

# LEGISLATION APPLIED TO OTTOMAN SUBJECTS IN DUBROVNIK REPUBLIC IN THE CLASSICAL PERIOD

Cihan YEMİŞÇİ

Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi

Department of History

Bilecik, Turska

UDK: 341 94(497.5 Dubrovnik)

DOI: yq32ohxq19

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Prihvaćeno: 14. siječnja 2023.

The Republic of Dubrovnik was a tributary city-state of the Ottoman Empire with a special status close to autonomy. Members of both polities conducted their political, social, and economic affairs under the legal umbrellas of treaties and some special edicts. The institution to which Ottoman subjects and the Republic could turn to resolve issues in their reciprocal relations was the office of the *emin*, appointed by the governor of Bosnia to supervise the salt trade and customs formalities. The Ottoman and Dubrovnik state archives recorded possible problems arising between two or more individuals or issues concerning their legal status and responsibilities. This study bases and focuses on similar documents of this kind that I have identified.

**Key Words:** Dubrovnik Republic, Ottoman Empire, *beylerbey* of Bosnia, *sanjak-bey* of Herzegovina, Legal History, International Law.

## INTRODUCTION

Some information from the later historical sources suggest that the people of Dubrovnik may have been granted the right to freely engage in trade in Ottoman territories under a treaty issued by Murad I in 1365.<sup>1</sup> The earliest surviving treaty

<sup>1</sup> Some 17th-century sources refer to them as yet the unproven belief that the first diplomatic contacts between the Ottoman state and the Republic of Dubrovnik took place during the reigns of Orhan Gazi (1326 – 1362) and Murad I (1362 – 1389). For example, the famous traveller Evliya Çelebi relates that envoys from Dubrovnik visited Orhan Gazi following the conquest of Bursa, presented gifts, and expressed good wishes. Evliyâ ÇELEBİ b. Derviş Mehmed Zillî, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi, V. Kitap, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 307 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*, eds. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman and İbrahim Sezgin, Istanbul, 2001., 235; *VI. Kitap, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan 1457 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu - Dizini*, eds. Seyit Ali Kahraman and Yücel Dağlı, Istanbul, 2002., 247. Many *firman*s dating from the same century refer to this event for several views on the idea that the first Dubrovnik treat framed back in 1365. Johann Wilhelm ZINKEISEN, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, I (1299 – 1453), ed. Erhan Afyoncu, trans. Nilüfer Epceli, Istanbul, 2011., 202; Şerafettin TURAN, “Dubrovnik”, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (TDVİA)*, IX, Istanbul, 1994., 542; Vesna MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Diplomacija u Istanbulu*, Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti (HAZU), Institute for Historical Sciences u Dubrovniku, Zagreb – Dubrovnik, 2003., 10; Mladen GLAVINA, *17. Yüzyıl Başında Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ile Dubrovnik Cumhuriyeti İlişkileri*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi



document drawn up after the permissions to trade granted to the Ragusans during the reigns of Bayezid I and Mehmed I was issued by Murad II in 1430.<sup>2</sup> The first defined the tributary and special status of Dubrovnik concerning the Ottoman Empire in a treaty passed in February 1442. This document formed the basis of treaties issued by later Ottoman sultans.<sup>3</sup> So far, as can be ascertained, this treaty contained the first legal clauses relating to Ottomans who travelled to Dubrovnik. One of these declares, “apart from envoys sent by the sultan himself, no other person who goes to Dubrovnik shall engage in any activity that contravenes the laws of that city.” Another clause based on the principles of Sharia law and, without specifying the country in which the event occurs, declares, “If a disagreement should occur between a Muslim and a citizen of Dubrovnik, they must have recourse to the *kadı*.”<sup>4</sup>

Meanwhile, during the year when the treaty was issued, Ottomans established a customs post near the Ploče Gate of Dubrovnik, appointing an *emin* as its head. Besides his duties as a chief customs officer *emin* also provided consular services for Ottomans who travelled to the city.<sup>5</sup> However, there is no mention of an Ottoman *emin* in Dubrovnik in 1442, 1459, or in 1513 treaties.<sup>6</sup> Since

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, unpublished master’s thesis, Ankara, 2009., 11; Özgecan KÖKER, *XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Devleti-Dubrovnik İlişkileri ve Hicri 1037 – 1056/1627 – 1646 Tarihli Ahkâm Defteri Transkripsiyon ve Deęerlendirmesi*, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, master’s thesis, Manisa, 2011., 4 – 5. For critique of these views see: Lovro Kunčević, *The Myth of Ragusa: Discourses on Civic Identity in an Adriatic City-State (1350 – 1600)*, Central European University, doctoral dissertation, 2012., 108 – 109.

<sup>2</sup> Hazim ŠABANOVIĆ, *Dubrovnik Devlet Arşivindeki Türk Vesikaları*, trans. İsmail Eren, *Belleten*, XXX/119, Ankara 1966, pp. 391 – 392; Robin HARRIS, *Dubrovnik: A History*, SAQI, London, 2003., 78; Vinko FORETIĆ, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808*, sv. I, Zagreb, 1980., 12, 117 – 120, 264, 265.

<sup>3</sup> Ćiro TRUHELKA, *Dubrovnik Arşivi’nde Türk-İslav Vesikaları*, *İstanbul Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1, İstanbul, 1956., 42 – 45; Zdenko ZLATAR, “Dubrovnik and Ottoman Balkans (1430 – 1808)”, *Türk Tarihinde Balkanlar, Balkans in the Turkish History*, I, eds. Zeynep İskefiyeli, M. Bilal Çelik and Serkan Yazıcı, Sakarya, 2013., 475; Franz BABINGER, *Fatih Sultan Mehmed ve Zamanı*, trans. Dost Körpe, İstanbul, 2002., 30, 37; F. BABINGER, “Ragusa”, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, IX, MEB, Eskişehir, 2001., 599; S. TURAN, “Dubrovnik”, 542 – 543; Idris BOSTAN, “Ahidnamele ve Uygulamalara Göre 15 – 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Ticari Münasebetleri”, *Osmanlı Deniz Ticareti*, İstanbul, 2019., 14.

<sup>4</sup> Ć. TRUHELKA, *Dubrovnik Arşivi’nde Türk-İslav Vesikaları*, 44 – 45; Metin Ziya KÖSE, *Osmanlı Devleti ve Dubrovnik Cumhuriyeti İlişkileri, 1500 – 1600, Doęu Akdeniz’de Casuslar ve Tacirler*, İstanbul, 2009., 37.

<sup>5</sup> Vesna MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *Emin na Pločama Kao Predstavnik Osmanlija na Području Dubrovačke Republike* (hereafter “Emin”), *Anali Dubrovnik*, no. 37, Dubrovnik, 1999., 205 – 215.

<sup>6</sup> Although there is no mention of the *emin* in Dubrovnik in the treaty issued by Selim I, this document contains a note that the customs tax payable by the people of Dubrovnik must collect “the *emins* in places where they are”. Fahri DALGAR, *Bursa Şer’i Mahkeme Sicillerine Göre: Selim I.in Dobrovnik Cumhuriyeti ile Yaptığı Muahede*, *Tarih Vesikaları*, II/12, İstanbul, 1943., 144.



many treaties have not survived, the first edition of a provision concerning this *emin* is confusing and unknown. Nonetheless, it surmised that a possible additional condition added to the treaties issued after 1521, in which customs rates payable by Dubrovnik's merchants took their final form and tax farming replaced customs tax collection by the state and to the renewed treaties in 1567. The treaty issued by Murad III in 1575 contains a clause about the *emin*:<sup>7</sup> "...let the *emin* stationed at the gate of Dubrovnik and collect customs tax of five per cent from Western Europeans".<sup>8</sup> However, there is no mention in the treaties of the *emin*'s powers and responsibilities concerning Ottoman subjects who visited Dubrovnik or lived there or the role he played in official and legal relations with the Republic of Dubrovnik.

The clause that was first found in the treaty of 1459 states that individuals suspected of committing theft in Ottoman territories and escape to Dubrovnik are to be investigated by the Dubrovnik authorities "per custom".<sup>9</sup> This is a repeated clause seen in the Dubrovnik treaties in subsequent years.<sup>10</sup> However, none of the documents mentions whether the extradition of the culprit to the Ottoman Empire is a case or not.

<sup>7</sup> I. BOSTAN, *Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Ticari Münasebetleri*, 15.

<sup>8</sup> Nicolaas H. BIEGMAN, *The Turco-Ragusan Relationship according to the firmans of Murad III (1575 – 1595) extant in the State Archives of Dubrovnik*, Hague, Paris, 1967., 58. The Dubrovnik *emin* continued to appear in subsequent treaties. State Archives in Dubrovnik (DAD), *Diplomata et Acta (DA.)*, *Acta Turcarum (7/2.1)*, vol. 9, no. 431 (Evâil-i Zi'l-hicce 1003/7 – 16 August 1595); Presidential Ottoman Archive (BOA), *Düvel-i Ecnebiyye Defteri (A. DVNS. DVE. d.)*, no. 13/1, p. 179/1, hk. 811 – 821 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-evvel 1027/5 – 14 May 1618); BOA, *Maliyeden Müdevver Defter (MAD. d.)*, no. 6004, p. 93 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1033/4 – 13 December 1623) and their copies (Evâil-i Zi'l-ka'de 1033/15 – 24 August 1624); BOA, *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 14/2, p. 7, hk. 10 and their copies: hk. 11 – 12 (Evâil-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1041/27 September – 5 October 1631) and extra copies (süretler): p. 8, hk. 13 – 14 (Evâhir-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1044/13 – 22 September 1634), 9 – 10, hk. 16 and their copies: hk. 17 – 20 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 1050/27 September – 5 October 1640); DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol. 23, no. 1066 (Evâil-i Ramazan 1059/8 – 17 September 1649); BOA, *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 15/3, 6 – 7, hk. 2 – 11 (Evâil-i Receb 1059/11 – 20 July 1649) and one copy hk. 12 (Evâsıt-ı Ramazan 1064/25 July – 3 August 1654.), 117 – 119, hk. 171 (Evâhir-i Muharrem 1073/4 – 13 September 1662), 120 – 121, hk. 174 (Evâhir-i Cemâziye'l-evvel 1073/31 December 1662 – 9 January 1663).

<sup>9</sup> Ć. TRUHELKA, *Dubrovnik Arşivi'nde Türk-İslav Vesikalari*, 47, document 13.

<sup>10</sup> The statement in the 1513 treaty: "...if anyone should take the *rızık* (money or property) of any person from my country and flee to Dubrovnik, an investigation will perform there, as is customary". F. DALŠAR, Selim I. in Dobrovnik Cumhuriyeti ile Yaptığı Muahede, 413. For the 1575 treaty see: N. BIEGMAN, *Turco-Ragusan Relationship*, 59; M. KÖSE, *Osmanlı-Dubrovnik İlişkileri*, 40. The last treaty to have new clauses added to the text and therefore has the characteristic form of the treaties that regulated Ottoman-Dubrovnik relations is the treaty granted by Mehmed III in 1595. All the treaties granted after this date consist of document renewals without any added clauses relating to Ottoman citizens in Dubrovnik. DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol. 9, no. 431 (Evâil-i Zi'l-hicce 1003/7 – 16 August 1595).



A notable feature of clauses in the Dubrovnik treaties is that they are often ambiguous and enigmatic due to brevity and a lack of explanatory information. For example, the abovementioned clause invites several questions. Did “investigation” (*teftiş*) mean only inquiry or include judicial proceedings? When the “investigation” had been completed, was the culprit’s trial held where the crime was committed - in other words, at a court in the Ottoman territory – or in Dubrovnik? Under these circumstances, were the Dubrovnik authorities responsible for taking the absconding culprit to court and arranging his trial? Does a *kadı* need to be present at the trial? Did the clause apply to other offences besides burglary, mentioned explicitly? Another clause in the treaties concerned citizens of Dubrovnik who died in the Ottoman territory. According to this clause, the *beytü’l-malcı* had no authority or responsibility regarding the deceased person’s property in the Ottoman region.<sup>11</sup> Goods and money owned by the dead were to be given to his heirs (or, in some instances, to agents authorised to represent the heirs).<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, what was the situation regarding an Ottoman subjects who died in Dubrovnik?<sup>13</sup>

A clause concerning the extradition of enslaved people who fled from one country to another is in treaty letters given to Venice but not in those given to Dubrovnik.<sup>14</sup> However, some edicts demonstrate that the same principle applied in the case of Dubrovnik.<sup>15</sup> These treaties were unilateral documents issued by the

<sup>11</sup> The official responsible for protecting the estate of a person who died in the Ottoman Empire. T. ÖZCAN, „Muhallefât“, *TDVİA*, XXX, Istanbul, 2005., 406 – 407.

<sup>12</sup> N. BIEGMAN, *Turco-Ragusan Relationship*, 59; M. KÖSE, *Osmanlı-Dubrovnik İlişkileri*, 40. For documents containing the legal provision expressed by the following sentence: “...If someone from Dubrovnik should come to the Ottoman state and die there, the *beytü’l-malcı* (finance officer) is prohibited from interfering in their property. Perhaps their heir might come from that place and request their property...” For more, see: *Abidnâmeler*.

<sup>13</sup> In the State Archives of Dubrovnik, several *kadis’* documents given to the Ottoman officials show the belongings of the Ottoman subjects who died in Dubrovnik. For example, *hüccet* no. 4029. give us accurate information and how matters and affairs were done and solved.

