

European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State

The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey

KATE FLEET



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Kate Fleet 1999

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999

Printed in United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in 10/12pt Times [CE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Fleet, Kate.

European and Islamic trade in the early Ottoman state: the merchants of Genoa and Turkey /
Kate Fleet.

p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in Islamic civilization)

Includes bibliographical references (p.).

ISBN 0 521 64221 3 (hb)

1. Islamic countries – Commerce – Europe. 2. Europe – Commerce – Islamic countries.

3. Turkey – History – Ottoman Empire, 1288–1918. I. Title. II. Series.

HF3868.Z7E854 1999 382'.094017671–dc21 98–38430 CIP

ISBN 0 521 64221 3 hardback

Contents

<i>List of tables</i>	<i>page</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>		ix
<i>List of abbreviations</i>		x
Introduction		1
1 Historical outline		4
2 Money		13
3 Commodities		22
4 Slaves		37
5 Grain		59
6 Wine		74
7 Alum		80
8 Cloth		95
9 Metals		112
10 The fall of Constantinople and Ottoman–Genoese relations after 1453		122
Conclusion The Latin contribution to the early Ottoman economy		134
Appendices		
1 Exchange rates		142
2 The price of slaves in Constantinople in the late 1430s		147
3 Alum prices		150
4 Imported cloth prices		153
5 Documents		156
<i>Glossary</i>		175
<i>Place names</i>		179
<i>Select bibliography</i>		187
<i>Index</i>		198

Tables

4.1	Prices of Turkish slaves sold in Crete, 1301	<i>page</i> 48
4.1	Prices of slaves bought originally from Turks and sold in Crete, 1301 and 1304	48
A1.1	Ratio of Turkish <i>akçe</i> to <i>hyperpyron</i>	142
A1.2	Ratio of <i>akçe</i> of Samsun to 1 <i>hyperpyron</i>	145
A1.3	Ratio of <i>akçe</i> of Trabzon to 1 <i>hyperpyron</i>	145
A1.4	Ratio of <i>hyperpyra</i> to 1 Turkish <i>ducat</i>	146
A2.1	Price of slaves in Constantinople in the later 1430s	147
A3.1	Alum prices	150
A4.1	Imported cloth prices	154

Historical outline

At the beginning of the fourteenth century the world of the eastern Mediterranean was a counterpane of political powers with small states forming and large ones in decline. The Seljuks of Rum, dominant in Anatolia since the twelfth century, had been defeated at the battle of Köseadağ, north-west of Sivas, in 1243 by the Mongols, who then became the major power in the region. By 1300, however, Mongol power in Anatolia had declined. The Byzantine state was a mere remnant of its former glory, losing even its capital in 1204 to the fourth crusade. Although the emperor Michael VIII Palaeologos was able to regain the city in 1261 the empire's Asiatic possessions had by now been reduced to a small strip of land in western Anatolia. From this time the Byzantine rulers set out in a constant, but fruitless, search for help from the west in an attempt to guarantee their state's survival.

Off the coast of Anatolia, the patchwork of islands scattered through the Aegean was under Latin or Byzantine control. The Genoese were established in Chios, first under the control of the Zaccaria family from the early fourteenth century to 1329, and then, from 1346, under the Maona. The Genoese family of the Gattilusio controlled Lesbos (Mytilene) from 1354. The Genoese were also established in Phokaea (modern Foça), on the Anatolian coastline opposite Chios, initially under the Zaccaria family, from the late thirteenth century, and in Pera, on the European side of the Golden Horn opposite Constantinople, from 1267. Venice controlled Crete and Negroponte, and Venetian lords ruled in many of the islands including

This chapter is an historical outline of events, serving as a background to the discussion on trade. For more detailed histories, see in particular Franz Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time*, trans. Ralph Manheim, ed. with preface William C. Hickman, Bollingen Series 96 (Princeton, 1978); Michel Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIe-début du XVe siècle)*, *ASLSP*, n.s. v.18 (92), fasc. I; Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 235 (Genoa and Paris, 1978), vols. I-II; Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey. A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c. 1071-1330* (London, 1968); Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481* (Istanbul, 1990); Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age 1300-1600* (London, 1973); Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade, Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin* Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 11 (Venice, 1983).

