

DAVOR DUKIĆ  
Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

## CONTEMPORARY WARS IN THE DALMATIAN LITERARY CULTURE OF THE 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES

Commencing from the cultural dichotomy between rural hinterland (Morlach) and urban coastal (Romano-Slavic) Dalmatia, the author studies the similarities and diversities in the accounts of the then-contemporary Venetian-Turkish wars in the works of Dalmatian writers of the 17th and 18th centuries. The analysed corpus of texts is made up of: chronicles of the Makarska Franciscans (P. Šilobadović, N. Gojak, P. Antulović); F. Divnić's historical account of the Candian War in Dalmatia; and works by J. Kavanjin, F. Grabovac and A. Kačić Miošić. The analysis focuses on: the mechanisms used in explanation and contextualisation of the wars in Dalmatia; evaluations of border area war strategy (pillaging and enslavement); the conception of the enemy and inter-Christian divisions (confessional, social, and the like). Finally, the accounts of war in the texts in question (narrative sources) are compared with published archive sources.

Keywords: Croatian literature of 17th and 18th centuries, war, the Other, borders, Morlachs, Venetians, Dalmatia

### I. Sources

The Ottoman Empire expanded during the 15th century to the coast of the eastern Adriatic, and achieved its maximum in that region at the end of the War of Cyprus (1571-1573).<sup>1</sup> A period of some seventy years of relative peace then ensued, followed by an equally long period of disturbances with three Venetian-Turkish wars: the Candian War, or the War for Crete

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1499, the Ottomans overran the Makarska Littoral; Knin and Skradin in 1521; Ostrovica in 1523; Sinj in 1524; Obrovac in 1527; Klis in 1537; Nadin and Vrana in 1538; and Zemunik in 1571. At the mid-16th century, the conquered regions in Dalmatia belonged to two *sandžaks* (military and administrative units): the Lika Sandžak (Kotari and Bukovica) and the Klis Sandžak (south of the River Krka).

(1645-1669); the Morean (or Vienna) War (1684-1699), and the Second Morean War (1714-1718). In each of these wars, the Republic of Venice managed to force back the Ottomans from Dalmatian territory, so that seven decades before its fall (in 1797) it crossed the borders dating from the time before 1500.<sup>2</sup>

This article shall present the results of efforts made to research the echoes of the three 17th and 18th century wars mentioned in the Dalmatian literary culture of that time. It is no secret that in the early Modern Age, and particularly during the 17th and 18th centuries – applying the criteria of genre and thematic diversity, with Italian literary models in mind – literature in Venetian Dalmatia lagged far behind that of Dubrovnik. It would be futile, for example, to seek the echoes of the Candian War in then-contemporary Dalmatia in drama, political poetry and epic poems, since such literary output was almost non-existent. Religious literature prevailed in the period under consideration while secular content, such as the contemporary wars and other political events, barely penetrated into it.<sup>3</sup> Such themes were found primarily in historiographic texts such as the chronicles of the Makarska Franciscan friars or the somewhat more ambitiously written history of the Candian War in Dalmatia, by the Šibenik historian Franjo Divnić. Interest in secular history and then-contemporary politics was also expressed in *Povijest vandelska* [An Evangelical Tale], a completely singular work by the Split writer, Jerolim Kavanjin, and in two books that literary history largely regards as being the most significant accomplishments of 18th century Dalmatian literature: Filip Grabavac's *Cvit razgovora* [The Flower of Conversation] (1947) and *Razgovor ugodni* [The Pleasant Conversation] (1756, 1759) by Andrija Kačić Miošić. That closes the circle of so-called narrative sources connected with the theme of this article. On the other hand, there still remain the historical archive sources. The pertinent sources frequently consist of official reports by Venetian officials stationed in Dalmatia. Unlike the narrative sources in the narrower sense, they provide an *outsider* view of sorts, since the reports were largely compiled by Italian military men and civil servants, for whom Dalmatia was just one the many posts they held in the course of their careers. Since these texts often conflict in content with domestic historiographic prose, their inclusion in

---

<sup>2</sup> With the peace treaty after the Candian War, the Venetians gained Klis, captured earlier in 1648, and several villages around Zadar and Šibenik. Even before the official beginning of the Morean War in 1684, the Ottomans had lost Obrovac, Ostrovica, Benkovac, Drniš and Skradin; the Venetians captured Sinj in 1686, and Knin and Vrlika in 1688. The captured areas were confirmed as being Venetian by the peace treaty of 1699. During the Second Morean War, the Venetians captured Imotski in 1717 and by this expansion of their territory, confirmed by the Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718, they attained their territorial maximum in Dalmatia.

<sup>3</sup> Apart from in the analysed works, the themes of important political and historical events also appear in 17th century Dalmatian literature in *Vila Slovinka* (1614) by Juraj Baraković (the Turkish siege of Zadar during the War of Cyprus) and in *Osmanščica* (1613) by Ivan Tomko Mrnavić (a tragedy based on the fall of Sultan Osman II).

this discussion and their comparison with "literary material" imposes itself as a matter of course.

## II. Starting point: The two Dalmatias

The contrariety between coastal and hinterland Dalmatia has been a long-term culturological phenomenon and it continues to be present in a particular way in the awareness of contemporary inhabitants of that Croatian region. Precepts concerning two diverse mentalities are linked with neutral value-judgement geographical notions: one, patriarchal and rural based largely on Slavic oral popular tradition (customary law, folklore, use of the Štokavian linguistic base), the other, Mediterranean and urban (communal social organisation, Slavic-Romanic-Latin multilingualism, a written literary tradition). This contrast in essence is basically older than the period we are observing; it is sufficient to recall the situation in Mediaeval times: on the one hand, the coastal world of Byzantine cities as the heirs to the Roman provincial culture of Antiquity, on the other, the hinterland rural world of the Slavic Mediaeval states. The structural difference had not changed to any extent by the early Modern Age; except for the fact that the Venetian Republic and the Ottoman Empire had, in the meantime, become the masters of two Dalmatian areas. During the three wars against the Ottomans in the 17th and 18th centuries, Venice was to become the ruler of the entire region of today's Dalmatia – with the exception of the Dubrovnik Republic – that is, of both culturally differing Dalmatian areas. In the official Venetian nomenclature of that time, these areas were given new appellations: a) *acquisto vecchio* (the old acquired territory) for the narrow coastal strip between the Rivesr Zrmanja and Cetina, with the pertaining islands; 2) *acquisto nuovo* (newly acquired territory, the territorial expansion up until 1699), and *acquisto nuovissimo* (the most newly acquired territory, expansion to which was confirmed in 1718) for the regions that the Venetian Republic had wrenched from the Ottomans during the three wars, that is, Dalmatian *Zagora*, the Makarska Littoral and the Neretva River area (Grabavac 1986:15).<sup>4</sup>

If one proceeds from the culturological assumption of the two Dalmatias, what questions should one ask in analysing the material?

### 1. The breadth of the view of the wars

All three Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia during the 17th and 18th centuries were hostilities unfolding on marginal battlegrounds; the main military operations always took place far from Dalmatia: in the eastern

---

<sup>4</sup> In the dichotomy set in this way, the Makarska Littoral has the characteristics of a certain interspace and/or meeting point of Romanic and Balkan-Oriental influences, which can be detected both in the language and literature of that region during the period in question. However, that is a theme not covered by the framework of this paper.

Mediterranean and the Peloponnesus. Consequently, one should ask: were the Dalmatian writers aware of the entreties of the wars they were writing about and did they try to fathom their causes?

## **2. The character of wars on the borders**

With the exception of several sieges of the larger towns and major fortresses, the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia were largely reduced to sacking and looting in the border areas: to individual and frequently uncoordinated forays by smallish armed groups with the objective of the enslavement of people and seizing of livestock, and the burning of the settlements on the other side of the border.<sup>5</sup> The Venetians tried to win over to their side the Christian population from the Ottoman region and to utilise them in war against their erstwhile neighbours. Moreover, those who crossed sides were often forced to burn their own old villages so as to make impossible any prospect of returning to them (Kečkemet 1986:49; similarly, Stanojević 1962:116 ff.). It is interesting to see whether the Dalmatian writers mention this hardly humane Venetian strategy of conquest. At the same time, because of the mentioned character of war along the border, one should ask: how did the Dalmatian writers evaluate this plunder of the border areas? Did they regard this manner of waging war as: a heroic feat, permissible military strategy, or, purely and simply, as armed robbery?

## **3. The stance towards the Other**

The participants in the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia were border dwellers, a mostly stock-raising population, whom contemporaries and contemporary sources call Vlachs/Wallachs, and/or Morlachs.<sup>6</sup> It will be interesting to see how the writers from the Venetian cities regarded them. Owing to the fact that the Dalmatian participants in the wars being considered here usually fought on the same side, they were, as has already been pointed out, representatives of the two Dalmatian worlds.

The Vlach/Morlach population of the Dalmatian hinterland and Herzegovina who defected to the Venetian side, as well as those who remained on Turkish land, were of either the Roman Catholic or Christian Orthodox faith. Did confessional differences play any role at all in the stance of the Catholic writers from both the Dalmatias? Are there any

---

<sup>5</sup> More extensive military operations certainly include: the Ottoman siege of Šibenik in 1647; of Split in 1657; and of Sinj in 1715; as well as the Venetian capture of Klis in 1648, Sinj in 1686, and Knin in 1688.

<sup>6</sup> Vlachs/Wallachs (Ital. *Morlacchi*) from the Lat. *Morovlacchi*, or Black Vlachs; this was the ethnonym by which the Venetians designated the Turkish Christian subjects, who had lived outside Venetian territory until the Candian War.

traces of religious hatred or the proclamation of religious tolerance in their texts?

