

PRODAJA ROBLJA NA JADRANU U 17. STOLJEĆU

THE SLAVE TRADE ON THE ADRIATIC IN THE 17TH CENTURY

Tea Perinčić Mayhew

Pomorski i povijesni muzej Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka / Maritime
and History Museum of Croatian Littoral Rijeka
Muzejski trg 1
HR - 51000 Rijeka
tea@ppmhp.hr

UDK / UDC:
326.1(262.3)“16”
Pregledni rad / Review article
Primljeno / Received: 27. 11. 2012.

ABSTRACT

Trgovina robljem dugotrajna je aktivnost koja je imala značajnog udjela u gospodarstvu dalmatinskih komuna još iz antičkog doba. Status robova i njihov promet regulirani su statutima dalmatinskih gradova. Promjene nastaju s pojavom Osmanlija u njihovom zaleđu u kasnom srednjem vijeku. Trgovina, tj. promet robova preusmjerava se prema istoku gdje se prodaju kršćanski zarobljenici. Međutim, s intenzitetom kršćanskog ratovanja protiv Osmanlija povećava se i trgovina muslimanskim robljem (robovi s teritorija Osmanskog carstva) u dalmatinskim trgovištima koja su posrednička jer se prava trgovina osmanskim podanicima odvija na Apeninskom poluotoku. Ovaj je promet robovima naročito intenziviran za vrijeme Kandijskog i Morejskog rata u drugoj polovici 17. stoljeća. U ovom članku razmatra se trgovina zarobljenim osmanskim podanicima na Jadranu, načini na koje su zarobljenici bili držani i prodavani te zakonske regulacije s gledišta Mletačke republike i Papinske države u 17. stoljeću.

Ključne riječi: Jadran, trgovina robljem, dalmatinske komune, Osmanlije, Venecija, 17. stoljeće, Papinska država

ABSTRACT

Since Antiquity the slave trade in the Adriatic had been a long term activity which had an important impact on the economy of the Dalmatian communes. The status of slaves and their traffic was originally regulated by the Statutes of individual Dalmatian towns. With the appearance of Ottomans in late Middle Ages into their hinterland numerous changes occurred. The traffic in slaves was redirected towards the east where the Christian captives were then sold. Nevertheless, with the new intensity of Christian warfare against the Ottomans, the Muslim slave trade from the Ottoman Empire increased particularly in Dalmatian marketplaces which were mediatory because the real trade of Ottoman subjects was across the Adriatic on the Apennine Peninsula. This traffic reached a special intensity during the Candian and Morean Wars in the second half of the 17th century. The trade of the Ottoman captives in the Adriatic, how they were kept and sold, including the legal regulations of the trade from the Venetian and Papal points of view in the 17th century, are discussed in this paper.

Key words: Adriatic, slave trade, Dalmatian communes, Ottomans, Venetians, 17th century, Papal State

UVOD

Prva, kraća verzija ovog članka bila je predstavljena na engleskom jeziku na drugoj međunarodnoj radionici za mlade istraživače “Venice overseas 1400-1800” (Venecija, 28. svibnja 2011.), a na hrvatskom jeziku na 4. kongresu hrvatskih povjesničara u Zagrebu (1.-4. listopada 2012.) gdje je glavna tema bila sloboda. Od najstarijih je vremena ropstvo (kao antonim slobode) predstavljano usporedno s idejom slobode u ljudskoj povijesti. Polazeći od postavke da su robovi bili tretirani i percipirani kao vlasništvo (ili roba za prodaju) i da je njihov vlasnik s njima mogao činiti što mu se prohtije, dolazimo do zaključka da je ropstvo potpuna negacija slobode. Rob je lišen bilo kakve moći upravljanja vlastitim životom i često u prošlosti opisivao kao “živ-mrtav”. Doista, rob je socijalno mrtav jer je privremeno svih socijalnih prava i u posrednom smislu proživljava ekskomunikaciju. Njegova ili njezina komunikacija u društvu u koje je nasilno doveden provodi se isključivo putem i prema odredbama njegova vlasnika. Mnoga su društva razvila mehanizme akulturacije robova te različite stupnjeve asimilacije s dominantnom grupom.¹ Ovdje ćemo se pozabaviti primjerima ropstva i trgovine robljem u kršćanskim društvima na Jadranu u razdoblju ranog novog vijeka, s posebnim osvrtom na 17. stoljeće kada dolazi do intenziviranja ove trgovine usljed mletačko-osmanskih sukoba.

SREDNJOVJEKOVNI KONTINUITET TRGOVINE ROBLJEM

Trgovina robljem razvijena je gospodarska aktivnost još od antičkih vremena. Na istočnoj obali Jadrana trgovina robljem slijedi dobro “utabane” pravce kojima se robovi iz Bosne dovode do dalmatinskih gradova. Osobito je značajna trgovačka ruta bila dolinom rijeke Neretve do njenog ušća gdje je postojalo posebno trgovište robljem. Sljedeće važno trgovačko središte za prodaju roblja iz Bosne bio je Dubrovnik (Ragusa), a zatim ostali dalmatinski gradovi. Ova su se dovodili zarobljenici iz kršćanskih pohoda na pripadnike crkve bosanske ili pak oni koje su nesretnim slučajem vlastiti rođaci (članovi obitelji) prodavali u roblje zbog siromaštva. Najviše je među njima bilo djece čiji su ih roditelji zbog siromaštva bili prisiljeni prodati. Bio je tu i veliki broj žena kao

INTRODUCTION

The first, short version of this paper was presented in English at the “Venice overseas 1400-1800 - second international workshop for young scholars” (Venice, 28th May 2011), and in Croatian language at the 4th Conference of Croatian Historians (Zagreb, 1-4 October 2012) where the main theme was Freedom. Since ancient time Slavery (as an antonym of freedom) has always been present alongside the idea of freedom in human history. Considering that slaves were treated and perceived as property (or goods for selling) and that their owners could do whatever they wanted with them, we can conclude that slavery is a total negation of freedom. A slave is deprived of any possibility of controlling his/her life and often in ancient times described as the ‘living-dead’. In fact a slave is socially dead due to deprivation of all social rights and could be said to have been excommunicated. The only communication a slave has is through and according to the orders of the owner. Many societies developed different levels of slave’s assimilation and acculturation.¹ This paper presents some examples of the slave trade within the Christian societies in the Adriatic in the early modern age with special attention to the 17th century when a significant increase in this trade occurred due to the Venetian-Ottoman conflicts.

