

THE RAGUSAN (DUBROVNIK) REPUBLIC AND THE SPANISH WAR OF SUCCESSION (1701-1714)

MILJENKO FORETIĆ

ABSTRACT: The hostilities between the Ottoman Empire and the Holy League (1683-99) were resolved in 1699 by the signing of the Treaty of Karlovci (Carlowitz), which contributed to the settlement of a number of controversial international issues. These newly-created conditions in Western Europe, known as the Spanish War of Succession (1701-1714), had an impact on the small Republic of Dubrovnik. Balancing itself between opposing powers - France and the Kingdom of Naples on one side, and Austria with the Senj Uscocs on the other - Ragusa's delicate position, if neutral, was often imperilled. Despite being on the very verge of conflict, the Republic managed to maintain its integrity and sovereignty.

After the Treaty of Carlowitz of 1699, The Republic of Dubrovnik was to settle several controversial issues (demarcation with Venice, payment of tribute to Turkey, tax charges within the Ottoman Empire, impost to Austria for the patronage and the resident in Dubrovnik). The survival of the small Republic of Dubrovnik depended also on its ability to cope with the coming

Miljenko Foretić, member of the Institute for Historical Sciences of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Dubrovnik. Address: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, Lapadska obala 6, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia.

A longer version of this article has already been published in Croatian under the following title: »Dubrovačka Republika i rat za španjolsku baštinu 1701-1714.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 31 (1993): pp. 71-117.

circumstances in Western Europe, known as the Spanish War of Succession (1701-1714).¹

Spain found itself in the storm of diverse interests which culminated in the death of the last Habsburg on the Spanish throne, King Charles II in 1700. The new successor to the throne was to be appointed. These dynastic controversies surpassed mere state matters, and aroused great attention in a number of European countries, France and Austria in particular, as they were both directly concerned. With the intention of expelling its old rivals out the Pyrenees Peninsula and in accordance with the King's will, France produced its candidate to the throne, Philip d'Anjou, the grandson of Louis XIV. Supported by its allies, England and the Netherlands, adherents of the policy of European balance of power, Austria considered its claim to the Spanish throne justifiable. The initial skirmishes made for a war which divided the diversely motivated western states into two confronting blocks.

This conflict involved states whose affairs had direct impact on the welfare of Ragusa. Although this south-eastern Adriatic Republic made an effort to remain neutral as in similar previous occasions, this time it was forced to meet the demands of the warring parties. The Adriatic region gained on its geopolitical value and the Republic was faced with unexpected problems. Similar situations had occurred before, each having specific features, as was also the case with European wars throughout the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries. This time more than just pure diplomatic games were in question. The problem was deeply rooted in the Republic's economy and public life. These facts fully justify the prime research of this subject with the intent to distinguish the features constantly recurring throughout the modern history of the Republic of Dubrovnik.²

¹ The bibliography on the subject of the Spanish War of Succession is voluminous. I shall produce only a few titles: Arthur Parnell, *The Spanish War of Succession*. London, 1892; Henry Kamen, *The War of Succession in Spain 1700-15*. Bloomington-London: Indiana University Press, 1969; R. Kohan, *The War of Succession in Spain, 1701-1715*. New York, 1977; Cfr. Arnold Gaedeke, *Die Politik Österreichs in der spanischen Erbfolgefrage*, 2 Bde. Leipzig: Verlag von Dunckler & Humblot, 1877; Arsène Legrelle, *La diplomatie française et la succession d'Espagne*, II-III. Paris: F. Pichon - Libraire du Conseil d'Etat, 1888; for the events at the Adriatic see Heinrich Ritter von Srbik, »Adriapolitik unter Kaiser Leopold I.« *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Geschichtsinstitut* 17 (1947): pp. 610-657.

² For sources pertaining to the attitude of the Republic of Dubrovnik towards the Spanish War of Succession see Vladimir Koščak, »Posljednje razdoblje Dubrovačke Republike.« *Forum* 15/10-11 (1976): pp. 674-675; and Vinko Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808*, II. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1980: pp. 199-200.

In order to convey a better understanding of this important episode in the history of Europe and Dubrovnik, a general survey of the basic facts on the old city and its territory will be presented.

The 1667 earthquake, its consequences and the general political moment determined Ragusa's further life. All social classes, including the nobility, were involved in restoring its vitality in spite of considerable devastation at the end of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries. Although poverty-stricken and directly threatened by powerful states, the Republic managed to save and preserve its independence. Owing to the skill, ability and adequate judgement of its citizens and government, the crisis was surmounted in an utmost pragmatic way.

The international position and treatment of Dubrovnik was directly induced by the great war of the Holy League against Turkey (1683-1699). A number of powerful European states, with which the Republic had various contacts or even adjoining territories, were involved in this conflict. Venice, Ragusa's traditional rival, blockaded its neighbour from land and sea in an attempt to obstruct its commercial intercourse with the Turkish hinterland. Venice's efforts to subdue Dubrovnik and impel it to recognize its sovereignty remained fruitless. So did Venice's intentions to preserve the occupied domains in Herzegovina after the war in order to keep the Republic surrounded. Unable to cope with the new state of world affairs, *Serenissima* insisted on trade links with the East, which had contributed to the gross of its wealth. Its status underwent dramatic changes, and the power of Venice was gradually declining. In such circumstances the Republic of Venice emphasized its *dominium maris* over the Adriatic, and the Dubrovnik Senate had to keep it in mind throughout the eighteenth century. Turkey occupied much an important position in Ragusa's affairs. Hardly had a violent earthquake abated when Dubrovnik was seriously threatened by Turkey, which it neighbored and was tribute-obliged. The Ragusan diplomats masterfully dribbled in order to mitigate growing Turkish aspirations and blackmail. Furthermore, the resourceful senators succeeded in decreasing the exhaustive taxes by 1695 and definitely settling the dispute in 1703 in the form of a triennial tribute instead of the previous annual one. The remainder of the Ragusan colonies in the Balkans saw the complete downfall during the war whereas Bosnia and Herzegovina remained as a potential exporter and importer via the Dubrovnik port. The Republic made an outstanding effort to preserve the leading position of its port on the Adriatic coast from Split to Durrës and to attract Bosnian and

Herzegovinian traders. The Republic fiercely struggled for the monopoly and with a result, despite the hypocrisy of the local Turkish authorities. With the Treaty of Carlowitz, Turkey acquired two enclaves, Neum and Sutorina, as confirmed by the Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718. This act separated the territories of the Republic and Venice in Dalmatia. The Ragusans foresaw the coming changes in the Balkans, the Mediterranean and Western Europe. Still, the general situation and the new historical processes halted progress; in other words, Dubrovnik no longer represented an attractive emporium between the East and the West. Under these new conditions, Dubrovnik turned to Austria, which showed considerable interest in the vast Turkish territories in the Balkans, spreading its impact over the north Adriatic. Deeply impressed by the Austrian victories, the senators were almost convinced that the Habsburgs would acquire Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slavonia and Hungary. Dubrovnik would undergo true transformations and become the mart of the hinterland. Having that in mind, the Republic signed a treaty with the Austrian ruler, German Emperor and Croato-Hungarian King Leopold I, in Vienna in 1684. This agreement factually renewed the 1358 Višegrad agreement on the patronage of the Croato-Hungarian Kingdom and recognition of the supreme protection of the Habsburg monarchy. It was not until the end of the war that the treaty was to be realized, but owing to adverse conditions it never saw its fulfilment. Still, this act remained valid and employed in Ragusan foreign policy of the eighteenth century as it was called upon in numerous critical situations. At the same time, the Republic opened its consulate in Rijeka in 1690, rightfully judging the significance of this town and the region for the well-being of Dubrovnik. Rijeka was soon to become an unavoidable link between Ragusa and Austria.

