaty of 1580 was the first official agreement between Ottoman Empire and England.⁸¹ Afterwards, Mustafa *Çavuş* wrote a letter to Queen Elizabeth in June 1580, advising Queen Elizabeth to send an ambassador to Istanbul for the confirmation of the agreement.⁸²

Ottoman Sultan aimed to develop trade with the English for cheaper English textile and raw materials such as steel and tin for weaponry. Furthermore some English merchants were granted some capitulations in 1580 similar to the French case. As was practiced before the English ships were trading under French flag. In addition, Harborne could manage to obtain another treaty against the intrigues of French and Venetians. Sultan confirmed this treaty with Queen Elizabeth. However the Dutch merchants

⁷⁹ Kurat, 1953, pp. 25-26; Rowland, 1968, pp. 11-12.

⁸⁰ Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. 3, 1927, p. 57.

⁸¹ Kurat, 1953, pp. 31-32.

⁸² Kurat, 1953, pp. 40; 183-185; Dereli, 1951, pp. 128-130.

continued trading under the English flag but this caused some difficulties. The Dutch were finally granted capitulations in 1612.⁸³

Pedani notes that after the discovery of new documents, the so-called claim of ‘Turks are not merchants’ has been refuted.” The first instance of an economic activity undertaken by an Ottoman subject was in Venice in 1384. A *çavuş* of Sultan Murad I developed pleasant relations with the Venetians, also possible alliance with the Genoese. Between 1500 and 1550 the Sultan’s envoys were travelling in Venice frequently. When another envoy left Venice in 1525, two brigs were needed to carry his goods. And other envoy arrived in Istanbul with silk cloths worth 1500 ducats. It can be suggested that, Ottoman trade increased in Venice in the early sixteenth century.⁸⁴

During the establishment of the Levant Company or the Turkish Company, Edward Osborne and Richard Staper took Muscovy Company’s activities as a model. Edward Osborne was officially selected as the governor of the company. After the establishment, members declared to Queen Elizabeth their desire to trade with the Ottoman Empire. Queen Elizabeth permitted Osborne, Staper and the other ten merchants for trading in the Ottoman Empire for seven years on September 11, 1581.⁸⁵ Initially, English traders were very young and inexperienced thus, William Harborne was appointed as an agent in Ottoman Empire.⁸⁶ Queen Elizabeth determined that Levant Company should have paid Harborne’s salary and expenses such as the gifts given to the Sultan and administrators of Seraglio.⁸⁷ Levant Company’s members accepted to pay

⁸³ Halil İnalcık, *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, “Osmanlı Dönemi Kapitülasyonların Karakter ve Mahiyeti”, *İhvan-ı Safâ*, İskit: 2000, pp. 248-249.

⁸⁴ Maria Pia Pedani, “Between Diplomacy and Trade: Ottoman Merchants in Venice”, *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire*, Paris-Louvain-Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2008, pp. 3-4-9.

⁸⁵ Kurat, 1953, p. 43.

⁸⁶ Kurat, 1953, p. 46.

⁸⁷ Rowland, 1968, p. 24.

Harborne's salary and expenses. Then, Queen Elizabeth signed and approved an enactment of trading to the Levant Company and sent it to Harborne on November 20, 1582 at the Windsor Palace in London.

Gradually Harborne was given various titles; eventually he became the representative of Queen Elizabeth and England. Queen Elizabeth firstly announced Harborne as 'our ambassador' to Sultan Murad III.⁸⁸ Later on, she defined his position as the public spokesman, in other words the substitute of an agent.⁸⁹ The reason behind this change might have been economic support of the Levant Company. Harborne was indeed responsible for trading thus he became an agent of any commercial relation. Literally, Harborne was a 'noble and legal ambassador' of England.⁹⁰ Preeminently, he was the 'servant' of the master, Queen Elizabeth, which was the generic title for Harborne. Harborne performed several tasks under this title such as an agent, spokesman or substitute.

Harborne arranged the presents to be given to the Great Sultan and the people in Sublime Porte before his visit to Istanbul. On November 14, 1582 the Levant Company's ship, 'Great Susan'⁹¹ -or just 'Susan'- sailed out from Blackwell, England to Istanbul. Harborne joined the ship at Isle of Wight on January 14, 1583.⁹² On January 27, the Susan passed the Straits of Gibraltar.⁹³ When the Susan arrived at Majorca Island in Spain, to the port San Pedro⁹⁴ the Spanish Governor tried to trap Harborne, however he

⁸⁸ Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. 3, 1927, p. 87 After the enactment, Queen Elizabeth had written a letter to Sultan Murad III, probably at the end of 1582.

⁸⁹ Kurat, 1953, p. 48.

⁹⁰ Kurat, 1953, p. 49.

⁹¹ Dereli, 1951, p. 78. Dereli notes the ship's name as the "Great Susan", though he quotes from Hakluyt who suggests just "Susan".

⁹² Hakluyt, Goldsmid, Vol. 3, 1927, p. 101.

⁹³ Rowland, 1968, p. 26.

⁹⁴ Dereli, 1951, p. 78; Kurat, 1953, p. 50.

got out of the trap. Another obstacle was the French Ambassador, Germigny, who did not want to let Harborne arrive in Istanbul. However Germigny was not able to prevent his visit and eventually Susan was accompanied by the two Ottoman ships to Seraglio Point on March 29, 1583.⁹⁵

Eventually, when Harborne kissed Sultan Murad III's hands, French Ambassador Germigny was also present in the Sultan's suit at that time. Harborne had the usual Banquet with Germigny in the same provision. Harborne gave the Sultan "one clocke, valued at five hundred pounds sterling: over it was a forest with trees of silver, among the which were deere chased with dogs, and men on horsebacke following, men drawing water, others carrying mine oare on barrows: on the top of the clocke stood a castle, and on the castle a mill. All these were silver. And the clocke was round beset with jewels."⁹⁶ In addition to these gifts, other gifts such as "twelve lengths of Royal cloth, ten pairs of shoes, two lengths of white linen, two pretty lap dogs, thirteen pieces of silver gilt, two pieces of fine Holland, ten pieces of plate doublets gilt, one case of candlesticks, two magnificent pots, one lesser, one basin and one ewer, two popinjays of silver, two bottles with chaines, three faire mastiffs in coats of redde cloth, three spaniels, two bloodhounds, one common hunting hound and two greyhounds."⁹⁷

Harborne also gifted to the Grandvizier and other Pashas such as Hadım Mehmed Pasha and İbrahim Pasha.⁹⁸ Also Harborne visited Kapudan (Kaptan) Pasha in his galleon. He presented him four pieces of cloth, two silver pots gilt and graven. As was noted, Harborne had so many friends such as Mustafa *Çavuş*, Hoca Saadeddin Efendi and

⁹⁵ Kurat, 1953, pp. 50-51.

⁹⁶ Hakluyt, *Goldsimd* Vol. 5, p. 257.

⁹⁷ Rowland, 1968, pp. 30-31.

⁹⁸ Dereli, 1951, p. 79. Dereli mentions about three Pashas. He is not sure about the last Pasha who was Siyavuş Pasha but Siyavuş Pasha was already the grand vizier therefore the issue of last Pasha is not clear.

Doctor Salamon who helped him before. Indeed the grandvizier Siyavuş Pasha and Kapudan Pasha were not as supportive as others.⁹⁹ Harborne had also delivered him Queen Elizabeth's letter which was about the protection of the treaty.¹⁰⁰

In some ways presenting gifts was a symbol of establishment of trade between the Ottoman Empire and England. Gifts were usually an effective way to establish good relations in the area of diplomacy and economy. Especially, it was very important to give presents to the high ranked people by considering the tastes and interests of them.¹⁰¹ Obviously, the clock set, which was presented to the Sultan, was selected as a present since he liked watches very much. In the following chapters, I will mention about the third English Ambassador, Henry Lello (r. 1597-1607), who presented an organ with a kind of clock to Sultan Mehmed III as a gift.

The most remarkable improvement for Harborne was having the same provisions with the French Ambassador. It meant that Queen Elizabeth's wish came true: finally English ships were trading under the English flag. After Harborne's appointment as an ambassador there were three other representatives in Istanbul: Venetian *balio*, French Ambassador and English Ambassador respectively.¹⁰²

During his post, Harborne had some challenges to overcome. One of the biggest challenges was about a detainment of an English ship in Tripoli. Harborne was responsible to save English captives. Afterwards, Queen Elizabeth wrote a letter to Sultan Murad III. The Sultan immediately wrote a letter to Romadan Pasha to solve this problem. During this process, Harborne realized the need of a personal representative in

⁹⁹ Kurat, 1953, pp. 57-58.

¹⁰⁰ Rowland, 1968, p. 30; Dereli, 1951, p. 81.

¹⁰¹ Kurat, 1953, p. 52.

¹⁰² Kurat, 1953, pp. 57-58.

Tripoli therefore he sent Edward Barton -Harborne's secretary- with a committee including *Kadi* Mehmed Bey, one janissary and translators for Ottoman Turkish, Greek, Italian, Spanish, and English translations.¹⁰³ Finally, the Sultan commanded to make full restitution therefore all the English properties and their ships returned. Hereupon, Harborne gained a big success.¹⁰⁴ Harborne assured to the support from the Ottomans against Spain via the letter of Sultan to Queen about the restitution of the English merchants.¹⁰⁵

Unfortunately, these incidents damaged the Levant Company. Consequently, Harborne was affected too. The Levant Company did not make enough profit after above-mentioned incident, thus Harborne's salary was not paid. Therefore he wanted to return to London in 1584; however Queen Elizabeth did not immediately accept his request. Because Queen Elizabeth's main goal which was to gain the Sultan's alliance against Spain, had not yet been accomplished. After she was convinced to appoint Edward Barton as the new representative on April, 1587 she permitted Harborne to return.¹⁰⁶ Harborne took all the records of his expenses for the period that he had spent in Istanbul and left a list of general tasks to his secretary Barton. Finally Harborne left Istanbul on August 13, 1588.¹⁰⁷

2.2. The Second English Ambassador, Edward Barton (1562 (?)- 1597)

Edward Barton was the second English Ambassador in Istanbul. Previously, Barton served as Harborne's secretary who worked in Istanbul until his retirement in

¹⁰³ Dereli, 1951, p. 91; Rowland, 1968, p. 40.

¹⁰⁴ Kurat, 1953, p. 68.

¹⁰⁵ Refik, 1932, p. 24.

¹⁰⁶ Kurat, 1953, p. 71.

¹⁰⁷ Kurat, 1953, p. 72.

1590.¹⁰⁸ Barton was known as a very skillful and smart diplomat. He was good at languages and he could speak Turkish, Italian, French, Greek and Latin.¹⁰⁹ He became a diplomat at a very young age and by the age twenty-five he was Harborne's secretary.¹¹⁰ He developed good relations via his skills in languages, for instance he had good friendships with the Ottoman bureaucrats¹¹¹ and people from the palace, especially with Safiye Sultan. John Sanderson notes that his sympathetic personality allowed him to make relations with patriarchs and princes; he established friendships with prominent women too. Via Safiye Sultan, Barton steadily encouraged Sultan Murad III to act against Spain.¹¹² Barton's personal contacts at the Sublime Porte and also his knowledge of the Ottoman gift system had brought him so many advantages.¹¹³ He was accepted by the Sublime Porte and also the principal administrators from the Seraglio in a very short period.

Mustafa Selaniki notes that Barton had arrived to Istanbul in a ship called 'Ascension' which was the biggest ship that had ever been seen in the city.¹¹⁴ Barton arrived bearing gifts for the Sultan Murad III in 1593. The gifts were twelve goodly pieces of plate, thirty six garments of cloth of all colours, twenty garments of cloth of gold, ten garments of satin, six pieces of fine Holland, and certain other things of good value.¹¹⁵ Barton had also presented Queen Elizabeth's gifts to the Sultan and Safiye

¹⁰⁸ *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volumes 1-20, 22 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2003, pp. 1262-1263. (ab. Edward Barton)

¹⁰⁹ Kurat, p. 74.

¹¹⁰ Kurat, p. 74.

¹¹¹ Kurat, p. 74.

¹¹² William Foster (ed.), *The travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602*, with his autobiography and selections from his correspondence (Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, 2d ser., no. 67) Kraus Reprint, 1967, p. 61 in Dereli, pp. 99-100.

¹¹³ Sohrawardy, p. 42.

¹¹⁴ *Selaniki Tarihi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi yazması*, 186b, Refik, 1932, p.13.

¹¹⁵ J. Theodoro Bent, *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*, The Hakluyt Society, London, 1893, p. 10.

Sultan on October 7, 1593.¹¹⁶ The gifts which were given from the Queen Elizabeth were “a jewel of Her Majesty’s picture, set with some rubies and diamonds, three great pieces of gilt plate, ten garments of cloth of gold, a very fine case of glass bottles, silver and gilt with two pieces of fine Holland.”¹¹⁷ He also delivered a letter from Queen Elizabeth to Safiye Sultan. One year later Safiye Sultan sent a letter to her noting her gratitude for the gifts and she asked if the Queen had any wishes.¹¹⁸

The summary of Safiye Sultan’s letter to Queen Elizabeth written in the first decade on November 25 and December 4, 1593:

*After elaborate praises of God and eulogies of the Prophet, Safiye, mother of the heir-apparent Mehemed, sends greetings to the Queen of England. Briefly alluding to the Queen’s gifts, she acknowledges the letter which the Queen’s ambassador delivered with them to the Qapuagha who, for his part, had handed them all to her personal attendant. The letter has been read to her and its message understood; further correspondence is encouraged so that the Queen’s requests to the Sultan may be transmitted to him by Safiye in person.*¹¹⁹

Additionally, there was another letter regarding the gifts from Italian Esperanza Malchi the Sultana Jewish agent, to Queen Elizabeth which dated November 16-26, 1599:

After addressing the Queen, the Kira discloses how she has desired to serve her ever since entering the Sultana’s employ, and now that the Queen’s ambassador

¹¹⁶ Kurat, 1953, p. 78.

¹¹⁷ Jardine, 2004, p. 212.

¹¹⁸ Dereli, 1951, pp. 95-99.

¹¹⁹ Susan A. Skilliter, “Three Letters from the Ottoman ‘Sultana’ Safiye to Queen Elizabeth I”, *Documents from Islamic Chanceries*, Oriental studies III, ed. S. M. Stern and R. Walzer, Bruno Cassirer, Oxford: 1965, p. 120.

*has arrived with a present for her mistress she has found her ready to help. She lists the presents sent in return from the Sultana, then advises the Queen about the gifts she should send in future-not jewels, but cosmetics and fine cloth. These should be sent to the Kira who will deliver them herself to the Sultana.*¹²⁰

Barton's salary was paid by the Levant Company and he obeyed Harborne's commission. Barton recorded his expenses and did not spend much from his allowance. Significantly, Barton's salary was much more than Harborne's. Kurat quotes from Wood that Harborne had made an effort for this issue when he was in London. The governor of the Levant Company again became Edward Barton and its financial condition was better than before. According to Francis Bacon, Barton was not appointed as an ambassador like Harborne by the Queen; she had wished to economize and sent him with the Levant Company like a trade agent. On the other hand he was not just an agent like Harborne; he also served as an Ambassador.¹²¹ As an Ambassador, Barton aimed to prevent a war between the Ottoman Empire and Habsburgs because of English desire to ally with the Ottomans against Spain. For this purpose Barton established good relations with Safiye Sultan and the Sublime Porte.¹²²

When Edward Barton was tackling this problem Sultan Murad III died in the beginning of January of 1595 and his son Mehmed III (r. 1595-1603) became the new Sultan.¹²³ Thus Barton had to present new gifts for Sultan Mehmed's accession to the throne. Unfortunately the gifts arrived very late but Barton was respected again.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Skilliter, 1965, p. 140.

¹²¹ Wood, 1964, p. 24, in Kurat, 1953, p. 75.

¹²² Dereli, 1951, p. 102; Kurat, 1953, p. 82.

¹²³ Foster, 1967, p. 18.

¹²⁴ Kurat, 1953, p. 82.

In July 1596, Sultan Mehmed III decided to proceed with the war in Habsburgs and also Barton had accompanied him. Barton was not given a permit from the Queen; he informed her by sending a very short letter. French Ambassador de Breves had accompanied to war but he had left in the middle of the war.¹²⁵ Barton attended several battles with the Ottoman army such as the battles of Eğri (Erlau, Agria, in 1596) and Haçova (Keresztes, in 1596).¹²⁶

Barton's secretary Thomas Glover wrote a narrative of Barton's experiences in the war and many years later Purchas published it, along with an apology for the action of a Christian envoy in accompanying the Great Turk in a war against Christians.¹²⁷

According to Glover's unique perspective Barton had turned into a servant for both the Queen and the Sultan during the Hungarian expedition. The reason behind this judgment may be related to his position as the trans-imperial mediator which was also assured by the Sultanic authority. Richard Hakluyt notes that during Barton's involvement in the battle of Eger, he was against the Christians like a Muslim. Barton's accompaniment to the Hungary Campaign with Mehmed III increased his prestige among Turks. Most probably the English diplomat made the suggestion himself.¹²⁸ On the other hand, Barton's existence in the Ottoman army was great help for the *Nemçes*. The Ambassador of Nemçe Kreckwitz and his 23 officers were taken prisoner in 1593. Barton showed great interest in them and helped them to be released.¹²⁹ Chew suggests that Barton's career in the Ottoman Empire was strange and pathetic in comparison to other

¹²⁵ Kurat, 1953, p. 82.

¹²⁶ Refik, 1932, p. 10; Kurat, 1953, p. 83.

¹²⁷ Chew, 1937, p. 159.

¹²⁸ Selâniki Tarihi, in Refik 1932, p. 12; Kurat, 1953, p. 82.

¹²⁹ D.B.N. (Bulletin, p. 159) in Kurat, p. 83.

early English Ambassadors. According to Chew, ‘going to the Balkans’ was the equivalent of a moral decline in exotic surroundings.¹³⁰

In 1598, after the Hungarian war, the epidemic of the bubonic plague hit Barton fled the city and stayed in *Heybeliada*, one of the Princes’ Islands in the Sea of Marmara. He succumbed to the effects of the plague. He died at the age of thirty-five on January 18, 1598. He was buried in *Aya Irini* Monastery of *Buyukada*, closer to the gate, by the Sultan’s order.¹³¹ Barton had a great reputation among the Ottomans. His death place and choosing of his graveyard in Istanbul was not a coincidence.

¹³⁰ Chew, 1937, p. 159.

¹³¹ Refik, 1932, p. 11; Kurat, 1953, p. 84; Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 44; Dereli, 1951, p. 105.