MEDIEVAL CONTINUATION OF THE SLAVE TRADE

The slave trade had been a well developed activity in the Eastern Adriatic since ancient times. It continued during the Middle Ages when it followed trading routes from Bosnia to the Dalmatian coastal towns. One especially important trade route was the River Neretva where there was a market place at the mouth of the river, specialising in the trading of slaves. The second most important slave market was in Dubrovnik (Ragusa) as well as occurring in other Dalmatian cities. Slaves of Bosnian Cathar origin, who had been captured or sold by their relatives, were brought to these places. The majority of them were children whose poor parents had been forced to sell them. There were also numerous women who were also the victims of this trafficking. Analyses of their names show that they were not always Bosnian Cathars, but also from Catholic fa-

1 W. D. PHILIPS, 1985, 6-7; O. PATTERSON, 1982.

1 W. D. PHILIPS, 1985, 6-7. Compare O. PATTERSON, 1982.

žrtava ove trgovine ljudima. Analize njihovih imena pokazuju da se nije uvijek radilo o pripadnicima crkve bosanske, već je tu bilo i katolika, a tada se radilo o ilegalnoj trgovini ljudima. Naime, Katolička crkva odobravala je zarobljavanje bosanskih katara pod uvjetom da se pokrste. Na taj je način pokrštavanje bilo vrlo dobar izgovor za porobljavanje u Bosni i prodaju robova u dalmatinskim trgovištima.²

Prodaja roblja pravno je regulirana statutima dalmatinskih komuna, a u mnogima se u kasnom srednjem vijeku zabranjivalo trgovanje robovima, osobito djecom. U dalmatinskim gradovima robovi su držani u statusu *servi et ancille* (sluge)³ i gospodar ih je mogao osloboditi ako mu se tako prohtjelo, a to je često bilo sadržano u oporukama kao čin pobožnosti koji je crkva poticala. Međutim, nije svo bosansko roblje završavalo u dalmatinskim gradovima. Većina njih prodana je i preprodana nekoliko puta i to u mreži trgovaca iz južne Italije. Veliki broj bosanskog roblja prodavan je u Napulju (gdje je bilo jedno od najvećih trgovišta robljem u južnoj Europi) te dalje na Iberskom poluotoku (Španjolska – Katalonija). Ovi su robovi kategorizirani kao *sclavus*.⁴ Taj se termin učestalo počeo upotrebljavati u raznim europskim jezicima ukazujući na to da je većina robova na europskim trgovinama bila slavenskog podrijetla.⁵

PROMJENE RUTA NAKON DOLASKA OSMANLIJA

Situacija se mijenja nakon dolaska Osmanlija čije se provale u Bosnu intenziviraju tijekom 15. stoljeća. Upadima, pljačkanjem i odvođenjem robova koriste se kao glavnom taktikom osvajanja neprijateljskog teritorija. Pri tome se robovi odvođe prema istoku, na tržišta Osmanskog carstva, tj. u Malu Aziju. Kako je kršćanska obrana bila slaba, Osmanlije su postupno do sredine 16. stoljeća osvojile Bosnu i veći dio Hrvatske i Dalmacije.⁶

Kršćanska obrana uključivala je posebne postrojbe uskoka koje su bile sposobne voditi gerilski rat duž habsburško-mletačko-osmanske granice što je jedino bilo moguće i djelovalo učinkovito protiv osmanskih upada.⁷ Jedna od glavnih aktivnosti ovih neregularnih postrojbi (samo je

milies. In this case the trade was considered illegal because the Catholic Church only approved the taking of Bosnian Cathars as slaves, if they were then later baptised. Thus baptising sometimes became a convenient excuse for slave trading in the Eastern Adriatic.²

The slave trade was regulated in Dalmatian communities' legal statutes and in the late medieval period many of them forbade the slave trade, especially of children. In the Dalmatian towns slaves were mostly kept as *servi et ancille* (servants)³ and the master could free them if he so wished, which was often regarded in testaments as a pious act that the church encouraged. Nevertheless not all Bosnian slaves ended up in Dalmatian communities. The majority of them were sold, then resold and the main participants in this kind of trade were merchants from south Italy. The slaves from Bosnia were often taken and sold in Naples (one of the main slave markets in south Europe) or further afield in Spain (Catalonia). These slaves were categorised as *sclavus*.⁴ This term became more frequently used with derivations in different European languages giving the implication that the majority of slaves on European markets were of Slavic origin.⁵

TRADING ROUTE CHANGES AFTER THE OTTOMAN ARRIVAL

The situation changed with the arrival of the Ottomans whose intrusions into Bosnian territory were intensified in the 15th century. Using raiding, plundering and taking slaves as their main method of conquering their enemies, the Ottomans moved the slave trade towards the east. The majority of the captive Christians were sold at markets in Asia Minor. As the Christian defence was weak, the Ottomans gradually by the middle of the 16th century conquered the whole of Bosnia as well as a large part of Croatia and Dalmatia.⁶

The Christian defence involved special troops of Uskoks who were able to conduct a guerrilla war along the long Habsburg-Venetian-Ottoman border as the only possible and efficient force against Ottoman intrusions.⁷ The Uskoks were in the service of

2 T. Z. TENŠEK, 2005, 321-322.

3 N. BUDAK, 1984, 5-33.

4 T. Z. TENŠEK, 2005, 331.

5 W. D. PHILIPS, 1985, 55-56.

6 K. PUST, 2010, 326-358.

7 G. DAVID, P. FODOR, 2007, 27-34.

2 More on this topic T. Z. TENŠEK, 2005, 321-322.

3 N. BUDAK, 1984, 5-33.

4 T. Z. TENŠEK, 2005, 331.

5 W. D. PHILIPS, 1985, 55-56.

6 K. PUST, 2010, 326-358.

7 On slavery along the Habsburg-Ottoman border see more in G. DAVID, P. FODOR, 27-34.

jedan manji dio uskoka smješten u utvrdu Nehaj kod Senja bio redovno plaćen od austrijske komore) bilo je odvođenje osmanskih podanika u roblje. Na taj način uskoci su obnovili trgovinu robljem na istočnom Jadranu. U svakom slučaju, uskoke je zanimala brza zarada i stoga oni nisu bili stvarni nositelji trgovine robljem. Oni su najčešće zarobljavali ljude radi otkupa (*riscato*) što je predstavljalo sigurniji izvor zarade od prodaje. Iako, kad im se pružila prilika, uskoci su i prodavali zarobljenike, osobito mletačkim galijama koje su postale veliki "potrošač" ljudske snage (robova veslača). Pored toga, i papinska mornarica kao i toskanska bile su opremljene robovima s istočnog Jadrana. Robovi koji su bili uskočki zarobljenici i prodavani trgovcima robljem najčešće su završavali na đenovешkom tržištu u 16. stoljeću.⁸ Mnogi su prodavani u Senju i Rijeci. No, zarobljenici su korišteni i za razmjenu. Ovdje je važno naglasiti da su uskoci smatrali da i osmanski kršćanski podanici (*raya*) mogu biti zarobljeni i prodani u roblje. Ponekad su čak napadali i mletačke podanike kao i Dubrovčane smatrajući da su svi oni koji trguju s Osmanlijama uskočki neprijatelji. Catherine Wendy Bracewell smatra da je trgovina zarobljenicima zajedno s krađom stoke bila dugo ukorijenjena praksa pograničnih područja Sredozemlja, a ne nekakav izuzetak vezan za istočni Jadran.⁹ Smatram da je to bio važan element pogranične ekonomije.