Direct and close relations with Spain, especially in the course of the sixteenth century with the "Catholic king" supporting Ragusan economy, freedom and independence, with Dubrovnik seamen sailing under the Spanish flag, were almost brought to a standstill toward the close of the eighteenth century. The importance of the Spanish governed Kingdom of Naples for the welfare of Dubrovnik (trade exchange, investments, rents, food import, cereals in particular) required cautious tending.

In the latter part of the seventeenth century, ties between Dubrovnik and France could be characterized as reserved. Antagonistic commercial interests in the Mediterranean, Levant, and the Balkan region aroused conflicts. France was in persistent search of prosperous commercial markets in the

Ottoman Empire with a resultant rise. By opening a consulate in Salonika in 1685 and in other Balkan cities, with the already existing ones in Durrës and Dubrovnik, France worked hard on building up its diplomatic network. France was granted trade privileges in Turkey, with Dubrovnik serving as a convenient transit market. The French insisted on exercising these privileges, considering the Republic an extension of Turkish territory. The Ragusan authorities defended their independent integrity and eliminated French influence in the city itself. During the Spanish War of Succession these conflicts culminated, and they continued so throughout the eighteenth century.³

The foreign affairs of the Republic were cautiously supervised by the state authorities, whereas domestic affairs were subject to scrutinizing control in the post-earthquake period. The supervision was exercised through a number of acts and laws in order to strengthen the organization of the vital segments. A new mercantilistic spirit based on profitable foreign trade was warmly welcomed in Dubrovnik and developed in the best possible manner, keeping pace with other European countries. These acts dealt with fiscal issues, protectionism, state monopoly, a customs and tax system, interventionism, etc. The authorities endeavoured to revitalize the decayed Republic, but the early eighteenth century did not seem to be the appropriate moment for this. Goods in transit were handled by the Dubrovnik port, once the main source of income, which proved to be insufficient. Maritime trade, the most lucrative branch of commerce, suffered a rapid decline, a trend which was speeded up by the earthquake. Europe, flaming in wars and generally unfavourable conditions, had direct and indirect impact on Ragusa's well-being. The govern-

³ Josip Lučić, »Društveni odnosi u Dubrovačkoj Republici od 16. do 19. stoljeća.« In: *Društveni razvoj u Hrvatskoj od 16. do početka 20. stoljeća*, ed. Mirjana Gross, Zagreb: SN Liber, 1981: pp. 153-173; Ilija Mitić, *Konzulati i konzularna služba starog Dubrovnika*. Dubrovnik: Historijski institut JAZU, 1973; Vuk Vinaver, *Turska i Dubrovnik u XVIII veku*. Beograd: SANU, 1960; Ilija Mitić, »Prilog proučavanju odnosa Dubrovnika i Venecije u XVII i XVIII stoljeću.« *Anali Historijskog odjela Centra za znanstveni rad JAZU u Dubrovniku* 13-14 (1976): pp. 117-141; Ilija Mitić, »O političko-ekonomskim vezama između Dubrovačke Republike i Napulja.« *Pomorski zbornik* 7 (1969): pp. 485-505; Miljenko Foretić, »Dubrovnik u vrijeme austrijsko-turskog rata (1736-1739).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti IC JAZU u Dubrovniku* 21 (1985): pp. 39-73; Ivan Krstitelj Švrljuga, »Prinosi k diplomatskim odnošajima Dubrovnika s Francezkom.« *Starine JAZU* 14 (1882): pp. 58-79; Lujo Vojnović, *La Monarchie Française dans l'Adriatique (Histoire des relations de la France avec la République de Raguse 1667-1789)*, Paris-Barcelona: Bloud et Gay, 1917; Mirko Deanović, »Anciens contacts entre la France et Raguse.« *Annales de l'Institut français de Zagreb* 24-25 (1944): pp. 1-39, and 26-27 (1945): pp. 41-110, reprinted in *The Bridge, Journal of Croatian Literature* 3-4 (1992). For recent literature on the subject see Miljenko Foretić, »Historiografija o Dubrovačkoj Republici 1975-1985.« *Historijski zbornik* 43 (1990): pp. 317-363.

ment and the citizens alike were well aware of the actual position of their homeland (its territory, population, geopolitical position, and state of economy, the presence of super powers and their neighbours). This resulted in a highly cautious policy and diplomacy, keeping a jealous eye on its peace and neutrality. Patriotism and solidarity were deeply implanted in all social classes. Whereas powerful European states considered war a convenient means for expanding interests, influence and building up international relations, Dubrovnik saw the very opposite.⁴

I.

The Ragusan government was relatively well-informed of the changes in Spain and Austrian preparations for war. Their consulates obtained detailed information on all the issues required by the senators.

Stunned by the gathered information, the senators expressed their anxiousness about possible repeated conflicts. To ensure their safety and well-being, they kept up voluminous correspondence, sending greetings and condolences whenever and wherever necessary. In 1700 they deeply condoled the Spanish Queen Maria Anna on the occasion of the death of her husband Charles II. In 1701 they did not fail to offer their warmest congratulations to the French King Louis XIV as well as to the new King on the Spanish throne, Philip V. Their kind requests for further protectorship were enclosed, too. However, the senators were willing to launch their special and urgent envoy to Spain, but eventually decided differently. Meanwhile, a boat set out for Naples in great haste, carrying detailed instructions. Dubrovnik strived to protect its own interests and remain loyal to the Spanish crown. The government took considerable interest in international affairs, their eventual impact on the financial policy and Ragusan capital in Naples banks. They expressed

⁴ Dragoljub Živojinović, »Merkantilizam kao privredni sistem Dubrovačke Republike u XVII i XVIII veku.« *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* 14/1-2 (1975): pp. 61-114; Dragoljub Živojinović, »Ideja o bogatstvu i izobilju u merkantilizmu Dubrovačke Republike u XVII i XVIII veku.« *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* 16/1-2 (1977): pp. 39-54; cf. Josip Luetić, *O pomorstvu Dubrovačke Republike u XVIII stoljeću*. Dubrovnik: Pomorski muzej JAZU u Dubrovniku, Građa za pomorsku povijest Dubrovnika 2, 1959; Bogumil Hrabak, »Pola stolecja najnižeg nivoa dubrovačkog brodarstva (1667-1718).« *Acta historico-oeconomica Iugoslaviae* 5 (1978): pp. 115-132; Vuk Vinaver, »Kraj dubrovačke trgovine na Balkanu.« *Istorijski glasnik* 1 (1956): pp. 21-60. Everyday life of this period has not yet been systematically researched. The interaction between political life, economy and public life of Dubrovnik is merely hinted in few partial studies.

their great concern, particularly to the French and Spanish ambassadors appointed to Venice, the diplomatic center of the time. The Republic of Dubrovnik recognized the new set of political conditions together with the changes in Spain, thus giving its support to France.⁵

The aforementioned rulers replied according to protocol, promising Dubrovnik full protection. The response of the French King Louis XIV weighed most with the Ragusans, since their demands applied to him for the previous thirty years had been either refused or left without reply.⁶

That matter could not have been overlooked by the Austrian resident in Dubrovnik, F. Saponara. He criticized the senators for their inconsistency in foreign policy, contradictory actions, stressing the breach of contract with Austria. In Vienna he directly charged Dubrovnik with entering into league with the Habsburgs' enemies. This view was generally accepted by the Austrian ministers and the Court.