Finally, the range of possible attitudes towards the Muslim enemy could have been a very broad one: from tolerance to Satanisation. In keeping the customary prejudices about the two Dalmatias, one would expect a more emphasised tolerance towards Others in the texts of writers from the Venetian communes. If for no other reason, this could be anticipated because of the reasonable assumption that the foreign policy of the Venetian Republic was probably more or less acceptable to the eminent inhabitants of the Dalmatian cities. That foreign policy was motivated by the economic interests of the Republic and was already very far from the Crusader ideology of Holy War and the Bulwark of Christianity myth by the very beginning of the early Modern Age. By dividing up spheres of interest and trade in the Mediterranean, the Venetians and the Ottomans, notwithstanding their frequent squabbles and occasional wars, did manage to find modes of neighbourly reciprocity. The Split harbour (*skela*) for trade with the Ottoman Empire, set up in 1592, can be considered a metonym for cultural interaction. However, it should also be said that the patrician class in the Dalmatian communes was not always unanimous in its acceptance of Venetian policy towards the Ottomans. The best illustration of that opposition was the short-lived capture of the Klis Fortress in 1596, organised on behalf of the Hapsburg Monarch by the Split nobleman, Ivan Alberti, and boycotted by official Venice (Novak 2001:154-155).

### **III. Divnić and Šilobadović: Two opposing views on one and the same subject**

The historian Franjo Divnić (Difnik 1607-1672)<sup>7</sup> was a descendant of an old and eminent Šibenik family. Juraj Divnić (c. 1450-1530) had been Bishop of Nin and wrote the anti-Ottoman epistle to Pope Alexander VI (1493), a personage who appears towards the end of Petar Zoranić's *Planine* [The Mountains], and the poet Petar Divnić (c. 1525-c. 1600), the author of the poem *U pohvalu grada Šibenika* [In Praise of the City of Šibenik], were among the better-known forebears of the Šibenik historian. Franjo Divnić completed the study of canon and civil law at the Venetian University in Padua, and, returning to Šibenik, conducted various legal affairs there, and also engaging in archaeology. He probably remained a bachelor, devoting himself fully to his profession, Humanistic education and historiography (Kečkemet 1986:22).

Almost nothing is known about the family origins and education of Pavao Šilobadović, it simply being assumed that he came from the

---

<sup>7</sup> The editor of the Croatian translation of Divnić's book, Duško Kečkemet, uses the form "Difnik"; however, because of well-established practice, which, incidentally, also includes the form of the name among the historian's nearest kinfolk, here I am using the Croaticised form, "Divnić". The Italian form of the same surname is "Difnico".

Makarska Littoral. He lived in the Makarska Franciscan Monastery, and served as a priest in the nearby villages of Tučepi, Makar, Veliko Brdo and Bast. From 1669 until 1681, he was the parish priest in Sumartin on the Island of Brač. He then returned to Makarska, where he died in 1686 (Soldo 1993:15).

Divnić wrote *Povijest Kandijskog rata u Dalmaciji* [The History of the Candian War in Dalmatia], a highly ambitious historiographic work written in the Italian language.<sup>8</sup> The Šibenik historian's intention was to publish at the end of the war a synthetic work in the form of a chronicle, showing all the most significant wartime events in Dalmatia along with the negotiations about border demarcation. Thus, the book was intended to have a place, side by side, with the most highly regarded contemporary histories of the Candian War (Girolamo Brusoni, *Historia dell'ultima guerra tra Veneziani e Turchi*, Venice 1673; A.Valiero, *Historia della guerra di Candia*, Venice 1679); admittedly, unlike the foregoing, it was oriented to only a less important field of battle. However, death prevented Divnić from preparing the text for publication. He bequeathed this task in his will to his brother Danijel, who had taken an active part in some of the most important events of the war and in the demarcation negotiations, so that it is assumed that he wrote the closing parts of the book. The text was perused and corrected by the leading Croatian historian of the early Modern Age, Ivan Lučić, otherwise a Divnić kinsman. So, accord to the historiographic criteria of the time, the final version of the book attained a high professional level, even though it was not published.

Šilobadović's chronicle has a completely different genre-defined status. It was an unpretentious chronicle of monastic origin, intended for "internal reading", and was written in the Croatian language using the *Bosančica*, that is, Bosnian, Cyrillic script. However, neither Šilobadović, nor those who worked later on the text, of whom we will hear more, showed much interest in monastery life, but were instead largely oriented to the secular events that took place in their native area, more precisely, to the wartime events on the Venetian-Turkish border. Therefore, it is appropriate to compare Šilobadović's text with Divnić's.

It seems that everything that has been said above about these two authors and their works shows that they did, indeed, represent the two Dalmatias. The contrast between them is evident in the language and style selections of the two authors; on the one hand, the language and style of learned Italian historiography, and on the other, the vernacular of the Makarska Littoral with a sprinkling of Latin phrases and, if Josip Ante Soldo's transliteration is anything to go by, by a host of writing mistakes. For this reason, and also because of the lack of information on the level of

---

<sup>8</sup> The original title reads as follows: *Dell' Historie di Dalmatia (...) Durante La Guerra Cretense Sino alla Separatione delli Confini*. Preparing the book for print, Ivan Lučić changed the title into *Historia della guerra di Dalmatia tra Venetiani e Turchi (...) dall'anno 1645 sino alla pace e separatione de Confini*.

Šilobadović's education, it is reasonable to assume that it was not particularly high, at least as far as can be seen from his chronicle.

However, what is the position regarding the content and underlying idea of the two works? Will one also find here confirmation of the assumptions presented above about the two Dalmatias?

After a brief introduction on the penetration into Europe by the Ottomans, elaborated by the well-known stereotype about Christian divisiveness, Divnić's *Historia* encompasses the period from 1645 until 1671, or, in other words, the entire duration of the Candian War, including its most immediate cause, and the peace negotiations conducted between 1669 and 1671. For his part, Šilobadović noted in his chronicle events that took place between 1662 and 1686, that is, the final part of the Candian War, the fifteen-year period of peace, and the beginning of the Morean War. Thus, the two texts coincide in only nine of the years they describe. However, further quantitative information shows that this co-incidence is, in fact, even briefer. Namely, Divnić dedicated some 9% of his text to the 1662 to 1669 period, and the 1669 to 1671 demarcation negotiations were given around 15% of the total text. For Šilobadović, the last 7 years of the Candian war were the backbone of his chronicle (some 70% of the text). He was obviously not well-informed about the demarcation negotiations, and provides only brief information on the Makarska Littoral being awarded to the Ottoman Empire. Disappointed with the Doge's indulgence towards the Ottomans, Šilobadović concluded: "And we are left like fish when the tide goes out" (Soldo 1993:47-48).

Nor did Šilobadović show much interest in the period of peace between 1671 and 1684; he did not note any event between 1672 and 1677, while the total space devoted to the period mentioned in his chronicle was only about 5%. The remaining 25% of the text was given over once again to the first two years of the Morean War. This quantitative data points directly to the difference in the attitudes of the two writers towards the events of war. In other words, the most significant wartime events from the Venetian point of view, which were also their greatest military successes in the Dalmatian theatre of war, took place in the first war years (breaking the Turkish siege of Šibenik, temporarily taking Skradin in 1647 and Drniš in 1648, and the final capture the Klis Fortress in 1648). Thus, Divnić devoted almost half of his *Historia* to the first three years of the war. The remaining, greater part of the war was largely characterised by small border skirmishes to which Divnić did not pay much attention. However, they were the focal theme of Šilobadović's chronicle. His view was locally oriented to such an extent that he did not even mention Candia (Crete), nor spoke of the causes of the war or the events that occurred on the frontlines, nor of the events in some more distant parts of the Dalmatian war theatre. It is as though he was not aware that what he was describing was only a marginal echo of the great conflict between the Mediterranean powers.

It is not necessary, of course, to stress particularly that Divnić's *Historia* did not suffer at all from local constraints: the book shows the causes of the wars, the events on the main battlefields and the course of the peace talks. It has already been pointed out that Divnić was not excessively concerned about the minor border conflicts; he was primarily interested in the fate of the larger towns and the more important fortresses fought over by the two armies. In contrast, Šilobadović noted each and every military plunder-oriented raid that took place in the border region that was his home territory, providing the following information in each case: the names of the leaders of the Christian companies (the *Harambaša*) and the number of soldiers under their command, the number of captured or fallen Turks, the number of livestock stolen, and the number of wounded and fallen Christians. Šilobadović showed his elation at the Christian successes with expressions like *Amen, f.[ala]B.[ogu]*, [Thank the Lord], and *tako budi* [Let it be so], with which he ended the accounts of individual events, and he expressed his positive stance towards warfare of this type with formulae such as *tako se vojuje* [*That is the way that war is waged*], which on occasion also accompanied even the Turkish successes (for example, Soldo 1993:36, 52).

However, not even once does Šilobadović speak of such forays – particularly the ones in which the defectors pillaged their former home territory – as being part of planned Venetian strategy. On the other hand, Divnić makes no attempt to hide this fact:

After visiting the cities of Makarska, Split and Trogir, the army retreats to Zadar, where *Proveditore* [the chief Venetian administrator] Prosedarski sends them out again with a strong company of Morlachs to rob enemy land, so that, imbruing their hands with Turkish blood, they lose all hope of ever returning to their homes (Divnić 1986:137, similarly, 163).

Both Divnić and Šilobadović directly legitimise their affiliation with one of the conflicting camps by use of the pronoun in the first person plural. However, that "We" in Divnić's case refers to the Venetian Army and Venetian authority, while in Šilobadović's text it refers to the Christians of the Makarska Littoral.