Naxos and Andros, which formed, together with other nearby islands, the duchy of Naxos, as well as on Mykonos, Karpathos and Santorini. The Hospitallers established themselves on Rhodes at the beginning of the fourteenth century and controlled the islands nearby, including Kos and Patmos. Like the Genoese, the Hospitallers too were later to establish themselves on the Anatolian coast, building a castle at Bodrum at the beginning of the fifteenth century. In 1344 combined Christian forces seized the harbour of İzmir, and the Latins remained there until its fall to Timur in 1402.

By 1300, the Turks had reached the Aegean coastline. Various petty states emerged. In the central area, based on Konya, was Karaman, the most important beylik in this period and one that was to continue as a thorn in the side of the Ottomans well into the fifteenth century. To the north-west, around Söğüt, was the small and, at this stage, insignificant, Ottoman beylik. Along the Aegean coast, from north to south, stretched Karası, Saruhan, Aydın, Menteşe and Teke. Inland from Teke was Hamid and east of Karası, based round Kütahya, was the beylik of Germiyan. The İsfendiyağulları controlled the Black Sea region round Kastamonu and Sinop.

The Ottoman beylik bordered on the remnants of Byzantine territory in Anatolia. Under its eponymous founder, Osman, the beylik expanded at Byzantine expense along the Sakarya river and westward towards the Sea of Marmara. It was under his son Orhan who succeeded him around 1324¹ that the Ottoman state developed considerably, the Byzantine cities of Bursa (Prusa), Ulubat (Lopadion), İznik (Nicaea) and İzmit (Nicomedia) all falling to the Ottomans between 1326 and 1337. The Byzantines were not the only ones to suffer from Ottoman advance for, sometime around the mid-1330s,² Orhan annexed the beylik of Karası. It was also under Orhan that the Ottomans gained their first foothold in Europe with the capture of Gelibolu (Gallipoli) in 1354.

This advance was maintained by Orhan's son Murad, who succeeded his father in 1362. In Anatolia, Murad annexed the beyliks of Germiyan and Hamid in the 1370s³ and Teke in the 1380s,⁴ and launched a successful attack on the beylik of Karaman. By the end of his reign Ottoman control in Anatolia stretched from the shores of the Bosphoros in the north to Antalya and the coastline of the Aegean in the south.

Gains in Anatolia were matched by those in Europe. Ottoman forces

¹ Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p. 19.

² The conquest had to be after the visit of ibn Battuta in the early 1330s, as he met the independent ruler there. The earliest source to date it is the Chronological List of 1421, which places it 1348/9 (Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 21–2).

³ Germiyan was taken probably soon after 1375. The Chronological List of 1421, the earliest source to date the event, places it in 1378/9 (Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p. 27). Hamid fell shortly after the conquest of Germiyan (*ibid.*).

⁴ Neşri dates it 1386, the Chronological List of 1421 to 1388 (Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p. 28).

took Edirne (Adrianople), probably in 1369,⁵ defeated the forces under the Serbian despots of Macedonia, Ugleša and Vlkašin in the battle of Çirmen on the Maritsa river in 1371 and, the way to Bulgaria and Macedonia now open before them, advanced into Bulgaria, taking Plovdiv (Philippopolis, Filibe) and Zagora and probably conquering much of Bulgaria. The Tsardom of Tarnovo seems also to have fallen under Ottoman suzerainty around this period while Ottoman attacks were launched into the kingdom of Bosnia and Serbia, Niš falling in 1385. Further south, Ottoman forces were active in Greece, taking Thessaloniki in 1387. Two years later Murad invaded Serbia. In the famous battle between the Ottomans and the Serbs on the plain of Kosovo both Murad and the Serbian prince Lazar were killed.

