
Ottoman documents that were issued during three and a half centuries of the intense Ottoman-Ragusan relations and were filed at the Turkish chancery in the Rector’s Palace represent a valuable source for the research of this period of Dubrovnik’s history. In 2002 the State Archives in Dubrovnik embarked upon detailed classification of a series of Ottoman documents, more specifically, those issued by the sultans, and their arrangement in chronological order. This project thus resulted in the new classification of 1,990 sultans’ charters, capitulations and other documents, crowned with a representative monograph by Vesna Miović, Dubrovačka Republika u spisima osmanskih sultanata: s analitičkim inventarom sultanatnih spisa serije Acta Turcarum Državnog arhiva u Dubrovniku [Dubrovnik Republic in the Documents of the Ottoman Sultans: with analytical inventory of the sultan documents of the series Acta Turcarum at the State Archives in Dubrovnik], published in 2005 (see reviews: Behija Zlatar, Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju 55 (2005): pp. 302-305; Kerima Filan, Pregled, 1 (2008): pp. 231-238).

Vesna Miović resumed her meticulous work of classifying Ottoman documents at the Dubrovnik Archives with a series that includes the decrees issued by the governors of the Bosnian eyalet and Herzegovinian sancak or buyuruldus, her aim thus being to follow the Ottoman state hierarchy from the highest rank downwards. The result of this demanding project, consisting of archival work, scholarly research and publishing, is the monograph Dubrovačka Republika u spisima namjesnika Bosanskog ejaleta i Hercegovačkog sandžaka here reviewed.

In view of concept, this book may be said to follow the pattern of its predecessor. It opens with an exhaustive chapter O nastanku i sudbinii osmanskih spisa Državnog arhiva u Dubrovniku (On the origin and fate of Ottoman documents from the State Archives in Dubrovnik, pp. 9-18), from which we learn that a fairly small number of buyuruldus have survived — 321 in all— dating from the period 1643-1807, this number being but a remainder of a once voluminous collection, the bulk of which was destroyed during the French and later Austrian rule over Dubrovnik.

The following chapter entitled Bujuruldije namjesnika Bosanskog ejaleta i Hercegovačkog sandžaka (Buyuruldus of the governors of the Bosnian eyalet and Herzegovinian sancak, pp. 19-26) contains diplomatic description of buyuruldus. Noting that the provincial governors started using this form of official order in the seventeenth century, V. Miović draws attention to the difference between the letters the Ottomans sent to the Ragusans in the earlier period, sometimes even in the form of order, and real buyuruldus, distinctive in form, style and fixed epithets, written in divani script. Moreover, she points to the existence of two kinds of buyuruldus: those which are self-contained and consist of a description of the events that led to the issue of the decree, then the decree itself, in addition to warning at times, even threat. Buturuldus of the other kind emerge somewhat later, with Ragusa at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and were written above the text of an application, petition or report to which they referred. Generally, they are short in form, often consisting of only a few words, since all the relevant details have already been given in the application itself.

The chapter Službeni profil namjesnika Bosanskog ejaleta i Hercegovačkog sandžaka: pečat, sâh, naziv funkcije, naslov (Official profile of the governors of the Bosnian eyalet
and Herzegovinian sancak: seal, sâh, office, title, pp. 27-36) examines the practice in which the documents were certificated and the titles used in addressing the governors. Buyuruludus were attested with the large governor’s seal, and sometimes with sâhs or abbreviated signatures. Why some decrees were certificated with a sâh and not seal is difficult to ascertain, yet the author has established that sâhs can be found only on buyuruludus that were written above certain applications. Given the fact that these decrees fail to cite accurately the governors’ titles, on the basis of the firmans addressed to the dignitaries concerned, the author concludes that the latter were addressed as beylerbey, mutasarrif, vali, muhafiz and serdar.

With an exhaustive historical survey on the relations between the Dubrovnik Republic and the Bosnian eyalet (Odnosi Dubrovače Republike i Bosanskog ejaleta, pp. 37-124) the author again confirms her leading scholarly reputation in the field of the history of the Ragusan-Ottoman relations, and Ragusan diplomacy in particular. She sets the scene with a description of the carefully elaborated Ragusan ceremony occasioning official congratulations to the newly-appointed governor of Bosnia or Herzegovina, to whom the Ragusans dispatched two of their envoys bearing letters of credentials and gifts. Besides this occasion, the envoys of haraç regularly called on the governor of Herzegovina on their route to Istanbul and presented him with gifts, while he, in return, secured military escort on their passage through his district. On their way to Novi, the governors of Bosnia and Herzegovina would travel through Konavle where the Ragusans would organise a reception. These visits, however, were not always friendly as evidenced by the hostile actions of Abaza Mehmed Pasha, who arrested Ragusan envoys appointed to salute him and whose soldiers plundered Konavle. The author emphasises that this and similar cases proved a true challenge to the famous Ragusan diplomatic skills. Upon recurrent Ragusan interventions in Istanbul, the governors who were ill-disposed towards the Dubrovnik Republic were eventually withdrawn.