TRGOVINA ROBLJEM U VRIJEME RATA I MIRA U DALMACIJI I PROMJENE U 17. STOLJEĆU

Mletački su podanici također bili akteri ove specifične trgovine robljem, čiji je intenzitet ovisio o stanju rata ili mira na osmanskoj granici. Kako su Mlečani nastojali izbjegavati sukobe s Osmanlijama, tako su strogo kontrolirali svoje podanike da za vrijeme mira ne izazivaju čarke, iako im je to teško polazilo za rukom. Mlečani su imali poseban interes održavanja mira pod svaku cijenu jer njihov najveći trgovački partner bilo Osmansko carstvo i stoga to nisu htjeli narušiti bespotrebnim ratovanjima koja su iscrpljivala resurse. No, jednom kad je rat bio objavljen i kad se zahuktao, odvođenje robova poticano je i od samih mletačkih službenika u Dalmaciji. Robovi su prodavani na trgovinama na

the Habsburg Emperor and therefore very often seen as enemies of the Venetian Republic as well. Nevertheless they enjoyed great popularity amongst the Christian population of all three powers and they were often supported by the local population. One of the main activities of these irregular troops (only one small group of Uskoks settled in the fortress of Senj were regularly paid by the Austrian Chamber) was the taking Ottoman subjects as slaves. In this way they renewed the slave trade on the Eastern Adriatic. However, the Uskoks were mostly interested in quick money, therefore they were not really involved in open trading. They mostly took captives for ransom (*riscato*), a more secure income. Although where there were other possibilities for earning money they would sell captives, particularly to Venetian galleys who became a great user of human power (slave oarsmen). Additionally the papal navy as well as the Tuscan fleet were equipped with slaves from the Eastern Adriatic. Slaves who were Uskoks' captives and sold to slave tradesmen were the most common good in the Genoa slave market in the 16th century.⁸ Many were sold in Senj or Rijeka to merchants from Naples or other Italian cities. Captives were also used for prisoner exchange. It is important to emphasise that the Uskoks even considered that Ottoman Christian subjects (*raya*) could be taken as captives and sold as slaves. Sometimes they also targeted Venetian subjects as well as those of the Dubrovnik Republic since they considered anyone who traded with the Ottomans to be their enemy. Catherine Wendy Bracewell finds that the trade in captives along with cattle stealing were long-established practices in the Mediterranean borderlands not just something exclusive to the Eastern Adriatic.⁹ This I see as an important element of border economy.

SLAVE TRADE DURING WAR AND PEACE IN DALMATIA IN THE 17TH CENTURY

Venetian subjects were also involved in this specific trade but it was mainly related to the war (and peace) in Dalmatia between the Venetian Republic and Ottoman Empire. During the war taking captives and selling them as slaves was a part of war tactics as well as war economy when other economic activities were not possible, such as agriculture and farming. The slaves were sold at open auctions

8 K. PUST, 2010, 327.

9 C. W. BRACEWELL, 1992, 100-103.

8 K. PUST, 2010, 327.

9 C. W. BRACEWELL, 1992, 100-103.

aukciji, a glavni protagonisti ove trgovine bili su domaći ljudi u dalmatinskim komunama te vojnici plaćenici koji su služili na dalmatinskom ratištu. Njihovi partneri s druge strane Jadrana bili su najčešće trgovci iz Apulije i Napulja. Robovi su bili muslimani, ali i kršćani, osmanski podanici iako držanje kršćanskih robova nije bilo u skladu ni s državnim ni crkvenim zakonima.¹⁰

Intenzitet trgovine robljem naročito se pojačao za vrijeme ratovanja u drugoj polovici 17. stoljeća (Kandijski i Morejski rat 1645.-1699.). Duga razdoblja rata nisu dopuštala poljoprivrednu proizvodnju niti bilo koji drugi oblik privređivanja stanovnika s obje strane mletačko-osmanske granice na istočnom Jadranu. Za vrijeme ovih ratova veliki broj osmanskih kršćanskih podanika – Morlaka, tj. Vlaha seli se na mletački teritorij dalmatinskih komuna i stavlja u službu mletačkoj vojsci. Štoviše, morlačke trupe postaju glavni adut mletačkog ratovanja protiv Osmanlija u Dalmaciji. Morlačka društva, u srednjovjekovnim izvorima spominjana i kao Vlasi, nisu bila nepoznanica u dalmatinskim komunama i oni koji se u pisanim dokumentima spominju prije osmanske invazije bili su uglavnom pomiješani ostaci predrimskih-rimskih-slavenskih fragmenata stanovništva, organizirani uglavnom kao stočarske skupine. Vlasi/Morlaci koji se sele na osmanski teritorij u dalmatinskom zaleđu do 1573. dolaze ovamo uglavnom iz Bosne gdje su već prethodno doseljeni tijekom osmanskih osvajanja Bosne i Hercegovine. Ove je migracije nadzirala i planirala osmanska vlast. Morlaci su većinom bili korišteni kao neregularne vojne postrojbe zvane martolosi. Martolosi su bili glavni akteri u trgovini robljem na osmanskoj granici.¹¹ Oni su bili uglavnom slavenskog kršćanskog porijekla (pravoslavci iz istočne Hercegovine i zapadne Crne Gore, ali je među njima bio i značajan broj katolika poznatih pod imenom Bunjevci). Ovo je nužno spomenuti s obzirom na to da su Morlaci postali glavni sudionici mletačko-osmanskih sukoba na istočnom Jadranu u 17. stoljeću i usporedo s time glavna roba kao i trgovci u trgovini robljem u spomenutom razdoblju. To je doba kada mletačka premoć na istočnom Jadranu dobiva novu dimenziju u ekspanziji prema osmanskoj Bosni. Po prvi puta Venecija prodire u dalmatinsko zaleđe vodeći ofenzivno ratovanje, boreći se za teritorij kao i za podanike. Ta se promjena također odrazila i na trgovinu robljem. Mletački podanici više nisu glavne žrtve osmanske trgovine

and the main perpetrators of this trade were local inhabitants - Dalmatian or Italian mercenaries who served in Dalmatia and slave merchants from Puglia and Naples. Slaves sold here were Ottoman subjects, most of the time of Muslim religion, but very often also of Christian religion¹⁰ although enslaving Christians was not according to the state and Church law.