Serbia then descended into a period of internal feuding. The Ottoman state, however, appears to have been more stable for, although it is possible that there may have been a power struggle between Murad's son Bayezid and his brother in the period immediately after Murad's death, any such dispute was over by October 1389 when the Genoese *podestà* of Pera confirmed the peace treaty concluded between Genoa and Bayezid.⁶

Under Bayezid (1389–1402), the Ottoman state continued its expansion. In Anatolia, the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın fell to the Ottomans in the winter of 1389/90 and Karaman once more came under attack. Accompanied by the Byzantine emperor Manuel II as his vassal, Bayezid campaigned against the İsfendiyaroğlu territory round Kastamonu and was probably successful in establishing control over northern Anatolia as far east as the Kızılırmak, which runs from the Black Sea, just west of Sinop, and passes just east of Ankara before turning east towards Sivas.

In Europe, Bayezid was locked into a power struggle over Serbia with King Sigismund of Hungary, a struggle in which Bayezid ultimately came out on top. Ottoman forces moved into Bulgaria and Wallachia. The menace of Ottoman advance forced both Sigismund and the Byzantine emperor Manuel, whose capital was now under Turkish siege and would remain so until 1402, to seek allies in the west. As a result a large crusading force was assembled, with troops from France, Germany and England, as well as those from Hungary. In 1396 this army met the Ottoman forces in battle at Nikopolis, on the Danube west of Ruse in modern Bulgaria, and was soundly defeated, thus effectively ending the era of Christian crusading to the east.

With the crushing of the crusaders, the position of Constantinople now looked very grave indeed and Manuel turned once more to the west for

⁵ Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p. 29.

⁶ Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p. 37; 1389.x.26 = ASG, Notario, Donato de Clavaro, c. 476, doc. 10; see appendix 5, doc. 2. Summary in M. Balard, Angeliki E. Laiou and C. Otten-Froux, *Les Italiens à Byzance et présentation de documents*, Série Byzantina Sorbonensia 6, Centre de Recherches d'Histoire et de Civilisation Byzantine (Paris, 1987), p. 33.

urgent help, which, apart from the arrival in the city of Marshal Boucicault, sent in 1399 by Charles VI of France, was not forthcoming. Bayezid moved on into Hungary and took Vidin. He was now master of the lands lying south of the Danube.

The Ottomans were also advancing in the region to the south, in Albania, Epiros and southern Greece, by means both of conquest and marriage. They were considerably helped in the Peloponnese by the presence of different warring Latin and Greek lords, among whom they could easily, allying with one against another, apply the principle of divide and rule. Ottoman advance was not merely on land, for Turkish ships increasingly conducted raids in the Aegean and harassed Latin navigation both there and through the straits.

Ottoman success in Europe was matched by continuing success in Anatolia. In 1397 Bayezid launched a campaign against Karaman as a result of which its ruler, Alaeddin, lost his life and the beylik lost its independence. To the north, Bayezid took Samsun from the İsfendiyarogulları, and Amasya. To the east, Burhan al-Din, the ruler of Sivas, was killed, the Akkoyunlu clan defeated and Sivas taken. To the south Bayezid seized Malatya from the Mamluks. By the end of the century, Bayezid's control stretched from Sivas and Malatya in the east, across the central plateau and over the whole of western Anatolia. This control was, however, transient rather than solidly based and within two years the whole edifice was to be reduced to rubble by an enemy approaching from the east.