<sup>14</sup> For the clause “...Should an enslaved person who escaped from Venice, who came to the Ottoman state and became a Muslim, let a thousand aspers will give if his owner should come? If his owner does not come, but his representative comes, let the aspers given to him. If he remains an infidel, then the enslaved person will return directly. If an enslaved person escapes from the Ottoman state and reaches Venice, whether Muslim or convert, let them return him without protecting him on any excuse. If he is an infidel, let them give his owner or representative a thousand aspers...” The 1625. Venice Treaty: BOA, *MAD. d.*, no: 6004, 118 – 120 (Evâsıt-ı Receb 1034/19 – 28 April 1625). For other Venice treaties composed and formulated in the 16th and 17th centuries, see: Meryem KAÇAN, *XVI ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı-Venedik Abidnâmeleri*, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, master’s thesis, Istanbul, 1995.

<sup>15</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.3, no. 105 (29 Şa‘bân 921/8 October 1515.); vol. 4, no. 180 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye’l-evvel 957/28 May – 6 June 1550); no.184 (Evâil-i Ramazan 957/13 – 22 September 1550.); no.187



sultan that laid down concessions granted to the polity to whom they addressed. Assumed that although the text only refers to the recipients of the treaty when speaking of rights granted to them, these rights were equally valid for Ottoman subjects. On the other hand, what would happen in the cases simply could not be reciprocally resolved? If, for example, one of two people engaged in a lawsuit was an Ottoman subject and the other a citizen of Dubrovnik? Moreover, would different regulations apply to whether an Ottoman subject was a Muslim? Alternatively, would the procedure vary depending on which of them was the defendant and which was the plaintiff?

We have so many other questions to think about regarding these situations. The answers to most of them are in the Ottoman *firman*s. So in cases where the treaties contained no rules for dealing with bilateral relations, documents in the form of *firman*s having judgments reached in the circumstances brought back before the *divan* (High Court) in Istanbul, or records drawn up specifying regulations to be applied in such cases (in a sense appendices to treaties) met the need for clarification and *firman*s of this type composed responses to requirements that arose during reciprocal relations. Sharia principles formed the legal foundation of *firman*s, and written documents followed contemporary interpretations of *ijtihad*<sup>16</sup> as they applied to the case. Since these were composed as appendices to a treaty, their content could not contradict the clauses of treaties, a principle that was valid for other types of *firman*s.<sup>17</sup> In this way, such documents applied not just to a specific case but set precedents that spread to other matters at a future time.

## THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF BILATERAL RELATIONS: TREATIES AND EDICTS (LEGAL PROCEDURES, PRACTICES, AND TENDENCIES RELATING TO OTTOMAN SUBJECTS IN DUBROVNIK)

### *Court Powers and Jurists*

One of the legal procedures not laid down in bilateral relations treaties concerns the power to try Ottoman subjects in Dubrovnik. *firman*s, however, reveal that law enforcers in Dubrovnik had the right to take an Ottoman citizen resident in

(Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 958/16 – 25 June 1551); vol.6, no. 291 (Evâsıt-ı Ramazan 980/15 – 24 January 1573); vol.17, no. 848 (Evâhir-i Zi'l-ka'de 1042/30 May – 8 June 1633).

<sup>16</sup> Easiest explained as Common law – contemporary interpretation of Islamic leading and reigning.

<sup>17</sup> “...if a *firman* that contradicts an imperial treaty should compose, then let it not be implemented. Let affairs always be carried out by this imperial treaty, and from now on, let no infringement be permitted...”. See: *Ahidnâmeler*.





the city or on Dubrovnik territory to court in the event of any infringement of local law. Consequently, Ottomans couldn't escape prosecution, inquiry, and trial by pleading that they were not from Dubrovnik or not subjects of the Republic.<sup>18</sup> The fundamental and primary principle of *dârü's-sulh* or *dârü'l-ahd*, emphasised in many Ottoman *firman*s, was respect for the autonomous administration and laws of the Republic officially acknowledged by the Empire.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, some issues still raise questions concerning legally unexplained principles in the documents. Who made the pleas mentioned above, Muslim or Christian Ottomans? Moreover, how were the judicial proceedings carried out? Again, *firman*s provide answer to these questions.

A measure on dealing with lawsuits caused by commercial disagreements between Ottomans and Ragusans within the borders of Dubrovnik was taken in 1568. Law officers in Herceg Novi, which neighboured the Republic to the south and so had close connections with the people of Dubrovnik, resulting in many problems between them, asked that a permanent *nâib* (deputy *kadı*) should be appointed to Dubrovnik and reside in the city. But since the people of Dubrovnik objected to this and demanded the continuation of the former system, the *divân* made the following decision: that in the event of an Ottoman citizen committing a crime in Dubrovnik or an Ottoman and a Dubrovnik citizen involved in a lawsuit - whether Muslim or non-Muslim - the case should be heard by the court in Dubrovnik, with the participation of the *kadı* of Herceg Novi. The *firman* also states that a *fatwa* exists, showing that such a procedure complies with *Sharia* law.<sup>20</sup> A *kadı* in court means observing

<sup>18</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.5, no. 232 (Evâil-i Zi'l-ka'de 970/22 June – 1 July 1563); no. 246 (Evâhir-i Receb 974/1 – 10 February 1567); vol.9, no. 434 (Evâil-i Zi'l-hicce 1003/7 – 16 August 1595); vol.14, no. 673 and the copy of a register: BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 13/1, p. 158/3, hk. 740 (Evâil-i Cemâziye'l-evvel 1027/26 April – 5 May 1618); vol.15, no. 726 (Evâsıt-ı Zi'l-ka'de 1032/6 – 15 September 1623) and the copy of a register: BOA., *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, 75/3 (14 Zi'l-ka'de sene 1032/9 September 1623); DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 791 (Evâil-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1036/20 – 29 November 1626.); vol.20, no. 951 and the copy of a register: BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 14/2, p. 132/1, hk. 236 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 1050/28 September – 7 October 1640).

<sup>19</sup> Under Islamic law, a non-Muslim state that agreed to pay tribute was given protection and taken out of the category of *dârü'l-harb* (a non-Muslim state that had not signed a peace treaty with the Ottomans) and put in the category of *dârü'l-ahd*/*dârü's-sulh* (a non-Muslim state at peace with the Ottomans). In Hanafi doctrine, this status was subject to the law concerning non-Muslim subjects of a Muslim country within the context of *dârü'l-Islam* (countries governed by Islamic law). In this way, the state involved no longer constituted a threat to the Islamic State. It could manage its interior affairs under the protection and tributary status, including the right to promulgate and implement laws. H. BIEGMAN, *Turco-Ragusan Relationship*, 29 – 32.

<sup>20</sup> This subject arises when the *kadı* of Herceg Novi proposed to the *divân* that the existing practice needs some changes. When the people of Dubrovnik objected, the proposal didn't take acceptance.



*Sharia* principles. Although partially not mentioned in the document, another official, the Ottoman *emin* in Dubrovnik, was to personally oversee and assist in the inquiry and court hearing procedures.<sup>21</sup>

The people of Dubrovnik and Herceg Novi, also extensively exchanged goods and lent money in the border areas. Disagreements that occasionally arose during this frontier trade were caused by the people of Herceg Novi selling their goods at a high-profit margin or engaging in usury by demanding excessively high-interest rates on credit and loans. When the people of Dubrovnik could not pay their debts, the merchants and usurers of Herceg Novi visited settlements in the region, picked quarrels, and engaged in other disorderly activities. We can find these complaints about such behaviour in the sections and descriptions of *kadı* of Herceg Novi. In cases where the court

And they decided that the former procedure should continue: "...since there is no one to perform the role of representing the *beys* of Dubrovnik convened and thought the matter over and replied 'we used to send a man (and call him). The *kadı* came and arranged matters and would then return to Nova.' Some Muslims sent their assurance that 'this is how it always used to be.' And the *beys* mentioned above assured that 'if Ottoman citizens, merchants, and others who come to our country should be involved in a dispute and impeachment, let us take them with our men to the Nova court.' You have said that 'no one accepted the appointment of a representative.' Now I command that you read my high command when it arrives. When it is necessary for a *kadı* to go to Dubrovnik, let him go there and conduct the court proceedings as in the past, but let a *nâib* (deputy judge) not be sent..." DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.6, no. 265 (Evâhir-i Rebi'ü'l-âhir 976/12 – 21 October 1568). In later periods this procedure continued to be valid: "...The people of Dubrovnik have been paying tribute (to our state) since very ancient times. Their *beys* govern their country according to their laws. Some non-Muslim subjects have gone to the city and settled there. Some of them have committed crimes and offences. When the city's judge wanted to try to convict them according to their laws, they objected with the words, 'We are not your citizens.' Since they (the *beys* of Dubrovnik) declare that they have a *fatwa* on this subject, during the reign of my ancestors, the late Sultan Selim Han (Selim II) and Sultan Mehmed Han (Mehmed III) issuing royal commands, and later during the reigns of my brother who now rests in heaven Sultan' Osman Han (Osman II) and Sultan Murâd Han (Murad IV) those laws and orders keep restated and continued. Since they requested renewal during my reign (Sultan İbrahim), I decided and commanded..." For the *firman* sent to the *kadı* of Herceg Novi see: BOA, *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no: 14/2, p. 132/1, hk. 236 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 1050/28 September – 7 October 1640). For the *firman* sent to the *sancakbey* and *kadis* of Herzegovina, see: BOA, *MAD. d.*, no: 6004, p. 75/3 (14 Zi'l-ka'de 1032/9 September 1623). For other *firman*s with the same content, see: DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.9, no. 434 (Evâil-i Zi'l-hence 1003/7 – 16 August 1595); vol.14, no. 673 and the copy of a register: BOA, *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no: 13/1, p. 158/3, hk. 740 (Evâil-i Cemâziye'l-evvel 1027/26 April – 5 May 1618); vol.15, no. 726 (Evâsıt-ı Zi'l-ka'de 1032/6 – 15 September 1623); DAD., *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 791 (Evâil-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1036/20 – 29 November 1626); vol.20, no. 951 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 1050/28 September – 7 October 1640).

<sup>21</sup> V. MIOVIĆ-PERIC, Emin, 205; Vesna MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima Namjesnika Bosanskog Ejaleta i Hercegovačkog Sandžaka*, Dubrovnik, 2008., 104; Vesna MIOVIĆ, *Na Razmeđu, Osmansko-Dubrovačka Granica (1667-1806)*, Dubrovnik, 1997., 156 – 164.



decision was considered unjust, envoys from Dubrovnik presented a petition to the *divân* to resolve the issue.<sup>22</sup>

### *Murder Suits*<sup>23</sup>

According to judgments promulgated in *firman*s, investigating crimes committed on Dubrovnik soil by citizens of Dubrovnik against Ottoman subjects or by Ottomans against Dubrovnik citizens was the responsibility of law officers appointed by the Republic. In such cases, the *divân* prohibited the authorities in Bosnia and *kadis* surrounding districts from launching investigations on their initiative before an order from Istanbul authorising them to do so. An example of this took place in 1626. According to the relevant document, Hacı Hüseyin of Herceg Novi accused some citizens of Dubrovnik of killing certain Ottoman subject. He informed the Herzegovina authorities of his accusation and made a complaint. In response, some court officials in the *sanjak* of Herzegovina crossed the border to investigate the murders. The Dubrovnik authorities objected to this and informed the *divân* of the affair, at which the *divân* governed that the case should be taken to the Dubrovnik court and the investigations carried out by officers of the Republic.<sup>24</sup>

Another murder occurred two years later when Petar, the bodyguard of a Dubrovnik merchant in Neretva, killed an Ottoman citizen named Luka. He was brought back to justice before the *kadı* in Gabela, who ordered that he pay 300 *riyals* in compensation.<sup>25</sup> It seems that the dead man's relatives were not satisfied with this. Petar and Nikola, brothers of Ivan Marko, a non-Muslim Ottoman, one of Luka's relatives, hunted down Petar and killed him in Dubrovnik territory. Both brothers were arrested and thrown into Dubrovnik's dungeon, where both died later. Ivan Marko then lodged a complaint with the Bosnian Council against the Dubrovnik authorities about the death of his brothers. Sending a

<sup>22</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.4, no. 195 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-evvel 960/25 April – 4 May 1553); vol.5, no. 248 (Evâil-i Şa'bân 974/11 – 20 February 1567.); vol.7, no. 312 (Evâhir-i Safer 983/31 May – 9 June 1575); vol.15, no. 703 (Evâsıt-ı Ramazan 1030/30 July – 8 August 1621).

<sup>23</sup> Apart from individual crimes, the attacks, murders, robberies, animal stealing, and kidnapping by Ottoman bandits and pirates were common in Dubrovnik or, more often, in its outlying regions. Since the subject of this study focuses on cases involving Ottoman civilians, acts of banditry and piracy by people based on Ottoman soil directed against Dubrovnik's sovereign territory didn't get in the scope of this study. These are subjects that require separate analysis. Vesna Mirović, Umorstva turskih podanika od strane Dubrovčana, <https://hrcak.srce.hr/241189>

<sup>24</sup> *Firman* sent to the *beylerbey* of Bosnia, the *sanjak-bey* of Herzegovina, and the *kadis* in the province: DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 791 (Evâil-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1036/20 – 29 November 1626).