The intensity of the slave trade changed especially during the long period of war between Venice and Ottomans in the second half of the 17th century (the Candian and Morean Wars 1645-1699). Long periods of war did not allow extensive agricultural production or provide for the needs of inhabitants on both sides of the Venetian-Ottoman border in the Eastern Adriatic. The wars were characterised by large migrations. Not this time from the Venetian territory but rather a large movement of Ottoman Christian subjects, known in the Venetian sources as *Morlacchi* (Morlachs) who changed their location and moved to the Venetian Dalmatian coast, fighting against their previous Ottoman masters. The Morlach society, known in medieval sources also under the name of Vlachs, was not new to the Dalmatian communities and those mentioned in written sources before the major Ottoman intrusions were mostly composed of pre-Roman-Roman-Slavic fragments of predominately shepherd groups. The Vlach/Morlachs who moved to the Ottoman areas in the Dalmatian hinterland, had by 1573 mostly moved from the areas of Bosnia (where they had once previously moved to during the Ottoman conquest of Bosnia and Herzegovina). These were migrations controlled and planned by the Ottoman government. The Morlachs were mostly enrolled as Ottoman irregular military troops called *martolosi*. Martolosi were also the main actors in the slave trade on the Ottoman border.¹¹ They were predominantly Slavic-Christians (mostly Orthodox from eastern Herzegovina and western Montenegro, but there was also a significant number of Catholics from western Herzegovina known as Bunjevci). It is necessary to give this explanation since the Morlachs became the main participants in the Venetian-Ottoman wars in Eastern Adriatic in the 17th century and along this the main goods as well as merchants of slave trade during this period. This period of Venetian domination on the Eastern Adriatic is interesting due to the Venetian expansion towards Ottoman Bosnia. For the first time Venice was penetrating into the Dalmatian hinterland conducting an offensive rather than defensi-

10 B. DESNICA, 1991, 192-203.

11 K. PUST, 2010, 327.

10 B. DESNICA, 1991, 192-203.

11 K. PUST, 2010, 327.

robljem. Umjesto toga, sada oni sami provode vrlo intenzivnu trgovinu robljem, obnavljajući srednjovjekovne pravce s istočnog prema zapadnom Jadranu i talijanskom poluotoku.

Prodaja roblja bila je ozbiljan i unosan posao u čemu je i sama Mletačka republika našla interesa. Robovi su osobito važni kao radna snaga na galijama. Zbog toga mletački Senat nastoji držati pod kontrolom ovu trgovinu postavljajući obavezna podavanja, tj. desetinu (*decima*) za svakog prodanog roba. Taj je prihod išao izravno u državnu blagajnu. Desetina je plaćana u novcu nakon izvršene procjene vrijednosti roba kad se radilo o ženama ili djeci, a desetina svih zarobljenih muškaraca išla je na raspolaganje kao radna snaga za državne potrebe (galije). Mletački kneževi i kancelari u dalmatinskim komunama bili su zaduženi za ubiranje ovog poreza i nadziranje trgovine robljem.¹² Moguće je samo pretpostaviti koliki je prihod mletačko gospodarstvo u dalmatinskim gradovima imalo od ove trgovine, uzimajući u obzir da je ogroman broj ljudi odvođen u roblje iz raznih dijelova Bosne i Hercegovine kako bi se prodali na mletačkom teritoriju. Na primjer u rujnu 1658. generalni providur Pietro Valier piše u svom izvještaju da 520 muškaraca, 98 žena i 46 djece čeka da ih se proda.¹³ Prema tome u samo je jednom mjesecu 664 robova, bivših osmanskih podanika (što je moglo biti stanovništvo jednog osmanskog grada – *kasabe*) bilo prodano.

CIJENA ROBA

Teško je utvrditi cijenu roba jer je ona ovisila o položaju osobe koja je zarobljena, spolu, godina, zdravlju, kao i broju robova koji se trenutno nalazio na tržištu. Obično su se robovi više puta preprodavali. Pravo je tržište bilo na zapadnoj obali Jadrana, iako Zadar, pored Splita, ima dobro razvijeno trgovište robovima na kojem su se skupljali preprodavači s cijelog Sredozemlja. Dalmatinci su i sami sudjelovali u ovoj unosnoj trgovini. U rujnu 1648. Jakov Kupin s otoka Visa (*Lissa*) došao je u Zadar kako bi kupio nekoliko robova s osmanskog teritorija. Poslovao je s mešтром Tomasom Chichinijem koji je očigledno bio dobro pozicioniran u ovom poslu. On je Jakova opskrbio s različitim *turskim* robovima među kojima su

ve war, fighting for territory as well as for subjects. This switch was also reflected in the slave trade. Now the Venetian subjects were not major victims of the Ottoman slave trade. Instead they conducted an intensive slave trade themselves, renewing the medieval route from the Eastern Adriatic towards the Western Adriatic and the Italian peninsula.

The slave trade was a serious business, which was of great interest to the Republic of Venice. Slaves were a valued working force in the Venetian navy. In addition the Senate intended to keep control over this business by imposing an obligatory tax (tithe - *decima*) for each slave sold, which was to go to the state treasury. The tithe was paid in money after the estimation of the value of slaves who were women and children; whilst a tenth of the total number of enslaved men had to be set aside for state purposes (most of the time on galleys). The rectors and chamber officers in every coastal city in Dalmatia were in charge of collecting this specific tax as well as keeping control of the slave trade.¹² The large impact of this trade can be only imagined taking into consideration that a large number of people were dragged as slaves from different parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina to be sold in Venetian territory. For instance *Provveditore Generale* Pietro Valier wrote in his report in September 1685 that 520 men, 98 women and 46 children were waiting to be sold.¹³ So in only one month 664 slaves, former Ottoman subjects (which could have been a number of inhabitants of an Ottoman town - *kasabah*) were sold.

PRICE OF A SLAVE

It is difficult to estimate the price of a slave, because they changed in relation to the rank of the person, their gender, age and health, as well as the number of slaves already at a certain market. The normal border transactions were not the real slave market places, which were on the other side of the Adriatic. Nevertheless Zadar, alongside Split had a well developed slave trade where people were gathered from all over the Mediterranean. The local people, Dalmatians, were also involved in this convenient business. In September 1648 Giacomo Cupin from the island of Vis (*Lissa*) came to Zadar to buy some slaves from the Ottoman territory. He dealt with Master Tomaso Chichini who obviously was well

12 T. MAYHEW, 2008, 263-264.

13 DAZd, *Dispacci*, Pietro Valier, book II, f. 161v.

12 T. MAYHEW, 2008, 263-264.

13 Državni arhiv u Zadru (DAZd), *Dispacci*, Pietro Valier, book II, f. 161v.

bili i žene i djeca (*diversi schiavi Turchi fra donne, putti e putte*). Jakov je prebacio ovu grupu robova trojici Dalmatinaca koji su bili vjerojatno njegovi kompanjoni: Franji Borčiću i Ivanu Lučiću s Brača te nekom Franji iz Komize. Tijekom plovidbe iz Zadra tri su se roba razboljela i umrla. Ostali su prodani na različitim mjestima. Jakov je za dobiveni 421 dukat od prodaje robova kupio žito za svoju obitelj na Visu.¹⁴