3. CHAPTER TWO: UNFORGETTABLE COMPETITION BETWEEN THE TRANS-IMPERIAL AGENTS: THE THIRD ENGLISH AMBASSADOR HENRY LELLO AND THE MUSICIAN THOMAS DALLAM

I investigated the trans-imperial relations between England and the Ottoman Empire based on their economic, diplomatic and political issues in the first chapter. As was noted England's trade activities with the Ottomans began later than other European states mostly because of the geographical distance between the two. Via constructing relations with the agents and merchants English gradually formed economic relations with the Ottoman Empire. For this purpose gift-giving took an important part which helped to strengthen the relations between two countries.

The second chapter sheds light on the trans-imperial mediators, the Sultan's "favourites" who served his/her multiple masters and/or employers. As the complex system of obligations was required between these kinds of networks, master and servant titles. The rivalries had a different nature in this multilayered world of powers. Obviously most servants sought his/her own profit no matter what was beneficial for the master. The craftsmen, merchants, translators and diplomats were all trans-imperial agents who had different areas of expertise. Henry Lello, as a diplomat, and Thomas Dallam, as a musician or as an organ-maker, perceived each other as rivals.¹³² Trans-imperial agents were obliged to serve their multiple masters/employers. The relationship between master and servant required a complex system of obligations. Lello and Dallam were servants both for the Queen and the Sultan, additionally, Dallam was Lello's servant.

¹³² Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 50.

3.1. Henry Lello's Ambassadorship (1597-1607)

After serving as Edward Barton's secretary, Sir Henry Lello became the third English Ambassador. Von Hammer calls him 'Sir Henry Billoe' but it is an obvious mistake; his name is commonly written as Sir Henry Lello'.¹³³ He was interested in commercial issues like Edward Barton of the Levant Company.¹³⁴ Lello's earliest extant dispatch to Robert Cecil was dated on March 1, 1597.¹³⁵ When Barton was Ambassador in Istanbul Lello stayed there too. In this way, he learnt about the Ottomans and the conditions in the empire. There is no evidence that Lello could speak Turkish. Nevertheless Lello had an excellent education; he graduated from an Oxford college. It is known that people in Istanbul disliked him because of his personal traits, namely being arrogant.¹³⁶

The principal issue was the gifts for the Sultan that were expected since 1595 during Sultan Mehmed's accession while Barton was the Ambassador. Therefore Lello began his career in a disadvantageous position. After the death of Sultan Murad, Barton wrote a letter to the Queen for dispatching the gifts. The diplomatic and commercial relations between the Ottoman Empire and England were under threat. Lello requested the Grand Signor to grant the English consulars control over Dutch ships in Ottoman ports, as the French also had desired this privilege.¹³⁷

¹³³ Thomas Dallam; John Covel; J. Theodore Bent, *Early Voyages and Travels in Levant*, London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, No: 87, 1893, p. 12.

¹³⁴ Wood, 1964, pp. 80-81, in Kurat, 1953, p. 85.

¹³⁵ Cal S. P. Venetian, IX, in Horniker, 1946, p. 293.

¹³⁶ Kurat, 1953, p. 85.

¹³⁷ MacLean, 2004, p. 9.

Gift-giving to the new Sultan was very important; in this way Henry Lello was going to be officially an Ambassador. The Levant Company had difficulty in choosing appropriate gifts for the Sultan because the gift which was presented to the Sultan had to be unique and remarkable.¹³⁸ It was agreed that the Queen's gift could only be a clock. Previously Edward Barton suggested that Queen Elizabeth should send "a clock in a form of a cock" which Barton heard that Queen Elizabeth had at one of her palaces. However, something more spectacular was needed to impress the Sultan. In the end the Levant Company decided to present something novel, namely a self-playing organ combined with a clock.¹³⁹ The gifts and letters reached about four years later which were dispatched from London in March 1599 in the ship of Hector.¹⁴⁰

According to Sohrawardy, delivery of the organ was Lello's first principal task which had been Barton's desire, Lello desired to escape from Barton's shadow but inevitably he was affected by the conditions which Barton had set earlier. Thus he was very anxious and this tempered Lello's actions. Lello was always disappointed and he had to rely on his imagination.¹⁴¹

3.2. The Organ of Thomas Dallam

The Sultan was given an organ which was built by the English man Thomas Dallam. Dallam was born in Flixton or Warrington -it is not certain- about 1575 in a small village called Dallam. The family of Dallam was famous organ-builders in England during the sixteenth century. Dallam, the head of the family, was apprenticed to a

¹³⁸ Dereli, 1951, pp. 107-108.

¹³⁹ Otto Kurz, *European Clocks and Watches in the Near East*, 1975, London: Warburg Institute, University of London; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, p. 43.

¹⁴⁰ Jardine, 2004, p. 220.

¹⁴¹ Sohrawardy, 2010, pp. 47-48.

member of the Blacksmiths' Company. After Queen Elizabeth learned of Dallam's reputation, he performed in front of the Queen. Then he was commissioned to make a mechanical organ which was given as a gift for "the Great Turk" from Queen Elizabeth.¹⁴² In addition Queen Elizabeth chose to give a horse carriage to Safiye Sultan.¹⁴³ Dallam was responsible for playing the organ and present it to the Sultan. The organ was a very complicated instrument therefore Dallam was the only person who could play it. In case the organ was broken during the long voyage, only Dallam could repair it.¹⁴⁴

Thomas Dallam had set sail from Gravesend, in a town of northwest Kent, England aboard the newly commissioned 300 ton *Hector* in February 1599. His voyage rounded the Iberian Peninsula, eastward through the Mediterranean and eventually ended in Istanbul.¹⁴⁵ Going to the Ottoman lands was unexpected for Dallam. When he arrived to Istanbul, he had tried to keep away from diplomatic disputes, yet he instantly found himself in them.¹⁴⁶

On June 27, the 'Hector' was anchored at Rhodes and Dallam gave a musical performance that would later save him from prison, the captain, master of the Hector and the other passengers.¹⁴⁷ Some of them liked his performance and even kissed him.¹⁴⁸ When the Hector entered the Dardanelles, Dallam found better company.¹⁴⁹ In Gallipoli,

¹⁴² J. Theodora Bent, Dallam's Voyage to Turkey, *The Musical Times*, Vol. 46, No. 752 (Oct. 1, 1905), p. 649; Dereli, 1951, p. 108.

¹⁴³ MacLean, 2004, p. 25.

¹⁴⁴ Kurat, 1953, p. 86.

¹⁴⁵ MacLean, 2004, p. 3.

¹⁴⁶ MacLean, 2004, p. 7.

¹⁴⁷ Lawrence Danson, "The Sultan's organ: Presents and Self-presentation in Thomas Dallam's Diary", *Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 5, 2009, p. 640.

¹⁴⁸ Dereli, 1951, p. 109.

¹⁴⁹ Thomas Dallam does not provide his friends' names in his *Diary*.

Dallam and other passengers left the Hector and set off by the three smaller boats for going to Istanbul.¹⁵⁰

Finally, the Hector arrived at Seven Towers in August 15 and it arrived to Istanbul, from Seraglio Point in August 16.¹⁵¹ In August 20, Dallam opened the organ which had been damaged, all the gluing had failed and some of the pipes were broken during the six-month-voyage.¹⁵² In addition, the gifts, which were mostly made of cloth, were damaged because of the mold. In ten days Dallam and his helpers had repaired the organ.¹⁵³ Dallam himself wrote that he went to Ottoman Empire with “my mate Harvie, who was the engineer, Mr. Rowland Buckett the painter, and Myghell Watson the joiner.”¹⁵⁴ While Dallam had constructed the organ, Harvie was responsible for the clockwork.

Lello’s relationship with Dallam started within the milieu of a number of problems; also the organ was much more than an instrument to Dallam. When Lello learned that the organ was broken he got very angry at Dallam and they had a row.¹⁵⁵ Lello had attributed too much meaning to the instrument. Lello’s status was under threat because the gift has arrived late. Dallam was very proud because of ‘his work’ and he was not as anxious as Lello.

As a result, Dallam had two great challenges: the first one was presenting his organ to Sultan Mehmed III and second one was Henry Lello who was nervously waiting for to be appointed as an ‘Ambassador’.¹⁵⁶ Lello wanted to earn Sultan Mehmed’s

¹⁵⁰ MacLean, 2004, p. 29.

¹⁵¹ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 57.

¹⁵² Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 58.

¹⁵³ MacLean, 2004, pp. 63-64.

¹⁵⁴ Kurz, 1975, p. 43.

¹⁵⁵ MacLean, 2004, p. 35.

¹⁵⁶ MacLean, 2004, p. 33.

personal favor yet Dallam was a different kind of mediator without ambitions. Lello was anxious about his own self-representation which was conditionally helping his status as a diplomat. It is clear that there was a competition between Lello and Dallam. They were different kinds of mediators and their relationship was based on servant and master status; and they were codependents. But secretly, both of the mediators considered each other as rivals.¹⁵⁷ Lello was very concerned about his appointment and decided to warn Dallam about his vital appointment. Thomas Dallam mentions Henry Lello's speech in his diary, entitled *Dallam's Travels*:

“Yow are come hether withe a presente from our gracious Quene, not to an ordinarie prince or kinge, but to a myghtie monarke of the worlde”, and therefore, “you must louke for nothings at his handes. Yow would thinke that for yor longe and wearrisom voyege, with daingerof lyfe, that yow weare worthy to have a litle sighte of him; but that yow muste not loake for nether.”¹⁵⁸

Clearly Lello warned Dallam about his social status which was a lower one; he was just an organ-maker and he could not deserve the “sight” of a Sultan. At the same time, Dallam had a monetary expectation therefore Lello tried to mitigate his expectation. According to Lello, Dallam had to be humble and expecting nothing in return of his service. MacLean notes that Lello had rehearsed for the protocol before Dallam's musical performance.¹⁵⁹ Indeed Lello was supposed to present the gifts instead of Dallam, in this way he could achieve his duties as an Ambassador. At the end he was not able to play the organ thus Dallam was the first to enter the Sultan's room. Lello aimed to manipulate Dallam.

¹⁵⁷ MacLean, 2004, pp. 66-67; Sohrawardy, 2010, pp. 49-50.

¹⁵⁸ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, pp. 64-65.

¹⁵⁹ Sohrawardy, 2010, pp. 50-51; MacLean, 2004, p. 38.

“We cale it kisinge of the Grand Signor’s hande; nute when I com to his gates I shalbe taken of my horse and seartcht, and lede betwyxte two men holdinge my handes downe close to my sides, and so lede into the presence of the Grand Signor, and I must kiss his kne or his hanginge sleve. Havinge deliverede my letters unto the Coppagawe, I shalbe presently ledd awaye, goinge backwardes as longe as I can se him, and in payne of my heade I muste not turne my backe upon him, and therefore you muste not louke to have a sighte of him.”¹⁶⁰

Gerald MacLean states that:

“Dallam must have relished this self-conjured image of Lello’s obsequious behavior, especially the possibility of mortal danger were Lello to adopt an improper attitude while leaving. But at the time of delivering his speech, Lello was attempting to impress and and frighten Dallam with multiple threats and minimal hope of reward. Lello had already come to resent not only Dallam’s skilled confidence, but also the fact of his own reliance on the craftsman’s success. If Dallam did not please the Sultan, Lello warned, Dallam would face more than Ottoman diffidence.”¹⁶¹

On September 24, 1599 Dallam presented the organ to the Sultan. Dallam, Harvie, Watson and Bucket have been already in the Seraglio and Lello was the one who “did ride lyuke unto a king, onlye tht he wanted a crowne” arrived.¹⁶² Lello personally had expected to kiss the Sultan’s hand but unfortunately he was late.¹⁶³ Dallam knew the importance of the ceremony as it can be observed in his lines:

“Thare roode with him 22 jentlemen and merchantes, all in clothe of goulde; ye jentlemen weare these: Mr. Humfrye Cunisbye, Mr. Baylie of Salisburie, Mr. Paule Pinder, Mr. Jonas Aldridge, and Mr. Thomas Glover. The other six weare merchantes; these did ride

¹⁶⁰ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 65.

¹⁶¹ MacLean, 2004, pp. 38-39.

¹⁶² MacLean, 2004, p. 38.

¹⁶³ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 66.

in vestes of clothe of goulde, made after the cuntrie fation, thare wente on foute 28 more in blew gounes made after the Turkie fation, and everie man a silke grogren cape, after the Ittalian fation. My livery was a faire clooke of a Franche greene, etc.”¹⁶⁴

Thereupon, the Venetian *bailos* were concerned that Lello’s aim was to contribute to England’s prestige with his dazzling appearance.¹⁶⁵ Finally Dallam and his company were escorted into the Seraglio. When they arrived the locked gate was opened and Dallam saw four hundred people in a little space and the Grand Signor who was sitting in his Chair of Estate. Thereupon Dallam was charmed by this amazing scenery.¹⁶⁶

“All being quiett, and no noyes at all, the gift began to salute the Grand Signor; for when I lefte it I did allow a quarter of an houre for his cominge thether. First the clocke strouke 22; then the chime of bells went of, and played a songe of 4 partes. That beinge done, two personagis which stood upon to corners of the seconde storie, holdinge two silver trumpetes in there handes, did lifte them to their heades, and sounded a tantarra. Then the muzicke went of, and the orgon played a song of 5 partes tywse over. In the top of the orgon, being 16 foute hie, did stande a holly bushe full of blacke birds and thrushis, which at the end of the musick did singe and shake their wynges. Divers other motions thare was which the Grand Signor wondered at.”¹⁶⁷

The event was described in the following lines by the publisher of the Hakluyt Society: When the organ performance was over, the Sultan asked the *kapıcı başı* (porter) whether the organ would ever do the same again. The *kapıcı başı* who really knew nothing about the matter replied that he would perform the next hour again. Fortunately, Dallam had set the machinery to go off only four times in a day. Lello had confirmed the

¹⁶⁴ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, pp. 66-67.

¹⁶⁵ MacLean, 2004, p. 40.

¹⁶⁶ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 67.

¹⁶⁷ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, pp. 67-68.

kapıcı başı that when the clock was hit next this would have released the mechanism for the next performance. The Grand Signor asked whether the organ could be played by hands as well as automatically. The *kapıcı başı* told that the organ-maker could play it and he had added he was waiting outside the door, the Sultan said ‘fetche him hither’. Then the *kapıcı başı* opened the Door in which Dallam saw very wonderful unto him. The Sultan was sitting sixteen paces from Dallam and the organ. The Sultan sat in a great state and he would not turn his head to look upon him. Dallam thought that he was in another world. Dallam describes the scenery in his diary in detail: two hundred people who were ‘very proper men, and Christian borne’ and also a hundred ‘Dum men’ that “neither hear nor speak, were richly dressed, some their hawks on their hands; and another hundred men were dwarfs, big bodied men, but verrie low of stature.”¹⁶⁸

Dallam’s *drogaman* (interpreter) asked the *kapıcı başı* where Dallam could play the organ because the Grand Signor was so close to the organ. Also he had to turn his back towards the Sultan and touch his knee. Hereupon, the Grand Signor smiled and let him stand a little. While Lello advised Dallam, he remembered that if he touched the Sultan, his head could be cut off. Dallam writes about his feelings in the following lines:

“He sat so righte behinde me that he could not se what I did; therefore he stood up, and his Coppagaw removed his chaire to one side, where he myghte se my handes; but, in his risinge from his chaire, he gave me a thruste forwardes, which he could not otherwyse dow, he sat so neare me; but I thought he had bene drawinge his sorde to cut of my heade.”¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁸ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, pp. 68-69-70.

¹⁶⁹ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, pp. 69-70-71.

Dallam played the organ. After his performance, the company saw him, they laughed at him. Then the Sultan put his hand full of gold. Dallam left the Seraglio not only with a joy but also with a big success. While Dallam was in the Seraglio, Lello and his team were kept waiting outside for two hours. When Lello saw Dallam he asked him whether he presented the gifts. Dallam answered him positively. Besides, Lello desired to hear good news. Dallam was so glad because he had been closeted with the Sultan yet the diplomatic hand-kissing was postponed and thus Lello was disappointed.

At the end of September, the Sultan's messengers asked Dallam, if he would remain in "two wyfes, ether tow of his Concubines or els tow virgins of the beste I Could Chuse my self, in Cittie or contrie" but Dallam answered them 'I had wyfe and Childrin in Inglande, who did expecte my returne. Then "they asked me how long I had been married, and how many children I hade. Thoughe in deede I had nether wyfe nor childrin, yeat to excuse my selfe I made them that Answere."¹⁷⁰ Sohrawardy remarks that Dallam was flattered by the attention that he received. Sultan Mehmed preferred to show Dallam more attention than Lello.¹⁷¹ Although Lello was an Ambassador of England, he did not kiss the Sultan's hand and this unequal situation was not over yet.

There was an uneasy relationship between Dallam and Lello. On the same night, Dallam and his lord Lello were at supper and Dallam mentioned about the event and Lello instructed him never to say, no 'flatly' to any offer made by an important Ottoman and to 'tell them yf it did please my Lorde that I should staye, I should be the better

¹⁷⁰ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, pp. 71-72-73.

¹⁷¹ Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 54.

contented to staye; by that meanes they will not go about to staye you by force, and yow may finde a time the better to goo away when yow please.’¹⁷²

Dallam felt very anxious after Lello’s advice but he did not record his reaction in his diary. Dallam did not understand Lello’s control over him in that way. Because Dallam’s friends allowed him to sit in one of the thrones and “to draw that sord out the sheathe with the which the Grand Signor doth croune his kinge.”¹⁷³ According to Dallam the Ottoman court was not as authoritarian as it has been thought.

Dallam’s friends showed him many other things which were Grand Signor’s concubines. Dallam records them in the following lines:

“By chance I called to my drugaman [translator] and asked him the cause of theireruning away; than he said the Grand Sinyor and his Conquebines weare coming, we must be gone in paine of death; but they run all away and lefte me behinde, and before I gott oute of the house they weare run over the grene quit out at the gate, and I runn as faste as my leggs would carrie me aftere, and 4 neageres or blackmoors cam runninge towards me with their semetaires drawne; yf they could have catchte me theye would have hewed me all peecis with there semeteries... Now, as I was runninge for my life, I did se a little of a brave show, which was the Grand Sinyor him selfe on horsbacke, many of his conquebines, som ridinge and som on foute, and brave fellowes in their kinde, that weare gelded men, and keepers of the conquebiens; neagers that weare as black as gate [jet], but verrie brave; by their sides great semeteris; the scabertes seemed to be all goulde.”¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 73; MacLean, p. 44.

¹⁷³ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 74.

¹⁷⁴ Thomas Dallam, “The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam 1559-1600” in Bent, 1893, pp. 1-98 in Gülru Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. New York: The Architectural History Foundation, 1991, p. 230.