<sup>25</sup> *Firman* sent to the *sanjak-bey* of Herzegovina and the *kadı* of Gabela at the request of *Sanjak Bey* Mehmed Bey: DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 800 (Evâhir-i Zi'l-ka'de 1037/23 July – 1 August 1628).





representative of the Dubrovnik administration named Vicko to the court, where the two parties settled. Ivan declared to Vicko “They died while in your dungeon.” The case was closed after the two sides agreed on an unspecified sum given in blood money as compensation. However, 13 years later, Ivan applied to the court to reopen the case because the blood money was inadequate and demanded additional payment - hoping for the Istanbul authorities’ solvation of the preferred issue. A *firman* was sent which ruled that since more than ten years had passed since the case had been closed, the time limitation laid down by law exceeded; that unless there was due cause for reopening the case, the application should be rejected, and that the *hüccet* (written document recording the court ruling) given by the judge should uphold.<sup>26</sup>

This event shows that the statute of limitation was ten years in the case of objections to compensation. Another document reveals that the law of limitation for bringing a charge of murder was twenty years. The *firman* in question dates from 1498 and concerns a case in which a non-Muslim named Radić applied to the kadı of Herceg Novi, claiming that some Dubrovnik citizens had killed his younger brother. This case referred to the Divân, whose verdict promulgated in a *firman* that declared the case annulled because 28 years had passed since the incident occurred.<sup>27</sup>

Another point that needs consideration here is blood money, which was not a practice found in the laws of Dubrovnik. The legists of the Republic first became aware of it only after some cases of murder arising from personal relations between two individuals took place. In 1590 and 1592, some Dubrovnik citizens killed some Ottoman subjects residing in the Republic and afterwards ran away. Dubrovnik legists found themselves in an awkward position concerning the Ottoman authorities. When the *kadis* insisted on paying blood money, the Dubrovnik judges had a rigid place between the contradictory legal principles applicable to such a case held by each side. The question was debated in the Major Council, after which the *knez* and the Minor Council asked for a solution over which he presided. The Senate members were sensitive to outside interference in the Republic’s home affairs and legal system, so their answer was to introduce an amendment to their laws, making them compliant with Ottoman law.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.20, no. 967 and a copy of the register: BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 14/2, p. 151/1, hk. 273 – 274 (Evâil-i Rebi’ü'l-evvel 1051/10 – 19 June 1641).

<sup>27</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.2, no. 53 (Evâhir-i Receb 903/15 – 24 March 1498.).

<sup>28</sup> There were three councils ruling the Republic. Senate (*Consilium Rogatorum*, Vijeće umoljenih, Senat), Grand Council (*Consilium Maius*, Veliko vijeće), and Minor Council (*Consilium Minus*, Malo vijeće). Each has different roles in the balance and dissolute Power in the Dubrovnik Republic constitutional arrangement. V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 111.



According to this amendment, all the possible costs of blood money will arise from property owned by the perpetrators. An auction sale mostly happens within eight days, and all possessions are sold and transferred to another one. Suppose the perpetrators owned no moveable or unmoveable property, the blood money would collect from residents in their home district. Local people could only avoid this responsibility by delivering the murderer or murderers to the authorities.

If a suspect, who was a citizen of Dubrovnik fled and was nowhere to be found, Dubrovnik's authorities sent a representative of the Republic to the court in the district where the plaintiff had made his complaint. If the law officers of the Republic assured that the accuser murdered someone in self-defence, they could give him refuge. In that case, the representative sent from Dubrovnik would discuss with the representatives related to the deceased person about the blood money decided by the Ottoman courts. He would bargain with them to come to an agreement. Dubrovnik authorities would later collect that money from the culprit's family if the culprit escaped.<sup>29</sup>

On the other hand, if the Dubrovnik legists believed that the murderer had committed the crime with malicious intent, they could try him in their courts and pass a sentence: a prison term, the demolition of his house, exile, or execution. In 1709, Petar Trojanović from the village of Postranje in Dubrovnik Republic murdered an Ottoman subject named Antonija Jovanov. Since Trojanović had previous convictions, the Dubrovnik court decided that he had wilfully committed murder sentencing him to execution. The execution was carried out in the presence of the Ottoman emin in the same year.<sup>30</sup>

As mentioned above, if one of the parties in a case questioned by the Dubrovnik court was an Ottoman subject, the *kadı* had to attend. However, numerous difficulties arose in attempting to follow this procedure. For example, in many cases, the accused escaped and was not arrested in the district where the crime occurred. If the culprit was an Ottoman subject, he could cross the border into the Ottoman territory, and a citizen of Dubrovnik into territory outside the city or over the edge into Venetian territory. The two examples above are rare instances where the culprits were caught and brought back to justice. There were many other examples where this did not occur; for example, in cases where an Ottoman suspect fled to Ottoman territory, another procedure accepted by both parties for pragmatic reasons was followed. The suspect should have been

<sup>29</sup> V. Miović, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 101.

<sup>30</sup> V. Miović, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 104.



facing trial in whatever district he would be found and caught. The Dubrovnik authorities sent a representative who took the evidence to the *kadı*, who was to hear the case. In addition, it became customary for practical reasons to file the suit in whichever place the plaintiff had made the complaint. Ottoman and Dubrovnik legists accepted such reasonable procedures for cases involving two individuals.<sup>31</sup>

## MOVEMENTS OF INDIVIDUALS FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO DUBROVNIK

Both officials and civilians crossed the border from the Ottoman territory into the Republic. Officials were sent to Dubrovnik by the Ottoman central or provincial authorities for various reasons relating to diplomatic, legal, or civil affairs to conduct inspections, collect taxes, or carry out other activities. Ottoman civilians, who are the main subject of this study, principally visited Dubrovnik for commercial purposes: to engage in the import and export of goods, to establish new business connections and pursue existing ones, engage in transit trade, borrow or lend money, and similar activities. Benefitting from the town health services<sup>32</sup> was one of numerous reasons for coming and going to the city or residing there temporarily or permanently, which advanced for the time; and in the case of Muslim pilgrims, to board ships that sailed from Dubrovnik harbour; or to give their boats for repairs in the port dockyard.<sup>33</sup>

### *Ottoman Merchants*

Travelling from the Ottoman territory, particularly from the Slavic hinterland to Dubrovnik for commercial reasons, had been expected in the pre-Ottoman period and continued during the Ottoman period. With the Ottoman expansion in the Balkans, members of Balkan nations who visited Dubrovnik continued

<sup>31</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 97; V. MIOVIĆ, *Na Razmeđu*, 21 – 22.

<sup>32</sup> Dubrovnik was among the cities visited by Evliya Çelebi, who remarked that the city's "physicians are famous", *Seyahatnâme*, VI, p. 255. Dubrovnik had an outstanding reputation in Europe in medicine and pharmacy (the pharmacy building at the Franciscan Monastery is one of the two oldest in Europe). For details of its quarantine building and quarantine procedures and more see: Antun BAĆE, Ivan VIĐEN, *Lazareti na Pločama od pada Dubrovačke Republike do danas (1808 – 2013)*, *Prostor*, 21, Zagreb, 2013., 327 – 328; Zdravko ŠUNDRICA, *Poisons and Poisoning in the Republic of Dubrovnik*, *Dubrovnik Annals*, 4, Dubrovnik, 2000., 7 – 9; R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 167 – 168; V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 95; V. MIOVIĆ, *Diplomacija*, 235 – 236.

<sup>33</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 95.



their activities as Ottoman subjects.<sup>34</sup> In time, Dubrovnik became the Ottoman “window to Europe” as a transit port for merchandise and a starting point for sea voyages.<sup>35</sup>

The attraction and advantages of the city in this respect led to large numbers of people, particularly those from Herzegovina, frequently crossing the border to settle in the Republic and conduct their commercial activities there. The Dubrovnik authorities “allowed these newcomers to stay”, and their increasing number attracted the attention of the Herzegovina authorities. In 1571, the governor of Herzegovina complained to the sultan on several occasions that the population of the *sanjak* would decrease if this rate continued, which would mean that it would no longer be necessary to collect taxes and there would be serious revenue losses in the region. In response, a *firman* was sent to the Dubrovnik authorities, ordering them not to allow the illegal settlers and that those already settled should be deported to their home region.<sup>36</sup> The migration of people from Ottoman territory to Dubrovnik, whether legally or (from the Ottoman point of view) illegally, was the natural result of the economic advantages of Dubrovnik as the Ottoman Empire’s only officially recognised commercial port on the Adriatic coast.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Among these, the most renowned local noble family was the Hersekzâdes. Cemal KAFADAR, *Kim Var İmiş Biz Burada Yoğ İken, Dört Osmanlı: Yeniçeri, Tüccar, Derviş ve Hatun* (hereafter *Dört Osmanlı*), Istanbul, 2009., 82. The Hersekzâde family descends from Herceg Vukčić Kosača and his son Stjepan. After converting to Islam, Stjepan took the name Ahmed and became Hersekzâde Ahmed Paşa. Şerafettin TURAN, Hersekzâde Ahmed Paşa, *TDVİA*, XVII, Istanbul, 1998., 235 – 237. Before entering the Ottoman service, Ahmed Paşa lived on his estates in the Republic of Dubrovnik. His land property caused a diplomatic crisis between some Ottoman dignitaries and the Republic of Dubrovnik in the 1590s. V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 66 – 68.

<sup>35</sup> Halil İNALCIK, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi, 1300-1600.*, vol. I, trans. Halil Berktaş, Istanbul, 2004. (2nd edition), 321.

<sup>36</sup> DAD, *Traduzioni di Capitulazioni e Fermani (TCF)*, vol.2, f. 137 and 138; V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 92.

<sup>37</sup> In the official policy of the Ottoman state, Dubrovnik harbour, apart from small harbours such as Risan, Slano, and Herceg Novi, was the only legal neutral harbour open to international transit trade on the Dalmatian coast until 1592. V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 100 – 101. When Split became an alternative transit trade harbour, Dubrovnik lost its monopoly over the transit trade. Split retained this role until 1645. apart from 1639 – 1640. when relations between the Ottoman Empire and Venice went through a period of tension. H. İNALCIK, *Osmanlı'nın Ekonomik*, 320, 326; Catherine WENDY BRACEWELL, *16. Yüzyılda Adriyatik'te Korsanlık ve Eşkıyalık, Senjli Uskoklar*, trans. Mehmet Moralı, Istanbul, 2009., 239. For *firman*s about the closure of Split by Murad IV in reaction to the Venetians after a diplomatic crisis; the resumption of Dubrovnik harbour’s monopoly; and the command that other piers should be closed to trade, for more, see: DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.19, no. 911 (Evâsıt-ı Şevval 1048/15 – 24 February 1639.); BOA, *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 14/2, p. 130, hk. 232 (Evâhir-i Cemâziye'l-âhir 1050/7 – 16 October 1640.). For other *firman*s confirming the monopoly of Dubrovnik harbour throughout the Cretan War, see: DAD,



The village of Vitaljina in Konavle, one of the few fertile regions in Dubrovnik's hinterland, was a frequent destination for merchants on both sides of the border made it a hub of commercial relations between the inhabitants of both regions due to its connections with the neighbouring Herceg Novi. Commodities carried to the border settlements by Herceg Novi's merchants consisted primarily of grain and a few other groceries. The people of Dubrovnik gained the right to export from Ottoman territories limited quantities of grain - one of the strategic commodities of the time due to famine in the Mediterranean littoral in the 16th and 17th centuries. Dubrovnik merchants usually loaded the grain they purchased onto large ships at many Ottoman ports.

Meanwhile, merchants from Herceg Novi carried goods to the consumers in Konavle and Vitaljina, whose inhabitants mainly comprised poor farmers, as we learn from *firman*s, commercial transactions financed by credits or loans. The same documents show that merchants from Herceg Novi and usurers sometimes endeavoured to take advantage of this situation to make extra unfair profits, primarily reflected in court cases where merchants from Herceg Novi were accused of selling goods at an excessive profit or charging exorbitant interest rates on credit and loans. When citizens of Dubrovnik could not pay their debts, the Herceg Novi merchants went to towns in the region. They started fights and complaints beyond Herceg Novi *kadı* to reach the *divân* in Istanbul.<sup>38</sup>

The road between Istanbul and Dubrovnik followed the military and trade route known as the Via Egnatia in Roman times leading through Edirne, Sofia, Skopje and Novi Pazar to Sarajevo, and from there, over the mountains via Mostar to reach Dubrovnik. The Ottomans improved this trade route to Dubrovnik by building *khans* for the caravans and redoubts and forts to protect the khans. Merchants travelled with the unique caravans that carried their goods and regularly set out from both destinations. They also issued *firman*s on ensuring the security of the processions and ordered local administrators on the route to offer every assistance in this respect.<sup>39</sup>

DA, 7/2.1, vol.23, no. 1058 and a copy of the register: BOA, A. DVNS. DVE. d., no. 15/3, p. 71, hk. 60 (Evâhir-i Receb 1059/29 July – 9 August 1649.); DAD, DA, 7/2.1, vol.30, no. 1228 (Evâil Rebi'ü'l-âhir 1080/29 August – 7 September 1669.); V. MIović, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 84, 101; V. MIović, *Diplomacija*, 91.

<sup>38</sup> DAD, DA., 7/2.1, vol.4, no. 195 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-evvel 960/25 April – 4 May 1553); vol.5, no. 248 (Evâil-i Şa'bân 974/11 – 20 February 1567); vol.7, no. 312 (Evâhir-i Safer 983/31 May – 9 June 1575); vol.15, no. 703 (Evâsıt-ı Ramazan 1030/30 July – 8 August 1621).