Differences continue in their description of the *Other*. Šilobadović used the term *Vlah* in only two places, giving no detailed definition of its meaning. Only the context indicates that this is a reference to the livestock-rearing population of the Dalmatian hinterland (Soldo 1993:25, 41). However, Divnić clearly defines the notion:

The Vlachs (the Morlachs) are shepherds who inhabit the mountains of Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia, and who, moving down from the mountains into the lowlands after 1300, started to till the soil, later spreading even as far as across the border of Dalmatia. They are called *Vlahi* or *Vlasi* in the Slavic language and, since they descend from those who are called



*Morovlahi* in Bulgaria, that is *Crni*, or Black, *Vlasi*, the Italians have corrupted their name into *Morlacchi/Morlachs* (Divnić 1986:128).

Divnić was always consistent in differentiating the Morlach component within the Venetian military forces, sometimes expressing a negative and derisive stance towards it:

When they had received it (money and bread, D. D.), arriving in Omiš, they started to eat and drink *in keeping with their customs* (Italics, D. D.) and, befuddled by the wine, they fought among themselves, and only after several of them were dead or wounded, did the altercation abate (Divnić 1986:224).

From his communal aspect, Divnić did not emphasise the inter-Christian confessional diversities. It seems that in Šilobadović's writing, too, the term "Christian" unified Roman Catholics and Orthodox Christians. Still, he does mention in one place that there was an "Schismatic" among the prisoners brought in by the Christians (Soldo 1993:50), and in another, "two male Old Vlachs" (ibid.:44), which could also be a reference to Orthodox Christians. However, it is important to note that the Catholic/Orthodox contrariety is not burdened with value judgements in either text.

There are greater differences in relation towards the Ottoman enemy and/or to the Muslims on the other side of the border. Šilobadović always designates them with a completely neutral term, *Turks*, while Divnić often uses the negatively judgmental attribute, *Barbarians*. There is no evaluation of the Turkish camp in Šilobadović's work even at higher textual levels; the only exception being the pointed commentary: "that is why everyone watches the Turk as if he were the very Devil from Hell", which he writes at the end of a note about a Turk who had robbed a certain Christian and then taken the Christian faith (ibid.:35). Evaluation of the Turks in Divnić's *Historia* at the level above the purely lexic (attributive) is much more complex. In a number of places, Divnić explicitly expresses sympathy about the fate of the defeated Turks, for example, in the account of the column departing from the conquered Klis Fortress:

This was all followed by that miserable crowd which, coming out grief-stricken and sadly from the fort, at one moment looked back at the home that they were abandoning, at another up to the heavens towards which they addressed painful sighs and sobs coming from the bottom of their hearts. Many of them were leading unfortunate women and children, most of them unclothed, so that, even though they were Barbarians, they invoked the sympathy of all who did not have a stone in the breasts (Divnić 1986:188-189, similarly 120).

It is especially moving to read Divnić's description of the crimes that the Christian army, that is, the Morlachs and the Venetian soldiers, committed after taking Klis Fortress:

The army did not hold back, since, when Baraković was cut down, several gold and silver coins fell out of the mattress. The soldiers picked them up, continuing to rob the people who were passing between their files, not even constraining themselves from snatching infant children from the breasts of their anguished mothers and the arms of their wretched fathers. Others, noticing that there were several ducats in the intestines of a Turk who had been hacked crosswise, swallowed by the poor creature to save them from the greed of the victors, disembowelled those sad corpses and with inhuman cruelty and avarice searched through their entrails for money or jewellery. Some of them took pleasure in skinning the executed Turks, then using their skin as foot cloths, laces and belts. There was no lack of rape, with no regard to age, gender or condition, and, all in all, there was no mindless act that did not take place (Divnić 1986:189-190).<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, Divnić never forget to praise the courage of the Turkish soldiers (for example, that of Halil-Beg during the Venetian attack at Zemunik in 1647, ditto, 120). Like many of the early Modern Age writers, he, too, stressed the piety of the Turks that could be a model to the Christians, and gives as an illustration the captured banner of Tekeli-Pasha (ibid.:171). Divnić's axiological openness in description of the Other is visible in a contrasting depiction of sorts of two leading Turks: Mehmed-Pasha as "a man of brutal spirit, irritable and cruel" (ibid.:308, 317, 318) and the *ćehaja* Kasimustafa as "a kind man, very clever, inclined to goodness and peace, who, apart from with a worthy spirit was also graced with happiness, while the peace of spirit was accompanied by a commendable skilfulness" (ibid.:318).

Divnić's *Historia* also leaves an impression on the contemporary reader and historian of an informative and convincingly interpretative book about the Candian War in Dalmatia. Even more than that, in the axiological sense – well-argued criticism of the Venetian authorities, unbiased accounts of the crimes committed in the battlefield and an absence of value-judgmental *a priori* statements in description of the Other – it satisfies today's historiographic criteria. On the other hand, Šilobadović's chronicle is a miserable testimony to cruel times, as is stressed by its editor, J.A. Soldo (1993:7).

#### **IV. Hunger, armies and plague: Three scourges in the 18th century Makarska chronicles**

The biography of the Franciscan friar, Nikola Gojak (1680-1772), has similarities with but also differences to that of his predecessor and fellow friar, Pavao Šilobadović. Apart from their both being members of the

---

<sup>9</sup> This description of the savage violence of the conquering army could be a reflection of the author's reading of the classics. My colleague, Vlado Rezar, to whom I am most grateful, drew my attention to certain similar places in Livy's work *Ad urbe condita* (Liber XXIX, 17), and in the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Liber IV, 51).

Franciscan Order, they shared the same native place: Gojak was born in Veliko Brdo in the hills above Makarska, where Šilobadović served for a time as parish priest. Both of them spent the main part of their lives in the Makarska Franciscan monastery and in the nearby parishes, including Sumartin on the Island of Brač. However, there is reliable information that Gojak studied in Italy and that he became a teacher of philosophy (Soldo 1993:72). It would seem that Gojak was better positioned in the Franciscan hierarchy than Šilobadović, this being supported by data on his frequent performances of the duty of Guardian in the Makarska monastery between 1717 and 1740. The chronicles of the two authors in their style and content also give the impression that Gojak was a much more educated person than Šilobadović. The language in Gojak's chronicle is much more fluent, with far fewer errors in writing and grammar than are found in Šilobadović's work. Gojak's particular style is marked by the frequent insertion of Italian phrases and sentences in what is, in essence, a Croatian text written in the Bosančica script. However, as further comparison will show, the differences between the two chroniclers are most evident at the level of content. They can be relativised to an extent by the fact the chronicles were written in considerably differing historical times. The final years of the Candian War and the beginning of the Morean War make up more than a third of the time section covered by Šilobadović's chronicles, but as far as content is concerned, its basic theme, the Second Morean War, covers only 7% of the time span of Gojak's chronicle (1715-1772), while the events connected with that war in Gojak's text make up a very much smaller part.<sup>10</sup> Unlike Šilobadović, Gojak did not only devote negligible space to the battles on the Venetian-Turkish border in Dalmatia (giving only somewhat more lines to the most significant episode, the unsuccessful Turkish siege of Sinj in 1715), but he also mentioned some other events that took place on more significant battlefields during the same war, but far from Dalmatia. There was no lack of wars in Europe during the period about which Gojak wrote, while there was relative peace on the borders in Dalmatia at that time. One could not complain that the Makarska chronicles showed a provincial lack of interest in European politics (at least in war as a means of conducting politics); Gojak mentioned all the important wars in his text (the Austrian-Turkish war, 1737-1739; the War of the Austrian Succession, 1741-148; and the so-called Seven Years War, or the seven-year Austrian-Prussian War, 1756-1763).

When the geographical regions of which Gojak speaks in his Chronicle are observed as indicators of identity, one can see the important role played by the Franciscan Order organisation. So in one place Gojak expressly says "we Bosnians" (Soldo 1993:92), which could be linked to the Province of *Bosna Argentina* that still existed undivided at that time. Gojak's own broader region was definitely Dalmatia, which had its separate

---

<sup>10</sup> Gojak dated his Chronicle as beginning in 1712, but the first real event in it takes place in 1715.

Franciscan Province from 1735. To Gojak, the neighbouring foreign region was "Turkish land", by which he meant Ottoman Herzegovina and Bosnia. Other more distant and thus more rarely mentioned foreign regions were Italy and some other European countries.

The own/foreign dichotomy can be read off from the value-judgement comments, that is, the statements and attributes used in describing the inhabitants of those regions. The anti-Turkish line is not particularly pronounced in Gojak's Chronicle, although in some places, while commenting on certain more important events in the "Turkish land", Gojak does not fail also to introduce an axiologically strongly coloured comment; for example, when mentioning the fire in Bihać at the mid-century, he writes that "the town of Biać in Bosnia burned down along with everything in the town, but the Turks escaped, whereas if they had burned, too, what good fortune that would have been!" (Soldo 1993:140, similarly, *ibid.*:98, 111). Describing the activities of a Church dignitary from Italy, who was in favour of the division of *Bosna Argentina*, Gojak adds to the attributes describing his character, "sly, full of [self-]interest and every sort of iniquity" the attribute "*nevirni lacmanin*" [unfaithful foreigner] (*ibid.*:198), an appellation used negatively in oral tradition, particularly in oral epic poems, to designate Italians and Germans and/or Westerners in general. Nor are there many anti-Orthodox Christian expressions in Gojak's Chronicle, even though he does use "*rkać*" ("arkać") in a number of places, this being a negative denotation widely spread among the people. Thus, speaking of the plague that had appeared in the Knin region in 1764, Gojak voices the assumption that it had been spread by the Orthodox Christian soldiers, and comments: "Damned *arkaći*. Scoundrels." (*ibid.*:192). Gojak is interested in a much broader range of chronicle themes than Šilobadović; Gojak is interested in economic themes (crop yield, fishing for sardines and grey mullet, the price of grain and other foodstuffs), meteorological issues and natural disasters, robberies and murders. The interest in wartime events as interest in one of the "three Scourges" is vividly contextualised in Gojak's notes of October, 1742:

Just as in the Littoral, across the mountains and elsewhere, there are no vegetables, the cabbage and turnip and radish crops have failed along with everything else so that there is hunger everywhere, more so in the Vlah region (the hinterland) than down by the coast. War and armies on all sides, only God's right hand can bring an end to it all! Plague is killing people in many places in Bosnia but particularly in Sarajevo, Travnik and Mostar. Oh, for the help of the Lord! So, here, the three Scourges have arrived among us: Hunger, Armies and Plague! (Soldo 1993:121).