MacLean states that none of these pleasing prospects persuaded Dallam to stay in Istanbul; Dallam wanted to go home and wrote about this in his diary. He did not prefer to become some sort of double-agent, living for the Sultan's pleasure and did not want to be under Lello's control.¹⁷⁵

After Dallam saw the Harem, he had a stern warning from his interpreter not to mention what he had seen to anyone on pain of death. When Dallam prepared his properties, one word came from Sultan Mehmed III that he would not let the ship leave on board: "yf the workman that sett up the presente in the surralia would not be perswaded to stay behind the shipe, the ship must staye untill he had removed the presente unto another place."¹⁷⁶ MacLean notes that "Dallam was furious when Lello insisted that he obey. He now literally had a price on his head, and he projected his anger in the form of grudging sarcasm directed at Lello."¹⁷⁷

After Lello's insistence Dallam had recorded in his diary his feelings ironically. Dallam writes that:

"I was in a wonderfully perplexitie," Dallam wrote, "and in my furie I tould my lorde that that was now come to pass which I ever feared, and that was that he in the end would betray me, and turne me over into the Turkes hands, whear I should Live a slavish Life, and nevercompanie againe with Christians, with many other suche-like words."¹⁷⁸

MacLean shows that the relationship between Lello and Dallam had changed once again with these new circumstances. Dallam never really respected Lello however after this event he was soon referring to him again 'my Lorde' almost with a respect.

¹⁷⁵ MacLean, 2004, p. 45.

¹⁷⁶ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 76.

¹⁷⁷ MacLean, 2004, p. 45.

¹⁷⁸ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 76.

Sohrawardy asserts that despite Dallam had gained big success; he had to accept the Sultan's authority and also Lello's advice.¹⁷⁹

After that, Dallam stayed there because Lello had reminded him that the ship Hector which had to return and there was always the threat of plague. Dallam recorded this conversation in the following lines: "My Lorde did speake this so friendly and nobly to unto me, that upon a sodon he had altered my mynde, and I tould him that I would yeld my selfe unto Godes hand and his."¹⁸⁰ Dallam grudgingly conceded Lello might have been correct in urging diplomacy and patience. After forty-six days, Dallam was given permission to leave. MacLean assumes that Lello had to pay Sultan Mehmed III in order to ensure Dallam's return to England.

¹⁷⁹ Sohrawardy, 2010, p. 55.

¹⁸⁰ Dallam; Covell; Bent, 1893, p. 77.

4. CHAPTER THREE: REPORT OF HENRY LELLO: THE THIRD ENGLISH AMBASSADOR TO THE SUBLIME PORTE

After the sudden death of Edward Barton, Henry Lello became the English Ambassador in Istanbul starting from 1597 until 1607. It is worthy repeating that during his post in Istanbul, Lello witnessed the reigns of two sultans in the Ottoman Empire - Sultan Mehmed III (r.1595-1603) and Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617) respectively- and in England Queen Elizabeth I (r. 1533-1603) and King James I (r. 1603-1625) were on the throne. During the same period, Ottoman Empire was still engaged in the “Long War” against the Habsburg Monarchy that started in 1593 and ended by the Treaty of Zsitvatorok in 1606. Additionally, *Jelali* Risings and *sipahi* rebellions were the most challenging internal events in Anatolia throughout the Empire.

Lello wrote his report during this period in which the Long War took place. For this purpose I will briefly explain the Long War and the grand vizier Damad İbrahim Pasha’s post before analyzing Lello’s report. It is remarkably important to briefly mention these events since Lello starts his report by focusing on Damad İbrahim Pasha.

4.1. The Ottoman Military Campaigns in Hungary, 1593-1606

This part will be setting the historical background in which 1593-1606 Ottoman military campaigns of Hungary took place. Ottoman- Hungary War was initiated by the grand vizier Sinan Pasha’s campaign after the *beylerbeyi* of Bosnia’s defeat, Telli Hasan Pasha, in 1593.¹⁸¹ For Hungarians, the date 1591 referred to “the fifteen years war”. Telli Hasan Pasha attacked the Croatian border between the Ottomans and Habsburgs. The

¹⁸¹ Finkel, 1988, p. 8; Christine Woodhead, *Ta’liki-zâde’s Şehnâme-i Hümayun, A History of the Ottoman Campaign into Hungary 1593-94*, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin: 1983, p. 31.

stronghold of Bihaç (Behke) on the river of Danube was captured by the successful Ottoman siege on April 1592. In the same year, Ottoman strike was unsuccessful at Tokaj and the north-east of Buda.¹⁸² *Vilayet* of Buda was not infringed the provisions of the peace, unless the Christians persisted to harass Ottoman subjects in Bosnia and Uskok. In August 1591, Hasan Pasha's order was sent to all *beylerbeyis* and *sancakbeyis* of the *vilayets* of Buda, Bosnia and Temeşvar which was passed the message to hold peace treaty with Austrians.¹⁸³

4.1.1. The Grand Vizier Sinan Pasha

The grand vizier Sinan Pasha was a very important statesman especially during the Ottoman-Hungary War.¹⁸⁴ As was mentioned before, Henry Lello does not mention about him in his report, instead Damad İbrahim Pasha's grand vizierate is covered. However it is important to investigate Sinan Pasha's reign in terms of pinpointing the historical continuities and distinctions that set the political and military struggles of the empire during long, tumultuous war years.

After the series rebellions of cavalryman, Sinan Pasha became the grand-vizier in January 1593 during the reign of Sultan Murad III. Sinan Pasha who was eighty-year-old statesman previously conquered Yemen and Tunis. Sinan Pasha attempted to convince Sultan Murad III to launch a military campaign on Hungary after the defeat of Telli

¹⁸² Finkel, 1988, p. 9; Baron Joseph Von Hammer Purgstall, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi*, Vol. 4, (German trans.) Mümin Çevik, İstanbul, Üçdal Yayınları, 1989, p. 208.

¹⁸³ Finkel, 1988, p. 10.

¹⁸⁴ For more details See Elif Özgen. "Grand Vizier Koca Sinan Pasha and Factional Politics in the Court of Murad III" Unpublished M.A. thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University, 2010.

Hasan Pasha.¹⁸⁵ As a good planner Sinan Pasha exchanged ideas with the local Muslim population in the region before his departure.¹⁸⁶

In the early months of 1593, Sinan Pasha and the troops of Rumeli were ordered to mobilize between the rivers of Danube and Sava which was the plain of Sirem (Srem).¹⁸⁷ Sinan Pasha left Istanbul on July 19, 1593. In the beginning of the war, Sinan Pasha was able to seize the fortresses of Veszprem (Veszprem) and Palota (Varpalota), although later Ottomans lost Buda which was Hungarians stronghold. In the spring of 1594, the Habsburgs with Archduke Matthias, brother of Emperor Rudolph besieged Estergon (Esztergom). At that time the Ottomans were threatening Vienna while General Teuffenbach attacked Hatvan.¹⁸⁸

Sinan Pasha left Belgrade in the late spring of 1594, and then he came to Yanık (Raab) in the south side of Danube with his forces. Meanwhile, the Austrian army has camped at Komran (Komarom) in the opposite bank of the river.¹⁸⁹ Gazi Giray, the Khan of Crimea, was assigned to go to the fort of Papa with a considerable force of Tatars which was located on the south of Yanık.¹⁹⁰ There was a disagreement between Sinan Pasha and Gazi Giray Khan during this campaign. Sinan Pasha was the leader of the campaign, however Gazi Giray Khan enjoyed a personal reputation as an experienced commander; he had brought 40.000 or 50.000 Tatar soldiers. Rhoads Murphey describes the Ottoman-Tatar relations as being problematic. According to the Ottomans, the Tatars were too disobedient thus in order to prevent their harmful acts, the Ottomans dismissed

¹⁸⁵ Hammer, 1993, p. 209.

¹⁸⁶ Woodhead, 1983, p. 31.

¹⁸⁷ Hammer, 1993, p. 210; Finkel, 1988, p. 11.

¹⁸⁸ Finkel 1988, pp. 11-12.

¹⁸⁹ Woodhead, 1983, p. 38.

¹⁹⁰ Woodhead, 1983, p. 44.

their incumbent *khan* and appointed a rival candidate.¹⁹¹ During the course of the siege, Sinan Pasha tried to exercise control over the Tatar troops.¹⁹²

On October 9, 1594, Sinan Pasha left Yanık, and stopped at Komran two days later. During the Yanık campaign of 1593-94, he established a successful campaign in Belgrade. Nonetheless, the year of 1595 did not go well for the Ottomans. As Estergon was lost, the rebellion in Wallachia was increasing.¹⁹³ The vassal states, namely Transylvania, Moldovia and Wallachia, were against the Ottomans and they strived separating themselves from the Ottoman leadership in the late 1594. The history of the Ottoman-Habsburg struggle is a complicated one in terms of the dynastic rivalries in this region during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.¹⁹⁴

4.2. The Analysis of Henry Lello's Report in Comparison to Other Chronicles

There is no clear information on when Henry Lello wrote his report. Most probably he wrote it when he was back in England after 1607. As an Ambassador he was obliged to write a report to be presented to the new master, who happened to be King James I (r. 1603-1625) at the time.¹⁹⁵ Documenting a report was a part of Lello's duty, when he narrated the events; he followed a way of literary genre. Lello narrates the internal affairs of Ottoman Empire in a descriptive manner covering the years of his ambassadorship in the Sublime Porte between 1597 and 1607. His writing style is similar to telling a story. Lello claims that he only wrote on the lives and duties of important

¹⁹¹ Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare: 1500-1700*, London: UCL Press, 1999, p. 32.

¹⁹² Woodhead, 1983, pp. 45-46.

¹⁹³ Finkel, 1988, p. 12; Woodhead, 1983, pp. 58-66.

¹⁹⁴ Finkel, 1988, p. 13.

¹⁹⁵ Lucette Valensi, *Venice and the Sublime Porte: The Birth of the Despot*, trans. by Arthur Denner, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1993, p. 14. Similarly, Lucette Valensi explains "Venetian ambassadors' reports which turned to be a literary genre later. Valensi notes that citizens who did not hold ambassadorial positions and who therefore were not required to present reports to the Senate would write them too.

statesmen's lives and their duties, yet he did not necessarily follow the contemporary historical events. His ultimate goal was to demonstrate the rivalries between important figures of the time and to convey the internal dynamics of the Ottoman Empire.

Hereby I will focus analyzing Henry Lello's report and also translator Orhan Burian's rereading of it from early 1950s. An English philologist Orhan Burian found Lello's report at the Cotton Collection of the British Museum. Burian states that Henry Lello's report has not been published yet thus he translated it. The folio volume numbered *Nero B XI* contains two versions of this report, one on pages 155 and 171 (MS I), the other on pages 229 and 240 (MS II). Burian refers both of these sources in his translation and explanations but he focuses on the MS I in comparison to the other version because of its oldness.¹⁹⁶

I will rely on Burian's source, MS I, for my analyses in this chapter. One of my main objectives is to scrutinize how Ambassador Henry Lello's report depicted the Ottoman palace rivalries, suppressions and murders in the empire during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Also I aim to focus on certain chronicles that were written during the same period such as the chronicles of Selaniki and Peçevi. In doing so, I utilize a comparative perspective which enables me to pinpoint the differences and similarities between these chronicles and Lello's report's accounts.

His report is worthy investigating in many ways due to its content and descriptions on the consolidation of power in palace and patronage relations among the Ottoman Sultans. In this respect, there were three important official figures about whom I can dwell on exploring their positions and power relations. Among these, firstly, the

¹⁹⁶ Henry Lello, *The Report of Lello, The Third English Ambassador to the Sublime Porte (Babiâli Nezdimde Üçüncü İngiliz Elçisi Lello'nun Muhtırası)*, (ed.) Orhan Burian, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1952, p. 33.

vizier comes who was in charge of ministering the Ottoman court. Secondly, the high-ranking, scholar-jurists, in other words *ulema*, and lastly various court factions, Janissaries and the *sipahis*¹⁹⁷ can be investigated in order to understand the competing power networks in the empire.

Murphey mentions about the limit of vizier's power and coercion during the Ottoman campaigns of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that witnessed series of struggles between influential viziers, their lobbies and factions. "In these stories accounts of the behind-the-scenes wrangling over succession to the grand vizierate sometimes take precedence over the reporting of tactical progress by Ottoman forces at the front."¹⁹⁸ Henry Lello describes the behind-the-scenes wrangling over succession to the grand vizierate in his report. One of the main reasons of these struggles was the hope to be a grand vizier who caused tension and rivalries on the Ottoman forces at the battlefield. These accounts confirm that in a number of cases deliberate withholding of strategic supplies and financial support by a jealous deputy grand vizier (*kaymakam*) in Istanbul could seriously compromise the readiness of commanders at the front to do battle. "The struggle for personal influence and the ambition to obtain higher office amongst the highest ranking of the sultan's *kul*, all of whom were potential candidates for sudden elevation to the grand vizierate, was most pronounced under weak and, especially, underage sultans."¹⁹⁹ Sultan Ahmed I is a good example of this phenomenon.

Relationship between the Sultan and vizier is similar to the relationship between master and servant. Murphey touches upon an important issue "Ottoman history period of between 1500 and 1700, a balance of give and take between master (the sultan)

¹⁹⁷ Börekçi, 2010, p. 5.

¹⁹⁸ Murphey, 1999, p. 30.

¹⁹⁹ Murphey, 1999, p. 30.

and servants (the *kul*) was carefully maintained. When this balance was spoiled, however, it was usually the *kuls* who dominated a weak or newly-installed sultan.”²⁰⁰ Especially during the reign of a weak sultan, struggle for a higher-ranked position and power increased among the servants of different administrative levels.

Second issue is about the official figures of *ulema*. Fatih Yeşil notes that when the army could not fulfill its principal role, the power of diplomatic bureaucracy filled the political vacuum. In this respect, the first candidate for a bureaucratic control was the *ulema*. Until the nineteenth century, all the treaties that were signed by the Ottoman government had to be accompanied by at least one of the members of *ulema*. However, the *ulema*, however, remained incapable of solving the empire's problems especially during the late sixteenth century. Nonetheless, they had prestige in the empire because they represented the most influential and legitimate paths of power. In addition, *ulema* represented Islam and therefore their prestige was preserved.²⁰¹ Halil İnalcık states that Ottoman political system's fundamental principle was to maintain the political balance between the competitive groups within the empire. According to this notion, the Sultan's men were against the *reaya*, the *ulema* was against the bureaucracy, the Janissaries were opposite of the *sipahi*. Thus all the elements would theoretically be in balance.²⁰²

The third official elements in the Ottoman Empire are Janissaries along with the *Sipahis*. During the Long War, the uprisings of the *Jelali* and *sipahis'* rebellions determined the political impact that the viziers gained within the military-administrative hierarchy because they had fought in all the wars. While these wars provided

²⁰⁰ Murphey, 1999, pp. 31-32.

²⁰¹ Yeşil, 2002, pp. 13-15.

²⁰² Halil İnalcık, “Decision Making in the Ottoman State.”, (eds.) C. E. Farah, *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*, Kirksville: The Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993, pp. 9-18 in Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p. 21.

opportunities for them to enrich themselves, the viziers also competed to increase more power and prestige in the government of Sultan Ahmed I.²⁰³

Of course, the Janissaries, the *sipahis* and also the *ulema* were competing in this hierarchical construction. Börekçi explains that high ranking members of the Ottoman *ulema* and the palace soldiers were deeply involved in factional court politics and found many alliances with the viziers.²⁰⁴ Baki Tezcan explains that from 1578 to 1606, the court gained centrality within the Ottoman bureaucracy.²⁰⁵ According to Fatih Yeşil other major event was *Divan-ı Hümayun*'s loss of function. *Divan-ı Hümayun* originally acted as a liaison between the Sultan and the grand vizier, but the councils proved to be inefficient and therefore the *telhis* (petition) system gained strength. In return, the officers, who were in charge of the *telhis* system, had an important position.²⁰⁶ Börekçi explains that “the favourites took full advantage of the new mode of communication with the sultan, which was a direct contact with the sultan, passing by the grand vizier. They not only had the privilege of submitting their own petitions to the sultan, but also controlled the order in which the sultan saw them.”²⁰⁷

Henry Lello's report contains extensive information on the viziers and court factions due to ongoing dismissions and executions that took place after the rebellions of *tımars* because of higher taxation burden on them.²⁰⁸ Additionally, military upheavals and internal rebellions were happening during the same time. Therefore a number of the executions took place at this period. Henry Lello focuses on the viziers' or other court

²⁰³ Tezcan, 2001, p. 245.

²⁰⁴ Börekçi, 2010, p. 150.

²⁰⁵ Tezcan, 2001, p. 245.

²⁰⁶ Recep Ahıskalı, *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttablık Müessesesi (XVIII. Yüzyıl)*, İstanbul: Tatav Yayınları, 2001; Ahmet Mumcu, *Divan-ı Hümayun*, Ankara: Birey ve Toplum Yay., 1986 in Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p. 24.

²⁰⁷ Börekçi, 2010, p. 153.

²⁰⁸ Börekçi, 2010, p. 6.

factions' dismissions and executions. Additionally, the women of the Sultanate, in other words Safiye Sultan as the most prominent imperial woman, were focused on a great-length in this report. Safiye Sultan had an important voice in decision-making process in the empire. According to the present report, the women of the Sultanate played a significant role in the consolidation of power in the Sublime Porte. At the time Safiye Sultan was influential in the palace, thus Lello's report is keen on discussing her role as an important voice in comparison to the so-called "weak Sultan" model.²⁰⁹ The Venetian ambassador to the Ottoman court, Paolo Contarini notes that "all good and all bad come from the queen mother."²¹⁰ The women of the imperial harem, especially *valide sultans* were more active than their predecessors in the direct exercise of political power; in creating and manipulating domestic political factions, in negotiating with foreign powers, and in acting as regents for their sons.²¹¹ The institution of the *valide sultan* emerged in the late sixteenth century due to two main reasons. Firstly, the royal family consolidated into a single family. The second reason was due to the new roles that were assigned to the mother of *şehzade* and mother of the Sultan. Before the reign of Süleyman, the mother's function was not only the head of the *şehzade*'s domestic household "but also to act as a public exemplar in the provincial capital of the dynasty's solicitude for its subject." Now the mother of *şehzade* and mother of the Sultan faced the task of articulating separate spheres of influence within a single physical domain due to the hierarchical power. "The fact that the dynastic family was now housed under one roof which meant that women of

²⁰⁹ Börekçi explains that the "decline" began on several fronts. Firstly, the *timars* which is the military-administrative system based on grants of land revenue was displaced by tax farming., Börekçi, 2010, pp. 12-13. For detailed information on the definition of "weak Sultan" See Börekçi, 2010.

