

Marija Andrić

The Institute of History, Belgrade
Original scientific paper

The reports of the Venetian rectors in Split as a representation of political and commercial relations between Venice and the Ottoman empire

Although the function of the Venetian representative in Split was an intermediate one, his observations concerning the economic life of Split were important since it effected on its development and growth. Through the dispatches that he sent to Venice with copies of letters that he had been exchanging with the Ottoman representatives from Sarajevo and Banja Luka, he had been

informing Venice of important questions and the everyday life of the port of Split. With an aim to contribute to the understanding of position and importance of the Venetian representative in Split, in this paper we are illustrating some of the problems that he dealt with in the first half of the 17th century concerning merchants and economic life in Split.

KEY WORDS:

Venice, Ottoman Empire, port of Split, Sarajevo, Banja Luka, dispatches, letters, merchants, merchandise

Introduction

Given the Venetian maritime possessions were important for maintaining trade, the Venetian rectors' position in some of the centres required them to deal with the economic issues. One of these centres was Split, which was of great importance to the Republic as it joined Venice with the Balkan roads, with its position on the eastern coast of Adriatic Sea. In opening the trade port of Split, Venice saw the possibility of establishing a better connection with the roads passing through Livno, Sarajevo, Pljevlja, Prijepolje and Novi Pazar, thus connecting it with larger trade centres. The idea of founding a trade port of Split (*Scala di Spalato*) was born in 1577, with a draft proposal submitted by Daniel Rodriaga to

the Senate in Venice, and the final decisions and the preparations needed to open the port were made between 1589 and 1592.¹

The project of *Scala di Spalato* was created on already very well-established connections between Venetian rectors in Zadar and Split and Venetian representatives in Ottoman Klis and Sarajevo. These relations point to a great interest in Balkan long before this port was opened. The interest was mutual, since Venetian fabrics remained among very well sold merchandise in Balkan trade centers such as Sofia, Skopje, and Sarajevo, in contrast to Aleppo, Izmir, and Cairo where Northerners became great competitors. The idea of creating free port which brought Balkan merchandise directly to Venice manifested as a consistent path in Venetian policy towards Ottoman Balkans.² In this port, the count and the captain of Split was a figure of great importance. His dispatches to Senate help us in our attempt to contribute to understanding of his role as an intermediary between Ottoman merchants, Venetian government and Ottoman representatives. Nevertheless, the count and the captain was a figure that contributed in Veneto-Ottoman trade relations, even when dealing with minor merchants' problems.

The Venetian rectors were responsible for ensuring that the Venetian law be implemented in every part of the Republic that had been assigned to them. They were governors responsible for civil, juridical, financial, and military questions of the town they administered.³ The rector in Split

¹ MONIQUE O'CONNELL, *Men of Empire – Power and Negotiation in Venice's Maritime State*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009; FREDERIC C. LANE, *Povijest Mletačke republike*, Zagreb: Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga, 2007, pp. 57-58; RENZO PACI, *La "scala", di Spalato e il commercio veneziano nei Balcani fra cinque e seicento*, Venezia: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1971, p. 16; ROSSANA D'ALBERTON VITALE, *Tra sanità e commercio: il difficile ruolo del Lazzaretto veneziano alla Scala di Spalato*, in «Studi veneziani», XXXIX (2000), pp. 253-288; VIKTOR MORPURGO, *Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje Splitske skele u XVI stoljeću*, I-II poglavlje, in «Starine», 52 (1962), pp. 185-248; VIKTOR MORPURGO, *Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje Splitske skele u XVI stoljeću*, III-IV poglavlje, in «Starine», 53 (1966), pp. 363-415.

² VERA COSTANTINI, *Alternative Paths Towards the Age of Mercantilism: The Venetian Project of the Scala di Spalato*, in «Bordering Early Modern Europe» ed. Maria Baramova, Grigor Boykov, Ivan Parvev, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2015, pp. 63-76.