U veljači 1649. devet osmanskih podanika odvedeno je u roblje iz zadarskog zaleđa. Njihova je vrijednost bila javno procijenjena na 20 reala svaki. Neki od njih zadržani su za razmjenu sa zarobljenim mletačkim podanicima koji su odvedeni kao osmansko roblje, dok su drugi zadržani ili prodani kao privatni robovi s guvernerovom dozvolom.¹⁵ U ožujku iste godine, morlačke su trupe napale osmanski teritorij u zadarskom zaleđu i 46 ljudi (*Turchi*) odvedeno je kao roblje u Zadar. Mletački ratni komesar Marco Molin iskoristio je svoje pravo i zadržao 17 robova za državne potrebe, a ostatak robova prepušten je Morlacima da ih prodaju. Svi ovi robovi, za koje nemamo informacija o spolu, godinama ili društvenoj klasi, bili su procijenjeni na 20 reala svaki.¹⁶ Godinu prije Angelo Pancini iz Molfette platio je 25 dukata za jednog osmanskog (*turskog*) roba po imenu Meho, nakon što je provedena javna procjena zabilježena u notarskim spisima Zuana Lantane.¹⁷ Knjige javnih bilježnika i kneževe kancelarije dalmatinskih komuna prepune su zabilješki o prodaji robova. Na ovaj način prodaja robova bila je legalna i pod državnim nadzorom. Mletački knez (*conte*) ispostavljao je dozvole trgovcima koji su dolazili s Apeninskog poluotoka u dalmatinske gradove kupovati roblje s osmanskog teritorija. Prodavali su ih galijama gdje su služili kao veslači, zakupnicima poljoprivrednih dobara, gdje su bili ispomoć ili pak u domaćinstva imućnijih obitelji negdje u Italiju ili Habsburšku monarhiju. Pravna osnova ovih postupaka u dalmatinskim gradovima nalazila se u njihovim statutima i rimsko-bizantskoj pravnoj tradiciji prema kojoj je svaki vlasnik roba morao imati ispravu o vlasništvu.¹⁸ Tako je 1649. Tomaso

positioned in the local business. He provided Giacomo with *diversi schiavi Turchi fra donne, putti e putte*. Giacomo transferred the group of slaves to another three men: Francesco Borcich and Zuane Lucich from Brač (Brazza) and Francesco from Komiza (Comisa). During the trip from Zadar three slaves fell ill and died, but the others were sold in different places for 421 ducats, which Giacomo used to buy grain for his family in Vis.¹⁴

In February 1649 nine Ottomans were taken as slaves in Zadar's hinterland. Their public price was estimated at 20 *reali* each. Some of them were kept for exchange with Venetian subjects taken as Ottoman slaves, while some others were kept or sold as private slaves with the government's permission.¹⁵ In March of the same year, Morlach troops attacked Ottoman territory in Zadar's hinterland again and 46 Ottoman subjects (*Turchi*) were taken as slaves to Zadar. *Commissario* Marco Molin as the representative of the Venetian government used his rights to keep 17 slaves for state purposes and the rest of slaves were left to the Morlachs to be sold. All of these slaves (of whom there is no information of gender, age or rank) were also estimated at 20 *reali* each.¹⁶ One year before Angelo Pancini da Malfetta had paid 25 ducats for an Ottoman slave (*Turco chiamato Mecho*) after a public estimation by Zuane Lantana.¹⁷ The books of the public notary and counts of the Dalmatian communities contain numerous evidence of the slave trade. In this way this business was legal and under state control. The city count (*conte*) would issue permission to the merchants who gathered in Dalmatian markets from the Italian peninsula to buy slaves from the Ottoman territory and then sell them on further as galley oarsmen, agricultural labourers or house slaves somewhere in Italy or even in the Habsburg Monarchy. The legal basis of this regulation in the Dalmatian cities was found in their Statutes and Roman-Byzantine legal tradition according to which every owner of a slave had to have a document of ownership issued.¹⁸ In 1649 Tomaso Pinto from Brindisi came to Zadar and with the payment of 30 ducats he had permission to export Selime *da Na-*

14 DAZd, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti di conte di Zara Alessandro Diedo*, 48r.

15 ASV, *Senato Dispacci, Provveditori da Terra e Mar*, Busta 692, No. 24.

16 ASV, *Senato Dispacci, Provveditori da Terra e Mar*, Busta 692, No. 36.

17 DAZd, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti del Conte di Zara Alessandro Diedo*, 103v.

18 K. PUST, 2010, 307.

14 DAZd, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti di conte di Zara Alessandro Diedo*, 48r.

15 Archivio di Stato di Venezia (ASV), *Senato Dispacci, Provveditori da Terra e Mar*, Busta 692, No. 24.

16 ASV, *Senato Dispacci, Provveditori da Terra e Mar*, Busta 692, No. 36.

17 DAZd, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti del Conte di Zara Alessandro Diedo*, 103v.

18 K. PUST, 2010, 307.

Pinto iz Brindisija došao u Zadar i za 30 dukata dobio dozvolu za izvoz Selime s Neretve, Fatime iz Krajine, Imre iz Klisa i Ezafije s Cetine. Svi su oni bili pokršteni nakon što su dovedeni s osmanskog teritorija, a prije nego što su prodani kako je nala-gao zakon.¹⁹

S DRUGE STRANE JADRANA

Robovi s istočne obale Jadrana kupljeni u dalma-tinskim gradovima bili su odvođeni i prodavani u Napulju, Siciliji, Đenovi i Firenci. Svi su robovi smatrani muslimanima iako je u stvarnosti većina zarobljenih civila s osmanskog teritorija bila ka-toličke ili pravoslavne vjeroispovijesti (Morlaci). U Tajnom Vatikanskom arhivu čuvaju se brojni dokumenti koji opisuju sudbine nekih od ovih ne-sretnih ljudi koji su prisilno imigrirali na talijanski poluotok, tj. Papinsku državu. Franjevački brat Donat Jelić iz Spiča (*Spizza*) u mletačkoj Albaniji (današnja Crna Gora) kao misionar koji je nau-kovao kršćanstvo i pokrstio brojne muslimanske robove slavenskog porijekla u Napulju i Lecce, često je apelirao najvišim katoličkim instancama u Rimu moleći za pomoć ovim jadnim ljudima među kojima su mnogi bili rođeni u katoličkim obiteljima i kršteni kao djeca, a neki među njima bili su i njegovi vlastiti rođaci - katolici.²⁰ Sudeći po njegovim pismima, u Napulju je u svibnju 1662. godine bilo oko 14.000 robova slavenskog porijekla.²¹ On napominje u svojem pismu: *I loro padroni, per poterli tenere e vendere, li facevano passare tutti per mussulmani*. Nadalje napominje da su mnogi bili zarobljeni kao katolici od ljudi koji su to čak i znali.²²

Vrlo često radilo se o djeci. Neku od njih pro-dali su vlastiti roditelji ili rođaci iako je to bilo zabranjeno u statutima dalmatinskih gradova još

renta, Fatima da Graine, Imra da Clisa and Ezafia da Zetina who were all baptised once they were on Christian territory and before they were sold, accord-ing to the regulations.¹⁹

ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ADRIATIC

Slaves from the Eastern Adriatic bought in Dalma-tian cities, were further transported and sold in Na-ples, Sicily, Genoa and Florence. All of the slaves from the Eastern Adriatic were considered Muslims although in reality, the majority of the enslaved ci-vilians from the Ottoman territory were actually Christians, mainly Orthodox (Morlachs). In the *Archivio Segreto Vaticano* there are numerous let-ters describing the destinies of some of these unfor-tunate people once they were forcefully migrated to the Italian peninsula. Franciscan brother Donat Jelić from Spič (Spizza) in bishopric of Bar (Anti-vari) in Venetian Albania (today Montenegro) was a missionary who had been teaching the Christian religion. He baptised numerous Muslim slaves of Slavic origin in Naples and Lecce and often wrote to the highest Catholic institutions in Rome pleading for help for those poor people amongst whom he even found and rescued some of his Catholic rela-tives. In Naples according to his letters, there were about 14,000 slaves of Slavic origin in May 1662.²⁰ He mentions in his letter: *I loro padroni, per poterli tenere e vendere, li facevano passare tutti per mus-sulmani*. Furthermore he wrote that many of them were captured by Catholics who knew them.²¹

Very often the victims of slavery were children. Sometimes relatives (and/or including, parents) sold their own children although this was banned in Dal-matian communities. *Provveditore Generale* Gero-lamo Corner at the beginning of the Morean War wrote about the miserable state of some Morlach

19 DAZd, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti del Conte di Zara, Alessandro Diedo*, 82r.

20 M. JAČOV, 1992

21 Čini se da su robovi s istočnog Jadrana bili posvuda na tali-janskom poluotoku. Neki su dokumenti o tome pronađeni u Državnom arhivu u Ferrari (Archivio di stato di Ferrara) – *vendita di una fanciulla turca schiava d'eta d'anni sei in circa, nominata Gruba, fatta da paron Lorenzo da Segna al signor Michele Angelo di Comacchio*. (Ovu informaciju dobila sam zahvaljujući gospodinu Cesaru Bonarzziniju, au-toru talijanskog dokumentarnog filma "Uskok").

22 M. JAČOV, 1992 .

19 DAZd, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti del Conte di Zara, Alessandro Diedo*, 82r.

20 Seems that the slaves from Eastern Adriatic were all over the Italian peninsula. Some records are found in Archivio di stato di Ferrara – *vendita di una fanciulla turca schiava d'eta d'anni sei in circa, nominata Gruba, fatta da paron Lorenzo da Segna al signor Michele Angelo di Comacchio*. (I have this information thanks to Mr. Cesare Bonarzzini, the author of the Italian documentary film Uskok).

21 M. JAČOV, 1992, 352-353.

od srednjeg vijeka. Generalni providur Gerolamo Corner početkom Morejskog rata piše o jadnom stanju morlačkih doseljenika koji su živjeli u takvoj bijedi da su neki bili primorani prodavati vlastitu djecu.²³

No, bilo je i slučajeva krađe morlačke djece i njihove prodaje u Senj i Rijeku ili natrag na osmanski teritorij. Ova su djeca bila ispitivana o njihovim obiteljima pri čemu se došlo do saznanja da se mnoga od njih sjećaju da su bila odgajana kao kršćani. Kako je prodaja kršćana u roblje bila zabranjena, ovakvi su ljudi često bili skrivani, preobučeni po muslimanskom običaju (muškarcima su brijali glave), zvalo ih se muslimanskim imenima, zatim ritualno pokrštavani, dobivali bi nova kršćanska imena koja nisu imala veze s njihovim prethodnim identitetom. Jedino se muslimanski rob mogao zadržati cijeli život ukoliko ga se preobratilo na kršćanstvo. To je bio način da mu se “spasi duša”.²⁴

ILEGALNA PRODAJA ROBOVA

Kako je već spomenuto i vidljivo iz ovdje korištenih izvora, žrtve ilegalne trgovine većinom su bili pravoslavni robovi. Kako bi spriječio ovakvu nezakonitu rabotu, mletački providur Pietro Valier 1685. donosi odluku da se za sve pravoslavne zarobljenike treba provesti posebna prijava kod nadležnih vlasti kako bi im se dala prilika da se otkupe, a ako je bilo potrebno za to se moglo koristiti i državni novac.²⁵

Ovdje treba napomenuti da vojnici koji su bili ratni zarobljenici (čak i muslimani, tj. osmanski vojnici) nisu smatrani robovima. Vojnici su uglavnom držani radi razmijene. Stoga su percipirani kao slobodni ljudi koji, ako već ne budu razmijenjeni, jednom kad plate otkup, mogu slobodno otići. Doduše, zarobljeništvo je najčešće bilo vrlo mukotržno, a grubi odnos prema zarobljenicima korišten je kako bi ih se primoralo da što prije plate svoj otkup. Ljudi koji su držani za otkup ipak su mogli biti prodani kao robovi ako na vrijeme nisu bili razmijenjeni ili pronašli novac za otkup. Katolička crkva nije bila benevolentna prema postupcima prodaje zarobljenih vojnika. Godine 1685. Kongregacija za promociju vjere (*Congregazione de Propaganda Fide*) poslala je protest

immigrants who lived in such poverty that they were actually forced to sell their own children as slaves.²²

There were also some other cases when Morlach children were stolen and sold as slaves in Senj and Rijeka or even back to the Ottomans. These children were interrogated about their families and according to public notary records, they were baptised although sometimes from their answers it could be understood that they belonged to Christian families and that they had already been baptised. Nevertheless, through the act of baptising they were presented as being non-Christians, which then confirmed their sale to new Christian masters as an act of salvation. Since the selling of Christian slaves was forbidden such people were often hidden, separated (although maybe belonging to the same family), given Ottoman names and clothed as Ottomans (men's hair being completely shaved). They would then be baptised again and given different Christian names. The practice was that a Muslim slave could be kept for life, only if they were educated and baptised into the Christian faith.²³

ILLEGAL SLAVE TRADE

As already mentioned and seen from available documents, the main victims of this illegal trade in Christian slaves were Orthodox Morlachs. In order to prevent this and entice them to become Venetian subjects, *Provveditore Generale* Pietro Valier brought in an order in 1685 that all the Orthodox captives had to be denounced to the Venetian government so they could be bought using state money if the captive could not provide money for ransom.²⁴

Here it needs to be stated that soldiers who were war captives (even as Muslims i.e. Ottoman soldiers) were not considered as slaves. Soldiers were mostly kept for exchange. They were thus perceived as free men who, if they were not exchanged, once they paid ransom could leave. Although imprisonment was not pleasant, the rough treatment was ruthless in order to make the captives undertake desperate measures to pay for their freedom. Nevertheless, people who were kept for ransom could also be sold as slaves if they were not exchanged or found the money for ransom. The Catholic Church was not benevolent towards the selling of captured enemy