<sup>39</sup> BOA, A. DVNS. DVE. d., no: 13/1, p. 143, hk. 682 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 1026/20 June 1617); p. 145, hk. 697 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1027/11 February 1618); Metin Ziya Köse, Osmanlı Balkanı'nda Kara Ticareti ve Rekabet: Rumeli'de Dubrovnik Tüccarları (1600-1630), *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16, Pamukkale, 2013., 43.





The existence of overseas trade conducted by Turkish, Greek and Armenian merchants from Anatolia and Balkan merchants traces back to the early 1450s. In the second half of the 15th century, a “Turkish middleman” is recorded as living in Venice, giving an idea of the extent of business connections established by Anatolian entrepreneurs in the city of that time. During the next century, trade volume increased, and documents frequently referred to the presence of Balkan and Anatolian Ottoman merchants in Ancona and Florence. This subject has been largely neglected until now but has recently become a subject of research. The Ottoman merchants active in Venice throughout the 16th century include a not-inconsiderable number of Muslim merchants and non-Muslims. According to documentation found so far, 97 Jewish and 75 Muslim merchants were arrested in the 1570s, presumably because the war had broken out between the Venetians and Ottomans.<sup>40</sup> However, the Ottoman-Venetian relations entered a long period of peace from the last quarter of the century onwards, and in response to the needs of the growing numbers of Ottoman merchants in *Serenissima*, the *Fondaco dei Turchi* or Turkish khan, opened in 1621.<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, it is not yet possible to give exact figures based on existing information, at least estimated that until 1592, when most Ottoman merchants sent their goods by ship from Dubrovnik to Split when it opened to transit trade. For Anatolian merchants, the principal export commodity was camlet (fine cloth woven from angora wool), and the primary import goods with which they returned were kersey (a coarse woollen material) and other fabrics.<sup>42</sup>

The main transit trade routes across the Adriatic in the 15th and 16th centuries were Dubrovnik – Ancona and Dubrovnik – Venice. Consequently, it discounts small-scale trading activities at harbours such as Risan, Slano and Herceg Novi as the Ottoman merchants usually set sail from Dubrovnik during this period. However, some upheavals directly affected the Ottoman transit trade in the 16th century, afflicted by so many political and military struggles. For example, due to the Papal State’s persecution of the Marranos in 1555 – 1556, Ottoman merchants, who usually used Jewish trade networks, were also adversely affected and even imprisoned. In response to these adverse developments affecting Ottoman merchants in Ancona, they soon found ways around the Papal State’s

<sup>40</sup> C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 89 – 90.

<sup>41</sup> Ş.TURAN, Venedik’te Türk Ticaret Merkezi (Fondaco dei Turchi), *Bellekten*, XXXII/126, Ankara, 1968., 247 – 283; Mahmut H. ŞAKIROĞLU, Venedik’teki Türk Ticaret Merkezi (Fondaco dei Turchi) Hakkında Yeni Bilgiler ve Bunun Ticaret Tarihimizdeki Yeri, *5. Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi (İstanbul, 23 – 28 September 1985)*, III. *Türk Tarihi – Tebliğler*, II, İstanbul, 1989., 615 – 620.

<sup>42</sup> C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 2 – 83.



measures by selling their goods to mediators in Dubrovnik or using alternative ports, such as Pesaro instead of Ancona.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, the Ottoman merchants continued their trading activities even under these circumstances.

In the second half of the 16th century, the volume of trade handled by Ottoman merchants began to rise rapidly, and they appeared to have sought an alternative port to Dubrovnik. The river port of Gabela,<sup>44</sup> situated on the upper reaches of the Neretva River, was an entrepot for the salt reserves required by the province of Bosnia and one of the alternative ports considered at this period. Three principal factors prompted this search. Firstly, there is evidence that local merchants in the Balkan region, which was beginning to develop in this century, could not compete with the merchants of Dubrovnik and avoided trading with them.<sup>45</sup> In addition, in times of war, the Republic exploited the situation by making extortionate increases in customs duties on goods arriving at the port,<sup>46</sup> leading to an antipathy among Ottoman merchants towards Dubrovnik. Another factor to question in which manner were possible problems or benefits influential during the second half of the century, as in Ancona and Venice on the Adriatic coast, was such Catholic bigotry in Dubrovnik that led to anti-Semitic feelings and the desire to eliminate Jewish competition.<sup>47</sup>

Ottoman Jews were another merchant involved in the transit trade via Dubrovnik. From the 13th century onwards, Jews conducting business in Dubrovnik lived in many different neighbourhoods of Dubrovnik city. In the beginning, Jews mostly lived outside the walls. After establishing the ghetto in 1546, they lived inside the City walls and backstreets around Sponza Palace.<sup>48</sup> When Sephardic Jews arrived from the Iberian Peninsula in the 16th century, Jewish trading activities and influence in the Adriatic coastal ports increased further. Jewish merchants living under Ottoman protection gradually established

<sup>43</sup> C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 84 – 85.

<sup>44</sup> C. YEMIŞÇI, *XVI ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda Gabela Tuz Pazarı ile Bosna ve Hersek'in Tuz İhtiyacının Karşılanması*, Istanbul, 2020., 176 – 178.

<sup>45</sup> M. KÖSE, *Rumeli'de Dubrovnik Tüccarları*, 51 – 54.

<sup>46</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 94.

<sup>47</sup> R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 172. Consequently, Muslim merchants made extensive use of Jewish trade connections and presumably were adversely affected by hostile acts of this kind. C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 85; Catholic prejudice towards Jews in Dubrovnik primarily did not influence authority's decisions concerning Jews. In the 1570s, there were 50 state middlemen (*sensali*) in Dubrovnik, and 20 were Jews. In the second half of the 16th century, Ragusans were completely aware of the benefits of Jewish trade networks. Vesna MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *The Jewish Ghetto in the Dubrovnik*, Zagreb, 2005., 64.

<sup>48</sup> B. KREKIĆ, *The Role of Jews in Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik, Italy, and the Balkans in the Late Middle Ages*, London, 1980., 257 – 271; V. MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *The Jewish Ghetto*, 71.



trading networks that included Valona, Venice and Ancona, and Dubrovnik and reached as far as Florence.<sup>49</sup>

In particular, during the War of Cyprus (1570 – 1573), like the merchants of many other nations, the Jews focused their commercial activities on the port of Dubrovnik. However, when Dubrovnik took advantage of the war to raise customs duties on goods belonging to foreign merchants in its harbours, this aroused anger and led to some controversies. The increased anti-Semitic feelings in Europe added to this, further affecting and influencing some parts of the city societies. Influenced by this, Dubrovnik Republic authorities had difficulty enrolling and controlling the mass. Generally, having a tolerant base, Dubrovnik conducted a more progressive and different approach as a government and a state, and it worked almost all the time. When the government and ruling fathers could not control the situation, their treatment shown in Dubrovnik prompted some Jewish merchants to find an alternative port as soon as possible,<sup>50</sup> and having selected Split, they gradually relocated their activities there for a while, whilst always having any alternative.<sup>51</sup>

The keenest advocate of the idea that the Ottomans and Venetians should collaborate in turning Split into an entrepot charging low customs duties was a Sephardic Jew named Daniel Rodrigez. Split had been developing as a port since 1560 and had already attracted the attention of the *sanjak-bey* of Klis, Ali Bey. He too became one of the project's primary supporters. In 1573, 1577, 1580 and 1582, Rodrigez and Ali Bey attempted to convince the Ottoman and Venetian

<sup>49</sup> B. KREKIĆ, *The Role of Jews*, 271; C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 82; M. ACIPINAR, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Floransa, Akdeniz'de Diplomasi, Ticaret ve Korsanlık 1453-1592*, Ankara, 2016., 123 – 124.

<sup>50</sup> Following the prohibitions against Jews introduced by Pope Paul IV, a similar crisis occurred in Dubrovnik during the War of Cyprus in the early 1570s. Events went so far that Jews who protested events in the harbour were all arrested and their property seized. However, the Republic could not take their persecution any further because of the Ottoman protection of the Jews. R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 172. It is interesting to see how the Dubrovnik government dealt its own harbour a blow similar to that negotiated by the Vatican to Ancona Harbour in the mid-1550s; both polities killed the goose that laid golden eggs. Dubrovnik was not just a Catholic city faithful to the Papacy but the starting point of the sea route to Ancona, which was the Vatican's commercial port. In this way, the anti-Jewish campaigns the two cities waged sabotaged their harbours and the sea route between them. As a result, between 1592 and 1645, the trade route between the Ottoman Balkans and Italy shifted mainly to the Split-Venice route, which carried the lion's share of Ottoman trade shipments.

<sup>51</sup> F. BRAUDEL, *II. Felipe Döneminde Akdeniz ve Akdeniz Dünyası*, vol. I, trans. Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, İstanbul, 1989., 188 – 189; Cihan YEMİŞÇİ, *Split Limanı'nın Uluslararası Ticarete Açılması ve Split-Dubrovnik Rekabeti (1590-1645)*, *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19 (1), Manisa, 2021., 268 – 269; Benedetto LIGORIO, *Le reti ecomiche e sociali degli ebrei nell Repubblica di Ragusa e la diaspora commerciale sefardita (1546-1667)*, doctoral thesis, Sapienza – Univeristà di Roma, 2017.



political authorities of its advantages.<sup>52</sup> As a result, Split Harbour opened its new role in 1590, and two years later, Ottoman merchandise destined for Venice began loading onto ships there.<sup>53</sup>

The start of shipping operations in Split not only ended Dubrovnik's monopoly over Dalmatian trade but also altered the route used by Ottoman merchants. Bosnian merchants had been increasingly active during the 16th century and became severe competitors to their fellow merchants from Dubrovnik in this region. Previously Dubrovnik merchants had dominated trade in the Slavic area, which consisted of goods such as beeswax, furs, silks, woollens and yarn. Still, the Bosnians offered increasingly intense competition in the supply and export of these goods, eventually overtaking them entirely.<sup>54</sup>

Until 1592, Bosnian merchants had conducted their overseas transit trade via Dubrovnik and Gabela. Still, from that time onwards, with the opening of Split Harbour and its convenient location close to Bosnia, they began to send most of their goods from Split.<sup>55</sup> Caravans from Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially from Banja Luka and Novi Pazar, were now headed for Split instead of Dubrovnik.<sup>56</sup>

Meanwhile, this change directly influenced the route from Istanbul to Venice through the Balkans. After reaching Sarajevo, most Ottoman merchants travelled a shorter journey to Split, not to Dubrovnik.<sup>57</sup> As the transit trade flowing from the Balkans to Italy shifted to Split, the port's profit volume grew five times from the beginning of the 17th century up to 1640.<sup>58</sup> This development was directly influenced by establishing close collaboration between Bosnia and Venice and crowned by commercial partnerships that flourished under the conditions obtained in the region at this period. This commercial conjuncture demonstrates that Ottoman merchants virtually abandoned Dubrovnik as trade shifted to

<sup>52</sup> Renzo PACI, La Scala di Spalato e la Politica Veneziana in Adriatico, *Quaderni storici*, V/13(1), 1970., 50 – 59; R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 172.

<sup>53</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 69; S. TURAN, Venedik'te Türk Ticaret Merkezi, 249 – 250.

<sup>54</sup> H. İNALCIK, *Osmanlı'nın Ekonomik*, 323; Z. ZLATAR, *Dubrovnik and Ottoman Balkans*, 494.

<sup>55</sup> F. BRAUDEL, *Akdeniz ve Akdeniz Dünyası*, I, 189; S. TURAN, Venedik'te Türk Ticaret Merkezi, 256; H. İNALCIK, *Osmanlı'nın Ekonomik*, 323; Suraiya FAROQHI, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Etrafındaki Dünya*, trans. Ayşe Berktaş, İstanbul, 2010., (2nd edition), 132.

<sup>56</sup> H. İNALCIK, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Klasik Çağ (1300-1600)*, trans. Ruşen Sezer, İstanbul, 2006. (7th edition), 141 – 142.

<sup>57</sup> Ş. TURAN, Venedik'te Türk Ticaret Merkezi, 256. For details see H. İNALCIK, *Osmanlı'nın Ekonomik*, 320 – 326; F. BRAUDEL, *Akdeniz ve Akdeniz Dünyası*, I, 188.

<sup>58</sup> Nedim EMİN, *Dubrovnikli Tüccarların Balkanlar'daki Ticarî Faaliyetleri ve Organizasyonu (XVII. Yüzyıl)*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, master's thesis, İstanbul, 2013., 86.