²¹⁰ Eugenio Alberi, *Relazioni delgi ambasciatori veneziani al senato durante il secolo decimosesto*, vol. 3, (ed.) Giorgio Franz, Monaco: Societa Editrice Fiorentina, 1855, p. 325 in Pierce, 1993, p. 7.

²¹¹ Peirce, 1993, p. 7.

considerable status and political influence pursued their own careers and promoted those of their sons in close proximity to one another.”²¹² Eventually, the authority of valide sultan was to bolster at the end of the sixteenth century.

4.2.1. The Grand Vizier Damad İbrahim Pasha

Henry Lello’s report chronicles the period of the grand vizier of Damad İbrahim Pasha. After Sinan Pasha’s death in April 1596, Damad İbrahim Pasha was appointed as grand vizier at the Sublime Porte. Lello mentions him in the following sentence: Damad İbrahim Pasha married Sultan Mehmed III’s oldest sister and he was managing the Sultan’s political tasks well.²¹³ Yeşil suggests that Sultanic marriages were common during the reign of Sultan Süleyman. The members of martial and ruling elite began to marry with the sultanas of the dynasty. However, the sultans generally tried to assimilate prominent bureaucrats. By these marriages, the bureaucrats who gained access into the dynasty became more powerful than ever before. For instance these types of marriages relatively increased during the reign of Sultan Süleyman and continued until the eighteenth century.²¹⁴

Lello explains that Damad İbrahim Pasha was dismissed six months later after his appointment. The reason behind this dismissal might have been related to Damad İbrahim Pasha’s reluctance to go to war with the Tatars, although Sultan Mehmed III was willing to do so.

Lello writes that Damad İbrahim Pasha was convinced by Maximilian II, the Emperor of Germany to make peace with the Sultan because German army was so weak

²¹² Peirce, 1993, p. 110.

²¹³ Lello, 1952, pp. 1-2.

²¹⁴ Fatih Yeşil, 2002, pp. 10-11.

at the time.²¹⁵ Likewise, Peçevi explains the same events in his chronicle right after capturing Komran fortress. He notes that it was decided to initiate an expedition to fortress of Vaç in 1597. Although the fort of Vaç was not armed, Ottoman army could not occupy it. Satırcı Mehmed Pasha, who was the commander-in-chief in Hungary, found a pretext in order to not to support the war.²¹⁶ There was an indictment which was related to Tatar Khan who did not take a part in this war.²¹⁷ Damad İbrahim Pasha influenced all these incidents since he was not interested in conducting the campaign.²¹⁸ Lello adds that Satırcı Mehmed Pasha and his entourage sent spy reports on Damad İbrahim Pasha to the Sultan. Also Lello mentions about the role of *Müfti* of Istanbul who was not sure about the incidents.²¹⁹ Naima notes that the official *Müfti* was Bostanzade who supported Damad İbrahim Pasha. It is noted that Bostanzade asked the Sultan whether İbrahim Pasha was guilty about this issue. But Sultan Mehmed III replied him that it was not a felony, eventually Damad İbrahim Pasha caused the death of Gazi Giray Khan during the campaign. Bostanzade explained that Cerrah Mehmed Pasha was responsible for this mistake but Sultan Mehmed III replied Damad İbrahim Pasha had to be provident.²²⁰

There is one more character about whom Lello mentions in his report, namely Hoca Sadeddin, “muftie or general pope.”²²¹ As was mentioned before, Yeşil argues that the *ulemas* were seeking merely their own profit, unless a problem was affecting them they would not have attempted to solve it.²²² Hoca Sadeddin wanted to take revenge on İbrahim Pasha and Safiye Sultan who cared for Damad İbrahim Pasha very much. Sultan

²¹⁵ Lello, 1952, p. 2.

²¹⁶ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 194-196.

²¹⁷ Naima, 2007, p. 131; Peçevi, 1982, p. 196.

²¹⁸ Peçevi, 1982, p. 196.

²¹⁹ Lello, 1952, p. 41.

²²⁰ Naima, 2007, p. 131.

²²¹ Lello, 1952, p. 1.

²²² Yeşil, 2002, pp. 13-15.

Mehmed III was affected by his complaint but Safiye Sultan convinced him not to execute Damad İbrahim Pasha. However, he was not given his position back as grand vizier.²²³ Leonardo Dona states that “the relations between the ruler and his subjects are characterized by violence rather than by common reference to a body of laws and legal institutions”²²⁴ and “taken by force and power is maintained through the use of force.”²²⁵ Agostino Nani assesses that “extortion is the natural means of tyrannical government, oppression the natural condition of its subjects.”²²⁶

4.2.2. The Grand Vizier Hadım Hasan Pasha

Following Damad İbrahim Pasha, Hadım Hasan Pasha became next grand vizier.²²⁷ He was in prison in *Yedikule Zindanları* because of his iniquities and was released with the financial support of Safiye Sultan on November 3, 1597.²²⁸

Lello writes that Hadım Hasan Pasha was appointed as grand vizier by Safiye Sultan’s support because he was Safiye Sultan’s favourite. Safiye Sultan should have advised not to inform the Sultan about the displeasing and bad luck within the empire because the Sultan was extremely melancholic, thus he understood nothing until Hoca Sadeddin (who much tendered the good of the state) acquainted him of bad accidents.²²⁹

Peçevi and Hammer note that Hadım Hasan Pasha was a corruptible man. Peçevi states that he told everyone that Valide Sultan was blackmailing him. According to Hammer, Hadım Hasan Pasha was going to be incarcerated in *Yedikule Zindanları*

²²³ Lello, 1952, p. 41.

²²⁴ Dona, 1596, 358, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

²²⁵ Dona, 1596, 358, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

²²⁶ Nani, 1603, 35, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

²²⁷ Peçevi, 1982, p. 196; Naima, 2007, p. 131.

²²⁸ Hammer, 1993, p. 255; Naima, 2007, p. 131.

²²⁹ Lello, 1952, p. 2.

because of his bad deeds in Egypt, however by bribing Valide Sultan. Hammer notes that Hadım Hasan Pasha ruined *Kapıağası* Gazanfer Agha's career and requested his execution from the Sultan.²³⁰ But Sultan Mehmed denied this request and informed Safiye Sultan about Hadım Hasan Pasha's plans. After Safiye Sultan learnt that she told everything to Gazanfer. Gazanfer warned her about Hadım Hasan Pasha's rumors saying she was accepting bribes. After all it was decided to execute Hadım Hasan Pasha on April 8, 1598.²³¹

Prior to this, *Müfti* Bostanzade died and Hadım Hasan Pasha proposed the Sultan to appoint Baki and Karaçelebizade as a new *Müfti*. Yet Hadım Hasan Pasha's advice made the Sultan get angry since he had Hoca Sadeddin in his mind as new *müfti* who was closer to himself.²³² As was mentioned before, İnalçık states that there should be a political balance between the competitive groups in the Ottoman political system,²³³ but this *müfti* crisis shows that there was not only a competition between different groups but also there could be a competition within the same group. After Hoca Sadeddin became the new *müfti*, Hadım Hasan Pasha complained to the Sultan about the issue of his election, neither Hadım Hasan Pasha nor the Safiye Sultan heard from him about the issue.²³⁴ Hoca Sadeddin ordered *Bostancı başı* to be arrested right after his dismissal, and all his wealth was confiscated by the Sultan.²³⁵

²³⁰ Hammer, 1993, p. 256.

²³¹ Peçevi, 1982, p.196; Hammer, 1993, pp. 255-256.

²³² Naima, 2007, p. 132; Hammer, 1993, p. 256.

²³³ İnalçık, 1993, pp. 9-18; in Yeşil, 2002, p. 21.

²³⁴ Lello, 1952, p. 2.

²³⁵ Lello, 1952, p. 2; Hammer, 1993, pp. 256-257; Naima, 2007, pp. 132-133.

4.2.3. Grand Vizier Cerrah Mehmed Pasha

Cerrah Mehmed Pasha became the new grand vizier by the support of Hoca Sadeddin although Damad İbrahim desired this position. A written order (*Hatt-ı Hümayun*) was enacted by the Sultan which included that if Cerrah Mehmed Pasha did not perform his duties, he would have been broken into pieces and had a bad reputation on the judgment day.²³⁶

Lello claimed that Safiye Sultan tried to convince the Sultan that İbrahim Pasha had a lovable personality however she could not achieve her aim. Cerrah Mehmed Pasha married the Sultan's aunt. As was mentioned previously, these marriages became very important for the bureaucrats to gain access into the dynasty. Meantime Yanık was conquered in November 1594 and Budin was surrendered by Hungarians.

Cerrah Mehmed Pasha just served his position for five months. Even though there was no reason, after these military expeditions Satırcı Mehmed Pasha and Cerrah Mehmed Pasha were dismissed.²³⁷ Later Damad İbrahim Pasha returned back his position, he was obliged to go to war against Hungary and he aimed to take his revenge on Satırcı Mehmed Pasha.²³⁸ According to Selaniki, Cerrah Mehmed Pasha was a vizier at the court and İbrahim Pasha was the governor-general of Rumeli at the time.²³⁹

In early 1596, confrontations at Lipova, Temeşvar, Vaç and Hatvan were followed by the fortress of Eğri (Eger) which lay on the access route of the Habsburgs to their ally Transylvania. It was against the Habsburg relief force commanded by Archduke Maximilian. The Ottomans fought successfully at the Battlefield of Haçova

²³⁶ Hammer, 1993, p. 257; Naima, 2007, p. 133.

²³⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 3; Hammer, 1993, pp. 259-260.

²³⁸ Lello, 1952, p. 3; Hammer, 1993, p. 260.

²³⁹ Selaniki, Vol. I, 1999, pp. 134-135.

(Mezőkeresztes).²⁴⁰ Sultan Mehmed III and his army left Istanbul after a magnificent ceremony. The Sultan's hodja, Mevlana Sadeddin, was explaining every detail about the war. The cause of the Eger war was to capture all the mines in the region.²⁴¹ The Eger situated between Austria and Transylvania together with Moldavia and Wallachia, which was under the Habsburg sovereignty. The siege took three weeks; the fortress of Eger fell to the Ottomans on October 12, 1596.²⁴²

Murphey explains that leadership disputes emerged in the period of Mehmed III's campaign against Egri in 1596. During the early and mid-seventeenth century, "the sultans could not lead the troops into battle because of the several nonadults to the sultanate. Thus the grand viziers began to lead both troops into battle and state administration. But this concentration of power in the hands of the Sultan's *kuls* did not go unnoticed in Anatolia; it caused a series of provincial rebellions which blocked the pursuit of empire's expansionist ambitions. Under such conditions of internal instability the effective prosecution of wars was clearly not possible."²⁴³

Börekçi explains that "on October 22-26, 1596, the Habsburgs took place in the nearby plain of Haçova (Mazökerezstes). They crushed the Ottoman camps, the Habsburg soldiers began to plunder the Ottoman tents. But Ottoman cavalry and infantry suddenly turned back and caught them in their act. Although the Habsburg army attacked the Ottoman army, the Ottomans were victorious at the last minute."²⁴⁴

²⁴⁰ Finkel, 1988, p. 15.

²⁴¹ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 178-179.

²⁴² Sándor László Toth, *A Mezőkeresztesi csta es a Tzinöt éves Haboru. A Mezőkeresztesi csata és a Ttizenő éves háború*, Szeged: Belvedere meridionale, 2000, pp. 186-199 in Börekçi, 2010, p. 45.

²⁴³ Murphey, 1999, p. 31.

²⁴⁴ Börekçi, 2010, p. 46.

When Damad İbrahim Pasha was in Hungary expedition, Halil Pasha and Hafiz Ahmed Pasha were the statesmen. Halil Pasha was the *kaymakam* and married Sultan's older sister. Both of İbrahim Pasha and Halil Pasha complained about their mother-in-law who was Safiye Sultan because of her interference with the affairs of state.²⁴⁵ Hafiz Ahmed Pasha succeeded Halil Pasha. He purchased this position from Safiye Sultan. But he was corrupting and was opposite of İbrahim Pasha, who complained about him to the Sultan, eventually Hafiz Ahmed Pasha was dismissed.²⁴⁶

4.2.4. The Death of Esperanza Malchi

Like Hafiz Ahmed and Halil Pasha, the *sipahi* or timar holders made a complaint about Safiye Sultan because she had begged from the Sultan. She took certain amount of annual revenue called the "Defter" or annual tribute of every village in Asia and Greece for the de-pasturing the sheep in use.²⁴⁷ Safiye Sultan gave this revenue to a Jewish woman named Esperanza Malchi or called as *kira* in Greek, meaning "lady". *Kiras* who served the sultanas were the most important contact person with the imperial Harem especially during Nurbanu and Safiye Sultan's periods.²⁴⁸ Günhan Börekçi explains that while referring all these factional struggles, power of Safiye Sultan should be considered during the Sultan Mehmed III's reign. "Safiye Sultan's factions and favourites formed the foci of power within the hierarchical construction of the court." Additionally, Sultan Mehmed III was affected by his mother's meddling in state affairs.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁵ Lello, 1952, p. 4.

²⁴⁶ Lello, 1952, p. 7.

²⁴⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 7.

²⁴⁸ Pedani, 2000, pp. 11-12.

²⁴⁹ Börekçi, 2010, pp. 150-153.

Henry Lello calls Esperanza Malchi as Kiranuk who sold some of this revenue and bestowed to her children. Hereupon, the *sipahi* movement raised a mutiny in Istanbul against Safiye Sultan and Kiranuk.²⁵⁰ The *sipahis* went to *Müfti* Sunullah Efendi for the *fetva* but Sunullah Efendi proposed to relay their desire but they did not admit this proposal.²⁵¹

All of the *sipahis* came to the Sublime Porte and required Sultan Mehmed III to deliver head of Kiranuk to them. They also required the Sultan to forbid his mother meddle in state affairs. This request even scared both the Sultan and Safiye Sultan and they decided to offer Kiranuk gifts and rewards. They also gave their revenue to the *sipahis*. However the *sipahis* did not calm down. Kiranuk fled the Sublime Porte and the Sultan and Safiye Sultan exiled her and she took a boat towards the Black Sea. But *sipahis* had spies in every corner that eventually captured her. The spies dragged her in the streets and brought back to house of Halil Pasha which was the central administration point.²⁵² *Sipahis* waited in front of Halil Pasha's house and wanted to take her back in order to kill. If not, they said that they would have demolished Halil Pasha's house. Hereupon, Halil Pasha came to window at his house and waved his hand by saying "they should do what they want to do with her". Afterwards, *sipahis* started to yell "kill her, kill her" and then one of them stabbed her.²⁵³

The *sipahis* also wanted Halil Pasha to deliver Kiranuk's sons. She was a widow who had three sons. One of them was "the chief customer"; *sipahis* caught them with

²⁵⁰ Lello, 1952, p. 5.

²⁵¹ Selaniki tarihi, 240a-241a in Lello, 1952, p. 75.

²⁵² Lello, 1952, p. 5; Selaniki tarihi, in Lello, 1952, pp. 75-76; Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı*, Ankara: TTK, 1988c in Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p. 23.

²⁵³ Lello, 1952, pp. 5-6.

Kiranuk at their house.²⁵⁴ On the other hand Lello and Selaniki write that the oldest son was not with his mother.²⁵⁵ As Lello notes that “the first son was not cut him so in pieces by the soldiers, only they slew him, straight burnt him to ashes.”²⁵⁶ Lello and Selaniki note that his end was like his mother’s.²⁵⁷ The second son fled away, and the third one was eventually converted to Islam.²⁵⁸

Besides, Hammer writes about same event, for him Kiranuk and her sons climbed up the Sublime Porte’s stairs, *sipahis* caught and killed them all. Only, Kiranuk’s fourth son ran away and became Muslim whose name was changed as Aksak Mustafa *Çavuş*.²⁵⁹ Naima notes that Aksak Mustafa *Çavuş* died during the reign of Sultan İbrahim Han (r. 1640-1648).²⁶⁰

Lello remarks two dead bodies at the end of his report that were dragged like dogs, it was calling as *Atmeydanı*, Lello compared this place to Smithfield in England. He describes woman eaten by dogs. The bodies of Kiranuk’s sons were not eaten by dogs, thus people were shocked. Not only Christians and Muslims but also the Jews were very glad by the death of Kiranuk and her sons, because she was a very pompous and arrogant woman. Safiye Sultan decided to take revenge on Halil Pasha, thinking that he was responsible for rumors about Kiranuk.²⁶¹

This event caused Halil Pasha’s suppression and new *kaymakam* became Hadım Hafız Pasha.²⁶² On the other hand, ten days later instead of Hafız Pasha, Yemişci Pasha -

²⁵⁴ BL_Cotton MS Nero B XI, *Cotton Manuscripts*, p. 11/20, Hammer, 1993, p. 273.

²⁵⁵ Lello, 1952, p. 6; Selaniki tarihi in Lello, 1952, p. 76.

²⁵⁶ *Cotton Manuscripts*, p. 11/20.

²⁵⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 6; Selaniki tarihi in Lello, 1952, p. 76.

²⁵⁸ *Cotton Manuscripts*, p. 11/2; Lello, 1952, p. 6; Selaniki, vol. 1, 1999, p. 76.

²⁵⁹ Hammer, 1993, p. 273.

²⁶⁰ Naima, 2007, p. 174.

²⁶¹ Lello, 1952, pp. 6-7.

²⁶² Hammer, 1993, p. 273; Naima, 2007, p. 174.

as I have mentioned about him- became the new *kaymakam* through Damad İbrahim's favoritism.²⁶³

Lello indicates a very important point that appointment of the favorites of Safiye Sultan, Damad İbrahim Pasha and the other great men were dismissed and disgraced by the *Müfti*. For this reason, Safiye Sultan thought that the Sultan would not have allowed his mother to interfere with state affairs. (Safiye Sultan had damaged Sultan's reputation very much, for him she was covetous and ambitious.) Nevertheless she continued to influence him until his death and protected Yemişci Hasan Pasha, however the bureaucrats of empire were aware of the fact he was very ignorant. Yemişci Hasan Pasha did not take anyone's advice, Safiye Sultan also despised him.²⁶⁴

4.2.5. Death of Damad İbrahim Pasha

According to Peçevi, Damad İbrahim Pasha died in Ösek.²⁶⁵ On the other hand, Lello noted that he could not be licensed to return to his home. According to some people, Damad İbrahim Pasha was poisoned.²⁶⁶ Rhoads Murphey focuses that "even when the succession of a new grand vizier was the result neither of political sabotage nor of a messy power struggle, but was necessitated by the natural death of an incumbent office, the disruptive effect of a change of leadership on military activity was the same. Damat İbrahim Pasha's death and also preparations for war efforts in Hungary coincided in 1601. This coincidence resulted with a season of campaigning."²⁶⁷

²⁶³ Naima, 2007, p. 174; Lello, 1952, p. 8.