In 1701, the Ragusan diplomat Mato L. Pucić was dispatched to the Austrian capital with the mission to embetter the mutual relations, but with an unfortunate outcome. The goal of his mission was to try to diminish the annual 500-ducat tribute-fee and eliminate further presence of the Empire's resident in Dubrovnik. Vienna regarded these intentions as a step toward the usurpation of close relations with Austria and a linking to Spain and France. The Ragusan envoy intervened radically with the Emperor Leopold I and the ministers in denying such false accusations. These misunderstandings were soon to be mediated by the Vatican. In regard to the complaints concerning the somewhat awkward style in the Ragusan address on the occasion of the French candidate succeeding to the Spanish throne, the Viennese Court was fully aware that such actions could not have any true impact on the general

⁵ The Historical Archives of Dubrovnik files a number of documents on the relation between Dubrovnik and the Spanish War of Succession. On government policy in series: *Consilium Rogatorum*, vol. 137-142 (hereafter cited as: *Cons. Rog.*); *Lettere di Ponente*, vol. 42-46; *Lettere di Levante*, vol. 66-68. Ragusan foreign correspondence: *Isprave i akti*, Dopisivanje naših konzula i drugih iz Napulja (18th c.), 130.3197; Dopisivanje Frana Ardia, otpravnika poslova u Napulju (18th c.), 130.3169; Dopisivanje dubrovačkog predstavnika Cremona iz Venecije (18th c.), 77.3166; 165.3220; Pisma Giulia Cesare Pallazuola, agenta iz Beča (18th c.), 60.3099; 61.3100; Dopisivanje konzula na Rijeci Petra Svilokossija (18th c.), 80.3119 and others; Jovan Radonić, *Dubrovačka akta i povelja*, 4/2. Beograd: SKA, 1940: pp. 600-601, 606-610.

⁶ *Isprave i akti*, Razna pisma španjolskih kraljeva i Sicilije na španjolskome (a letter of Philip V), (18th c.), 176. 3287, n. 5; file I (3123), n. 6 (a letter of Louis XIV).

outcome or even upon affairs of lesser importance. The favourable geographical position of Dubrovnik, its port and trade volume could have been taken into account in Habsburg military and economic plans. Due to this, the Ragusan requests to repeal the tribute and recall the resident were eventually approved.⁷ Meanwhile, the Republic was impeached for entering into an alliance with Austria. Their links were evident and recognized by the interested parties. From the spring of 1701 until the beginning of 1702, Dubrovnik received numerous complaints and even threats due to the alleged flocking of ships for Austrian purposes. These statements purport that the Republic's fleet was to have sailed to Croatian ports and Trieste, transporting troops and provisions to the Apennines peninsula, the Po valley and Lombardia, all in concordance with the plans of Prince Eugene of Savoy. The rumour had it that the orders were given by the Austrian Emperor himself and that a special contract was signed by which Dubrovnik was to profit 4,000 ducats. With war operations warming up, rumour also had it that Dubrovnik was to have become an Austrian military harbour and a safe haven for English and Dutch ships in case they sailed into the Adriatic. Another hearsay claimed that Dubrovnik served as an exchange post of secret correspondence between the Austrian Court and their followers in the Kingdom of Naples. Dubrovnik was further accused of collaborating with the Uscoacs from Senj, violating French ships on Austria's behalf and flying the Turkish flag in order to accomplish their purposes more easily. The autumn of 1701 brought astonishing news from private sources that French ships were planning to bomb Dubrovnik. Further mistrust on the part of France was provoked by dispatching an envoy specially appointed by the King to Dubrovnik in 1702, a certain Henric Debland, who had introduced himself as a merchant. His mission was to investigate and verify the presence of Austria in Dubrovnik. Meanwhile, Dubrovnik received repeated complaints for permitting foreign vessels to sail under its flag, Austrian ones in particular. This was true, indeed, with the trade and economy of Dubrovnik experiencing a standstill in the latter part of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, the Republic's government did grant alien ships to fly its flag for a certain compensation. In the

⁷ *Isprave i akti*, Pisma carskoga rezidenta u Dubrovniku Barona de Saponare (18th c.), 3361, n. 3; Pisma Mata L. Pucića iz Beča (18th c.), 180.3336, n. 1-4; *Lettere di Ponente* 42, ff. 144v-145v; Augustin Theiner, *Vetera monumenta Slavorum Meridionalium* II. Zagrabiae: Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, 1875: pp. 237-238.

first years of the Spanish War of Succession such practise could have been the cause of indirect trouble. A considerable number of Ragusan seamen rendered their services to Austria. Their vessels frequently sailed between the Croatian coast and Apulia, furnishing Austria with salt. On their voyages they alternatively flied two flags (Ragusan and Austrian) which gave grounds for disturbance among the Spanish authorities. Incidents were not rare, accompanied by direct accusations for irresponsible actions on behalf of the Ragusan government. The senators, however successfully managed to cloak the factual role of the Republic.⁸

Although Dubrovnik was truly interested in keeping up good relations with every party concerned, the Kingdom of Naples in particular, the senators were still not agitated enough by the said impeachments. They persistantly refused to recognize these false and ill-intended charges. Naples and Venice were the places where Ragusa insisted most upon its loyalty to Spain and France, convincing their agents of their innocence and long established neutrality. The arrival of the new Spanish King Philip V in the Kingdom of Naples in May 1702, which was to be the first step in his survey of Italian territory, prompted the Ragusans to launch an express boat with special instructions for their agent who was to "kneel down" before the monarch, officially exhibiting Ragusan interests in the region. He spoke most highly of Spain as a peacekeeper in Europe, a protector of Ragusan liberty and a voucher of its integrity. He went as far as to declare that "Dubrovnik was a member of the Spanish states."⁹

In spite of all its precautions and skilled diplomacy, the tiny Republic of Dubrovnik found itself between two millstones and on the outskirts of the European battlefield. Its position further worsened with open French hostilities.

⁸ *Isprave i akti* (18th c.), 77. 3116, n. 42-79. passim; 80.3119. n. 178-179; Dopisivanje i izvještaji iz države, 181. 3346, n. 13-20; Archives Nationales, Paris, Affaires étrangères, B1-947, Raguse (1700-1758), n. 21-22; *Lettere di Ponente* 42, passim; *Cons. Rog.* 137, ff. 100v, 103v.

⁹ *Isprave i akti*, Dopisivanje dubrovačkoga konzula Francesca Bonellija u Barletti (18th c.), 3129, n. 15-18; *Lettere di Ponente* 42, ff. 207-208v, 211, 243.

II.

During the Spanish War of Succession, the Adriatic once again became the destination of numerous hostile vessels. The coalition between France and Spain aimed at striking Austria at sea with the prime intention of obstructing its transport of troops to Italy, which proved to be the ultimate goal of the powerful Habsburg Empire. Austrian ports were also endangered. The siege of Rijeka followed in April 1702 and lasted until October. The French fleet bombarded Trieste in August and managed to occupy Aquileia. It even burnt down English merchant vessels in the Venetian lagoon near Malamocco. Similar incidents occurred throughout 1703 and after. The former actions impelled Austria to formulate a fortification plan of the Bakar port, constructing the harbour to serve war purposes as well as building a shipyard in Kraljevica, all of which was partly accomplished.