23 G. STANOJEVIĆ, 1962, 139.

24 D. KLEN, 1976, 203-204.

25 D. ROKSANDIĆ, 2003, 156-159.

22 G. STANOJEVIĆ, 1962, 139.

23 D. KLEN, 1976, 203-204.

24 D. ROKSANDIĆ, 2003, 156-159.

mletačkom Senatu vezano uz prodaju osmanskih Morlaka na tržištu roblja, napominjući da čak i kad su zarobljeni u bitci, trebaju biti smatrani ratnim zarobljenicima i prema tome slobodni ljudi. Namjera mletačke vlasti bila je integrirati takve vojnike kršćanske vjeroispovijesti u vlastite vojne postrojbe. Isto je vrijedilo i za muslimane koji su bili voljni prijeći na mletačku stranu i kršćansku vjeru kako bi mogli živjeti u “ispravnoj” vjeri i kao slobodni ljudi.²⁶

Mletačka republika imala je vlastiti fond za pomoć zarobljenima u prikupljanju otkupa. Godine 1588. mletački Senat donio je odluku da *Provveditori sopra Ospedali e Luoghi Pii* trebaju voditi brigu o prikupljanju novaca za otkup zarobljenika.²⁷ Negdje u isto vrijeme kad započinje njezina teritorijalna ekspanzija u Dalmaciji u 17. stoljeću, Republika također prepoznaje važnost osiguranja vlastitih ili potencijalnih podanika od pada u ropstvo, tj. ulaže se u državni fond za otkup robova. Ropstvo je smatrano gospodarskom i vjerskom prijetnjom.²⁸

ZAKLJUČAK

Kao što je Suraiya Faroqhi naglasila, još uvijek nedostaje detaljnijih istraživanja o trgovini robljem na Sredozemlju u razdoblju ranog novog vijeka.²⁹ Mnoštvo je arhivskih dokumenata koji još uvijek nisu istraženi niti interpretirani u ovom smislu. Iako je trgovina kršćanskim robljem na muslimanskoj strani bolje istražena i zapravo postala dio percepcije osmanskih osvajanja u Europi, to nas dovodi do krivog zaključka da su kršćani češće bili žrtve trgovanja robljem u usporedbi s osmanskim muslimanskim podanicima i onima drugih vjeroispovijesti. S druge strane arhivi u Dalmaciji kao i u Italiji čuvaju bogatu građu o muslimanima (ili “lažnim” muslimanima) koje su kršćani zarobljavali i prodavali. Moje dosadašnje saznanje dopušta mi zaključiti da je trgovačka ruta prodaje robova koja je u 17. stoljeću išla iz pravca Bosne preko Dalmacije i dalje za Apeninski poluotok bila vjerojatno jednako tako intenzivna kao i ona u pravcu prodaje kršćanskih robova prema Maloj Aziji u tom i prethodnom stoljeću.

soldiers. In 1685 *Congregazione de Propaganda Fide* sent a protest to the Venetian Senate relating to the selling of Ottoman Morlachs at slave markets stating that even if they were captured during battle, they should be considered as prisoners of war and therefore free people. The intention of the Venetian government was to integrate those soldiers of Christian religion into their military troops. The same applied to Muslims who were willingly passed onto the Venetian side and accepted Christianity, so that they could live the “right” religion as free people.²⁵

The Republic had its own funds for helping its subjects to pay ransoms. In 1588 the Venetian Senate made a decision that *Provveditori sopra Ospedali e Luoghi Pii* had to have the main role in collecting ransom money. The parish churches in main Venetian cities had to have a special box for collecting this money.²⁶ At about the same time when the Republic was expanding its territory in Dalmatia in the 17th century, it began to recognise the seriousness of the threat of its subjects being taken as Muslim slaves. This was both an economic and religious threat.²⁷

CONCLUSION

As Suraiya Faroqhi stated, research concerning this topic is far from being exhausted.²⁸ There are plenty of archival documents which still need to be studied as well as interpreted. The Muslim slave trade with captured Christians has been quite extensively studied within some European historiographies. This gives the slight impression that Christians were more often victims of slave trade than Ottoman Muslims and other religions. Conversely the archives in Dalmatia, as well as in Italy, seem to provide abundant sources about Muslim (or a fake “Muslim”) slaves captured and sold by Christians. The analysis given previously allows me to conclude that in the 17th century the renewed trade route which directed slaves from Bosnia, across Dalmatian ports towards Italy was as intensive as the one which directed Christian slaves captured by Ottomans towards eastern marketplaces. But further in depth studies of the sources of both sides of this question are needed. However some similarities can be found in both the Christian and Muslim slave trades. For example

26 DAZd, *Dispacci*, Pietro Valier, book III, f. 64; T. MAYHEW, 2008, 262-263.

27 K. PUST, 2010, 342.

28 R. C. DAVIS, 2000, 454.

29 S. FAROQHI, 2004, 119-136.

25 DAZd, *Dispacci*, Pietro Valier, book III, f. 64. T. MAYHEW, 2008, 262-263.

26 K. PUST, 2010, 342.

27 More in R. C. DAVIS, 2000, 454.

28 S. FAROQHI, 2004, 119-136.

Tezu valja nadalje potkrijepiti i paralelama u zakonitostima ove trgovine, kao što su to državni interesi (mletačka desetina, sultanova petina) pri čemu država ima svoj posebni interes za ovu vrstu trgovine. Nadalje, ideološki, robovi su uglavnom predstavljeni kao oni suprotne vjeroispovijesti. Na taj način interes države i vjerskih ustanova vezan je uz preobraćenje vjernika. U Osmanskom su carstvu robovi bili islamizirani, a u Mletačkoj republici obavezno pokrštavani, a oni koji nisu htjeli prihvatiti kršćanstvo poslani su na galije. U tom kontekstu treba sagledati i mnoge ratne akcije kao bitke za podanike i robove kao vrijednu robu. Pored toga ljudi koji su nasilno odvoženi s neprijateljskog teritorija, slabili su njegovu snagu. Tržište robljem bilo je gladno ljudske snage osobito nakon velikih epidemija kad je robovska radna snaga nadoknađivala slobodne ljude, a ratovi su bili najveći opskrbljivači tom robom. Posljedice ovog intenzivnog lova na ljude i trgovine bile su ogromne u područjima kao što je dalmatinsko zaleđe jer su rezultirale velikim demografskim promjenama. S druge strane, u talijanskim komunama gdje su dovedene tisuće slavenskih robova i na kraju integrirani u njih, puno je teže pratiti utjecaje tih promjena. Kako su ti ljudi uglavnom bili odvojeni od svojih rođaka, morali su napustiti vlastitu kulturu i jezik i prihvatiti nove u koje su silom uronjeni. Prema tome vrlo je teško pratiti bilo kakve poveznice koje su oni eventualno mogli imati s njihovim mjestom porijekla i društvom u kojem su rođeni. Bilo bi također zanimljivo provesti potpunu komparativnu studiju s afričkim tržištem roblja kako bi se razmotrile sličnosti i razlike. Naposljetku, trgovina robljem oduvijek je bila duboko ukorijenjena u kulturu društava istočnog Jadrana i šireg balkanskog područja. Dok su u srednjem vijeku robovi s obje strane Jadrana mahom bili iz Bosne, s osmanskim prisutnošću na ovom području prodaja robova, mogućnost da kršćanin i musliman postane rob bila je realnost tijekom 500 godina. Ta se realnost reflektira i u popularnoj kulturi, odnosno narodnim pjesmama. Primjerice, hrvatska riječ *rob* vrlo je bliska po zvučnosti s rječju *roba*, a *zarobiti* gotovo da bi u tom smislu moglo značiti pretvoriti nekoga u robu. No, slične prakse odvođenja u roblje i prodaja robova bile su široko rasprostranjene u ranom novom vijeku u Europi kao i na istočnom Jadranu koji nije bio povijesni izuzetak. Ne bih se složila s mišljenjima da je trgovina robljem na Sredozemlju u ranom novom vijeku bila neka vrsta anakronog fenomena koji je preživio zahvaljujući osmanskim osvajanjima