War, at least as far as Dalmatia was concerned, was by far the least terrible of the three scourges during the time covered by Gojak in his Chronicle, so that the chronicler addressed his broad native place as follows: *povera Dalmazia, altro non si resti che puro nome di Dalmazia* (*ibid.*:127).

There would be no crucial changes among the three Makarska Franciscans who continued Gojak's work: Petar Antulović, who noted events from 1773 until his death in March, 1781; Bartul Ribarović, who outlived Antulović by only eight months and left a brief account on the period; and Andrija Ivičević, who continued the chronicle up to 1794. Dalmatia was also spared war in the 1773-1794 period, although Ivičević did not fail to describe some important events from the so-called Dubica War (the final Austrian-Turkish war), waged by the two powers from 1788 until 1791. Although the chronicles continued to show interest in events taking place in the neighbouring "Turkish land", the axiological potential of the texts does not lie in the Christian / Muslim (Turkish) dichotomy. Moreover, it could be thought that the Roman Catholic / Christian Orthodox contrariety became more potent, both semantically and judgementally, primarily because of the notes written by Petar Antulović about the *Hajduk* [something like a highwayman or brigand], Ivan Bušić Rošo. Rošo was a *Hajduk* chieftain, or *harambaša*, a Catholic from Dalmatian Zagora who was known as a wrathful enemy of the Orthodox Christians. Antulović wrote about several of Rošo's altercations with those to whom he disparagingly referred as the "*rkaći*", obviously a term in common use by those who thought as he did. Although Antulović mentions the reasons for Rošo's rage against the Orthodox Christians, nowhere in the text is there any expression of praise or approval for Rošo's wrangling with them. Moreover, when describing those events, the Makarska chronicler as a rule expresses sympathy of sorts for the suffering Orthodox Christians, often adding the attribute "wretched": "The wretched *rkaći* died, although they were completely blameless..." (ibid.:276-277, similarly, 283). Antulović's stance toward Rošo should be viewed in the context of his condemnation of the activities of the *Hajduks* as downright brigandry, which, together with plague and famine, is the misfortune of the common man in Dalmatia most frequently mentioned in the 18th century Makarska chronicles, from Gojak to Ivičević. The word "heroism" (*junaštvo*) in Antulović's writings is connected, as a rule, with the *Hajduk* exploits and is a synonym for brigandry. Therefore, if one accepts the assumption that *Hajduk* activities in 18th century Dalmatia were similar in many respects to the border-area plundering from the time of the Candian War, the difference between Šilobadović and those who continued his work in the evaluation of such similar activities has the status of a worldview/mentality divide.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Ivan Lovrić, probably the most liberal 18th Croatian writer, saw brigandry [*hajdučija*] as a social phenomenon, trying to penetrate into its causes. Nonetheless, despite his critical attitude, Lovrić's portrait of Stanislav Sočivica was not without a certain affinity with and admiration for the famous *Hajduk* chieftain. See Ivan Lovrić, *Notes on the Journey through Dalmatia by the Abbot Alberto Fortis and the Life of Stanislav Sočivica*, translated by M. Kombol, Zagreb: Izdavački zavod Jugoslavenske akademije, 1948, 183-213.

## V. Pale traces of the Dalmatian wars in Kavanjin's *Povijest vandelska* [The Evangelical Fable]

The Split writer Jerolim Kavanjin (1641-1714) survived both the Candian and the Morean Wars. He took part in the latter on the Venetian side, in the battles near Sinj and Herceg-Novi in 1686 and 1687. Because of his military – and civil – services to the Republic, he was allocated an estate in one of the newly-conquered area in the environs of Split. Other important information from his biography indicates a firm connection with the communal world of the Venetian cities in Dalmatia. His family, of Italian extraction, settled in Split at the end of the 16th century. He completed the study of law in Padua and spent his professional life as a lawyer, firstly for a brief time in Zadar, and then in Split until his retirement. He spent his last fifteen years or so in the idyllic atmosphere of Sutivan on the Island of Brač, where he finished writing one of the most distinctive works of early Croatian literature. Its long title was: *Povijest vandelska bogatoga a nesrećna Epuluna i ubogoga a čestita Lazara...* [The Evangelical Fable of the Rich Tho' Miserable Epuloun, and the Poor but Honest Lazarus... ]. This huge epic with 30 cantos and 32 724 octosyllabic verses in a-b-a-b-c-c sextains resists precise categorisation by genre. Its structure is loose and would seem to be arbitrary since there is an absence of anything that would unify the epic into a whole. Religious themes (Cantos 1-V, XVII-XXX) and secular themes (Cantos VI-XVI) interchange throughout the poem. The latter are largely linked to native place history, but with the addition of observations about the European politics of that time. *The Evangelical Fable...* does not have firm narrative links, while some parts are frequently structured in a catalogical way. Consequently, because of the poetic framework set in this way in Kavanjin's work, one cannot expect narrative about the individual historical events in which the author either participated or about which he was at least informed. The historical events usually serve Kavanjin only in the more detailed definition /attribution of personalities brought into this catalogue of sorts according to spatial / professional criteria. The cantos speak of the history of the individual Dalmatian Venetian communes (VI-IX), of distinguished Venetian personages (XI), of Christian and Slavic heroes and kings (XII-XIII), and of coats-of-arms (XIV).

Kavanjin often introduced autobiographic facts into his work. On the other hand, his anti-Turkish stance in the form of Crusader-type ideas on the need to drive the Turks out of Europe, is the continuing guiding idea throughout the epic. It could, therefore, be expected that the author would pay particular attention to those episodes in the Candian and Morean Wars in which he had himself participated. However, that expectation is not met. Kavanjin does not devote many verses to the battles of the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia, nor to those conducted some distance to the east in the Mediterranean. Admittedly, speaking of individual military officers, he does not fail to stress, for example, that they

took part in the War of Cyprus and the Candian War, just as he emphasised that some clerics participated in the work of the Council of Trent. It has been pointed out above that *The Evangelical Fable...* is structured catalogically, and that it does not have any longish narrative parts. Even the few exceptions in the central, secular historical part of the epic, do not relate to military events in the recent past, but to elaboration of the Ljubdrag and Sunčanica episodes from Gundulić's *Osman* (XII, 67-101)<sup>12</sup> and about Vladimir and Kosara from *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina* [The Chronicle of the Priest from Duclia] (XIII, 10-65). So when narration in verse is in question, Kavanjin showed greater skill in dealing with literary themes than in the literary shaping of historical events.

Apart from his pronounced allegiance to his city, which often lead him into stormy polemics with Ivan Lučić and to repeated emphasis of the primacy of Split (ancient Salona) over Zadar, Kavanjin also revealed in *The Evangelical Fable* his firm attachment to the world of the communes on the eastern Adriatic coast. The first five cantos with religious motifs are followed by cantos about Split (VI), Trogir, Kotor (VII), the islands of Hvar, Korčula, Rab, Pag and Brač (VIII), about Zadar (IX) and Dubrovnik (X). Kavanjin did not pay any particular attention to the newly-conquered Venetian acquisitions in Dalmatia. True enough, he did list in one catalogue the most significant heroes from Ravni Kotari, whom he called "Vlachian sons" (Kavanjin 1913:132).

However, the actual presence of that "Vlach region" is quite insignificant in his epic. That is why it is worthwhile to draw attention to the only few sextains in which the author touched on what is an interesting issue for this discussion. Thus, although he himself, as a Split nobleman, was awarded state property located in the new acquisitions, Kavanjin was against the distribution of land to the "Vlachian sons" who, in his view, were unlike the old urban nobility and prone to be unreliable and inclined to change sides:

101.  
And whatever spread in wartime  
All went to the Vlachian son,  
Just division would have meant  
Something given to the squire,  
Who has lost all hope,  
Since it goes to others now.

102.  
Foreigners [the Vlachs] are spreading there,  
The gentleman looks on and sighs,  
Serf and apprentice everywhere,  
Pushed above him to the top,

---

<sup>12</sup> The Roman numeral relates to the canto, while the Arabic relates to the sextains as they are given numbers in J. Aranza's critical edition (1913).

And the agile defector has it all,  
Though he'll always be an outlaw.

103.  
He whose nature knows no fetters,  
Now in peace and now in war,  
Now to Turk, now to gentlefolk,  
Spinning with each wind that blows,  
Incapable of being constant,  
As the old noble whose word was famous as his bond.  
(Kavanjin 1913:162-163)

Reading *The Evangelical Fable* as a cultural and historical source, Tomo Matić noticed Kavanjin's anti-Venetian attitudes in a number of places (1970:41-43). One is particularly interesting; in the final four sextains of Canto 13 Kavanjin seems to be criticising the Venetian policy of sowing discord among the border populations:

262.  
And the Venetians lacking conscience,  
Choose to do things in this way,  
Let the Vlah subdue the Vlah,  
Venice always uses them in war,  
That they fight the Janissaries,  
And bring the Sultan down.

263.  
And they know, that when one's own  
Is the subject of attack,  
That the outcome often is that  
The masters take the fort,  
It's sad when weeping's eye to eye,  
And when people oppress their own.

264.  
If they [the Slavs] had not been weakened  
By their squabbles 'mongst themselves,  
The world would still look up to them,  
The Slavic Kingdom would live on;  
Those who still have power,  
Let them beware of such decline.