In the summer of 1702 Ragusan ships were assaulted, too. French corsairs headed by Forbin robbed and set on fire a vessel on voyage from Venice to Dubrovnik. Ragusan subjects were robbed of their money and valuables. One squadron sailing under the Spanish flag acted likewise with a Ragusan vessel shipping the goods of Turkish merchants. These piracies, significant in number, put forward some basic matters of government malfunction. The major demand was to claim a document, a guarantee in writing, from the warring countries, France in particular, which was to grant licence of free passage to the Ragusan merchants and those carrying commodities for the Ragusan market. Dubrovnik persisted in this request, which eventually had a most profitable effect on its economy.¹⁰

¹⁰ Cf. Ch. de la Ronvère, *Histoire de la Marine française*, vol. 6. Paris, 1932: pp. 336-342; Giuseppe Cappelletti, *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia*, vol. 8. Venezia: Antonelli, 1852: pp. 16-19; Roberto Cessi, *La Repubblica di Venezia e il problema Adriatico*. Napoli: ESI, Edizioni scientifiche italiane, 1953: pp. 40-244; Giovanni Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica città di Fiume*. Fiume: E. Mohorich 1896: pp. 207, 208, 287; Giovan Battista Romanini, »Notizie intorno alla guerra della successione spagnuola ed alla ribellione di Francesco Rákóczy.« *Archeografo triestino* n.s. 17/1 (1891): pp. 104-165; Danilo Klen, »Izgradnja ratne luke i brodogradilišta u Kraljevici na početku XVIII stoljeća.« *Pomorski zbornik* 17 (1979); On the visit of Edmond Halley, the famous English astronomer and his surveys of the Imperial ports in the northern Adriatic, see: Alan H. Cook, »An English Astronomer on the Adriatic. Edmond Halley's Survey of 1703 and the Imperial Administration.« *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 38 (1985): pp. 123-162; Alan H. Cook, »Istraživanja u Istri i Dalmaciji na početku rata za španjolsku baštinu.« *Problemi sjevernog Jadrana* 6 (1988): pp. 167-175; Danilo Klen, »Edmond Halley u Bakarskom zaljevu.« *Dometi* 4 (1986); Cf. Ragusan sources: *Isprave i akti*, 77. 3116, n. 62, 65, 107; 3119, n. 27; *Cons. Rog.* 138, f. 4v; *Lettere di Ponente* 42, ff. 221-224 and other.

From April 1703 the local authorities reported on several occasions of presence of vessels of the warring parties in their territorial waters. The Uscocs of Senj were engaged in the Austrian Navy due to lack of domestic forces. They attacked French, Spanish and south Italian vessels. Several incidents of the kind occurred in the waters of the Republic of Dubrovnik, which revolted France. The procedure consisted of seizing the ship and goods, while the crew was set free. The Ragusan government was far from confronting the Uscocs. They stressed their mutual good relations, accepting them as friends and fellow citizens. Moreover, they granted the Uscocs from Senj different privileges and safe harbour. However, Dubrovnik was willing to tolerate their misconduct as long as it did not interfere with the Republic's interests. In order to act cautiously, the government notified Austrian authorities, the captain of Senj, the Duke of Karlovac and Vienna itself that the Uscocs from Senj and the others along the Croatian coast would be given strict orders against harassing Dubrovnik and its subjects and against causing loss and hinderance. Dubrovnik leagued closely with Austria and relied on its support and protectorship. A somewhat lengthy diplomatic mission (1703-1704) performed by Antun Damjan Ohmučević, an artful and experienced emissary with special tasks in Senj, Rijeka, Graz and Vienna, included practical matters as to redeem the forceably arrested Ragusan vessel and goods, and general issues such as the treatment of the Republic of Dubrovnik.

After a wearisome prolonged negotiation with Senj attempted to disclose the conspirational Ragusan deeds taken against them, France and the Kingdom of Naples, the Republic gained another diplomatic victory. On 12 April 1704, Emperor Leopold I himself executed an edict according to which the seized sailing vessel with the goods aboard was to be reclaimed by its owners. By the same edict, it was also ordained that under the threat of the supreme authority everyone caught in the act of disturbing or attacking the citizens of the Republic of Dubrovnik would be seriously punished. Dubrovnik thus enjoyed support from the highest places and the protection concerned both Austrian and Ragusan subjects.¹¹

¹¹ Sources on suits with Senj at the Historical Archives of Dubrovnik are voluminous. Most important are: *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 23 to the end, passim; *Cons. Rog.* 137; from f. 132, passim; *Isprave i akti*, Pisma i izvještaji Antuna Damjana Ohmučevića iz Beča, Graza, Ljubljane i Rijeke, 179.3333, n. 1-45; 60.3099, n. 68-88; *Dopisivanje raznih korenspondenata iz Senja 1704-1788*, 157.3196, n. 29-33; see Marin Lucianović, »Pomorski sukobi oko Lastova i Šolte kao posljedice rata za Španjolsku baštinu.« *Naše more* 17/2 (1970): pp. 82-83.

This, however, did not restrain the Senj Uscocs from continuing with their uncomely conduct and attacks. The whole matter culminated in an another unpleasant episode with the Senj Uscocs sailing into the Dubrovnik port aboard a French tartana captured in the waters off the shore of Corfu. On 24 May 1704, a purchase contract was signed between the captain of the Senj vessels and the commander of the French ship, Antonio Roman of Marseille, to whom the Uscocs sold the boat and the merchandise for the amount of 9,982 Ragusan ducats. Frano Tudišević, a Ragusan nobleman, loaned the sum to the Frenchman. The latter promised to pay off the amount to the Ragusan representatives in Venice up to 9,000 Venetian ducats. If the contract was violated, the ship would come into the creditors' possession. This agreement was most probably witnessed by the French consul in Dubrovnik, the crucial piece of evidence on which the Senate founded its defence later on. This event almost evolved into a disaster for such a small state as Ragusa. It served as a motive, backed up with principal reasons, to charge the Republic with direct involvement in hostile activities against France. The Ragusan government sensed the possible forthcoming peril. The Senate declared that Dubrovnik was left optionless and was forced into the agreement with the Uscocs and the French consul alike. To prove this, the authorities prohibited the purchase of stolen goods. Moreover, this act of prohibition enabled them to preserve the ship and its cargo in favour of the French. As it seems, not only did the arrival of ships from Senj do damage but also caused great harm to the prosperity of the Republic. Similar actions might have been performed by French, Apulian or Spanish vessels. That would have most certainly induce Venice and Turkey to take more serious steps as they already had very frigid relations with Spain. The Turks might then have considered Dubrovnik hostile and would have sought every opportunity to seize Spanish vessels sheltered in the Dubrovnik haven. That would most certainly imperil the independence of Ragusa.¹²

The quoted incident had a favourable but not durable outcome. The Uscocs of Senj continued with their assaults. Naples' ruler gave a serious warning to Dubrovnik of a possible offensive to burn down the city. This was demonstrated by two French vessels sailing close to the Dubrovnik harbour under

¹² *Assemblee e Consolato di Mare* 4/5 (1698-1738), ff. 57-59v; *Diversa de foris* 134, ff. 58v-62v; L. Vojnović, *La Monarchie*: pp. 91-96; J. Luetić, *O pomorstvu*: pp. 11, 141-142; *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 80-84.

the command of Count Sabrano. No matter how unpopular these measures were, they exhibited an ultimatum to Ragusa: in case of any further presence of Senj ships in the Dubrovnik port, open hostilities would be launched against Dubrovnik. By the end of August 1704, Dubrovnik found itself in a most troublesome situation. The intimidated Senate passed several resolutions pertaining to the city's defence. The Senj ships were strictly forbidden admission to the harbour, particularly those with seized cargo aboard. This prohibition included the use of force. Orders were given to strengthen the military units, Ragusan vessels were not permitted to traffic to Italy in the following ten days and were thus compelled to employ alien charters.¹³

The events taking place in the course of the Spanish War of Succession touching Dubrovnik territories, shed light on the most vulnerable spot of the Republic: it was incapable of protecting its own integrity. The entire eighteenth century witnessed incidents of a similar nature, which worsened Ragusa's position even further. In 1751-1752 there arose a conflict on a larger scale between Tripolitan corsairs and Venetian galleys in the very vicinity of the Dubrovnik city-port which Venice had kept blockaded for seven months. This was followed by a demonstrative action taken by a French squadron in the Gruž Bay in 1766, stirred by the dissatisfying position of the French merchants in the Republic. Dubrovnik also experienced great danger from the Russian fleet during the Russian-Turkish war (1768-1774). Ragusa's integrity was also at stake in the period of international political crisis from 1796 to 1797 when Gruž harboured vessels from different countries in search of inappropriate privileges.