Timur, born in Transoxiana probably in the 1320s or 1330s,⁷ swept at the head of his forces across Central Asia and, at the turn of the fifteenth century, into Anatolia. In 1402, at the battle of Ankara, Timur inflicted a shattering defeat on the Ottoman army and took Bayezid captive. Ottoman authority fractured into fratricidal fighting between Bayezid's sons, and the independent beyliks were re-established by Timur. Ottoman territory was now reduced to lands in northern Anatolia stretching from the Sea of Marmara to Bursa, Ankara and Sivas in the east and northwards to Amasya. After the defeat of their father, Bayezid's sons scattered. Süleyman fled to Europe, Mehmed to the region of Amasya, Tokat and Sivas, and Isa, apparently, to Bursa, while Musa appears to have been taken captive with his father. What happened to Mustafa is unclear.⁸ There followed a period of internecine struggle among the sons of Bayezid from which Mehmed eventually emerged the victor.

It was during Mehmed I's reign (1413–21) that the Ottoman state was once more rebuilt. Mehmed was able both to overcome the internal revolts in Anatolia in 1416 under Şeyh Bedreddin and Börklüce Mustafa, and to

⁷ For an account of Timur, see Beatrice Forbes Manz, *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane* (Cambridge, 1989).

⁸ He may perhaps have ruled Bursa for some period. See Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, p. 63 and n. 26.

extend his territories in Anatolia and in Europe. The beyliks of Aydın and Mentеше, revived by Timur, now lost their independence and passed under permanent Ottoman control. The İsfendiyarogulları and Karaman too suffered defeats at the hands of the new Ottoman ruler while the Genoese lost their colony in Samsun to him in 1420. In Europe, Mehmed's forces advanced in Albania and reduced Wallachia to vassal status, raided Bosnia and attacked Negroponte. By 1421 therefore, when Mehmed died, the Ottoman state had re-emerged after the disaster of the battle of Ankara and the subsequent internecine fighting.

Although the position of the state was now far more stable than it had been ten years before, the early phase of the reign of Mehmed's son and successor, Murad II (1421–51), was by no means easy, for his initial task was to survive civil war. Challenged first by his uncle, Düzme Mustafa, and then by his brother Mustafa, Murad overcame both attempts to oust him from power. His initial task was to establish firm Ottoman control in the European section of the empire and in Anatolia where he campaigned against the perennial Ottoman enemy, Karaman, and secured Ottoman power in the north-east and west. In Europe, the position was complicated for the Ottomans by the presence of a successful commander, John Hunyadi, the *voivoda* of Transylvania. Hunyadi defeated Ottoman forces both in 1441 and again in 1442.

Murad's main aim at this point was to secure peaceful relations with the surrounding powers. He had already made a treaty with the Byzantines in 1424, after his unsuccessful siege of Constantinople at the beginning of his reign. Now, after the Hungarian campaign of 1443, he concluded the treaty of Edirne with Serbia and Hungary in 1444 and an agreement with Karaman in the same year. It was at this point, having thus apparently stabilised relations with his neighbours, that Murad abdicated in favour of his son Mehmed.

Mehmed II's first reign was to be both brief and difficult. The treaty of Edirne did not prove to be very reliable for, in September, John Hunyadi and King Vladislav I of Hungary crossed the Danube against the Ottomans. Murad, who had returned from retirement to lead the campaign, commanded the Ottoman forces. The two armies met in battle near Varna. The Hungarian forces were defeated, Vladislav being killed and Hunyadi fleeing from the battlefield.

Murad's return to the political stage was temporary and after this Ottoman victory he once more withdrew, leaving Mehmed precariously in charge. Mehmed's reign, however, did not continue for long and was brought down two years later by a janissary revolt in Edirne. Murad's second reign now began with his recall to the throne and ended with his death in 1451. During this period Ottoman forces in Europe overcame John Hunyadi who, although defeated with the Hungarian forces at the battle of Varna in 1444, was not crushed until the second battle of Kosovo in 1448.