265.  
What is modest grows with concord,  
Lack of it can ruin the great,  
All the kingdoms fell through discord  
Due to plots and use of force;  
Majesty soon fades and withers,  
In the whirlwind of this storm.

The attitude towards Orthodox Christians in Kavanjin's work is far more meaningful than that of his predecessor, Franjo Divnić. In keeping with his Slavophile and anti-Turkish feelings, Kavanjin also glorifies the comba-



tants against the Ottomans from the Orthodox world, placing no particular emphasis on their confessional affiliation. It is generally known that Kavanjin was one of a large number of admirers of the famous Russian Czar, Peter the Great, in whom he saw a possible victor over the Turks.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, as a fervent Catholic, Kavanjin supported the unity of the Church (1913:211), and, in addition to Muslims and Jews, he also saw Orthodox Christians in Hell, designating them with the derogative term "rkači" (1913:433).

For the theme of this discussion, Kavanjin's biography promised more than was found in his work. For its part, the latter reveals all the complexity and contradiction in ideas that emerge from the reticulation of identity (communal, regional, State, ethnic, and confessional) in the early Modern Age society living on the eastern Adriatic coast.

## VI. Filip Grabovac: The Morlach on Venetian *terra ferma*

There has not been much significant progress made in uncovering information about the life of Filip Grabovac since the research done by Karlo Eterović during the 1920s. The years 1697 and 1698 continue to be given as the probable years of his birth, while nothing is known about his childhood and education. It is only reliably known that he entered the Franciscan Order in Zaoštrog in 1718 and that, from 1729 until his arrest in 1747, he was the chaplain of the Croatian cavalry-men in the Venetian *terra ferma*, with headquarters in Verona, and that he spent the last two years of his life incarcerated in the jail in Venice.<sup>14</sup> It is definitely known, therefore, that Grabovac lived in Italy for at least twenty years (1729-1749), not counting the years he spent studying there, probably at some Italian Franciscan institute of higher learning. It is also probable that he spent only his childhood in his native place, in Vrlika, where, according to Eterović, his father Mate moved from Ravni Kotari after the Venetian conquest of Knin in 1688. It is assumed that Grabovac spent the period between his novitiate and studies in Franciscan monasteries in Dalmatia: in Zaoštrog, also perhaps on the island of Visovac. What is it that makes this data about Grabovac's life seem important? The answer is that the participation of his immediate native place, that is, the area in which he spent his childhood (the Vrlika-Sinj area) and the broader Dalmatian

---

<sup>13</sup> This Russian Czar was also extolled in Croatian literature by his contemporaries, Pavao Ritter Vitezović, Ignjat Gradić (*Plam sjeverski* 1710) and Stjepo Rusić (*Petar Aleksiović, aliti 15 zlamenja djela i časti Petra Prvoga* 1717).

<sup>14</sup> Grabovac ended up in court after a complaint brought by six people from Sinj at the end of 1747, accusing him of offending their region and the Venetian authorities. The incriminating parts of *Cvit razgovora* were translated into Italian for the requirements of the court case, and all the copies of his book that the Court could lay its hands on were publicly burned. After two months in the infamous *Sotto i piombi* prison, Grabovac was transferred to Santo Spirito Island, where he died a year later in 1749, worn down by disease (Eterović 1927:70-99).

hinterland, is far greater in *Cvit razgovora...* than the places in which he was educated and grew up (the Makarska Littoral) and those in which he later worked (*terra ferma*). The region of the early acquisitions, more specifically the cities of Split, Zadar, Šibenik and Trogir, were emphasised by Grabovac in the poem *Slava Dalmacije* that, according to his prosecutors, contained the incriminating anti-Venetian verses. If one adds to this the fragment about Solin (Grabovac 1951:216-217), then these are all the important parts of *Cvit razgovora* that are thematically concentrated on the region of the Dalmatian coastal communes. All the remaining, extensive parts of the book that speak about Dalmatia largely give accounts of the near past in that area, which the Venetians seized from the Ottomans in the 17th and 18th century wars.

Although the Christian-Turkish conflicts are the basic theme of the second, secular and historical part of Grabovac's book, he does not deal in detail with the Venetian-Turkish wars. He does mention them with names such as the *War of Candia*, the *War of Vienna*, and the *Third War or a Minor One*, providing information on the beginnings, ends and outcomes, and, in some places, about particularly important battles. However, individual parts of *Cvit razgovora* are not devoted to the wars; historical content is largely built around the major historical personalities, dynasties, peoples and regions. Still, Grabovac does devote space to the conflicts in Dalmatia that took place in the framework of the Venetian-Turkish wars referred to; he does so in the form of a prose chronicle (Grabovac 1951:189-190), narratives in verse about individual events (*ibid.*:201, 207-211, 222-229), a catalogue of leading Christian warriors (*serdars* and chieftains, *ibid.*:201-205), and the conversation between the Elder and the Young Man about Vrlika (*ibid.*:215-216). From the point of view of historiography, the unsuccessful Turkish siege of Sinj in 1715 is the sole important event of the war that Grabovac separately specifies, devoting to it his longest decasyllabic poem. The poem *Izkazanja od oca fra Petra Kumbata, kako porobi svu Imosku krajinu i za malo grad osta* describes a reprisal action of the Christian fighters that can be categorized as border plunder and sacking, while the shorter poem *Primalena uspomena od Kotara* very succinctly shows the Venetian advance in central Dalmatia in 1684, the first year of the Morean War. It is interesting to note that Grabovac always depicted the individual wartime events in decasyllabic verses, and that those events were connected with the newly acquired regions. He does not mention, as does Divnić, the Venetian strategy towards the defectors from the Turkish side of the border. It is to those very defectors from regions captured by the Ottomans during the 16th century that Grabovac gives the main credit for their re-conquest during the 17th and 18th centuries:

Just before all of Dalmatia was Venetian, the Turk came and conquered everything down to the sea. Then the Uskoks fled towards the sea, and they were the ones who liberated it from the hands of the unbelievers at the time mentioned (Grabovac 1951:200).

One also finds exclusively in Grabovac's catalogues famous fighters against the Turks, the names of *serdars*, the Turkish term for military commanders, and chieftains from the new acquisitions and the Venetian areas right beside the border with the Ottomans.

Grabovac obviously considered acceptable as a form of waging war the sacking of the border areas, since he does not explicitly condemn it anywhere in his work, while he links the torching, robbery and people being lead off into slavery with both the Ottoman and the Christian side (Dukić 1998). Moreover, Grabovac also mentions brigandry, but he does not condemn it; the men of Omiš, Skradin and Senj, Hajduk strongholds, are given the neutral appellation *maritime Hajduks* (ibid.:216), while Mijat Tomić is included in the series of old heroes, immediately after: Novak, Radivoj of Smederova, Miloš Obilić, Marko Kraljević (towards whom he was somewhat reserved) and Relja (ibid.:261).

Grabovac's book, at least in the parts that speak of the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia, is seen as the product of the border mentality of continental Dalmatia. The author's relatively high formal education and long years of living in a community of superior civilisation leave few traces in his work. His image of Dalmatia was exactly opposite to the one given by Kavanjin. However, although ethnic origins, native place, class and civil status separate the two authors, they are linked by certain mindset elements. Apart from being deeply religious, they both demonstrate a forceful anti-Turkish stance. In the case of Kavanjin, this attitude is subordinated to Slavophile ideologemes, which are not found in Grabovac. Thus, Kavanjin seems to extol Peter the Great of Russia primarily as a potential force to expel the Turks from Europe. The situation is similar with Grabovac; his strongly marked intolerance towards all non-Catholic Christians, particularly Orthodox Christians, to whom he refers pejoratively as *rkaći*, "semi-believers" (*polovirci*), "followers of the Old Calendar", "Schismatics", and "Arians", terms that literary historians usually associate with the ideology of Roman Catholic Renewal (Grabovac 1986:129; Fališevac 1998:51), is absent only when Christianity is in conflict with Islam. That is why he writes with words of praise or, at least, neutrally about the leading personalities of the Serbian Mediaeval State, without making any particular mention of their Orthodox Christian faith. However, Grabovac's obsession with confessional divisions comes to the fore in the mentioned catalogue of Dalmatian combatants against the Ottomans, in which he marks the Catholics with a Cross.

## **VII. Andrija Kačić Miošić: The sporting spirit of war-making**

Andrija Kačić Miošić (1704-1760) spent almost his entire life in the area between Makarska (Zaostrog) and Šibenik on the Dalmatian coast. He was absent only during the time of his advanced Franciscan schooling: according to earlier historians, he studied literature in Budim, while newer

research indicates he did this study in Osijek. He was a member of the Dalmatian Franciscan elite and performed very highly-placed and responsible duties: he was a teacher at the School of Philosophy at the Zaoštrog monastery (1730-1735), a lecturer at the General Theological Institute in Šibenik (1735-1740), and Guardian of the Franciscan monasteries in Sumartin on the Island of Brač and in Zaoštrog. However, he intended his most important literary work, *Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga* [Pleasant Conversation of the Slavic Peoples] (Venice 1756, 2nd ed. 1759) to be read by the common man. Beside their both belonging to the same monastic order and their elementary schooling in the Zaoštrog monastery, this fact also links him with Filip Grabovac.

Literary historians often emphasise the similarity between Kačić's *Pleasant Conversation...* and the second part of *The Flower of Conversation*. Both texts were intended to be something like popular histories written through a compilation of Italian and Latin literature, and both are either in prose or in decasyllabic verse. The latter is particularly characteristic to Kačić who saw the oral epics of his countrymen as being a substitute for historiography.