The senators obviously sensed the threat from the French superpower with negative effect on their economy and maritime trade. They urgently contacted with their protector Austria, pointing out their delicate international position, their relations with Senj, France and the Kingdom of Naples. The government insisted upon passing a regulation by the order of the Emperor, of special treatment-protection of the Republic of Dubrovnik. The senators also required an act that would bar the Senj Uscocs from sheltering seized vessels in the Dubrovnik port. Their further wrong-doings could provoke the total destruction of the town. On 21 April 1705, the government informed the French monarch in writing, of a matter of utmost importance: the position of

¹³ *Isprave i akti* 130.3169, n. 168, 170, 172; *Cons. Rog.* 139, ff. 64v, 66v, 69, 70v.

the Ragusan fleet on the international scale. With the intention of accomplishing fuller guarantee of safe voyage, the Republic appealed to King Louis XIV for an edict by which all the Ragusan vessels were to be treated amicably and as loyal to the French crown. The Ragusan diplomacy was again at its best. The Commission in charge agreed that all the Dubrovnik vessels should be treated equally as the ones from Venice, Genoa and other neutral states. However, the Commission refused to issue a decree of general free passage for all the ships sailing under the Ragusan flag, hinting possible trade and military misuse which in the years to follow proved justified.¹⁴

Meanwhile, the Ragusan authorities offered more convenient redemption terms to the captain of the French ship pawned in Dubrovnik. Despite mutual compromise, the Venice negotiations between the Dubrovnik and the French representatives showed no signs of progress, only giving way to new misunderstandings. The French persisted in their complaints against the rigorous Dubrovnik customs regulations and damage caused by withholding their goods. The French members departed from Venice with prevailing bitterness. The French were too proud to yield to compromise and the affair came into the open.

The French authority repeatedly accused the Ragusans of their intolerable conduct displayed in collaboration with the Senj Uscocs on the occasion of seizing several French ships, causing damage to the subjects of the French and Spanish crowns. Naples also made serious allegations against the Republic. Unfortunately, the Republic did not succeed in substantiating them in spite of detailed analyses of each incident.¹⁵

The stated affairs inevitably led to a confrontation between the European powers. On 29 August 1705, the French monarch issued an order by which he appointed the Navy admiral Count of Toulouse to consider all the vessels of the Republic of Dubrovnik and those under its flag as hostile. The explanation followed in a nutshell: Dubrovnik violated neutrality, failed to protect French merchant shipping, collaborated with the enemy, the Senj Uscocs and other subjects of the Austrian Crown in particular. Thus the Republic, tributary to the Habsburgs, as quoted in the order, provoked trade losses of French

¹⁴ *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 84v-86v, 102; J. Radonić, *Dubrovačka akta*: pp. 24-25.

¹⁵ *Isprave i akti*, 77.3116, n. 220-224; *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 109v-121, 163-173v; *Diversa de foris* 134, ff. 61-62v.

and Spanish citizens at Levant and the Adriatic. This order enabled the commanders of French war ships, private vessels and corsairs to hijack Ragusan ships, tow them into French ports and treat as seizure. Dubrovnik merchant affairs were to be treated likewise. The Count of Toulouse received the order on 15 September that very year when it was actually brought into effect. According to Ragusan intelligence in Venice, Forbin, the commander of the French ships in the Adriatic was given direct orders to harass the Republic and even bombard the city. The Ragusan government was appalled at the shocking news. Fully aware of the possible outcome, on 31 October 1705 it decided to come forward to King Louis XIV with a humble plea for restoration of protectorship over the Republic. The senators repeated their statements in relation to false charges against the Republic. Coming to hostile terms with France was the most disagreeable fact the Ragusans could bare, much worse than the earthquake itself (1667) whose impact they still felt. The senators stressed their loyalty to the French Court which they readily proved on every occasion.

In regard to unfavourable circumstances troubling Dubrovnik, the government launched a special envoy, a diplomat of experience, Ivan Sarov Bunić, to Venice on 31 October 1705. In the midst of world intelligence and information sources (French and Spanish ambassadors), he could effectively contribute to the resolution of the conflict. Ragusan diplomacy presented its loyalty and fidelity to the French Crown in the so-called memorials, elaborating its attitude towards the Senj Uscocs and Austria. These documents represented a specific declaration of Ragusa's foreign policy which was to refute the rumour putting the Republic on the same side with the enemies of France in this war. The senators stressed the tremendous harm and displeasing effects such an order could cause.¹⁶

Truly, the issued order had dramatic impact on trade, particularly in the Adriatic. The Ragusan envoy to Venice, Bunić, reported of the general talk of the town: letters from Livorno and Genoa were arriving with strict directions to avoid chartering Ragusan vessels or the ones sailing under its flag and even those boarding Ragusan members of the crew. This knowledge soon spread throughout Istria and Poreč. In 1706, the Ragusan consul in Rijeka

¹⁶ J. Radonić, *Dubrovačka akta*: pp. 25-27; *Isprave i akti*, 77.3166, n. 225-227; *Lettere di Ponente* 43, f. 135v.

sent news of a rumour that the French King intended to attack Dubrovnik and turn it into a military training base.¹⁷

With more intelligence gathered from various sources, Dubrovnik realized that this rumour could easily become a fact. According to the archives, few isolated incidents took place. The presence of French sailing ships in the Albanian port of Dürres offered more reason for concern. It was there that a Venetian merchant ship was seized by a special French war vessel with the special task to harassing and seizing Austrian, Ragusan, English and Dutch vessels. The crew of the Venetian ship was accused of collaboration with Ragusa, as the Ragusan flag was found aboard. The French ship *Flying Eagle* performed the special tasks of seizing Ragusan vessels and investigating the possibility of sailing into Lastovo port and disembarking 200 people on that off-shore island of the Republic of Dubrovnik in order to set up a permanent corsair post. Fortunately, it was never realized and the worried senators continued with their industrious diplomatic activities.¹⁸

Among the numerous charges against Dubrovnik was one by the Hungarian hussars, who, led by Eugene of Savoy, deserted the Austrian army and reached Dubrovnik on 1 December 1705. Under the French protectorship, they soon joined Rákóczi's rebels against Austria. In their reference to the French King, the Ragusans were openly accused of animosity towards France which was the reason they harassed Hungarian soldiers.¹⁹

In accordance with the status of an unprotected state, Ragusan diplomacy was by no means partial. It strived hard on protecting its welfare multilaterally, involving states whose interests coincided with theirs. Synchronizing their activities and eyeing sharply foreign affairs, the Senate persisted in reaching

¹⁷ *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 127-152v, passim; *Isprave i akti*, Pisma i izvještaji Ivana Serafina Bunića iz Venecije, 179.3334, n. 1-2; 30.3169, n. 43-44.

¹⁸ *Isprave i akti*: Dopisivanje i izvještaji iz države (1700-1712), 181. 3346, n. 45, 183, 185; *Delta* 24 (1705-1712), f. 37; *Cons. Rog.* 140, ff. 182-185; *Lettere di Levante* 67, ff. 160v-161v; *Letiere di Ponente* 43, ff. 171-172v. On the importance of Dürres, cf. Ch. Gut: »Correspondance des consuls de France: Durazzo 1699-1725, inventaire.« *Bibliographie historique, documentations et informations dans les pays balkaniques* 3 (1978).