Eighteenth century witnessed an interesting change in the ceremony with which the Ragusans congratulated the new governor on his assumption of duty. By this time, the governors of Bosnia also had Herzegovinian sancak under their jurisdiction. Ragusan envoys were then dispatched to Travnik, carrying two letters of credentials to one and the same person. Two days in a row an identical ceremony took place: on the first day the envoy visited the vizier who acted as the governor of Bosnia, and the next day made a same call on him as the governor of Herzegovina. The third visit was private. An important component of the ceremony and a worthwhile investment in the Ragusan attempts to gain privileges were the gifts. In Bosnia Ragusan envoys were challenged by their Venetian counterparts with more luxurious gifts, which the Bosnian side made perfectly clear to the Ragusans. Vesna Miović argues that modesty in gift offering was but one of the carefully thought strategies of the Ragusan diplomacy; their intention was to show how poor they were, and yet loyal. Gifts were also given on other occasions, when the envoys, in search of assistance in certain matters, were known to frequently visit the governors. Through the Bosnian governor Seyfullah Pasha, who misinformed the Porte of Dubrovnik’s poverty, the Ragusans managed to negotiate the decrease of haraç; Mehmed Pasha Kukavica acted on Ragusan behalf in the dispute with the Venetians over passage toll, which ended in favour of the Ragusans. The governors of Bosnia and Herzegovina often showed good will in protecting Ragusan merchants from the authorities of Trebinje who collected numerous taxes from them. Data on these and many other cases dealing with relations between Ragusan and Ottoman subjects, robberies and haiduc raids, protection of Herzegovinian Catholics, warrants for safe passage issued to the Ragusans who travelled to Bosnia to health spas and the like are provided by none other but buyuruludus, Ottoman documents most thoroughly analysed and classified by Vesna Miović.

The conclusion (pp. 125-127), which outlines the main features of the relationship
between the Dubrovnik Republic and the governors of Bosnia and Herzegovina, is followed by the second section of the monograph entitled Analytical inventory of buyurulduš of the governors of the Bosnian eyalet and Herzegovinian sanjak (pp. 129-212). Buyurulduš are given in chronological order, each entry containing name and function of the governor who issued the document, name and function of the addressee, date of issue and short description of the contents. In addition, entries referring to the buyurulduš written above applications also contain the name of the applicant and short description of the contents.

The appendix entitled Pečati namjesnika Bosanskog ejaleta (‘Seals of the governors of the Bosnian eyalet’, pp. 213-251) contains reproductions of all the seals found on the buyurulduš documents. Information concerning the name and title of the governor, date of issue and the documents bearing it is given on each seal. Inscriptions from some seals have been translated in full. The appendix also contains Glossary of translated Ottoman Turkish terms (p. 253), Glossary of original Ottoman Turkish terms (pp. 254-255), Sources of the State Archives in Dubrovnik, manuscripts and literature (pp. 256-262), Index of persons (pp. 263-270), Index of place-names and the pertaining administrative and judicial Ottoman districts (pp. 271-275), and Summary (pp. 277-280).

Also, the book contains 33 illustrations: facsimiles of buyurulduš and other documents, along with the drawings by Petrunjela Vuković.

Thanks to the careful and extensive research of Vesna Miović, the sultans’ documents and now the contents of the governors’ buyurulduš are accessible to the specialists in the Ottoman studies, historians and more general readership. With equal expertise and depth as in her previous book in which she discusses the relations between Dubrovnik and the Porte, in the text preceding the analytical inventory the author submits the results of the research of the relationship between the Ragusans and the governors of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On countless occasions these relations proved crucial both to the attitude of the Ottoman Porte and to the implementation of its decisions. As the author rightly asserts, it was in their immediate neighbourhood that the Ragusans best witnessed how much effort had to be invested to turn the Porte’s theory into practice (p. 125).
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