Another opponent of Ottoman rule in the Balkans was George Kastriote, who came to be known as Scanderbeg, a corruption of his Muslim name İskender Bey. Based in Albania, Scanderbeg was able to hold out against Murad by retreating out of reach after each encounter. Further to the south, Ottoman forces operated in the Peloponnese and against Venetian territories attacking Negroponte in the later 1440s, and the islands of Tinos and Mykonos in 1450.

Murad II's reign came to an end with his death in February 1451. Mehmed II (1451–81) ascended the throne once again and, two years later, captured the city of Constantinople and with it the Genoese settlement of Pera.

Genoa itself passed much of the 150 years between the beginning of the fourteenth century and the fall of Constantinople in a mess.⁹ There was considerable political instability, civil war and foreign domination. From 1353 until 1356 the city was under Giovanni Visconti, in 1396 it fell to France, in 1409 to Teodoro di Monteferrati and several years later, in 1421, it was back under the domination of Milan, in the control of Filippo Maria Visconti. At other times, government was in the hands of the doge, whose hold on power could be flimsy. Between July and September 1393 there were five successive doges. At the same time, however, Genoa managed to be an extremely important commercial player in the Mediterranean and the Banco di San Giorgio was to be, by the early sixteenth century, a formidable financial power. Political instability at home left the Genoese colonies with a much freer hand than might otherwise have been the case in their dealings with the Turks.

Throughout this period Genoa's main rival in the Levant remained Venice, a state much more stable politically, and one with a much tighter control over its Levantine colonies. This rivalry resulted in various wars between Genoa and Venice, fought largely over control of the Black Sea and with largely inconclusive results for the balance of power between the two states in the eastern Mediterranean, the status quo remaining intact, with neither side being able to dominate the other. During the war of Curzola which took place between 1294 and 1299 the Venetians, in July 1296, set fire to the Genoese commercial settlement in Pera, attacked Caffa and devastated Phokaea, while the Genoese, enraged at the burning of Pera, murdered the Venetian *bailo* and Venetian merchants. From a Genoese standpoint, the result of this war, which was finally settled by the treaty of Milan, signed on 25 September 1299, was that Genoa remained dominant in the Black Sea, but had sustained considerable loss in Pera and Caffa.¹⁰

From 1351 to 1355 Genoa and Venice were once more at war, in the war

⁹ For an account of the history of Genoa in this period see Steven A. Epstein, *Genoa and the Genoese 958–1528* (Chapel Hill and London, 1996).

¹⁰ Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, pp. 58–61.

of the Straits, in which the two sides again disputed control of the Black Sea, and the outcome of which made no appreciable difference to the balance of power between them in the region.¹¹ This applies equally to the outcome of the war of Tenedos, or the war of Chioggia, which ended with the peace of Turin, signed in August 1381. Once again, neither Genoa nor Venice had succeeded in gaining the upper hand, and the status quo prevailed.¹²

From the early beginnings of the Ottoman state to the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453, the Ottomans and the Genoese maintained close relations. While the Genoese did on occasion take part in various anti-Turkish leagues organised by Latin powers, they were not as active in this regard as their main maritime rival Venice, refusing, for example, to join the crusade against İzmir in 1344.¹³ Genoese behaviour was in part instrumental in ensuring that an anti-Turkish league between Genoa, Venice and Byzantium, urged by Pope Innocent VI in 1362–3 did not in fact get off the ground.¹⁴ Even when Genoa was involved in anti-Turkish leagues, this does not always seem to have hampered contacts with the Turks, for Genoese sources show that there were frequent exchanges of embassies in the 1380s¹⁵ while Genoa, in 1388, proposed an anti-Turkish league with Venice and a division of the Mediterranean into spheres of influence between them,¹⁶ and, in the same year, the Genoese of Pera entered into treaty arrangements with the Hospitallers of Rhodes, the Maona of Chios and Francesco Gattilusio of Mytilene.¹⁷ Frequent Turkish–Genoese contacts, however, continued, in the 1390s,¹⁸ although in 1392 the Maona of Chios, the Gatillusi of Lesbos and the Hospitallers of Rhodes discussed joint action against the Turks,¹⁹ and at the beginning of the fifteenth century,²⁰ and one may presume that this was true also for the much of the rest of the period but for which the sources have not survived.²¹ As Professor Balard has said,

¹¹ See Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, pp. 78–83; and Michel Balard, ‘A propos de la bataille du Bosphore. L’expédition génoise de Paganino Doria à Constantinople’, *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970), 431–69.