¹⁹ *Isprave i akti*, 179.3334, n. 8-10, 13, 17, 19, 21; *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 167-173v, passim; Cf.: »La guerre d'indépendance de Rákóczi et l'Europe.« *Acta historica Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae* 22/3-4 (1976): pp. 332-394; Béla Köpeczi, »La guerre d'indépendance hongroise du début du XVIIIe siècle et l'Europe.« *Nouvelles études hongroises* 12 (1977): pp. 227-237.

a favourable outcome, a possible annulment of the French King's order. In the latter part of 1705 and early 1706, the Ragusan government dispatched numerous requests for mediating, with the accounts proving their justness and jeopardized existence. The addressees were in Naples, Venice, Rome (Vatican), Vienna, Spain etc. The senators insisted on an official document which would licence free passage for their vessels and also a document in writing repealing the hostility edict. They received promises and various instructions on neutral conduct but no lawful document. Venice and Austria were particularly interested in controlling the Adriatic, so they both took precautionary measures.²⁰

The anxiety of an eventual French attack hovered for long over Dubrovnik and with a reason. At the beginning of May 1706, the senators received news of 16 French vessels flocking with an intent to harass the coast of the Republic and its fleet. That very year, in June, a sporadic event disturbed the citizens of Dubrovnik. A French sailing ship was spotted in close vicinity of the city, preceded by a small Venetian vessel in an attempt to drive it off shore. According to witnesses they exchanged fire.²¹

France became more yielding toward the Republic, aware of Ragusa's impartialness and neutrality, which was backed up by positive references of the French consul in Dubrovnik who witnessed the whole event. On 5 May 1706, the French King Louis XIV addressed a note to his agent in Dubrovnik, purporting that the Republic, in case it remained neutral, would again be considered amicable. The Ragusan government was repeatedly warned by its sources abroad, with a special contribution made by the Spanish ambassador to Venice. The senators cautiously notified the Viennese Court of the matter.

As it seems, the Ragusan authorities were not officially notified of the withdrawal of the edict. They contacted various parties in order to acquire accurate information and firm guarantee. The Senate took most serious steps in the Vatican, hoping for the mediation of the nuncio in Paris. Unfortunately, the Republic received no official reply, not even a single letter of consola-

²⁰ *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 106v-173v, passim; *Isprave i akti*, 179. 3334 (Bunić iz Venecije): n. 4-11, 20, 25; 77.3116, n. 196; 130.3169, n. 46-48; 60. 3099, n. 129; *Cons. Rog.* 139, ff. 161v, 173v, 174v, 199, 207; *Razna pisma kraljeva Španjolske i Sicilije*, 176.3287, n. 6; Šime Ljubić, »Poslanice dubrovačke na mltačku republiku.« *Starine JAZU* 15 (1883): pp. 66-67.

²¹ *Isprave i akti*, 179.3334, n. 20, 22, 24; 181. 3346, n. 46.

tion. For this reason, on 12 November 1706, the Senate directly appealed to Louis XIV to revoke officially the previous year's orders. Their effort remained fruitless, only to be supported by a reference of the Navy minister, considered as an act of the suspension of hostilities. The status of Dubrovnik had not been completely lawfully defined and could again be discussed on the agenda of the peace talks at the end of the war, when Ragusa demanded an entry of a separate article, a clause on the neutrality of Dubrovnik.²² The Republic of Dubrovnik succeeded in surmounting the greatest problem. Fortunately, it was not directly involved in war activities but still the winds of war stirred the Republic profoundly.

III.

The sudden offensive on the Kingdom of Naples by Austria in 1707 marked a new step in the war operations with evident consequences. To Europe's great surprise, the Spanish economy in southern Italy saw its downfall fairly quickly. Although quite exhausted by economic mismanagement, having southern Italy under its rule was of vital importance for Austria. The prime objective of the Emperor's policy was accomplished - dominion over the Spanish regions in Italy. This, of course, affected Ragusa's foreign policy and administration. By gaining a better position, Austria was able to take full control of the passage in the Adriatic, thus reducing the danger of French corsairs. Meanwhile, the harassments by Uscocs were almost brought to a halt.²³

The Senate rejoiced at the news of Austrian troops entering Naples and congratulated Joseph I in a most pompous way. The Austrian Emperor respectively accepted the best wishes, vouching protectorship over Dubrovnik. The Republic managed to preserve its safety without any direct threat to the end of the European conflict. There were occasional incidents at sea but for-

²² J. Radonić, *Dubrovačka akta*: pp. 33, 39; *Lettere di Ponente* 43, ff. 182v-224, passim; 44, ff. 1v-4; *Isprave i akti*, 130.3169, n. 48.

²³ Cf. Antonio Di Vittorio, *Gli Austriaci e il Regno di Napoli (1707-1734). Le finanze pubbliche*. Napoli: Giannini, 1968; Antonio Di Vittorio, *Gli Austriaci e il Regno di Napoli (1707-1734). Ideologia e politica di sviluppo*. Napoli: Giannini, 1973; Lino Marini, «Il mezzogiorno d'Italia di fronte a Vienna e a Roma (1707-1734)». *Annuario dell'istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea* 5 (1953): pp. 3-69; Giulio Fancica, «Puglia asburgica (1707-1734)». *Annali della Facoltà di Economia e Commercio della Università di Bari* n.s. 39 (1990): pp. 73-146; Heinrich Benedikt, *Das Königreich Neapel unter Kaiser Karl VI*. Wien-Leipzig: Manz Verlag, 1927.

tunately with no impact on international affairs and economic policy. Ragusa's activity was solely focussed on the embetterment of financial and commercial affairs as well as acquiring a special position in the peace negotiations and agreements. The government continued to take great interest in the development of war operations along the European battlefield through their correspondents, the chief sources of valuable information.

The Republic's principal concern was over regular income from deposits made by charity institutions and individuals in public banks of Naples (*Monti*), their earnings from rents in the former Kingdom (*Arrendamenti*), regular supply of food, particularly wheat and oil and tax reduction.

The state of war and problematic financial affairs obliged the Kingdom of Naples to undertake recovery measures. It issued an act by which all foreign deposits were to be blocked, whereas the export of wheat was limited to the lowest extent. The Ragusan government tolerated such an act nominally, but considered that the Republic had to be excepted of such a rule, being an inseparable part of Spanish and Austrian spheres. The senators forwarded letters to their agents in Naples and Vienna with detailed instructions of how to secure these privileges. Persistent demands resulted satisfactorily. They were granted authentic documents by Emperor Joseph I himself, who recommended to his vice-kings Daun and Grimani (16 May and 21 August 1708) the protection of Ragusan interests at Naples. Confirming loyalty and lasting devotion of the Republic to the Habsburgs, Spain and Naples and its acceptable general conduct, the Austrian pretender to the throne Charles III, later to be the Austrian Emperor Charles VI, also assented to the privileges granted to the Ragusans in Barcelona on 22 September 1709, by ordering vice-king Grimani "to see to the regular endorsement of all the privileges once enjoyed by the Republic of Dubrovnik, considering the honourable politeness and zeal with which the said Republic showed at all occasions related to the accepted protection on behalf of the Royal House," and that "it is my duty, within the protectorship always performed by Kings, my predecessors, to ratify that all the privileges and outcoming profits which the Republic had enjoyed in the past in this Kingdom for special and just reasons should be granted. Such is my will."²⁴

²⁴ Cf. Vinko Ivančević, »Dubrovački novčani polozi u inozemstvu pred pad Republike.« *Anali Historijskog odjela Centra za znanstveni rad JAZU u Dubrovniku* 13-14 (1976): pp. 147-167;