Split. Consequently, we find that Dubrovnik Harbour experienced a period of conspicuous stagnation in the 1620s – 1630s.<sup>59</sup>

Ottoman – Venetian cooperation at Split ended with the outbreak of the Cretan War in 1645. The harbour was immediately closed down, forcing the Ottomans to re-route trade to Dubrovnik again. Bosnian merchants also began to send their export commodities from Dubrovnik again, although they turned their backs on Split with great reluctance. Nor was it easy for them to abandon business contacts established with the Venetians. Since the Bosnians saw that their commercial interests lay with the Venetians, they occasionally violated the prohibition on trade. During this war, the Bosnians secretly continued their partnerships and business connections with the merchants of Serenissima.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, contrary to official Ottoman policy, they sent goods to Venetian harbours that should have been closed to them rather than to Dubrovnik. When this reached the ears of the Ottoman government, a *firman* was issued prohibiting the Bosnians from committing further such violations.<sup>61</sup> However, during the Cretan War – apart from these Bosnian lapses – Ottoman merchants mostly returned to the port of Dubrovnik and conducted their overseas transit trade from that city. Thanks to the swing back to Dubrovnik, the port's profit levels were the highest they had ever been during this war.<sup>62</sup>

Serbian and Greek were among the Ottoman merchants, and they extended their commercial activities via Dubrovnik, as far as Lyon and Antwerp. In the 17th century, Dubrovnik's role in Balkan trade declined, and Bosnian merchants and other groups of Orthodox merchants became increasingly prominent in the region. Nevertheless, they continued to ship most of their merchandise from Dubrovnik Harbour.<sup>63</sup>

### *Enslaved people and criminals who escaped from Ottoman territory*

Not all those who travelled from the Ottoman territory to the Republic of Dubrovnik did so to engage in commercial activities. Runaway bondservants, sentenced criminals, offenders who wanted to avoid trial and debtors running

<sup>59</sup> R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 170; S. FAROQHI, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, 132 – 133; Francis W. CARTER, The Commerce of the Dubrovnik Republic, 1500-1700, *The Economic History Review*, New Series, XXIV/3, London, August 1971, 386.

<sup>60</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 99 – 100; C. YEMIŞÇI, Gabela Tuz Pazarı, 201; N. EMİN, *Dubrovnikli Tüccarların*, 88.

<sup>61</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.23, no. 1058 (Evâhir-i Receb 1059/29 July – 9 August 1649).

<sup>62</sup> F. W. CARTER, The Commerce of the Dubrovnik Republic, 393; M. KÖSE, Rumeli'de Dubrovnik Tüccarları, 46.

<sup>63</sup> M. KÖSE, *Rumeli'de Dubrovnik Tüccarları*, 49, 51.





away from their creditors headed for Dubrovnik. As a rule, governments were inclined to deport those who crossed frontiers illegally in any direction. However, in the case of Dubrovnik, numerous examples show that the authorities were reluctant to deliver fugitives to the Ottomans.

The earliest of such documents dates from 1515 and concerns an incident where the people of Dubrovnik avoided returning runaway captives. News of the incident reverberated as far as Istanbul. According to witness statements, some citizens of Dubrovnik brought some runaway bondservants to the city and concealed them. When the Republic's authorities asked to hand the runaways over, they denied any knowledge of the affair, saying that the matter needed investigation, leaving the issue in abeyance. Informing the authorities in Istanbul, a *firman* about this was sent to the *kadı* of Herceg Novi ordering him to follow up on the matter to conclude it.<sup>64</sup> A *firman* addressed to the rulers of Dubrovnik in 1573 sending a response to the fight or kidnapping of two enslaved Christians owned by Hacı Hamza, who brought them to the city to exchange for two enslaved Muslims.<sup>65</sup> The *firman* emphatically states that the Dubrovnik authorities must find and return the runaway captives.<sup>66</sup>

Two similar incidents in the 17th century show that the Republic was determined not to deport the runaway captives. In 1630, three enslaved people in the employ of İsa, one of the messengers (*çavuş*) of the *divan*, took refuge in Dubrovnik. While in the city, İsa Çavuş demanded their return, but the Republic refused his request. When this incident was referred to Istanbul, a *firman* was sent to the *kadı* of Cernica, commanding that Dubrovnik arranges to return the escaped enslaved people.<sup>67</sup>

Another example that led to correspondence between the two sides was the case of two suspected criminals, Dilaver and Keyvan, from the village of Bezvine near Čajniče, who escaped to Dubrovnik. Sefer Çavuş arrived in the city with a court order (*kadı hücceti*) and demanded that the Dubrovnik government give the

<sup>64</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.3, no. 105 (29 Şa'bân 921 / 8 October 1515).

<sup>65</sup> Due to its position on the border between the Crescent and the Cross and its status as a neutral region, Dubrovnik was also a city where prisoner exchanges happened. Cihan YEMİŞÇİ, Muhamed VALJEVAĆ, Türk Esirlerin Kurtarılması ve Mübadelesinde Bir Merkez Olarak Dubrovnik ve 1575 ile 1592 Yıllarındaki Esir Mübadeleleri, *Uluslararası Türk Savaş Esirleri Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı*, eds. Okan Yeşilot, Yüksel Çelik, Leyla Coşan and Ali Satan, Istanbul, 2018., 95 – 134; H. BIEGMAN, *Turco-Ragusan Relationship*, 131; V. MILOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 50 – 51; V. MILOVIĆ, *Diplomacija*, 96. Ahmet ÖNAL, XVI. Yüzyılda Avrupa'daki Osmanlı Esirlerin Kurtarılması Meselesine Dair Bazı Gözlemler, *Türkiye-Almanya Araştırmaları Dergisi*, IV/1 – 2, Istanbul, 2015., 49-52; M. KÖSE, *Osmanlı-Dubrovnik İlişkileri*, 25 – 29.

<sup>66</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.6, no. 291 (Evâsıt-ı Ramazan 980/15 – 24 January 1573).

<sup>67</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.17, no. 833 (Evâhir-i Şa'bân 1032/19 – 28 June 1623).



fugitives up, but they played for time and avoided complying. At this, the former *sanjak-bey* of Herzegovina, Yusuf Bey, submitted a petition to the *divân*, which sent a *firman* saying that this was the second time the same command ordered on the same subject. The *firman* declared that the Dubrovnik government should not refuse the deportation request and deliver the runaways.<sup>68</sup> Our sources are unfortunately silent about the later developments in events of this kind, so we do not know how the affair ended.

The examples quoted here are incidents we know about because they were referred to the *divân* and became the subject of official correspondence. It is important to remember that the Ottoman authorities never got involved and were never recorded in other cases of runaway captives and fugitives from justice.<sup>69</sup> Documents recording Dubrovnik's denials of any knowledge of some cases that had reached the ears of the sultan demonstrate that the Ottoman government took such matters seriously and kept informed about them.<sup>70</sup>

The stand by Dubrovnik to incidents of this kind intended to stress the Republic's status of sufficient autonomy exercised to extent close to independence,<sup>71</sup> *vis a vis* the Ottoman Empire.<sup>72</sup> In this way, Dubrovnik gained

<sup>68</sup> For the *firman* sent to the *beylerbey* of Bosnia and the *kadis* of Sarajevo, Tařlica, Foça and Çayniçe see: DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.17, no. 848 (Evâhir-i Zi'l-ka'de 1042/29 May – 7 June 1633).

<sup>69</sup> For example, during the Ottoman-Austrian War of 1787-91, some prisoners of war who escaped from the Ottomans were hidden by the Dubrovnik authorities and, as soon as possible, sent by ship and delivered to the Austrian authorities. V. MIOVIĆ, *Na Razmeđu*, 103 – 104.

<sup>70</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 53.

<sup>71</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 61. In any case giving a high degree of independence was the Ottoman and Christian West's highest interest since it was essential to everyone to maintain Dubrovnik neutrality.

<sup>72</sup> Lovro Kunčević sought an answer to whether the Republic of Dubrovnik was a state subject to the sultan's rule or whether it was a free and independent polity that paid tribute to the Ottomans to protect its independence. Kunčević has studied contemporary sources in his search; evaluated statements about the status of the Republic made at various levels in Dubrovnik, Venice, and different Western European countries; and finally, by giving examples from Ottoman documents that established Dubrovnik's subjection to the Ottomans and multi-judicial status. He notes the emphasis the people of Dubrovnik placed on their independence. On the subject of how, in line with this view, they regarded the annual tribute they paid to the Ottomans as security for their trading activities in the *Memâlik-i Mahrûse* (Protected Land), as the cost of protection by the empire, and a guarantee of their freedom. Lovro KUNČEVIĆ, Janus-faced Sovereignty: The International Status of the Ragusan Republic in the Early Modern Period, *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*, eds. Gábor Kármán, Lovro Kunčević, Leiden – Boston, 2013., 91 – 121. In this respect, the reasons for Dubrovnik occasional acts engaging in opposition to official Ottoman policy should be sought in the aforementioned delusive belief in their independence. We can find motivations for opposing the official Ottoman policy in Dubrovnik's political and economic interests.



its historical role of harbouring refugees and runaway captives,<sup>73</sup> and attitudes of this kind reinforced its image of independence. Moreover, by keeping enslaved Christians and assisting in their escape by ship from the harbour, Dubrovnik calculated on the effects of its image in the eyes of European states. By this means, the Dubrovnik authorities intended to raise the value placed on the Republic by the conditions from which the fleeing captives had come, and thus serve a dual purpose. However, as observed on some occasions, a direct *firman* sent from Istanbul meant the Dubrovnik government was obliged to submit to the dominant power of the Empire and deliver the fugitives up. Even so, there is no efficient and adequate evidence that Dubrovnik followed the sultan's requests in above-mentioned *firman*s.<sup>74</sup>

### *Muslim Pilgrims*

Another group of Ottoman Muslims who sometimes set foot in Dubrovnik temporarily were pilgrims. Every year ships set sail from the city, heading for Alexandria, the starting point for one of the land routes to the holy cities.<sup>75</sup> Due to absence of any records of complaints from such pilgrims, we can conclude that the outward journeys went smoothly, but we cannot say the same for their return voyages.

Those who returned by ship from Alexandria consisted of pilgrims from Balkan, mainly Bosnia. Upon arriving at Dubrovnik Harbour every year, they needed to remain in quarantine if they contracted any infectious diseases in the Middle East. Isolated from society and their families for forty days, the pilgrims frequently attempted to escape. It became customary for Ottoman subjects to object to observing quarantine regulations. Consequently, these unwilling guests had first to sign a statement in the presence of the emin, undertaking to obey

<sup>73</sup> Eastern Roman refugees who fled to Dubrovnik after the conquest of Istanbul are among the most prominent examples, as well as members of the Komnenos, Laskaris, Kantakuzenos, and Paleologos families, there were scholars such as Konstantinos Laskaris, Demetrios Khalkondilas, Theodoros Spandugino and Paulos Tarchaniotis, sent to Florence under the patronage of the Medici. H. BABINGER, *Fatih ve Zamani*, 104. After the conquest of Bosnia and the execution of King Stjepan, the king's mother, Katarina, and his wife, Marija, also took refuge in Dubrovnik. Mehmed II pursued them and demanded that they should deliver to him, but since they had already set sail for Italy, the Republic avoided meeting this demand. J. W. ZINKEISEN, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, II, 106, 112, 113. Another example is Dubrovnik's former enemy Herceg Vukčić Kosača and his son, who were permitted to take refuge in the Republic after being routed by the Ottomans. R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 94. Apart from such eminent figures, many ordinary people are known to have fled to the city and been accepted by the Republic.

<sup>74</sup> V. MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *Na razmeđu*, 41

<sup>75</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 95.



the rules of quarantine, not offer any resistance and not run away. One of *emin's* duties was to take the necessary precautions to prevent escape attempts.<sup>76</sup>

## THE QUARANTINE PROCESS BEFORE ENTERING DUBROVNIK

The Lazaretto was a complex of buildings where anyone arriving in Dubrovnik, whether by land or sea, from an area with a risk of contracting an infectious disease was to be held in quarantine or subjected to quarantine procedures. Merchants, pilgrims, enslaved people brought into the city from various regions,<sup>77</sup> and even officials from the Ottoman Empire were prepared for staying and possible symptoms and kept under observation in case they carried disease.<sup>78</sup>

The *emin* supervised Ottoman subjects kept in quarantine. For this reason, from 1640 onwards, he lived in a two-storey building adjoining the Lazaretto instead of the previous non-official, dwelled and temporal *emin's* residence in the Dubrovnik district, later known and settled as the Jewish quarter of Dubrovnik.<sup>79</sup> Other Ottoman officials sent to Dubrovnik for various reasons stayed in this house as guests of the *emin* for their stay.<sup>80</sup>

When the 17th-century Ottoman traveller Evliya Çelebi visited the city, he stayed in the Lazaretto and described his own experiences and quarantine procedures:

“In this land of infidels, there is a place they call the Lazaretto, where merchants and officials who arrive from India, Yemen, Samarkand, Arabia and Persia; and from Istanbul, from Bosnia and Herzegovina. In other words from all the lands of the world, have to remain in this lazaretto *khan* and are not allowed into the

<sup>76</sup> V. MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *Na Razmeđu*, 117 – 135.

<sup>77</sup> A. BAĆE, I. VIĐEN, *Lazareti na Pločama*, 327 – 328; V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 95; V. MIOVIĆ, *Diplomacija*, 235 – 236; Bruna GAMULIN, *Dubrovačka Republika: Međunarodnopravni Subjektivitet i Diplomatski i Konsularni Odnosi*, *Pravnik*, XLIX/99, Zagreb, 2016., 60 – 61; C. YEMIŞÇI, M. VALJEVAČ, *Türk Esirlerin Kurtarılması*, 97 – 119; M. KÖSE, *Osmanlı-Dubrovnik İlişkileri*, 25 – 29.

<sup>78</sup> When discussing medical examination, we must make a clear difference between examining some sicknesses and curing sicknesses. In general, there was no special examination of some diseases, or it's not very familiar to us, because all travellers from the Ottoman Empire were obliged to spend three to forty days in quarantine. <https://lazaretihub.com/sites/default/files/preuzimanja/2019-08/Monografija%20LAZARETI%20FINAL%2028.11.%20ENG.pdf>

<sup>79</sup> *Emin* did not live in the Jewish quarter. He dwelled in that area before the ghetto was established. V. MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *Na razmeđu*, 31.