¹² Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, pp. 88–91.

¹³ Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 45 (despite papal appeal).

¹⁴ Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, p. 85.

¹⁵ 1387.1.29 = ASG, Antico Comune 83, fo. 53; 1387.1.29 = *ibid.*, fo. 84; 1387.ii.27 = *ibid.*, fo. 54; 1388.vi.14 = *ibid.*, fo. 59; 1388.v.10 = *ibid.*, fos. 7–8; 1388.vi.25 = *ibid.*, fos. 66–67.

¹⁶ Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 36; Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, p. 95.

¹⁷ Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 74.

¹⁸ There are many references in ASG: San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1304; Antico Comune, 22; and Archivio Segreto, 498.

¹⁹ Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 78.

²⁰ 1402.v.26 & 27 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1306, fos. 97r–98r and 1402.v.11 = *ibid.*, fos. 148r–152r and 1402.v.30 = *ibid.*, ffos101r–102r; 1413.i = ASG, Notaio, Giovanni Balbi, Sc. 46, filza 1, doc. 104.

²¹ In this context it is a great pity that so few of the Massaria of Pera have survived. They are particularly useful in building up a picture of the exchange of embassies as they enter all related expenses.

for the Genoese 'il était plus important de maintenir contre les prétensions vénitiennes les comptoirs génois et le réseau commercial constitué en Orient que de participer à une alliance de la chrétienté contre les Turcs'.²²

The Genoese certainly had close relations with the Turks, relations which began early on with Menteşe, for Genoa made an alliance with the beylik in 1311 for a joint attack on Rhodes and the surrounding islands,²³ and with Saruhan to whom the Genoese of New Phokaea were paying tribute in return for freedom to trade soon after the construction of the new city.²⁴ Treaties were made between the Genoese and Saruhan in, probably, the late 1340s,²⁵ and with Hızır of Aydın in 1351.²⁶ At the end of that year the Genoese requested provisions from Aydın for their fleet.²⁷ The treaty between the Genoese and the Ottoman ruler Murad I, enacted in 1387, is extant and, although no other Ottoman–Genoese treaty has apparently survived from the fourteenth century, the Genoese are known to have concluded treaties with the Ottomans in the winter of 1351–2²⁸ and in 1389.²⁹ They were also, together with the Byzantines, the Venetians and the Hospitallers, signatories to the treaty with Bayezid's son Süleyman in 1403.³⁰

Genoese–Ottoman relations were based very firmly on mutual interest.

²² Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, pp. 103–4.

²³ Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 108.

²⁴ Dukas, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1843), pp. 162–3; Dukas, *Ducae Historia Turcobyzantina (1341–1462)*, ed. B. Grecu (Bucharest, 1958), p. 207, ll. 24–7; Dukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, ed. and trans. H. J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1975), p. 149. Tribute was also being paid to Saruhan in the 1330s: ibn Battuta, *Voyages d'ibn Batoutah*, ed. and trans. C. Defremery and B. R. Sanguinetti (Paris, 1854), vol. II, p. 314. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 17 says, referring to ibn Battuta, that this tribute was probably new as it was unlikely that Saruhan could have extracted it when Zaccaria was established on Chios.

²⁵ 1364.x.8, ASG, Nota; Ignoti, XVIII. 14 refers to an agreement made between Saruhan and Leone Kalothetos, lord of Old Phokaea. See Kate Fleet, 'The treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese', *BSOAS* 56 (1993), 21–2.