A document such as this was not sufficient for the Naples authorities, which continued to obstruct the realization of the decrees and kept Dubrovnik quite unsatisfied. In the course of settling the relations with Naples, special envoy Christophor Vlajki, set on the voyage on 26 January 1710. His mission was documented with old decrees by Philip III from 1608 and 1623 with various confirmations, including the one by Charles III from 1668. On 25 April 1710, the Ragusan representative was finally issued the document which represented the endorsement of privileges related to currency deposits only. However, the export of wheat failed to increase, although the Republic government worked hard on its rise. Their hopes were somewhat realistic when the new Emperor Charles VI succeeded to the throne after the sudden death of Joseph I in 1711 and the failure of Austrian engagement in war operations in Spain. The Ragusan diplomacy was fully prepared for the dynastic switch. Their representative was received in audience by the Emperor in Vienna, where he was given firm assurance of protection. Privileges in the Kingdom of Naples were numerous: free trade, unobstructed oil and salt supply, exemption from all regular taxes, customs and port duties and getting hold of capital earnings. With the war operations in 1714 and the signed peace agreement, the Naples authorities decided to deliver 500 measures of wheat annually, according to previous contracts. After the peace agreement, the senators demanded compensation for the non-payment of deposit and rent profits during the war. They also demanded that Ragusa be spared of any further taxation and their capital to receive equal treatment as that of Naples, that is, as the subject of the Austrian Empire.²⁵

Antonio Di Vittorio, »Gli investimenti finanziari Ragusei in Italia tra XVI e XVIII secolo.« *Studi in memoria di Federigo Malis* 4 (1978): pp. 309-347, passim; Luigi De Rosa, *Studi sugli Arrendamenti del Regno di Napoli. Aspetti della ricchezza mobiliare nel Mezzogiorno Continentale (1648-1806)*. Napoli: L'Arte Tipografica, 1958; Ilija Mitić, »Prilog proučavanju odnosa Napuljske kraljevine - Kraljevstva dviju Sicilija i Dubrovačke Republike od sredine XVII do početka XIX stoljeća.« *Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 19 (1986): pp. 101-132; *Lettere di Ponente* 44, ff. 45-122, passim; *Isprave i akti*, 130.3169, n. 55-62; 60.3099, n. 167-224, passim; 18th c. file I, n. 240 (a letter of Joseph I); diploma of Charles III from 1709; Dokumenti o odnosima s agenturom i konzulatom dviju Sicilija u Dubrovniku, 164. 3213, n. 3; see Đuro Körbler, »Dubrovačka republika i zapadno evropske države. Veze s Napuljem, Sicilijom, Francuskom i Španjolskom.« *Rad JAZU* 214 (1916): pp. 250-251; J. Radonić, *Dubrovačka akta*: pp. 69-70.

²⁵ On the mission of Vlajki: *Lettere di Ponente* 44, ff. 213v-214v, 217-218, 234v-235, 242, 245; *Isprave i akti*, Dopisivanje Kristofora Vlajkija iz Napulja, 158.3197; Dopisivanje Mata Barabića, dubrovačkog konzula u Napulju, 75.3142, n. 3. On further actions in Naples: *Lettere di Ponente* 45, ff. 6-237, passim; 46, ff. 6-47v; *Isprave i akti* 130.3169, n. 79-99. On the measures

This was much an important issue of the Ragusan fiscal policy, at the time when city restoration funds were founded under the supervision of State treasurers, as well as institutional funds (for churches, monasteries, charity), public services, diplomatic and military funds.

When in 1707 a war expedition was launched against Toulon, the French Navy port and important bastion of French influence in the Mediterranean, it seemed that danger from the French corsairs would completely be eliminated in the Adriatic. Still, a few harassments by French vessels occurred. The Ragusan government undertook several precautionary measures, but was unable to efficiently prevent harassments on its territory, especially its waters. The local authorities informed the central government of the arrival of French vessels into the Adriatic, moreover their sailing in Ragusan territorial waters. The documents illustrate several direct incidents. In 1708, two French tartans flying Genoan flags intercepted and robbed a Ragusan ship on its way from Barletta to home port. This incident took place near Monte S. Angelo. Three years later, the French confiscated the ship of Captain Braili from the island of Lopud including its complete cargo. They stated that the reason for such action was the Captain's origin, Dubrovnik, the enemy of France. In 1712, another French vessel was involved in piracy in the southern waters of the Republic (Bay of Molunat). The Ragusan authorities acted with great precaution upon the repeated incident, learning from the painful past experience. Moreover, there is evidence of cooperation, too. Ragusan agents in Venice and Ancona frequently chartered French vessels for delivery of government mail to Dubrovnik and back. In December of 1707, the corsairs from Ulcinj assaulted a French ship in the Gruž's port. The Ragusans offered aid and managed to overpower the pirates. Two Ragusans were killed as well as one French sailor.²⁶

undertaken in Vienna: *Cons. Rog.* 143, ff. 113v, 117v, 196v, 214v; *Lettere di Ponente* 45, ff. 72-146v, passim; *Isprave i akti*, Pisma G.C. Pallazuola, agenta u Beču, 61.3100, n. 2-48, 61-69; on the privileges: *Lettere di Ponente* 45, ff. 236-237; 46, ff. 1-149v, passim. For salt cf. Antonio Di Vittorio, *Il ruolo del sale nella ripresa economica ragusea del XVIII secolo. u: Sale e saline nell'Adriatico (sec. XV-XX)*, *Atti del Convegno Internazionale*. Napoli: Giannini, 1981: pp. 291-308.

²⁶ *Assemblee e Consolato di Mare* 4/5, ff. 70-73v, 84-88; *Isprave i akti*, Dopisi i izvještaji iz države, 131/3 (18) 3346, n. 38; 181/5 (18) 3346, n.108, 110, 122, 132; *Lettere di Levante* 68, ff. 156v-157.

Factual implications of the termination of war inspired the Ragusan authorities to make every possible effort for a favourable peace agreement, satisfying its own interests and acquiring firm assurance for the future. International agreements between the great European states (treaties in Utrecht in 1713, in Rastatt and Baden in 1714) created fundamentally new relations on the old continent. Spain and its uncrowned colonies were handed over to the Bourbons. Austria compensated this loss by gaining the Spanish Netherlands, whereas the former acquisition of the Kingdom of Naples, Milan and Sardinia (in 1720 it was exchanged for Sicily) was then formally confirmed. Although the circumstances pertaining to Dubrovnik remained unchanged, apart from the Naples Kingdom in the hands of Austria, the senators expressed their deepest concern over the far too general formulation of the agreement between France and Austria with no clear assurance of peace in Dubrovnik. As the 1705 order by the French King on the seizure of the Ragusan ships was never officially derogated, such incidents could have recurred. The senators categorically claimed their faithfulness to the Austrian Crown, devotion to the Emperor as Austrian subjects, pointing out their assistance to the Uscoacs and their supply of information to the Court on all matters. That proved to have been the very cause of French enmity. The Senate insisted that the annex of the peace agreement should contain a clause which would protect the Ragusans from French harassment and attacks of any kind, including the case of Dubrovnik's official assistance to Austrian Emperors. Ships flying the Ragusan flag should be granted full freedom of trade and transport.

These statements comprised the fundamental bases for the prospect of Dubrovnik in those troublesome times and eventual future wars between the European powers. However, these highly optimistic demands of the small Adriatic state devoted to the Habsburgs, could not be met. Anxious senators were consoled with the words of their keen agent in Vienna, Pallazuolo, that from that time on, Austria was the sole protector and patron of Dubrovnik.²⁷

²⁷ *Isprave i akti* (Pallazuolo from Vienna), 61.3100, n. 31-75, passim; *Lettere di Ponente* 46, ff. 78v-81 (of great importance).

IV.