<sup>80</sup> V. MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *Emin*, 214.



city in case they are carrying the plague. To observe hidden aspects of their state of health, they stay at this guesthouse, some men for forty days, but at least ten days or seven days or three days for sure. In addition, a military officer with fifty infidel soldiers under his command stands guard over the visitors residing in this Lazaretto. Moreover, suppose they bring merchandise into the city that has not stayed in the Lazaretto for forty days. In that case, they rub vinegar on one end or edge of that merchandise. The infidels take it to sell in the city, so according to their superstitious beliefs, rubbing vinegar on that, merchandise will not transmit the plague into the city, so they claim... On the west side of Dubrovnik Castle... is a many-storeyed building like a rectangular khan with many rooms, a kitchen, stables and quarters for the soldiers. Every night the infidel guards shut the gates on the guests and open them again at dawn. Your humble servant and all our compatriots also stayed in a *khan* near them, and they posted an officer to watch over us. They let us have plenty of food and drink while we stayed in our house, but the watching infidels never let us wander about, and as evening fell, they shot the doors on the *paşa's* officials and us and opened them again in the morning. We had other guards, and they were strange devils."<sup>81</sup>

## TAX LIABILITIES OF OTTOMAN MERCHANTS IN THE REPUBLIC OF DUBROVNIK

### *Customs tax*

Ottoman merchants released from quarantine and allowed into Dubrovnik were responsible for paying customs tax and consular duty. Whether staying temporarily or settling in Dubrovnik, Ottoman merchants were responsible for paying customs duties of three to four percent to the *emin* on merchandise they brought from the Empire or dispatched from the city to Ottoman territory.<sup>82</sup> Even if they settled permanently within the borders of Dubrovnik, they were not eligible for the reduced customs tax rate of two percent, which was a concession only valid for citizens of Dubrovnik, and they were not subject to the Ottoman tax farming system applied in the Republic. Instead, they were obliged to pay customs taxes directly to the Ottoman tax collectors. However, they also had to pay taxes on merchandise passing through the harbour to Dubrovnik officials, who collected these payments. At the same time, the goods were being loaded

<sup>81</sup> E. ÇELEBI, *Seyahatnâme*, VI, 257 – 258.

<sup>82</sup> Customs taxes were charged at three percent for Muslims and four percent for non-Muslims. H. İNALCIK, *Osmanlı'nın Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi*, 317; H. İNALCIK, *Klasik Çağ*, 142; I. BOSTAN, *Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Ticari Münasebetleri*, 17.





onto or unloaded from ships in the port.<sup>83</sup> It shows that the Ottoman merchants were obliged to pay two sets of customs taxes on the goods they imported or exported from the Empire, to both the emin and the Dubrovnik tax collectors. On the other hand, if they intended to export goods only into Dubrovnik from Ottoman territory or import them from Dubrovnik to the Empire, they were liable only for taxes to the emin. If they imported merchandise into Dubrovnik from other countries or exported merchandise from Dubrovnik, they only had to pay customs tax to the Dubrovnik authorities.

A disagreement that occurred in 1623 is an exciting example of a problem caused by a misunderstanding about customs regulations, aroused when Ottoman Greek merchants complained to the *divân* about an increased customs tax they thought the Dubrovnik administration had introduced. The Council sent a *firman* to the Dubrovnik administration asking about the matter.<sup>84</sup> At the same time, the governor of Herzegovina and the kadı of Herceg Novi were charged with investigating it.<sup>85</sup> If these enquiries proved that the complaints were correct and the collection of excessive customs tax from the non-Muslim merchants was accurate, the Dubrovnik authorities would be held responsible for the excess charge and repay the difference.<sup>86</sup> Initially, everyone assumed that the Greek merchants had been correct, and the verdict was that they should compensate for their loss.<sup>87</sup> However, in the next steps of the investigation, envoys from Dubrovnik explained the matter to the *divân*, revealing the proper and correct circumstances. The reason for the higher charge, which merchants wrongly interpreted as an increase in the tax rate, was that when Split Harbour had opened in competition with Dubrovnik in 1592, Dubrovnik responded by halving its customs tax rate in an attempt to preserve its advantage as a commercial port. Much later, the Dubrovnik government cancelled the reduction and restored customs taxes to their former level, giving rise to the complaints above. Almost

<sup>83</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 91.

<sup>84</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 764 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1033/4 – 13 December 1623).

<sup>85</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 765 and a copy of a register: BOA, *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, p. 95/1 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1033/4 – 13 December 1623).

<sup>86</sup> Over the next few months, some Ottoman Greeks who attempted to hold them responsible stopped envoys returning to Dubrovnik from Istanbul. A *firman* sent to the kadıs of Edirne and Sofia states that these envoys had no connection with this case, claiming the mission was complete, they had returned to Dubrovnik, those envoys who would arrive with a later delegation would discuss the case, and commanded that they should be safe and sound and no harm, maltreat and molestation should come to them. DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 774 and the copy of a register: BOA, *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, p. 107/1 (Evâhir-i Zi'l-ka'de 1033/4 – 13 September 1624).

<sup>87</sup> DAD, *DA*, 7/2.1, vol.16, no. 774 and the copy of a register: BOA, *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, p. 107/1 (Evâhir-i Zi'l-ka'de 1033/4 – 13 September 1624).



31 years have passed since the decline's introduction, and merchants who did not know about the actual rate interpreted it as a new increase.<sup>88</sup>

Another example records a deception attempted on an extensive scale and seems to have become accepted as a regular practice to some extent. Ottoman merchants wishing to take advantage of the unique customs rate of two percent charged on merchandise belonging to Dubrovnik citizens would pretend that their goods belonged to Dubrovnik merchants to qualify for the lower rate. In this way, they and the Dubrovnik citizens with whom they agreed to engage in this illicit practice would share the amount they had avoided paying in tax or the profits that resulted. This practice was more common among Western European merchants than Dubrovnik citizens, but Ottoman subjects sometimes engaged in it.<sup>89</sup> This illicit practice was even mentioned in the treaties and even traced back to the reign of Selim I.<sup>90</sup> When they would discover merchandise being out of order or falsely represented in this manner, the whole confiscation would go to the *emin*.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>88</sup> V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 92.

<sup>89</sup> In 1558 attempts by some Ottoman merchants to take advantage of the two percent customs rate by falsely representing their merchandise as belonging to citizens of Dubrovnik and/or pretending that they were trading in goods owned by citizens of Dubrovnik, were discovered by officials and the matter was referred to the capital. For more see: DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.5, no. 212 (21 Cemâziye'l-âhir 965/10 April 1558). For other incidents of the same kind, see: vol.10, no. 486 (23 Zi'ka'de 1008/5 June 1600); vol.11, no. 507, 508 (11 Ramazan 1011/22 February 1603).

<sup>90</sup> This deception was first revealed in 1518. The *emin* discovered that some foreign merchants had collaborated to take advantage of the reduced customs tax rate of two percent, for which only Dubrovnik merchants were eligible, by misrepresenting their merchandise in Pera as belonging to the latter. R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 98. In response an announcement was immediately issued throughout the Ottoman state, including the *emin* at Ploçe, that the reduced rate of two percent for citizens of Dubrovnik had been abolished. But a few months later, due to the intensive efforts of Dubrovnik envoys, the two percent rate was reinstated with the proviso that it should remain at five percent in Istanbul and three percent in Bursa and Edirne. F. DALGAR, Selim I. in Dobrovnik Cumhuriyeti ile Yaptığı Muahede, 412; I. BOSTAN, Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Ticari Münasebetleri, 18 – 19. There is evidence that the same deception continued to be practised from time to time, and it should be kept in mind that probably only a fraction of the culprits were found out, so most cases were unrecorded.

<sup>91</sup> For the clause in the Dubrovnik treaty reading "...the person appointed as *emin* should be on duty behind Dubrovnik gate and collect (customs taxes) at the rate of five per cent for Franks other than these, and it is ruled that if the Franks practice deception and transgression by falsely claiming that the merchandise is theirs so as not to pay customs, and if their deception be proven and uncovered, let their goods be confiscated..." BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 13/1, p. 179/1, hk. 811 – 821 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-evvel 1027/5 – 14 May 1618). The first treaty that includes a clause about this malpractice is the treaty that was renewed following the accession of Süleyman I. V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 14. We can be certain that similar clauses were included in later renewed Dubrovnik treaties that have not survived. This is confirmed by the fact that the treaty issued by Murad III in 1575 includes this clause. N. H. BIEGMAN, *Turco-Ragusan Relationship*, 58.



### Consular Tax

Another tax payable to the Republic's authorities by Ottomans doing business in the city was the consular tax known as *baylac resmi*. The amount of this fee was not fixed but varied according to the type of merchandise. Problems that arose in applying the laws relating to the collection of this tax or abuses that occurred were the subject of several *firman*s sent to Dubrovnik from the Ottoman capital.<sup>92</sup> These documents provide records about problems frequently encountered in tax regulations applied to Ottoman subjects in Dubrovnik and tax collection procedures.

In 1686, some Ottoman merchants refused to pay the consular tax to the Dubrovnik authorities, resulting in a *firman* sent from Istanbul. According to *firman*, the source of this charge, collected annually from Dubrovnik, was revenues from the harbour collected by the Republic. Since adverse behaviour of this kind would reduce these revenues and the Republic's tribute paid to the Empire, this would negatively affect Ottoman finances. Consequently, attempts to avoid paying this tax could not be tolerated and were forbidden.<sup>93</sup> Therefore, by commanding its subject to comply with Dubrovnik laws, the Empire was also endeavouring to ensure that its treasury revenues remained stable.

On the other hand, Ottoman subjects residing permanently in Dubrovnik were exempt from new taxes imposed by the Republic<sup>94</sup> and from Ottoman taxes on its subject. Attempts by the emin and tax farmers in Dubrovnik to collect

The existence of this clause in Dubrovnik treaties that were renewed in the 17th century. BOA., *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, p. 93 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1033/4 – 13 December 1623) and their copies (Evâil-i Zi'l-ka'de 1033/15 – 24 August 1624); BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 14/2, p. 7, hk. 10 and their copies 11 – 12 (Evâil-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1041/27 September – 5 October 1631) and their copies p. 8, hk. 13 – 14 (Evâhir-i Rebi'ü'l-evvel 1044/13 – 22 September 1634), 9 – 10, hk. 16 and their documents hk. 17 – 20 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-âhir 1050/27 September – 5 October 1640); DAD., *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.23, no. 1066 (Evâil-i Ramazan 1059/8 – 17 September 1649); BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 15/3, pp. 6 – 7, hk. 2 – 11 (Evâil-i Receb 1059/11 – 20 July 1649) and one copy hk. 12 (Evâsıt-ı Ramazan 1064/25 July – 3 August 1654), 117 – 119, hk. 171 (Evâhir-i Muharrem 1073/4 – 13 September 1662), 120 – 121, hk. 174 (Evâhir-i Cemâziye'l-evvel 1073/31 December 1662 – 9 January 1663).

<sup>92</sup> DAD., *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.15, no. 706 (undated, reign of Osman II); vol.16, no. 764 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1033/4 – 13 December 1623); vol.16, no. 765 and the copy of a register: BOA., *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, p. 95/1 (Evâsıt-ı Safer 1033/4 – 13 December 1623); vol.33, no. 1329 and record composition: BOA., *Hadariye Defteri (A. DVNS. HADR. d.)*, no. 2, p. 100, hk. 153 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-evvel 1097/5 – 14 April 1686). For more details, see: V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 92.

<sup>93</sup> For Mehmed IV's *firman*, the sultan has written in his hand, "Let my honourable command be carried out accordingly" You can check more on DAD., *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.33, no. 1329 and the copy of a register: BOA., *A. DVNS. HADR. d.*, no. 2, p. 100, hk. 153 (Evâsıt-ı Cemâziye'l-evvel 1097/5 – 14 April 1686).

<sup>94</sup> DAD., *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.15, no. 706 (undated, reign of Osman II). It is also recorded that this law was initially drawn up during the reign of Süleyman I.



taxes of this kind from Ottoman residents prompted two separate *firman*s issued in 1618<sup>95</sup> and 1623.<sup>96</sup> However, some Ottoman subjects were attempting to abuse this legal provision. For example, one method was that when the time for collecting taxes approached, taxpayers would cross the border into Dubrovnik and claim to be permanent residents there. In such situations, Ottoman tax collectors occasionally attempted to collect the unpaid duties from the families of missing individuals or cross the Dubrovnik frontier without permission, an infringement of the Republic's sovereign rights, to find the defaulting taxpayer and demand payment. Lately, on record, they attempted to make the first Dubrovnik citizen who crossed the border pay the tax owed by an Ottoman subject.<sup>97</sup>

### ESTATES OF OTTOMAN SUBJECTS WHO DIED IN DUBROVNIK

The legal situation of property owned by Ottoman merchants who died in Dubrovnik soil was another matter that required regulatory measures. Property owned by those who died in the Republic was delivered to the *emin* for transferral to their heirs later. A *firman* sent to the rulers of Dubrovnik in 1573 commanded that the broadcloth and other goods and property belonging to an Ottoman merchant named Hacı Hamza, who had died in the city, were to be delivered in entirety to Abdürrezzak. He was representative of the family of the deceased so that he could take it to Hacı Hamza's sons Mustafa and İbrahim, his daughter Mahin and her husband, Firduz.<sup>98</sup> A portion of the estate of Hüseyin Çelebi, murdered in Venice in 1575, was in Dubrovnik.<sup>99</sup> In records, we see that the estate of two Ottoman merchants who died in Dubrovnik in 1590 or 1591 (H. 999) consisted principally of bolts of fabric.<sup>100</sup> In addition, in 1722, the widow of an Ottoman Armenian named Hubiyar complained that the confiscation of his property happened by the *emin*. Upon this complaint, a sent command from

<sup>95</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.14, no. 664 and the copy of a register: BOA., *A. DVNS. DVE. d.*, no. 13/1, p. 164, hk. 754 (Evâil-i Cemâziye'l-evvel 1027/26 April – 5 May 1618).