²⁶⁴ Lello, 1952, p. 8.

²⁶⁵ Peçevi, 1982, p. 221.

²⁶⁶ Lello, 1952, p. 8.

²⁶⁷ Murphey, 1999, p. 31.

4.2.6. The Grand Vizier Yemişci Hasan Pasha

After Damad İbrahim Pasha's death on July 10, 1601, Yemişci Hasan Pasha became the new grand vizier. Peçevi and Hammer note that Damad İbrahim Pasha had abandoned army commandership to his nephew, Murtaza Pasha. However, finally Yemişci Hasan Pasha was the new grand vizier and Damad İbrahim Pasha's widow, Ayşe Sultan, was married Yemişci Hasan Pasha. One of Yemişci Hasan Pasha's *telhis*'s, he mentions about this issue to the Sultan.

“Telhis-i merhum ve mağfur Vezir-i a'zam Yemişci Hasan *Pasha*:

Arz-ı bende-i bî mikdâr budur ki, saâdetlu Padişahum bu kulları İstanbul'da iken Vezir-i a'zamlık ve serdarlık hıdmeti sadaka buyrulduğundan mâ'adâ bir hatt-ı humâyunlârı vârid olup *hemşirem Ayşe sultanı Allah'ın buyruğu ile sana verdim İnşallahu Te'alâ seferden geldükden sonar alâsın deyü* buyurulmuş...Sa'âdetlü padişâhumun hüsn-i nazarları ve bu kullarına ve asker-i islam hayır du'aları reca olunur devletlü padişâhım zikr olunan tashih-i sikke akçasından bâkî kalan on bin sikke altın semâyeyi verilen yerlerden geldükde iç hazîneye teslim olunur bu bâbda ferman [izzetlü pâdişahumundur].”²⁶⁸

With this *telhis* Yemişci Hasan Pasha announced that the Sultan Mehmed III promised himself marrying, Ayşe Sultan. Sultan Mehmed III replied him: “Merhûm ve mağfur Sultan Mehemed Han hazretlerinün cavâb-ı şerîfleridür: Ma'lûm oldu, heman hıdmet üzere olasız bakî kalan altunu tenbîh edesiz gelüp bize vâsıl ola (R, 27 a-28 b).”²⁶⁹ Whereas Sultan Mehmed III did not even mention about his marriage promise and he only referred to the revenue of the state treasure.

²⁶⁸ Cengiz Orhonlu (ed.), *Osmanlı Tarihine Âid Belgeler, Telhîsler (1597-1607)*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1970, p. 12. (11 Muharrem 1110 [Fezleke, I, 147; Naima, I, 243]).

²⁶⁹ Orhonlu, 1970, p. 13.

In accordance to this *telhis*, Naima explains that Yemişçi Hasan Pasha and Ayşe Sultan were only engaged.²⁷⁰ Lello describes Yemişçi Hasan Pasha that “he was called as ‘Yemişçi’ because he was the fruit seller of the Sultan. Lello also added that he was a very rude and an ignorant man. Lello claims that he was from Slovenia,”²⁷¹ however Peçevi notes that he was from Albania.²⁷²

Halil Pasha was the new *kaymakam* of Istanbul.²⁷³ In early January 1603, the political crisis was bigger than before because this rebellion had its roots in the campaign of 1602. Grand Vizier Yemişçi Hasan Pasha made critical mistakes: Ottoman Army lost two crucial fortresses after six months fighting. When the *sipahis* were back from their miserable journey they joined the Janissaries’ forces.²⁷⁴ Lorenzo Bernardo states that “Today that order is all being changed and corrupted. He writes, the ‘three foundations’ on which the Ottomans had built up their power in so little time -religion, obedience and parsimony, which we should take to mean the art of living and the governing at the least expense, the careful management of resources- have been shaken.” The Ottomans have their warlike ardor, and their virile frugality. “ ‘Disunity’ and ‘disobedience’ have found their way into the civil and military corps.”²⁷⁵

The *sipahis* and Janissaries revolted against the favors of Safiye Sultan. They wanted to banish and kill *Kapı Ağası*, *Kızlar Ağası*, *Bostancı başı* and the others from the Sublime Porte. Safiye Sultan bribed the rebels therefore she stayed in the Sublime Porte,

²⁷⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 221; Hammer, 1993, p. 333; Lello, 1952, p. 8, Naima, 2007, p. 179.

²⁷¹ Lello, 1952, pp. 7-8.

²⁷² Peçevi, 1982, p. 230.

²⁷³ Lello, 1952, p. 8.

²⁷⁴ Hasan Beyzade Ahmed Pasha, *Hasan Bey-Zade Tarihi (1003-1045/1595-1635)*, (ed.) Şevki Nezihi Aykut, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, Vol. 3, 2004, p. 690.

²⁷⁵ Valensi, 1993, p. 70.

also Sublime Porte's minister and Harem's minister could stay too. The others escaped from the Sublime Porte because they were afraid of the rebels.²⁷⁶

According to Hasan Beyzade, Mehmed Sultan III had no choice therefore he met with the leaders of the outraged *sipahis* who demanded the executions of *kapı ağası* Gazanfer Agha and *kızlar ağası* Osman Agha and Saatçi Hasan Pasha who were dismissed his position of Grand Vizier. All of these people were responsible for the military corruption.²⁷⁷ As was mentioned before, the relations between the ruler and his subjects are characterized by violence rather than by common reference to a body of laws and legal actions.²⁷⁸ At the slightest incident, the Sultan could 'behead' them.²⁷⁹ Halil Pasha's neglect was seen as the reason of this rebellion because of the previous incidents during his period. He was dismissed and disfavored, therefore he died from sorrow or -as suspected- he was poisoned.²⁸⁰

4.3. The Continuous Ottoman-Habsburg War

According to Lello when Halil Pasha died, Yemişçi Hasan Pasha was the commander-in-chief in Hungary therefore Yemişçi took Belgrade from the Christians and then he captured Peşte with his army.²⁸¹ Naima noted that after İbrahim Pasha's death, a *ferman* was given to Yemişçi Hasan Pasha to capture Belgrade.²⁸² Peçevi notes that Yemişçi Hasan Pasha captured Belgrade in 1603 with Budin Beylerbeyi Menkuzkuşu Mehmet Pasha's help and the army entered to Budin and stayed a few days in Peşte.²⁸³

²⁷⁶ Lello, 1952, pp. 8-9.

²⁷⁷ Hasan Beyzade, III, 2004, vol. 3, pp. 690-691.

²⁷⁸ Dona, 1596, 358, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

²⁷⁹ Nani, 1603, 35, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

²⁸⁰ Lello, 1952, pp. 8-9.

²⁸¹ Lello, 1952, p. 9.

²⁸² Naima, 2007, p. 179.

²⁸³ Peçevi, 1982, p. 227.

Lello explains Yemişci Hasan Pasha's self-confidence after these good fortunes because he was known as ignorant. He attempted to conquer and recover all the places which were conquered by the Christians. He immediately decided to dispatch the army from Erdel which was a very far away place.²⁸⁴ Peçevi shows that there was a different *budun* (clan) in Erdel. One of them was Sekel which leading by Sekel Mazoş who took Yemişci Hasan Pasha as refugee and helped to capture Erdel. Hereupon Yemişci Hasan Pasha reacted positively to his offer and then decided to capture Erdel. But İstoyni Belgrade was not in the Ottoman Empire therefore, İstoyni Belgrade firstly had to be conquered. Ottoman army moved from Erdel to İstoyni Belgrade.²⁸⁵

Lello describes Yemişci Hasan Pasha's winter journey. He writes camels and horses were wearied; the men were sick who died like dogs. When the army was in half way, the news was brought that the Christians recovered Peşte.²⁸⁶ According to Peçevi when the Christians learned that the Muslims went towards Erdel, they conquered Budin then settled a bridge and finally recovered Peşte. There, all women and men were robbed and killed by them.²⁸⁷ Hereupon Yemişci Hasan Pasha was so daunted and he accepted his ignorance.²⁸⁸

Lello states that Yemişci Hasan Pasha also wanted to hang himself because of his fault. When he returned, he found so many soldiers, some dead and sick. Yemişci Hasan Pasha ordered to kill the sick ones there. When the Sultan learned all of these, he disgraced Yemişci Hasan Pasha and thought that he should have been strangled. He had some enemies; one of them was Güzelce Mehmed Pasha who gave rewards to the chief

²⁸⁴ Lello, 1952, p. 9.

²⁸⁵ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 228-229; Orhonlu, 1970, p. 66.

²⁸⁶ Lello, 1952, p. 10.

²⁸⁷ Peçevi, 1982, p. 231.

²⁸⁸ Lello, 1952, p. 10; Peçevi, 1982, p. 231.

of the soldiers to instigate against him. Güzelce Mehmed Pasha also wanted to marry Yemişçi Hasan Pasha's fiancée, because according to Yemişçi there was a great attraction between them.²⁸⁹

4.3.1. Kaymakam Güzelce Mehmed Pasha

Peçevi notes that Güzelce Mahmut Pasha -not Mehmet Pasha- was the *kaymakam* of Istanbul district and in his period there were the *Jelali* Rebellions. All the *sipahis* and Janissaries ran away and arrived to Istanbul.²⁹⁰ But for this event everything turned upside down.

Lello talks about this event in the following lines: When Sultan Mehmed III understood the danger, he admitted eight people who came from two different classes. The Sultan asked the reason of rebellion; they replied that it was for his and state's benefits. Lello adds that the Sultan was not aware of how the empire was standing. Sultan's mother, Safiye Sultan, and her favourites served for their benefits. These people also complained about Yemişçi Hasan Pasha because of his ignorance. The Sultan answered that his mother, his and her favors did not have any fault. If there was any fault, it was committed by the governor Saatçi Hasan Pasha.²⁹¹

Lello writes about Saatçi Hasan Pasha in his report, it came to open court with many letters stuck under in his girdle and in his *tulbent* (head scarf). These letters were addressed to him by Safiye Sultan and others. No doubt, the soldiers would not have been permitted to answer him and wanted to behead him before his defense. They asked him why he did not warn the Sultan about the possibility of the rebellion and his operations in

²⁸⁹ Lello, 1952, p. 10.

²⁹⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 239.

²⁹¹ Lello, 1952, pp. 10-11.

Hungary.²⁹² According to Peçevi, when Yemişçi Hasan Pasha arrived to Istanbul, the rebels received a *fetva* (Islamic law) from *Müfti*. Güzelce Mahmut Pasha sent the *fetva* to the Sultan for approval but the Sultan did not admit this *fetva* and added that “I knew Yemişçi’s all operations.”²⁹³ Hereupon, the Sultan answered whether he commanded Safiye Sultan, *kapı ağası* and the others which will be mentioned in the following parts. When Yemişçi Hasan Pasha showed the letters of Safiye Sultan and other bureaucrats, the Sultan could not say anything and was ashamed, and then he set him free. The Sultan promised the soldiers hereafter that neither his mother nor the others would interfere with the affairs of state. Only his vizier and pashas should deal with matters of the empire.

However, the soldiers were not satisfied. They wanted to banish Safiye Sultan and execution of others. If the Sultan did not perform his Sultanic tasks, they would have deposed him and put his son at his place. Thus he was terrified very much. Clearly, “...the administration was corrupt from top to the bottom. In a system whose linchpin was the Sultan himself, any weakening at the center affected the entire structure. Now, the sultans at this critical period were said to have lacked the qualities of their predecessors. Raised not on the battlefield but in the Harem, and without the benefit of having governed the provinces before coming to power, they were incapable of leadership and were helpless before the insubordination and insolence of the Janissaries.”²⁹⁴ Although the Sultan loved *kapı ağası*, *kızlar ağası* and the others, he ordered their execution and then he cried like a child. Firstly *kapı ağası*, then *kızlar ağası*

²⁹² Lello, 1952, pp. 11-12.

²⁹³ Peçevi, 1982, p. 240.

²⁹⁴ Stanford J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, I: 169ff., in Valensi, 1993, p. 80.

were killed.²⁹⁵ Lello did not write their names but Peçevi notes them as Sinan Pasha Zade, *kapı ağası* Gazanfer Agha and *kızlar ağası* Osman Agha who were killed before the Sultan's eyes on January 6, 1603.²⁹⁶ According to the Janissaries, they were killed as they were responsible for the incident. Pedani notes that Gazanfer became the first *kapı ağası*, and after his brother's death, he was also appointed as *hasodabaşı*. Therefore he was the most important man in the Ottoman Empire; he held his office more than thirty years. Until 1603, Gazanfer Agha and his party succeeded in directing Ottoman politics. "On 21 March 1601, the eight persons who, besides the Safiye Sultan, governed the empire were the *kapı ağası* and *saray ağası*, Ömer Agha from Zara, the *kapı ağası*'s *kahya*, the *kapıcılar kethüdası*, the *bostancı başı*, Raziye *hatun*'s daughter and two most important court jesters." These people were sustained by the Janissaries, and *sipahis* and *ulema*.²⁹⁷

Finally, Tırnakçı Hasan Pasha was forgiven by the *sipahis* and Janissaries. Safiye Sultan was banished because she begged the Sultan and also she gave benefaction to the *sipahis* and Janissaries. Shaw notes that "when these sultans stopped eliminating their rivals physically, there was nothing to prevent the formation of contending factions within the seraglio or the deleterious influence of wives and mothers, the famous sultanate of women."²⁹⁸ After that, Safiye Sultan began to work for Yemişçi's freedom and Yemişçi was not back until she approved.²⁹⁹ Peçevi explains that Yemişçi Hasan Pasha was protected by the Sultan, and he also wanted to catch the rebels by a *fetva*. Hereupon, Yemişçi Hasan Pasha relieved and told the Sultan that *kuls* were planning to

²⁹⁵ Lello, 1952, pp. 11-12.

²⁹⁶ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 239-240; Lello, 1952, p. 12.

²⁹⁷ Pedani, 2000, pp. 14-15.

²⁹⁸ Valensi, 1993, p. 80.

²⁹⁹ Lello, 1952, p. 13.

make Sunullah Efendi the caliph. Yemiřci Hasan Pasha added that he stopped all these bad seeds. Afterwards he won the Sultan's trust.³⁰⁰

Kapı ağası Ali Agha and Tırnakçı Hasan Pasha were executed because of Yemiřci Hasan Pasha although there was no reason for them to be killed. Peçevi adds that Yemiřci Hasan Pasha's pride and specter was the cause of these actions. After that *Müfti* Mustafa Efendi and the Agha of Janissaries' Kasım Agha complained about Yemiřci Hasan Pasha to the Sultan and claimed that if the Sultan wanted to take the holy seal, Yemiřci Hasan Pasha would not have given it. Obviously Yemisci Hasan Pasha did not obey the Sultan. When the Sultan wanted it, he gave immediately. Hereupon, the Janissaries rebelled and they threatened the primary statesmen if the seal was not given back to Yemiřci Hasan Pasha, consequently the rebellion increased. Thereupon these statesmen informed Sultan but there was no news. After that the Janissaries' new Agha was appointed who had different politics.³⁰¹

4.3.2 Yemiřci Hasan Pasha's Supersession and Deaths in Lello's Report

Safiye Sultan thought that neither she nor her son had enemies to trouble them after the event of Şehzade Mahmut's death, which will be explained in the following sections. Yemiřci Hasan Pasha's death is described in Lello's report in the following lines: Yemiřci Hasan Pasha saw Safiye Sultan affecting her son's decisions according to her wishes. He spied on her to the Sultan. Sultan Mehmed III informed his mother about this secret complaint. When Safiye Sultan saw Yemiřci's ingratitude towards herself, she construed this to her son that he had much dishonored him to say. According to Safiye Sultan, Yemiřci was blaming her on a groundless basis; she was being insulted by his

³⁰⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 241.

³⁰¹ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 241-242.

corrupted thoughts. His hidden aim was to dishonor her. He tricked her and even bribed the soldiers for his own agenda. Sultan Mehmed III believed her mother thereupon he dismissed Yemişci and ordered to expel him from Istanbul on November 2, 1603. But Safiye Sultan was not satisfied completely and she began to follow her son with many other accusations against Yemişci Hasan Pasha, until she had convinced Sultan Mehmed III.

The *Bostancı başı* was accompanied with 200 *acemioğlans* to Yemişci Hasan Pasha's place, but before their arrival Yemişci had learnt their plans. He locked his door when *acemioğlans* climbed the walls, then some of them got injured. Thus they could not enter his place without support. Yemişci's wife, Ayşe Sultan, dispatched a post to her mother, Safiye Sultan, and her brother, Sultan Mehmed III. She promised that if the Sultan could forgive her husband, she and Yemişci could go to Mecca without any further charge or trouble. However the Sultan replied her indicating that she should have accompanied him with death if she insisted. Hereupon, Yemişci Hasan Pasha was succumbed, he was yelling at the executioners. After the executioners could enter they strangled him with a cord which they had for that purpose. His body was thrown into a stinking ditch. Yemişci was not buried in the Muslims graveyard.³⁰²

On the other hand Lello describes the incident in the following way: after Yemişci reestablished Sultan's support and he bribed the soldiers. Afterwards he found the *sipahis* who were against Yemişci, on Safiye Sultan's side. Those *sipahis* were the followers of Güzelce Mahmut Pasha. They were found with a bag of money with Güzelce's seal upon it, and then their heads were beheaded.³⁰³

³⁰² Lello, 1952, pp. 16-18.

³⁰³ Lello, 1952, p. 14.

Hammer notes that the Janissaries obeyed the Sultan's and Yemişçi Hasan Pasha first punished the *sipahis*. For that purpose he sent the Janissaries who were guilty and informed that they were going to be executed. In return the Janissaries announced that they were not going to release anyone and they requested the dismissal of *müfti* Sunullah Efendi and appointment of Mustafa Efendi instead; eventually their requests were carried out. On January 28, 1603 Poyraz Osman and Öküz Mehmed visited grand vizier Yemişçi Hasan Pasha. Poyraz Osman was a fellow soldier of Yemişçi Hasan Pasha. He accepted his crime and he confessed that he wanted to be a shareholder to *Müfti* Sunullah Efendi for 30.000 golds. Poyraz Osman's last wish was not to be strangled; he wanted to die by a sword. During this period, the rebellion of *sipahis* was suppressed by the Janissaries, consequently a big hostility began.³⁰⁴

Lello mentions that Yemişçi attempted to stop the rebellion in Anatolia. He aimed to stay at home and spend time with his new wife. However, when he involved with these incidents, another accident happened.³⁰⁵

4.3.4 The Death of Şehzade Mahmud (June 7, 1603)

According to İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, Sultan Mehmed III had five sons, Selim, Mahmud, Ahmed, Cihangir and Mustafa respectively. The oldest one was Selim who died on April 20, 1597, at his fourteen. Cihangir died at the end of Sultan Mehmed III's period. Uzunçarşılı notes that Mahmud was the second child, who was born in 1587; he died when he was sixteen on June 7, 1603.³⁰⁶ On the other hand, Lello narrates that Sultan Mehmed III's oldest son Şehzade Mahmud was eighteen or nineteen years old.