One can also note certain similarities in connection with Grabovac's work in the first edition of *Pleasant Conversation...* Kačić also gives a catalogue of leading participants in the three Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia. Although many of the names are repeated, Kačić's catalogue is considerably longer and is structured in a different way; the heroes are listed by region, continuously for all three wars, while the division into regions in Grabovac's list is subordinated to the basic classification by the three wars. Kačić also omits data on the place of death and the names of those who killed the Christian heroes. However, in addition to the prose catalogue in the first edition of *Pleasant Conversation...* there are also two decasyllabic poems of catalogue structure, in which the content of Grabovac's prose catalogue is repeated, with minor departures.<sup>15</sup> In his poems, Kačić mentioned only those heroes, of course, who had died in battle, not those who had died of natural causes. In the first edition of *Pleasant Conversation...* he also included Pavao Šilobadović's chronicle (Kačić calls him Friar Pavao Šilobad of Imotski), with the remark: "If I am to amount to anything, even [something] small imposed [upon me], [it will] obviously be because of what can be known to the extent that I found it in writings and heard it from my elders" (Kačić 1942:74). However, Kačić would also omit many events that Šilobadović described, probably because

---

<sup>15</sup> They are *Pisma od vitezova dalmatinski, koji, posli nego mnoge turske glave odsikoše, od Turaka pogiboše rata od Kandije* [A Poem of Dalmatian Knights Who, after Having Cut Off Many Turkish Heads, Died at the Hands of the Turks in the War of Candia] (No. 32), and *Pisma od vitezova, koji izgiboše rata Bečkoga* [A Poem about Knights Who Perished in the War of Vienna] (No. 33) (Kačić 1941:53-57). Both poems were included in the second edition, only the regional division of the heroes being omitted (Nos. 19 and 130, *ibid.* 595-598). The ordinal numbers of the poems relate to the T. Matić's critical edition; there are no numbers in the original.

he did not think them important or that they did not correspond with his fundamental objectives: glorifying the heroic exploits of the anti-Turkish warriors from his broad native place. Two examples of Kačić's expansion of Šilobadović's text can be clearly seen in the author's relation towards presentation of the border warfare. Šilobadović noted that on October 20, 1664 three engagements between the Christian and Muslim fighters took place beneath Kozica, and he gave information on the outcomes (Soldo 1993:29). Although Šilobadović's description was relatively long in comparison with his customarily terse depiction of events, Kačić took the trouble of introducing many new details (Kačić 1942:80). Further, for May 7, 1665 Šilobadović wrote:

Martin Glumčević went alone to Duvno, and brought back a Turkish child and sold it (for) 70 groschen. It would be a long tale to tell it all! (Soldo 1993:32).

Kačić links this event with the same date but in the preceding year, 1664, and gives a broad account of how the Glumčević mentioned captured a Muslim boy and then sold him to his father (Kačić 1942:81). Contrary to Šilobadović's orientation to facts and wartime occurrences in the narrower sense of the words (killing people or taking them captive, stealing livestock), Kačić shows interest in the diverse and interesting features of war. Comprehending war as a manifestation of Man's need to prove himself similar to some modern sporting activity – already noticeable in Šilobadović's work – is even more directly expressed in Kačić's *Pleasant Conversation* (Venice 1759). Kačić devoted to the three wars 15 of the total 39 poems in the first edition, and some 50 of the total 135 in the second. Šilobadović's *Chronicle* is omitted from the second edition so that the already small share of prose in the account of the three wars is reduced even more. Kačić devoted 13 poems to individual wartime events in the second edition. Of the more significant occurrences during the Candian War he wrote about the siege of Šibenik (Nos. 77 and 80, Kačić 1942:436-438, 442-445) and of Split (No. 79, *ibid.*:441-442). It is interesting that Kačić did not devote a separate poem to the conquest of Klis Fortress in 1648, even though this was the most significant Venetian success on the Dalmatian battleground during the Candian War. There are also no poems about the major battles of the Morean War, for example, the Venetian capture of Knin in 1688, while he devoted a poem entitled *The Third Poem of Sinj and Its Knights* (No. 103, *ibid.*:514-518) to the 1715 Turkish siege of Sinj, the most significant wartime event in Dalmatia during the Second Morean War, which Kačić also refers to as the War for Sinj. The other poems in this group largely celebrated in verse wartime events of less significance (Nos. 78, 106, 107, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 132). A far larger number of poems in the second edition of *Pleasant Conversation...*, a total of 24, are, in fact, catalogues in verse listing the heroes of particular areas (Nos. 84, 87, 88, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 127, 129, 130, 131, and 133). Finally, the theme

of the Venetian-Turkish wars is touched on by some poems that in motif, composition and style are similar to the so-called Uskok-Hajduk epics, an identifiable branch of Southern Slavic oral epic poetry, which will be discussed later in the text (Nos. 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 97, 102, 121, 122, 123, and 126).

To Kačić, as well as to Grabovac, the Candian, Morean and Second Morean Wars made up a connected whole in which the re-conquest of Dalmatia was realised during the 17th and 18th centuries. The two authors were also linked by their lack of interest in the battles fought during these wars on the major battlegrounds, which were distant from their broad native place. For example, G. Brusoni's book offered Kačić sound material on the Candian War and he consulted it on events in Dalmatia during the first war years (poems Nos. 77-80). The two Dalmatian Franciscan friars were further connected by their affirmative attitude towards the border plunder. The ideology of heroism is much more pronounced in Kačić's work, and often suppresses the Crusade ideology against the unbeliever, which, on its part, is the basic idea in the development of Turkish themes in Grabovac's writing. Kačić's comprehension of war as a sporting competition derives from the heroism ideology, along with his relatively tolerant stance towards the opponent. In other words, Kačić often recognised the heroism of the Muslim fighters, even devoting part of the final poem to them (*The Very Last Poem of Glorious Bosnia*) (Dukić 1998). The greatest diversity at the ideological level in the works by these authors emerges because of the emphasis of the Slavophile idea in Kačić's writing, and the absence of it in Grabovac's work. Kačić's tolerant stance towards the Orthodox Christian Slavs stands in contrast to Grabovac's intolerance towards them (Rapacka 1998; Dukić 2002:47-49).<sup>16</sup>

### **VIII. Folk epic poetry: An assumption for analysis**

The reflections of the Venetian-Turkish wars in the popular, Uskok-Hajduk epic poetry of Dalmatia are an exceptionally interesting theme that has not been analysed to date. However, the theme has pertaining methodological problems, solution of which would exceed the limits of the analysis set herein. Therefore, I shall only mention those issues here and set initial assumptions for some future research.

In principle, and in analysis of this part of the corpus, it would be advisable to keep to the specified limitations of time and space; only notations of folk epics from 17th and 18th century Dalmatia should be taken into account. However, setting the temporal criteria in this way presents an almost unsolvable problem. In other words, the oldest known

---

<sup>16</sup> As regards the then-contemporary Venetian-Turkish wars, Kačić in *Korabljica* [Ark] largely repeats the contents of the first and second edition of *Peasant Conversation...* The only new parts are the chronicle parts; the first for the 1491-1699 period (Kačić 1945:305-313), and the second for the time from 1701 to 1760 (ibid.:320-321).

notations of folk epic poetry from Dalmatia originate from the period of transition from the 18th to the 19th century (Ante Franjin Alačević's collection *Pismar narodni*). The major part of the preserved notations of Dalmatian heroic epics was written in the second half of the 19th century. However, when this type of literature is in question, two assumptions allow the inclusion of somewhat earlier notations: 1) the assumption that folk songs about historical events emerge immediately after the events that are being committed to verse, unless it is a matter of the "descent" of content from written to oral culture; 2) the assumption on the slower rhythm of change in folk (oral) literary tradition and/or of its relative conservativeness in comparison with the other so-called written types of literature.<sup>17</sup>

Folk epic poems differ in yet another aspect from all the texts included in this analysis, despite the genre differences between them. Namely, the poetics of the folk epic does not aspire to a detailed description of the historical event committed to verse, it does not have imperative informative veracity, so that the epic poems about the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia are, in a certain sense, more fictionalised than the other texts dealt with here. The poetics of the folk epic marks the existence of variants and/or procedures in which characters and locations are replaced in poems with similar topics. The information deficit in folk poems was criticised by Andrija Kačić Miošić, who tried in his poems to avoid this shortcoming of folk epics, which, in his opinion, had only "a sound foundation of truth". That is why anyone studying folk epics encountering a poem, which has a host of information about a particular historical event, will wonder if it is perhaps an author's work that has not yet undergone transformation in long-term oral transmission. However, the border line is often a slight one and difficult to define. Thus, for example, F. Grabovac's poem about Friar Petar Kumbat is transcribed in A. F. Alačević's *Pismar narodni* mentioned above, together with the "authentic" folk epic poems. For their part, some of A. Kačić Miošić's poems do not differ from such poems in phraseology, motif and composition, as has already been mentioned.

Folk epic poems, at least those that have been preserved and are known, do not celebrate in verse the significant battles of the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia. They preserve the memory of some leading Morlach fighters (for example, Ilija Smiljanić, Vuk Mandušić, Stojan Janković, and others), but deal largely with minor border conflicts (robbery and the taking of prisoners). Here we can only roughly indicate

---

<sup>17</sup> One can also consider these issues in a different way. When discussing the attitudes of the Church and the Venetian authorities towards the "heroic times" myth concerning the struggle against the Ottomans in Dalmatia, Bernard Stulli said: "The myth of the "heroic saga of courage" and the "liberation" (of Dalmatia from the Ottomans, D.D.) was not in this case only a question of *spiritual worth*. The more time that passed, the merit was shown to be greater and more significant, with new versions and additions, just as is fitting and as happens in folk poems; the credit becomes even more unquestionable, the myth becomes even more irrational" (Stulli 1979:83).

some of the general characteristics of folk epic poems, connected with the theme of this discussion. The representative, although relatively small, *Junačke pjesme (historijske, krajiške i uskočke pjesme)* can serve as an illustration of the poems.<sup>18</sup>

- 1) Folk epic poems mainly demonstrate a positive stance towards the robber raids on the border: enslaving the people and leading off the livestock from the enemy side. This act is usually explicitly or implicitly argued: as reprisal or as part of a broader conflict, usually between Christians and Muslims (cf. HNP IX, No. 20).
- 2) The poems often have as their theme people being taken prisoner, which includes the ransom motif and variants of the flight of Christian heroes from Turkish slavery (cf. HNP IX, Nos. 24, 28).
- 3) Traditional epic poems glorify the institution of the heroic *mezdani*, or duels, as a means of proving authentic heroism (cf. HNP IX, No. 18)

In the event that a more extensive analysis would show the correctness of the above assumptions, it could be concluded that the folk epic poems about the events and heroes of the Venetian-Turkish wars in Dalmatia are very close on the level of theme and idea to the Chronicle of Pavao Šilobadović, the epic poems of Filip Grabavac, and certain poems by Andrija Kačić Miošić.