<sup>96</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.15, no. 746 and the copy of a register: BOA, *MAD. d.*, no. 6004, p. 83/1 (Evâsıt-ı Zî'l-hicce 1032/6 – 15 October 1623).

<sup>97</sup> On the view of the Ottoman government that this practice was illegal, see: V. MIOVIĆ-PERIĆ, *Na Razmeđu*, 104 – 106, V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 92.

<sup>98</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.6, no. 294 (Evâil-i Şa'bân 981/26 November – 5 December 1573); Miović, *Spisima I*, p. 97.

<sup>99</sup> The fact that the central part of Hüseyin Çelebi's property was in Venice, and some of the remainders was found in Dubrovnik gives an idea about the route used by this merchant. C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 119.

<sup>100</sup> C. KAFADAR, *Dört Osmanlı*, 116 – 118.



Istanbul to the effect that the emin had to give the estate to the woman as her rightful inheritance.<sup>101</sup>

An extraordinary event that took place in 1592 is an example of how Ottoman central and regional administrators were able to abuse the decision-making system. That year the property left by three Ottoman subjects from Herzegovina who died in Dubrovnik was under regulations left in charge of the emin. The treasurer of Bosnia sent one of his officers to Dubrovnik to collect the property for the provincial treasury. The heirs were enraged, and holding Dubrovnik officials responsible for this, they attempted to stop every Dubrovnik citizen they encountered and force them to pay the money that they thought was equivalent to the value of the estate. These incidents so disrupted law, order, and security that Dubrovnik envoys were obliged to issue passports on six occasions to ensure the safety of travellers to Herzegovina.<sup>102</sup> To prove the legality of their action and overcome the families' objections in Herzegovina, the Bosnian administration requested a *firman* from Istanbul, which confirmed that the action taken complied with the law.<sup>103</sup> Yet this was the first time that such an event had occurred. Examples from the 16th and 18th centuries demonstrate that *firman*s on the subject of the estates of Ottoman subjects who died in Dubrovnik commanded that this property be handed over to the heirs, as mentioned above.

Since the treaty contained no clause about the estates of Ottoman subjects who died in Dubrovnik, the general conclusion was that some mistakes crept in. Still, another possibility that we must consider is that administrations of the Bosnian *eyalet* and *sanjak* of Herzegovina and their supporters in Istanbul had a collective ulterior motive concerning the estates of those three people.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>101</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.36, no. 1422 (Evâil-i Zi'l-hicce 1134/12-21 September 1722).

<sup>102</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.8, no. 395 (10 Zi'l-ka'de 1000/18 August 1592);no. 396 (Evâsıt-ı Zi'l-ka'de 1000/19 – 28 August 1592);no. 397 (Evâhir-i Zi'l-ka'de 1000/29 August – 7 September 1592);no. 398 (24 Zi'l-hicce 1000/1 October 1592);no. 399 (Evâhir-i Muharrem 1001/28 October – 6 November 1592); vol.9, no. 402 (14 Şevval 1001/14 July 1593).

<sup>103</sup> DAD, *DA.*, 7/2.1, vol.10, no. 475 (8 Şa'bân 1007/5 March 1599).

<sup>104</sup> Hasan Paşa, who was serving as the *beylerbey* of Bosnia at the time, and his finance secretary were members of the faction led by Koca Sinan Paşa, to which second vezir İbrahim Paşa also belonged. This faction had designs on some of the rights of the Republic of Dubrovnik that the Ottoman Empire had recently guaranteed. Their first initiative, taken in 1588, was to claim ownership on behalf of the Ottoman treasury to some lands in Dubrovnik that they claimed belonged to the estate of a grandson and last surviving heir of Hersekzâde Ahmed Paşa. Meanwhile, the same faction implemented a plan to establish a *sanjak* in the region of Konavle, which constituted the southern part of the Republic of Dubrovnik and appoint İne-Han, a lower-ranking member of the faction, as bey of the new *sanjak*. This plan worsened when envoys from Dubrovnik complained to the sultan and got support from politicians from the opposing faction in the capital led by Ferhad Paşa. Cihan YEMİŞÇİ, *XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Siyasî İlişkileri*, Marmara University Institute



Although we do not have the probate registers for their estates, they likely had a high total value.

## CONCLUSION

As a port city linking the Balkans to the Adriatic Sea, Dubrovnik was one of the essential entrepôts in the Mediterranean for international transit trade throughout the Mediaeval and Early Modern periods. The city's geographical position also meant that Dubrovnik was a vital hub for business trade along the Dalmatian coast. At the same time, it played a crucial role in overseas commerce for the Ottoman Balkans. As a mid-point in pursuit and trade between Italy and the Balkans, it offered extensive business opportunities for investment by entrepreneurs. Hence, it soon became an extremely attractive lodestone for Ottoman subjects.

Ottomans who came and went to the city for various reasons, mainly relating to commercial activities, not only made short stays but also often became residents of Dubrovnik or lands under the Republic's control. Muslim pilgrims from the region also came to the city to board ships that sailed annually to the Mediterranean port of Alexandria, which was the starting point for one of the land routes to the holy cities. Ottomans in Dubrovnik had legal, commercial and financial responsibilities to both states, which meant there was a need for laws to regulate these responsibilities and relations between individuals.

Treaties were the principal documents that established the legal foundation for relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Dubrovnik Republic. However, we can find that clauses in the treaties concerning relations between individuals were not of sufficient scope. When the treaties lacked clauses able to deal with problems that arose, attempts in practice were made to resolve the situation by issuing *firman*s in specific cases and introducing a series of regulations. For example, how were legal proceedings to be followed when an Ottoman citizen committed an offence or was a party to a lawsuit in Dubrovnik territory? We find solutions to such problems written down in *firman*s, which ruled that in the event of any legal case involving Ottoman subjects, Dubrovnik's

of Turkish Studies, doctoral dissertation, Istanbul, 2017., 117 – 127. According to Biegan, grand vizier Koca Sinan Paşa may have been behind these conspiracies against Dubrovnik. N. H. BIEGMAN, *Turco-Ragusan Relationship*, 61 – 63. V. MIOVIĆ, *Dubrovačka Republika u Spisima*, 66 – 68; R. HARRIS, *Dubrovnik*, 108 – 109. Because of these endeavours, the Bosnian finance minister may have intended to gain possession of the estates of the three Ottoman merchants from Herzegovina who died in Dubrovnik for the state treasury.





law officers were to carry out the necessary investigations and enquiries following the Republic's laws, but the kadı had to participate in the court hearings in Dubrovnik. In later periods, however, a more straightforward practice started to show filing the lawsuit, meaning whereby court procedures would happen, and a representative of the other party would attend the court. When court cases were held in Dubrovnik, officials of the Republic mainly asked for the assistance and cooperation of the customs emin at the Ploče Gate.

Concerning bilateral relations between the Empire and Dubrovnik, the latter had a special status granted by treaties that recognised the city-state's sovereign rights and commanded that Ottoman civil servants had to respect the Republic's borders, lands, laws, administration and citizens. Based on this principle, Ottoman officials could only enter Dubrovnik with the sultan's or the authorities' permission. As far as the documents reveal, Ottoman officials who visited Dubrovnik were principally *çavuşs* or *kapıcıbaşıs* sent as envoys by the central government in Istanbul or regional administrations to carry out inspections or collect taxes; and other officials sent from *Sanjak* or by kadıs in the region. However, some recorded instances of Ottoman civil servants from regional administrations violated this principle by entering Dubrovnik without authorisation.

The only Ottoman to hold an official post in Dubrovnik mentioned in the treaty is the emin, who resided permanently at Ploče Gate. The emin's primary duty was the collection of customs taxes, but in practice, he was also in charge of consular affairs for Ottoman subjects. He was responsible for collecting customs taxes from Ottoman and foreign merchants whose merchandise was imported into or exported from the Ottoman territory. Moreover, he had to ensure merchants paid customs and consular taxes to Dubrovnik's tax collectors per local laws. Ottoman residents in Dubrovnik were not responsible for paying any newly introduced taxes other than those mentioned above.

In the same way, they were exempt from taxes payable by citizens resident on Ottoman soil. However, these privileges did not apply to subjects who stayed only temporarily in Dubrovnik. Ottoman tax collectors could only collect taxes if the government in Istanbul issued a particular command, as in the case, for example, when the *kapıcıbaşı* was authorised to collect the 1% *kassâbiyye* tax at Ploče, which was just outside the city.

In conclusion, Ottoman subjects who were permanent residents or short-term visitors to Dubrovnik caused relatively few problems over the period that both polities existed. Documents show that some crimes, violations and infringements of the law took place, but not frequently enough to base any generalisations on



them. Documents in the Dubrovnik and Ottoman archives reveal that while very few legal cases involving murders by civilians in the city are recorded (not including incidents involving bandits and government employees), one court case arising from a misunderstanding about an increase in customs tax by the Republic, and one incident when residents refused to pay the consular tax are known. Seven separate *firmani* state that Ottomans could not avoid Dubrovnik's right to try Ottoman subjects by claiming they were not Dubrovnik's citizens.

At the same time, due to the Uskok issue and various blood feuds, neither government could satisfactorily prevent attacks from both sides of the border. Moreover, although the number of cases of people crossing the border from the Ottoman Empire into Dubrovnik to flee justice is small, we can be sure that many similar situations will never see them surface in documentation as in these sensitive issues fugitives most likely did their best to hide from the authorities. Similarly, we can assume that attempts to evade customs tax were more numerous than recorded. Mainly local court trials, which included merchants, the principle was not to reciprocate back to the Istanbul authorities. That is why they do not appear in the central archive, making it difficult to track issues of this kind.

The most significant handicap facing this study is the fact that official documents such as *fatwas*, *hüccet*, and *ilam* in the Bosnian archives and the State Archives in Dubrovnik still haven't been wholly classified in Turkish historical literature, making it impossible to study the subject in detail and in all its aspects. Most probably, since this article and topic focused on central authorities and their given orders, it might have missed and not written the attempts of classification which happened and occurred four years ago. This new classification will reveal itself in some other papers. Nonetheless, issues referring to the capital and regional administrations made it possible to identify documents such as *firmani* and *buyruldu*s drawn up to resolve diverse problems, preserved in both archives. Hence, they present the fundamental sources required to discuss the legal issues that form the subject of this study.



## SOURCES AND LITERATURE

### UNPUBLISHED SOURCES:

#### **State Archives in Dubrovnik (HR- DAD):**

*Traduzioni di Capitulazioni e Fermani (TCF):*

*Diplomata et Acta (DA), Acta Turcarum (AT) 7/2.2, Bujuruldije*

*Diplomata et Acta (DA), Acta Turcarum (AT) 7/2.1, Fermani*

#### **Ottoman Archive of Turkish State Archives (BOA):**

*Düvel-i Ecnebiyye Defterleri (A. DVNS. DVE. d.)*

*Maliyeden Müdevver Defter (MAD. d.)*

*Hadariye Defteri (A. DVNS. HADR. d.)*

### PUBLISHED SOURCES:

DALSAR, Fahri, Bursa Şer'i Mahkeme Sicillerine Göre: Selim I.in Dobrovnik Cumhuriyeti ile Yaptığı Muahede, *Tarih Vesikaları*, II/12, İstanbul, 1943.

DIRAGA CANBAZ, Sevda, *15/3 No'lu Dubrovnik Düvel-i Ecnebiyye Defteri (H. 1057-1073 / M. 1647-1663) (İnceleme-Metin)*, Marmara University Institute of Turcic Research (master's degree thesis), İstanbul, 2014.

EVLİYÂ ÇELEBİ b. Derviş Mehemed Zillî, *Evlîya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi, V. Kitap, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 307 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*, trans. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman and İbrahim Sezgin, İstanbul, 2001.

EVLİYÂ ÇELEBİ b. Derviş Mehemed Zillî, *Evlîya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi, VI. Kitap, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan 1457 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*, trans. Seyit Ali Kahraman and Yücel Dağlı, İstanbul, 2002.

KÖKER, Özgecan, *XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Devleti-Dubrovnik İlişkileri ve Hicri 1037-1056/1627-1646 Tarihli Ahkâm Defteri Transkripsiyon ve Değerlendirmesi*, Celal Bayar University Enstitute of Social Science (master's degree thesis), Manisa 2011.

*Liber Statutorum Ragusii Compositus anno MCCLXXII / Statut Grada Dubrovnika Sastavljen Godine 1272*, ed. Ante Šoljić, Zdravko Šundrica, Ivo Veselić, State Archives in Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik, 2002.

ŞABANOVIÇ, Hazım, Dubrovnik Devlet Arşivindeki Türk Vesikaları, trans. İsmail Eren, *Belleten*, XXX/119, Ankara, 1966.