³ Zadar was the only Dalmatian city that had two rectors – the count and the captain. All other cities in Dalmatia had only the count who also undertook a duty of the captain: TOMISLAV RAUKAR, IVO PETRICIOLI, FRANJO ŠVELEC, ŠIME PERIČIĆ, *Zadar pod Mletačkom upravom*, Zadar, zbornik, Filozofski fakultet, 1987, p. 45; TEA MAYHEW, *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian rule: Contado di Zara 1645 – 1718*, Roma: Viella 2008, p. 158.

had its title of the count and the captain from 1467, and as a representative of Venetian authority in Split he respected orders that came from Venice. He had the competence of surveying Venetian *lazzareto*, except when *provveditore generale* was in Split. Depending on reports of *priore*, who was in charge of administering *lazzareto*, the count and the captain of Split had all information needed to inform Venice and *provveditore generale* about the amount of imported and exported goods.⁴

Some glances at the relations between the count and the captain of Split and Ottoman merchants

Just a few years before the opening, in 1580, the count (*conte, knez*) and the captain of Split, Alvise Loredan recorded how trade in Split was taking place and which obligations a rector had to fulfil in this city:

La Serenità Vostra sa che la città di Spalato è divisa come anco sono l'altre Città della Dalmatia, in Nobili et Cittadini [...] che bisogna ch'i Rettori sian circonspecti nel preveder l'occasioni, che potessero mover gl' humori, et suscitar le discordie, et troncarle, altramente sarebbe per apportar disturbi, non solo alla Città et alli Rettori, ma alla Serenità Vostra ancora.

Loredan also described one of his attempts to convince Ottoman merchants of the possible privileges they could enjoy if Venice decided to form a customs in Split. However, Loredan failed to convince them as merchants were determined not to pay extra taxes, in addition to the one they paid to the Sultan. Merchants explained to him that they were satisfied with the conditions provided by the port of Neretva, where they always found a sufficient number of transport horses and armed vessels that provided safety. At this occasion, Loredan tried to point out the authorities in Venice to the fact that it was unrealistic to expect the construction of a port to be possible from additional customs duties and that it was necessary to carry out the plan in a manner that would suit merchants first. In this case, after having conversation with them, he had to arrange unloading of their merchandise and finding a place to accommodate them,

⁴ NATAŠA BAJIĆ-ŽARKO, *Split kao trgovačko i tranzitno središte na razmeđu istoka i zapada u 18. stoljeću*, Split: Književni krug 2004, pp. 9–10, p. 72.

he wrote down: «bisognò finalmente far à lor modo», pointing at the fact that he had to please them with their requests.⁵ This example is good for understanding that the count and the captain had to make an effort and have conversation with merchants, collecting their opinions about the matter, but also fulfilling their demands.

On the other hand, one letter from 1590 shows a change in the situation on the subject of the port of Split. A letter written by Mustafa a *sancakbeyi* of Klis to the count and the captain of Split indicates to the fact that all merchants from that territory were eagerly looking forward to the forming of a port of Split as in the waters of the Neretva they were threatened by the Uskoks. In his letter he also emphasized that the port of Split should be safer for merchants and if anything bad happened to them the Venetian representative in Split and the others would have to be liable and ensure compensation.⁶

Other Venetian representatives left a written testimony of how the Venetian representative in Split had to devote himself greatly to approach his role of a rector in this city. This can be seen from the report by 'bailo' Venier who in 1593 noted that the count and the captain Daniele de Molin paid special attention to merchants, testifying to the progress of this port.⁷

In the years following the opening, through his dispatches, the Venetian representative in Split sent information about merchants present at the port, the departures of trade galleys and about the quantity and type of goods stored in the *lazzaretto* ready to be transported to Venice. One of the main problems in Split was the trade galleys that were very often late thus making a risk to form a bad image of the functioning of this port. For the same reason, in 1602 the count and the captain Andrea Renier tried to appease a group of merchants who came to him claiming they felt cheated. At the same time, in his dispatch, Renier informed the Doge it would be best, in the interest of the port's prosperity, if the merchants were pleased and the galleys arrived on time.⁸

⁵ GRGA NOVAK, (ed.), *Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji (Commissiones et relationes venetae)*, svezak 4, od 1572. do 1590. godine, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1964, pp. 229-233.

⁶ VIKTOR MORPURGO, *Daniel Rodriguez*, III-IV, cit., pp. 409-410.

⁷ RENZO PACI, *La "scala" di Spalato*, cit., p. 63.

⁸ Archivio di Stato di Venezia (abbreviation: ASVe), Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 1, unnumbered doc. (March 21, 1602).