³⁰⁴ Hammer, 1993, pp. 349-351; Peçevi, 1982, p. 241.

³⁰⁵ Lello, 1952, p. 14.

³⁰⁶ İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "Üçüncü Mehmed'in Oğlu Şehzâde Mahmud'un Ölümü", Belleten, 24. Cilt, 94. Sayı, 1960, pp. 263-267.

Lello's depicts the events of Şehzade Mahmud in his report. He saw the empire's decline and his grand mother, Safiye Sultan's attitudes; her desire getting money and seeking her own benefit. He observed how his father was led by Safiye Sultan. Şehzade Mahmud often lamented to his mother, Hâlîme Sultan who was not supported by Safiye Sultan. Şehzade Mahmud was upset because of these rivalries.³⁰⁷

Uzunçarşılı notes that Hafız Ahmed Pasha who was the grand vizier in the period of Sultan Murad IV (r. 1623-1640), administered in *enderun*. Hafız Ahmed Pasha's observations during the reign of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617) set the *Jelali* Risings in Anatolia and the war of Iran. Sultan Mehmed III was very upset because of these events.³⁰⁸ On the other hand, Hammer explains that there were two crises one of them was *Jelali* Risings, and the second one was Hungary war.³⁰⁹ When Şehzade Mahmud saw his father in those conditions, he made a request, saying "Send me to the war, I can succeed these expeditions." Thereupon Şehzade Ahmed who was younger than Şehzade Mahmud, noticed that Sultan Mehmed III was not glad. Şehzade Ahmed attempted to discourage him however Şehzade Mahmud did not take heed of it.³¹⁰

Hafız Ahmed Pasha recounts a different version of this incident that one of the *Şeyhs* who wrote a letter to Şehzade Mahmud informed him that he could be the new Sultan instead of Sultan Mehmed III. Then, a fight started between *Şeyh* and Şehzade Mahmud.³¹¹ This letter was given to the Sultan by *Kızlar ağası* Abdürrezzak Agha. Hereupon Şehzade Mahmud, his mother (Hâlîme Sultan), *Şeyh* and the others were arrested and approximately one month later Şehzade Mahmud was strangled. His

³⁰⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 14.

³⁰⁸ Uzunçarşılı, 1960, p. 263; Peçevi, 1982, p. 264.

³⁰⁹ Hammer, 1993, p. 356.

³¹⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 281.

³¹¹ Uzunçarşılı, 1960, pp. 263-264; Hammer, 1993, p. 356; Peçevi, 1982, p. 265.

supporters were sacked into the sea on June 7, 1603.³¹² By utilizing the sources of Venetian *bailos* Contarini, B rek i explains that H lime Sultan was not actually killed during  ehzade Mahmud’s assassination. According to him, H lime Sultan lived until 1622.³¹³

In his report, Lello notes that as a superstitious person, H lime Sultan asked a Wiseman or a fortune-teller whether her son was going to be Sultan in the future and how long her husband Sultan Mehmed III was going to live. Her questions were replied in a note. But, the messenger accidentally delivered it to Safiye Sultan instead of young Sultan. When Safiye Sultan opened the letter she saw that it was saying that H lime Sultan’s son was going to be the next Sultan in six months. However, there was nothing written about the death or deprivation of his father, namely the Sultan Mehmed III. Safiye Sultan immediately realized that it was a treachery. Thereupon, Safiye Sultan called her son, Sultan Mehmed III, to provoke him. Peirce explains that the valide sultan was head of a household in which her daughters-in-law were present and moreover theoretically subordinated to her by the end of the sixteenth century. One of the primary duties of the valide sultan was to protect her son and his sultanate. “She inevitably clashed with the *haseki*, who was manuvering under the same roof to defend and promote *her* son (or sons). As the sultans scrutinized the behaviour of the prince, so did the valide sultan scrutinize the potentially subversive activities of her daughter-in-law the *haseki*.”³¹⁴ Lello explains that Sultan Mehmed III was very angry and had no mercy. Sultan called  ehzade Mahmud to question him and realized that he did not know anything about his mother’s

³¹² Uzun arşılı, 1960, p. 264.

³¹³ G nhan B rek i, “ nkirazın E i inde Bir Hanedan: III. Mehmed, I. Ahmed, I. Mustafa ve 17. Y zyıl Osmanlı Siyasi Krizi”, *D v n Disiplinlerarası  alışmalar Dergisi*, 26, 2009, p. 58.

³¹⁴ Peirce, 1993, p. 111.

plan. Then Şehzade Mahmud was sent to prison and no one heard back from him. Then Hâlîme Sultan was questioned. She confessed that she requested to know her son's fortune however she had no intention to hurt anyone or any thought of the deprivation of her husband. But this did not satisfy Sultan Mehmed III and especially Safiye Sultan. Therefore the same night, Hâlîme Sultan and her 30 followers were sacked into the sea. Sultan Mehmed III held a council to consult about his son. The clandestine council was composed of Sultan, Yemişçi and *Müfti*. The soldiers were in favor of Şehzade Mahmud who was also very handsome and gifted. Lello notes that the soldiers hated Sultan Mehmed III's baseness and cowardliness. He suffered himself as a child because he was managed by Safiye Sultan. In this council the *Müfti* thought that if there was any witness about this issue, Şehzade Mahmut could not be killed. Nevertheless *Müfti* knew that Sultan Mehmed III was not satisfied. He would have been in fear and jealousy if Şehzade Mahmud lived hence that it was better to execute him. Eventually Şehzade Mahmud was strangled. After the death of Sultan Mehmed III, Sultan Ahmed I honored Şehzade Mahmud with a Godly tomb.³¹⁵

During backdrop of these events, the Long War was taking place. According to Peçevi the Ottoman army left Belgrade to go to Erdel. They passed Budin Bridge and came to Peşte. The Christians were waiting for the Ottoman army in Ciğerdelen which was before Estergon. Peçevi adds that the Christians prayed "Jesus, Jesus!" altogether every morning and evening like the Muslims did. When the Ottoman army saw this scenery, none of the soldiers wanted to go to Erdel. However Yemişçi Hasan Pasha was so stubborn to go to Erdel.³¹⁶

³¹⁵ Lello, 1952, pp. 14-16.

³¹⁶ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 229-231.

4.3.5 The Grand Vizier Malkoç Ali Pasha and the Death of Sultan Mehmed III (December 22, 1603)

When the governor of Cairo, Malkoç Ali Pasha, was appointed as the grand vizier, Cerrah Mehmed Pasha was already the governor of the district. However Cerrah Mehmed Pasha had pedigree therefore until Malkoç Ali Pasha came from Cairo. *Kapıcı başı* Kasım Pasha was promoted in his place because he was a great favourite of Safiye Sultan.³¹⁷ Peçevi notes that after *Müftü* Mustafa Efendi's recommendation, Kasım Pasha was appointed in Malkoç Ali Pasha's position.³¹⁸

Lello notes that when Malkoç Ali Pasha was still in Cairo, Sultan Mehmed III died on December 12, 1603 because of plague.³¹⁹ Yet, Peçevi and Hammer note his death as December 22, 1603.³²⁰ Peçevi explains that Malkoç Ali Pasha arrived to Istanbul forty days after Sultan's death.³²¹ On the other hand Hammer indicates that he came to Istanbul after Sultan Ahmed I ascended the throne on December 29, 1603.³²²

4.4. Enthronement of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617)

After the execution of Şehzade Mahmud, Ahmed I's enthronement was an expected result because Ahmed I's younger brother Mustafa was just four years old, in this way Şehzade Ahmed became the new sultan.³²³ Börekçi mentions how Sultan Ahmed I was the first sultan in Ottoman history who became the sultan within the palace without first serving as governor of a princely province. Hence, he had no existing servants and he was forced to select his own servants from the imperial house and court.

³¹⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 18; Peçevi, 1982, p. 242.

³¹⁸ Peçevi, 1982, p. 242.

³¹⁹ Lello, 1952, p. 18.

³²⁰ Hammer, 1993, p. 360; Peçevi, 1982, p. 264.

³²¹ Peçevi, 1982, p. 275.

³²² Hammer, 1993, p. 369.

³²³ Börekçi, 2010, p. 81.

During Ahmed I's reign, political struggles and the patronage system shifted to a larger setting. He had to operate in a complicated network of factionalism and favouritism that was occupied by both the members of his court and also the imperial government. Börekçi discusses that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Sultan Murad III, Sultan Mehmed III and especially Sultan Ahmed I initiated new means of asserting their sovereign authority among the Ottoman ruling elite, which at that point meant the royal favourites. Ottoman royal favourites, called *musahîb*, *mukarreb* or *makbûl*, became the sole points of access to the Sultan.³²⁴

By this time, Kasım Pasha who was an Albanian and a sly man was promoted in Malkoç Ali Pasha's position. Peçevi explains that when Sultan Ahmed I ascended the throne, Kasım Pasha was favored but Sultan Ahmed I did not take this issue into consideration. Hammer narrates that Kasım Pasha could not accomplish his goals because of *Müfti* Mustafa Efendi's preventions.³²⁵ Lello explains that because of Kasım Pasha had all the government in his own hands, then he became arrogant. The young Sultan Ahmed I was managed by him.³²⁶ Lello explains that Kasım Pasha banished Safiye Sultan from the Ottoman Porte. Hammer confirms that Safiye Sultan, who administrated the empire for 28 years, all Safiye Sultan's concubines and servants were banished in the Old Palace (*Eski Saray*).³²⁷ Kasım Pasha also sent Kaptan-ı Derya Ciğaloğlu to Iran who was the oldest and trustworthy Pasha in the empire. Because Kasım Pasha was afraid; if Kaptan-ı Derya Ciğaloğlu was in Istanbul his position could be in danger.³²⁸ Agostino Nani's interpretation was important again for this event that "extortion is the natural means of

³²⁴ Börekçi, 2010, pp. 150-153.

³²⁵ Hammer, 1993, p. 369.

³²⁶ Lello, 1952, p. 19.

³²⁷ Hammer, 1993, p. 370; Lello, 1952, p. 19.

³²⁸ Lello, 1952, p. 19.

tyrannical government, oppression the natural condition of its subjects. Every member of the social body is fear-stricken.”³²⁹ When Kasım Pasha was appointed to go to Baghdad, he wanted to delay going to Baghdad because he understood that he was suspended from the Palace. Kasım Pasha was waiting for the dismissal of Malkoç Ali Pasha but he was still in the border of Anatolia because Malkoç Ali Pasha realized his trick and informed the Sultan.³³⁰ Peçevi notes that Kasım Pasha would not have compromised with the grand vizier Malkoç Ali Pasha. He was appointed to Egypt but Hacı İbrahim Pasha was still in Egypt, thus Kasım Pasha was promoted a position in Baghdad. When Kasım Pasha arrived to Ankara, he began to collect taxes from *reaya* like the *Jelalis* did.³³¹

Baki Tezcan explains Kasım Pasha’s reasons behind collecting tax as follows: He shows that between 1578 and 1606 there was a newly developing political patronage which cut ties between the viziers and their imperial networks. The commander-in-chief gained extraordinary powers for controlling a number of provincial treasuries and also he could make appointments and dismissals. Leadership of a military campaign meant extraordinary powers of appointment, dismissal and also ‘tax collection’. Tezcan indicates that “the Long War became an opportunity for a vizier who was assigned to increase his base of power through new recruits, and to sell certain positions of power. This was an ability which normally rested with the grand vizier or the sultan himself. In addition, war provided Ottoman viziers with another opportunity, which was to extract funds from the inner treasury.”³³²

³²⁹ Nani, 1603, 35, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

³³⁰ Lello, 1952, p. 20.

³³¹ Peçevi, 1982, p. 276.

³³² Tezcan, 2001, pp. 245-247.

4.4.1. Kasım Pasha's Death

Lello notes that Malkoç Ali Pasha informed Sultan Ahmed I about Kasım Pasha's trick. The Sultan believed him because Kasım Pasha could be dangerous for this position. Hereupon the Sultan wrote a letter to Kasım Pasha that he stayed there so long and considered that there was no position in Istanbul therefore he was supposed to return to the Sublime Porte at once. Kasım Pasha believed that very easily. When Kasım Pasha arrived to the Sublime Porte, the Sultan was in the garden and asked him why he did not go to Baghdad. Kasım Pasha could not satisfy the Sultan with his answers. Sultan Ahmed I ordered him to be tied to a tree in the garden and killed him with his own hands.³³³

Differently, Peçevi narrates briefly that the Sultan enacted that "I appointed you as a grand vizier instead of Malkoç Ali Pasha." Hereupon Kasım Pasha believed and immediately came to Istanbul. During that day, three letters were sent to him. Next morning, there was a council with *Müfti* and the other viziers. When Kasım Pasha was going to the throne of the Sultan, he was caught and killed.³³⁴ For Hammer, Kasım Pasha was a *kaymakam* just in one day. He had three letters (tezkire) from the Sultan on that day. This event was enough to believe that he became a *kaymakam*. Next day, Kasım Pasha came to the Sultan's presence. There was a council when he arrived. The Sultan asked him two times why he did not obey the Sultan's order, whereas Kasım Pasha kept silent. The Sultan ordered a verbal *fetva* from the *Müfti*. Thereupon, the *Bostancı başıs* caught Kasım Pasha to be beheaded.³³⁵

Nani notes that "the subjects are caught in the grip of fear because the sultan is the master of their property and their lives. His viziers are afraid too, for those who have

³³³ Lello, 1952, pp. 20-21.

³³⁴ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 276-277.

³³⁵ Hammer, 1993, pp. 378-379.

risen highest have reason to fear the most brutal fall. At the slightest incident, the sultan can ‘remove’ their heads. But if he ‘causes trembling’ in everyone around him, he too is ruled by suspicion and fear, for he can trust no one...³³⁶ The insight that Nani offers on the deaths of *Bostancı başı* and Kasım Pasha is a reasonable one to confirm.

4.4.2. Grand Vizier Malkoç Ali Pasha’s Expedition to Hungary and his Death

After the death of Kasım Pasha, Malkoç Ali Pasha went to Hungary expedition. He wanted to appoint Sofu Sinan Pasha in his position; however the Sultan allotted Hafız Ahmed Pasha on May 30, 1604.³³⁷ Malkoç Ali Pasha was not pleased with Hafız Ahmed Pasha’s assignment because he thought that the Sultan began to restrict him hereupon, he felt degraded. One month after his arrival to Hungary he passed away. Lello writes about the different accounts of, Malkoç Ali Pasha’s death as follows: The first account suggests that it was natural death. The second one explains that his death was due to the Sultan’s diminishing trust on him. The last account was that he was poisoned by either the Sultan’s favourite or a friend of Ciğaloğlu or Kasım Pasha.³³⁸ As Murphey mentions, there were different accounts about Malkoç Ali Pasha’s death similarly to Damad İbrahim Pasha’s in which both of the examples were suspicious and the cause of the deaths was unknown. Obviously, it could simply be a political sabotage.³³⁹ Peçevi narrates the death of Malkoç Ali Pasha’s in the following lines: Before the expedition of Hungary, Malkoç Ali Pasha could not fulfill his aims as a governor because Sultan Ahmed I did not allow him. He was hurt deeply and disappointed by this decision. When he arrived to Sofia, his health deteriorated day by day. After arriving Belgrade, he died on

³³⁶ Nani, 1603, 35, in Valensi, 1993, p. 74.

³³⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 21; Hammer, 1993, pp. 375-376.

³³⁸ Lello, 1952, p. 21.

³³⁹ Murphey, 1999, p. 31.

July 26, 1604.³⁴⁰ Before Malkoç Ali Pasha's death in Hungary, he appointed Lala Mehmed Pasha to his position until Sultan Ahmed I made his final decision for his position.³⁴¹ Mehmed Pasha stayed in Hungary for a while and came back to Istanbul in the beginning of winter.

4.4.3. The Death of *Kaymakam Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha*

When Hafız Ahmed Pasha was dismissed, *Sarıklı Başı Mustafa Pasha* was appointed as the *kaymakam*. Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha was the Sultan's *tulbent* winder.³⁴² He was Sultan's favourite but he became insolent hereupon the Sultan began to dislike him. One day, he was called into the Sultan's presence and he was strangled.³⁴³

According to Peçevi, Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha was intrepid and generous. But he could not pay the wages of the soldiers as a result his actions brought his death.³⁴⁴ Hammer confirms that Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha was appointed and he attempted to dismiss *Müfti Sunullah Efendi*. Hereupon Sunullah Efendi informed the Sultan as he was oppressing the subjects. Following this, he was executed.³⁴⁵

4.4.4. Sofu Sinan Pasha

After Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha's death, Sofu Sinan Pasha became the *kaymakam*.³⁴⁶ In his report Lello refers to Sarıkçı Mustafa Pasha as Sofu Hasan Pasha, but I will refer him as Sofu Sinan Pasha because that is the most common name in Ottoman chronicles. He remained in his position for a very short period because Sultan Ahmed I was not

³⁴⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 278; Hammer, 1993, p. 376.

³⁴¹ Lello, 1952, p. 21; Peçevi, 1982, p. 278; Hammer, 1993, p. 377.

³⁴² Lello, 1952, p. 22; Hammer, 1993, p. 379.

³⁴³ Lello, 1952, p. 22.

³⁴⁴ Peçevi, 1982, p. 292.

³⁴⁵ Hammer, 1982, p. 380.