TRUHELKA, Ciro, Dubrovnik Arşivi'nde Türk-İslav Vesikaları, *İstanbul Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1, İstanbul, 1956.



## LITERATURE:

- BABINGER, Franz, Ragusa, *İslam Ansiklopedisi (İA)*, IX, MEB, Eskişehir, 2001., 598 – 601.
- BABINGER, Franz, *Fatih Sultan Mehmed ve Zamani*, trans. Dost Körpe, İstanbul, 2002 (8th edition).
- BAĆE, Antun, VIDEN, Ivan, Lazareti na Pločama od pada Dubrovačke Republike do danas (1808. – 2013.), *Prostor*, 21, Zagreb, 2013., 2 (46), 327 – 339.
- BERTOŠA, Slaven, Nastanjenici i Prolaznici Iz Dubrovačke Republike, Boke Kotorske i Mletačke Albanije u Puli (17. – 19. Stoljeće), *Anali Dubrovnik*, 41, Dubrovnik, 2003, 157 – 174.
- BIEGMAN, Nicolaas H., *The Turco-Ragusan Relationship according to the Firmans of Murad III (1575-1595) extant in the State Archives of Dubrovnik*, The Hague-Paris, 1967.
- BOSTAN, Idris, Ahitnamelere ve Uygulamalara Göre Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Ticarî Münasebetleri, 15 – 16. Yüzyıllar, *Beylikten İmparatorluğa Osmanlı Denizciliği*, Kitap Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007. (2nd edition), 249 – 259.
- BOSTAN, Idris, Ahidnâmelere ve Uygulamalara Göre Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Ticarî Münasebetleri (XV-XVI. Yüzyıllar), *Prof. Dr. Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu'na Armağan*, İstanbul, 2006., 79 – 87.
- BOŽIĆ, Ivan, *Dubrovnik i Turska u XIV. i XV. Veku*, Srpska Akademija Nauka, Belgrade, 1952.
- BOZKURT, Nebi Eman, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (TDVİA)*, XI, İstanbul, 1995., 75 – 77
- BRACEWELL, Catherine Wendy, *16. Yüzyılda Adriyatik'te Korsanlık ve Eşkiryalık, Senjli Uskoklar*, çev. Mehmet Moralı, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009., 239.
- CARTER, Frank W., The Political Geography of the Dubrovnik Republic, *Acta Geographica Croatica*, 29, Zagreb, 1994., 77 – 98
- CARTER, Frank W., The Commerce of the Dubrovnik Republic, 1500-1700, *The Economic History Review*, New Series, XXIV/3, August 1971., 370 – 394.
- ÇETİN, Cemal, *Sultanın Esirleri, İstanbul'da Bir Esir Kampı (1715)*, Konya, 2015.
- EKİN, Ümit, Seyahatnamelerin Işığında Osmanlı Toplumunda Köleler, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kölelik: Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*, eds. Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı, Fırat Yaşa and Dilek İnan, İstanbul, 2017., 187 – 208.
- FORETIĆ, Vinko, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808*, sv. I, Ljubljana, 1980.
- GAMULIN, Bruna, Dubrovačka Republika: Međunarodnopravni Subjektivitet i Diplomatski i Konsularni Odnosi, *Pravnik*, XLIX/99, Zagreb, 2016., 57 – 76.



- GLAVINA, Mladen, *17. Yüzyıl Bařında Osmanlı İmparatorluęu ile Dubrovnik Cumhuriyeti İliřkileri*, Hacettepe University Enstitute of Social Science (master's degree thesis), Ankara, 2009.
- HARRIS, Robin, *Dubrovnik: A History*, SAQI, London, 2003.
- ILKIĆ, Mato, TOPIĆ, Nikolina, Dubrovački Nalazi Seldžučkog, Ilkhanidskog i Mamelučkog Novca, *Anali Dubrovnik*, 51/1, Dubrovnik, 2013., 1 – 16.
- INALCIK, Halil, *Osmanlı İmparatorluęu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi, 1300-1600*, I, çev. Halil Berktaş, Eren Yayınları, İstanbul, 2004. (8th edition).
- INALCIK, Halil, *Osmanlı İmparatorluęu, Klasik Çaę (1300-1600)*, trans. Ruřen Sezer, İstanbul, 2006. (7th edition).
- IPŐIRLI, Mehmet, Eman, Osmanlı Dönemi, *TVDİA*, XI, İstanbul, 1995., 77 – 79.
- KAÇAN, Meryem, *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı-Venedik Ahidnâmeleri*, Marmara University Enstitute of Social Science (master's degree thesis), İstanbul, 1995.
- KÖSE, Metin Ziya, *Osmanlı Devleti ve Dubrovnik İliřkileri, 1500-1600, Doęu Akdeniz'de Casuslar ve Tacirler*, İstanbul, 2009.
- KÖSE, Metin Ziya, Osmanlı Balkanı'nda Kara Ticareti ve Rekabet: Rumeli'de Dubrovnik Tüccarları (1600-1630), *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16, Pamukkale, 2013., 41 – 58.
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, The Role of Jews in Dubrovnik (Thirteenth-Sixteenth Centuries), *Viator*, 4, Los Angeles, 1973., 257 – 271.
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, Contributions of Foreigners to Dubrovnik's Economic Growth in the Late Middle Ages, *Symposium of Urban Societies in the Mediterranean World*, *Viator*, 9, Los Angeles, 1976., 375 – 394.
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, Four Florentine Commercial Companies in Dubrovnik (Ragusa) in the First Half of Thirteenth Century, *The Medieval City*, ed. H. A. Miskimin, D. Herlihy, A. L. Udovitch, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1977., 25 – 41.
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, Venetian Merchants in the Balkan Hinterland in the Fourteenth Century, *Wirtschaftskraefte und Wirtschaftswege, Vol. I: Mittelmeer und Kontinent; Festschrift für Hermann Kellenbenz*, *Beitrage zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 4, Nuremberg, 1978., 257 – 271.
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, Italian Creditors in Dubrovnik (Ragusa) and the Balkan Trade, Thirteenth and through Fifteenth Centuries, *The Dawn of Modern Banking*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1979., 257 – 271.
- KREKIĆ, Bariša, *The Role of Jews in Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik, Italy, and the Balkans in the Late Middle Ages*, London, 1980.
- KÜTÜKOęLU, Mübahat S., Ahidnâme, *TDVİA*, I, İstanbul, 1988., 536 – 540.



- LIGORIO, Benedetto, *Le reti ecomiche e sociali degli ebrei nell Repubblica di Ragusa e la diaspora commerciale sefardita (1546-1667)*, doctoral thesis, Sapienza – Univeristà di Roma, 2017.
- MACDONALD, D. B., *Dârussulh, İA.*, III, MEB., Istanbul, 1979., 490 – 491.
- MIOVIĆ-PERICĆ, Vesna, *Na Razmeđu, Osmansko-Dubrovačka Granica (1667-1806)*, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, Dubrovnik, 1997.
- MIOVIĆ-PERICĆ, Vesna, Emin na Pločama kao Predstavnik Osmanlija na području Dubrovačke Republike, *Anali Dubrovnik*, 37, Dubrovnik, 1999., 205 – 215.
- MIOVIĆ, Vesna, *Dubrovačka Diplomacija u Istanbulu*, Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti (HAZU), Zavod za povijesne znanosti u Dubrovniku, Zagreb – Dubrovnik, 2003.
- MIOVIĆ, Vesna, *Dubrovačka Republika u spisima osmanskih sultana: s analitičkim inventarom sultanskih spisa serije Acta Turcarum Državnog arhiva u Dubrovniku*, Državni arhiv u Dubrovniku, Dubrovnik, 2005.
- ÖNAL, Ahmet, XVI. Yüzyılda Avrupa'daki Osmanlı Esirlerin Kurtarılması Meselesine Dair Bazı Gözlemler, *Türkiye-Almanya Araştırmaları Dergisi*, IV/1-2, Istanbul, 2015., 39 – 56.
- ÖZEL, Ahmet, *Dârulislam, Dârulharb, İslâm Hukukunda Ülke Kavramı*, İz Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1991.
- ÖZEL, Ahmet, *Dârülharp, TDVİA*, VIII, Istanbul, 1993., 536 – 537.
- ÖZEL, Ahmet, *Dârülislâm, TDVİA*, VIII, Istanbul, 1993., 541 – 543.
- ÖZEL, Ahmet, *Dârüssulh, TDVİA.*, IX, Istanbul, 1994., 5 – 6.
- ÖZTÜRK, Yücel, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Köle Emeginin Rolü ve Hacmi, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kölelik: Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*, eds. Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı, Fırat Yaşa, Dilek Inan, Istanbul, 2017., 31 – 56.
- PEDANI, Maria Pia, Erken Modern Dönemde Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Venedikli Köleler, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kölelik: Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*, eds. Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı, Fırat Yaşa and Dilek Inan, Istanbul, 2017., 117 – 136.
- POPOVIĆ, Toma, *Turska i Dubrovnik u XVI veku*, Srpska Književna Zadruga, Belgrad, 1973.
- ŠUNDRICA, Zdravko, Poisons and Poisoning in the Republic of Dubrovnik, *Dubrovnik Annals*, 4, Dubrovnik, 2000., 7 – 79.
- TANERI, Aydın, Türk Tarihinde “Eman” Kurumu, *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, XVII/25, Ankara, 1995., 165 – 172.
- TURAN, Şerafettin, Venedik'te Türk Ticaret Merkezi (Fondaco dei Turchi), *Bellekten*, XXXII/126, Ankara, 1968., 247 – 283.
- TURAN, Şerafettin, Dubrovnik, *TDVİA*, IX, Istanbul, 1994, 542 – 544.





- ULUSKAN, Murat, *Divân-ı Hümayun Çavuşları*, Marmara University Institute of Turkic Research (doctorate's degree thesis), Istanbul, 2004.
- WEIR, T. H., *Dârülharb, IA.*, III, MEB., Eskişehir, 2001., 492.
- WEIR, T. H., *Dârülislâm, IA.*, III, MEB., Eskişehir, 2001., 492.
- YAĞCI, Zübeyde Güneş, Istanbul Esir Pazarı, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kölelik: Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*, eds. Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı, Fırat Yaşa, Dilek Inan, Istanbul, 2017., 57 – 90.
- YAĞCI, Zübeyde Güneş, ATAŞ, Emre, Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kaçak Köleler: Abd-ı Abık, *Osmanlı Devletinde Kölelik: Ticaret, Esaret, Yaşam*, eds. Zübeyde Güneş Yağcı, Fırat Yaşa, Dilek Inan, Istanbul, 2017., 297 – 324.
- YEMIŞÇI, Cihan, *XVII.Yüzyılda Osmanlı-Dubrovnik Siyasî İlişkileri*, Marmara University Institute of Turkic Research (doctorate's degree thesis), Istanbul, 2017.
- YEMIŞÇI, Cihan, Valjevac, Muhamed, Türk Esirlerin Kurtarılması ve Mübadelesinde Bir Merkez Olarak Dubrovnik ve 1575 ile 1592 Yıllarındaki Esir Mübadeleleri, *Uluslararası Türk Savaş Esirleri Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı*, eds. Okan Yeşilot, Yüksel Çelik, Leyla Coşan, Ali Satan, Istanbul, 2018., 95 – 134.
- YEMIŞÇI, Cihan, XVI ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda Gabela Tuz Pazarı ile Bosna ve Hersek'in Tuz İhtiyacının Karşılanması, *Pazar Kitabı*, Istanbul, 2020., 169 – 222.
- ZINKEISEN, Johann Wilhelm, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, II (1299-1453), eds. Erhan Afyoncu, trans. Nilüfer Epçeli, Istanbul, 2011.
- ZLATAR, Zdenko, Dubrovnik and Ottoman Balkans (1430-1808), *Türk Tarihinde Balkanlar, Balkans in the Turkish History*, vol. I, eds. Zeynep Iskefiyeli, M. Bilal Çelik, Serkan Yazıcı, Sakarya, Üniversitesi Balkan Araştırmaları Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi, Sakarya, 2013., 475 – 512.



Cihan YEMIŞÇI

## ZAKONODAVSTVO PRIMJENJIVANO NA OSMANSKE PODANIKE U DUBROVAČKOJ REPUBLICI U KLASIČNOM RAZDOBLJU

### SAŽETAK

Dubrovačka Republika bila je tributarni grad-država Osmanskog Carstva s posebnim statusom bliskim autonomiji. Stanovnici obiju država vodili su svoje političke, društvene i gospodarske poslove pod pravnim kišobranima ugovora i posebnih edikata. Poput Dubrovčana, osmanski su građani posjećivali mjesta gdje su se odvijale te aktivnosti ili su se tamo stalno nastanjivali. Institucija kojoj su se osmanski građani i Republika mogli obratiti za rješavanje pitanja u međusobnim odnosima bila je kancelarija emina, koju je namjesnik Bosne imenovao da nadzire trgovinu solju i carinske formalnosti. Budući da Osmanlije u to vrijeme nisu imali konzulat u Dubrovniku, emin je po pravilu preuzimao dužnosti osmanskog konzula u gradu. U Osmanskom i Dubrovačkom državnom arhivu zabilježene su razmirice između dubrovačkih i osmanskih podanika kao i pitanja koja se odnose na njihove pravne statute i odgovornosti. Ova se studija temelji na takvim i sličnim dokumentima.

**Ključne riječi:** Dubrovačka Republika, Osmansko Carstvo, bosanski beglerbeg, hercegovački sandžakbeg, pravna povijest, međunarodno pravo.