Only a year after this, a dispatch written by count and captain Polo Trevisan informed of his decision to postpone the departure of a fully loaded galley as he received information about the existence of Uskok's ships anchored in the territory of Trogir. Trevisan also tried to calm down all merchants who were waiting for the departure of this galley, but as he reported, he failed to convince them that the decision was made for their own good. Ottoman merchants were pleased only when the galley set sail for Venice after the *provveditore generale* reported that it was safe to authorize sailing, as the Uskoks set out for Senj.⁹

When the suspicions of plague were born to Split in 1607, the count and the captain Marin Bundumier held several meetings with merchants present at the port. On this occasion, Bundumier wrote that a certain number of Ottoman merchants tried to break through the door of the *lazzaretto* to return home, but he managed to dissuade them with kind words, convincing them that the galley would soon set off, while hoping to receive orders from Venice.¹⁰

Although rectors in Split had to consult with the Venetian authority on some questions, he was always the first person to receive complaints and supplications from Ottoman merchants in Split. He was a person that connected merchants with Venetian authority, but also had to maintain contact with Ottoman representatives. Some administrative procedures had to be completed in cooperation with Ottoman officials. Dispatches and letters of the count and the captain of Split can be used in order to help understand this cooperation in commercial purposes.

A contribution to understanding communication between Venetian rectors and Ottoman officials

For the sake of the economic prosperity of this port, the Venetian representative in Split had to maintain communication with the Ottoman officials in Banja Luka and Sarajevo, and we will present it through several examples. When the Ottoman merchant from Ankara (d'Angori), Bayram

⁹ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 2, unnumbered doc. (June 14, 1603).

¹⁰ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 6, unnumbered doc. (April 18, 1607).

Cebeci (Beiran Gebegi)¹¹, died in 1613 in the *lazzaretto*, the count and the captain of Split cooperated with Ottoman officials from Bosnia about the goods that remained after his death. Bayram came to Split with a greater quantity of camlets¹², bringing some also on behalf of certain Jewish and Christian merchants. Together with his dispatch from January 1613, the count and the captain Marin Mudazzo also sent a letter he received from Mustafa Pasha *beylerbeyi* of Bosnia, as well as the response he wrote to him. In his letter, Mustafa Pasha noted that he had heard of the death of the Ottoman merchant in Split. According to the orders Mustafa Pasha wrote, the merchandise and money should be listed and put in a safe place, and the whole procedure should be controlled by a *nazır, kadı* of Klis and Rizvan Ağa *kapıcı* (Rizvan Agga *capigi*). Rizvan Ağa *kapıcı*, that Mustafa Pasha sent, should use his stamp in this process, after the deceased's goods were transferred to a safe place. He also wanted to remind Mudazzo that all the goods belonging to the one who professed Islam and who did not leave heirs after death must be handed over to the Sultan or one of his officials, since in that case it belonged to the Ottoman Empire. He also pointed out that this rule was laid down by the contracts concluded between the Doge and the Sultan: «[...] *come sono li canoni et li patti, tra il nostro Re et il Vostro Principe* [...]».¹³

These contracts were capitulations (*ahidnames*) and they regulated political and economic relations of Venice and the Ottoman Empire. The postulates of Veneto-Ottoman capitulations discussed the issue concerning the goods of Venetian merchants who passed away on the Ottoman territory. According to the capitulations, the merchant's goods should be well preserved after his death, but also it should be meticulously

.....

¹¹ His name probably derived from the name of the *kapı kulu* troops or armorers –*cebeci* (pl. *cebeciyan*), that were responsible for manufacture and repair of weapons and armor, as for stockpiling and storing them in peacetime: HALİLİ NALDŽIĆ, *Osmansko carstvo. Klasično doba 1300-1600*, Beograd, Utopija, 2003, pp. 123-130; MARK L. STEIN, *Guarding the Frontier: Ottoman Border Forts and Garrisons in Europe*, London-New York, Tauris Academic Studies, 2007, pp. 81-83. I am thankful to Dr. Aleksandar Fotić for this suggestion.

¹² Camlets or zambelotti (ciambelotti): MARIA PIA PEDANI, *Facilities for Ottoman merchants in the Rialto market (1534-1621)*, in XIV. *Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Ankara : 9 - 13 Eylül 2002 *Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, Ankara Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, p. 1006.