²⁶ Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 58.

²⁷ A. Luttrell, 'Venice and the Knights Hospitallers of Rhodes in the Fourteenth Century', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 26/n.s. 5 (1958), 205.

²⁸ Concluded by Filippo Demerode and Bonifacio de Sauli, 1358.xi.20, ASG, San Giorgio, Manoscritti Membranacei IV, fo. 304r; = L. T. Belgrano, 'Documenti Riguardanti la Colonia Genovese di Pera', *ASLSP* 13 (1877–84), no. 21, p. 129. 1352.v.6 = *Liber Jurium, Reipublicae Genuensis*, ed. Ercole Ricotti, Monumenta Historiae Patriae 9 (Turin, 1857), vol. II, no. CCIII, p. 602, in the peace agreement between Genoa and the Byzantine emperor John VI, it was stipulated that the peace made by Pagano Doria with 'Orcanibei amirati' should remain firm and unaffected by this new agreement with Byzantium. Kantakuzenos, *Ioannes Kantakuzenos, Historiarum libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, CSHB (Bonn, 1828–32), vol. III, p. 288, ll. 8–19 and Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. Schopen and I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1828–55), vol. III, p. 84, ll. 4–11, both speak of legates sent to Orhan to secure an agreement with him, though neither of them name these emissaries.

²⁹ 1389.x.26, ASG, Notario, 476, Donato de Clavaro, c. 476, doc. 10, see appendix 5 below, doc. 2.

³⁰ G. T. Dennis, 'The Byzantine–Turkish treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 72–88.

The Genoese were essentially pragmatic in their dealings with the Turks, something that was no doubt encouraged by the fact that Genoese Turkish policy was largely dictated by the Genoese on the spot in colonies such as Pera and Chios rather than directed from Genoa itself. Even during the siege of Constantinople, the Genoese of Pera managed to maintain their relations with the Turks while, simultaneously, siding with the defenders of the city, sending letters urgently requesting help to Genoa, ambassadors to the sultan in Edirne to renew treaty relations and express undying friendship, soldiers to Constantinople, oil for Turkish cannons to the sultan's camp and betraying Longo Giustiniano's scheme to set fire to the Turkish ships.³¹ Relations were such that when Turkish cannon sank a ship belonging to Genoese merchants of Pera, loaded with merchandise and ready to leave for Italy, the Perotes complained. Explaining that they had not realised that the ship belonged to the Genoese of Pera, taking it rather as belonging to the enemy, the Turks assured them that, after the capture of the city, the merchants would be fully indemnified.³² Once Constantinople had fallen, what the Genoese really wanted was to have Pera back and to continue trading as before, a situation for which they were quite prepared to pay tribute. Their overriding concern was to ensure freedom of movement and, in particular, access to and from the Black Sea.³³

Relations between the Turks and the Genoese were thus highly developed with a constant exchange of embassies and conclusion of treaties and agreements of one sort or another. The main motivating force behind these relations was money, generated by an active and lucrative commerce.

³¹ Dukas, *Historia Byzantina*, chap.38, p. 265, ll. 10–11, p. 267, ll. 8–11, p. 275, ll. 10–20, p. 277, ll. 13–14; Dukas, *Historia Turcobyzantina*, p. 329, ll. 25–6, p. 333, ll. 5–7, p. 343, l. 28 – p. 345, l. 4, p. 347, l. 13; Dukas *Decline and Fall*, pp. 211, 212, 217, 218.

³² Dukas, *Historia Byzantina*, chap. 38, p. 278, l. 8 – p. 279, l. 8; Dukas *Historia Turcobyzantina*, p. 347, l. 29 – p. 349, l. 13; Dukas, *Decline and Fall*, p. 219.

³³ 1454.iii.11 = Belgrano, 'Documenti', no. 154, pp. 265–7.