### IX. The archive sources backdrop

Archive historical sources from the 17th and 18th century are collected and commented on in two of Boško Desnica's posthumously published books (1950; 1951). This historian from Obrovac believed that they offered material for study of the historical framework of the Uskok-Hajduk folk epics, but also for the history of the Dalmatian hinterland as a whole, primarily for the history of the worldview of the inhabitants of that region in the respective period.

The archive documents published provide a clear picture of the Venetian interests and wartime strategies in the Dalmatian border region. The Venetian authorities tried to capture the important strategic points in the eastern Adriatic hinterland such as Klis, Knin, Drniš, Vrlika, Sinj, and Zadvarje. The most effective way to retain the conquered territory was to transform it into *krajine* or marches, that is, separately administered borderland territories. However, the necessary manpower for maintaining the *krajina* system was not available from among the internal migrants; for that, it was necessary to attract Christians from the other side of the border. Some documents reveal that the Morlachs were sometimes brought by force from the Ottoman to the Venetian side (Desnica 1950:33-34;

---

<sup>18</sup> This is the 9th volume in the well-known edition *Hrvatske narodne pjesme* [Croatian Folk Songs], ed. N. Andrić, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1940 (HNP IX, hereinafter in the text).



Desnica 1951:69-70); Stanojević 1962:116). In order to destroy the hope among the Christian defectors that they would be able, in case of need, to return to their abandoned villages, the Venetian authorities would sometimes order that the houses and crops that the defectors had left should be put to the torch (Desnica 1950:17). Divnić's *History of the Candian War in Dalmatia* also speaks of that Venetian strategy. On the other hand, those domestic chieftains who organised that the Morlachs be brought over to the Venetian side and/or those who lead the armed incursions in the interest of the *Signoria* (Desnica 1951:3, 26-28, 37-40, 211-212; Stulli 1979:82), were handsomely rewarded. For the same purpose, the land of the Muslims who had fled was allocated to the Christian newcomers, but also to the old settlers who had distinguished themselves in war (Desnica 1950:144-148). However, the highly-placed Venetian officials in Dalmatia often emphasised that the Morlach defectors were not motivated by elevated interests and liking for the Republic, but that they fled because of their fear of Ottoman reprisals or in the hope of personal gain (Desnica 1951:21-22, 84-85, 175-178, 201-203). That is why "fickle", "distrustful" and "vascillating" (*volubile, diffidente, vacillante, and dubio*) were some of the typical value-judgement attributes that were attached to the Morlachs (Desnica 1950:339; Desnica 1951:55, 91). Traces of such character assessments can also be found in Kavanjin's *Evangelical Fable*. Further, the Venetian *provveditori*, or chief administrators, described the Morlachs in reports to the Senate, usually stressing the Morlachs' lack of discipline and their inclination to steal, which lessened their military efficacy (Desnica 1951:82, 126-128). It is obvious that the Morlachs fighters themselves were well aware of the entrenched Venetian opinion about them, and that is why Stojan Janković, after the unsuccessful attempt to capture Sinj in the Autumn of 1684, told the Venetian authorities that the Morlachs had hoped with that exploit to show that they were capable of more than plunder raids along the border, that they were also capable of carrying out real military campaigns (Desnica 1951:50-52). However, some of the highly-placed Venetian officials also stressed the Morlachs' military qualities, primarily their staying power under extreme wartime conditions (Desnica 1951:61, 94, 341-342). The chief administrators' reports also contained brief comparisons between the Catholic and Orthodox Christian Morlachs. The latter were usually shown as being less reliable than the Catholics (Desnica 1951:83, 87, 200), and when they were on the other side of the battlefield, they were worse than the Turks themselves, stated the General *Provveditore* Valier (*ibid.*:89).<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Boško Desnica regarded the observations of the Venetian civil servants concerning the domestic population in Dalmatia as being "objective", "psychologically subtle" and "profoundly critical", so that "contemporary scholarship would have nothing to add or subtract from them either" (1950:6). The common sense argument for such a claim lies in the very function of the chief administrators' reports to the Senate; it was on the basis of these reports that the concrete / practical Venetian policy in Dalmatia was structured.

Naturally enough, the Venetians supported Morlach border robbery raids as a form of military strategy for as long as it was in the interest of their conquests, and the population policy related to them. In times of peace, cross-border plundering raids into Turkish territory were not tolerated. In this sense, the most strained situation in Dalmatia followed after the defeat of the Ottomans near Vienna in 1683; the Christian populations on both sides of the border undertook activities which could be characterised as an anti-Ottoman armed uprising, while the Venetians stalled with entering into open warfare against the Ottomans until as late as April 29, 1684, when the Senate officially declared war against the Porta. The fate of two brothers – Ilija and Stojan Janković – can serve as a good illustration of that state of semi-war between October, 1683 and May, 1684. Ilija had organised an armed raid into Turkish territory and the resettlement of Turkish Morlachs on the Venetian side. The *Provveditore* placed him on the wanted list and interned his brother Stojan for a time in Venice. Then *serdar* Stojan warded off the Morlach anti-Turkish actions on the border right up until the war actually commenced, thus coming into direct conflict with his brother Ilija (Desnica 1950:253-260, 288-291, 294-295, 315-316). The texts from Dalmatian literary culture analysed here do not deal with these Venetian-Morlach tensions.

The Venetians treated as simple brigandry what had been normal wartime strategy during the hostilities. In post-war times, the domestic *Hajduks* who robbed the population on the Turkish side of the border, but also the merchant caravans on their own territory, in both cases without any particular consideration for the confessional affiliation of the victims, were the Venetian's most pressing problem (Desnica 1950:153, 237-238, 245-251; Desnica 1951:395).

The attitude of the Venetian authorities towards the Turkish slaves and the institution of enslaving people overall, and towards the conflict and the decapitation of enemies, is particularly important for the cultural and historical analysis of the literary texts referred to here. These motifs appear especially frequently in Kačić's *Pleasant Conversation...*, the combat having already appeared in folk epics, while the enslavement theme is found in almost all the literary forms that have the Turkish-Venetian wars in Dalmatia as their theme. The enslavement policy was also part of the military strategy that the Venetians supported. Moreover, they did also try to introduce legal order in the sale of the enslaved persons, which, like all other forms of legitimate trade, was subject to State taxes (Desnica 1950:52-53, 60-61, 79-80; Desnica 1951:52, 114-115; Stanojević 1962:147-156). At the same time – although probably with a certain disdain from their superior civilisational position – they also tolerated the domestic custom of decapitating enemy soldiers, especially the military leaders (Desnica 1950:69; Desnica 1951:89). The heads that had been chopped off were displayed in public places to be seen, and their owners, the decapitators, could count either on a reward from the Venetian military authorities, or on the payment of ransom by the family of the man who

had been executed (Desnica 1950:112-113). However, to the contrary, the Venetians placed a strict ban on *međani* [duels] (Desnica 1950:56-57, 104-105, 240-241). The concept of heroism as presented in folk epics and in Kačić's *Pleasant Conversations...* was obviously an essential component in the mindset of the patriarchal society of Dalmatian Zagora; however it did not coincide with the interests of the Venetian authorities in controlling the situation on the border and avoiding disorder and unnecessary bloodshed.

Finally, archive sources also allow us to read off a network of internal divisions in the Dalmatian region. There were particularly frequent conflicts – about the conquered land and/or the land that had been abandoned by the Muslims – between the old settler population (or the older settlers) and the newly arrived Morlachs (Desnica 1950:196-197; Desnica 1951:10-11, 20-21, 336, 346-347). Similar material interests underlined the conflict between leading opposing chieftains and their family and subjects (Desnica 1951:20-21, 274-278, 300-302). At least from what can be gleaned from the documents published by B. Desnica, confessional conflict among the Christians were not of any significance during the wartime period in Dalmatia being considered in this text. Still, a number of documents also reveal that there were tensions between Roman Catholics and Orthodox Christians (Desnica 1950:135, 157-158; Desnica 1951:406). The conflict between the domestic military chieftains and the Venetian authorities, which arose at the beginning of the Morean War in 1684, speaks of the divisions between the rural, coastal, Morlachian Dalmatian regions and Dalmatian urban coastal Venetian communities. The acting chief administrator, D. Mocenigo, added four military commanders from the Zadar nobility to the four existing chieftains, Frano Posedarski, Šimun Bortulačić, Stojan Janković and Smoljan Smiljanić. The old chieftains rebelled, threatening to leave for the Levant battleground if new chieftains were appointed, who, as they emphasised, had not until then fought against the Turks in Dalmatia, and had no connections at all with the people whom they were intended to have under their command (Desnica 1951:24-34).