the Venetian Republic imposed a tithe of one tenth (in money or people) from all captured groups of slaves. In the Ottoman Empire the Sultan had the right to a fifth of the war booty including captives. Thus the state was involved in this trade and had particular financial interest. Furthermore, ideologically the slaves were mostly presented as being of opposing religions. In this way it was in the state's as well as religious institutions' interests to take slaves in order to convert them. In the Ottoman Empire slaves were converted to Islam, while Venetian captives were obligatorily converted to Christianity and those who did not want to accept Christianity were kept as slaves on galleys. In this way the opposing sides indulge in a battle for subjects, which was an important factor because more subjects could provide more income for the state treasuries whilst at the same time, people forcefully taken away from the enemies' territory weakened its force. The slave market was hungry for human resources especially after great epidemics when slave labourers replaced free men and so the wars were the main supply of these "goods". The consequences of intensive slave hunting and trading were enormous in an area such as the Dalmatian hinterland resulting in great demographic changes. For example in Italian communities where thousands of Slavic origin slaves were brought and finally integrated, it is more difficult to trace. As those men and women were mostly separated from their own people, they had to abandon their own culture and language and accept the new one into which they had been forcibly coerced. Thus it would be difficult to follow any connections they might have with the place of their origin or their native society. It would be also interesting to complete a comparative study with the African slave trade to establish similarities and differences. Finally the slave trade had always been deeply embedded in the culture of the societies of the Eastern Adriatic and the wider Balkan populations. Whilst in the Middle Ages slaves were mostly from Bosnia, during the 500 years of Ottoman presence in this territory, the slave trade became a common daily reality. This is reflected and preserved in popular epics. For example the Croatian word for slave is *rob* which brings us close to the word *roba* i.e. goods; and *zarobiti* means to capture although it can be interpreted also as to turn someone into goods. Nevertheless, the similar practice of taking captives and trading them as slaves was widely spread throughout Early Modern Europe as well as Eastern Adriatic and was not an historical exception.

ma i sukobima s kršćanima.³⁰ To je donekle istina, ali trgovina robljem kao širi antropološki fenomen postoji dokle god postoje “drugi” (drugog etničkog, konfesionalnog, ekonomskog, rodnog, dobrog određenja) koje je stoga moguće pretvoriti u “robu” i prodati, što nije nikakva posebnost samo mediteranskog svijeta, a što na žalost dokazuju primjeri ropstva i u suvremenom svijetu.

I would not agree with the opinion that slave trading in the Mediterranean was a kind of anachronistic phenomenon which survived due to the Ottoman conquests and conflicts with Christian states.²⁹ It is partially true, but slave trading as an anthropological phenomenon (even within different historical frameworks) had existed as long as there were “others” (i.e. members of different ethnic or religious groups or even different social and economic groups, different gender and/or age). Since they were perceived as different, it was common for slaves to be seen as ‘goods’ and be deprived of freedom and sold to the advantage of the leading social groups. Unfortunately the cases of slavery still exist in the contemporaneous world and prove this thesis.

POPIS LITERATURE I POVIJESNIH VRELA / BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Arhivski izvori / Archival sources

Archivio di Stato di Venezia (ASV), *Senato Dispacci, Provveditori da Terra e Mar*
Državni arhiv u Zadru (DAZd), *Dispacci*, Pietro Valier
DAZ, *Knjige zadarskih knezova, Atti di conte di Zara*
Alessandro Diedo

Popis literature / Literature

- C. W. BRACEWELL, 1992 - Catherine Wendy Bracewell, *The Uskoks of Senj*, Cornell University Press, 1992.
N. BUDAK, 1984 - Neven Budak, Pregled literature i objavljenih izvora o problemu serva i famula u srednjovjekovnim društvima na istočnom Jadranu, *Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest*, 17, 1984, 5-33.
G. DAVID, P. FODOR, 2007 - Geza David, Pal Fodor (eds.), *Ransom Slavery along the Ottoman Border*, Leiden - Boston, 2007, 27-34.
R. C. DAVIS, 2000 - Robert C. Davis, *Slave Redemption in Venice 1585-1797, Venice reconsidered: the history and civilization of an Italian city-state*, Baltimore, 2000.
B. DESNICA, 1991 - Boško Desnica, *Stojan Janković i uskočka Dalmacija*, Beograd, 1991.

- S. FAROQHI, 2004 - Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World around it*, London, 2004.
M. JAČOV, 1992 - Marko Jačov, *Le missioni Cattoliche nei Balcani durante la Guerra di Candia*, 1992.
D. KLEN, 1976 - Danilo Klen, Pokršćavanje “turske” djece u Rijeci, *Historijski zbornik*, XXIX-XXX 1976, 203-210.
T. MAYHEW, 2008 - Tea Mayhew, *Dalmatia between the Ottoman and Venetian rule - Zara's hinterland 1645-1718*, Roma, 2008.
O. PATTERSON, 1982 - Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and social death*, Harvard University Press, 1982.
W. D. PHILIPS, 1985 - William D. Philips, *Slavery from Roman times to the early transatlantic trade*, Manchester University Press, 1985.
K. PUST, 2010 - Klemen Pust, “Za odkup ubogih sužnjeva, naših podanikov”. Reševanje Benečanov iz osmanskega in Osmanov iz beneškega suženjstva na območju rzhodnega Jadrana v 16. stoletju, *Zgodovinski časopis*, leto 2010, 2-3, 326-358.
D. ROKSANDIĆ, 2003 - Drago Roksandić, *Triplex Confinium*, Zagreb, 2003.
G. STANOJEVIĆ, 1962 - Gligor Stanojević, *Dalmacija u doba Morejskog rata*, Beograd, 1962.
T. Z. TENŠEK, 2005 - Tomislav Zdenko Tenšek, Krstjani i trgovina robljem na Sredozemlju između 13. i 15. stoljeća, *Fenomen “Krstjani” u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni i Humu*, Sarajevo, Zagreb, 2005, 309-334.

30 K. PUST, 2010, 331.

29 K. PUST, 2010, 331.