³⁴⁶ Hammer, 1993, p. 380; Peçevi, 1982, p. 292.

pleased by his actions. When Sofu Sinan Pasha was the *kaymakam* in Istanbul, the rebels in Anatolia arrived to Bursa. Both the Sultan and his subjects were in fear, because the Ottoman Army was in Hungary and the season was winter, the army could not come immediately.³⁴⁷ Peçevi narrates that when Sofu Sinan Pasha became the *kaymakam*, *Jelali* rising increased. One of the pioneers in the rising was *Jelali* Tavi Mehmed³⁴⁸ who wrote a letter requesting some lands for himself and his favourites in the Ottoman Empire. Sofu Sinan Pasha conveyed this letter to the Sultan. Thereupon the Sultan did not like Sofu Sinan Pasha's behavior and he dismissed him. Instead of Sofu Sinan Pasha, Hızır Pasha was appointed in his position.³⁴⁹

Morosini states that “the sultan has very *little* courage, his first vizier a very *short* memory; the vizier is a man of *little* judgment; the second is remarkable, but the others think *little* of him because he has no experience in war and is believed to have *little* courage.”³⁵⁰ “The Sultan, he writes, lacks good counselors and able commanders -but not arrogant ones.”³⁵¹

4.4.5. Bursa Expedition of Sultan Ahmed I (1605)

Although it was winter and unsafe, Sultan Ahmed I decided to go to Bursa. When the Sultan and his subjects were in Bursa and Derviş Pasha was assigned to manage the state affairs.³⁵² Meantime Safiye Sultan passed away on November 12, 1605. *Müfti* Sunullah Efendi and Hoca Saadeddin tried to convince the Sultan not to go to Bursa.

³⁴⁷ Lello, 1952, p. 22.

³⁴⁸ Mustafa Akdağ, *Celali İsyamları (1550-1603)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1963, p. 233.

³⁴⁹ Peçevi, 1982, p. 295.

³⁵⁰ Morosini, 1585, 285ff. Venier, 1586, 297-298, in Valensi, 1993, p. 71.

³⁵¹ Valensi, 1993, p. 71.

³⁵² Lello, 1952, pp. 22-23.

However, after Safiye Sultan's funeral, he went to Mudanya and then to Bursa.³⁵³ When the grand vizier Lala Mehmed Pasha heard Sultan's expedition, he was very angry with Sofu Sinan Pasha who should not have let him leave or advised him properly.³⁵⁴

Peçevi narrates the same incident in the following lines: When the Sultan decided to go to Bursa, the position of governorship was not assigned to Sofu Sinan Pasha yet. Because he was not qualified for that position, instead Nasuh Pasha and Davut Pasha were appointed.³⁵⁵ Nasuh Pasha was the commander-in-chief, fighting against the *Jelalis* in Anatolia and the Safavids in the East. Nasuh Pasha had a large *segban* army. He was more effective than any other ruling vizier.³⁵⁶ Baki Tezcan focuses on the subject of *segban* which resulted from competition for a political power in the provinces. In a way, Vizier Nasuh Pasha was like a *segban* leader.³⁵⁷ *Segbans* supported by the governors of vilayet and *sancak* took the place of *sipahis*.³⁵⁸

Also Lello narrates Bursa expedition of Sultan Ahmed I in his report. He writes that when the rebels heard that Sultan Ahmed I was in Bursa, they retired from the city to villages in the mountains. The weather was extremely cold at this time. Sultan was not accustomed to drink cold water which came from snowy hills that eventually hurt his stomach. Lello continues that the Sultan sent a proclamation to the rebels ordering them to withdraw in return they were going to be forgiven and receive an office and daily pay. Hereupon, four hundred people came and submitted themselves. They also promised that they were convincing others to withdraw. Thus, according to the treaty, the rebels were

³⁵³ Hammer, 1993, p. 395.

³⁵⁴ Lello, 1952, pp. 23-24.

³⁵⁵ Peçevi, 1982, p. 294; Hammer, p. 395.

³⁵⁶ Hasan Beyzade, 2004, vol. 3, p. 836.

³⁵⁷ Baki Tezcan, 2001, p. 215.

³⁵⁸ Mustafa Akdağ, "Genel Çizgileriyle XVII. Yüzyıl Türkiye Tarihi", Ankara: *Ankara Üniversitesi Tarih Araştırma Dergisi*, 4/6-7, 1966, p. 212.

mostly awarded and were sent back with an accompanying soldiers and Pashas. Thereupon, Sultan Ahmed I returned to the throne saying this was his last expedition.

According to Hammer, after Sultan Ahmed I visited six Ottoman Sultans' tombs and the thermal springs in Bursa, he returned to Istanbul on November 27, 1605.³⁵⁹ Peçevi does not provide any details about this expedition; he only notes that Sultan Ahmed I stayed in Bursa for 15 days and his return took totally 20 days.³⁶⁰

4.4.6. The Grand Vizier Lala Mehmed Pasha's Death

After Sofu Sinan Pasha's submission, Hızır Pasha was appointed to his position but Derviş Pasha was Sultan's favourite. He became Kaptan-ı Derya and advised Sultan in many aspects.³⁶¹ Yet, there was a conflict between Lala Mehmed Pasha and Derviş Pasha. Derviş Pasha attempted to distance Lala Mehmed Pasha from the Sultan. Thus Nasuh Pasha and Derviş Pasha sent him to Iran. Lala Mehmed Pasha wanted to go to Engürüs expedition to declare peace. Lala Mehmed Pasha could not understand their goals. He was upset and had a stroke. He died on March 23, 1606. According to Sunullah Efendi's account, Derviş Pasha caused his death; in other words Lala Mehmed Pasha's was poisoned by a Portuguese doctor.³⁶² Peçevi notes that he died on June 22, 1606.³⁶³ Lello accounts that Derviş Pasha attempted to disgrace Lala Mehmed Pasha who became weak after these events, and eventually passed away. Lello does not provide any details about his death in his report.³⁶⁴

³⁵⁹ Hammer, 1993, p. 396.

³⁶⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 294.

³⁶¹ Lello, 1952, p. 24; Peçevi, 1982, p. 297.

³⁶² Hammer, 1993, pp. 398-399.

³⁶³ Peçevi, 1982, p. 300.

³⁶⁴ Lello, 1952, p. 24.

4.4.7. The Grand Vizier Derviş Pasha and his Death

After Lala Mehmed Pasha's death, Derviş Pasha became the new grand vizier. He began to alter most of the customs of government without respecting other Pashas and officers' ideas.³⁶⁵ Peçevi recounts that Derviş Pasha threatened the officers that they would have been killed if they did not perform their works well and took money much more than they deserved. The clerks were not glad when they heard these. They were not sure about the reason of his criticism.³⁶⁶ Lello notes that Derviş Pasha was good at fulfilling his tasks. He attempted to create a less corrupted working environment.

Derviş Pasha also attempted to make a peace with King of Germany. He asked Lello's help how to contact the King of Germany. Lello advised him to write a letter to King James I.³⁶⁷ Lello writes that if the letter was not effective, the war would have been resuming. However the war with the Christians was very costly, the treasure had already finished. The number of rebels was increasing too. Derviş Pasha thought to seek financial support of *ulema* that had higher funds. According to Derviş Pasha, Jewish community could help them too. Sultan Ahmed I could pay back them in a short period of time. Some religious people were opposing to Derviş Pasha's plans, thinking that he was a robber. These people complained about his actions.³⁶⁸

Lello narrates that Derviş Pasha was seeking to be Sultan himself. The entire army trusted him because he was brave. He built a house near the Ottoman Porte and paid for it from the treasure of the expedition money. The *hocas* set a trap for Derviş Pasha that they brought Sultan's concubines to this house. The Jews gave 400 thousands gold

³⁶⁵ Lello, 1952, p. 25.

³⁶⁶ Peçevi, p. 305.

³⁶⁷ This letter, written in Italian, was translated into Turkish by Suat Sinanoğlu. There is no clear information about the date and place of the publication.

³⁶⁸ Lello, 1952, p. 25.

for this trap. The aim was to enter his house and to prove that Derviş Pasha tried to be a Sultan himself with all his actions. When Sultan Ahmed I heard the rumors he believed at once Derviş Pasha was dangerous. The *hocas* also added that most of the soldiers supported Derviş Pasha and wanted to see him as a Sultan. The Sultan was surprised to hear all these. Later on, Sultan Ahmed I had a meeting with Derviş Pasha, for their regular sessions. As soon as Derviş Pasha entered the room, the *acemioğlans* caught him. Thereupon, he understood that it was a betrayal and he resisted and injured some *acemioğlans* with his dagger. The Sultan was watching them from the window. When he saw that the *acemioğlans* were struggling, he ordered them to kill him at once, yelling that their power was not enough to kill an infidel. When Derviş Pasha heard of his cruel voice, he shouted very sadly to the Sultan that “You are unfaithful and hard-headed. You do not deserve to live.” However Sultan kept crying “kill this dog.” The *acemioğlans* killed him and his body was carried out the street. Finally, his closer friends took his body to bury him.³⁶⁹

Halil İnalçık suggests that the transformation of the Ottoman Sultan and his image was the principal element in the gradual decline of the Ottoman Empire.³⁷⁰ Instead of the sixteenth century Ottoman Sultan, who was the protector of the faith and a very successful commander, the institutional monarchy affected law and a tradition of bureaucracy.³⁷¹ As was mentioned, the Ottoman administrative centre was transformed from palace to the Pasha’s house.³⁷²

³⁶⁹ Lello, 1952, pp. 26-27.

³⁷⁰ Halil İnalçık, “Osmanlı Padişahı”, SBFD, XIII, 1958: pp. 68-79 in Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p.10.

³⁷¹ Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p. 10.

³⁷² Uzunçarşılı, 1988c in Fatih Yeşil, 2002, p. 23.

Lello comments about Derviř Pasha that he was the most capable man he had seen at that position. Lello also adds that he was so cruel. For him the *hocas* lied to the Sultan about Derviř Pasha that he had a picture of Jesus and the Virgin Mary at his house, but *hocas* hung those pictures in his house secretly. Lello adds that Derviř Pasha was not a Christian.³⁷³

Peçeui and Hammer explain that similar to Lala Mehmed Pasha, Derviř Pasha donated some money to an orphanage.³⁷⁴ The belongings of Lala Mehmet Pasha valued just more than 200 load *akçe*. The Sultan donated these to the children of the Pasha. Derviř Pasha bargained for the houses around the palace and bought 20 of them for a cheaper price and sent the owners away forcefully.³⁷⁵

Peçeui notes that Derviř Pasha built a barn between the *Hasbahçe* and bulwark tower. His enemies benefited from this building, they put sewage which went from the barn to the Ottoman Porte. When Sultan Ahmed I heard these developments he began to dislike Derviř Pasha. This event was not conveyed to Derviř Pasha but the Sultan and *Müfti* planned to kill him. When Derviř Pasha came to the Sultan's presence he was strangled with a shelter tent bond. His body stayed in front of the Sultan for a while. When Derviř Pasha moved his foot, Sultan killed him with a dagger.³⁷⁶

Hammer also writes about the death of Derviř Pasha. He offers a completely different account, claiming that Derviř Pasha's Jewish servant killed him. Apparently Derviř Pasha donated money to the servant in order to build a house. When the servant wanted the payment from Derviř Pasha, he paid him more than he would have like.

³⁷³ Lello, 1952, pp. 24-27.

³⁷⁴ Hammer, 1993, p. 399; Peçeui, 1982, p. 305.

³⁷⁵ Peçeui, 1982, p. 305.

³⁷⁶ Peçeui, 1982, p. 308.

Derviş Pasha was building this house around the Ottoman Porte and the so-called Jewish servant spied on Dervis Pasha, by telling it to the *Kapı ağası*. Then the Sultan was informed who considered this act as an attack to himself. After taking the advice of *Müfti*, Sultan asked Derviş Pasha to come to the Sublime Porte next morning. There he was strangled by the *Bostancı başıs*. Afterwards, he was beheaded by the Sultan on December 11, 1606.³⁷⁷

4.4.8. The Grand Vizier Kuyucu Murat Pasha

After Derviş Pasha's death, Kuyucu Murat Pasha became the new grand vizier. He was in Belgrade when he received Sultan's holy seal. He was very happy when he learned that he was going to be a grand vizier.³⁷⁸ Lello notes that when Nakkaş Hasan Pasha became the *kaymakam* instead of Kuyucu Murat Pasha, Lello went back to England and appointed Sir Thomas Glover to his position.³⁷⁹ Lello mentions that Kuyucu Murat Pasha was asked to go to Istanbul immediately, Lello met him in Istanbul and said goodbye to him and Kuyucu Murat Pasha sent his greetings to the English nation.

Peçevi notes that Kuyucu Murat Pasha was a warrior and a fair man. When Sultan Ahmed I appointed him as a grand vizier, he was aware of his qualities.³⁸⁰ Lello also confirms that Kuyucu Murat Pasha was a sophisticated and an experienced soldier.³⁸¹ Hammer describes him as a person with a calm appearance and crafty at hiding his ambitions and bad temper.³⁸²

³⁷⁷ Hammer, 1993, pp. 402-403.

³⁷⁸ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 308-309.

³⁷⁹ Lello, 1952, p. 27.

³⁸⁰ Peçevi, 1982, p. 309.

³⁸¹ Lello, 1952, p. 28.

³⁸² Hammer, 1993, p. 425.

When Kuyucu Murat Pasha arrived to Istanbul, he immediately waged war against Canpolatoğlu in Aleppo. After that Kalenderoğlu Piri, Kara Sait and Ağaçtan Piri with the 30.000 bandits ransacked and destroyed Bursa for along time.³⁸³ Hammer notes that Canpolat escaped with the *segbans* from Aleppo. He entered the doors of Anatolia, and then came to Eskişehir to apologize. However when Kalenderoğlu heard that he arrived to Eskişehir, he kept rebelling. Thereupon, Canpolat escaped Istanbul. Canpolat's *segbans* attended the Kalenderoğlu. Then Kalenderoğlu set Bursa a fire.³⁸⁴ Karen Barkey notes this event in the following lines: "after a preliminary battle between the Ottoman forces and Kalenderoğlu, Ottoman armies were ordered toward the more important bandit, Canpolat Ali Pasha, whose activities were deemed more serious than those of Kalenderoğlu. Yet, to keep the latter occupied and unable to join other rebels, especially Canpolat, Kuyucu Murad Pasha resolved to offer him a post and a governorship in January 1607. But since the *Jelali* continued his rampage, the grand vizier retracted his offer soon afterward." Barkey suggests that the other *Jelalis* joined Kalenderoğlu in Ankara. Hereupon, Ottoman armies arrived to help but they were defeated in Ankara. Kalenderoğlu continued on to Bursa and then toward Istanbul. The provincial militias in Istanbul, with 40.000 urban citizens were called to protect Bursa and Istanbul. But these efforts did not end with a great success.³⁸⁵

Lello does not mention about these events but he emphasizes the Iran war when the Iran Shah captured Kuyucu Murat Pasha for thirteen years.³⁸⁶ Peçevi narrates that when Kuyucu Murat Pasha arrived to Iran, Tabriz was abandoned. Kuyucu Murat Pasha

³⁸³ Peçevi, 1982, p. 312.

³⁸⁴ Hammer, 1993, p. 417.

³⁸⁵ Karen Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994, pp. 109-110.

³⁸⁶ Lello, 1952, p. 28.

and his soldiers fired all the houses and buildings and went to Diyarbakır for the winter. When he was in Diyarbakır, he died on August 5, 1611 at the age of ninety.³⁸⁷ He was buried next to a *medrese* which was built by Kuyucu Murat Pasha. He was the member of Nakşibendi dervish order and also was one of the greatest Ottoman statesmen.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁷ Peçevi, 1982, pp. 317-318.

³⁸⁸ Hammer, 1993, p. 456.

5. CONCLUSION

One of the first objectives of this study is to investigate the trans-imperial relations between England and the Ottoman Empire in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries by analyzing trade relations that eventually initiated diplomatic affairs. I attempted to compare these trade relations to other European states that had engaged in commercial activities in the Ottoman lands. Also, these trade relations were investigated within the context of gift-giving ceremonies. Additionally, the monumental gift-giving was the symbolization of power inside the court, and also it represented the status of various state actors and the internal mobility of hierarchy. Indeed, gift-giving was a way to legitimize the internal and international relations of the empire. The trans-imperial mediators could be ambassadors, interpreters, and merchants; in addition they were called Sultan's "favourites". The relationships between master and servant required a complex system of obligations. Within the context of English diplomatic relations there was a big competition between Thomas Dallah -as an organ-maker- and the diplomat Henry Lello.

English Ambassador Henry Lello's report is a fundamental source to trace the diplomatic negotiations in the Ottoman Empire. I analyzed Henry Lello's report which depicted the Ottoman palace rivalries, suppressions and murders in the empire during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Lello's report is a valuable example to understand the relations between the ruler and his subjects that were characterized in dynastic and political structures as a series of "crisis and changes" during this period. When Lello wrote his report, the Ottoman Empire was still engaged in the "Long War" against the Habsburg Monarchy that started in 1593 and ended by the Treaty of

Zsitvatorok in 1606. Additionally, *Jelali* Risings and *sipahi* rebellions were the most challenging internal events in Anatolia throughout the empire. Although, Lello does not mention the historical background, his accounts are connected to those events implicitly and he hints that he is aware of them. Instead of events and occurrences of the period, Lello focuses on the statements' duties, lives and deaths of important figures in his report that was presented to the English administration.

The sultan's authority rested on his ability to maintain control of the ruling elites and satisfy their expectations. The sultan maintained control principally by manipulating factions and preventing any one from gaining a monopoly of power. Dynastic marriages, which were customary during the period, represent the sign of this control. Nevertheless, the dynastic marriages, which mostly were initiated by grand viziers, served to gain access into the dynasty and eventually to obtain more power. Safiye Sultan played an important role about this issue.

As was indicated in chapter 3, there are three important official figures in the Ottoman bureaucracy. These are the vizier, the *ulema* and lastly various court factions and *Janissaries* and the *sipahis*. In order to understand the competing power networks in the empire one needs to investigate these Ottoman official figures. Ottoman women such as the Sultan's mothers, especially Safiye Sultan, are also important figures for the scope of this thesis. Safiye Sultan played an active role in the state-affairs and in the patronage activities during the reigns of Sultan Mehmed III and Sultan Ahmed I as was seen in the last chapter. She was considerably active in creating and manipulating domestic political factions, also in negotiating with foreign powers. After the sixteenth century, the institution of the valide sultan emerged and valide sultan's authority was bolstered at the

end of the sixteenth century. During the reign of Sultan Murad III, the institution of the valide sultanate became politically more prestigious and powerful. The dynastic family began to be housed under one roof which eventually let the influential women pursue their own careers. These women promoted their sons in close proximity to one another.