\*\*\*

Analytical reading of the selected corpus of Dalmatian texts from the 17th and 18th centuries, which have as their theme the then-contemporary wars, shows that the assumption about the existence of two Dalmatias is largely correct. Archive documents show the firm civilisational and mental border that divided the Morlachs and the representatives of Venetian power in Dalmatia. Two secular writers from the Dalmatian cities, Divnić and Kavanjin, were close to the Venetian vision of things. However, Kavanjin's writing shows a direct expression of political fellowship with the Slavic (Vlach) world of the Dalmatian hinterland. For the Franciscan writers who came from the Dalmatian region, which had also been under Ottoman rule

in the early Modern Age, the border was a much weaker one, although they, too, gave preference to their own territory in their works, the territory of the "new acquisitions".

The analysed texts are also essentially different in their overall interpretation of the contemporary wars, this being only partly a consequence of the selection of diverse genre frameworks. Thus, Divnić offers a relatively neutral historiographic picture of the Candian War in Dalmatia. Šilobadović's account of the same war is, to an extent, freed of ideology, although quite narrowly focused to the local level. Unlike them, Kavanjin and Grabovac, and Kačić, too, to an extent, start out from the idea of a Holy War. Šilobadović, Grabovac, and Kačić, particularly the latter, raise the border warfare to a state of heroism (enslavement of the people, stealing livestock, duels, decapitation of enemy soldiers). However, this is not mentioned by the later chroniclers from the Makarska Franciscan Monastery (Gojak, Antulović). Satanising the opponent and an extremely intolerant stance in general towards the Other (Muslims, non-Catholics, women, and even some 'fellow countrymen') characterises the work by Grabovac. This component is far less emphasised among the other writers, and is almost completely absent in Divnić's writings.

Thematic analysis implies the assumption that the conception and idea of a text does not represent only its author but also, to a certain extent, the values of the community to which he belongs. However, the analysis carried out here indicates that one and the same thematic complex (contemporary wars) in texts by writers from the same religious Order (the Dalmatian Franciscans), written in the period from the second half of the 17th century to the second half of the 18th, can be treated in completely different ways, and that mere chronology cannot provide sufficient explanation for the causes of such differences (Grabovac, Kačić and Gojak were contemporaries!).

#### REFERENCES CITED

- Desnica, Boško. 1950. *Istorija kotarskih uskoka 1646-1684*: Sveska I. "Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda". Treće odeljenje, knjiga XIII. Beograd: SAN. [archive sources]
- Desnica, Boško. 1951. *Istorija kotarskih uskoka 1684-1749*: Sveska II. "Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda". Treće odeljenje, knjiga XIII. Beograd: SAN. [archive sources]
- Difnik [=Divnić], Franjo. 1986. *Povijest Kandijskog rata u Dalmaciji*. Trans. S. Kečkemet & D. Kečkemet. Split: Književni krug.
- Dukić, Davor. 1998. *Figura Protivnika u hrvatskoj povijesnoj epici*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Dukić, Davor. 2002. *Poetike hrvatske epike 18. stoljeća*. Split: Književni krug.

- Eterović, Karlo. 1927. *Fra Filip Grabovac. Buditelj i mučenik narodne misli u prvoj polovici XVIII vij. (Njegov život, rad i stradanje)*. Split. [Reprint from "Nove revije" 1925-1927.]
- Grabovac, Filip. 1951. *Cvit razgovora naroda i jezika iliričkoga aliti rvackoga*. T. Matić, ed. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. [Stari pisci hrvatski 30]
- Grabovac, Josip. 1986. *Ethische und didaktisch-aufklärerische Tendenzen bei Filip Grabovac "Cvit razgovora"*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Kačić, Miošić Andrija. 1942. *Djela*. Knjiga prva: *Razgovor ugodni*. T. Matić, ed. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. [Stari pisci hrvatski XXVII]
- Kavanjin, Jerolim. 1913. *Poviest vandělska bogatoga a nesrećna Epuluna i ubogoga a čestita Lazara (Bogastvo i uboštvo)*. J. Aranza, ed. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. [Stari pisci hrvatski XXII]
- Kečkemet, Duško. 1986. "Franjo Difić i njegova 'Povijest Kandijskog rata u Dalmaciji'". In Franjo Difić: *Povijest Kandijskog rata u Dalmaciji*. Trans. S. Kečkemet & D. Kečkemet. Split: Književni krug, 7-52.
- Matić, Tomo. 1970. "Hrvatski književnici mletačke Dalmacije i život njihova doba". In *Iz hrvatske književne baštine*. Zagreb - Slavonska Požega. Matica hrvatska, 17-211.
- Novak, Grga. 2002. *Prošlost Dalmacije*. Zagreb: Golden marketnig.
- Rapacka, Joanna. 1998. "Popularne kodifikacije domaće tradicije (Iz problema oblikovanja vizije nacionalnog prostora)". In *Zaljubljeni u vilu: studije o hrvatskoj književnosti i kulturi*. Split: Književnim krug, 185-190.
- Soldo, Josip Ante, ed. 1993. *Makarski ljetopisi 17. i 18. stoljeća*. Split: Književni krug.
- Stanojević, Gligor. 1962. *Dalmacija u doba Morejskog rata 1684-1699*. Beograd: Vojno delo.

## SUVREMENI RATOVI U DALMATINSKOJ KNJIŽEVNOJ KULTURI 17. I 18. STOLJEĆA

### SAŽETAK

Polazeći od kulturološke dihotomije ruralna kopnena (morlačka) / gradska priobalna (romansko-slavenska) Dalmacija autor istražuje sličnosti i razlike u prikazu suvremenih mletačko-turskih ratova u djelima dalmatinskih pisaca 17. i 18. st. Analizirani korpus čine: ljetopisi makarskih franjevac (P. Šilobadović, N. Gojak, P. Antulović), djela F. Divnića, J. Kavanjina, F. Grabovca i A. Kačića Miošića, te objavljeni arhivski izvori. Analiza je usredotočena na: mehanizme objašnjenja i kontekstualizacije ratova u Dalmaciji, ocjene pogranične ratne strategije (pljačke i zarobljavanje ljudi) i ratnih običaja (megdani, odsijecanje glava neprijatelja), predodžbu neprijatelja i unutarkršćanske podjele (konfesionalne, društvene i sl.).

F. Divnić je napisao opsežnu i historiografski ambicioznu kroniku važnijih događaja Kandijskoga rata u Dalmaciji, u kontekstu mletačke politike i ukupnih ratnih

zbivanja. Divnić, pripadnik komunalnog dalmatinskog svijeta, ne poklanja previše pozornosti pograničnom ratovanju i njegovim glavnim protagonistima, Morlacima. U njegovu djelu izostaju postupci negativnog vrednovanja Drugih: Turaka, Morlaka i pravoslavaca. Isto vrijedi i za ljetopis P. Šilobadovića namijenjen samostanskom "internom čitanju". On, međutim, heroizira pogranično robljenje (otimanje stoke, zarobljavanje ljudi), a vizuru sužuje samo na lokalne događaje. Šilobadovićeви nastavljajući, N. Gojak i P. Antulović, iskazuju oštar stav prema lokalnoj hajdučiji koja se sadržajno ne razlikuje od pograničnog ratovanja. Njihova vizura nije lokalno skućena (zanimanje za susjedne i udaljenije europske prostore), a granica "dviju Dalmacija" nije posebno istaknuta. J. Kavanjin, još jedan predstavnik priobalne urbane Dalmacije, u golemom, sadržajno raznolikom djelu, *Povijesti vandelskoj*, razmjerno malo prostora posvećuje suvremenim mletačko-turskim ratovima u Dalmaciji. Njegov je odnos prema vlaškom/morlaćkom svijetu ambivalentan: s jedne strane kritičke opservacije nalik onima predstavnika mletačke vlasti u Dalmaciji, s druge protonacionalni osjećaj slavenskog zajedništva i osuda mletačke politike prema Slavenima na istočnoj obali Jadrana. Kavanjinovo političko polazište ipak je ideja svetoga rata protiv Osmanlija. Isto vrijedi i za franjevačkog pisca Filipa Grabovca. U svjetovno-povijesnim dijelovima njegova *Cvita razgovora* tematiziraju se i suvremeni ratovi u Dalmaciji. Njegova je vizura u velikoj mjeri sužena na događaje u kopnenom prostoru, uz slavljenje pograničnog ratovanja. Aksiologija *Cvita razgovora* proizlazi iz radikalno netolerantnog pograničnog mentaliteta s naglašenim sotoniziranjem Drugih: muslimana, pravoslavaca, žena, pa i samih susjeda (Sinjana). Andrija Kačić Miošić u aksiološkom je pogledu Grabovčeva suprotnost; njegov je protuturski stav ublažen ideologemima junaštva i slavenskog zajedništva, iz čega slijedi slavljenje i muslimanskih junaka, te izrazito tolerantan stav prema pravoslavicima. Heroizacija pograničnog ratovanja dobila je u *Razgovoru ugodnom* svoj klasičan poetski oblik (motivi junačkih megdana i odsijecanja turskih glava).

Arhivski izvori (izvještaji mletačkih činovnika u Dalmaciji) upućuju na duboku civilizacijsku granicu koja dijeli romanski i morlački svijet. Stavovi mletačkih vlasti prema Morlacima nisu jedinstveni i ovisе o trenutačnim interesima. Prezir prema pograničnom robljenju i zabrana megdana miješaju se s poticanjem pljačke i paleža na "turskoj zemlji", pravnom regulacijom trgovine ratnim zarobljenicima i nagrađivanjem morlačkih boraca za odsječene turske glave. Nasuprot isticanju nediscipliniranosti, sumnjičavosti, kolebljivosti i lopovskog instinkta morlačkih boraca stoje pohvale njihovoj hrabrosti i izdržljivosti u najtežim ratnim uvjetima.

Ključne riječi: hrvatska književnost 17. i 18. stoljeća, rat, Drugi, granica, Morlaci, Mlećani, Dalmacija