¹³ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 11 (a letter to Bosnian Pasha is from January 5, 1613 *more veneto*; a dispatch to Venice is from January 10, 1613 *m. v.*).

controlled if the person that claimed to be merchant's heir or representative was legitimate. Suraiya Faroqhi pointed out that these capitulations did not handle all trade-related issues, assuming the Ottoman administration considered that economic issues were local by nature and therefore should always be solved *ad hoc*.¹⁴ On the Ottoman territory, if the deceased did not have any ancestors, all of his belongings were automatically transferred to the State's treasury.¹⁵ When it comes to above mentioned Ottoman merchant, it was indicated that after his death the goods belonged to the Sultan, unless he left heirs. From the case presented above, and the information from both the rector's and *beylerbeyi*'s letter, we can see how this procedure was also respected when an Ottoman merchant died in Venetian territory.

In his dispatch, Mudazzo informed the Doge that the merchant from Ankara left no heirs, and therefore his goods had to be handed over to the treasury of the Ottoman Empire. He also wrote down that he had already sent a letter to the Venetian Board of Trade (*Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia*) and was waiting for further instructions on dealing with the merchandise kept in the *lazzaretto*. Shortly after the merchant's death, the count and the captain Mudazzo informed Mustafa Pasha that an inventory list of his merchandise was made, but also he pointed out that the goods of the deceased were taken good care of in Split.¹⁶

Similar cooperation was established in 1619 when Mustafa Pasha informed the count and the captain of Split, Marin Garzoni that a Venetian merchant died in Banja Luka. As in the case of merchant from Ankara, an inventory list of goods was made in Banja Luka, and *beylerbeyi* informed in his letter that he was expecting further instructions from *Imperial Maestà*, that he already asked for by sending an *arz* (petition). He also assured

¹⁴ HANS P. A. THEUNISSEN, *Ottoman-Venetian Diplomats: The 'Ahd-names. The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of Political-Commercial Instruments together with an Annotated Edition of a Corpus of Relevant Documents*, in «EJOS» I (1998), No 2, p. 411; SURAIYA FAROQHI, *The Venetian Presence in the Ottoman Empire*, in «The Journal of European Economic History», 15 (1986), pp. 395-396.

¹⁵ АЛЕКСАНДАР ФОТИЋ, *Између закона и његове примене*, у: *Приватни живот у српским земљама у освит модерног доба*, приредио Александар Фотић, Београд: Клио 2005, pp. 51–52.

¹⁶ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 11 (January 10, 1613 m.v.; January 5, 1613 m.v.).

Garzoni that the merchant's goods were in a safe place and that nothing would be missing. In his dispatch to the Senate, Garzoni informs that he is sending copies of the letters exchanged with Bosnian *beylerbeyi*.¹⁷

For this case, we have to briefly turn to the question of the Venetian consul in the Ottoman Bosnia. The officials appointed by the Republic to protect their merchants and fellow citizens in places outside its borders were consuls. They were part of a scattered network of Venetian consuls who were sent to places important for trade, in which there was a larger colony of Venetians. The first attempt to establish the Venetian consulate in the Ottoman Bosnia in 1588 was completed with the decision from 1592 to appoint Ottavio dall'Oglio as a consul. A few years later, from a petition filed by a group of merchants in 1604, we find out that after the death of the last consul nobody was appointed to replace him. The Venetian Board of Trade responded negatively to their petition to appoint a new consul, explaining that the decision from 1592 did not meet expectations. The conclusion was drawn that there was no need to appoint a Venetian representative in the Ottoman Bosnia since the trade was performed by the Ottoman merchants coming to Split and the number of Venetian merchants in Sarajevo decreased.¹⁸

But the question of Venetian representative in Sarajevo did not end here, because it is known that in the period between 1616 and 1625, a person named Marc' Antonio Velutelli fulfilled some role of a Venetian representative in Sarajevo.¹⁹ In 1617, in one of his dispatches the count and the captain Marin Garzoni mentions a person named Marc' Antonio Velutelli. Along with Velutelli's letter concerning some merchandise, the count and the captain Garzoni wrote down in his dispatch that «*Turchi venuti di Bossina*» saw Marc' Antonio Velutelli as a person that assumed the position of a Venetian representative.²⁰ Concerning the question of a

¹⁷ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 20 (April 23, 1619).

¹⁸ MARIA PIA PEDANI, *Consoli veneziani nei porti del Mediterraneo nel età moderna, in Mediterraneo in armi (secc. XV-XVIII)*, vol. 1, a cura di Rossella Cancilla, Palermo, Associazione Mediterranea, pp. 175-205; ASVe, Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia, Seconda serie, b. 26, fol. N° 98 (September 1, 1604); ГЛИГОР СТАНОЈЕВИЋ, *Покушај отварања млетачког конзулата у Босни*, in «Историјски гласник», 1 (1972), pp. 111-114.