Relationship between the Sultan and grand vizier is similar to the relationship between master (the sultan) and servant (the *kul*). When this balance was spoiled, however, it was usually the *kuls* who dominated a weak or newly-installed sultan. Especially during the reign of a weak sultan, struggle for a higher-ranked position and power increased among the servants of different administrative levels. Also, the limit of vizier's power and coercion during the Ottoman campaigns of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that witnessed series of struggles between influential viziers, their lobbies and factions. In his report Henry Lello analyzes the behind-the-scenes wrangling over succession to the grand vizierate. One of the main reasons of these struggles was the hope to be a grand vizier who caused tension and rivalries on the Ottoman forces at the battlefield. These accounts confirm that in a number of cases deliberate withholding of strategic supplies and financial support by a jealous deputy grand vizier (*kaymakam*) in Istanbul could seriously compromise the readiness of commanders at the front to do battle. Second issue I have demonstrated was on the official figures of *ulema*. The first candidate for a bureaucratic control was the *ulema* in the empire. Their prestige stemmed from representing the most influential and legitimate paths of power in the Ottoman Empire. The third official element in the Ottoman Empire consisted of Janissaries along with the *sipahis*. During the Long War, the uprisings of the *Jelali* and *sipahis'* rebellions determined the political impact that the viziers gained within military and administrative

levels. Within all these competing hierarchies Janissaries, *sipahis* and *ulema* were competing among themselves for their own agendas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahskalı, Recep. *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülkütüblük Müessesesi (XVIII. Yüzyıl)*, İstanbul: Tatar Yayınları, 2001.

Alberi, Eugenio. *Relazioni delgi ambasciatori veneziani al senato durante il secolo decimosesto*, vol. 3. (ed.), Giorgio Franz, Monaco: Societa Editrice Fiorentina, 1855.

Altınay, Ahmet Refik. *On Altıncı Yüzyılda Türkiye Türkler ve Kraliçe Elizabeth*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1951.

Andrews, K. R. "Sir Robert Cecil and Mediteranean Plunder", *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 87, No. 344 (Jul., 1972): 513- 532.

Akdağ, Mustafa. *Celali İsyancıları (1550-1603)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1963.

Akdağ, Mustafa. "Genel Çizgileriyle XVII. Yüzyıl Türkiye Tarihi", Ankara: *Ankara Üniversitesi Tarih Araştırma Dergisi*, 4/6-7, 1966: 201-248.

Barkey, Karen. *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Barozzi, Da Nicola; **Berchet**, Guglielmo. *Le relazioni degli stati europei lette al senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo decimosettimo*, serie II, Francia, Vol. III, Venezia: Dalla prem tip di pietro naratovich, 1863.

Baschet, M. Armand. *La diplomatie venitienne: les princes de l'Europe au XVI siecle d'apres les rapports des ambassadeurs venitiens*, Paris: H. Plon, 1862.

Bent, J. Theodore. *Dallam's Voyage to Turkey*, *The Musical Times*, Vol. 46, No. 752, Oct. 1, 1905:649-654.

Bent, J. Theodore. *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*, The Hakluyt Society, London, 1893.

BL_Cotton MS Nero B XI, *Cotton Manuscripts*.

Börekcı, Günhan "İnkirazın Eşiğinde Bir Hanedan: III. Mehmed, I. Ahmed, I. Mustafa ve 17. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Siyasi Krizi", *Dîvân Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 26 (2009): 45-96.

Börekçi, Günhan. *Factions and Favourites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (R. 1603-17) and His Immediate Predecessor*, Ohio State University: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 2010.

Capponi, Nicola. *Victory of the West: The Story of the Battle of Lepanto*, Oxford, UK: MacMillan, 2006

Chew, Samuel C. *The Crescent and the Rose Islam and England during the Renaissance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Cal S. P. Venetian, IX, NOS.

Crowley, Roger. *Empires of the Sea: The Siege of Malta, the Battle of Lepanto, and the contest for the center of the World*, The United States of America: Random House Publishing Group, 2009.

Danson, Lawrence. “The Sultan’s Organ: Presents and Self-presentation in Thomas Dallam’s Diary”, *Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 5, 2009: 639-658.

Dallam, Thomas. “The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam 1559-1600” in J. T. Bent, *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*. The Hakluyt Society, London: 1893: 1-98.

Dallam, Thomas; **Covel**, John; **Bent**, J. Theodora. *Early Voyages and Travels in Levant*, London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, No: 87, 1893.

Daş, Abdurrahman. “Osmanlılarda Münşeât Geleneği, Hoca Sadeddin Efendi’nin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Münşeâtı”, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İslam Tarihi ve Sanatları Anabilim Dalı İslam Tarihi Bilim Dalı, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, 2003.

Dereli, Hamit. *Kraliçe Elizabeth Devrinde Türkler ve İngilizler*, İstanbul: Anıl Matbaası, 1951.

Dictionary of National Biography, Volumes 1-20, 22 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2003. (ab. Edward Barton)

Dursteller, Eric R. “The Bailo in Constantinople: Crisis and Career in Venice’s Early Modern Diplomatic Corps”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (December 2001): 1-30.

Emecen, Feridun M. “Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar Üzerine Bazı Örnekler ve Mülâhazalar”, *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 6, 2001: 63-76.

Eton, W. *A Survey of the Turkish Empire*, London, 1801, republished England: Gregg International, 1972.

Fleet, Kate. *European and Islamic Trade in the early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Finkel, Caroline. *The Administration of Warfare: The Ottoman Military Campaigns in Hungary, 1593-1606*, Wien: VWGO, 1988.

Firpo, Luigi. *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al senato, Vol. 13: Costantinopoli, 1590-1793*, Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1984.

Foster, William (ed.). *The travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602*, with his autobiography and selections from his correspondence, Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, 2d ser., No. 67, Kraus Reprint, 1967.

Hammer (Baron Joseph Von Hammer Purgstall), *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi* Vol. 4, (translated from German) Mümin Çevik, İstanbul: Üçdal Yayınları, 1989.

Hakluyt, Richard; **Edmund**, Goldsmid. (eds.) *The Principal Navigations Voyage Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*, London & Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons Limited, Vol. 3-5, 1927.

Hasan Beyzade Ahmed Pasha. *Hasan Bey-Zade Tarihi (1003-1045/1595-1635)*, (ed.) Şevki Nezihi Aykut, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, Vol. 3, 2004.

Horniker, Arthur L. "William Harborne and the Beginning of Anglo-Turkish Diplomatic and Commercial Relations", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Sep., 1942): 289-316.

Horniker, Arthur L. "Anglo- French Rivalry in the Levant from 1583 to 1612", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Dec., 1946): 289-305.

İnalçık, Halil. "Decision Making in the Ottoman State", (ed.) C. E. Farah, *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*, Kirksville: The Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993.

İnalçık, Halil. *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, "Osmanlı Dönemi Kapitülasyonların Karakter ve Mahiyeti", İhvan-ı Safâ, İskit, 2000: 245-252.

İnalçık, Halil. "Osmanlı Padişahı", SBF, XIII, 1958: 68-79.

Isom-Verhaaren, Christine, *Ottoman-French Interaction, 1480-1580: A Sixteenth Century Encounter*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago: 1997.

Jardine, Lisa. “Gloriana Rules the Waves: Or, the Advantage of being Excommunicated (and a Woman)”, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Sixth Series)*, 14, 2004: 209-222.

Kurat, Akdes Nimet. *Türk-İngiliz Münasebetlerinin Başlangıcı ve Gelişmesi (1553- 1610)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Fakültesi, 1953.

Kurz, Otto. *European Clocks and Watches in the Near East*, London: Warburg Institute, University of London; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Kütükoğlu, Mübahat S. *Osmanlı- İngiliz İktisadi Münasebetleri I (1580- 1838)*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Fakültesi, 1974.

Lello, Henry. *The Report of Lello Third English Ambassador to the Sublime Port (Babıâli Nezdinde Üçüncü İngiliz Elçisi Lello 'nun Muhtırası)* (ed.) Orhan Burian, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1952.

Lucette, Valensi, *Venice and the Sublime Porte: The Birth of the Despot*, trans.by Arthur Denner, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993.

MacLean, Gerald. *The Rise of Oriental Trave: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Menage, V. L. “The English Capitulation of 1580: A Review Article”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Nov., 1980): 373-383.

Murphey, Rhoads. *Ottoman Warfare: 1500-1700*, London: UCL Press, 1999.

Mumcu, Ahmet. *Divan-ı Hümayun*, Ankara: Birey ve Toplum Yayınları, 1986.

Naima Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Naima (Ravzatü'l Hüseyin Fî Hulâsati Ahbâri'l-Hâfıkayn) I*, Mehmed İpşirli, Türk Tarih Kurumu: Ankara, 2007.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. *Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, New York: The Architectural History Foundation, 1991.

Orhonlu, Cengiz. (ed.), *Osmanlı Tarihine Âid Belgeler, Telhîsler (1597-1607)*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1970.

Özgen, Elif. “Grand Vizier Koca Sinan Pasha and Factional Politics in the Court of Murad III” Unpublisled M.A. thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University, 2010.

Pardi, G. (ed.). *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, 2nd edn, xxiv, pt 7, Bologna: 1928-33.

Peçevi İbrahim Efendi. *Peçevi Tarihi*, Vol. 2, (ed.) Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992.

Pedani, Maria P. “Safiye’s Household and Venetian Diplomacy”, *Turcica*, 32, 2000: 9-32.

Pedani, Maria P. “Between Diplomacy and Trade: Ottoman Merchants in Venice”, *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire*, Paris- Louvain- Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2008: 3-21.

Pedani, Maria P. “Sultans and Voivodas in the 16th C. Gifts and Insignia”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, The Journal of International Social Research*, Vol. 1/1, Fall 2007: 193-209.

Peirce, Leslie P. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, USA: New York-Oxford University Press, 1993.

Reindl-Kiel, Hedda. “Ottoman-European Cultural Exchange: East is East and West is West, and Sometimes the Twain Did Meet Diplomatic Gift Exchange in the Ottoman Empire”, *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies, State, Province, and the West Volume II*, eds. Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey, 2005.

Ricci, Giovanni, *Türk Saplantısı: Yeniçağ Avrupası’nda Korku, Nefret ve Sevgi*, İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005.

Rothman, Natalie. “Between Venice and İstanbul: Trans-Imperial Subjects and Cultural Mediation in the Early Modern Mediterranean”, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 2006.

Rowland, Albert Lindsay. *English Commerce and Exploration in the Reign of Elizabeth*, New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Samarcic, Radovan. *Dünyayı Avuçlarında Tutan Adam: Sokullu Mehmed Pasha*, İstanbul: Gençlik Yayınları, 1995.

Selaniki Mustafa Efendi. *Tarih-i Selâniki (1003- 1008/1595- 1600)* Vol. 2, (eds.) Mehmet İpşirli, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1999.

Selaniki Tarihi, *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi yazması*, 240a-241a, 186b.

Skilliter, Susan A. “Three Letters from the Ottoman ‘Sultana’ Safiye to Queen Elizabeth I”, *Documents from Islamic Chanceries*, Oriental studies III, ed. S. M. Stern and R. Walzer, Bruno Cassirer, Oxford: 1965: 117-157.

Skilliter, Susan A. *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey 1578-1582*, London: British Academy, 1977.

Sohrawardy, Ameer. “Trans- Imperial Mediations of the ‘Turk’: Early Modern Depictions of Ottoman Encounter in English Drama and Non-Fiction Prose”, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Graduate School-New Brunswick, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, The State University, 2010.

Shaw, Stanford, J. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol.1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Tezcan, Baki. “Searching for Osman a Reassessment of the Deposition of the Ottoman Sultan Osman II (1618-1622)”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Princeton University, 2001.

Toth, Sándor László. *A Mezőkeresztesi csata és a Tizenöt éves Haboru. A Mezőkeresztesi csata és a Tizenöt éves háború*, Szeged: Belvedere meridionale, 2000.

Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı*, Ankara: TTK, 1988.

Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. “Üçüncü Mehmed'in Oğlu Şehzâde Mahmud'un Ölümü”, *Bellefen*, 24. Cilt, 94. Sayı, 1960: 263-267.

Valensi, Lucette. *Venice and the Sublime Porte: The Birth of the Despot*, trans.by Arthur Denner, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Veinstein, Gilles. “Les capitulations Franco-Ottomanes de 1536 sont-elles encore controversables?” *Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community*, eds. Markus Koller, Vera Constantini, Brill, 2008: 71-88.

Wood, Alfred C. *A History of the Levant Company*, London: Frank Cass & Co Ltd, 1964.

Woodfield, Ian. “The Keyboard Recital in Oriental Diplomacy, 1520- 1620”, *Journal of the Association*, Vol. 115, No.1 (1990): 33- 62.

Woodhead, Christine. *Talikizade's Şehname-i Hümayun, A History of the Ottoman Campaign into Hungary 1593-94*, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1983.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Les Voyageurs dans l'Empire Ottoman: XIVE-XVIIe siecles*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.

Yeşil, Fatih. “III. Selim döneminde bir Osmanlı bürokrati Ebubekir Ratib Efendi”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tarih Anabilim Dalı, 2002.

APPENDIX

EK I

Selânikî, tarihinin sonunda "na gâh sipah taifesi gulûv-i âm idüp Kera karı ve oğlunu helâk eyledükleridir" başlığıyla bu vakayı anlatırken, Sipahilere 1008 (1599) Recec ulûfesi dağıtıldığı sırada ayaklandıklarını söyleyip şöyle devam eder¹:

"hizmet defterleri tevziine gelicek seferlû taife defterin adedini istedüp eyû defterler ekâbir ü âyan içinde giranbahalara fûruht olunacağın bilüp gûruh-i enbuh ile cuma gün paşa hazretleri kapusundan gelen Muhammed Ağayı ihate idüp getürdüğün defterler nice oldu yine içeri kadınlara ve ağalara mı virildi hizmetler bizimdir virdiğiniz ulufe akçesin ata vü yarağa almazlar gözünüz açın size doğru haber biz işimizi bilürüz deyüp gavga ü şemat ile nice bin sipahi hücüm ile şeyh-el-islâm Sunullah Efendiye varup bize virdikleri faşit ü kâsit akçe ile olduğumuz² mekûlat helâl olur mu dimişler değildir deyicek Yahudiyye Kera karı gümrükleri iltizam etmiştir bu kalp akçe cümle anındır biz anı katlı ideriz deyüp fetva-i şerif isterler cevap virirler ki zimmiyenin katlı şer'en caiz değildir amma şehirden taşra sürülsün gitsün derler ve dahi niçe dürlü fitne vü fesada cüret idüp çok hezeyan söylediklerinde varın bir arz-ı hal yazın getürün muradınız ne ise ben saadetlû Padişah hazretlerine göndereyim hat-ı humayunlarıyla cevap buyursunlar dedikleriyle müteselli olmayup ol mahalde ahd ü peyman ü eyman-i filaz ile ittifak cileyüp cumartesi seherden cemiyet ile Halil Paşa hazretleri kapusuna gelüp divan-ı âliye çıkartma-

¹ Selânikî tarihi, Dil ve Tarih - Coğrafya Fakültesi yazması, 240a - 241a.

² Herhalde "aldığımız" olacak.

ORHAN BURIAN

lerinin başına geçerek İran Şahına karşı yürümüş bulunuyor. Maksadı, müşkül zamanında Yüce Türkten zaptetmiş oldukları araziyi İranlılardan geri almaktır. Kanaatimce alacaktır da; yeter ki ömrü vefa etsin, ve efendisi olan Yüce Türk öbürlerine olduğu gibi onun hareketine de set çekmesin.

The Janiziers have .5. or .6. Aspers a day: & so have some Geomogianes. Their habit is different, specially of their head: The Geomogianes wearing a Ginger colour cap; which bristles sharp about like a Sufferloph. The other a white felt, braided to, but flatter above with a massy grauen, or silver bande gilt & a horse before nose a foot long of the like stuff set with Stones, & hollow within to stick a feather in when he goes to the Quarters, which shall rise over his head & hang quiver downe behind his back, it is so long, in his hand, he hath ease a bare staff, to be fished. It is privileged above the rest, which is a Crane of India, bearded, & .5. for long & being wonderful. With these they commonly have malislers with the furs. Janiziers have yetely .2. Vestes, Geomogianes but one for the most part. they use their Hazardous well, & fight obstinantly for reputation. The Geomogians are commonly in fortresses & upon the frontiers, for use of Sea, but the most, where the Prince himself is. They are very insolent not only to private persons which respect their purpose, but even towards the King himself, for being in their hands the principal forces of the Turkes power & that they be rarely punished, or slightly: & therefore holding themselves hungry & terrible: they have often threatened to depose the Emperour & to put the Sonne in to his Seare, & after forced with barbarous uprore, their prince to yield unto them in most unwise things, as to leave into exambles, they did with the Turkes of this force cage him to deliver into their hands, alive or dead, the head Dephverdne or high Treasurer & Mahomet Bassa, an Armenian both which, were beyond measure beloved of him accusing them for having paid them with bad money, and the last Sonne they drew the Keran out of her house, this was a Jew Woman, most deare to the Sultana, who by such grace with her comelines concerned in effect, the whole Empire; & was worth at her death Millions. After they had through the Slaues fresh at Andrinople gate, & those taking her alive she had offered more for her life than their pay is came unto they cutt her into small peeces

away one that woud get carrying backe through the streets to their houses, a piece of her flesh upon his finnes ponne. She was widow, & had .3. Sonnes: one which was chief. Customes they caught in the hedge with her, but cutt not him, so in peeces only they saw him, & straight burnt him to ashes. The seconde fled cleane away abroad of. The third to save himselfe towards Turkey. I remember her the rather because she sent letters & presents of worth with the Sultanaes from herself, to her Majesty. & they did, thinking since for avarice she would much rather she was a hindrance unto their pay. Neither for this counte was any one of them ever toucht. When any of them is executed, it is ever done in the night he is tied in a bag, & thrown into the Sea, & presently a Cannon shot of. They are become the more odious & insolent in that number is increased (the number being but .30000) & by the fault of the officers, which serve to make choice of the worst choise not the best, & the worst for warre, as they were to do, but those which see smallest gotten taking in among them commonly for favour & rewards, namely the Turkes & the Sonnes of the very Janiziers, as of late yeres they have time not regarding other than the only proportion of the body, & ripenes, that so they might quickly be ready to serve, or brave for unwarlike soldiers, though most ignorant of discipline. Some Spanies there are that serve afooe, as those of Negro: both Lacedemon, & other Sea coast places, & other Sea coast places & are commanded by the Captain of the Sea. There is also the form of the Geomogians, called Asaps. The last Amozar finding that there were not that number of sufficient Soldiers in his Empire as beforetime, did also erect a new order, both of horse & foot, namely the Turkes & served unto them many Privileges of Honour & profit giving them the title of the brothers of Slaues, which among Turkes is the most honorable that may be. In Africa, the Turkes hath fith, or no horse, but fith: it remaine in the Geomogians, of Argive Coastage, Tunis, Tripoli.