Literature and poetry could not but mirror reality, and war themes were rather common. Numerous accounts elaborated on aspects of the Spanish War of Succession, the balance of political power and justification of official views. Throughout the eighteenth century, it was considered customary to react to political events and writers were not an exception. In England Daniel Defoe (1660-1731), the author of the celebrated *Robinson Crusoe*, published several essays on the Spanish War of Succession. Jonathan Swift (1667-1745) took passionate interest in contemporary events, publishing satirical newspaper articles and brochures on the conflict from 1701-1714. Larger cities of the warring sides and neutral countries saw pamphlets, leaflets and articles specially published for the occasion, reflections on the war in so-called momentous epics.²⁸

Contemporary European literature was present in Dubrovnik as proven from four preserved manuscripts. They defend the thesis of the entirety of the Habsburg territories, aiming against French supremacy with the maintenance of European balance, with special roles performed by England and the Low Countries. These examples display existing interest for key issues among the more sophisticated circles of the Republic. These transcripts were most probably distributed all over Dubrovnik in the form of manuscript copies.²⁹

This war, like many others before it, reflected in the poetical forms and was as such incorporated into Croatian literature. Ragusan poets were also inspired by it and could not remain indifferent, including the ones residing abroad. There are two poems thematically based on the Spanish War of Succession. A poem celebrating the heroism of the Senj Uscocs by the famous Croatian polyhistorian Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652-1713) is *Senjčica aliti djačka od senjskoga na moru junaštva učinjena v misecu sičnju leta tekućega*

²⁸ Carl Ringhoffer, *Die Flugschriften - Literatur zu Beginn des spanischen Erbfolgekriegs*, Wien, 1881; Ernst Kaeber, *Die Idee des europäischen Gleichgewichts in der publizistischen Literatur vom 16. bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin, 1907; Horst Kospach, »Englische Stimmen über Österreich und Prinz Eugen während des spanischen Erbfolgekrieges.« *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 73/1-2 (1965): pp. 39-62.

²⁹ The Library of the Friars Minor in Dubrovnik, manuscripts (in Italian) 1128, 1333; the Library is closed due to the aggression on Dubrovnik (1991-1992) and all the documents were not available.

1704, consisting of 24 sextets. One stanza is dedicated to the Ragusans whom he scorns for offering shelter to the French vessels in the Adriatic. Ivan Vidović, who died in 1721, bishop of Skradin and Trogir, expresses his greatest sympathy for the Habsburgs, Emperor Charles III and his invasion of Spain in an unfinished poem. The Ragusan Latinist, Vice Petrović, in his extensive poem *Carolus VI Romanus imperator electus* (Charles VI, elected Roman Emperor) from 1711, dreams of the reunion between Spain and the Habsburgs. According to his unrealistic artistic prophesy, the newly elected monarch was to become even more celebrated and glorified than Charles V; namely, he expected Charles VI to become Roman Emperor, King of Spain and perhaps France, and to totally defeat the Turks. Petar Kanavelić conceived verse embodying similar best wishes to the Austrian Emperor. This poet from Korčula had close ties with Dubrovnik and composed in the manner of the Ragusan poets. In his extensive epic *Sveti Ivan biskup trogirski*, he elaborates a short survey of contemporary events in Europe, seeing the young ruler as one who unites western and eastern Europe. In the poem *Trstenko pastijer u veselju* (1703), he reflects upon the senselessness of human conflicts-wars, embellishing in the baroque manner. He paid special attention to the Spanish War of Succession, seeing it as potential peril, clouding the old continent. He was specially concerned about "luxurious Italy", "that perivoy of the world", which was swarming with foreign military troops leaving bloody wasteland behind. He appealed for Christian unity, glorifying the peace and harmony of Dubrovnik as an example. Jerolim Kavanjin (1643-1714) of Split shared the same views as his predecessors in his most extensive epic of all Croatian literature, *Poviest vandelska*. Like Orbini, Kavanjin supported the idea of pan-Slavism. Ambitiously attempting to produce a baroque picture of the entire universe, he also described political events. He agitated for peace among the Christians, calling for peace between the Austrian and French monarchs, appealing for the just division of Spain by means of marriage. In the tenth canto of his epic in honour of Dubrovnik and its outstanding personages, he mentions Jere Gundulić, the grandson of the celebrated poet of *Osman* and *Dubravka*. He took part in war operations in Spain, fighting on the Austrian side, in which he was mortally wounded during King Charles's seizure of Barcelona in 1705.³⁰

³⁰ Vitezović's poetic work has been probably first published in 1704. After the edition by August Musić, »Vitezovićeve Senjčica.« *Nastavni vjesnik* 10 (1902): pp. 258-262, critical editions

These examples serve as evidence of political events expressed artistically. Their true literary value has yet to be judged. Themes from everyday life have been common in Croatian literature, starting with Marulić (early sixteenth century), the Renaissance poets and those of manirism, baroque, neoclassicism, and romanticism, as well as writers of the nineteenth and twentieth century up to the present (poetry dealing with the recent war in Croatia). This kind of utilitarian poetry can also be found in European literature. Italian verse of the seventeenth and eighteenth century resembles Croatian poetry the most, influencing Dalmatian poets in particular. Along with anonymous authors, there were great men of letters. Such poetry can be a helpful source in studying historical phenomena.

V.

The Spanish War of Succession was a war over political areas of interest and prestige between powerful states in Europe, which eventually suffered most. This conflict, as presented in the study, affected the Republic of Dubrovnik, whose neutrality and integrity were at stake. Despite these unfavourable conditions and general hostile attitude, Dubrovnik succeeded in preserving its international position owing to its skilful diplomats. The Republic was treated as a non-influential state, expected to follow the general rules of the game and keep to the stated agreements. However, Dubrovnik was occasionally forced into open conflicts which it solved masterfully to its benefit. The eighteenth century brought numerous serious and critical moments upon the Republic. This small state successfully defended its princi-

followed, the latest being in *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti*, vol. 17. Zagreb, 1976; Petar Kolendić, »Jedna pjesma Ivana Vidovića o Španjolskom naslednom ratu.« *Narodna starina* 24 (1930): pp. 461-462. For Petrović, see: Library of the Friars Minor in Dubrovnik, manuscript 244, ff. 168-185; Cf. Đuro Körbler, »Vićentije Petrović Dubrovčanin 1677-1754.« *Rad JAZU* 186 (1911): pp. 212-215. For Kanavelić, see: *Šveti Ivan biskup trogirski i kralj Koloman*. U Osijeku: Troškom Josipa Jurja Strossmayera, 1858; »Trstenko pastijer.« *Zbornik otoka Korčule* 2 (1972): pp. 260-268. Cf. Zlata Bojović, *Barokni pesnik Petar Kanavelić*. Beograd: SANU, 1980. For Kavanjin, see: two editions of the canto, *Bogatstvo i ubožtvo, velepjesan u 30 pjevanjah*. Zagreb: Troškom Josipa Jurja Strossmayera, 1861 and *Poviest vandelska...., Stari pisci hrvatski*, vol. 22, Zagreb: JAZU, 1913; see Tomo Matić, »Jerolim Kavanjin o prilikama svojega doba.« In: *Bulićev zbornik*. Zagreb, 1924: pp. 613-624; cf. the close analysis of the epic by Zoran Kravar, »Povijest vandelska kao umjetničko djelo.« In: *Studije o hrvatskom književnom baroku*, Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske 1975: pp. 7-102.

ple of sovereignty, its capital principle over the centuries. It remained recognized as an active subject of the international community, although not incorporated into international agreements.

The Spanish War of Succession can be considered an example of the embodiment of a variety of features related to the history of Dubrovnik in the post-earthquake period (after 1667). The lack of comparative archival sources affected a somewhat broader research of the problem. Still, the voluminous and detailed sources existing in Dubrovnik, along with available domestic and foreign literature on the subject, enabled a study of this segment of the history of the Republic of Dubrovnik.