¹⁹ SEID TRAJLIĆ, *Trgovina Bosne i Hercegovine s lukama Dalmacije i Dubrovnika u XVII i XVIII stoljeću*, in «Pomorski zbornik», 1 (1962), pp. 341-371.

²⁰ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 16 (August 7, 1617).

deceased Venetian merchant in Bosnia in 1619, it is strange that Garzoni did not write about the possible help of a Venetian representative that at that moment might have been in Sarajevo, and we cannot tell from his dispatch whether or not he was included in this question. Also, this issue was not further elaborated through the dispatches.

Friendly relations between Venetian and Ottoman representatives led to decisions that could have been very useful for the prosperity of the port of Split. From the letters exchanged by Cussain Bey *nazir* from Sarajevo, and the count and the captain of Split Marin Garzoni, it is possible to observe how this kind of communication influenced bringing greater volumes of goods to Split. In his letter from 1617, Cussain Bey showed how much he was willing to cooperate for the sake of mutual profit: «[...]in segno della grandissima stimea, che facciamo della vostra alta et honorata persona, che mandiamo un zambellottiero, con molta robba, à questa scala, non lassandola andar a Ragusi [...] et così veniranno anco dà Vostra Signoria fra sei giorni altri con lane, et cere, però ancor voi fate bene à loro [...]».²¹

Nazir was an Ottoman customs administrator, who supervised the work of *emin* (tax farmer) and who was able to obtain approval to collect income from trade ports.²² After the port of Split was opened, the Ottoman Bosnia began to earn, so it was common for the Ottoman officials in this province to direct trade to Split, causing some damage to Dubrovnik.²³

These were the decisions that made profits for both sides, as seen from the letter that Garzoni wrote to Cussain bey: «[...] non restando di raccordarle in tanto à continuar in questa bona dispositione d'inviar a questa scala li Mercanti con le loro robbe, deviandoli da quela di Ragusa, poiche si veda di frutuoso servitio à suoi proprij interessi [...]».²⁴

Contrary to the previous case, in his dispatch the count and the captain Garzoni informed that he wrote to Velutelli about the intentions Cussain

²¹ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 16 (August 12, 1617).

²² ЖИЛ ВЕЈНСТЕЈН, *Балканске провинције (1606-1774)*, in РОБЕР МАНТРАН, (ed.), *Историја Османског царства*, Београд: Клио, 2002, p. 400; ВЛАДИСЛАВ СКАРИЋ, *Изабрана дјела, књига III (Прилози за историју Босне и Херцеговине и југословенских народа)*, Сарајево: Веселин Маслеша, 1971, pp. 209-210.

²³ ВІКТОР МОРПУРГО, *Daniel Rodríguez*, III-IV, cit., p. 370.

²⁴ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 16 (August 18, 1617).

Bey had, and that Velutelli considered *nazır's* plans good, since it was profitable to the port of Split.²⁵

Sometimes, in order to gain the support of Ottoman officials that would contribute to the work of the trade port, Venetian representative in Split had to receive some demands that were not satisfactory to Venice. We know about one such case from a note written by the count and the captain Costanzo Pesaro in 1640 and sent along with a copy of the letter he received from Muslim Effendi Bosnian *defterdar* (finance administrator). At the very beginning, Muslim Effendi explained to Pesaro that he was very well informed by his people about the protection and assistance Pesaro provided. Accordingly, *defterdar* wrote that he would like to ask Pesaro to allow a Jewish merchant named Moise, who would come from Sarajevo, to go to Venice immediately after arriving in Split, without the obligation to be kept in the quarantine. The reason for this lies in the fact that this Jewish merchant had to negotiate some merchandise on behalf of Muslim Effendi. He also asked Pesaro to allow the merchant to travel by frigate and not to be kept in Venice.²⁶ It is obvious that Muslim Effendi wanted to speed up the trade in this way, as otherwise Moise would have to wait for a merchant galley that was often late. Frigate, the type of vessel that *defterdar* requested for the Jewish merchant, was fast vessel propelled by rowing, a type of lighter *galeotta*, similar to brigantine.²⁷

Along with the same dispatch, Pesaro sent a letter written by a Bosnian Pasha from Banja Luka, in which he asked the same favor, but for another merchant Jussuf from Banja Luka. According to Bosnian Pasha, they sent a merchant named Jussuf because they needed some silk and other textiles, and that is why he asked Pesaro to let him go as soon as possible.²⁸

This type of request by the Ottoman representatives was not unknown to the Venetians. Trade with the Ottomans was always a lucrative deal that could also cause various problems. Sultan's officials could always seek a special treatment, which often included a tax exemption, the priority right

²⁵ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 16 (August 18, 1617).

²⁶ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 45 (March 28, 1640).

²⁷ ALBERTO TENENTI, *Piracy and the Decline of Venice 1580–1615*, Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967, pp. 152-154; FREDERIC C. LANE, *Povijest Mletačke republike*, cit., p. 441.

²⁸ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci dei rettori, Dalmazia, filza 45 (March 28, 1640).

when it comes to loading goods on limited-load ships, trade of smuggled goods, and avoidance of customs.²⁹

Conclusion

The role of the Venetian rectors in Dalmatian towns was subject of many research studies, and their activities in the economic field are well known. Ever since the port of Split was open, the count and the captain of Split had to deal with various problems that Ottoman merchants encountered. Any disorder that happened on the border could arouse Ottoman representatives to interfere. Because of that, it was important that the count and the captain intervene in every inconvenience encountered by Ottoman merchants', but also in a way that assured the intervention was done for the sake of both Venetian and Ottoman interests.³⁰ From all of the presented cases, we can see how he was managing in order to help merchants but in a way that was acceptable to Venetian policy. To conclude, from his dispatches and letters it is obvious that one of the obligations of the rectors in Split was to maintain good relationship with Ottoman officials and to analyse every situation involving Ottoman merchants, all with the aim of achieving good economic cooperation.

²⁹ ERIC R. DURSTELER, *Commerce and Coexistence: Veneto-Ottoman Trade in the Early Modern Era*, in «Turcica», 34 (2002), p. 122.

³⁰ VERA COSTANTINI, *Fin dentro il paese turchesco: stabilimento della Scala di Spalato e potenziamento delle reti mercantili e diplomatiche veneziane nel entroterra bosniaco*, in «Studi Veneziani», LXVII (2013), pp. 267–281.

Izješća mletačkih kneževa u Splitu kao prikaz političkih i trgovačkih odnosa između Mletaka i Osmanskog Carstva

Kada je 1592. godine otvorena splitska luka, obveze mletačkih predstavnika u Splitu bile su da se strože brinu o robi i trgovcima koji prolaze kroz luku, te da budu spremni riješiti svaki problem koji bi mogao utjecati na gospodarski život Republike Venecije. Redovito su nastojali ukazati na svaki potencijalni problem i potražiti savjet od Venecije. Također, morali su komunicirati s osmanskim predstavnicima iz Banje Luke i Sarajeva, zbog činjenice da su u Split dolazili trgovci iz osmanske Bosne sa svojom robom. U ovom radu donosimo nekoliko slučajeva iz depeša splitskog grofa i kapetana koje je on slao

s kopijama pisama osmanskih dužnosnika. Smrt osmanskog trgovca u Splitu ili mletačkog trgovca u osmanskoj Bosni zahtijevala je komunikaciju dužnosnika s obje strane, jer su se morale poštivati neke procedure oko pokojnikove robe. Bilo je slučajeva da su osmanski dužnosnici odlučili poslati robu u Split, čime su nanijeli određenu štetu Dubrovniku. S druge strane, budući da su ovi korisni i miroljubivi odnosi morali funkcionirati na obostranu korist, bilo je situacija u kojima je splitski grof morao poručiti Veneciji o osmanskim zahtjevima koji se često nisu slagali s planovima Mletačke Republike.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI:

Venecija, Osmanlijsko Carstvo, splitska luka, Sarajevo, Banja Luka, pošiljke, pisma, trgovci, roba

Bibliography:

Unpublished Primary Sources

- Archivio di Stato di Venezia, ASVe (State Archives of Venice):
-Senato, Dispacci dei Rettori, Dalmazia, filza 1, 2, 6, 11, 16, 20, 45.
-Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia, Seconda serie, b. 26.

Published Primary Sources

- NOVAK GRGA (ed.), *Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji (Commissiones et relationes venetae)*, svezak 4, od 1572. do 1590. godine, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1964.

Secondary Works

- BAJIĆ-ŽARKO NATAŠA, *Split kao trgovačko i tranzitno središte na razmeđu istoka i zapada u 18. stoljeću*, Split: Književni krug, 2004.
- COSTANTINI VERA, *Alternative Paths Towards the Age of Mercantilism: The Venetian Project of the Scala di Spalato*, in *Bordering Early Modern Europe* ed. Maria Baramova, Grigor Boykov, Ivan Parvev, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2015, pp. 63–76.
- COSTANTINI VERA, *Fin dentro il paese turchesco: stabilimento della Scala di Spalato e potenziamento delle reti mercantili e diplomatiche veneziane nel entroterra bosniaco*, in «Studi Veneziani», LXVII (2013), pp. 267–281.
- D'ALBERTON-VITALE ROSSANA, *Tra sanità e commercio: il difficile ruolo del lazzareto veneziano alla scala di Spalato*, in «Studi veneziani», XXXIX (2000), pp. 253–288.
- FAROQHI SURAIYA, *The Venetian Presence in the Ottoman Empire*, in «The Journal of European Economic History», 15 (1986), pp. 345–384.
- ФОТИЋ АЛЕКСАНДАР, *Између закона и његове примене, у: Приватни живот у српским земљама у освит модерног доба*, приредио Александар Фотић, Београд: Clio, 2005, pp. 27–71.
- INALDŽIK HALIL, *Osmansko carstvo. Klasično doba 1300-1600*, Beograd: Utopija, 2003.
- LANE FREDERIC C., *Povijest Mletačke republike*, Zagreb: Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga, 2007.
- MAYHEW TEA, *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian rule: Contado di Zara 1645-1718*, Roma: Viella, 2008.
- MORPURGO VIKTOR, *Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje Splitske skele u XVI stoljeću*, I-II poglavlje, in «Starine», 52 (1962), pp. 185–248.

- MORPURGO VIKTOR, *Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje Splitske skele u XVI stoljeću*, III-IV poglavlje, in «Starine», 53 (1966), pp. 363–415.
- O'CONNELL MONIQUE, *Men of Empire – Power and Negotiation in Venice's Maritime State*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- РАСИ RENZO, *La "scala" di Spalato e il commercio nei Balcani fra cinque e seicento*, Venezia: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1971.
- PEDANI MARIA PIA, *Consoli veneziani nei porti del Mediterraneo nel eta moderna*, in *Mediterraneo in armi (secc. XV-XVIII)*, vol. 1, a cura di Rossella Cancilla, Palermo, Associazione Mediterranea, 2007, pp. 175–205.
- PEDANI MARIA PIA, *Facilities for Ottoman merchants in the Rialto market (1534–1621)*, in *XIV. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara: 9 - 13 Eylül 2002 Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, Ankara Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, pp. 1003–1014.
- РАУКАР ТОМИСЛАВ, PETRICIOLI IVO, ŠVELEC FRANJO, PERIČIĆ ŠIME, *Zadar pod Mletačkom upravom*, Zadar: Filozofski fakultet, 1987.
- СКАРИЋ ВЛАДИСЛАВ, *Изabrana дјела*, књига III (Прилози за историју Босне и Херцеговине и југословенских народа), Сарајево: Веселин Маслеша, 1971.
- STEIN MARK L., *Guarding the Frontier: Ottoman Border Forts and Garrisons in Europe*, London-New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007.
- СТАНОЈЕВИЋ ГЛИГОР, *Покушај отварања млетачког конзулата у Босни*, in «Историјски гласник», 1 (1972), pp. 111–114.
- TENENTI ALBERTO, *Piracy and the Decline of Venice 1580-1615*, Berkley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.
- THEUNISSEN HANS P. A., *Ottoman-Venetian Diplomats: the 'Ahd-names. The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of Political-Commercial Instruments together with the Annotated Edition of a Corpus of Relevant Documents*, in «EJOS», I (1998), no.2, pp. 1–698.
- TRALJIĆ SEID, *Trgovina Bosne i Hercegovine s lukama Dalmacije i Dubrovnika u XVII i XVIII stoljeću*, in «Pomorski zbornik», 1 (1962), pp. 341–371.
- ВЕЈНСТЕЈН ЖИЛ, *Балканске провинције (1606–1774)*, in МАНТРАН, РОБЕР, (ed.), *Историја Османског царства*, Београд: Клио, 2002, pp. 346–410.